

I have suggested (*Am. Jr. Phil.* xv. 366) that the so-called contracted forms of which *ama-ssē* is typical were pre-rhotacistic presents in *-se* restrained from normal phonetic development in archaic legal formulas with *volō*, and subsequently interpreted, after the analogy of *fuisse*, as perfects. There is still another step in the analogy thus: *dixē*: *dixī* = *fuisse*: *fui* = *amā(s)se*: *amāsti*.

This explanation may be applied to *infittias ire* 'to deny,' regarding *infittias* as an elided form of **infittiasē* (archaic pres. infin.) in dependence upon *ire*, a construction fairly common in Plautus (Brix, *Trin.*⁴ 1015). I find it hard to believe that *infittias* is acc. plur. in a terminal sense, being, as it is, an abstract noun. The same objection holds against *suppetias ire* 'go to the help of,' and *exsequias ire* 'go to the burial of,' which last however is also explained as cognate

accus., an explanation that does not seem to me probable, for no Roman ever said, I fancy, *funus ire* 'go (to) a funeral.' Neither *venum ire* 'be sold,' nor *pessum ire* 'go down' (to sink), seem to me parallel cases: for *venum*, if not an infin. in *-om*, such as we have in Oscan-Umbrian, may mean some concrete thing like 'market,' and be modelled on *domum ire*, as *foras ire* is; while *pessum* is probably supine to \surd *pet* 'fall.' As to *malam crucem ire* (Brix on *Capt.* 469) for the usual *in malam*, etc., this may be a comic contrast modelled on *domum* 'home' beside *in domum* 'to the house,' implying that *malam crucem* is the customary habitation of the person berated.

It seems to me worthy of note that beside *suppetias*, *infittias*, *exsequias ire* we have deponent infinitives *infittiarī*, etc.

EDWIN W. FAX.

Lexington, Va.

ARISTOTLE'S CLASSIFICATION OF THE ARTS OF ACQUISITION.

In a careful paper entitled 'Aristotle's doctrine of Barter,' which appeared in the *Harvard Quarterly Journal of Economics*, April 1895, Professor Ashley has called attention to the difficulties which he and others find in a passage of Aristotle's *Politics* (Bk. i. 1258^b 27 *sqq.*), about the τρίτον εἶδος χρηματιστικῆς, and has endeavoured to determine what kind of classification is really intended by Aristotle. The passage is as follows:—

τρίτον δὲ εἶδος χρηματιστικῆς μεταξὺ ταύτης καὶ τῆς πρώτης (ἔχει γὰρ καὶ τῆς κατὰ φύσιν τι μέρος καὶ τῆς μεταβλητικῆς), ὅσα ἀπὸ γῆς καὶ τῶν ἀπὸ γῆς γινομένων ἀκάρπων μὲν χρησίμων δέ, οἷον ὕλοτομία τε καὶ πᾶσα μεταλλευτική.

The syntax of this has been pronounced almost desperate; *ὅσα* is supposed to be without any regular grammatical construction; and the text has been suspected by more than one critic. Bernays *e.g.* conjectured *οἷσα* for *ὅσα*.

One must venture to think that the text is sound and the syntax correct. The construction is a familiar one in Aristotle, and the difficulties are due to slips of translation in which by some ill luck even distinguished scholars have been involved. The origin of the mistake is the translation of *ὅσα ἀπὸ γῆς* by 'products of the soil (or

earth),' which of course leaves *ὅσα* without construction. The rendering is natural enough, but ought to have been questioned because of difficulties in the remainder of the sentence, which however have been overlooked. τῶν ἀπὸ γῆς γινομένων would also mean products of the earth, and if the construction of these genitives is after *ὅσα* (*ὅσα ἀπὸ γῆς καὶ ὅσα τῶν ἀπὸ γῆς γινομένων*), there results an illogical statement, in which the species is added to the genus—'products of the soil, and products of the soil, not fruits though useful.' If the construction is (as it really is) *ὅσα ἀπὸ γῆς καὶ ὅσα ἀπὸ τῶν ἀπὸ γῆς γινομένων*, the distinction would be between direct products of the soil, and things derived from or made from products of the soil which are not fruits. This again is hardly possible, because firstly, the examples given are not of the manufacture of raw products, but of the acquisition of them—mining (*μεταλλευτική*) and not *e.g.* *χαλχορυγική*, woodcutting (*ὕλοτομία*) and not *e.g.* *τεκτονική*. Secondly, the classification would be incomplete, because the species of product with which *ὕλοτομία* and *μεταλλευτική* are concerned, *i.e.* things which are useful but not fruits, is not named. If it be replied that it is included implicitly in the generic term *ὅσα ἀπὸ γῆς*, because the division of this into *κάρπιμα* and *ἀκαρπα* is implied in the mention of commodities made from the

latter, it is odd that this should not be made clear by examples of both species of the division.

Further, if *ῥσα ἀπὸ γῆς* include useful products both edible and inedible, then since the classification recognizes articles made from the latter (*ἀπὸ τῶν κ.τ.λ.*), it ought also to recognize articles made from the former, e.g. bread from corn. In fact, whereas a fourfold division ought to have been made—(1) edible products of the soil, (2) inedible though useful products of the soil, (3) articles made from the first, (4) articles made from the second, the third species would not be mentioned at all, instead of the first two we should have the corresponding genus without indication of its division into the two species, and finally the examples would illustrate one species only of the four, and that too one which is not named in the classification which is made.

Though Aristotle is not so infallible in analysis as interpreters may sometimes think, he is not likely to have been so illogical as this; and at any rate an explanation of the text which makes the classification logical and the examples adequate will have the advantage.

Another serious difficulty is caused by the fact that *ῥσα ἀπὸ γῆς* is taken to include 'fruits.' This is quite necessary in a context which mentions products of the earth which are not fruits, supposing *ῥσα ἀπὸ γῆς* means 'products of the earth' at all.

But the form of *κτητική* or *χρηματιστική* which has to do with the fruits of the earth is *γεωργία*, and this is included in the *πρώτων εἶδος κτητικῆς*, that *κατὰ φύσιν* and concerned with *τροφῆ*, from which the *τρίτον εἶδος* is expressly distinguished in the passage before us.

To get over this, it has been supposed that the *τρίτον εἶδος* does not mean the direct acquisition of the *ῥσα ἀπὸ γῆς κ.τ.λ.* from nature, but the barter of them. This is obviously untenable. For, (1) the examples, *ἰλοτομία* and *μεταλλευτική*, are not examples of exchange, but of direct acquisition from nature. (2) If Aristotle meant the *τρίτον εἶδος* to be barter, it would be easy to say so, and it is incredible that he should not; yet there is not a hint in the text to this effect. (3) Aristotle here actually distinguishes the *τρίτον εἶδος* from exchange (*μεταβλητική*), the second kind of *χρηματιστική*. It is true *μεταβλητική*, the generic term, is here used for a species, the 'unnatural,' *μεταβλητική*; but then, if the *τρίτον εἶδος* distinguished from it were

itself a kind of *μεταβλητική*, it would be all the more necessary to say this expressly.

It is the syntax which really gives the key to the solution of these difficulties. *τρίτον εἶδος...ῥσα* corresponds to a regular formula for enumerating the species of a genus. A clause beginning with *ῥσοι, ῥσα*, etc., gives the species and is grammatically either a predicate of the *γένος* or *εἶδος*, or else in apposition to the phrase which expresses it. Consequently *ῥσα* would refer to the various species of this third kind of acquisition, that is to *industries* and not to commodities. This is entirely borne out by the examples introduced by *οἶον*, for they are examples of *industries*, *ἰλοτομία* and *μεταλλευτική*. The construction of *ἀπὸ* is that which is usual after *χρηματιστική* and similar expressions to denote the source of profit. Cf. *Pol.* 1258^a 37, *χρηματιστική ἀπὸ τῶν καρπῶν καὶ τῶν ζῳῶν*; 1258^b 1, *οὐ κατὰ φύσιν (ἢ μεταβλητικῆ χρηματιστικῆ) ἀλλ' ἀπ' ἀλλήλων*; 1258^b 14 *ἐχρηματίζοντο ἀπὸ τῶν κοινῶν*; *Soph. Elench.* 171^b 27-29, *ἢ γὰρ σοφιστικῆ ἐστίν...χρηματιστικῆ τις ἀπὸ σοφίας φαινομένης*.

Thus *ῥσα ἀπὸ γῆς* means 'industries depending upon earth' (lit. 'in which the profit is made from earth'), and *ῥσα ἀπὸ τῶν ἀπὸ γῆς γινομένων ἀκάρπων μὲν χρησίμων* δέ, industries depending upon a particular kind of *γινόμενα ἀπὸ γῆς*.

The opposition is between *γῆ* as minerals in general and *γινόμενα ἀπὸ γῆς*, things which grow from the earth. Of the latter, the *χρήσιμα* are either *κάρπιμα* or *ἄκαρπα*, and of these two the last only comes here into consideration, because the first of them belongs to the industries of the *πρώτων εἶδος*.

ῥσα ἀπὸ γῆς then represents mineral industries, and of these *μεταλλευτική* is the example: *ῥσα ἀπὸ τῶν ἀπὸ γῆς γινομένων ἀκάρπων μὲν χρησίμων* δέ means industries in which are acquired useful things which grow from the earth but are not edible, for instance timber, and of these *ἰλοτομία* is the example.

It must be noticed that in both cases the commodities are got directly from nature.

This interpretation is in accordance with a general sense of *γῆ* found in Aristotle, and its correctness seems proved by the following passage from the *Economics* 1343^a 25, *κατὰ φύσιν δὲ γεωργικῆ προτέρα, καὶ δευτέρα ὄσαι ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς, οἶον μεταλλευτικῆ καὶ εἰ τις ἄλλη τοιαύτη*; where on the one hand *γεωργικῆ* is distinguished from the industries which are *ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς*, and on the other hand *μεταλλευτικῆ* is given as an example of them.

This last passage may suggest the emendation *δσ α ι ἀπὸ γῆς* in the *Politics*, but no change is necessary, and the neuter may stand. Cf. e.g. 1258^b 23, *καὶ ταύτης μέρη τρία, ναυκληρία φορηγία παράστασις· διαφέρει δὲ τούτων ἕτερα ἑτέρων τῶ τὰ μὲν ἀσφαλέστερα εἶναι, τὰ δὲ πλείω πορίζειν τὴν ἐπικαρπίαν*, where the neuters in the last clause are not likely to be in agreement with *μέρη*.

The passage may therefore be rendered:—

‘A third kind of acquisition of commodities lying between the second and the first (for it has something in common with natural acquisition and with exchange) consists of those industries which depend on minerals and those which depend on inedible but useful products of the soil, for instance, woodcutting and every form of mining.’

Or, possibly, ‘a third kind of acquisition lies between these two etc., consisting of those industries etc.’

The distinction of the three kinds of acquisition (*κτητική* or *χρηματιστική*) is as follows:—

The first kind (*ἐν εἶδος κτητικῆς κατὰ φύσιν μέρος τῆς οικονομικῆς* 1256^b 27) is the acquisition from nature of products fit for food (*ἀπὸ τῶν καρπῶν καὶ τῶν ζώων* 1258^a 37), to which is to be added, as will be seen presently, simple barter of these things for one another, which is the good *μεταβλητική*. The second kind is trade in general, *καπηλική* (1258^a 39 etc.) = *μεταβλητική* in the narrower sense = *χρηματιστική* in the narrower sense (1256^b 40), in which Aristotle thinks men get their profit not out of nature but out of one another and so unnaturally (1258^b 1–2, *οὐ κατὰ φύσιν ἀλλ’ ἀπ’ ἀλλήλων*).

The *τρίτον εἶδος* is, like the first, the acquisition from nature of useful products, but the products are not edible.

The text shows plainly that this is what Aristotle intends, but doubts have arisen as to what he precisely means by saying that the *τρίτον εἶδος* comes between the other two and has something in common with both—*τρίτον δὲ εἶδος χρηματιστικῆς μεταξύ ταύτης καὶ τῆς πρώτης, ἔχει γὰρ καὶ τῆς κατὰ φύσιν τι μέρος καὶ τῆς μεταβλητικῆς*. The text contains no explanation of this statement.

The affinity of the first and third kinds is clear, as in both the source of profit is the natural product. But what has the third in common with the second? The answer must be looked for in the points in which they severally differ from the first.

The characteristic of the second kind as compared with the first lies, as has been

said, in a certain unnaturalness in the profit. The gain is *ἀπ’ ἀλλήλων*; the meaning of which seems to be that the middlemen or tradesmen, including usurers, are conceived as getting what they get from others, without giving an equivalent for it in the shape of a commodity (*χρήσιμον*).

The distinction between the third kind and the first, as indicated by the words *ἀκάρπων μὲν χρησίμων δέ*, is that the commodities of the third kind are not consumable, not *τροφή*, like those of the first kind, but such as wood and minerals. Now Aristotle may have thought that though such things were *χρήσιμα* they were less naturally so than articles of food, as these are the immediate support of human life while minerals and the like are not. This would be in the spirit of what he says about the connection of *φύσις* and *τροφή*: e.g. 1256^b 7, *ἢ μὲν οὖν τοιαύτη κτήσις (i.e. of edibles) ὑπ’ αὐτῆς φαίνεται τῆς φύσεως δεδομένη πᾶσιν, ὥσπερ κατὰ τὴν πρώτην γένεσιν εὐθὺς οὕτω καὶ τελειωθείσιν*. See the rest of the passage and compare 1258^a 35, *φύσεως γὰρ ἐστὶν ἔργον τροφήν τῶ γεννηθέντι παρέχειν παντὶ γὰρ ἐξ οὗ γίνεται τροφή τὸ λειψόμενον ἐστίν. διὸ κατὰ φύσιν ἐστὶν ἡ χρηματιστικὴ πᾶσιν ἀπὸ τῶν καρπῶν καὶ τῶν ζώων*. Compare also the epitome of these passages in *Economics* 1343^a 30, *ἔτι δὲ καὶ τῶν κατὰ φύσιν (ἡ γεωργικῆ) φύσει γὰρ ἀπὸ τῆς μητρὸς ἡ τροφή πᾶσιν ἐστίν, ὥστε καὶ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς*.

The inferior ‘naturalness’ therefore of the source of profit in the *τρίτον εἶδος* may constitute the affinity of this class to the second.

Again, the wealth which is the object of the second kind, consisting of money (*πλήθος νομίσματος* 1275^b 5–40), is unnatural as contrasted with the *πλοῦτος ὁ κατὰ φύσιν* of the first kind (1257^b 19–20), and the commodities which form the wealth of the *τρίτον εἶδος* are clearly more like the unnatural wealth. To them also might be applied what is said of money in 1257^b 15 *καίτοι ἄποπον τοιοῦτον εἶναι πλοῦτον οὐ εὐπωρῶν λιμῶ ἀπολείται*.

Further, the first kind of acquisition is more natural than the third in the sense in which the ‘natural’ is opposed to the ‘artificial’ rather than to the ‘unnatural.’

This leads to the discussion of another passage which has caused difficulty and controversy. After describing various forms of livelihood corresponding to various forms of getting food, which therefore fall to the side of natural acquisition, Aristotle says (1256^a 40) *οἱ μὲν οὖν βιοί τοσοῦτοι σχεδόν*

εἰσιν, ὅσοι γε αὐτόφυτον ἔχουσι τὴν ἐργασίαν, καὶ μὴ δι' ἀλλαγῆς καὶ καπηλείας κομίζονται τὴν τροφήν, νομαδικὸς γεωργικὸς ληστρικὸς ἀλιευτικὸς θηρευτικὸς.

The expression αὐτόφυτος ἐργασία is differently interpreted. Liddell and Scott make it the same as αὐτουργία. Another interpretation is "lives whose work is self-wrought" and not achieved with the help, or at the expense of others, like the life of ἀλλαγὴ καὶ καπηλεία.' Bernays translates 'diejenigen welche auf Ausbeutung von Naturerzeugnissen beruhen.' Jowett—'whose labour is personal' or 'whose industry is employed immediately on the products of Nature.' Another renders 'a direct personal effort to obtain subsistence,' and says 'Aristotle is clearly thinking of direct action on nature but the stress of the argument would seem to be on the directness.' Another suggests 'who deal personally (i.e. at first hand) with nature in their work.'

It must be contended that none of these views are tenable, and that the explanation of the phrase is quite simple.

According to the analogy of compounds with αὐτο-, e.g. αὐτόματος, αὐτοδίδακτος, the word αὐτόφυτος cannot mean anything but 'grown up of itself,' very like αὐτοφυής: see the instances under the latter word in Liddell and Scott. The opposition is between that which 'springs up of itself,' naturally that is, and that which is the result of human design and choice (προαίρεσις), the natural as opposed to the artificial: an idea prominent in the first book of the *Politics*. Cf. 1252^b 28 καὶ τοῦτο οὐκ ἐκ προαίρεσεως... ἀλλὰ φυσικόν. αὐτόφυτος is only a little more precise than φύσει.

Aristotle simply means that the industries (ἐργασίαι) which he has in view spring up of themselves, from our natural want of food, and from the means which nature¹ offers to supply it; and these are contrasted with industries founded rather upon our own thinking and contrivance, which are in this sense 'artificial.' And further on Aristotle puts this quite plainly, for, speaking of the same contrast between καπηλεία and the acquisition of natural products in the way of food, he says (1257^a 3) ἐστὶ δ' ἡ μὲν φύσει ἢ δ' οὐ φύσει αὐτῶν ἀλλὰ δι' ἐμπερίας τινὸς καὶ τέχνης γίνεται μᾶλλον, and so in the present context ἡ μὲν οὖν τοιαύτη κτήσις ὑπ'

¹ The βίος ληστρικὸς may seem an obvious exception, but yet Aristotle in a context where he is speaking expressly of this kind of life as well as of the others, says that in all of them the κτήσις, which is τρεφῆ, is ὑπ' αὐτῆς τῆς φύσεως δεδομένη (already quoted).

αὐτῆς φαίνεται τῆς φύσεως δεδομένη πᾶσιν (1256^b 7).

From this point of view, then, the first kind of κτητική is natural and the second 'artificial'; and clearly the third kind as involving (in general) more art and contrivance than the first is so far like the second.

It remains to ask what place in the classification belongs to μεταβλητική, with which, or with a form of which, the τρίτον εἶδος has been erroneously identified by more than one writer. There are two kinds of μεταβλητική. The principal one, usually called by the generic name μεταβλητική without qualification, coincides with the second kind of κτητική. It is unnatural, as already explained, and ψεγομένη. It is sometimes called καπηλική and sometimes χρηματιστική in the narrow sense of the word as explained in 1256^b 40. It includes not only ἐμπορία, to which the term μεταβλητική seems the most appropriate, but also usury (τοκισμός) and μισθαρνία, which again includes employment in the mechanical arts and bodily labour for hire.

The second kind of μεταβλητική is barter of natural products (edible, as will appear) for one another without the middleman's profits. Cf. 1257^b 25, αὐτὰ τὰ χρήσιμα πρὸς αὐτὰ καταλλάττονται. It is natural (1257^a 28, ἡ μὲν οὖν τοιαύτη μεταβλητικὴ οὔτε παρὰ φύσιν κ.τ.λ.; cf. 1257^a 15, ἀρξαμένη τὸ μὲν πρῶτον ἐκ τοῦ κατὰ φύσιν) while the other is unnatural. It is necessary (cf. 1257^b 1, ἐκ τῆς ἀναγκαίας ἀλλαγῆς ἠτέρον εἶδος τῆς χρηματιστικῆς ἐγένετο), while the other is unnecessary (1258^a 15, τῆς μὴ ἀναγκαίας χρηματιστικῆς). Compare also 1257^a 18, ὅσον γὰρ ἰκανὸν αὐτοῖς ἀναγκαῖον ἦν ποιῆσθαι τὴν ἀλλαγὴν (where one may suggest that the words ἰκανόν and ἀναγκαῖον should be transposed) and 1257^a 23, ὧν κατὰ τὰς δεήσεις ἀναγκαῖον <ἦν> ποιῆσθαι τὰς μεταδόσεις.²

Aristotle does not say in so many words to which of the three main classes the good μεταβλητική belongs: but it seems clearly to belong in conception to the first class,

Both are φύσει: cf. τὸ κατὰ φύσιν (1257^a 15) and οὐ παρὰ φύσιν (1257^a 28), said of the good μεταβλητική, with similar expressions for the first kind of χρηματιστική (οἰκονομική) in 1257^b 19, 1257^a 4, 1258^a 37. Both are ἀναγκαῖαι. Thus they are distinguished from the second main class (μεταβλητική = καπηλική) in the same manner. The statement that the good μεταβλητική is εἰς

² In 1257^a 17, τῆς ἀναγκαίας χρηματιστικῆς probably refers not only to the good μεταβλητική but to the whole of the first kind of χρηματιστική, as it certainly does in 1258^a 40.

ἀναπλήρωσιν τῆς κατὰ φύσιν ἀνταρκείας (1257^a 30) is parallel to the description of the οἰκονομική κτητική as θησαυρισμὸς χρημάτων πρὸς ζῶν ἀναγκαίων καὶ χρησίμων εἰς κοινωνίαν πόλεως ἢ οἰκίας.

Again the good μεταβλητική is said to be no kind of χρηματιστική at all—1257^a 28 ἢ μὲν οὖν τοιαύτη μεταβλητική οὔτε παρὰ φύσιν οὔτε χρηματιστικῆς ἐστὶν εἶδος οὐδέν. Here of course χρηματιστική is used in the narrow sense in which it is the second main class of acquisition = κατηλική. Thus the good μεταβλητική would fall to the first main class, for as yet Aristotle is keeping to a twofold division (διπλῆς οὔσης, 1258^a 39), the τρίτον εἶδος being an afterthought.

What are the commodities exchanged in the good μεταβλητική? In the passage which describes it, Aristotle is probably thinking of food-products only: (1) because the examples are of this sort (οἶνος, σῖτος 1257^a 27), (2) because he implies that it is distinctive of what is opposed to the bad μεταβλητική to be περὶ τροφήν—1258^a 15 περὶ μὲν οὖν τῆς τε μὴ ἀναγκαίας χρηματιστικῆς...καὶ περὶ τῆς ἀναγκαίας, ὅτι ἑτέρα μὲν αὐτῆς οἰκονομική δὲ κατὰ φύσιν ἢ περὶ τροφήν κ.τ.λ.; and (3) because, as already said, he has not as yet thought of the inedible commodities with which the third class is concerned.

If it be asked how the simple barter of these latter for one another or for food would be classed, the answer seems to be that Aristotle has not considered the point; and this is not surprising, as the conception of the τρίτον εἶδος seems to have been developed after he had begun to write his theory down. According however to the principle of his threefold division, the μεταβλητική of these commodities would have the same kind of naturalness as the μεταβλητική of edibles, because the profit would not be ἀπ' ἀλλήλων: but possibly, if the question had occurred to him, Aristotle would have followed the analogy of his treatment of the direct acquisition of the inedible commodities, and considered the barter of them as not quite so natural as that of articles of food.

This unequal method of composition—development of the subject during the process of writing, not followed by adequate revision and adjustment—whatever may be the reason of it, is specially characteristic of

the *Politics*, though found in varying degrees in the other writings of Aristotle. It extends even to the structure of periods (cf. e.g. a good example in *Pol.* i. 1259^a 37–^b211) and may perhaps be the main reason for anomalies in the *Politics* which are often ascribed to the work of redactors.

A table of the classification of the Arts of Acquisition is added to illustrate the views put forward in this article.

J. COOK WILSON.

¹ It may be here noted that a lacuna has been erroneously assumed in the first part of the passage by Conring and others—

1259^a 37. ἐπεὶ δὲ τρία μέρη τῆς οἰκονομικῆς ἦν, ἐν μὲν δεσποτική, περὶ ἧς εἰρήται πρότερον, ἐν δὲ πατρική, τρίτον δὲ γαμική,—καὶ γὰρ γυναικὸς ἄρχειν καὶ τέκνων ὡς ἐλευθέρων μὲν ἀμφοῖν, οὐ τὸν αὐτὸν δὲ τρόπον τῆς ἀρχῆς, ἀλλὰ γυναικὸς μὲν πολιτικῶς τέκνων δὲ βασιλικῶς.

The lacuna is supposed to be after γαμική.

After writing or dictating the clause in which the three kinds of οἰκονομική are recapitulated, it seems to occur to Aristotle that, the rule in the first kind being of slaves, while the rule in both the second and third is over the free, the distinction between the two last kinds needs justification, i.e. it needs to be shown that there are really *three* kinds and not two, and so he adds what is in effect a parenthesis, καὶ γὰρ γυναικὸς, &c. The sense is 'Whereas there were, as we saw, three kinds of οἰκονομική, the first the management of slaves, the second that of children, the third that of a wife—[now there really *are* three] for, as we said, though the last two are alike in the fact that the rule in both is over the free, the nature of the rule is different in each case; in the one case it is a constitutional rule and the other monarchical.' The emphasis is thus upon the words οὐ τὸν αὐτὸν δὲ τρόπον τῆς ἀρχῆς. One of the commentators supposes so large a gap in the text before καὶ γὰρ that the English equivalent of what he thinks lost would occupy about twenty-four lines of a column of this Journal. Victorius says: 'statim autem causam affert, cur distinxerit copulam patris ac liberorum a copula viri et uxoris; docet enim illa imperia diversa esse,' and so doubtless took the passage as above suggested. Yet a commentator who quotes him does not seem to see that this was his meaning, and supposes that Aristotle's object in distinguishing the rule in πατρική from that in γαμική was to show 'that the two latter relations represent a higher kind of rule (πολιτική or βασιλική) than the former [i.e. δεσποτική], the result being that οἰκονομική is more concerned with πατρική and γαμική than with δεσποτική,' whereas Aristotle's object is simply to justify making three divisions of οἰκονομική instead of two.

κτητική = χρηματιστική (in wide sense of the term)

(ii)

της χρηματιστικής διπλῆς οἰκίας 1258^a 38

ἐν εἶδος κτητικῆς κατὰ φύσιν μέρος τῆς οἰκονομικῆς 1256^b 27

γένος ἄλλο κτητικῆς ἢ μάλιστα καλοῦσι, καὶ δίκαιον αὐτὸ καλεῖν χρηματιστικὴν (in the narrow sense) 1256^b 40

θησαυρισμὸς χρημάτων πρὸς ζῶν ἀναγκαίων καὶ χρησίμων εἰς κοινωνίαν πόλεως ἢ οἰκίας 1256^b 27

This is τὸ καπηλικόν and arises out of the natural kind of exchange through the introduction of money (νόμισμα) 1257^a 6 *sqq.*, 1257^b 2

Τῆσιν χρήματα constitute ὁ ἀληθινὸς πλοῦτος 1256^b 30, = ὁ πλοῦτος ὁ κατὰ φύσιν 1257^b 19

τὸ νόμισμα στοιχεῖον καὶ πῦμα τῆς ἀλλαγῆς ἐστὶν 1257^b 23

Called οἰκονομική 1257^b 20, 1258^a 17, 39; μόνιον τῆς οἰκονομίας 1258^a 28

Called μεταβλητική (in the narrow sense), and καπηλική 1258^b 1, 21, 1258^a 39

κατὰ φύσιν ἐστὶν ἡ χρηματιστικὴ πᾶσιν ἀπὸ τῶν καρπῶν καὶ τῶν ζῶων 1257^a 37 ἢ περὶ τρυφῆν 1258^a 17

οὐ κατὰ φύσιν ἀλλ' ἀπ' ἀλλήλων 1258^b 1—2

φύσει 1257^a 4; κατὰ φύσιν 1257^b 19

οὐ φύσει, 1257^a 4
ψευδομένη 1258^b 1
μὴ ἀναγκαία 1258^a 15

ἐπανουμένη 1258^a 40

= μεταβλητικὴ χρηματιστικὴ 1258^b 21 *sqq.*

* (1) 1258^b 12 *sqq.*

(ἀπὸ ζῶων) 1258^b 12
εἰ. ἵππων
βοῶν
προβάτων
μελιτῶν
τῶν ἄλλων ζῶων τῶν πλωτῶν ἢ πτηνῶν ἀφ' ὧσιν ἐστὶ τυχάνειν βοθήσας.

(2) The good or natural kind of μεταβλητικὴ αὐτὰ τὰ χρήσιμα πρὸς αὐτὰ καταλαμβάνονται 1257^a 25 ἢ μὲν τοιαύτη μεταβλητικὴ οὐτε παρὰ φύσιν οὐτε χρηματιστικῆς ἐστὶν εἶδος οὐδὲν 1257^a 28

(1) ἐμπορία
(2) τοκισμὸς
(8) μισθάρνια

ναυκληρία, φορηγία, παράστασις τῶν βαρυσσῶν τεχνῶν τῶν ἀτέχνων καὶ τῶ σόματι μόνον χρησίμων

μη ἀναγκαία 1258^a 17

* The βίον named in 1256^b 1—νομαδεῖς, γεωργικῆς, λιπτικῆς, ἀλευρικῆς, θηρικῆς—belong to this head, as they are ἀπὸ τῶν καρπῶν καὶ τῶν ζῶων. This may seem not to apply strictly to the ἵππων, though Aristotle himself describes it and the other lives all as modes of acquiring τρυφή. However, Aristotle has not got this classification of the βίον before him when making the classification in 1258^b 12.

μεταβλητικὴ

(iii) (an afterthought) 1258^b 27

τρίτον δὲ εἶδος χρηματιστικῆς μεταξὺ ταύτης (sc. τῆς δευτέρας) καὶ τῆς πρώτης . . . ὅσα ἀπὸ γῆς (mining industries μεταλλευτικὴ) καὶ τῶν ἀπὸ γῆς γινόμενων ἀκόσμων μὲν χρησίμων δὲ (acquisition of inedible products of the soil—e.g. ἄλοστομία).