

**İSTANBUL BİLGİ UNIVERSITY INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
PHILOSOPHY AND SOCIAL THOUGHT MASTER'S DEGREE
PROGRAM**

ARISTOTLE'S ETHICS AND POLITICS

**Glsm GNEY
114679015**

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ferda KESKİN

**İSTANBUL
2018**

ARISTOTLE'S ETHICS AND POLITICS
ARİSTOTELES'TE ETİK VE POLİTİKA

GÜLSÜM GÜNEY

114679015

Tez Danışmanı: Doç. Dr. Ferda KESKİN

Jüri Üyesi: Prof. Dr. Kenan Çayır

Jüri Üyesi: Yrd. Doç. Dr. Ömer Behiç ALBAYRAK



Tezin Onaylandığı Tarih: 18.01.2018

Toplam Sayfa Sayısı: 86

Anahtar Kelimeler (Türkçe)

- 1) Etik
- 2) İyi
- 3) Mutluluk
- 4) Erdem
- 5) Politika
- 6) Anayasa

Anahtar Kelimeler (İngilizce)

- 1) Ethics
- 2) Good
- 3) Happiness
- 4) Virtue
- 5) Politics
- 6) Constitution

ABSTRACT

Various studies have been carried out on ethics throughout the history of philosophy. Philosophers have manifested different perspectives on the development processes of the concepts of ethics and types of ethics. What will guide my study will be Aristotle who is one of the most important names in the history of philosophy in the early ages and draws attention with systematic considerations about ethics.

In the first section, emphasis has been placed on the notion of "being the mean" which is used in the determination of virtue by taking the issues such as good, happiness and virtue into consideration. Later, ethical virtues and virtues of thought were explained in detail.

In the second section, attempts have been made to place emphasis on the connection between politics and ethics taking Aristotle's sense of politics into consideration, and then, to explain the best regime by classifying the constitution and the regimes.

My basic objective in this study is to evaluate the conceptual framework of ethics in philosophy, and try to present the Aristotle's thoughts on ethics and the relationship between these ideas and politics.

Keywords; Ethics, good, happiness, virtue, politics, constitution,

ÖZET

Felsefe tarihi boyunca, etik üzerine çeşitli çalışmalar yapılmıştır. Etik kavramının gelişim süreçleri ve etik türleri üzerine, düşünürler farklı bakış açıları ortaya koymuşlardır. Çalışmamıza yön verecek olan ise, felsefe tarihinin ilk çağdaki en önemli isimlerinden biri olan ve etik konusunda sistemli düşünceleriyle dikkat çeken Aristoteles olacaktır.

İlk bölümde Aristoteles'in etik anlayışında önemli bir yer tutan iyi, mutluluk, erdem konularına yer verilerek erdemin belirlenmesinde kullanılan "orta olma" kavramı üzerinde durulmuştur. Daha sonra etik erdemler ve düşünce erdemleri ayrıntılarıyla açıklanmıştır.

İkinci bölümde ise Aristoteles'in siyaset anlayışına yer verilerek siyaset ve etik arasındaki bağlantı vurgulanmaya çalışılmış ve ardından anayasa ve yönetim biçimleri sınıflandırılarak en iyi yönetim biçimi açıklanmaya çalışılmıştır.

Bizim bu çalışmadaki temel amacımız ise, felsefede etik konusundaki kavramsal çerçeveyi değerlendirmek ve Aristoteles'in etik konusundaki düşünceleriyle, bu düşüncelerin siyasetle ilişkisinin ne olduğunu ortaya koymaya çalışmaktır.

Anahtar Kelimeler; etik, iyi, mutluluk, erdem, siyaset, anayasa,

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	III
ÖZET	IV
TABLE OF CONTENTS	V
SECTION 1: INTRODUCTION	1
SECTION 2: THE CONCEPT OF ETHICS	7
1.1. DEVELOPMENT PROCESSES OF THE CONCEPT OF ETHICS.....	7
1.2. TYPES OF ETHICS.....	10
1.2.1. Descriptive Ethics.....	10
1.2.2. Normative Ethics	12
1.2.3. Meta-ethics	13
1.3. ARISTOTLE’S ETHICS.....	14
1.3.1. Aristotle’s Good.....	14
1.3.2. Aristotle’s Happiness.....	18
1.3.3. Aristotle’s Virtue.....	21
1.3.3.1. Ethical Virtues.....	23
1.3.3.1.1. Bravery.....	26
1.3.3.1.2. Generosity.....	29
1.3.3.1.3. Magnanimity.....	30
1.3.3.2. Virtues of Thought.....	31
1.3.3.2.1. Phronesis, Moral Wisdom (Practical Wisdom)	33
1.3.3.2.2. Nous (Direct Comprehension)	34
1.3.3.2.3. Sophia (Philosophical Wisdom)	36
SECTION 3: ARISTOTLE'S POLITICS AND ETHICS AND POLITICS RELATIONSHIP	39
2.1 ARISTOTLE'S ETHICS AND POLITICS RELATIONSHIP.....	39
2.2 ARISTOTLE'S UNDERSTANDING OF "HUMAN NATURE" AND THE STATE AS A NATURAL ENTITY IN THIS UNDERSTANDING.....	43

2.2.1 Polis and Its Nature.....	50
2.3 CONSTITUTION AND REGIMES	55
2.3.1 Kingdom and Tyranny.....	58
2.3.2 Aristocracy and Oligarchy.....	61
2.3.3 Constitutional Regime and Democracy.....	64
SECTION 4: CONCLUSION AND EVALUATION.....	68
REFERENCES.....	74
CITED ARTICLES AND THESIS.....	79

ABBREVIATIONS

a. g. e.	: İbidem
Bas.	: Printing House
Bkz.	: See
C.	: Volume
Çev.	: Translator
Der.	: Compiler
TFK.	: Turkish Philosophy Institute
Trans.	: Translation
vb.	: And the like

INTRODUCTION

Research questions related to ethics constantly occupied the human mind, considering the history of thought. Because, its moral practices have become a matter of debate at every place where human is. Ethics is a discipline of philosophy that handles and discusses the moral life, and tends towards a phenomenon comprising moral values and ideals and called morality.

The problem regarding the morality of human behaviors¹ is the theoretical problem of ethics. The subject of what could be said about the sequence of what is required to do is the problem of the ethics has been handled over and over in order for the infinitely large number of actions continuously in the state of formation on earth and relationships between humans to become true somehow, however, in such a way as to form the conditions which always leads to a better life.

Ethical theories are divided into three main categories: Meta-ethics is concerned with where our ethical principles originate and what their meanings are; Normative-ethics that tries to determine the moral standards that regulate right and wrong behavior; Applied-ethics that tries to suggest solutions to contradictory special situations in practice.

Many philosophers have done studies on ethics in the course of history. Among these philosophers Aristotle who laid the foundations of the ethics has made detailed analyzes on many issues related to ethics such as good, happiness, virtue, pleasure, and voluntary acts.

On the basis of all these analyzes , there is an effort to determine "how human beings, as social creatures, will have a good life and be happy". Aristotle's

¹ Pieper, Introduction to Ethics, 1999: s.16

considerations on good, happiness and virtue form the main frame of his solution to this problem.

Aristotle begins to examine First Book of Nicomachean Ethics as follows:

It is thought that every craft/artwork and research, in the same way, every action and choice aims at a good. For this reason, it is a proper expression to say that the good is the thing at which everything aims.

Aristotle, in the context of this excerpt, reflects that humans aims the good in all their doings, however, that such aims differ according to actions, arts and sciences. Aim of the soldiery is victory, and economy's aim is wealth whereas the medicine's aim is health.² The thought mentioned here is that different types of human doings or human activities have different aims and every aim has a different Good.

In this regard, the ethical dimension of human reveals the distinctive aspect of the human from other beings. Because no living being other than human beings pursues the purpose of what good is and how good life is to be attained.

If every action and every preference aims at a good, in other words, if “the good itself is the aim of human actions”³ and if there is a good called "good for man" above these individual goods, then what makes such supreme good "good"? Aristotle who began to question what a happy life is and which is the life that will provide a happy life to man by means of the concept of "good" could not stop himself to ask "what the good is as an aim for man, and what is the best of things

² Aristotle: Nicomachean Ethics; 1094a 5-10. ³ Aristotle, Eudemian Ethics; 1218b 10.

to do?"³. Eudaimonia is the goal determining the things each single human individually and all human jointly choose and avoid.⁴

The thing that everyone calls happiness can be different from one another even though both ordinary people and elite people call it happiness⁵. "Some realize clear, certain things, for example pleasure, wealth and honor from happiness, some realize other things, and even the same person can realize different things in many instances".⁶

Aristotle explains with pleasure that the good is the principle which is the most perfect sense in everything. Happiness is the activity appropriate for the virtue, which is the goal itself, of the soul⁸. Instant happiness is not the "happiness" Aristotle refers. It can't be said that the soul can reach final good with a single activity appropriate for the virtue, as in the case that a single swallow can not bring the spring.⁹ Because, honor, pleasure, wealth, fame etc. can be included in the instant happiness, and these are the things that keep a person away from the good. In this respect, true happiness is always preferred for itself, not for anything else.

Virtue of every being is the thing that makes it to be in good condition and fulfill its work well. For instance, the virtue of eye is the thing that makes it and its work well, in other words, seeing well is its virtue. Just as the virtue of a horse is to carry its rider well, and escape from his enemy in case of enemy. In that case, virtue of a man is the temperament that enables man to be well and do his own job

³ Aristotle, Eudemian Ethics 1218b 25.

⁴ Aristotle, Rhetoric 1360 b 5.

⁵ Aristotle, Nicomachean Ethics 1095a 15-30.

⁶ a. g. e. 1095 a 15-30. ⁸ a.

g. e. 1099b 25- 1102a 5 ⁹

a. g. e. 1098 a 15.

quite well.⁷ In other words, "... the best temper, attitude creates the best activity, and the virtue is the best temper, so activity of the virtue of the soul is the best thing"⁸.

Thus, confirmation of the fact that the virtue is included in the temperament is provided as the answer to the question "where" the virtue is; however, the question of "where" does not reveal what and how the virtue is. In such case, now it is necessary to ask what the virtue is. Virtue is being mean; it is a mean between excess and deficiency. According to a preferred mathematical proportioning, it is not a mean, it is a mean with respect to us.⁹

What is considered to be mean is, when required, to act as required against required things and required persons since it's required. Such state specific to the best and virtue is valid for the actions where excess and deficiency is of no concern. Because "The thing that is not extreme is good".¹⁰ That's why virtue aims at the mean.¹¹

Aristotle has divided the virtues into two categories such as virtues of thought and virtues of character while studying on the virtues at the end of his Nicomachean Ethics book 1.¹⁵

Virtues of thought, are the those purely originating from the part of the soul which is wise and having intelligence; as for the virtues of character, they are originating from the part which has no intelligence but has a share from the

⁷ a. g. e. 1106 a 15-20.

⁸ Aristotle, Eudemian Ethics 1219 a 30.

⁹ Aristotle, Nicomachean Ethics 1106 a 25, 1106 b 5.

¹⁰ Aristotle, Rhetoric 1363 a 5.

¹¹ Aristotle, Nicomachean Ethics 1106 b 20-35.

¹⁵ a. g. e. 1103 a 15.

intelligence in a sense, and from the part which can follow the mind¹² compared to the imperative intelligence part, that is, desire or appetite faculties. ¹³

Virtues are obtained neither naturally nor contrary to the nature; we have a natural structure, and tendency enabling us to acquire them and they are fully developed with habits. Virtues, as an activity, are the things learned by exercising repeatedly; just as being a just person by doing just things, and being temperate person by doing temperate things. ¹⁸

Seeking the virtues in character virtues which are acquired with habits is also an indication of the fact that virtue is not innate. People would be good or bad when they were born if the virtues were innate.¹⁴ Virtues of thought and virtues of character are not innate since they are able to be acquired and improved by means of training or habits. However, there is such an innate predisposition in the human being, and when this predisposition is actualized, then "character" develops. "... Virtue, a habit associated with preferences"¹⁵, virtuous action and activity is that which is the mean since the character is present in the mean; for this reason, the character virtues are those that are the mean.

Aristotle establishes a bridge to politics as a requirement for the completion of the philosophy on the subject of human things in the last sentences of Nicomachean Ethics. Aristotle suggests that a single person is inherently a member of a society in terms ethics, and, in politics, a good life of a state is only possible if its citizens survives good lives. ¹⁶

¹² Aristotle, Eudemian Ethics 1220 b 5.

¹³ Arslan Ahmet, İlkçağ Felsefe Tarihi, İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları. İstanbul, 2011, c.3, s.251

¹⁸ Aristotle, Nicomachean Ethics 1103 b 5-15.

¹⁴ a. g. e. 1103 b 10-15.

¹⁵ a. g. e. 1107 a 5.

¹⁶ D.Ross, Aristotle, s.220

Ethics will make what is good for man possible; in other words, since politics also covers the ethics, what a man is will be identified with virtue and morality; and what a morality is will be identified with politics.

The fact that man can live a virtuous life is only a matter of discussion in a state and society. The aim of politics, in this case, is to investigate how to make citizens good and accordingly how to make them happy. In this case, the supreme good target covering all goods and the highest of communities will be aimed, that's what is known as the state and the type of such community is then a political community. So, every state is a community built for a good purpose.¹⁷ The natural tendencies of people to be virtuous are revealed in the state as a citizen. That is to say, the objective of the state is to create conditions that will enable people to improve their morals. This demonstrates once again what kind of relationship is existing between good citizenship and good human.

Man first comes together in the family and proceeds towards the state. This is a natural process and an indication that people who constitute the state together are also natural. Therefore, the state can be said to be a part of human natural aspect and a formation of human nature. In such case, which type state or constitution may correspond exactly to the human nature?

Constitutions are the sum of citizens. There are many constitutional categories as there are many citizens' communities. There are a variety of constitutions which are considered to be right and aim to ensure everyone's wellbeing and also those which is composed of the deviations from the foregoing; these are the constitutions where sovereignty will be in possession of a single man, a minority or a majority.

¹⁷ Aristotle, Politics 1/1, (Çev. Mete Tuncay), İstanbul: Remzi, 2008, s. 7.

The constitutions are the right constitutions if the state is governed by the common purpose, whether it may have been constituted by a single person, a minority, or a majority, and, on the other hand, the constitution is a deviation if only the interests of one part of the community is observed, whether this part may be a single person, a minority, or a majority.

For this reason, the right constitutions will be the management of a single person who aims for common good, that is, kingdom; the management of more than one person but a minority who is aiming for common good, that is, aristocracy; the management applied by all citizens who aim for common good, which is political regime. Deviation from the correct constitutions is towards tyranny from the kingdom; towards oligarchy from aristocracy; towards democracy from the political regime or constitutional sovereignty of the majority.

Constitutions that ignore the interests of majority are deviations since tyranny only regards the interests of a single administrator, oligarchy only regards the interests of wealthy people, and democracy only regards the interests of poor people.¹⁸ The right constitutions, then, are the constitutions in which the characters of the citizens are shaped according to common good; deviated constitutions are those shaped according to the interests of individuals or a group where there is no common good.

SECTION I: THE CONCEPT OF ETHICS

1.1. DEVELOPMENT PROCESSES OF THE CONCEPT OF ETHICS

Since Aristotle, "ethics", the name of a philosophical discipline; is derived from the word "ethos" of the Greek language with such meanings as customs, good

¹⁸ Aristoteles, Politika 3/7, s. 80-81.

manners, traditions and morality, and has two different uses. Its first use implies habit, traditions and customs meaning. According to the same, the person is deemed to have acted in accordance with the ethics as long as he observes the norms of moral law which are generally accepted. The latter has a narrower meaningful use. According to this use, a person who does an act or behaves is such a person who doesn't implement the imposed rules of acts without querying them, and to the contrary, intends the good by perceiving and reflecting on them and turns them into habits in order to realize the "good". Habits, traditions and customs thus take on the meaning of character and are reinforced as the basic attitude of being virtuous. ¹⁹

Both in Western languages and in Turkish, the words ethics and moral/morality are often perceived as substitutable terms.²⁰

Ethics are commonly used synonymously with the words moral or traditional in both traditional ethics and everyday language. Ethical actions, ethical demands, etc. are mentioned using this word. Moral language or ethical language is the everyday speech about the actions that are subject to critical judgment. ²¹

The result of this conceptual differentiation between morality and ethics is: that the ethical considerations are not being moral spontaneously, and may be originating from the interest in a certain problem associated with the ethics, or, conversely, that ethical considerations are not the ethical considerations with just being ethical, nevertheless they could be well turned into ethical problems.

What can be the right action for a person in such a situation? Or can it be a universal good behavior pattern in the face of similar situations rather than the "correct action according to the situation" that the person may experience? Does a

¹⁹ Pieper, Introduction to Ethics, 1999, ss.30,31

²⁰ Sarp Erk Ulaş, Felsefe Sözlüğü, Bilim ve Sanat Yayınları, Ankara 2002, s. 25.

²¹ Pieper, Age., s. 32

person make his/her choice with free will? Again, what is the ethical value of an act that is necessarily mandatory? Is an objective moral principle possible? What kind of assessment can be made about the action not based on objective moral values? Under what conditions is the debatability of the values that people build in their own history possible? On what social or psychological grounds does the presence of these values be based? Which behavior may be useful in the face of a particular situation?

These questions determine the boundaries of the ethics. Ethics thinks about morality by asking these questions and revealing its difference from morality.

The moral items that emerge either in the individual or in the social dimension of human life constitute the problem domain of ethics. However, ethics has been made a beginning to be used as a value in response to the human weaknesses that have emerged especially recently in all areas of life (politics, medicine, environment, communication, sports, economics, etc.).

Here, the distance between "the truth" and "the choice" creates the main line of the questioning. At this point, emphasizing on the basic questions such as "what is human? What should human be? and trying to answer both at the same time is setting an "objective" for human. Therefore, 'to determine a purpose for man' means to set a purpose for his actions. Thus, it can be said that some aims in human actions have moral qualities.²²

We often see that both words are used in place of each other in daily life or even philosophy despite this separation between ethics and morality. Morality is a thing, a phenomenon that is experienced actually and historically at an individual, group, and social level, whereas ethics is the name of the philosophical discipline

²² Doğan Özlem, *Etik, İnkılap Yay.*, İst. 2004, s. 13-16.

that handles such phenomenon, examines and classifies the moral perspectives, doctrines, reveals the similarities and differences between them, and compares and criticize them.

Nicolai Hartman says, "There is only one ethics against a plenty of morals." On the other hand, the etymological investigation shows us that the word ethics comes from the Greek word "ethos" and the moral word comes from the Latin word "Mos". Both "Ethos" and "Mos" mean, rules, traditions, customs, habits and established, sensibility, character, temper, temperament etc. The word "morality" we use in our language comes from the root of Arabic word "hulk", and this root has been also used again in the sense of rules, traditions, customs, habits and character. Accordingly, they may appear to have the same meaning if the nuances of the words "ethics", "morals" and "morals" are ignored.

Task of the ethics is not to develop any morality, to add new one to the many existing moralities and to educate people to obey this morality. On the contrary, the ethics is a field to study the phenomenon called "morality".²³

1.2 TYPES OF ETHICS

There are different types of ethics having historical, epistemological relationship between them, or there are three levels of research in the philosophy of ethics. These are: descriptive ethics that express the application of a scientific, factual attitude to the field of ethics, rather than establishing an ethical rule, normative ethics²⁴ that attempts to define what good is and how to acquire good and

²³ a. g. e. , ss. 22,23

²⁴ Ahmet Cevizci, *Etiğe Giriş*,Paradigma Yayınları, İstanbul, 2008, ss.7,8.

develops rules and finally, the meta-ethics that intends to do the analysis of the situation rather than establishing the rule.²⁵

1.2.1 Descriptive Ethics

In the context of morality and moral action, descriptive ethics deals with truth or phenomena rather than what is required (choices) or value. In the said approach, ethics is more of a spectator-viewer or observer. In other words, ethics watches moral phenomena and events from the outside and observe and describe them with a scientific approach.²⁶

The descriptive ethics, as the name implies, focuses more on definition than on setting any rule. Therefore, descriptive ethical point of view is not expected to study on a new formation or standard or to provide us with answers related to our questions about innovations required to improve a subject.²⁷

However, there is one more area that we should address about the descriptive ethics. It is a field that focuses on descriptive ethical practice. Its proposals for the current situation can be effective in the field of ethics although it does not set a new norm. For example, it makes descriptive ethical proposals for such matters as environmental ethics, animal rights, death penalty, nuclear war and so on.²⁸ Such situation helps us to draw the system of thinking which we define as descriptive ethics into the life more and makes it more common in the social conditions of life. Despite all of these conditions, descriptive ethics can not go beyond assessing the current situation or a particular standard instead of setting rules and new standards.

²⁵ a. g. e. ss. 9.

²⁶ a. g. e. ss 5.

²⁷ a. g. e. ss 6.

²⁸ Yaran C. Ahlak ve Etik, Rağbet Yayınları. 2010, ss.42

1.2.2. Normative Ethics

Normative ethics: mostly attempts to carry out evaluations. It tells us what is "good" and what is "bad". Identifying and classifying facts and behaviors in terms of ethical thinking are very important but not sufficient.²⁹ What is expected from ethics rather is the answers given to the questions such as what is wrong, what is right, what is good or bad for a human, what will be done and what will not be done under certain conditions, and what is the ultimate goal in the life of a human. These are the answers revealing the transition requirement rather definition state than classification state. These definitions are put forward by moral philosophers and these people offer certain norms to people in what they do and how they do it.

Normative ethics focuses on three areas in an intellectual sense. The first of these relates to the moral virtue, that is, morally what is "good" and what is "bad", and moral act which is the appropriate action for the human character. As a result, a morally good person is required to be a person who is virtuous and exhibits virtuous and morally correct behavior.³⁰

In this way, this first title intending to improve the personal part of human, actually forms a basis for the targeted structure in the ongoing process and starts out remarking "individual first". It also describes where a certain movement of a person can get by the influence of the wave after recognizing the person with certain definitions.

The second focal point of the normative ethical intellectual system related to social life and social structure. The question in this problematic where the person is handled as a whole rather than individual ones is through which principles and

²⁹ Cevizci,2008: ss.7.

³⁰ a. g. e. 2008: ss. 8

administrative styles are required to bring the society together or get structured.³¹ It focuses on the subjects such as the effects of individual behavior patterns of people in their environment and the interaction of people with the social environment, and finally the question of how social environments of people should be.

The last question that normative ethics intends to solve is the problem of what values are fundamental, and what or which of our experiences are valuable and desirable in themselves or by themselves. The topics such as joy and happiness, in this context, are the questions the answers of which have been sought most by the ethics philosophers.³²

Normative ethics, as seen and in a manner completely consistent with its definition, handles human as a part of the whole, attempts to set norms from the human's personal experience to the social environment, from the behaviors exhibited, to the desires and wishes, and seeks answers to its questions.

1.2.3. Meta-ethics

Another area included in the ethical thinking is meta-ethics which is the last level of ethical research and ethical thinking. Metaethical thinking represents a contemporary approach as analytical or critical attitude in moral philosophy.³³

What is new in meta-ethics is that analysis is considered to be the unique and important work of ethics.³⁴ Meta-ethics, represents a new style of ethics and research of the modernist enlightenment philosophy, which appeared under the new circumstances of the 20th century, and was spontaneously developed independent of

³¹ a. g. e. 2008: ss. 8

³² a. g. e. 2008: ss. 8

³³ a. g. e. 2008: ss. 9

³⁴ a. g. e. 2008: ss. 12

the alternative ethical theories of the continental Europe in an age where value is roughly reduced to power, against the futility of suggesting normative ethics.³⁵

Meta-ethics as a word meaning; it means ethical supremacy. Its defenders who adopt the idea of meta-ethics have more analytical thinking and suggest that ethics should focus on analyzing.

The last thing we can say about meta-ethics is that meta-ethics doesn't accept a system which sets ideas and rules in a way, instead, adopts examining the existing norms and subject to evaluations in terms of results.

1.3 ARISTOTLE'S ETHICS

Aristotle has also pioneering ideas about ethics as in the case with many basic subjects of philosophy. Aristotle has detailed analyzes on many issues concerning the field of morality, such as good, happiness, virtue, pleasure, and voluntary action. At the basis of these analyzes, there is the effort to determine "how a human being as a social creature will have a good life, how to be happy." The main frame of Aristotle's solution to this problem is his views on good, happiness and virtue.

Aristotle wants to know that human has many goods, but which of the goods is the real good for human, and which of the goods is proper for the human nature? His answer to this question is eudaimonia or happiness. Happiness is the primary purpose of human, and human can attain this purpose with a proper effectiveness of the soul on mind and virtue. Therefore, firstly human's good, then, in turn, happiness which is the supreme good among these goods, relationships with the virtues, of the activities which is the only way to achieve happiness and lastly which of the

³⁵ a. g. e. 2008: ss. 330

activities has the supreme good will be evaluated. Thus, Aristotle's good he describes as nature and purpose of human will be understood.

1.3.1 Aristotle's Good

Aristotle's book, which deals with the human good in the ethical scene, is the "Nicomachean Ethics". There are philosophers who think that such a big impact Aristotle had in the ethical field is arising from the question he asked. Because, many moral philosophers, until Aristotle, start asking "what is my duty?" or "what is my moral duty" in their studies by discriminating between ethics and other fields, whereas Aristotle, instead, starts with more general question "What does it mean for a man to live a good life?". Thus, the investigation on ethics does not fall within narrow limits in the sense we know today. This investigation is also conveyed to the relations with human's intellectual activity and with the areas such as personal love and friendship. Because "a good life" is considered to be more or less related to all these things.³⁶

Of course, this does not mean that your ethics cover all human activities. Human seeks right and beauty as well as good in his life.

The famous opening line of Nicomachean Ethics clearly shows this situation:

“Every art and every inquiry, and similarly every action and pursuit, is thought to aim at some good; and for this reason, the good has rightly been declared to be that at which all things aim”³⁷

³⁶ Magge, B., "Martha Nussbaum ile Aristotle Üzerine Tartışma", Büyük Filozoflar, (çev.: A. Cevizci), İstanbul: Paradigma Yay, 2002, ss. 46.

³⁷ Aristotle, Nicomachean Ethics. 1094a 1-5

However, we learn that the topic to be investigated in these lines is not only good, but also learn that the human's good is the thing he desires; that is, this desire is assumed to be the purpose of human because according to Aristotle, human aims at and wishes what he finds good. Therefore, for Aristotle, "one human's aiming at something is his good".³⁸ For example, one person's desires to be a doctor, another person's desire to be rich can be regarded as their goods and purposes.³⁹⁴⁰ For this reason, the subject to be investigated is good or purpose.

At this point, an important characteristic of good or purpose appears since the good becomes the purpose of a person and such person will naturally desire different goods; and such characteristic is that good or purpose may change from one person to another:

By expressing with Aristotle's words:

... it will not be good any the more for being eternal, since that which lasts long is no whiter than that which perishes in a day. Further, since 'good' has as many senses as 'being' (for it is predicated both in the category of substance, as of God and of reason, and in quality, i.e., of the virtues, and in quantity, i.e., of that which is moderate, and in relation, i.e., of the useful, and in time, i.e., of the right opportunity, and in place, i.e., of the right locality and the like), clearly it cannot be something universally present in all cases and single; for then it could not have been predicated in all the categories but in one only⁴¹ of honor, wisdom, and pleasure, just in respect of their goodness, the accounts are distinct and diverse. The good, therefore, is not some common element answering to one Idea....

³⁸ Aristotle, Nicomachean Ethics 1097a 20-25

³⁹ Santas, G. 2001, Goodness and Justice: Plato, Aristotle and The Moderns, USA: Blackwell Pub., ss.

⁴⁰ .

⁴¹ Aristotle, Nicomachean Ethics 1096a 20-30

*Because, if there is a single good commonly imposed or a separate good which is itself good, it is clear that it is not something that man will do or will obtain*⁴²

Aristotle perhaps carries out evaluations to remove the relativity by making a definition of the good in response to all the controversial issues.

*Only those things which are for the sake of themselves and which are pursued are expressed as good belonging to one species. The other things are good due to them in a way. It is clear that the term good has two meanings. Those being good in themselves and those which are good since they are means for the previous.*⁴⁷

The goods vary from one person to the next, but there is a hierarchy of goods where the good is not of the same value, so it will not tone in relativity.

The goods differ from one person to the next, but there is a hierarchy of good where the good is not of the same value, so it will not tone in relativity.⁴³ Because goods or purposes can be gathered under a higher purpose. For example, all military-related actions will take place under the concept of military service; among the abundance of the aims, higher aims that are the master art will be preferred to aims positioned below.

By expressing with his words:

Now, as there are many actions, arts, and sciences, their ends also are many But where such arts fall under a single capacity ... in all of these the ends of the

⁴² a. g. e. 1096b 1-35

⁴⁷ a. g. e. 1095a 5-10

⁴³ Kraut, R. 1991, Aristotle on the Human Good, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, ss. 5.

*master arts are to be preferred to all the subordinate ends; for it is for the sake of the former that the latter are pursued.*⁴⁴

In other words, due to the fact that these subordinate ends are desired for a higher end,⁵⁰ it must be divided into as the goods that are sought, loved and desired for themselves and those desired⁴⁵ for which they constitute, protect such mentioned goods. In this distinction, the supreme good is solely desired by itself, and such a good is desirable by all other goods.⁵²

The Aristotle is so sure that such a good having an end in itself will be desired. The reason for being so sure is that such supreme good can also required for the sake of higher good even if this supreme good is not enough in itself and this process is going to continue forever. However, this process can not continue everlastingly. If it continues, then all our desires will be in vain and become meaningless in such an endless process.⁴⁶

Now, the good Aristotle is looking for has the following character:

*"... if there is only one thing that is an end itself, that is what we are looking for, if there is more, among them, the one which is and itself at the most..."*⁴⁷

⁴⁴ Aristotle, Nicomachean Ethics, 1094a 10-15

⁵⁰ Kraut, R. 1991, ss. 5-6.

⁴⁵ Aristotle, Nicomachean Ethics, 1096b 10-15

⁵² Kraut, R. 1991, ss. 79-80.

⁴⁶ Aristotle, Nicomachean Ethics 1094a 20-25

⁴⁷ a. g. e. 1097a 25-32

1.3.2 Aristotle's Happiness

Aristotle defines happiness as the activity of the soul in accordance with the virtue.⁵⁵ At the beginning of Eudemian Ethics book he expresses with the following words that he placed the happiness onto the base of his ethical thinking and starts weaving his moral philosophy around this concept:

“Happiness, which is the most beautiful and the best of everything, is the most pleasant thing.”⁴⁹

He names the highest, the most complete, the most perfect, the most noble, as eudaimonia. According to him, both ordinary and distinguished people agree that this supreme good, and the good life is the happiness.⁵⁰

Good of human and that his aim is to be happy is as clear as a stone will freely fall due to its nature. Greek society almost speaks no differently on this matter. However, that the happiness is the highest goal does not prevent the debate on what constitutes its essence.⁵¹

Aristotle starts looking for answers to these questions. What is the source of good life? And how to get it? Is happiness a requirement of human nature or something teachable?

Aristotle states that what the happiness is can not be known thoroughly without analyzing what the good is, what is good for human, and what are the

⁴⁸ A. A. Stroll/ A. A. Long/ V. J. Bourke/ R. Campbell, Etik Kuramlar, çeviren ve Derleyen, Mehmet Türkeri, Lotus Yayınları. Ankara. 2013, s.23

⁴⁹ Aristotle, Eudemian Ethics, çev. Saffet Babür, Dost Kitabevi Yayınları. Ankara, 1999, s.11

⁵⁰ Aristotle, Nicomachean Ethics, 1095a 15-20

⁵¹ a. g. e 1097b 20-25

conditions for happiness. So, happiness generates virtue, and virtue generates happiness. But the difference here is that; we always choose it for its own sake and never as a tool for something else, but we choose honor, pleasure, intelligence and virtue for themselves, and also for the sake of happiness, because we think that we will be happy through them.⁵² So whereas happiness is not a tool for anything, they may be the means of seeking or attaining happiness.

Aristotle tells us that people will be happy if they do activities that are appropriate for their nature; that is to say, according to him, human beings may be happy if they deal with appropriate activities. Because it is the mental activity that fits to the soul, and that distinguishes human beings from other beings, so human being will not pursue a consumer life that is worthy of animals by organizing human enthusiasm through such activities. For this reason, Aristotle associates the happiness, which is the supreme good that also means good living, good activity, with the nature, function, and aim of the human being.⁵³

To say however that the supreme good is happiness will probably appear a truism; we still require a more explicit account of what constitutes happiness. Perhaps then we may arrive at this by ascertaining what man's function is. For the goodness or efficiency of a flute-player or sculptor or craftsman of any sort, and in general of anybody who has some function or business to perform, is thought to reside in that function; and similarly, it may be held that the good of man resides in the function of man, if he has a function. Are we then to suppose that, while the carpenter and the shoemaker have definite functions or businesses belonging to them, man as such has none, and is not designed by nature to fulfill any function? Must we not rather assume that, just as the eye, the hand, the foot and each of the various members of the body manifestly has a certain function of its own, so a human being also has a certain function over and above all the functions of his

⁵² a. g. e 1098b 17

⁵³ Clark, S. R. L. 1975, Aristotle's Man, USA: OUP, ss. 23.

particular members? What then precisely can this function be? The mere act of living appears to be shared even by plants, whereas we are looking for the function peculiar to man.... Let us exclude, therefore, the life of nutrition and growth. Next there would be a life of perception, but it also seems to be common even to the horse, the ox, and every animal. There remains, then, an active life of the element that has a rational principle exercising thought. ⁵⁴

Happiness is an activity that is desired for itself, and it is intrinsic to person, and happiness of human and its power to reveal human nature relates to its function. This function shows us that good life for a human is achieved through human's own actions and activities that are, fulfilling his function. ⁵⁵ Just as a being in some form becomes a certain thing by being activated according to the aim having inherently in itself, human beings will be effective when they are activated according to the intrinsic goal they have, and they will be human in a real sense, and this can only happen when the person behaves in accordance with the mental capacity which the most important skill of the soul and distinguishes human from other beings.

Aristotle here is aware of the power of man's enthusiasm. He relates such facts with the passions that human behaves contrary even if he knows what is good, and that human perceives the things in a negative manner, with the passions. The definition of happiness as activity is now given in the following way: "Happiness is the activity appropriate for the virtue which is an aim itself, of the soul".⁵⁶

1.3.3 Aristotle's Virtue

The facts that Aristotle accepts the supreme good as that human fulfills his function in a good way in respect of being human and such function is nothing but

⁵⁴ Aristotle, Nicomachean Ethics, 1097b 15

⁵⁵ Aristotle, Eudemian Ethics 1219b 1-2

⁵⁶ Aristotle, Nicomachean Ethics, 1102b 5-10

an activity which is appropriate for the virtue or perfection, means that the supreme good of human, accordingly happiness is related to the virtue.⁵⁷

Virtue is one of the basic bearer concepts in Aristotle ethics. He treats virtue as a means of reaching happiness. Hence virtue is addressed on the basis of functionality. It defines this concept as follows; According to the conventional point of view, virtue is the ability to find and hold good things, or the ability to give, to bestow many great benefits.⁵⁸

In fact, it is possible to understand how virtue, happiness and good concepts cause a cyclic existence from the Aristotle's following expression; Virtue is the source from which the good activity is emerged. Pleasure is its natural companion and external wealth is its prerequisite. Happiness, on the other hand, gains a meaning as an activity in accordance with virtue. According to Aristotle, the definition of happiness is an activity of the soul in line with virtue which is the goal itself. It is the mind that ensures the activity of soul according to virtue.

Now, Aristotle of the soul teaching states that the soul has two parts, "one side is lacking in intelligence, and the other side is intelligent" in response to the question why does not everybody behave in a virtuous or rational way? since all people are intelligent beings. The part that lacks reasoning power, the nutritive soul, is common to all living things. Aristotle divides the part of the soul possessing mental power into two parts such as the part with intelligence in the real sense" and the other part which is irrational, contrary to reasoning, but "has a share from reasoning".

The part that has no share from the reasoning "conflicts with and opposes to the reasoning" in those who are not self-dominant, that is, unvirtuous people.

⁵⁷ Broadie, S. Ethics with Aristotle 1991, s. 57.

⁵⁸ Aristotle, Rethoric, 1366a s.64

Therefore, the element that leads to virtuousness or no virtuousness in human behavior, is the part which is but has a share from the reasoning. Such part which is separate from the nutritive soul being still irrational and reconciles with the reasoning as well as it opposes to is the "desiring and in general demanding" part.⁵⁹

Then, the individual then has a reasoning and make a deliberate choice using intelligence. Therefore, he is responsible for his behaviors due to his free will. Virtuousness or badness, on this basis, is gained with a voluntary choice.

Parallel to this classification, Aristotle divides the virtues in two as follows: Virtues of characters (for example, generosity, temperance) are those related to the part which is irrational in the real sense but follows the reasoning, and virtues of thought (for example, wisdom, prudence) are those related to the part which is rational in the strictest sense. Habits in both groups are praised as well; however, virtues of character reveal the type of a person's character whereas virtues of thought do not reveal the character of a person but pave the way for him to be praised.⁶⁷

1.3.3.1 Ethical Virtues

Aristotle uses ethical virtue in relation with the Greek word *ethos*, which means habit, character. The most important reason for this is that the ethical virtue has an inner connection with and can be acquired with habits.⁶⁸ Human activity can not be considered in a forced relationship like natural phenomena, because there is no obligation imposed on human behavior to such extent. Nevertheless, the fact that human's behavior is far from this necessity doesn't imply that human will acquire virtue in an unnatural way.

⁵⁹ Nurhan Tekerek- İsmet Tekerek, *Aristotleles Poetik ve Etik Bütünlük Örneklerle Eylem, Karakter ve Erdem, Tiyatro Araştırmaları Dergisi*, Sayı 26, 2008, s. 73 ⁶⁷ Aristotle, 1999:1220a 4-12; 1998a:1103a 3-10 ⁶⁸ Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, 1103a 15-20.

We have still a natural disposition we can habitually improve and bring to perfection in order to acquire a virtue.⁶⁰ We can be a fair man by doing fair things, and a temperate man by acting moderately and a brave man by acting bravely, just as being an architect by constructing houses, a guitarist by playing guitar.⁶¹

Pleasure and pain play important role in the acquisition of the virtues. Pleasure and pain can make the person virtuous, as well as they impair to be virtuous. Because, according to Aristotle, one of the characteristics of the virtuous man, is to be honest and to be pleased with being honest and the other one is the capacity to make choices between pleasure and pain. At this point, the choices made by a human with his feelings and abilities, leads him to be called virtuous or unvirtuous.

Every soul can be better as well as worse according to the things with which the soul is in relation and the things in the area of that soul. People may become evil, by fleeing from or following the pleasure and pain although there is no notable requirement. For this reason, the virtues are explained as the state of being unaffected and stillness related to pleasure and pain, or by connecting their misdeeds to their opponents

Being virtuous and surviving a virtuous life will enable one to reach the final destination. There is also an animal's nature and an animal's side of human. At this point, human can take control of and manage which he can not refuse, through practical reasoning. Human must train and organize his desires and wishes, instead of suppressing them. If man can not realize this, he will get away from the mankind.

⁶⁰ a. g. e.1103a 20-25

⁶¹ a. g. e 1103a30-35

For this reason, ethical virtues are the virtues that serve to find the "golden mean" between two extreme ends, without overdoing or understating.⁶²

Aristotle, states such case in his book Nicomachean Ethics as follows:

*"Virtue, then, is a state of character concerned with choice, lying in a mean, i.e., the mean relative to us, this being determined by a rational principle, and by that principle by which the man of practical wisdom would determine it. Now it is a mean between two vices, that which depends on excess and that which depends on defect; and again, it is a mean because the vices respectively fall short of or exceed what is right in both passions and actions, while virtue both finds and chooses that which is intermediate."*⁶³

Aristotle reveals intermediate status of ethical virtues through virtues available in the following table.⁶⁴

Vice of Excess	Vice of Deficiency	Virtuous Mean
Rashness	Cowardice	Courage
Irascibility	Spiritlessness	Good Temper
Intemperance	Insensibility	Temperance
Shamelessness	Bashfulness	Modesty
Jealousy	Harassment	Proper worryment
Illegality	Legality	Justice
Extravagance	Illiberality	Generosity
Deception	Denialism	Sincerity

⁶² ÖZLEM, Doğan, Etik. 2004: ss.54

⁶³ Aristotle, Nicomachean Ethics, 1998: ss.32

⁶⁴ Aristotle, Eudemian Ethics, 1221a, ss.57

Flattery	Surliness	Friendliness
Buffoonery	Boorishness	Wittiness
Greediness	Indifference	Solid character
Boastfulness	Faintheartedness	Magnanimity
Vanity	Smallness of Spirit	Greatness of Spirit
Cunning	Gullibility	Lucidness

1.3.3.1.1 Courage

According to Aristotle, courage is a mean. As mentioned in the table above, the right place positioned between cowardice and rashness is the mean. The one who exhibits boldness excessively is rash and the one who scares excessively and exhibits insufficient boldness is coward. One of them resists extremely scary things, the other is afraid of even harmless things.⁶⁵

Aristotle explains the virtue of courage as follows:

"... for example, the cowardice (this name is given to the man who unnecessarily fears so much and shows unnecessarily less boldness) and rash man. The latter is the one who unnecessarily fears less and shows unnecessarily much boldness, that's why the name is derived therefrom, hence derived from fearfulness and boldness. So then, whereas the courage is the best habit related to coward and rash man and whereas rash man (having deficiency in fears and

⁶⁵ a. g. e. 1228b ss.107

*being in excess of fearfulness) and also coward (who does the same thing as the rash man but the opposite, i.e. having deficiency in fearfulness and being in excess of fears)... it is clear that courage is a mean attitude between rashness and cowardice, so it is the best attitude.*⁶⁶

Bravery's following of the intelligence makes the courage a golden mean. Because the mind does not give order to stand against the things that will bring about significant harm. But it orders to choose the right one.

At this point, Aristotle does not consider as courage the attitude which is afraid of nothing. Because we have the fear of poverty, desolation, death, illness, death of people in our surrounding. It is our human feelings. So it is virtue to be afraid of certain things and not to be afraid of some other things, and to determine this extent by reasoning.

Aristotle speaks of five different courage. First of them is the social courage. This bravery is regarded as the courage to stand against the danger in order to gain honor dedicated to bravery and to escape from humiliation dedicated to cowardice.

In this kind of bravery, citizens show courage against dangers both because the laws will punish such action and it's a shame, and because they will be honored if they act so. Therefore, these people are said to be the most courage in places where cowards are considered to be dishonorable and braves are regarded as honorable honorless.⁶⁷ Aristotle's social courage can be described as being able to stand against dangers in a reasonable manner with a sense of honor.

⁶⁶ a. g. e 1999: ss.105

⁶⁷ a. g. e 1998: ss.56

Second one is the military courage. The source of your military courage is ex-perience and knowledge. But Aristotle considers that such knowledge is not being aware of what dangerous things are but being aware of remedies in danger.⁶⁸

The third one resulting from inexperience and ignorance is found in children and insane people. The insane people advance towards horrifying things while the children may take the snakes in hand and play with them.⁶⁹

As you can see here, the children and the insane people are courageous because of their inexperience and ignorance. Their situation is considered to be the lack of appeal power in present-day law. For this reason, they do not have their criminal responsibility.

The fourth is the courage due to optimism. The source of this courage is optimism. Such people believe that good living conditions frequently experienced in their lives will always continue. This can be exemplified by the fact that those who often land upon both feet take chances more easily and the drunks show courage based on optimism under the influence of vine.⁷⁰ Such courage is the result of that things always go well in previous actions and there is an established opinion that this will be always the case and the optimism generated with the influence of substances such as alcohol.

The fifth one is the courage connected with irrational passion. It is observed in the people under the control of not mind but emotions. For example, it may depend on love or ambition. If a person falls in love, the person will be blind to see anything and will face up to all kinds of danger. Courage based on anger

⁶⁸ a. g. e 1999: ss.109

⁶⁹ a. g. e 1999: ss.111

⁷⁰ a. g. e 1999: ss.111

and passion is the same as this. Passion and anger will make you lose control of yourself. Courage based on passion and anger is regarded as the most natural one.

Because, according to Aristotle, anger and passion are something that can not be suppressed.

In short, courage is to base on the mean under the guidance of mind. Brave man is the one who stays calm not in the face of things to be ventured but things to be scared and exhibit rational attitude towards them.

1.3.3.1.2 Generosity

Aristotle's generosity is the right place between two extremes of extravagance and stinginess. Generosity is a virtue relates to property. He defines the concept of assets as "we call asset the value of which is measured by money."⁷¹

According to Aristotle, the stingy person, who is very meticulous about properties, expects a continuous gain in his acquisition of natural property, and does not spend or spend in a limited manner.⁷² He divides the misers into two categories. Those in the first category agree neither to give nor to receive because they are afraid of returning the favor. Those in the second category immediately accept the given thing, regardless of how, where, why it comes. Those who are

⁷¹ Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, 1120b ss.68

⁷² a. g. e 1999: ss.127

mentioned in this category use every all kinds of derogatory means possible for their interests.

When it comes to those who are extravagant, those who scatter and do not appreciate their fortune are called extravagant. Extravagancy can occur in different forms; for example, those who can not control themselves, and spend a lot of money in search of pleasure, are called licentious. The licentious scatters his fortune and burns himself out.⁷³

Aristotle, the person who will best use the wealth will have a virtue regarding the property, that's what is known as the generous person. In other words, it's rather giving to the required place than receiving from the necessary place and not receiving from the unnecessary place. Generous persons forming the right mean between stingy persons and extravagant persons are loved due to their virtue because they are useful, and what is beneficial is the "giving". Generous people do not care if their money goes out of their hands instead of fighting for it, whereas others think money more than anything else.⁷⁴

Consequently, generosity is regarded as the right mean between extravagance and stinginess.

1.3.3.1.3 Magnanimity

Magnanimous person is a person who thinks that he is worthy of great things and appreciates himself and assumes a status for himself, and he is truly worthy of his assumed status and self-appreciation. Because, according to

⁷³ a. g. e 1998:ss.65

⁷⁴ Aristotle, Rethoric, 1366b ss.64

Aristotle, If a person thinks he deserves such things but actually he does not, then he is stupid, and a virtuous person can not be stupid or thoughtless.

The person who is worthy of small things and who evaluates himself like that is the temperate person. The person is self-righteous if he is not worthy but sees himself worthy of great things. The person is fainthearted if he sees himself worthy of fewer things than he is actually worthy. In such case the magnanimous person is at the extreme in terms of greatness, and at the mean in terms of necessity, because he deserves what he is worthy.⁷⁵

Aristotle regards magnanimity in connection with many virtues magnanimity is more of a personal attitude. It is an rather self-evaluation of magnanimous person for himself rather than the others, and person's fair attitude towards himself. According to Aristotle, this name to the magnanimous person for a certain supremacy of heart, soul and possibilities according to the nature of this name and also, it seems that it accompanies all virtues.⁷⁶ It continues to analyze the magnanimity on this basis.

Magnanimous person can not live in need of anyone other than their friends, because it is a thing for slaves; therefore, all the toady people are somewhat slaves. All the vile people are toady. He is not the one who has hooked on admiration; because nothing is too big for him. He is not revengeful and tries not to remember bad things, but rather to wipe the slate clean.⁷⁷

Another feature of magnanimous person is that he does not talk about people, talks neither about himself nor about any others, and he is not interested in being praised as well as he is not involved in the talks slandering another person.

⁷⁵ Aristotle, Nicomachean Ethics, 1123b ss.77

⁷⁶ Aristotle, Eudemian Ethics, 1232a ss.17

⁷⁷ Aristotle, Nicomachean Ethics 1124a ss.81

Magnanimous person speaks calmly, does not move fussy, tone of his voice is rich, not tense.⁷⁸

As you can see, the magnanimous person lives for his honor, always acts modestly, and manifests a helpful, no revengeful, calm, positive and moderate personality.

1.3.3.2 Virtues of Thought (Intellectual Virtues)

Aristotle examines the virtues of thought in the sixth book of Nicomachean Ethics. These virtues are, unlike ethical virtues related to human activities based on the part of the soul that possesses passion, the virtues, activities or perfections of thought about the mental field of the human soul.

Soul has two parts where one is rational and the another is irrational. We can further subdivide the rational part into that the one by which we perceive unchanging principles and that the one by which we investigate things that vary.⁷⁹ In other words, Aristotle divides the two actions of the mind into two categories, regarding as the theoretical and the practical. Theoretical one relates to those that are imperative and unchanging and where as practical one deals with the things that vary. One is thinking by weighing each factor, the other is speculative thinking.

Virtues of thought or intellectual virtues are the virtues of soul,⁸⁰ that are determined with theoretical wisdom or Sophia, deal with philosophy, science and art, and are about eternal perpetual objects and the highest beings. It defines as the virtues that bring about the human beings at the highest level, provide them with

⁷⁸ a. g. e 1998:ss.78

⁷⁹ a. g. e 1998:ss.114

⁸⁰ Ahmet Cevizci, Etiğe Giriş, s.70

the greatest happiness, and bring human beings, closest to the god which is observing the human being or contemplating.

According to Aristotle, there are three basic faculties that can lead one to behave correctly. These are sense, intellect (or intuition) and desire. Sense among these three faculties can not be a principle of action. Because this is also found in animals, however, does not lead to any actions. The other two faculties influence the action in different ways.⁸¹ In fact, these virtues actually take place from the right action of the theoretical mind.

According to Aristotle, there are five basic elements that convey us to the right in the spirit. These are: Tekhne, (practical action, art); Episteme-science (scientific knowledge); Phronesis, moral right view (practical wisdom); Nousdirect understanding; Sophia-philosophical wisdom (theoretical wisdom).⁸² Now let's examine some of these;

1.3.3.2.1 Phronesis, Moral Right View (practical wisdom)

Phronesis is, in fact, is associated with all ethical and intellectual virtues. Because it is that of the rational. It should be noted here that the mental area plays a central role in the Aristotle ethics. But this is not a simple faculty that would lead to a practical end in other ethical virtues. Because, Aristotle calls this power ingenuity and thinks it is morally neutral, and has equal use both for a man pursuing such kind of ends to be praised and for a man pursuing such kind of ends to be condemned.⁸³

⁸¹ Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics* 1998: ss.114

⁸² Akarsu, 1982: ss.113

⁸³ MacIntyre, *Etik'in Kısa Tarihi*, ss.86

Phronesis is a virtue that aims at good life. And therefore, it is not merely an intellectual, theoretical virtue. It is a virtue about practical life at the same time. Aristotle, also bases his approach as follows; There is a great difference between thinking that the supreme good is present in the possession of virtue and thinking that it is present in the use, that is to say, thinking that it is present in the habit and thinking that it is present in the activity. Because, even though a habit may be present but it may generate no good; for example, as in the case of those who are sleeping or are restrained from action; whereas this is impossible for activity, because one will be in action by necessity and even be in good action.⁸⁴ And this is not a situation that can happen immediately. It will take place in life by efforts in the course of time. For this reason, this virtue is not equally observed on young, mature, and old people depending on age and experience. Because it is as much experimental as intellectual.

At the same time, phronesis is a virtue associated with good and evil. It can think pertinently about what are good and useful for it in relation with the judicious Good life.⁸⁵

In other words, Phronesis requires the utmost perfection of all intellectual and all moral virtues. It is the best head integrated to the best heart. It is the most perfect wisdom combined with the most perfect virtue.⁸⁶ We will catch the essence of the virtues of thought if we discuss nous, that is, the concept of intellect which is the chief pillar of Phronesis concept.

⁸⁴ Aristotle, Nicomachean Ethics, 1098b-1099a, ss.20

⁸⁵ Aristotle, Nicomachean Ethics, 1140a, ss. 118

⁸⁶ Tufan Çötök, Aristotle Ahlakının Kurucu Erdemi Olarak Phronesis, Sakarya, 2011, ss.178

⁹⁶ Aristotle, Ruh Üzerine 429a 9-10

1.3.3.2.2 Nous (Direct Understanding)

Aristotle describes nous, that is, thinking faculty, as the part through which soul thinks and understands.⁹⁶ Because, if a living thing has a spirit, it also means that at the same time, it deals with self-nourishment, perception, and basically thinking for man. Therefore, having a faculty to think is essential for a human just as how essential having a perception faculty is for an animal.

Those who have the faculty to think, know and understand the things external to them in the world because of this faculty; even this desire to know and understand is in their nature. Thinking allows us to understand ourselves and to create characteristic human activities and at the same time to explain these activities. This kind of explanation, at the same time, brings an understanding of the world. A person who has the faculty to think differently from other faculties is a special living being and, as a living being, has a different nature compared to other living things.⁸⁷

Happiness occurs in the activity appropriate for the highest virtue, that is, the supreme good. This is the activity appropriate for nous, that is theoretical activity and it is continuous.

It is a clear indication that this activity is partially open to pleasure and it is the most pleasant of activities.⁸⁸ In addition, "... the wise man can, even if he is on his own, carry out a theoretical activity: the wiser the man is, the more the

⁸⁷ a. g. e 423a 20-6

⁸⁸ a. g. e 1998a:1177a 12-28

theoretical activity. He maybe much better if he has people to work with him, even so he's the most sufficient person.⁸⁹

*"... because nous activity is related to the theory, it bears differences in terms of virtue, it does not make for any destination except itself (this whips the activity up as well), it is self-sufficient, still, as seamless as possible for a human being, and all other attributes appropriate for a happy human seem to be suitable for this activity"*⁹⁰

Happiness herein corresponds to a life-long entirety; because something that is not complete in matters related to happiness is unthinkable. however, in such case, there will be transcendence, a divine life in the human nature.⁹¹ Nevertheless, Aristotle has such opinion that this life should be implemented as far as possible.

*"..., If nous is divine, then, in comparison with man, the life according to it is divine in comparison with human life. But we must not follow those who advise us, being men, to think of human things, and, being mortal, of mortal things, but must, so far as we can, make ourselves immortal, and strain every nerve to live in accordance with the best thing in us; for even if it be small in bulk, much more does it in power and worth surpass everything. It must be understood that if it is essential, the best then, it is the thing that makes each person himself. (...) naturally, which is proper to each thing is by nature best and most pleasant for each thing; for man, Therefore, the life according to reason is best and pleasantest, since reason more than anything else is man. This life therefore is also the happiest."*⁹²

⁸⁹ a. g. e 1998a:1177a 32-1177b 2

⁹⁰ a. g. e 1998a:1177b 19-24

⁹¹ a. g. e 1998a:1177b 24-30

⁹² Aristotle, Nicomachean Ethics, 1178a 208

*So, the best criterion for the soul is that the soul pays little to irrational part of the mind that is independent of reason. In this way, the supreme good and happiness are the activities guided by the mind.*⁹³

1.3.3.2.3 Sophia (Philosophical Wisdom)

Sophia, also defined as philosophical wisdom, is the most complete and authoritative wisdom. The wise man should not only know the things that are learned from the premises, highest principles, basic propositions and antecedents, but also have a reliable knowledge on these first propositions. So, philosophical wisdom is the unity of direct understanding and discursive knowledge; the knowledge of the forms of the highest beings.⁹⁴ In such case, philosophical knowledge is the scientific knowledge and direct understanding on the forms of the highest beings.⁹⁵

Aristotle's wisdom in Nicomachean Ethics;

... wisdom must be the most precise of the sciences, that's clear. It means that the wise man must not only know the things which are based on the principles, but also find out the truth about the principles. Hence wisdom must be science and us as the science that leads the most valuable things.⁹⁶

According to Aristotle, this type of wisdom deals with the unmoved mover, the god which is the final, teleological cause of all things in the universe while other theoretical activities of human being are less precise and less general.

⁹³ Aristotle, Eudemian Ethics ss.255

⁹⁴ Akarsu, Bedia, Mutluluk Ahlakı, s.142

⁹⁵ a. g. e, s.142

⁹⁶ Aristotle, Nicomachean Ethics, 1141a 1520

For this purpose, it does not only follow the first principles of science, but also try to understand these first principles themselves.

Philosophical wisdom; the sole purpose of this activity, which Aristotle calls it also theoretical wisdom, is to know the truth, to pursue it in terms of that the mind is about the imperative, infinite, eternal, everlasting principles. For this reason, philosophical wisdom does nothing but tries to clearly perceive the most real, the truthful, the divine, principles and causes because of the reason for the unmoved mover.

Man achieves the highest happiness with the help of these virtues. Theoretical reasoning directly grasps the highest concepts and the highest values. The fact of accessing the knowledge of these highest concepts, is called *theoria* by Aristotle. A person who makes use of *theoria* rises above the practical life and reaches full and true happiness.⁹⁷

In this sense, philosophy, wisdom and *theoria* are the same kinds of activities.⁹⁸ And all these activities bear their own aims in themselves, do not aim to perform the action, and do not care about the good of human.⁹⁹ For example, this is the reason for the fact that Aristotle had introduced Thales and Anaxagoras as valued people, and considered them as wise persons. They are precious people who have dealt with the first arche of the universe, the divine thing, independent of the human things. Aristotle thinks that these people did not deal with practical, useless questions such as what is the good of human, good, how to become virtuous.¹⁰⁰ It is now understood that Aristotle refers to philosophical wisdom by

⁹⁷ Akarsu, 1982:117)

⁹⁸ Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, 1177a 25-30

⁹⁹ Baracchi, *Aristotle's Ethics as First Philosophy*, Cambridge University Press, 2008, ss. 221-225.

¹⁰⁰ Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics* 1141a 1-5

"happiness" which is defined by him as an activity of the soul in accordance with virtue which is the aim itself.¹⁰¹

As you can see, Aristotle's ethical virtues enable to be virtuous in the practical life whereas intellectual virtues enable to achieve complete and real happiness above the practical life.

SECTION II: ARISTOTLE'S POLITICS AND RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ETHICS AND POLITICS

2.1. ARISTOTLE'S POLITICS AND RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ETHICS AND POLITICS

Aristotle's thoughts about politics are closely tied to his ethical view. According to Aristotle, ethics and politics are a group of practical sciences that examine objects created by human actions. and they are like two sides of the same medallion.

The politics seems to be important for humans as a social, political being, in the realization of a person's possibilities or live a "good" life. Since the goal of politics is to be good for human beings, ethics is included in the politics in respect of aims. For this reason, a study on ethics basically is a study on "politics".¹⁰²

¹⁰¹ a. g. e 1102b 5-10

¹⁰² Aristoteles, Nikomakhos'a Etik, 1998: 1094b; 11

Because ethical study will form the basis of politics by revealing what this "good for man" is, however, the policies will provide the necessary conditions in order to achieve the said "human good".

Aristotle supports these statements at the beginning of the Nicomachean Ethics and says that ethics is part of politics.¹⁰³ Because both are interested in what is the good for human. However, politics focuses on the good that a person is able realize socially while ethics considers what is good for human beings.¹⁰⁴¹⁰⁵ The important thing in the politics is that the constitution, the law, the polis must be good while the important thing in ethics is that every person should have individually a good character and a good personality. Politics, however, is supposed to be on top of all practical sciences, and therefore ethics.

*"We don't want to know what the virtue is but being virtuous, we don't want to know what the justice is but being fair, just as we don't want to know what the healthy is but being healthy, and we don't want to know what the fitness is but being fit.."*¹⁰⁶

In his research on ethics Aristotle begins by stating that, every art, every inquiry, every action and choice likewise is thought to desire a good, and for this reason, it will be better to express the good as "the thing that everything desires".¹⁰⁷ According to Aristotle, perhaps the most important factor that will help to make people virtuous is a proper political structure.

In that case, human will as much happy as the share he can get from the virtues and the extent he can realize the actions in accordance with such virtues,

¹⁰³ a. g. e 1094a; 25, 1094b; 4

¹⁰⁴ Annas, J. "Human Nature and Political Virtue", Aristotle: Critical Assesments, Vol. IV, 1999, ss.

¹⁰⁵ -52

¹⁰⁶ Aristotle, Nicomachean Ethics, 1999: 1216b; 17-25

¹⁰⁷ a. g. e 1998: 1094a 27

because the goal of the politics is the best for a human, politics attempts to enable people to be qualified and good people, and causes them to do good actions.¹⁰⁸

Task of human is to activate the mind available in himself as an opportunity unlike other living beings, and act in accordance with the virtues and be happy, and thus actualize himself. The source of human happiness is to put his soul on the road of mind and virtue. Mandatory element accompanying the human in actualizing this task is the political structure where the human is present.

Like other philosophers, Aristotle thinks that man can only survive by getting together with the other people. People, just like animals, came together with other people and formed a community in order to satisfy their essential needs such as accommodation, nutrition and security that they can not meet individually.

However, it is unthinkable that the purpose of creating a community by getting together is not limited only to this one as far as the human is concerned.

The community established by human beings serves a higher aim than this, and this aim is happiness. Man can only be happy when he is in a political society. Although it is necessary to meet basic requirements for happiness, the fact that these requirements are met is not enough to make a person happy. Human does not just want to survive, but also wants to live well. This good life desired by a man can only be provided by a political community.

According to Aristotle, the political community differs from any community or group. Because the political community is not a collectivized public union in which people are only pursuing their private interests. There is no need to be a human to establish such a community, and we can observe this kind of community

¹⁰⁸ a. g. e 2007: 1099b 30

also in the majority of animals. We are aware that animals merge together in order to protect their lives and survive, by creating communities. It is possible to be a four-legged animal by creating such a community but not a human.

The political community we say that it is intrinsic to human only is of a quality that serves the higher ends beyond the basic needs that the living beings have to meet, exceeding individual interests.

In this case, if there is a goal which is desired for its own sake, for which we desire other things too in those committed, then this will be the good and the supreme good. According to Aristotle, it is the science of politics that will reveal what it is.

Political science determines which science is necessary for cities, and who should learn which ones and how much. The goal of the politics includes goals of the other sciences too due to the fact that it employs the other sciences as well as it makes laws on what to do and what to avoid.

Practical wisdom, as good and right contemplating power, is not about how particular things are done but it is about the good things for itself. What is good for itself is the happiness which is the activity of soul in accordance with the virtue. Happiness is something that people want for themselves, not for something else, it is the thing which is the goal itself. Thanks to the intelligent part of the human soul, human can know things that could otherwise be, and they can make different choices in their actions. Human achieves happiness by doing virtuous actions.

"So, it is natural that we can not use the word happy for an ox, a horse, or another animal.¹⁰⁹ A child can not be happy because of the same reasons, since the

¹⁰⁹ a. g. e 1998: 1099b; 30-35

fullest extent of both virtue and life are required for a person to be happy "because the virtue is not the virtue of body but that of soul".¹¹⁰ If it is necessary to make virtuous actions in the whole of life to be happy, it is the duty of politics to do so.

According to Aristotle, the policy at this point tries to make sure that the citizens are qualified and become good people and make good actions. The person who is really a politician must deal with happiness in particular, since it is determined in the study of ethics that it is the "happiness" which is the good for human and which is desired only for itself not for another thing, and human "happiness" can be reached through the activity of soul in accordance with the virtue. Because he wants to make the citizens good and to be those who fit in with the law.¹¹¹

According to the information Aristotle puts forth in the ethical field, virtues are gained by carrying out activities, as in the case of other arts. Just as we mentioned earlier, to be fair and to behave valiant are the things that must be learned and performed, and "we become fair people by doing fair things, and modest person by acting modestly and brave man by acting bravely."¹¹² "What happens in the cities confirms that, lawmakers make citizens to become good people by exercising them."¹¹³ So, this means that the politics enables the citizens to perform good actions and accordingly gain the virtues of character owing to the laws put into force. Thus, it is revealed that why political life is important for human; Politics is the way in which people live a decent life, that they achieve happiness by doing virtuous actions, that is, it is the life that makes people a real human.

¹¹⁰ a. g. e 1998: 1100a; 4

¹¹¹ a. g. e 1998: 11022a; 8-10

¹¹² a. g. e. 1998: 1103a; 35

¹¹³ a. g. e. 1998: 1103a; 36

It is the city or the state where the person can reveal his or her own nature and maintain a political life. Aristotle, at this point, studies such subjects as what is the state, what is the existence of the state and how the most appropriate state should be.

2.2. ARISTOTLE'S UNDERSTANDING OF "HUMAN NATURE" AND THE STATE AS A NATURAL BEING IN THIS UNDERSTANDING

Philosophers build their philosophical systems to a great extent on the question of "what is man?". We do not know what we should place on the basis of neither ethics nor politics nor other human activities without answering the question "What is human?". Because these activities are all human creation, and are the areas originating from that human being is human and is only intrinsic to human.

According to Aristotle, man is a natural, living being that exists in the event of activity. Natural, living beings; that is, the beings in activity are the substances composed of matter and form¹¹⁴ and bearing principles of change and motion in itself. In that case, investigating the nature of something that exists in an activity means investigating both its material and its form.¹¹⁵ But according to Aristotle, matter and form are not such things that can be separated from each other, we can only separate them conceptually, theoretically or intellectually.

The matter of human is the body that is his carrier. Aristotle regards the "form" which is another sense of nature, more nature than matter.¹¹⁶ Because one thing owes its being the thing what it is more to its form than its matter, it is not clear what that thing is yet until its form comes into existence. It is in the state of potential (dynamis), in terms of its style of being. However, it develops into a being

¹¹⁴ a. g. e 1997: 190b 18

¹¹⁵ Aristotle, Ruh Üzerine (Çev. Zeki Özcan), Ankara, 2011: 96

¹¹⁶ Aristotle, Nicomachean Ethics, 1997: 193b 5-10

as something specific after it takes a certain shape; In other words, the fact that something has got to a certain form means that the said thing is switched over from the state of potential (dynamis) to a state of activity (energeia).

In order for a thing to attain its nature exactly, it must have got into its own form.¹¹⁷ The matter's process of getting into final form is, at the same time, its process of formation when we look at it from this point of view. Because the object is formed as a certain thing during the course of this process. A certain thing shows up when such process of formation is completed. But the process of formation is not yet complete with this; it is imperative that the being is required to reach its unique goal in order to complete the formation. The being has completed its formation and actualized itself when it reaches its goal, and this being is, at the same time, complete and perfect:

Beings that have reached their goals are called perfect beings because their goals are "good". Because reaching the goal is perfection.¹¹⁸

In that case, each being has a specific function, an aim that it desires to achieve. However, there is an important distinction that should not be left unnoticed at this point: it is the distinction between aim of a blade and a aim of a human. The function or aim of the blade is to cut the objects, but the blade is an object of manmade, not natural. Unlike natural object, manmade objects requires a power to be provided outside of it in order to achieve its function or reach its ultimate aim, a piece of iron turns to a knife only if a master blacksmith gives it a certain form and an aim. As opposed to manmade objects like this, there are also natural objects such as human, which don't need any other external power than their own power in order

¹¹⁷ a. g. e 1997: 193a 35- 193b 10

¹¹⁸ a. g. e 1996: 1021b 25

to finalize their form and reach their eventual aim or to fulfill their functions, such power is reserved in their own nature.¹¹⁹

Human requires no other power than his own power in order to finalize his formation and actualize himself, he has capable of actualizing to be the thing what it is on his own. The fact that a blade has an aim does not mean the same thing as that a person has an aim, when we examine the case from this point of view, in the strict sense, it is the human who has a goal. For this reason, according to Aristotle, human is a being which generates his own form, his own nature and his self on his own by himself.

We should examine his soul more than matter if we intend to understand what human is and indicate its particular place of being since human nature is a basis that will allow us to separate man from other beings and manifest the things pertaining to what human is. We can only understand what a person's unique function and ultimate goal is by examining the human soul.

According to Aristotle, the human soul has different faculties. These are nutrition, desire, hearing, imagination, movement and reasoning. Among these faculties, the lower one includes the upper one and at the same time, upper faculty owes its being to the lower one. If we examine from this perspective nutrition faculty located lowermost are available in all living things others can not be present without this faculty. Because this power is the most basic indicator of vitality. So much so that plants are considered living beings by only having nutrition faculty even though they have no other faculty. Hearing, desire, imagination and movement faculties of the soul are the common faculties with the animals.¹²⁰ For this reason, none of these faculties guide us to understand the distinguishing nature of human.

¹¹⁹ Özcan, 2006: 100

¹²⁰ Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, 2000: 413a 20-30

There is only one faculty of reasoning left behind that we can understand the human's special place of being only by means of this faculty.

The distinction of man's soul lies in his having a kind of reasoning power. According to Aristotle, human is rational by his nature. One can look at what are the principles to set human and animal into motion in order to understand the reasoning power that distinguishes human beings from other beings. In fact, the principle that set both animals and humans into motion is desire. From this point of view, there is something in common between these two-living species. However, the desire to move a human may be under the control of mind whereas the desire to move an animal is blind or coarse, that is to say, the desire is based on pure appetite and wish. For this reason, the faculty to set a human into motion may not be a blind and coarse appetite as in the case of animals but it may also be a desire that goes along with reason.

The faculty to put his desire on the road of mind is only available in human and even such fact that human has only this opportunity justifies that he has a special place in being. So much so that if an animal is not under any obligation, then there is no other power to move it apart from its own will.¹²¹ Therefore, the reason for the movement of animals is their appetite and desire. But, when the subject is human, the situation changes; it is only the human that can choose the reason as his guide in addition to appetite and desire in his actions, however not every person, but some people.

The reasoning power Aristotle says it is available only in humans is important since it is a faculty that reveals the difference between human beings and other living things, enables human to actualize himself and helps human to identify the ultimate aim.

¹²¹ a. g. e 2000: 432b 15

According to Aristotle, human's essence is intelligence. That is why human reaches the ultimate goal of the good and happiness with reason.¹²² The good and happiness can only become evident in the social life of man based on the fact that human nature is a social being. Aristotle evaluates human in the sociality in every respect. In this regard, Aristotle doesn't mean, by saying that human is self-sufficient, that human lives all alone and survive a solitary life instead human lives together with his parents, children, husbands, friends and citizens, because human is social due to his nature.¹²³

As we mentioned in the upper titles of the thesis, human achieves the good as much as he participates in the social good. Aristotle regards the acts of individual as ethics and acts of society as the politics in the individual-society and ethics-politics relationships.

Aristotle's political views are also closely related to his ethical considerations. According to Aristotle, the execution area of the ethics is the state.

He underlines that every community merges together to perform a certain good and the state which is the highest and covers all kinds of communities is required to achieve the highest good.¹²⁴

Aristotle detects that the reason for being of the state is originating from the nature, the nature of human. According to Aristotle, men and women have come together as a mandatory for breeding and have established the family. Family is not established as a result of a selection based on reasoning, the family is a natural togetherness based on common interests established in accordance with the natural law.

¹²² Macit Gökberk, *Felsefe Tarihi, Remzi Kitabevi*, Ekim, 2011, ss.87

¹²³ Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, ss.17, 1097b

¹²⁴ Ross, 1993:287

After the establishment of a family which is the first unity, many homes have come together by the addition of children and grandchildren, then villages have showed up in order to satisfy a goal beyond the daily necessities. The city, that is, the state which is the last unity has been established by the integration of the villages and families which are the unities that maintain the life itself, and the goal of the state does not only meet daily needs but provide a good life.

Because of the reasoning power they have, people who need others to live and who come together as a necessity, can distinguish good and evil, communicate with each other through their language faculty, understand each other, speak and understand the world, share a common view on the good and the bad, create a world of culture the other animals don't have and enact laws. This natural structure of human being is the reason for human to achieve a good life in accordance with the virtue through politics.

According to Aristotle, "Human being is a sociable living being (zoon politikon) by its nature." It means that political life, i.e. social life, is based on the law and is the life that makes man human, and according to Aristotle's opinion, man can achieve his unique virtuous life style in political/social life. The place where the political life takes place is the city or the state as we mentioned earlier.¹²⁵

"Our own observations tell us that every state is a community founded for a good aim. I say 'good', because actually, all people try to get what they believe to be good in their actions. Then, the unity which is the supreme of the communities and covers all of them will aim at the highest good as all the

¹²⁵ Aristotle, Politika 1/2, s. 9-10.

*communities' aims at one good or another good. This is the community we call state, and we call that type of community a political one.*¹²⁶

Aristotle, who defines man as a political animal by his very nature and thinks that human has created the state again by this very nature, believes that the common benefit which brings people together is an important factor. Though "There is a natural desire of people for living in a society even when they do not need each other's help"¹²⁷, even so the benefit, in particular, the common benefit of everyone is an important factor which necessitates to bring them together, because such benefit which covers everyone will also make contributions to the life of every single person. Individually and socially, the main goal of the state is to live well.¹²⁸ Those who want to achieve the best, have established the state, which is the top of and covers all of the communities.¹²⁹

2.2.1 Polis (City-State) and Its Nature

Aristotle, discusses the good at which human aims by starting from the first book of the Politics through such communities as the family which collectively takes or aims, the village composed of the families and the polis constituted by the villages.¹³⁰ Especially among these communities, the polis is the highest of all communities and aim at the good with most authority since it embraces all the other communities; the polis differs from the other

¹²⁶ a. g. e. 2000b: 7

¹²⁷ a. g. e 2000b: 79

¹²⁸ a. g. e 2000b: 80

¹²⁹ a. g. e 2000b: 7

¹³⁰ Yack, B. (1993), The Problem of a Political Animal, USA: University of California Press, ss. 2728.

communities¹³¹ in terms of both quality and size. The most important reason why the police differ from these communities of the same kind is that it aims at "a good life" unlike the others.¹⁴¹

The aim or the good of the family which is the smallest part of the polis, composed of wife, husband, children and slaves is just to reproduce, protect and maintain life. Aim of the villages is the same as the aims of the families. The only difference between them is that the good and the aim are more successful, and achieved easily in the family with the increase of cooperation.¹⁴²

Polis which is formed by the gathering of the villagers and corresponds to a more complex phase of the social organization, provides not only a source or opportunity of survival, but also an opportunity for a good life which is its real goal. For example, it is possible to find an opportunity for greater material abundance including friendship and satisfactory family relationships, the musical staging of poetry, and full achievement of our moral and intellectual skills together with the polis where external requirements are abundant, that is, relationships such as trade is present whereas procurement of only daily needs is important in the earliest communities composed of separated houses.

The main issue to be emphasized here is the progress which is starting from the family and village corresponding to the pre-political period proceeding towards the polis is inevitable though it is not foreseen by the people. It was inevitable for human being to end up with the polis appearing as a bigger and more complicated association since man has an instinct to live together with the others rather than being isolated and a desire for survival.

¹³¹ Ross, D. (1993), ss. 288.

¹⁴¹ Aristotle, *Politika* 1.1

¹⁴² a. g. e 1.2.

This process is a natural development. It is neither about election nor learning; but it appears rather as a feature of psychology in the form of survival, reproduction, and fulfilling everyday needs.¹³² Just as a seed possesses hereditary tendency to grow under the appropriate conditions primitive human communities also have an instinct to develop as a seed and the communities become more self-sufficient in the course of time at every stage of such process. Aristotle, himself, also expresses this process clearly:

... the male and female partnership is necessary for reproduction because one without the other is ineffective. It is not a choice made by reasoning; it is originating from the desire to replicate themselves, which is provided by the nature to animals and plants. The association of the ruler and the ruled is just as necessary as this; the aim of their association is to protect their common security City-state is a type of natural community with competence just as the old communities are natural. This association is the aim for the others and this is a natural aim in itself; because what we call the completed product of maturation process of something is the nature of that thing. - human, home, family, everything aims at being it (achieving its own nature). Moreover, the goal and the end (ultimate cause) are only the best; self-sufficiency is both goal and competence.¹³³

There is no doubt that the polis exists naturally because of natural desire of human which found out the polis and provide continuance of the polis. Polis exists by human nature and at the same time, it is required to serve as an end in the actualization of human nature. Because " ... naturally, which is proper to each thing is by nature best and most pleasant for each thing; for man, Therefore, the life according to reason is best and pleasantest, since reason more than anything else is man. This life therefore, is also the happiest." ¹³⁴

¹³² Annas, J. (1999), s. 51.)

¹³³ Aristotle, Politika 1.2

¹³⁴ Aristotle, Nicomachean Ethics, 1178a 5-10

In that case, man must fulfill all these conditions in order to achieve his own goal due to his natural capacities or instincts. Polis, in this sense, have a natural existence in order for the achievement of human natural aims, and in fact, the achievement of a level of self-sufficiency which is required for the human to reach the good or actualize himself is only provided by the polis.

Since for a human, reaching his own perfection is only possible in the polis, action of the human in accordance with the virtue of justice, that is, his action considering the public benefit will be the action which is also good for him. The only element that can bring out this common good is the individual's attribute of being a citizen.

Being a citizen in the polis means to have some important basic qualities. According to Aristotle, the citizen is the one that have the privileges of ruling and being ruled. Aristotle suggests that not all citizens living in the same city should be called citizens, and they must have certain qualifications in order to earn the right to citizenship.

We do not even a moment think of such a thought that we should accept all people required for the existence of the state as citizens.¹³⁵

The reason for Aristotle's not accepting every people as citizen is reserved in the type of constitution Aristotle called the political administration. Citizens alternately will be the ruler or the ruled in his ideal constitution. This view is a totally different view from the modern citizenship view, because today's management is representative form of government and Aristotle's understanding from a management is direct government.

¹³⁵ a. g. e. 2009: 77

In his management understanding, citizens will not only participate in the elections but will also be involved in the administrative affairs. The necessity of not accepting every people as citizen must be investigated at this point, because managing is not an activity that every person can accomplish successfully, some virtues are required in order to manage a city. The fact that slaves and workers can not be citizens is based on these grounds, and they lack the virtue and ability to participate in governance. Aristotle does not accept workers and slaves as citizens because these virtues and faculties are not present in slaves and workers: a slave does not have the virtues necessary to govern it, is not free and can not think with his own mind; he only knows to obey and be governed. On the other hand, the worker has to work to survive and he is so busy with working and has no time to spare for the virtues and faculties required for the citizenship.

For this reason, according to Aristotle, it is necessary not to accept slaves and workers as citizens for an ideal and good constitution, because "a typical citizen is the one who has management privileges"; but neither the worker nor the slave has these privileges.¹³⁶

Thus, according to Aristotle, governments who accept people as citizens without distinguishing them, are doomed to collapse because the quality of the citizens will define the quality of the state at the same time since the state is constituted by the total citizens.

As a result, according to Aristotle's political understanding, not everybody can be a citizen, the most basic condition of being a citizen is to be free and to have a share in the administration; the condition to be a good citizen is to possess the knowledge and faculty to govern and to be governed. According to Aristotle,

¹³⁶ Aristoteles, Politika 1.78

it's a golden rule that every person can not be a citizen for a proper constitution though the condition to be citizen for each constitution differs.

If we express with Aristotle's own words;

*A citizen, in general takes a share from both ruling and being ruled; this will not be identical in every kind of constitution, but such a citizen in the best constitution is the person who is both ruling and being ruled aiming a life that will be in accordance with goodness, and able to chose it.*¹³⁷

In that case, some people will be the ruler and the rest will be the ruled within the state, whatever the nature of the state. The ruler-ruled relation is an element that can not be taken away from political structure. However, type of ruling-ruled relationship differs may differ depending on the nature of the political structure, though it appears in every political structure; whereas some of the government exhibit a humanly qualification, such relationship may become more vulgar in some governments. Therefore, any kind of ruler-ruled relationship is not worthy of human. Now we will examine these forms of government.

2.3 Constitution And Forms Of Government

Aristotle reveals that how a proper government, governance and a ruler will be brought about and his best and most accurate government model by examining the forms of government and constitutions that have showed up until his time.

¹³⁷ a. g. e. 1.94

According to Aristotle, the most important thing for a city is its constitution; the constitution is a way of living for a city¹³⁸, a way of organizing the living beings.¹³⁹

The Constitution is a form of organization adopted to carry out the distribution of the powers of the states (authorities), and identify the goal that each community has set out to achieve.¹⁴⁰

In other words, the constitution is the fundamental principle of how and for what people will live. In that case, the people of a city will be the same as the constitution of that city. Laws that determine how people will behave with punishment and awards are also determined by the constitution. For this reason, the correctness of the constitution is the fundamental factor which ensures the correctness of the laws and thereby the correctness of the community as a whole.

Aristotle, in his book Politics, examines the types of constitutions and searches the type of best constitution. In this study, he makes after the constitution that will make human virtuous and happy. Aristotle, again in the same work, gives us the first clues of a good constitution, while starting the study on constitution.

*... pleasure of people due to the position assigned for them, absence of serious internal conflict, or in question that scarcely ever, and absence of any dictator pretending to be a master are the signs of good establishment of the constitution.*¹⁴¹

¹³⁸ Aristotle, Nicomachean Ethics, 2009: 127

¹³⁹ a. g. e 2009: 70

¹⁴⁰ a. g. e 2009: 110

¹⁴¹ Aristotle, Politika 3-62

According to Aristotle, there are many kinds of constitutions where some are good and some are bad. The Aristotle links the cause of multitude of constitutions to the multitude of the state's elements, because the characteristics of society differ in every state, the majority in some community, and minority in some community receive a share from the citizenship whereas all people are accepted to be a citizen in some community. Some are rich and some are poor in the society, some carries gun, some carries not, some are of noble birth, some are not, some are virtuous, some are not, the proper constitution for a community differs depending on the characteristics of the people in the society and there are many established constitutions distinct from each other.¹⁴²

According to Aristotle, the criterion that makes a constitution correct is that constitution must in compliance with the absolute justice, and absolute justice requires to care everyone's well-being. As we have already mentioned, the state has a goal to be achieved just as everything in the nature has a goal. This goal is a good life. We can achieve good living in a political society by maintaining the common benefits. In that case we can always judge everything in the political structure, political regimes, laws and institutions, according to this concept; those complied with the common benefits must be accepted as correct constitutions and those contradicted with and opposed to must be accepted as deviated constitutions.¹⁴³ Aristotle occasionally uses the concept of justice instead of the concept of common benefit or common advantage in his work "Politics"; because we can not distinguish these two concepts between each other, these are identical concepts. Because securing the justice requires considering and maintaining everyone's good, otherwise it leads to injustice. Another reason for the deviation of a Constitution, which considers the interests of a single party, is that in such constitutions the ruled relationship looks like master-slave more; because in the master-slave relation, the goodness and the benefit of the master are regarded. Whereas, in

¹⁴² a. g. e 3- 113

¹⁴³ Arslan, Ahmet, İlk Çağ Felsefe Tarihi 3, s. 286-287.

Aristotle's conception, the state is the association of free men.¹⁴⁴ Every citizen in the state is free and everyone's well-being must be considered. In that case, the constitution, which can provide everyone's benefit and goodness, will become the right constitution.

In that case: we can speak of a correct polity, correct government, and correct rulers in cases where those who keep hold of sovereignty and authority in the state, which means a community of free citizens, exercise this power in such a way as to serve the common benefits of the community.¹⁴⁵

According to Aristotle, if, whoever is in the government, a person, minority or majority have adopted the principle of governing the state to provide the common benefit, then each of these constitutions is a correct constitution, however, if interests of only one party is taken into consideration, then it is a “deviated constitution” regardless of whether such party is a single person, minority or majority.¹⁴⁶

The forms of government and constitutions in Aristotle's conception, together with their deviated counterparts, are determined as follows: Monarchy and tyranny, aristocracy and oligarchy, constitutional government (*politeia*) and democracy. Monarchy (royalty) is the government in which a single person aims at common good whereas tyranny is the government in which a single person governs for his own benefits and ego. Monarchy (royalty) is the government in which a single person aims at common good whereas tyranny is the government in which a single person governs for his own benefits and ego. Aristocracy is the government of minority whereas the oligarchy is the government in which wealthy people are only interested in their own benefits. Democracy is the government is interested in

¹⁴⁴ Aristoteles, *Politika* 3, ss.80

¹⁴⁵ Aslan, 2011: 287

¹⁴⁶ Aristotle, *Politika* 3, ss.81

poor people whereas constitutional government (politeia) in which free and equal citizens aim at the well-being of the whole community.

2.3.1 Monarchy And Tyranny

Aristotle does not say much about the monarchy, which he regards as one of the right forms of government. On the other hand, he says that it is easy to see the availability of many forms of monarchy. The Aristotle, though in the different forms, identifies five forms of monarchy that are restricted by some principles.

They are those in the Lakedaimonia, barbarians, aisymneteia, or in the countries of chosen persons and in the heroic ages. In these monarchies, the power of the sovereign is limited. Unlike these, he identifies the fifth type, in which a ruler with an unlimited authority exists, is also an absolute monarchy.¹⁴⁷

Aristotle begins to describe the forms of monarchies he has identified, by demonstrating the difference between tyranny which is a constitution opposite to it. According to Aristotle, this difference is determined by taking the origin of the sovereignty into consideration. In other words, it is proof of what the royalty's sovereignty is based on and in which respects he is not assumed to be tyrant.

Aristotle explains such basis depending on whether the monarch is elected or not, or his/her relationships with citizens, position in the state of war, adherence to the laws and whether kingdom descend from father to son or not.

"The most obvious example of the constitutional monarchy is the one observed in the constitution of Lakedaimonia. The powers of the Spartan kings are

¹⁴⁷ Aristotle, Politika 3, ss.14

limited, however, when a king comes up to the top of the army, he will exalt his superiority over all questions concerning war." ¹⁴⁸

In Lakedaimonia, there is an authority limited with the periods of war, which can be passed from father to son or taken by election. This is what Aristotle calls a sort of army command. This is what Aristotle calls a sort of army command and the authority is unlimited as long as the army is on expedition. The king, for example, does not have the authority to kill anyone, outside this.

According to Aristotle, authority of the monarch in the monarchy of barbarians is equal to tyrant in terms of qualities such as the passing of sovereignty from the father to the son, and the citizens being more slave. Because those who live under his rule, like in the tyranny, will show him unconditional obedience. This similarity, which arises from the requirement of unconditional obedience, gets lost when this source of obedience is considered. Because, the source of obedience in the monarchy of barbarians is the citizens, whereas it is the tyrant himself in tyranny. *"The monarch governs the citizens who ask him to do so in accordance with the law; tyrant those who don't".* ¹⁶⁰

The third of the constitutional monarchies is *aisymneteia*, which Aristotle calls elected tyranny. ¹⁴⁹ This kind of sovereignty depends on the consent of the citizens as it is in the monarchy of barbarians. But there is a difference that the government doesn't pass from the father to the son. In this kind of sovereignty, the thing in question is that the monarch shall have an ongoing power as long as he does what is required. According to Aristotle:

¹⁴⁸ a. g. e. 3, ss. 97

¹⁶⁰ a. g. e. 3, ss. 97.

¹⁴⁹ a. g. e. 2, ss. 98

*“for such rulers, we can say that they are tyrant to the degree that their governance is of a master or a despot, and monarch to the degree that they are elected by the willing citizens”.*¹⁵⁰

Aisymneteia, as the elected tyranny, is in question sometimes throughout the life of the monarch and sometimes for a certain period depending on the wills of his citizens. For this reason, Aristotle calls it dictatorship. Because whether the dictator is a tyrant or not is identified by whether whatsoever the thing dictated by him is wanted by the citizens or not. If it is wanted, then the ruler is despot and his polity is not despotic; if it's not wanted, then the ruler is despot and his polity, as it were, is not a government but tyranny

The fourth type of monarchy, which emerged peculiar to the age of heroism, is the one where authority of the ruler is passed from the father to the son, and also it is legal and in accordance with the wills of the citizens. According to Aristotle, the ruling king in this monarchy, is the judge in respect of hearing cases, commander in terms of warrior abilities and the priest in terms of offering sacrifices. Sources of the sovereignty is the consent of the citizens.

“So, these are the four types of the constitutional monarchy: (1) the monarchy in the heroic ages; this was accepted by the people and based on a number of certain assignments and privileges that were clearly defined; the monarch was the judge, army commander and religious chief; (2) the monarchy of barbarians; this is obtained legally and through father to son, and is monopolized, but used despotically; (3) aisymneteia elected dictatorship and (4)

¹⁵⁰ a. g. e. 3, ss. 98

*Lakedaimoniantype monarchy; this is nothing but a lifelong generalship that passes from father to son."*¹⁵¹

It is clear that these four kinds of the monarchy give the king a limited authority in some respects. In the absolute monarchy, identified as the fifth by Aristotle, the power of the monarch or the ruler is not limited to anything. In this monarchy type,

*"the king solely rules and have control over everything: this monarch is independent just as each individual nation or state is independent in controlling its affairs it governed - just as a family is governed, because, governing a family is almost like a royal authority at home, here is what I call the Absolute Monarchy, the whole government of a state or a nation or of nations "*¹⁵²

In that case, there are five forms of monarchy, four of which are unlimited and four of which are unlimited. Among these monarchies, Aristotle considers Lakedaimonia in respect of being the most restricted monarchy type, and the fifth, the absolute monarchy, in respect of being unlimited.¹⁶⁵

2.3.2 Aristocracy And Oligarchy

Aristotle prefers the latter among the correct forms of government aristocracy to oligarchy due to the abovementioned reasons both in terms of applicability and in terms of fair decision making but also because of the risk of a monarch that may turn into a tyrant due to his own tendencies.

¹⁵¹ a. g. e. 3, ss. 98.

¹⁵² a. g. e. 3, ss. 98-99.

¹⁶⁵ a. g. e. 3, ss. 99.

“If a person wants the sovereignty of the law, this means that he wants nothing but only the sovereignty of the God and Intelligence; if a person wants the sovereignty of a human, then, this means that he is introducing a wild animal into the subject; because people's passions are like those of wild animals and powerful passions mislead a ruler and even the best of the good people. You can find the intelligence free of passions.”¹⁵³

Aristotle, while explaining why the Aristocracy is the best form of government, acts on the knowledge of what is important to man. The most important thing for the state, which is the whole of the individuals, must be virtue because the most important thing for a person is virtue. Because the human without virtue is the most savage and the most unjust of the beings. In fact, justice is the mainmast of the state; because the basis of a political community is the rights. In fact, justice is the mainmast of the state; because the basis of a political community is the rights and the right to decide is the criterion of what is rightful.¹⁵⁴

Aristotle, who realizes that both the ruler and the ruled are required to receive a share of virtue, thinks that the ruler must be fully equipped with the ethical virtues while the others should be as virtuous as necessary for their duties.¹⁵⁵ "It is strictly expected that a good ruler is, at the same time, should be wise. Wisdom is necessary for a person who is engaged in the government affairs.¹⁵⁶ For this reason, aristocracy which means the government of plurality the main principle of which is the virtue and the members of which is virtuous and wise, is considered the best form of government.

¹⁵³ a. g. e. 3, ss. 103

¹⁵⁴ Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, 2000b: 10

¹⁵⁵ a. g. e. 1975: 28

¹⁵⁶ a. g. e. 2000b: 78

However, it is not certain that even so the aristocracy knows as the government of more than one good human can actually eliminate the said risks mentioned above. According to Aristotle, the thought that establishment of such a monarchy is possible, and the thought that the establishment of aristocracy is possible as a minority government which aims at the well-being of all, means expecting a lot from human nature. Because we know that, Aristotle says in his *Nicomachean Ethics* that humans act on the basis of their tendencies and they can achieve the mean not by knowing what is virtuous but by keeping away from the extremes.

In that case, we should say that, possibility of the government which are expected to establish justice or common good in accordance with the mean is something else and existence of them is something else.

Just for this very reason, Aristotle does not expect the aristocracy to take place as the government of the best men. Aristocrats turn into oligarchs in any case when they do not aim for common good of society and the form of government they constitute becomes the oligarchy, which is the evil or corrupted opposite of aristocracy.

*“Aristocracy passes into oligarchy owing to badness in the rulers, who do not distribute what the state has to offer according to desert, but give all or most of its benefits to themselves, and always assign the offices to the same persons, because they set supreme value upon riches; thus power is in the hands of a few bad men, instead of being in the hands of the best men”.*¹⁵⁷

The reasons for the conversion of the management of more than one good men into the management of more than one bad men is that what the state has to

¹⁵⁷ a. g. e. 1160b 11-18.

offer is not distributed fairly, and that the offices are always assigned to the same persons and being rich is valued above being virtuous. These same reasons turn a king into a tirade, and aristocrats turn into oligarchs. In other words, it is the fact that both have a bad use of authority.

In the regime of oligarchy, the criterion of being a part of the minority who has power in the government relates to the property. So much so that Aristotle, while mentioning the different forms of oligarchy, classifies the oligarchy where the limit of property is kept very high and oligarchy where the limit of property is kept relatively low, as different forms of oligarchies. However, there are also oligarchies of the kind where administratorship is inherited through family and passes from the father to the son.¹⁵⁸

According to Aristotle, the property factor is very important. Being entitled to participate in the government based on the amount of property as in the oligarchy government will prevent to maintain the justice and at the same time, will cause to deviate from the goal of good life which is the ultimate end. Because the state is not a financial partnership in which those who can contribute to it in a material sense have a voice, but is a place where the completion of the human existence will be achieved by reaching the goal of eudaimonia.¹⁵⁹

2.3.3 Constitutional Government And Democracy

Another one of the deviated constitutions is democracy. According to Aristotle, if the category consisting of the majority is the people who are free and unwealthy and if they have taken over the government, then this constitution is democracy. The characteristic of democracy is that it is based on the principle of

¹⁵⁸ Aristotle, *Politika*, 4, ss.21

¹⁵⁹ a. g. e. 4, ss.25

equality and freedom, in other words, democracy has chosen equality and freedom as its value. Those who are standing with democracy, taking into consideration the principle of equality, indicate that this equality is not an equality based on qualification but numerical equality, according to them, what the majority says is right and fair, "what majority decides is absolute, and that is also the justice".¹⁶⁰

However, Aristotle criticizes democracy's understanding of such equality, because people are not all equal, there are differences between people in terms of wealth, birth, virtue, education, and ignorance of this fact and provision of equal treatment and equal rights to unequal people will pave the way for not justice but injustice.

On the other hand, democracy supporters say that is that every person is free and for this reason, every man has the right to live as he wishes. Since those who do not have sufficient share in reasoning power are not expected to make appropriate decisions and to distinguish between fair and unfair, legitimate and illegitimate, ethical and no ethical, and right and wrong, it will be not right if they take part in the government. As a result, we suggest that democracy is a deviated constitution, due to the fact that it accepts an unjust situation as justice and provides right to rule to those without ruling virtues, and thus, eliminates the Aristotle's idea which is the cornerstone of his political understanding, that is, "the virtuous people must rule".

As a result, none of these deviated constitutions will benefit the community; tyranny regards the interest of single person, oligarchy regard that of riches, and the democracy regards that of the poor. For this reason, each of the deviated constitutions are bound to turn into some kind of master-slave relationship and accordingly, are not appropriate for a political relationship.

¹⁶⁰ Aristotle, *Politika* 4, ss.180

Aristotle suggests constitutional government or Politea as a form of government such that most people can participate and most of the cities can achieve more easily, i.e. as the best possible form of government. This form of government is the most viable administration rather than Aristotle's ideal form of government.

Constitutional government, or politeia, is a mixture of oligarchy and democracy which are two forms of bad governments. Rather, it is a combination of the best forms of these two bad government models. From this point of view, politeia is a correct model of government, which is a combination of two bad governments.

The reason why political administration is constituted by the combination of the good sides of oligarchy and democracy lies in the Aristotle's belief that what is good in every case is the mean. Just as he thinks that in case of the morality, what is most reasonable is neither in the excess nor in the deficiency, but in the mean, and neither the excess nor the deficiency but the mean is the best, he continues to think the same about the constitution. An ideal constitution should pattern itself on moderation, not excess or deficiency at all times.

In all states, the community has three sections; very rich, very poor and moderate. It is understood that moderation and an intermediate condition are the best things, so it will be also clear that the best of all is the mean in the property ownership.¹⁶¹

In that case, we can say that politeia is the government based on a constitution in which as many people as possible can participate as a citizen with a certain property, and which accordingly aims at the common interest of the majority.

¹⁶¹ a. g. e. 4, ss.127

The middle class on which politeia is based is the one that hardly wants to change and which gives the most consent to the rule of law. Members of this class do not envy others because of their wealth, or they are not envied by others in terms of their possessions, in this regard, they are exposed to reaction of neither the wealthy nor the poor.

*“members of the middle class lives a safer life; neither do they make a scheme against others, nor do others against them, ”.*¹⁶²

For this reason, they can stay away from internal conflicts and keep their impartiality, as a matter of fact, they are also able to fulfill the supervision of political power as it should be.

Political partnership based on the middle class will be the best due to the fact that it acts not according to its passions but to the law, and that it is neither too wealthy nor too poor, in other words, it combines in itself and equalizes or stabilizes the factors which are reason for the extremist desires for power. Because, the stability of the community will deteriorate in case the winds of a government changes only in favor of one.

*“So those two things are obvious, the political partnership working through middle class is the best and possibility of good government is very high in the cities where the middle class is larger, if possible, than the sum of the other two classes, or at least, than one of them ”.*¹⁶³

As a result, then, we can say that politeia is the best of the possible regimes due to the fact that it enables the common benefit, a government that aims at

¹⁶² a. g. e. 4, ss.128

¹⁶³ a. g. e. 4, ss.128

common benefits of all citizens constituting the state. Because it is suitable for justice virtue and applicable forms of government in terms of the fact that rulers are selected in accordance with the qualification and they govern regarding not their personal benefits but general well-being and also that it provides the laws to serve the common interest of the society, and that it characterizes the mean.

SECTION III: CONCLUSION AND EVALUATION

Human being is a social being that produces value. Man has equipment that can discover the eternal-everlasting truths and interpret the value judgments. In this content man has created not only an elitist hierarchy by configuring the values communicated to himself in the direction of his tendencies, but also tended towards building the origin of legitimacy of the socio-political and economic process created in this direction. In that case, human has been in an effort of discovering and transforming these truths while producing his own benefit with the said tendencies.¹⁶⁴

Aristotle does not evaluate human beings, in the areas with no interconnection in between. In a sense, he thinks interdisciplinary. He does not ignore the interconnections between psychology, ethics, and politics. Therefore, he takes seriously the effects of nature on human beings and relationship of human with the nature. He comprehensively examines human capacities, their similarities and differences with other living beings, and human relationship with each other.

The fact that man is a social being requires people to be interacting with the other people and doing an action together. Nevertheless, human actions occur every time for a specific purpose. It is a human aspect to see that the universe is

¹⁶⁴ İoanna Kuçuradi, İnsan ve Değerleri, Türkiye Felsefe Kurumu, Ankara,1998, ss.28

purposeful and full of value because goal setting and realization is a category of conscious and deliberative action is only intrinsic to human.

Aristotle's views on man and in particular on the soul of man is the basic building block of his moral understanding. As a matter of fact, Aristotle explicitly states this situation in the Nicomachean Ethics, as follows:

*“Now the goodness that we have to consider is clearly human virtue, since the good or happiness which we set out to seek is human good and human happiness. But human virtue means in our view excellence of soul, not excellence of body; also our definition of happiness is an activity of the soul. Now if this is so, (...) the statesman has to study the nature of soul as well, above all politics is a higher and more honorable art than medicine, he has to pursue the subject in further detail...”*¹⁶⁵

The moral items that are manifested in the individual and social aspect of the human life are the problem of ethics. Therefore, ethics has begun to be used as a value in response to the human weaknesses that have emerged especially in recent times concerning all aspects of life (politics, medicine, environment, communication, sports, economics, etc.). The distance between "what is" and "what ought to be" constitutes the base line of the question. At this point, emphasis is laid on such basic questions as "what is human?" and "What should it be? ". Attempting to answer both of these questions is to accept setting a "goal" for human at the same time. Therefore, "to determine a purpose for a man" means is to set a goal for his actions. Thus, it can be said that some goals in the human actions have moral qualities. These areas of action constitute the domain of ethics.

¹⁶⁵ Aristotle, Nicomachean Ethics, 1998a:1102a 13-21

According to the general acceptance, ethics is considered as an activity of thinking about morality.¹⁶⁶ In this context, ethics is to ask questions investigating "what is valuable" or "what is the right or valuable action?" beyond a certain state.¹⁶⁷

Problems related to ethics have constantly occupied the mind of the human, when viewed from the point of view of the history of thought. Because, the moral actions of man have become a matter of debate at every place where human is. In that case, it may be said that ethics is a discipline of philosophy which deals with and discusses the moral life, and tends towards the phenomenon which is called moral and comprising of moral values and ideals.

Politics, like ethics, is manifested through relations between humans and human produces the politics, that's why there can not be as natural situation as that ethics and politics relate to each other.

Politics aims at the happiness of people and what Aristotle meant with the man's happiness is as follows:

The best life for both individuals and cities is a virtuous life supported with tangible assets enough to carry out the actions required by virtue.

The state itself is the one that will provide this happy life both to the people and to the society. For this reason, Aristotle never breaks the connection between virtue and the political structure, and doesn't deem that the one that breaks such connection is worth of the name "political community". Aristotle tells that the basic

¹⁶⁶ Harald Delius, "Etik", Günümüzde Felsefe Disiplinleri, (Çev. Doğan Özlem) Ankara, 1997. İnkılâp Yay. s. 336.

¹⁶⁷ Tepe, Harun, "Bir Felsefe Dalı Olarak Etik", Ankara, 1998, S. 16

principle of society and its value must be virtues since he knows that virtuous people will show up if and only if the society is a virtuous one.

According to him, Politics, in terms of its goal, is the highest practical science covering ethics, though politics and ethics are practical sciences; politics aims at achievement of good things for human beings through legislation. Ethics has been discussed in the first place since the identification of "What is the good for human" is the research field of ethics, because the information revealed in the ethics will constitute the basis of politics.

As we have mentioned earlier, as a matter of fact Aristotle defines the ethics as a political research and indicates that the "good for human", which is the object of ethical research, forms the basis of politics. Politics demonstrates the ways to achieve what is good for human, that is, the life good for human by using the knowledge revealed through the ethics.

He reveals the ways to achieve the best life for human by classifying constitutions into various categories, and by finding the most ideal form of applicable constitution, that is political constitution. According to him, this represents constitutional government or Politeia. This form of government is the most viable administration rather than Aristotle's ideal form of government.

Political administration is not a totally disconnected constitution from the kingdom and the aristocracy in terms of the government of virtuous people. However, it differs from the other two in that it lowered the expectation in terms of virtue and that it participates more people compared to the other two. In political administration, every man who lives in a city shall not be accepted as a citizen; aristocratic principle will also be taken into consideration by limiting the citizenship to the persons who are virtuous, have sufficient reasoning power and possess properties.

Aristotle reveals the purpose of political administration as the protection of interests of both the rich and the poor, both wealth and individual freedom,¹⁶⁸ where, as we have already mentioned, a fair system requires this. However, it is revealed that this is only possible through the administration of the community of elected virtuous citizens.

Because, as we have seen before, giving administration to a single person who is not mature and incompetent in terms of virtue, leads to a tyranny. On the other hand, giving the administration to the poor majority, as in the democracy, may lead the poor to monarchize by stealing from the wealthy's property. Both of these represent the extremes, those involved in these governments are not observing common interests but their own interests. Therefore, the common interest will be maintained not with riches or poors but with a community which is positioned in the middle of these groups, and constituted by those with certain level of fortune and those with sufficient share from the virtues. As you can see, the idea of moderation or being the mean, which is revealed by Aristotle as a measure of virtues and correct behavior works also in the field of politics.

In brief, according to Aristotle, the state is a community created for a perfect and self-sufficient life for the happiness of its citizens. In other words, the state is an association of family and villages for a perfect and self-sufficient life that means a happy and honorable life.¹⁶⁹

Such association is different from the union of animals, people can form a political community while animals can only form communities, and the difference lies here in this "politics"; because, according to Aristotle, politics is not a mutual agreement of interests, but it is available to enable humans to achieve the highest good eventually. For human, the highest good refers to a virtuous life.

¹⁶⁸ Aslan, 2011: ss.302

¹⁶⁹ Aslan, 2011: 291

In that case, the function of politics at that time is to guide people to be virtuous, to make available the conditions of building a decent life, and to contribute to the humanization of human beings. The state will provide it with punishment and awards, and the laws. Therefore, as we have repeatedly mentioned before, Aristotle argues that a real state will not only be contended to provide the external and physical well-being of its citizens, but a real state, also, is supposed to serve more than that, a more humane goal, and that such goal is not to provide only a life but also to enable the best possible life. the good of the state is to provide happiness since the happiness is what the best is.

As a result, the duty of a good statesman, administrator or legislator is revealed in this way: to contemplate about how to create an order that will enable citizens to live well, and to search for ways to achieve this and to establish the conditions for the possibility of such a life. Aristotle, while searching for the best life, the most correct constitution, is always in search of the order that will lead to this very goal. As it can be understood from this, Aristotle's politics & ethics combination can not be separated, these two fields of activity require each other and one of them can not complete its function exactly without the other one.

REFERENCES

- A. A. Stroll/ A. A. Long/ V. J. Bourke/ R. Campbell; Etik Kuramlar (*Ethical Theories*), çev. Mehmet Türkeri, Lotus Yayınları. Ankara. 2013, S.23
- Akarsu, Bedia; Mutluluk (*Happiness*), Ahlakı, İnkılap Yayınları, İstanbul 1998 (1. Ve 2. Basım Edebiyat Fakültesi, İstanbul, 1965-1970).
- Annas, J.; “Human Nature And Political Virtue”, Aristotle: Critical Assesments, Vol. IV
- Arendt, Hannah; İnsanlık Durumu (*The Human Condition*), Çev. Baha Sina Şener, İletişim Yay. İstanbul 2000
- Aristoteles; Eudemos’a Etik (*Eudemean Ethics*), Çev. Saffet Babür, Dost Kitabevi, Ankara 1999
- Aristoteles; Metafizik (*Metaphysics*), Çev. Ahmet Arslan, Sosyal Yayınları, İstanbul 1996.
- Aristoteles; Nikomakhos’a Etik (*Nicomachean Ethics*), Çev. Saffet Babür, Bilgesu Yayıncılık, Ankara 2009.
- Aristoteles; Politika (*Politics*), Çev. Mete Tunçay, Remzi Kitabevi, 1993, İstanbul.

- Aristotle; Retorik (*Rhetoric*), Çev. Mehmet H. Doğan, İstanbul, Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 2001.
- Aristoteles; Ruh Üzerine (*On the Soul*), Çev. Zeki Özcan, Birleşik Kitabevi, Gözden Geçirilmiş 3. Baskı, (1. Baskı Haziran 2011, Ankara).
- Aristotle; Eudemos'a Etik (*Eudemian Ethics*), Trans. By J. Solomon, The Complete Works Of Aristotle, Princeton University Press, 1995
- Aristotle; Nikomakhos'a Etik (*Nicomachean Ethics*), Trans. By Roger Crisp, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Arslan, Ahmet; İlkçağ Felsefe Tarihi (*History of Ancient Philosophy*), İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları. İstanbul, 2011
- Atayman, Veysel; Etik (*Ethics*), Donkişot, İstanbul, 2005
- Baracchi; Aristotle's Ethics As First Philosophy, Cambridge University Press, 2008
- Broadie, S.; Ethics With Aristotle, 1991
- Cevizci, Ahmet; Etiğe Giriş (*Introduction to Ethics*), Paradigma Yayınları, İstanbul, 2008

-
- Cevizci, Ahmet; İlkçağ Felsefesi Tarihi (*History of Ancient Philosophy*), Asa Yay. Bursa 2001

Clark, S. R. L. 1975, Aristotle's Man, USA

- Çötök, Tufan; Aristotle Ahlakının Kurucu Erdemi Olarak Phronesis (*Phronesis as the Founding Virtue of Aristotle's Morality*), Sakarya, 2011
- Doğan, Mehmet; Büyük Türkçe Sözlük (*Great Turkish Dictionary*), İz, İstanbul 1996
- Doğan, Özlem (Der.); Etik (*Ethics*), İnkılap Yay., İstanbul 2004
- Gökberk, Macit; Felsefe Tarihi (*History of Philosophy*), Remzi Kitabevi, Ekim, 2011
- Harald Delius; "Etik", Günümüzde Felsefe Disiplinleri (*"Ethics", Today's Disciplines of Philosophy*), Çev. Doğan Özlem, Ankara, 1997. İnkılâp Yay.
- İoanna Kuçuradi; İnsan Ve Değerleri (*Human and Values*), Türkiye Felsefe Kurumu, Ankara, 1998
- Kraut, R.; 1991, Aristotle On The Human Good, New Jersey: Princeton Universtiy Press

-
- MacIntyre, Alasdair; Erdem Peşinde (*After Virtue*), Çev. Muttalip Özcan, Ayrıntı Yayınları, İstanbul 2001.

MacIntyre, Alasdair; Etik'in Kısa Tarihi (*Short History of Ethics*), Çev. Hakkı - Hünler – Solmaz Zelyüt Hünler, Paradigma Yayınları, İstanbul 2001.

- Magge, B.; “Martha Nussbaum İle Aristotle Üzerine Tartışma” (*Discussion on Aristotle with Martha Nussbaum*), Büyük Filozoflar, Çev. A. Cevizci, İstanbul: Paradigma Yay, 2002
- Pieper, Annemarie; Etiğe Giriş, (*Introduction to Ethics*) Çev. Veysel Atayman-Gönül Sezer, Ayrıntı Yay., İstanbul 1999
- Ross, David; Aristotle, Çev. Ahmet Arslan-İhsan Oktay Anar-Özcan Kavasoğlu-Zerrin Kurtoğlu, Kabalcı Yayınları, İstanbul 2002
- Santas, G.; 2001, Goodness And Justice: Plato, Aristotle And The Moderns, Usa: Blackwell Pub.
- Tekerek, Nurhan- Tekerek, İsmet; Aristotle's Poetik ve Etik Bütünlük Örneklerle Eylem, Karakter ve Erdem (*Aristotle's Poetic and Ethical Integrity - Action, Character and Virtue with Examples*), Tiyatro Araştırmaları Dergisi, Sayı 26, 2008
- Tepe, Harun; “Bir Felsefe Dalı Olarak Etik: “Etik” Kavramı, Tarihçesi Ve

- Günümüzde Etik”, Dođu-Batı (*"Ethics as a Philosophical Branch: The Concept of "Ethics", History and Ethics Today", East-West*), Cantekin, Ankara 1998,

Ulař, Sarp; Felsefe Sözlüğü (*The Philosophy Dictionary*) , Bilim Ve Sanat Yayınları, Ankara 2002
- Yack, B.; (1993), *The Problem Of A Political Animal*, USA: University Of California Press
- Yaran C.; *Ahlak ve Etik (Moral and Ethics)*, Rađbet Yayınları. 2010

•

CITED ARTICLES AND THESIS

- Abdulvahap oşkun, Ulus-Devletin Dönüşümü Ve Meşruluk Sorunu (*The Transformation of the Nation-State and the Problem of Legitimacy*), Ankara Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Doktora Tezi
- Ahmet Kesgin, Pragmatik Etik-Siyaset İlişkisi (*Pragmatic Ethics and Politics Relations*), Ankara Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Felsefe Ve Din Bilimleri (Felsefe Tarihi) Anabilim Dalı, Doktora Tezi (*Doctoral Thesis*)
- Barış Mutlu, Aristotle's Doğal Etik Politik Bir Tasarım Olarak İnsan Anlayışı (*Aristotle's Natural Ethics Human Understanding As a Political Design*) Ankara Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Felsefe (Sistemik Felsefe Ve Mantık) Anabilim Dalı, Yüksek Lisans Tezi (*MA Thesis*),
- Cemal Güzel, Aristotle's Bilgi, Bilim, Bilgide Kesinlik (*Aristotle's Knowledge, Science, Precision in the Knowledge*), Hacettepe Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Dergisi, 2003, Cilt: 20, Sayı 1
- Dr. Muhittin Bilge, Gelenekselden Moderne Etik ve Siyaset (*Ethics And Politics from TRaditional to Contemporary*), Zkü Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, Cilt 8, Sayı 15, 2012
- Murat Adıyaman, Aristotle'in Adalet Anlayışı (*Aristotle's Understanding of Justice*), Ege Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Felsefe Anabilim Dalı
- N. Murad Omay, Aristoteles İnsanın Nihai Amacı (*Aristotle's Ultimate Purpose*), T. C. İstanbul Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Felsefe Anabilim Dalı,

Doktora Tezi (*Doctoral Thesis*)

- Sefa Kakis, Aristotle Etiğinin Bilgi – Mantık Temelleri (*The Knowledge-Logic Foundations of the Aristotle Ethics*), Atatürk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Felsefe Anabilim Dalı, Yüksek Lisans Tezi (*Master Thesis*)
- Vehip Birlik, Platon Ve Aristotle'in Erdem Anlayışının Akıl Bilgi Ve Mutluluk İle Olan İlişkisinin Karşılaştırılması (*Comparison of the Relation of Platon's and Aristotle's Virtue Understanding with REason, Intelligence and Happiness*), İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Felsefe Anabilim Dalı, Yüksek Lisans Tezi (*Master Thesis*)
- Yrd.Doç. Dr. Özgüç Orhan, Aristotle's Siyasal Yönetim Kavramı Ve Politika'nın Türkçe Çevirilerinin Bir Eleştirisi (*A Critisizm on Translations of Aristotle's Concept of Political Administration and Politics into Turkish*) Ankara Üniversitesi, Sbf Dergisi, Cilt 70, No. 3, 2015, S. 607 – 653