

The state of research on Aristotle's *Politics*¹

Thornton Lockwood
Quinnipiac University/Clare Hall, Cambridge
tlockwood@qu.edu / t1580@cam.ac.uk
philpeople.org/profiles/thornton-lockwood

Introduction

Aristotle's *Politics* is a study of the political and social institutions of the 4th C. BCE Mediterranean world, including both Greek communities (like Athens and Sparta) and non-Greek communities (like Persia and Carthage). In some ways it is the first work of political science in the western tradition, one which treats rigorously of the common good, systematic kinds of political institutions, the causes of their stability and instability, and a vision of their ideal types, namely a "best constitution" in which all citizens "do best and live a blessedly happy life" (7.2.1324a2).² The work has influenced political thought since its rediscovery in the 13th C. up through the modern day. The work's extensive references, descriptions, and analysis of ancient Greek and non-Greek political institutions are also a major resource for classists and ancient historians.

Contemporary scholarship on Aristotle's *Politics* has been quite robust: from 2015 until 2021 scholars have produced on average, every year, 4.8 book-length studies (including monographs and edited volumes) and 25.4 journal articles or book chapters.³ This report reviews

¹ A shorter version of this report is forthcoming in C.J. Nederman and G. Bogiaris-Thibault, eds., *Research Handbook on the History of Political Thought*.

² All citations within the chapter refer to Aristotle's *Politics* unless otherwise noted. Aristotle's works are abbreviated as follows: *Nicomachean Ethics* (EN), *Eudemian Ethics* (EE), *Magna Moralia* (MM), *Art of Rhetoric* (Rhet.), *Poetics* (Poet.).

³ For online bibliographies on Aristotle's *Politics* see "Scholarship on Aristotle's Ethical and Political Philosophy (2011–2020) [<https://philpapers.org/rec/LOC SOA>]" and "Scholarship on Aristotle's Ethical and Political Philosophy (2021–) [<https://philpapers.org/rec/LOC SOA-2>]." Oxford Bibliographies Online includes my annotated bibliography on scholarship about the *Politics* prior to 2013 [<https://www.oxfordbibliographies.com/view/document/obo-9780195389661/obo-9780195389661-0159.xml>].

scholarship on the *Politics*, focusing on work produced since 2010. The report first reviews general introductions, editions, and interpretative strategies for understanding the *Politics*. It then reviews major subsections or conceptual issues within the *Politics*. The report concludes with a review of major trends in scholarship and suggestions for future scholarly directions in understanding Aristotle's *Politics*.

1: General treatments of the *Politics*

Readers of Aristotle's *Politics* have a number of general scholarly introductions to pick from, including both chapter-length and monograph-length studies. In the former category, perhaps the best work is Miller (2022), an online encyclopedia article, which provides an overview of the *Politics*, surveys major scholarly problems of the work, and includes a regularly updated bibliography. Pangle (2011), Devereux (2011), Kamtekar (2012), Pellegrin (2012), and Hatzistavrou (2014), and Pangle (2020) are chapter and article-length introductory treatments of the *Politics*. The *Politics* was written during the 4th C. BCE, a period of rapid change due to the Macedonian conquests of Philipp II and his son Alexander. Cartledge (2000) is a chapter-length introduction to the "polis world" of classical Greece and Hansen (1991) and (2006) are monograph-length studies of its 4th C. political institutions; Dietz (2012) surveys major changes to the polis world brought about by the Macedonian conquests during Aristotle's life.

Perhaps the most influential monograph on the *Politics* in the last 50 years is Miller (1995), a work that provides an exhaustive account of Aristotle's theory of justice and (more controversially) a defense of the claim that Aristotle embraced a qualified theory of natural rights. Kraut (2002) is a more general introduction that includes extensive discussion of the place

of justice in Aristotle's ethical treatises. Simpson (1998) is an analytical commentary that reconstructs every single argument in the book. Frank (2005), Garver (2011), Trott (2013), Pangle (2013), Inamura (2015), Johnson (2015), Terrel (2015), and Pellegrin (2017/2020) all examine the *Politics* from beginning to end, but with different methodological frameworks and foci on different questions. Bermon et al. (2011) and (2017), Zehnpfennig (2012), Deslauriers and Destrée (2013), Lockwood and Samaras (2015), Lisi and Curnis (2017), and Bourbon et al. (2019) are edited volumes devoted to the study of the *Politics*.

SCHOLARSHIP REFERRED TO IN THIS SECTION

- Bermon, E., V. Laurand and J. Terrel, eds., 2011. *Politique d'Aristote: famille, régimes, éducation*. Pessac: Presses Universitaires de Bordeaux.
- Bermon, E., V. Laurand, and J. Terrel, eds. 2017. *L'Excellence politique chez Aristote*. Louvain: Peeters.
- Bourbon, M., V. Laurand, and T. Lockwood, eds. 2019 *Aristote Politique VII: La constitution « selon nos vœux »*. *Polis* 36.1.
- Cartledge, P. 2000. "Greek political thought: the historical context." In C. Rowe and M. Schofield, eds., *Greek and Roman Political Thought*. Cambridge, pp. 7–22.
- Deslauriers, M. and P. Destrée, eds. 2013. *The Cambridge Companion to Aristotle's Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Devereux, D. 2011. "Classical Political Philosophy: Plato and Aristotle." In G. Klosko, ed. *The Oxford Handbook of the History of Political Philosophy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 96–119.
- Dietz, M.G. 2012. "Between Polis and Empire: Aristotle's *Politics*." *American Political Science Review* 106: 275–93.
- Frank, J. 2005. *A Democracy of Distinction: Aristotle and the Work of Politics*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Garver, E. 2012. *Aristotle's Politics: Living Well and Living Together*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Hansen, M.H. 1991. *The Athenian democracy in the age of Demosthenes: Structure, principles, and ideology*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Hansen, M.H. 2006. *Polis: An introduction to the ancient Greek city-state*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hatzistavrou, A. 2014. "Aristotle on the Political Life." In J. Warren and F. Sheffield, eds., *The Routledge Companion to Ancient Philosophy*. London: Routledge, pp. 361–376.

- Inamura, K. 2015. *Justice and Reciprocity in Aristotle's Political Philosophy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Johnson, C.N. 2015. *Philosophy and Politics in Aristotle's Politics*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Kamtekar, R. 2012. "Aristotle's Social and Political Philosophy." In G. Gaus and F. D'Agostino, eds., *Routledge Companion to Political and Social Philosophy*. London: Routledge, 14–24.
- Kraut, R. 2002. *Aristotle: Political Philosophy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lisi, F. L. and M. Curnis, eds. 2017. *The harmony of conflict: The Aristotelian foundation of politics*. Sankt Augustin: Academia Verlag.
- Lockwood, T. and T. Samaras, eds. 2015. *Aristotle's Politics: A Critical Guide*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Miller, F.D. 1995. *Nature, Justice, and Rights in Aristotle's Politics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Miller F.D. 2022. "Aristotle's Political Theory", *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Fall 2022 Edition), Edward N. Zalta, ed., URL = <<https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2022/entries/aristotle-politics/>>.
- Pangle, T. 2011. "The Rhetorical Strategy Governing Aristotle's Political Teaching." *Journal of Politics* 73: 84–96.
- Pangle, T. 2013. *Aristotle's Teaching in the Politics*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Pangle, T. 2020. "A Synoptic Introduction to the Ontological Background of Aristotle's Political Theory." *Interpretation* 46: 261–89.
- Pellegrin, P. 2012. "Aristotle's *Politics*." In C. Shields, ed., *The Oxford Handbook of Aristotle*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 558–85.
- Pellegrin, P. 2017. *L'Excellence menacée. Sur la philosophie politique d'Aristote*. Paris: Editions Classiques Garnier.
- Pellegrin, P. 2020. *Endangered Excellent: On the Political Philosophy of Aristotle*, trans. A. Preus. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Simpson, P. 1998. *A Philosophical Commentary on the Politics of Aristotle*, Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Terrel, J. 2015. *La Politique d' Aristote. La démocratie à l'épreuve de la division sociale*. Paris : J. Vrin.
- Trott, A.M. 2013. *Aristotle on the Nature of Community*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Zehnpfennig, B., ed. 2012. *Die "Politik" des Aristoteles*. Baden-Baden: Nomos.

2: Editions of the *Politics*

There exist numerous editions of Aristotle's *Politics*, including critical Greek texts and translations into modern European languages. Ross (1957) and Dreizehnter (1970) are standard Greek critical texts. Over the last decade, Italian scholars have produced a six-volume edition of the *Politics*

that includes a critical Greek edition, Italian translation, and commentary on each of the individual books (see Curnis et al. (2011), (2012), (2013), (2014), (2016), and (2022)). Prominent recent translations of the *Politics* into modern languages include Stalley (2009), Sachs (2012), Lord (2013), Pellegrin (2015), and Reeve (2017). Reeve (2017) is especially useful insofar as it includes indices, extensive notes, and a glossary of Aristotle's main terms (including references to their uses in the text). Stalley (2009) is a revision of Ernest Barker's translation, which was standard through most of the 20th C. The Clarendon Aristotle Series includes four volumes on the *Politics* that include both translation and commentary for non-Greek readers: Saunders (1995) covers *Politics* 1–2, Robinson (1995) covers *Politics* 3–4, Keyt (1999) covers *Politics* 5–6, and Kraut (1997) covers *Politics* 7–8. Lintott (2017) provides a historical commentary on *Politics* 5–6. Newman (1887–1902), Susemihl and Hicks (1894), Aubonnet (1960–1989), and Schütrumpf (1991–2005) are comprehensive scholarly commentaries that include comments on individual passages and essays addressing major themes in the book. Lockwood (2013) is an annotated bibliography of scholarship on the *Politics* prior to 2013.

SCHOLARSHIP REFERRED TO IN THIS SECTION

Aubonnet, J. 1960–1989. *Aristote: Politique*. 3 vols. Paris: Budé.

Curnis, M. and G. Besso, eds. 2011. *Aristotele, La politica, Libro I*. Rome: L'Erma di Bretschneider.

Curnis, M. and F. Pezzoli, eds. 2012. *Aristotele, La politica, Libro II*. Rome: L'Erma di Bretschneider.

Curnis, M. and P. Accattino, eds. 2013. *Aristotele, La politica, Libro III*. Rome: L'Erma di Bretschneider.

Curnis, M. B. Guaglium, P. Accattino, F. Pezzoli, G. Besso, and M. Canevaro, eds. 2014. *Aristotele, La politica, Libro IV*. Rome: L'Erma di Bretschneider.

Curnis, M., M.E. De Luna, and C. Zizza, eds. 2016. *Aristotele, La politica, Libro V–VI*. Rome: L'Erma di Bretschneider.

Curnis, M., L. Bertelli, and M. Canevaro, eds. 2022. *Aristotele, La politica, Libro VII–VIII*. Rome: L'Erma di Bretschneider.

Dreizehnter, A. 1970. *Aristoteles' Politik*. Munich: Wilhelm Fink.

- Keyt, D. 1999. *Aristotle: Politics: Books V and VI*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Kraut, R. 1997. *Aristotle: Politics: Books VII and VIII*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Lintott, A.W. 2017. *Aristotle's political philosophy in its historical contexts: a new translation and commentary on Politics books 5 and 6*. New York: Routledge.
- Lockwood, T. 2013. "Aristotle's *Politics*." *Oxford Bibliographies in Classics*. Ed. D. Clayman. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Lord, C. 2013. *Aristotle's Politics*, 2nd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Newman, W. L. 1887–1902. *The Politics of Aristotle*. 4 vols. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press.
- Pellegrin, P. 2015. *Les Politiques*, 2nd ed. Paris: Flammarion.
- Reeve, C.D.C. 2017. *Aristotle Politics*. A New Translation. Indianapolis: Hackett.
- Robinson, R. 1995. *Aristotle: Politics Books III and IV*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Ross, W.D. 1957. *Aristotelis Politica*. Oxford: Oxford Classical Texts.
- Sachs, J. 2012. *Aristotle Politics*. Focus.
- Stalley, R.F. 2009. *Aristotle Politics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Saunders, T. J. 1995. *Aristotle: Politics Books I and II*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Schütrumpf, E. 1991–2005. *Aristoteles Politik*. 4 vols. Berlin and Darmstadt: Akademie-Verlag.
- Susemihl, F., and R.D. Hicks. (1894) *The Politics of Aristotle, Books I–V: A revised text*. New York: Arno Press.

3: Interpretative Strategies for Reading the *Politics*

In Anglophone scholarship, the *Politics* has been explored by a plurality of disciplinary perspectives, some of which have significant and even controversial methodological presuppositions. Broadly construed (and with significant potential for overlap), four interpretative perspectives dominate 20th- and 21st-century Anglophone scholarship: historically contextualized readings, developmental readings, analytical reconstructions and/or expositions, and philosophical readings influenced by the hermeneutical ideas of Leo Strauss. Historically contextualized approaches seek to understand the *Politics* in a historical-critical fashion sensitive to the philological and historical context of 4th-century Greece; less important to such an approach is determining the philosophical truth of Aristotle's claims or their relevance for contemporary debates (good examples of this methodology include Cartledge (2009) or Dietz

(2012)). Although currently somewhat out of favor, developmental readings seek to explain discontinuities within the text as the result of its composition at different times in Aristotle's life; thus, sections of the *Politics* could be the result of an "early" Aristotle but other sections may reflect his "late" or more mature thinking (a good example of this methodology is Jaeger (1948)). Analytical reconstructions seek to extract a coherent philosophical position which is sensitive to Aristotle's text but is oriented toward contemporary concerns (good examples of this methodology include Duke (2020) or Brill (2020)). Straussian readings begin from the principle that although political philosophy concerns perennial questions, its articulation needs to be sensitive to its audience; thus, astute political philosophers may speak to multiple audiences simultaneously (and perhaps inconsistently on purpose) within the same text (good examples of this methodology include Strauss (1978) or Pangle (2013)). At the risk of disciplinary overgeneralization, historically contextualized and developmental approaches predominate in the disciplines of classics and ancient history, analytical reconstructions predominate within the discipline of philosophy, and Straussian readings predominate within the disciplines of political science or government.

SCHOLARSHIP REFERRED TO IN THIS SECTION

Brill, S. 2020. *Aristotle on the concept of shared life*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Cartledge, P. 2009. *Ancient Greek Political Thought in Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dietz, M.G. 2012. "Between Polis and Empire: Aristotle's *Politics*." *American Political Science Review* 106: 275–93.

Duke, G. 2020. *Aristotle and Law. The Politics of Nomos*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Jaeger, W. 1948. "The original *Politics*." In his *Aristotle: Fundamentals of the history of his development*. 2d ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 259–292.

Pangle, T. 2013. *Aristotle's Teaching in the Politics*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Strauss, L. 1978. "On Aristotle's *Politics*." In his *The City and Man*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, pp. 13–49.

4: The relationship between Aristotle's *Politics* and *Nicomachean Ethics*

Clearly, Aristotle believes there is a close relationship between his *Nicomachean Ethics* (*EN*) and the *Politics*: the final chapter of the *EN* explicitly states that the two works are a kind of diptych or two-volume study of the "philosophy of human things" (*EN* 10.9.1181b15). Furthermore, the *Politics* explicitly refers to the "ethical treatises" in numerous places⁴ and the introduction of the *EN* explicitly notes that the contents of that work are a "kind of political science" (*EN* 1.2.1094b10–11). As Bodéüs (1993) noted long ago, *EN* appears to have as its audience statesmen and legislators who are responsible for crafting laws and fashioning education in their political communities. (For discussion of the significance of Bodéüs' work, see Lockwood (2020)). But Vander Waerdt (1985) and (1991) also pointed out long ago that, whereas *EN* abstracts almost entirely from the different kinds of constitutions described in the *Politics*, nonetheless the *Politics* explicitly states that laws and education must be tailored to specific constitution types (3.11.1282b10, 4.1.1289a11–17). Thus, the relationship between the *Politics* and the *Nicomachean Ethics* is an important, but somewhat perplexing one.

In his magisterial commentary on the *Politics*, Newman (1887) includes an extended essay that identifies a number of different ways of characterizing the relationship between the *Politics*

⁴ The *Politics* refers to the "ethical logoi" a half dozen times. Several passages rather clearly refer to book 5 of the *Nicomachean Ethics*, but that book is common to both the *Nicomachean* and *Eudemian* treatises (see 2.2.126aa31, 3.9.1280a18, 3.12.1282b19). But other references may fit better with the *Eudemian* treatise, which is pluralistic about the highest good (see, e.g., 7.13.1332a8, 7.13.1332a21; cf. 4.11.1295a36).

and Aristotle's ethical works. Schofield (2006), Depew (2009), Frede (2013) and (2019), and Stricker (2022) are more recent examinations of the intersection between the two works. Cohen de Lara and Brouwer (2017) is an edited volume devoted to the interconnections between politics and ethics. In book 6 of Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics*, Aristotle discusses the relationship between practical wisdom and the knowledge of the statesman: Lautner (2013), Nielsen (2015), Sebell (2016), Reeve (2018), Jagannathan (2019), and Kontos (2021), and Duke (2021); see also Cashen (2016). Chen (2018) and (2019) and Jimenez (2021) explore the connection between moral habituation or education in general and its discussion in the *Politics*. offers extended reflection on the nature of the anthropological sociability involved in Aristotle's "philosophy of human things."

SCHOLARSHIP REFERRED TO IN THIS SECTION

- Bodéüs, R. 1993. *The political dimensions of Aristotle's Ethics*. Translated by Jan Edward Garrett. Albany: State Univ. of New York Press.
- Cashen, M. 2016. "Aristotle on External Goods: Applying the *Politics* to the *Nicomachean Ethics*." *History of Philosophy Quarterly* 33: 293–303.
- Chen, S. 2018. "Two Aspects of Moral Habituation in Aristotle's Practical Science." *Rhizomata* 6: 213–31.
- Chen, S. 2019. "The Stages of Moral Education in Aristotle's *Ethics* and *Politics*." *Rhizomata* 7: 97–118.
- Cohen de Lara, E., and R. Brouwer, eds. 2017. *Aristotle's Practical Philosophy. On the Relationship between his Ethics and Politics*. Berlin: Springer.
- Depew, D.J. 2009. "The Ethics of Aristotle's *Politics*." In R. Balot, ed., *A Companion to Greek and Roman Political Thought*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, pp. 399–418.
- Duke, G. 2021. "The Aristotelian Legislator and Political Naturalism." *Classical Quarterly* 70: 620–638.
- Frede, D. 2013. "The Political Character of Aristotle's *Ethics*." In Deslauriers, M. and P. Destrée, eds. *The Cambridge Companion to Aristotle's Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 14–37.
- Frede, D. 2019. "The Deficiency of Human Nature: The Task of a 'Philosophy of Human Affairs.'" In G. Keil and N. Kreft, eds., *Aristotle's Anthropology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 258–74.

- Jagannathan, D. 2019. "Every Man a Legislator: Aristotle on Political Wisdom." *Apeiron* 52: 395–414.
- Jimenez, M. 2021. *Aristotle on Shame and Learning to Be Good*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kontos, P. 2021. *Aristotle on the Scope of Practical Reason: Spectators, Legislators, Hopes, and Evils*. New York: Routledge.
- Lautner, P. 2013. "Political phronesis." *Magyar Filozófiai Szemle* 57: 24–33.
- Lockwood, T. 2020. "ὁμόνοια: The Hinge of Aristotle's *Ethics* and *Politics*?" *Dialogue: Canadian Philosophical Review/Revue canadienne de philosophie* 59: 7–30.
- Newman, W.L. 1887. "Appendix A: On the relation of the teaching of the *Nicomachean Ethics* to that of the *Politics*." In his *The Politics of Aristotle* (Oxford: Clarendon), Vol. 2, pp. 385–400.
- Nielsen, K.M. 2015. "Aristotle on Principles in Ethics. Political Science as the Science of the Human Good." In D. Henry and K.M. Nielsen, eds., *Bridging the Gap Between Aristotle's Science and Ethics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 29–48.
- Reeve, C.D.C. 2018. "Practical Wisdom and Happiness as a Political Achievement in Aristotle." In A. Anton, ed., *The Bright and the Good*. Latham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield, 49–76.
- Schofield, M. 2006. "Aristotle's political ethics." In R. Kraut, ed., *The Blackwell guide to Aristotle's Nicomachean Ethics*. Malden, MA: Blackwell, pp. 305–322.
- Sebell, D. 2016. "The Problem of Political Science: Political Relevance and Scientific Rigor in Aristotle's 'Philosophy of Human Affairs.'" *American Journal of Political Science* 60: 85–96.
- Striker, G. 2022. "Aristotle's ethics as political science." In her *From Aristotle to Cicero: Essays on Ancient Philosophy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 128–141.
- Vander Waerdt, P.A. 1985. "The political intention of Aristotle's moral philosophy." *Ancient Philosophy* 5:77–89.
- Vander Waerdt, P.A. 1991. "The Plan and Intention of Aristotle's Ethical and Political Writings." *Illinois Classical Studies* 16: 231–251.

5: Nature and biology in the *Politics*

Aristotle claims that the *polis* (that is, the "city-state" or the predominant political organization of classical Greece) exists by nature and that humans are "political animals" (1.2.1252b30, 1253a3); subsequent passages speak about natural subordination, like that of the "slave by nature" and women and children more generally (1.4.1254a15–18, 1.13.1260a9–14). Schofield (1999a) and Deslauriers (2006) show unequivocally that the main argument of *Politics* 1 is the refutation of an apparently Socratic claim (found in Plato's *Statesman* and Xenophon's *Memorabilia*, on which see Cherry (2012) and Depew (2019)) that rule over slaves is qualitatively

the same as rule over a city; rather, *Politics* I shows that rule takes different forms in the household (for instance, between husband and wife, between parents and children, between master and slave) and in the political community (see further Riesbeck (2015)). What scholars sometimes call “Aristotle’s naturalism” needs to be understood within the context of that refutation; that the polis exists by nature is not an independent thesis which Aristotle seeks to demonstrate. Nor does Aristotle ever articulate a doctrine by that name; “naturalism” is the name of a doctrine ascribed to Aristotle (unlike, say, his account of the best constitution, which is an object of inquiry that Aristotle repeatedly refers to). Nonetheless, literature on “Aristotelian naturalism” is massive. Chappell (2013), Pellegrin (2015) and (2017), Berryman (2019), Berrón (2020) and several of the chapters in Adamson and Rapp (2021) are recent studies that explore the claim that the city-state exists by nature (which are listed individually below); Ober (2015), Pellegrin (2015), Depew (2019), Chen (2018), Leunissen (2017a), Hu (2020), and Rapp (2021) are articles and chapters that examine the same. Güremen and Jaulin (2017) is an edited volume on the claim that humans are political animals (individual chapters of which are listed below); Ober (2013b), Abbate (2016), Labarrière (2016), Vegetti (2016), Labarrière (2017), Kirkland (2017), Güremen (2018), Karbowski (2019), Langmeier (2019), and Simon (2020) are articles that explore the same.

Although Aristotle scholars have appreciated that humans are not the only political animals, a challenge is that Aristotle uses the term “political animals” to mean different things both within and outside of the *Politics*. Being “political” may consist in exhibiting sociability and cooperation and/or sharing in common goals and communication. Over the last decade,

scholarship on the intersection between the *Politics* and Aristotle's writings on nature has grown robustly. Leunissen (2017b) is a landmark work in this framework because it seeks to understand ethical and political concepts on the basis of principles of natural causation and teleology described in Aristotle's natural scientific works. Trott (2013) and Brill (2020) explore Aristotle's *Politics* drawing upon the similarities between humans and other non-human animals and Cagnoli Fiecconi (2021) provides a chapter-length overview of politics and biology. Weber (2015) examines notions of authority and rulership in the household and the political community. The question of Aristotle's view of natural sexual subordination has received an especially robust examination that draws upon Aristotle's biology of sexual difference: Connell (2021) and Deslauriers (2022) are recent book-length studies of sexual inequality; Karbowski (2012), Veloso (2013), Karbowski (2014), Nielsen (2015), Yates (2015), Fortenbaugh (2015), Samaras (2016), Sissa (2018) and Lienemann (2021) are article-length studies of the same.

SCHOLARSHIP REFERRED TO IN THIS SECTION

Abbate, C. 2018. "Redefining Nonhuman Justice in Complex Animal Communities: A Response to Jacobs." *Journal of Animal Ethics* 8: 159–165.

Adamson, P. and C. Rapp, eds. 2021. *State and Nature. Studies in Ancient and Medieval Philosophy*. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Berrón, M. 2020. "Aristotle's *Politics* I and the Method of the *Analytics*." *Rhizomata* 8: 83–106.

Berryman, S. 2019. *Aristotle on the Sources of the Ethical Life*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Brill, S. 2020. *Aristotle on the concept of shared life*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Cagnoli Fiecconi, E. 2021. "Elements of Biology in Aristotle's Political Science." In S. Connell, ed., *Cambridge Companion to Aristotle's Biology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 211–227.

Chappell, T. 2013. "'Naturalism' in Aristotle's Political Philosophy." In R. Balot, ed., *A Companion to Greek and Roman Political Thought*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, pp. 382–398.

Chen, S. 2018b. "Aristotle on the Sense of Nature and the Naturalness of the City." *Mnemosyne* 71: 993–1014.

Cherry, K. M. 2012. *Plato, Aristotle and the purpose of politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Connell, S. 2021. *Aristotle on Women. Physiology, Psychology, and Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Depew, D. 2019. "Political Animals and the Genealogy of the Polis: Aristotle's Politics and Plato's Statesman." In G. Keil and N. Kreft, eds., *Aristotle's Anthropology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 238–57.
- Deslauriers, M. 2006. "The argument of Aristotle's Politics 1." *Phoenix* 60:48–69.
- Deslauriers, M. 2022. *Aristotle on Sexual Difference. Metaphysics, Biology, Politics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fortenbaugh, W.W. 2015. "Aristotle on Women: *Politics* i 13.1260a13." *Ancient Philosophy* 35: 395–404.
- Güremen, R. 2018. "In What Sense Exactly are Human Beings More Political According to Aristotle?" *Philosophy and Society* 29: 153–181.
- Güremen, R. and A. Jaulin, eds. 2017. *Aristote, l'animal politique*. Paris: Publications de la Sorbonne.
- Hu, X. 2020. "The City as a Living Organism: Aristotle's Naturalness Thesis Reconsidered." *History of Political Thought* 41: 517–537.
- Jaulin, A. 2017. "La nature de l'animal politique humain selon Aristote." In R. Güremen and A. Jaulin, eds., *Aristote, l'animal politique*. Paris: Publications de la Sorbonne, pp. 89–107.
- Karbowski, J. 2012. "Slaves, Women, and Aristotle's Natural Teleology." *Ancient Philosophy* 32: 323–50.
- Karbowski, J. 2014. "Aristotle on the Deliberative Abilities of Women." *Apeiron* 47: 435–460.
- Karbowski, J. 2019. "Political Animals and Human Nature in Aristotle's *Politics*." In G. Keil and N. Kreft, eds., *Aristotle's Anthropology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 221–37.
- Kirkland, S.D. 2017. "On the Ontological Primacy of Relationality in Aristotle's Politics and the 'Birth' of the Political Animal." *Epoché* 21: 401–420.
- Knoll, M. 2017. "Aristotle's Arguments for his Political Anthropology and the Natural Existence of the Polis." In R. Güremen and A. Jaulin, eds., *Aristote, l'animal politique*. Paris: Publications de la Sorbonne, pp. 31–57.
- Labarrière, J.-L. 2016. "Que fait la nature en politique selon Aristote? Retour sur la définition de l'homme comme 'animal politique par nature.'" *Revue de la philosophie ancienne* 34: 141–160.
- Labarrière, J.-L. 2017. "L'homme apolitique : pessaia, polis et apolis—*Pol.* I, 2, 1253a1–7. » In E. Bermon, V. Laurand, and J. Terrel, eds., *L'Excellence politique chez Aristote*. Louvain: Peeters, pp. 51–84.
- Langmeier, B. 2019. "Der Mensch als das ruchloseste und wildeste Tier. Zum Menschenbild in der Politik des Aristoteles." In C. Riedweg, ed., *Philosophie für die Polis. Akten des 5. Kongresses der Gesellschaft für antike Philosophie 2016*. Berlin: De Gruyter, pp. 331–354.
- Lefebvre, D. 2017. "Vivre et bien vivre." In R. Güremen and A. Jaulin, eds., *Aristote, l'animal politique*. Paris: Publications de la Sorbonne, pp. 59–88.

- Leunissen, M. 2017a. "Biology and Teleology in Aristotle's Account of the City." In J. Rocca, ed., *Teleology in the Ancient World: The Dispensation of Nature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 107–125.
- Leunissen, M. 2017b. *From Natural Character to Moral Virtue in Aristotle*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lienemann, B. 2021. "Aristotle on the Rationality of Women: Consequences for Virtue and Practical Accountability." In P. Adamson and C. Rapp, eds., *State and Nature. Studies in Ancient and Medieval Philosophy*. Berlin: De Gruyter, pp. 135–158.
- Morel, P.-M. 2017. "Animal politique, animal pratique." In R. Güremen and A. Jaulin, eds., *Aristote, l'animal politique*. Paris: Publications de la Sorbonne, pp. 109–120.
- Morrison, D. 2017. "Aristotle and the Happiness of the City." In E. Bermon, V. Laurand, and J. Terrel, eds., *L'Excellence politique chez Aristote*. Louvain: Peeters, pp. 11–24.
- Nielsen, K.M. 2015. "The Constitution of the Soul: Aristotle on Lack of Deliberative Authority." *Classical Quarterly* 65: 572–586.
- Ober, J. 2013b. "Political Animals Revisited." *Good Society* 22:201–214.
- Ober, J. 2015. "Nature, History, and Aristotle's Best Possible Regime." In T. Lockwood and T. Samaras, eds., *Aristotle's Politics: A Critical Guide*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 224–43.
- Pellegrin, P. 2015. "Is Politics a Natural Science?" In T. Lockwood and T. Samaras, eds., *Aristotle's Politics: A Critical Guide*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 27–45.
- Pellegrin, P. 2017. "Y a-t-il une sociobiologie aristotélicienne?" In R. Güremen and A. Jaulin, eds., *Aristote, l'animal politique*. Paris: Publications de la Sorbonne, pp. 13–33.
- Rapp, C. 2021. "Whose State? Whose Nature? How Aristotle's Polis is 'Natural.'" In P. Adamson and C. Rapp, eds., *State and Nature. Studies in Ancient and Medieval Philosophy*. Berlin: De Gruyter, pp. 81–118.
- Riesbeck, D.J. 2015. "Aristotle on the Politics of Marriage: 'Marital Rule' in the Politics." *Classical Quarterly* 65: 134–152.
- Samaras, T. 2016. "Aristotle on Gender in *Politics* I." *History of Political Thought* 37: 595–605.
- Schofield, M. 1999. "Ideology and Philosophy in Aristotle's Theory of Slavery." In his *Saving the City: Philosopher-Kings and other Classical Paradigms*. London: Routledge, pp. 101–124.
- Simon, A. 2020. "Man and Other Political Animals in Aristotle." In Z. Kulcsár-Szabó, T. Lénárt, A. Simon, and R. Vegso, eds., *Life After Literature. Perspectives on Biopoetics in Literature and Theory*. Basel: Springer Nature, 55–66.
- Sissa, G. 2018. "Bulls and Deer, Women and Warriors. Aristotle's Physics of Morals." In M. Formisano and C. Kraus, eds., *Marginality, Canonicity, Passion*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 141–176.
- Trott, A.M. 2013. *Aristotle on the Nature of Community*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Vegetti, M. 2016. "L'animale politico e i suoi rivali : Aristotele e il conflitto delle antropologie." In A. Havlíček, C. Horn, and J. Jinek, eds., *Nous, Polis, Nomos. Festschrift Francisco L. Lisi*. Sankt Augustin: Academia Verlag, pp. 229–238.

Veloso, C.W. 2013. "Aristote, ses commentateurs et les déficiences délibératives de l'esclave et de la femme." *Les Études philosophiques* 4: 513–534.

Weber, S. 2015. *Herrschaft und Recht bei Aristoteles*. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Yates, V.L. 2015. "Biology is Destiny: The Deficiencies of Women in Aristotle's Biology and Politics." *Arethusa* 48: 1–16.

6: Slavery, the economy, and the household in the *Politics*

Although Aristotle wrote extensively on the subject of *oikonomica* (including a whole separate treatise, on which see Valente (2011) and Helmer (2021)), at least since Polanyi (1957) and Finley (1970), scholars have debated whether he has a notion of "economy" (for further historical discussion, see Miller (2011)). The paradox stems from the fact that *oikonomica* means "the objects of the science of household management," namely how a citizen-farmer should best improve the members of his household (such as his wife, children, and slaves) and utilize his household property (such as arable land and raw materials for clothing and food production). Aristotle devotes most of *Politics* 1—including discussions of money-making, charging interest, and slavery—to the discussion of household management and its relationship to the city-state. But for Aristotle, "economic concepts" are normative: The *Politics* presents an extended argument against "unnatural forms of acquisition," namely making money through charging interest in lending. Thus, how those concepts relate to what today we call "the economy" (the societal domain concerned with the production and consumption of goods and the supply of money) is hard to answer and potentially anachronistic. Meikle (1995) is a landmark book-length study of economics in Aristotle's thought; Nagle (2006) Helmer (2021) are the equivalent for the household. Crespo (2014) and Gallagher (2018) are more recent monographs on economics; recent article-length studies include Mei (2009), Inamura (2011), Nielsen (2013), Dinneen (2015),

and Riesbeck (2015). Recent discussions of family relations within the household include Veloso (2011), Wilgaux (2011), and Schmitz (2017).

One of Aristotle's most controversial claims is that there exist humans who are "slaves by nature" for whom slavery is ultimately beneficial. At the same time, Aristotle's defense of the "slave by nature" seems to imply that he is critical of the majority of slave-holding practices in classical Greece (since few of the slaves at that time fit the characteristics of Aristotle's "slave by nature"). Scholars have wondered whether Aristotle's account of slavery is either an internally coherent philosophy or an incoherent ideology that seeks to justify the slave-holding practices of Aristotle's time (including, apparently, his own slaves). Schofield (1999) (followed by Lockwood (2007)) sought to clear Aristotle of criticisms of ideology and incoherence, but not of repugnant moral inequality and Aristotle's failure to recognize the moral personhood of all humans. The subject continues to generate a robust discussion, including Karbowski (2012), Karbowski (2013), Pellegrin (2013), Kamtekar (2016), Trott (2017), Christiaens (2018), Nah (2018), Fritsche (2019), and Bhorat (2022). Cherry (2014), Monteils-Laeng (2019), and Lockwood (2021) explore the subject of slavery insofar as it intersects with Aristotle's views on non-Greeks (namely, "barbarians" or non-Greek speaking peoples).

SCHOLARSHIP REFERRED TO IN THIS SECTION

- Bhorat, Z. 2022. "Automation, Slavery, and Work in Aristotle's *Politics* Book I." *Polis* 39: 279–302.
- Cherry, K.M. 2014. "Does Aristotle Believe Greeks Should Rule Barbarians?" *History of Political Thought* 35: 632–655.
- Christiaens, T. 2018. "Aristotle's Anthropological Machine and Slavery." *Epoché* 23: 239–62.
- Crespo, R.F. 2014. *A Re-assessment of Aristotle's Economic Thought*. London: Routledge.
- Dinneen, N. 2015. "Aristotle's Political Economy: Three Waves of Interpretation." *Polis* 32: 96–142.

- Eich, S. 2019. "Between Justice and Accumulation: Aristotle on Currency and Reciprocity." *Political Theory* 47: 363–90.
- Finley, M. 1970. "Aristotle and Economic Analysis." *Past & Present* 47: 3–25.
- Fritsche, J. 2019. "Aristotle's Biological Justification of Slavery in *Politics* I." *Rhizomata* 7: 63–96.
- Helmer, É. 2021. *Oikonomia. Philosophie greque de l'économie*. Paris : Classiques Garnier.
- Gallagher, R. 2018. *Aristotle's Critique of Political Economy with a Contemporary Application*. London: Routledge.
- Inamura, K. 2011. "The Role of Reciprocity in Aristotle's Theory of Political Economy." *History of Political Thought* 32: 565–587.
- Kamtekar, R. 2016. "Studying Ancient Political Thought Through Ancient Philosophers: The Case of Aristotle and Natural Slavery." *Polis* 33: 150–171.
- Karbowsky, J. 2012. "Slaves, Women, and Aristotle's Natural Teleology." *Ancient Philosophy* 32: 323–50.
- Karbowsky, J.A. 2013. "Aristotle's Scientific Inquiry into Natural Slavery." *Journal of the History of Philosophy* 51: 331–353.
- Lockwood, T. 2007. "Is Natural Slavery Beneficial?" *Journal of the History of Philosophy* 45: 207–211.
- Lockwood, T. 2021. "Aristotle's *Politics* on Greeks and non-Greeks." *Review of Politics* 84: 465–485.
- Mei, T. 2009. "The preeminence of use: Reevaluating the relation between use and exchange in Aristotle's economic thought." *Journal of the History of Philosophy* 47:523–548.
- Meikle, S. 1995. *Aristotle's Economic thought*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Miller, F. 2011. "Was Aristotle the first economist?" *Apeiron* 31: 387–398.
- Monteils-Laeng, L. 2019. "Aristote croit-il au déterminisme environnemental ? Les Grecs, les esclaves et les barbares (*Pol.* VII.7)." *Polis* 36: 40–56.
- Nagle, D.B. 2006. *The household as the foundation of Aristotle's polis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nah, D. 2018. "Aristotle as Realist Critic of Slavery." *History of Political Thought* 39: 399–412.
- Nielsen, K.M. 2013. "Economy and Private Property." In M. Deslauriers and P. Destrée, eds., *The Cambridge Companion to Aristotle's Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 67–91.
- Pellegrin, P. 2013. "Natural Slavery." In Deslauriers, M. and P. Destrée, eds. *The Cambridge Companion to Aristotle's Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 199–222.
- Polanyi, K. 1957. "Aristotle discovers the economy." In his *Trade and market in the early empires: Economies in history and theory*. Glencoe, IL: Free Press, pp. 64–94.
- Riesbeck, D.J. 2015. "Aristotle on the Politics of Marriage: 'Marital Rule' in the *Politics*." *Classical Quarterly* 65: 134–152.
- Schmitz, P. 2017. "Oikos, polis, and politeia. Das Verhältnis von Familie und Staatsverfassung bei Aristoteles, im späteren Peripatos und in Ciceros 'de officiis.'" *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 160: 9–35.
- Schofield, M. 1999. "Ideology and Philosophy in Aristotle's Theory of Slavery." In his *Saving the City: Philosopher-Kings and other Classical Paradigms*. London: Routledge, pp. 101–124.

Trott, A.M. 2017. "‘Not Slavery but Salvation’: Aristotle on Constitution and Government." *Polis* 34: 115–136.

Valente, M. 2011. *[Aristotele]: Economici. Introduzione, testo rivisto, traduzione e commento*. Alessandria: Edizioni dell’Orso.

Veloso, C.W. 2011. "La relation entre les liens familiaux et les constitutions politique." In E. Bermon, V. Laurand and J. Terrel, eds., *Politique d’Aristote: famille, régimes, éducation*. Pessac: Presses Universitaires de Bordeaux, pp. 23–40.

Wilgaux, J. "De la naturalité des relations de parenté : inceste et échange matrimonial dans les Politiques d’Aristote." In E. Bermon, V. Laurand and J. Terrel, eds., *Politique d’Aristote: famille, régimes, éducation*. Pessac: Presses Universitaires de Bordeaux, 41–54.

7: The Definition and Virtue of a Citizen

Politics I begins by claiming that the polis is composed of households; *Politics* III begins by claiming the polis is composed of citizens; Hansen (2013) considers the difference between the two claims and whether they involve different notions of a polis. *Politics* III presents at least two different definitions of a citizen and defining citizenship is complicated because different constitutions embody different notions of citizenship. The participatory capacities of a citizen in a democracy or polity will be quite different from those living under a monarchy. The question receives solid discussion in book-length studies such as Miller (1995) and Riesbeck (2016). There is also a substantial line of scholarship devoted to these conceptual problems in journal articles and chapters, beginning with Morrison (1999), and continuing on to Khan (2005), Woods (2014), Samaras (2015), White (2019), Bermon (2017), and Natali (2020). Another line of inquiry concerns the relationship between the civic virtue of a citizen relative to one constitution and the ethical virtue of a good person: recent discussions include Rosler (2013), Keyt (2017), and Pellegrin (2017). Aristotle’s account of citizenship, with its emphasis on inclusive and robust civic

participation, inspires comparisons and contrasts with contemporary notions of citizenship: see further Frede (2005), Collins (2006), and Boyd (2013).

SCHOLARSHIP REFERRED TO IN THIS SECTION

- Bermon, E. 2017. "Une image de l'excellence politique comparable à un couteau de delphes : La navigation des marins (Pol. III, 4, 1276B16–34)." In E. Bermon, V. Laurand, and J. Terrel, eds., *L'Excellence politique chez Aristote*. Louvain: Peeters, pp. 25–51.
- Boyd, R. 2013. "Boundaries, Birthright, and Belonging: Aristotle on the Distribution of Citizenship." *Good Society* 22: 215–235.
- Collins, S. 2006. *Aristotle and the rediscovery of citizenship*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Frede, D. 2005. "Citizenship in Aristotle's Politics." In R. Kraut and S. Skultety, eds., *Aristotle's Politics: Critical essays*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield, pp. 167–184.
- Hansen, M. H. 2013. "Aristotle's two complementary views of the Greek polis." In his *Reflections on Aristotle's Politics*. Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press, pp. 19–38.
- Khan [Biondi], C.-A. 2005. "Aristotle, citizenship, and the common advantage." *Polis* 22:1–23.
- Keyt, D. 2017. "The Good Man and the Upright Citizen in Aristotle's Ethics and Politics." In his *Nature and justice: studies in the ethical and political philosophy of Plato and Aristotle*. Leuven: Peeters, pp. 197–222.
- Morrison, D. 1999. "Aristotle's definition of citizenship: A problem and some solutions." *History of Philosophy Quarterly* 16:143–165.
- Natali, C. 2020. "La definition du citoyen chez Aristote, Politique III." *Revue de philosophie ancienne* 38: 339–366.
- Pellegrin, P. 2017. "Vertu éthique et vertu politique : qu'a voulu dire Aristote au chapitre III,4 des Politiques?" In E. Bermon, V. Laurand, and J. Terrel, eds., *L'Excellence politique chez Aristote*. Louvain: Peeters, pp. 85–106.
- Rapp, C. 2020. "Definitions in Aristotle's Politics: State and constitutions." *Revue de philosophie ancienne* 38: 367–409.
- Rosler, A. 2013. "Civic Virtue: Citizenship, ostracism, and war." In M. Deslauriers, M. and P. Destrée, eds., *The Cambridge Companion to Aristotle's Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 144–175.
- Samaras, T. 2015. "Aristotle and the Question of Citizenship." In T. Lockwood and T. Samaras, eds., *Aristotle's Politics: A Critical Guide*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 123–141.
- Terrel, J. 2017. "Deux voies d'accès à l'excellence pour les cités et leurs régimes." In E. Bermon, V. Laurand, and J. Terrel, eds., *L'Excellence politique chez Aristote*. Louvain: Peeters, pp. 107–136.
- White, S. 2019. "Good Citizenship in Aristotle." In C. Riedweg, ed., *Philosophie für die Polis. Akten des 5. Kongresses der Gesellschaft für antike Philosophie 2016*. Berlin: De Gruyter, pp. 299–330.
- Woods, C. 2014. "The Limits of Citizenship in Aristotle's Politics." *History of Political Thought* 35: 399–435.

8: The constitutional theory in the *Politics*

The central concept of the *Politics* is *politeia*, which I will define as “constitution” (although Mulhern (2015) amply shows why that is far from the only meaning of the term). Aristotle uses the term to describe the internal structure (usually unwritten) of a political community, including (but not limited to) the determination of who may participate in its offices and what are their powers. Thus, Aristotle’s “constitutional theory” identifies six fundamental types of political organization (all of which admit of further subdivisions and even mixtures): kingship, aristocracy, and polity or republic are “right” constitutions in which those in power rule in the interest of the ruled and tyranny, oligarchy, and democracy are “deviant” constitutions in which those in power rule in their own interest. Miller (1995), Johnson (2015), Riesbeck (2016), and Duke (2020) are book-length studies that examine the most fundamental (and often contested) concepts in the theory, for instance the nature of the common good or what Aristotle means by rule of law. Pezzoli and Poddighe (2022) is a journal issue devoted to Aristotle’s constitutional theory. Horn (2013), Morrison (2013), Collins (2017) and Bertelli (2020) are chapter-length surveys of the major issues in Aristotle’s account of law and constitutions.

Aristotle claims that different kinds of constitutions embody different views about who can share in the constitution, which modern scholars often refer to as Aristotle’s theory of “distributive justice” (on which see Keyt (1991) and Schofield (1999)). For instance, in an oligarchy like Corinth, property qualifications limit who can participate in various offices because oligarchy assumes that people who possess more property or wealth deserve to participate—for instance because their property makes them more like shareholders in the political system or

because their property provides them with opportunities for education and leisure that are simply unavailable to wage-laborers. By contrast, in a democracy like Athens, native born citizenship includes all male Athenians because democracy assumes that one's bonds to one's native land qualify one to participate in its political administration, regardless of one's socio-economic status. Nonetheless, Athenian democracy, for instance, was profoundly exclusive insofar as it limited citizenship to those born of two Athenian parents; "mixed" families (i.e., those with only one Athenian parent) and non-Athenian persons (metics or what we call "resident aliens") were largely excluded from all forms of political participation. From Aristotle's perspective, this is both descriptively correct—different constitutions embody different views about inclusion and exclusion—and normatively incorrect or unjust, since participation is determined by arbitrary criteria such as wealth or parental lineage. *Politics* 3.6–18, is complicated and extended analysis that seeks to establish and evaluate heterogeneous claims of justice within a single community. Schofield (1999b) is the clearest statement of Aristotle's view that justice is not a matter of "rights" but rather a notion of merit or desert, relative to different political organizations. In addition to the monographs mentioned above, Kraut (2002), Frank (2005), and Inamura (2015) are monograph-length studies that include discussion of the major details in Aristotle's theory of distributive justice; article-length studies include Knoll (2010) and Bodéüs (2017). By contrast, Schütrumpf (2015), (2016), and (2019) challenge the notion that distributive justice plays an important role in the *Politics*. Insofar as injustice is one of the main causes of faction and revolution, see section 9 in this report below which connects the discussion of *Politics* 3 with that of *Politics* 5.

Hansen (2013) argues that Aristotle's six-fold taxonomy undergoes change between *Politics* 3 (where it is first articulated) and *Politics* 4–6 (where it is invoked repeatedly); Riesbeck (2015) is a thorough critique of the claim. Duke (2022) claims that the constitution should be understood within the framework of Aristotle's four causes as the "formal cause" of a political organization. Inamura (2019) and (2022) argue that we should understand the taxonomic analysis of constitutions (which makes up a good part of *Politics* 4–6) as forms of craft or science, contra the claim of Sebell (2016), which likens Aristotle's political science to non-scientific practical wisdom. Pellegrin (2011), (2015), and (2017), and Inamura (2019) explore the relationship between taxonomy in Aristotle's natural science and the *Politics*.

SCHOLARSHIP REFERRED TO IN THIS SECTION

Bertelli, L. 2020. "Law and Justice in Aristotle." In E. Harris and M. Canevaro, eds., *The Oxford Handbook of Ancient Greek Law*. Oxford: Oxford University Press (published online: <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199599257.013.22>).

Bodéüs, R. 2017. "Le rôle des justes en politique selon Aristote." » In E. Bermon, V. Laurand, and J. Terrel, eds., *L'Excellence politique chez Aristote*. Louvain: Peeters, pp. 155–172.

Collins, S. 2017. "Aristotle's Political Science and the Problem of the Regime." In E. Bermon, V. Laurand, and J. Terrel, eds., *L'Excellence politique chez Aristote*. Louvain: Peeters, pp. 209–234.

Destrée, P. 2015. "Aristotle on improving imperfect cities." In T. Lockwood and T. Samaras, eds., *Aristotle's Politics: A Critical Guide*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 204–223.

Duke, G. 2020. *Aristotle and Law. The Politics of Nomos*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Duke, G. 2022. "Explanatory Causes in Aristotle's Constitutional Theory." *Classical Philology* 117: 45–62.

Frank, J. 2005. *A Democracy of Distinction: Aristotle and the Work of Politics*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Hansen, M.H. 2013. *Reflections on Aristotle's Politics*. Copenhagen: Museum Tusulanum Press.

Horn, C. 2013. "Law, Governance, and Political Obligation." In M. Deslauriers and P. Destrée, eds. *The Cambridge Companion to Aristotle's Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 223–246.

Inamura, K. 2015. *Justice and Reciprocity in Aristotle's Political Philosophy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Inamura, K. 2019. "Scientific Classification and Essentialism in the Aristotelian Typology of Constitutions." *History of Political Thought* 40: 196–218.

- Inamura, K. 2022. "Aristotle's Political Theory as a Craft and Science in *Politics* 4–6." *Polis* 39: 553–575.
- Johnson, C.N. 2015. *Philosophy and Politics in Aristotle's Politics*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Keyt, D. 1991. "Aristotle's theory of distributive justice." In D. Keyt and F. Miller, eds., *A Companion to Aristotle's Politics*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell, pp. 238–278.
- Knoll, M. 2010. "Die distributive Gerechtigkeit bei Platon und Aristoteles." *Zeitschrift für Politik* 57: 3–30.
- Kraut, R. 2002. *Aristotle: Political Philosophy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Miller, F.D. 1995. *Nature, Justice, and Rights in Aristotle's Politics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Morrison, D. 2013. "The Common Good." In M. Deslauriers and P. Destrée, eds. *The Cambridge Companion to Aristotle's Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 176–198
- Mulhern, J.J. 2015. "*Politeia* in Greek Literature, Inscriptions, and in Aristotle's *Politics*: Reflections on Translation and Interpretation." In T. Lockwood and T. Samaras, eds., *Aristotle's Politics: A Critical Guide*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 84–102.
- Pellegrin, P. 2011. "Parties de la cité, parties de la constitution." In C. Natali, ed., *Aristotle: Metaphysics and Practical Philosophy. Essays in Honour of Enrico Berti*. Louvain-la-Neuve : Éditions Peeters, pp. 177–199.
- Pellegrin, P. 2015. "Is Politics a Natural Science?" In T. Lockwood and T. Samaras, eds., *Aristotle's Politics: A Critical Guide*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 27–45.
- Pellegrin, P. 2020. *Endangered Excellent: On the Political Philosophy of Aristotle*, trans. A. Preus. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Pezzoli, F. and E. Poddighe, eds. 2022. *Politeia in Aristotle's Political Theory and Historical Research. Araucaria*. 49: 265–425.
- Riesbeck, D.J. 2015. "The Unity of Aristotle's Theory of Constitutions." *Apeiron* 49: 93–125.
- Riesbeck, D.J. 2016. *Aristotle on Political Community*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schofield, M. 1999. "Sharing in the constitution." In his *Saving the city: Philosopher-kings and other classical paradigms*. New York: Routledge, pp. 141–159.
- Schütrumpf, E. 2015. "Little to do with justice: Aristotle on distributing political power." In T. Lockwood and T. Samaras, eds., *Aristotle's Politics: A Critical Guide*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 163–1083.
- Schütrumpf, E. 2016. "An Overdose of Justice or the Chimera of alleged 'Distributive Justice' in Aristotle's Politics." In A. Havlíček, C. Horn, and J. Jinek, eds., *Nous, Polis, Nomos. Festschrift Francisco L. Lisi*. Sankt Augustin: Academia Verlag, pp. 239–256.
- Schütrumpf, E. 2019. "Die Obsession mit Gerechtigkeit in der Deutung von Aristoteles' politischer Theorie—zu den Bedingungen innenpolitischer Stabilität." In C. Riedweg, ed., *Philosophie für die Polis. Akten des 5. Kongresses der Gesellschaft für antike Philosophie 2016*. Berlin: De Gruyter, pp. 249–276.
- Sebell, D. 2016. "The Problem of Political Science: Political Relevance and Scientific Rigor in Aristotle's 'Philosophy of Human Affairs.'" *American Journal of Political Science* 60: 85–96.

9: Analysis of specific constitutional forms and the nature of stasis

Individual constitutions have received significant scrutiny, especially the constitutions of tyranny and democracy (extreme versions of which—as Jordovic (2011) shows—appear quite similar). Among book-length studies, Miller (1995) and Pellegrin (2020) have good treatments of Aristotle's "deviant" constitutions, especially insofar as Aristotle's analysis of how to preserve deviant constitutions is a sort of Machiavellian "realism." Kraut (2018) provides a concise overview of all of Aristotle's "deviant" constitutions. Recent analyses of tyranny include: Jordovic (2011), Jochim (2020a) and (2020b), Buekenhout (2021), and Stewart (2021). Recent analyses of democracy include: Schofield (2012), Berti (2013), Gastaldi (2016), Pellegrin (2018), Arlen (2019), Filonik (2019), Schillinger (2018), Smith (2018), Zingano (2022), Zizza (2022), Irrera (2022), Landauer (forthcoming), and Lockwood (forthcoming). Recent analyses of kingship include: Atack (2015), Laurand (2017), Buekenhout (2016) and (2018), and Mesquita (2020). Recent analysis of Aristotle's "mixed" constitution or "polity" include: Schofield (2012) and Balot (2015).

Aristotle's constitutional theory also includes substantial discussion of both the causes of constitutional factionalism and revolution (or what classical Greeks called *stasis*) in *Politics* 5.1–7, which is then followed by an analysis of the causes by means of which different kinds of constitution are preserved in *Politics* 5.8–11, including an infamous discussion of how to preserve unjust constitutions, such as tyranny (on which see Buekenhout (2021)). Debate has circulated around what sort of model Aristotle uses to understand both the instability and the stability of individual constitutions, for instance whether it derives from psychological models of conflict or from models that derive from Aristotle's natural scientific writings. Recent analyses include the

book-length studies Rogan (2018) and Skultety (2019), and article and chapter-length studies of Hatzistavrou (2013), Saxonhouse (2015), Rocher (2016), Pellegrin (2019), Knoll (2022), and Cairns et al. (2022).

SCHOLARSHIP REFERRED TO IN THIS SECTION

Arlen, G. 2019. "Aristotle and the Problem of Oligarchic Harm: Insights for Democracy." *European Journal of Political Theory* 18: 393–414.

Atack, C. 2015. "Aristotle's Pambasileia and the Metaphysics of Monarchy." *Polis* 32: 297–320.

Balot, R. 2015. "The 'mixed regime' in Aristotle's *Politics*." In T. Lockwood and T. Samaras, eds., *Aristotle's Politics: A Critical Guide*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 103–122.

Berti, E. 2013. "Aristotele e la democrazia." In C. Rossitto, A. Coppola, and F. Biasutti, eds., *Aristotele e la storia*. Padova: Cleup, pp. 31–52.

Buekenhout, B. 2016. "Kingly versus Political Rule in Aristotle's *Politics*." *Apeiron* 49: 515–537.

Buekenhout, B. 2018. "Aristotle's Peculiar Analysis of Monarchy." *History of Political Thought* 39: 216–34.

Buekenhout, B. 2021. "Aristotle on the Preservation of Tyranny." *Classical Philology* 116: 102–112.

Cairns, D., M. Canevaro, and K. Mantzouranis. 2022. "Recognition and Redistribution in Aristotle's Account of *Stasis*." *Polis* 39: 1–34.

Filonik, J. 2019. "'Living as one Wishes' in Athens: The (anti-)Democratic Polemics." *Classical Philology* 114: 1–24.

Gastaldi, S. 2016. "Le forme de democrazia nella *Politica* di Aristotele." In A. Havlíček, C. Horn, and J. Jinek, eds., *Nous, Polis, Nomos. Festschrift Francisco L. Lisi*. Sankt Augustin: Academia Verlag, pp. 273–282.

Hatzistavrou, A. 2013. "Faction." In M. Deslauriers and P. Destrée, eds. *The Cambridge Companion to Aristotle's Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 275–300.

Irrera, E. 2022. "Friendship, ethos and equality in Aristotle's treatment of democratic politeiai." *Araucaria* 49: 373–392.

Jochim, J. 2020a. "Aristotle, Tyranny, and the Small-Souled Subject." *Political Theory* 48: 169–91.

Jochim, J. 2020b. "From Tyrannicide to Revolution: Aristotle on the Politics of Comradeship." *American Political Science Review* 114 (2020): 1266–1279.

Jordovic, I. 2011. "Aristotle on Extreme Tyranny and Extreme Democracy." *Historia* 60: 36–64.

Knoll, M. 2022. "Aristotle on the Demise and Stability of Political Systems." *Araucaria* 49: xxx–xxx.

Kraut R. 2018. "The Political Kakon. The Lowest Forms of Constitutions." In P. Kontos, ed., *Evil in Aristotle*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 170–188.

Landauer, M. Forthcoming. "Demos (a) kurios? Agenda power and democratic control in ancient Greece." *European Journal of Philosophy*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14748851211015331>

- Laurand, V. 2017. "Nature de la royauté dans les Politiques d'Aristote." » In E. Bermon, V. Laurand, and J. Terrel, eds., *L'Excellence politique chez Aristote*. Louvain: Peeters, pp. 137–154.
- Lockwood, T. Forthcoming. "In Praise of Solon: Aristotle on Democracy." In E. Robinson and V. Arena, eds., *Cambridge History of Democracy*. Cambridge University Press.
- Miller, F.D. 1995. *Nature, Justice, and Rights in Aristotle's Politics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Mesquita, A. P. 2020. "Aristotle's Lost Dialogue *On Good Birth* and Kingship as the Best Regime." In A. P. Mesquita, S. Noriega-Olmos and C. Shields, eds. *Revisiting Aristotle's Fragments: New Essays on the Fragments of Aristotle's Lost Works*. Berlin: De Gruyter, pp. 201–220.
- Pellegrin, P. 2018. "Aristotle and Democracy." In D. Sfondoni-Mentzou, ed. *Aristotle – Contemporary Perspectives on His Thought: On the 2400th Anniversary of Aristotle's Birth*. Berlin: De Gruyter, pp. 197–209.
- Pellegrin, P. 2019. "Aristotle on Stasis as a Natural State of Cities." In C. Riedweg, ed., *Philosophie für die Polis. Akten des 5. Kongresses der Gesellschaft für antike Philosophie 2016*. Berlin: De Gruyter, pp. 235–248.
- Pellegrin, P. 2020. *Endangered Excellent: On the Political Philosophy of Aristotle*, trans. A. Preus. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Rocher, L.S. 2016. "*Kerdos, philia, and mesoi*. Aristotle and the ways of preventing stasis." *Incidenza dell'antico* 14: 143–174.
- Rogan, E. 2018. *La stasis dans la politique d'Aristote: la cité sous tension*. Paris: Editions Classiques Garnier.
- Saxonhouse, A. 2015. "Aristotle on the corruption of regimes: Restatement and justice." In T. Lockwood and T. Samaras, eds., *Aristotle's Politics: A Critical Guide*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 184–203.
- Schillinger, D. 2018. "Aristotle, Equity, and Democracy." *Polis* 35: 333–55.
- Schofield, M. 2012, "Aristotle and the Democratization of Politics." In B. Morison and K. Ierodiakonou, eds., *Episteme, Etc.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 285–301.
- Skultety, S. 2019. *Conflict in Aristotle's Political Philosophy*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Smith, S. 2018. "Democracy and the Body Politic from Aristotle to Hobbes." *Political Theory* 46: 167–196.
- Stewart, E. 2021. "The Tyrant's Progress: The Meaning of TURANNOS in Plato and Aristotle." *Polis* 38: 208–236.
- Zingano, M. 2022. "La Démocratie et les constitutions chez Aristote." *Philosophiques* 49: 241–249.
- Zizza, C. 2022. "Aristotle, the Agricultural Democracy, and the Aphytaiians (*Pol* 6, 1319a14–19)." *Araucaria* 49: 329–349.

10: Collective Deliberation (*Politics* 3.11) and the Rule of Law (*Politics* 3.15–16)

Aristotle's examination of justice in relationship to different constitutional forms includes two important and surprisingly timely analyses, namely those of collective deliberation and the rule of law. In the former case, legal theorist Jeremy Waldron notes that *Politics* 3.11 provides a novel defense of the superiority of collective deliberation (for instance, in an assembly or legislative body) over the deliberative ability of any single wise individual (Waldron (1992)), one which justifies inclusive political institutions not only on the basis of their fairness, but also because of their epistemic superiority. Nonetheless, Aristotle's account falls within the complex dialogical account of distributive justice in a political community that ranges over *Politics* 3.8–18 (mentioned above in subsection 8). Some of Aristotle's basic examples defy clear application of his theory. The text has received enormous scrutiny over the last decade. Narbonne (2019) is a book-length study of the text. Ober (2013), Garsten (2013), and Schwartzberg (2016) explore 3.11 from the perspective of political theory; Bouchard (2011), Cammack (2013), Bobonich (2015), Lane (2013) and (2016), Horn (2016), Girard (2019), Tsouni (2019), Anagnostopoulos (2021), and Hatzistavrou (2021) focus on exegetical aspects of the text.

In the later case, Aristotle's discussion of the constitution of kingship (a "right" form of constitution, distinct from the "deviant" form of monarchy, namely tyranny) takes up the question of whether it is more beneficial to be ruled by the best laws or the best men (3.15.1286a7–9). The question arises because Aristotle identifies one form of kingship as "absolute kingship" (*pambasileia*), namely that political organization in which a superlatively virtuous individual rules absolutely, based on the individual's godlike epistemic superiority.

Aristotle inherited the conceptual dilemma from Plato's *Statesman*; more controversially, as Cartledge (2009) suggests, Aristotle may be motivated by the Macedonian kingships of Phillip II or even Alexander the Great. But the very question of the normative superiority of absolute kingship seems to be at odds with the notion of participatory government and even collective deliberation (a tension noted by Buekenhout (2018); a tension examined at length by Riesbeck (2016)). Further, the question goes to the heart of executive priority within political organizations, a question familiar not only familiar to medieval political theorists like Dante and Marsilius of Padua, but also contemporary political theorists examining autocracy. The various arguments that Aristotle presents in *Politics* 3.15–16 for and against absolutely kingship (the former which Aristotle ultimately appears to endorse) have been echoed for millennia.

SCHOLARSHIP REFERRED TO IN THIS SECTION

- Anagnostopoulos, G. 2021. "Aristotle's Defense of the Multitude Being in Authority in *Politics* III.11." In P. Mitsis and H. Reid, eds., *The Poetry in Philosophy. Essays in Honor of Christos C. Evangeliou*. Parnassos Press, pp. 161–194.
- Bobonich, C. 2015. "Aristotle, Decision Making, and the Many." In T. Lockwood and T. Samaras, eds., *Aristotle's Politics: A Critical Guide*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 142–62.
- Bouchard, E. 2011. "Analogies du pouvoir partagé: remarques sur Aristote, *Politique* III.11." *Phronesis* 56: 162–179.
- Buekenhout, B. 2018. "Aristotle's Peculiar Analysis of Monarchy." *History of Political Thought* 39: 216–34.
- Cammack, D. 2013. "Aristotle on the Virtue of the Multitude." *Political Theory* 41: 175–202.
- Cartledge, P. 2009. *Ancient Greek Political Thought in Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Garsten, B. 2013. "Deliberating and Acting Together." In M. Deslauriers and P. Destrée, eds. *The Cambridge Companion to Aristotle's Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 324–349.
- Girard, C. 2019. "La sagesse de la multitude. Actualité d'un argument aristotélicien." *Journal of Ancient Philosophy* 13: 348–369.
- Hatzistavrou, A. 2021. "Aristotle on the Authority of the Many: *Politics* III 11, 1281a40–b21." *Apeiron* 54: 203–232.

- Horn, C. 2016. "Individual Competence and Collective Deliberation in Aristotle's *Politics*." In C. Arruzza and D. Nikulin, eds., *Philosophy and Political Power in Antiquity*. Boston: Brill, 94–113.
- Lane, M. 2013. "Claims to Rule: The Case of the Multitude." In M. Deslauriers and P. Destrée, eds., *The Cambridge Companion to Aristotle's Politics*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, pp. 247–74.
- Lane, M. 2016. "Popular Sovereignty as Control of Office-Holders." In R. Bourke and Q. Skinner, eds., *Popular Sovereignty in Historical Perspective*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 52–72.
- Narbonne, J.-M. 2020. *Sagesse cumulative et idéal démocratique chez Aristote*. Presses de l'Université Laval.
- Ober, J. 2013. "Democracy's Wisdom: An Aristotelian Middle Way for Collective Judgment." *American Political Science Review* 107: 104–122.
- Riesbeck, D.J. 2016. *Aristotle on Political Community*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schwartzberg, M. 2016. "Aristotle and the Judgment of the Many: Equality, Not Collective Quality." *Journal of Politics* 78: 733–745.
- Tsouni, G. 2019. "Maximising Political Wisdom and the Defense of Democratic Participation in Aristotle's *Politics*." In C. Riedweg, ed., *Philosophie für die Polis. Akten des 5. Kongresses der Gesellschaft für antike Philosophie 2016*. Berlin: De Gruyter, pp. 277–298.
- Waldron, J. 1992. "The Wisdom of the Multitude: Some Reflections on Book 3, Chapter 11 of Aristotle's *Politics*." *Political Theory* 20: 613–41.

11: Best constitution and education

The *Politics* includes substantial discussion of what contemporary theorists call "ideal theory," offering both critiques of the theories of Aristotle's predecessors and his own account of what he calls "the best constitution." *Politics 2* surveys those predecessors, which includes both "theorists" of best constitutions (Plato's *Republic* and *Laws* receive extended scrutiny, more so than any other ancient source) and political organizations that are reputed to be best (he has in mind both the Greek political communities of Crete and Sparta, but also the non-Greek Northern African political community of Carthage, which in the 4th C. BCE formed a commercial empire that controlled most of the eastern Mediterranean basin). As Alexander (2000) notes, an initial challenge is that Aristotle uses the phrase "best constitution" to characterize a number of

different political organizations in the *Politics*; Mittiga (2021) is a recent treatment of the same puzzle. Samaras (2007) offers the clearest and most persuasive account that the term is best applied the constitution described in *Politics* 7 and 8, which he also argues was a model for 4th C. colonists in western Anatolia rather than any sort of regulative ideal for evaluating other constitutions.

Politics 2 surveys what Aristotle's predecessors described as the best constitution. He includes both "theorists" of best constitutions (Plato's *Republic* and *Laws* receive extended scrutiny, more so than any other ancient source) and political organizations that are reputed to be best (he has in mind both the Greek political communities of Crete and Sparta, but also the non-Greek community of Carthage. Lockwood (2015) provides an overview of Aristotle's critiques of his predecessors in *Politics* 2. Müller (2016), Segev (2018), and Santoro (2019) are recent examinations of his critique of Plato (on which there is substantial literature over the last 40 years). Rubin (2011), Hitz (2012), Lockwood (2017) and (2018), and Schofield (2018) examine Aristotle's critique of Sparta. Jaïdi (2014), Lockwood (2021), and Pezzoli (2022) examine his critique (and praise) of Carthage.

Aristotle's examination of the constitutional proposals of Hippodamus of Miletus, a 5th C. urban planner who designed the quasi-geometric street plan of Athens' main port-city, the Peiraeus, occasions a fascinating debate about progressivism and conservatism in political reform. Hippodamus proposed incentivizing institutional change by honoring individuals who innovate new policies, something Aristotle describes as "sweet to hear, but not safe" (2.8.1268b24). What follows are BOTH all the reasons that statesmen should innovate and

change institutions (on the assumption that statesmanship is an art—like medicine—that improves progressively over time) AND all the reasons that statesmen should not innovate and change institutions (on the assumption that the binding force of law depends upon habit). Some scholars like Nussbaum (1988) take Aristotle to be endorsing the former progressive view; others take Aristotle to be endorsing a quasi-Burkean conservative view. But as Pangle (2013) and Lockwood (2015) note, Aristotle fails to resolve the conceptual dilemma, even though the question of radical innovation and ideal theory is precisely the issue under examination in *Politics* 2 (see also Duke (2020)).

The last two books of the *Politics* contain a description of Aristotle's "best constitution," an aristocratic political organization in which all citizens are provided with the education and leisure necessary to live truly happy lives. Leunissen (2017) and Jimenez (2021) engages with the ample literature on ethical education in both the *Politics* and Aristotle's ethical treatises (additional recent studies of education in the *Politics* include Gauthier (2019)). Bourbon et al. (2019) is a journal issue devoted to *Politics* 7 that includes articles on the structure, material basis, and foreign policy of the best constitution. Segev (2017) is a book-length study of Aristotle's view of religion, including in the best constitution. Lefebvre (2011), Natali (2016), Jaulin (2017), Lockwood (2019), Segev (2019), and Ishino (2022) examine aspects of ideal "city-planning" in *Politics* 7. Although much of *Politics* 7 and 8 is concerned with public education, the text that survives focuses primarily on musical education. Bénatouïl (2011), Destrée (2013), Weinman (2014), Kidd (2016), Aygün (2017), Simpson (2017), Snyder (2018), and Lockwood (2020) explain the goals of such education and Jones (2012), Brüllman (2013), Cagnoli Fieconi (2016), and

Destrée (2018) are recent examinations of Aristotle's musical theory (subjects on which there are substantial discussions over the last 40 years).

SCHOLARSHIP REFERRED TO IN THIS SECTION

- Alexander, L. 2000. "The best regimes of Aristotle's *Politics*." *History of Political Theory* 21:189–216.
- Aygün, Ö. 2017. "L'être humain, animal précaire." In R. Güremen and A. Jaulin, eds., *Aristote, l'animal politique*. Paris: Publications de la Sorbonne, pp. 121–137.
- Bénatouïl, T. 2011. "Choisir le labeur en vue du loisir : une analyse de *Politiques*, VII, 14." In E. Bermon, V. Laurand and J. Terrel, eds., *Politique d'Aristote: famille, régimes, éducation*. Pessac: Presses Universitaires de Bordeaux, 155–176.
- Bourbon, M., V. Laurand, and T. Lockwood, eds. 2019. *Aristote Politique VII: La constitution « selon nos vœux »*. *Polis* 36.1.
- Brüllmann, P. 2013. "Music Builds Character. Aristotle, *Politics* VIII 5, 1340a14–b5." *Apeiron* 46: 345–73.
- Cagnoli Fieconi, E. 2016. "*Harmonia, Melos, and Rhythmos*: Aristotle on Musical Education." *Ancient Philosophy* 36: 409–424.
- Destrée, P. 2013. "Education, Leisure, and Politics." In M. Deslauriers and P. Destrée, eds., *The Cambridge Companion to Aristotle's Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 301–23.
- Destrée, P. 2018. "Aristotle on Music for Leisure." In T. Phillips and A. D'Angour, eds., *Music, Text, and Culture in Ancient Greece*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp 183–202.
- Duke, G. 2020. *Aristotle and Law. The Politics of Nomos*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gauthier, T. 2019. "φύσις, ἔθος, λόγος: comment devient-on vertueux ? Lecture de *Politiques*, VII, 13." *Polis* 36: 77–91.
- Hitz, Z. 2012. "Aristotle on Law and Moral Education." *Oxford Studies in Ancient Philosophy* 42: 263–306.
- Ishino, K. 2022. "The Best Life in Aristotle's *Politics*." *Polis* 39: 327–345.
- Jaïdi, H. 2014. "La constitution de Carthage: son actualité et les leçons d'Aristote." *Anabases* 20: 315–323.
- Jaulin, A. 2017. "Aristote et la 'chorégie politique' : les conditions quantitatives de l'excellence politique." In E. Bermon, V. Laurand, and J. Terrel, eds., *L'Excellence politique chez Aristote*. Louvain: Peeters, pp. 173–186.
- Jimenez, M. 2021. *Aristotle on Shame and Learning to Be Good*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jones, E. 2012. "Allocating Musical Pleasure: Performance, Pleasure, and Value in Aristotle's *Politics*." In I. Sluiter and R. Rosen, eds. *Aesthetic Value in Classical Antiquity*. Leiden: Brill, 159–82.
- Kidd, S.E. 2016. "Play in Aristotle." *Classical Philology* 111: 353–371.

- Lefebvre, D. 2011. "La puissance du thumos in *Politiques*, VII, 7." In E. Bermon, V. Laurand and J. Terrel, eds., *Politique d'Aristote: famille, régimes, éducation*. Pessac: Presses Universitaires de Bordeaux, pp. 105–138.
- Leunissen, M. 2017. *From Natural Character to Moral Virtue in Aristotle*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lockwood, T. 2015. "Politics II: Political Critique, Political Theorizing, Political Innovation" in T. Lockwood and T. Samaras, eds., *Aristotle's Politics: A Critical Guide*. Cambridge University Press, pp. 64–83.
- Lockwood, T. 2017. "Judging Constitutions. Aristotle's Critique of Plato's *Republic* and the Constitution of Sparta." *Archiv für Geschichte der Philosophie* 99: 353–379.
- Lockwood, T. 2018. "Servile Spartans and Free Citizen-Soldiers in Aristotle's *Politics* 7–8." *Apeiron* 51: 97–123.
- Lockwood, T. 2019. "The Best Way of Life for Aristotle's Polis (*Politics* VII.1–3)." *Polis* 36: 5–22.
- Lockwood, T. 2020. "Is there a *Poetics* in Aristotle's *Politics*?" In P. Destrée, M. Heath, and D. Munteanu, eds., *The Poetics in its Aristotelian Context*. London: Routledge, pp. 129–144.
- Lockwood, T. 2021. "Aristotle's *Politics* on Greeks and non-Greeks." *Review of Politics* 84: 465–485.
- Mittiga, R. 2021. "Ranking the Regimes in Aristotle's *Politics*: The Four-Principles Approach." *Review of Politics* 83: 1–20.
- Müller, J. 2016. "The Politics of Aristotle's Criticism of Plato's *Republic*." In S. Weisser and M. Thaler, eds., *Strategies of Polemics in Greek and Roman Philosophy*. Boston: Leiden, pp. 93–112.
- Natali, C. 2016. "Il materialismo politico di Aristotele." In C. Viano, ed. *Materia e causa materiale in Aristotele e oltre*. Roma: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura, pp. 77–98.
- Nussbaum, M.C. 1988. "Nature, function and capability: Aristotle on political distribution." *Oxford studies in ancient philosophy: Supplementary volume*, 145–184.
- Pangle, T. 2013. *Aristotle's Teaching in the Politics*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Pezzoli, F. 2022. "Aristotle and the politeia of the Carthaginians." *Araucaria* 49: 311–328.
- Rubin, L.G. 2011. "Aristotle's *Politics* on the Hoof: Sparta, Crete, and Carthage." *Interpretation* 30: 3–36.
- Santoro, A. 2019. "A City of Guardians: Refocusing the Aim and Scope of Aristotle's Critique of Plato's *Republic*." *Polis* 36: 313–36.
- Samaras, T. 2007. "Aristotle's *Politics*: The city of Book Seven and the Question of Ideology." *Classical Quarterly* 57:77–89.
- Schofield, M. 2018. "Aristotle's critique of Spartan Imperialism." In P. Cartledge and A. Powell, eds., *The Greek Superpower: Sparta in the Self-Definition of Athenians*. Swansea: University of Wales Press, pp. 215–234.
- Segev, M. 2017. *Aristotle on Religion*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Segev, M. 2018. "Aristotle on Plato's *Republic* VIII–IX: *Politics* V.12.1316a1–b27." *Polis* 35: 374–400.
- Segev, M. 2019. "Aristotle's Ideal City-Planning: *Politics* 7.12." *Classical Quarterly* 69: 585–596.

Simpson, P. 2017. "Aristotle's Prayer." In E. Bermon, V. Laurand, and J. Terrel, eds., *L'Excellence politique chez Aristote*. Louvain: Peeters, pp. 187–208.

Snyder, J.T. 2018. "Leisure in Aristotle's Political Thought." *Polis* 35: 356–73.

Weinman, M. 2014. "Education: The Ethico-Political Energeia." In C. Baracchi, ed., *Bloomsbury Companion to Aristotle*. London: Bloomsbury, pp. 263–276.

12: Contemporary appropriations of Aristotelian justice

Aristotle's *Politics* has been a significant launching pad for contemporary neo-Aristotelian theories of justice. In a series of works in the 1980s and 1990s, the social and political philosopher Alasdair MacIntyre embraced Aristotle, both historically and in the context of neo-Thomistic philosophy, as a foundational communitarian thinker, one who emphasized the flourishing of the community in contradistinction to the allegedly atomistic and egoistic social philosophy of liberalism (see especially MacIntyre (1981) and (1988)). Within that context, Miller (1995) argued that Aristotle provides a novel account of natural rights that ignores the perils of modern social contract theories. Within Miller's view, individuals are ultimately subordinate to the community, but they nonetheless bear rights or claims within that community (rather than against other rights bearers in a community), an interpretation that Miller elaborated further in Miller (1996), (2000), (2003), and (2009). Somewhat earlier, in a series of landmark articles that include Nussbaum (1988), (1990), (1992) and (2000), Martha Nussbaum attributed to Aristotle a "social democratic" vision of justice that was compatible with her own capabilities approach, which grounded justice in the claims that human beings generate in order to flourish. The accounts of Miller and Nussbaum have generated their own substantial literatures, including an issue of the *Review of Metaphysics* (1996, issue 49.4) devoted to critiques of Miller's account of natural rights

in Aristotle and an issue of *Ethics* (2000, issue 111.1), Inamura (2012) and Knoll (2015) and (2022) to critiques of Nussbaum's account of Aristotelian social democracy.

More recently, Rosler (2005), Trott (2012), Kraut (2013), Aubenque (2014), Miller (2014), Weber (2015), Weinman (2016), Roochnik (2016), Salkever (2016), Trott (2017), Schollmeier (2019), Ludwig (2020), and Woodcox (2022) are book and article-length studies that have put Aristotle in dialogue with contemporary debates about obligation, Rawlsian justice, human rights, and republicanism, that both engage and go beyond the re-readings of Aristotelian justice found in MacIntyre, Miller, and Nussbaum.

SCHOLARSHIP REFERRED TO IN THIS SECTION

- Aubenque, P. 2014. "Would Aristotle be a Communitarian?" In C. Baracchi, ed., *Bloomsbury Companion to Aristotle*. London: Bloomsbury, pp. 338–347.
- Inamura, K. 2012. "Democratic and Aristocratic Aristotle: An Aristotelian Response to Nussbaum's Capabilities Approach." *Polis* 29: 286–308.
- Knoll, M. 2015. "Martha Nussbaum und Aristoteles: Ist der capabilities approach ein aristotelischer Ansatz?" *Archiv für Rechts- und Sozialphilosophie* 101: 32–51.
- Knoll, M. 2022. "Martha Nussbaum and Aristotle on Distributive Justice and Equality." *Polis* 39: 498–526.
- Kraut, R. 2013. "Aristotle and Rawls on the Common Good." In M. Deslauriers and P. Destrée, eds., *The Cambridge Companion to Aristotle's Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 350–374.
- Ludwig, P.W. 2020. *Rediscovering Political Friendship: Aristotle's Theory and Modern Identity, Community, and Equality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- MacIntyre, A. 1981. *After Virtue: A Study in Moral Theory*. Notre Dame: Notre Dame University Press.
- MacIntyre, A. 1988. *Whose Justice? Which Rationality?* Notre Dame: Notre Dame University Press.
- Miller, F.D. 1995. *Nature, Justice, and Rights in Aristotle's Politics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Miller, F.D. 1996. "Aristotle and the Origins of Natural Rights." *The Review of Metaphysics* 49: 873–907.
- Miller, F.D. 2000. "Aristotle: Naturalism." In C. Rowe and M. Schofield, eds., *The Cambridge History of Greek and Roman Political Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 321–43.

- Miller, F.D. 2003. "Aristotle's Theory of Political Rights." In R. Brooks and J. Murphy, eds., *Aristotle and Modern Law*. Aldershot Hants: Ashgate, pp. 309–50.
- Miller, F.D. 2009. "Aristotle on the Ideal Constitution." In G. Anagnostopoulos, ed., *A Companion to Aristotle*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, pp. 540–54.
- Nussbaum, M.C. 1988. "Nature, function and capability: Aristotle on political distribution." *Oxford studies in ancient philosophy: Supplementary volume*, 145–184.
- Nussbaum, M.C. 1990. "Aristotelian Social Democracy." In R. Douglas, G. Mara, and H. Richardson, eds. *Liberalism and the Good*. London: Routledge, pp. 203–52.
- Nussbaum, M.C. 1992. "Human functioning and social justice: In defense of Aristotelian essentialism." *Political Theory* 20:202–246.
- Nussbaum, M.C. 2000. "Aristotle, Politics, and Human Capabilities: A Response to Anthony, Arneson, Charlesworth, and Mulgan." *Ethics* 111: 102–40.
- Roochnik, D. 2016. "Aristotle's Topological Politics; Michael Sandel's Civic Republicanism." In G. Kellow and N. Leddy, eds., *On Civic Republicanism: Ancient Lessons for Global Politics*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 41–58.
- Rosler, A. 2005. *Political Authority and Obligation in Aristotle*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Salkever, S. 2016. "Aristotelian *Phronesis*, the Discourse of Human Rights, and Contemporary Global Practice." *Polis* 33: 7–30.
- Schofield, M. 1996. "Sharing in the Constitution." *The Review of Metaphysics* 49: 831–58.
- Schollmeier, P. 2019. *Rewriting contemporary political philosophy with Plato and Aristotle. An essay on Eudaimonic politics*. London: Bloomsbury.
- Trott, A.M. 2012. "Rancière and Aristotle: Parapolitics, Party Politics, and the Institution of Perpetual Politics." *Journal of Speculative Philosophy* 26: 627–646.
- Trott, A.M. 2017. "Nature, Action, and Politics: A Critique of Arendt's Reading of Aristotle." *Ancient Philosophy* 37: 113–128.
- Weber, S. 2015. *Herrschaft und Recht bei Aristoteles*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Weinman, M. 2016. "Living Well and the Promise of Cosmopolitan Identity: Aristotle's *ergon* and Contemporary Civic Republicanism." In G. Kellow and N. Leddy, eds., *On Civic Republicanism: Ancient Lessons for Global Politics*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 59–71.
- Woodcox, A. 2022. "Platonic and Aristotelian Teichopolitics." *Polis* 39: 185–202.

13: Current trends and future directions for scholarship on the *Politics*

My report on the state of research on Aristotle's *Politics* shows that there is a robust body of scholarship on the work and that two current trends stand out. First, Aristotle scholars have increasingly recognized the advantages of inter-disciplinary research within his body of writing. As noted above in section 5, the work of Leunissen (2017) and other scholars who bring to bear

insights from Aristotle's zoological works to the *Politics* is a welcome trend. No doubt, the trend did not begin with Leunissen; Aristotle scholars have discussed the notion of political animals in the *Historia Animalium* since the 1970s. Nonetheless, as a matter of emphasis, Aristotle scholars appear to be drawing from those sources for interpreting the *Politics* far more than was the case in the 1990s. One hopes that such inter-disciplinary approaches to Aristotle will draw not only on Aristotle's biological works, but also his *Rhetorica* and his *Constitution of Athens*, two other works that bear upon the *Politics* without explicitly being works in political science. Second, interpreting *politeia* or "constitution" remains the key challenge for understanding the *Politics*. Insofar as there is a trend in the scholarship, it consists in the recognition that the account of *politeia* in *Politics* 4–6 is much more nuanced and complicated than the simple six-fold constitutional taxonomy of *Politics* 3. As noted above in section 8, Riesbeck (2015) presents compelling arguments that Aristotle's account of constitution is consistent throughout the *Politics*; but as Riesbeck himself acknowledges, such consistency sits alongside complexity.

From my personal vantage point as a scholar of Aristotle's *Politics*, I would like to suggest two future directions that motivate my own work and which I would commend to scholars working on the *Politics*. First, although scholars have shown greater appreciation of the interdisciplinary nature of Aristotle's works—including the relevance of zoological and biological treatise to elucidate aspects of the *Politics*—I also think that it is time to move away from what is sometimes monolithically called "Aristotle's naturalism," perhaps especially the claims made in *Politics* 1.2 that the primordial polis exists by nature and that humans are political animals by nature. As Frede (2019) makes clear, Aristotle is obviously committed to the claim that humans

exhibit a form of natural sociability. But Aristotle is not a natural law philosopher and outside of *Politics* 1, the “city by nature” does little to no argumentative work in the subsequent seven books in the *Politics*. Indeed, one can count on one hand the number of times that Aristotle invokes the concepts of “naturalism” outside of *Politics* 1. The “city by nature” in *Politics* 1.2 does very important work in showing that the notion of “ruling” is pluralistic and qualitatively differentiated: ruling a slave differs fundamentally from ruling a child or ruling a fellow citizen. But I do not think Aristotle’s “city by nature” is supposed to present some sort of naturalistic alternative to say a Hobbesian state of nature (even though there are quasi-social contract thinkers in ancient Greek political thought, such as Lycophron or Epicurus). I believe Aristotle scholars will produce exegetically superior interpretations if they recognize that ultimately, Aristotle rejects an antithesis between “nature” and “convention” (or *nomos* and *physis*).

A second direction at which my own research aims and which I hope will be embraced by other scholars of Aristotle’s *Politics* is the appreciation that Aristotle’s *Politics* as a work of the 4th C. Mediterranean world that demands accurate historical contextualization. By means of example, consider the case of Sparta. Sometimes, 4th C. authors like Plato and Xenophon invoke the Sparta of the 5th C., namely the city-state that exercised de facto hegemony over mainland Greece and which was integral to defeating the Persian invasion of mainland Greece in 480 BCE. But as I show in Lockwood (2018), for Aristotle Sparta is the 4th C. failed hegemonic state that, although victorious over Athens in the Peloponnesian Wars, was crushed by Thebes and its Boeotian allies at the battle of Leuctra (371 BCE). Indeed, Aristotle explicitly chides his ahistorical contemporaries who praise Sparta. He claims that such scholars

praise the Spartan constitution and express admiration for the aim of its legislator [i.e., Lycurgus], because his entire legislation was intended to promote conquest and war. What they say is easy to refute by argument, and has now been refuted by facts too....They admire the Spartan legislator because by training the Spartans to face danger he enabled them to rule over many. And yet it is clear, now that their empire is no longer in their hands at any rate, that the Spartans are not a happy people, and that their legislator is not a good one. (7.14.1333b12–16, 18–23)

I repeat: Aristotle himself has little patience for the “Spartan Image” because the “geopolitical” events of the early 4th C. have completely undermined claims about Lycurgus’ legendary educational and societal reforms. Whatever virtues some Lycurgus inculcated in the 8th C. BCE are largely indecisive in the 4th C. BCE. Historical accuracy and contextualization are the foundation of Aristotle’s own methodology in the *Politics*; one should expect no less from modern-day scholars who study the same work.

SCHOLARSHIP REFERRED TO IN THIS SECTION

Brill, S. 2020. *Aristotle on the concept of shared life*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Frede, D. 2019. “The Deficiency of Human Nature: The Task of a ‘Philosophy of Human Affairs.’” In G. Keil and N. Kreft, eds., *Aristotle’s Anthropology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 258–74.

Leunissen, M. 2017. *From Natural Character to Moral Virtue in Aristotle*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Riesbeck, D.J. 2015. “The Unity of Aristotle’s Theory of Constitutions.” *Apeiron* 49: 93–125.

Lockwood, T. 2018. “Servile Spartans and Free Citizen-Soldiers in Aristotle’s *Politics* 7–8.” *Apeiron* 51: 97–123.