

the realization of the highest type of society, just as the household must consist of both slaves and free.¹ Unless, however, there was to be frankly accepted a dichotomy of the Hellenic race itself, such as would be fraught with the gravest menace of national disruption and chaos, there was nothing for it but to adopt the old standing division of humanity into Hellenic and non-Hellenic,² and to find therein the philosophic justification of the institution of slavery, while doing what could be done for the slave himself. The 5th cent., less troubled than the 4th with doubts, had not discovered the comfortable doctrine that slavery might be actually good for the slave, enabling him, under the mild yoke of the exponents of culture, to lead a higher sort of life than was otherwise possible for him.

The bias of Aristotle being, in general, to accept, with his own amendments, the institutions and views in which the collective experience of the Greek race had crystallized, he retains slavery in his ideal state, but retains it in an ideal form which would make it spiritually as well as practically advantageous to the highest capacities of both master and slave. The slave is an article of household property, an indispensable animate instrument,³ of a superior sort—an instrument not of production, but of action, i.e. not coming solely within the sphere or purview of economics, but within that of ethics;⁴ being an article of property, he belongs wholly to his master. The facts of the world show that there is a natural, and therefore just, because actually existing, principle of rule and subordination, or scheme of co-ordination in nature, both animate and inanimate.⁵ There is, then, a 'natural slavery' (*φύσει δούλων*), in which the slave's bodily strength is complementary to the master's intelligence and 'virtue,' just as the union of male and female is necessary for purposes of reproduction and continuance of the species.⁶ The natural slave is as far inferior to his master as the body is to the soul, or as the lower animals to man generally, so that the relation of rule and subordination which obtains between soul and body, or between men and animals, is applicable here also. The only difference, indeed, between such men and animals is that the former can listen to reason; but their best function is the obedient expenditure of their physical strength,⁷ making noble life (*τὸ εὖ ζῆν*) possible for their master. The moral possibilities of the institution of slavery justify it—justified as it is indeed already by the mere fact of its existence as part of the teleological scheme of things. Paradoxical as it may sound, it was not every one who could be a slave in the true sense,⁸ for the status properly connoted a certain spiritual as well as physical aptitude. It is less therefore upon the social or economic necessity for slavery than upon the moral benefits which through it arise for both master and slave that Aristotle insists, and he postulates for the master an intellectual and moral endowment as high as that of the slave is low. Thereby, in effect, was condemned a great deal of current slavery, in so far as it included captives, not a few even of Greek blood, taken in war, i.e. men in whose case mere brute force was the basis of the status. The true test of just freedom and just slavery, according to Aristotle, lay in the relative goodness and badness, i.e. the intellectual and moral capacities, of men. Constituted on such lines, slavery would be, for the slave, no such one-sided bargain as in actual fact it was.

Aristotle's theory, though it started from fact and claimed to return to fact, yet made shipwreck upon the rock of fact. For, in the first place, there were in Attica tens of thousands of slaves who, being in no genuine sense elements of a household, were yet in mental and moral capacity and actual output fully on a par with the free citizens who owned them and claimed the main part of the fruits of their intelligence and conscientious labour. In the second place, the ultimate basis of their status, let the theorists say what they would about laws of nature and existent right, was mere force and violence enlisted in the service of idleness and greed, and worse. Lastly, the actual moral effects of slavery, alike for slave and for slave-owner,

were as a rule very conspicuously different from those desiderated by Aristotle; yet, if the institution was natural and right just because it was an objective fact, how could its fruits be logically condemned? The task of moralizing an essentially immoral institution was beyond his powers. Then as now rapacity and selfishness were apt to define right strictly from their own standpoint, and men were not slow, with grandiloquent phrase and fitful exhibition of capricious benevolence, to glaze national wrongdoing.

The noteworthy points are, not the precise amount of truth in Aristotle's attitude, but, firstly, the fact that 'the Greeks are characteristically the first human beings who felt a doubt or scruple about slavery' and that it was 'in Greece alone that men's consciences were troubled' by it, so that Aristotle found himself driven to defend the position with what forces of argument he could muster; secondly, that he makes little or no point of any supposed indispensability of slavery to the maintenance of the economic fabric of his age. And practical philosophy itself was soon to demonstrate the illusoriness of his fundamental axioms. Kleanthes was none the less a 'wise' man though he earned his living by the sweat of his brow in nightly toil as a drawer of water and kneader of bread, both reputed servile employments.¹ The Stoics demonstrated that virtue and happiness were independent of social condition,² thus making it clear that slaves were not essential by way of bolstering up virtue in order to save supposed higher natures from deterioration through contact with the cruelties of life; thus 'slavery lost its Aristotelian *raison d'être*.'³ Aristotle perceived clearly enough that slavery is incompatible with full human dignity, but, his thought being conditioned always by the vicious aristocratic antithesis of Hellenic and *βάρβαρος* (though Plato could have taught him better),⁴ he was unable to go on to perceive also that the concept of human dignity is either universally valid or everywhere equally worthless. He is honest enough, however, to confess that nature has left us without any practical criterion by which to distinguish the noble from the ignoble;⁵ for the obvious criterion of colour, to which men in more modern times were fain to appeal, was to the Greeks unknown, or at least insignificant, and he was unwilling to fall back upon the 'verdict of history' as given by war, for that, as all Athenians knew to their sorrow, often proves far too much.

For the influence of Stoicism on slavery see art. SLAVERY (Roman).

LITERATURE.—P. Foucart, 'Mémoire sur l'affranchissement des esclaves par forme de vente à une divinité,' in *Archives des miss. scient. et litt.* iii. [1867] 375 ff.; W. Oncken, *Die Staatslehre des Aristoteles*, 2 vols., Leipzig, 1875; H. Wallon, *Histoire de l'esclavage dans l'antiquité*, 3 vols., Paris, 1879; W. A. Becker, *Charikles*, new ed., 3 vols., Berlin, 1877-78, tr. F. Metcalf, London, 1882; Julius Beloch, *Die Bevölkerung der griechisch-römischen Welt*, Leipzig, 1886; W. Richter, *Die Sklaverei im griechischen Altertum*, Breslau, 1886; W. L. Newman, *The Politics of Aristotle*, 4 vols., Oxford, 1887-1902; Fustel de Coulanges, *Nouvelles Recherches sur quelques problèmes d'histoire*, Paris, 1891; Ludwig Mitteis, *Reichsrecht und Volksrecht in den östlichen Provinzen des römischen Kaiserreichs*, Leipzig, 1891; George Foucart, *De Libertorum conditione apud Athenienses*, Paris, 1896; L. Beauchet, *Hist. du droit privé de la République athénienne*, 4 vols., do. 1897; Henri Francotte, *L'Industrie dans la Grèce ancienne*, 2 vols., Brussels, 1900; Paul Guiraud, *La Main-d'œuvre industrielle dans l'ancienne Grèce*, Paris, 1900; R. Dareste, B. Haus-soullier, and T. Reinach, *Recueil des Inscriptions juridiques grecques*, 2nd ser., 2 vols., do. 1904; E. Barker, *The Political Thought of Plato and Aristotle*, London, 1906; Aristide Calderini, *La Manomissione e la Condizione dei Liberti in Grecia*, Milan, 1908; A. E. Zimmern, 'Was Greek Civilization based on Slave Labour?', in *Sociological Review*, ii. [1909] 1-19, 159-176, *The Greek Commonwealth*, Oxford, 1911; Eduard Meyer, *Kleine Schriften*, Halle, 1910; W. E. B. Du Bois, 'The Economics of Negro Emancipation,' in *Sociological Review*, iv. [1911] 303-313; Josef Kohler and Erich Ziebarth, *Das Stadtrecht von Gortyn*, Göttingen, 1912; R. v. Pöhlmann, *Gesch. der sozialen Frage und des Sozialismus in der antiken Welt*, 2 vols., Munich, 1912, *Aus Altertum und Gegenwart*, do. 1912, p. 139-198. W. J. WOODHOUSE.

SLAVERY (Hindu).—Slavery is an institution fully recognized in the Sanskrit lawbooks of India. The Code of Manu (viii. 415) names seven causes of slavery, viz. capture in war, voluntary submission to slavery for a maintenance, birth from a female slave, sale, gift, inheritance from ancestor, and condemnation to slavery by way of punishment. Manu adds that wives and sons, like slaves, can have no property of their own,

¹ Diog. Laert. 168.

² Cf. Ar. *Eth. Nic.* i. x. 8.

³ Newman, i. 156.

¹ Ar. *Pol.* i. 3=1253 B: οἰκία δὲ τέλειος ἐκ δούλων καὶ ἐλευθέρων.

² βάρβαρος; cf. Ar. *Pol.* i. 2=1252 B: ταῦτο φύσει βάρβαρον καὶ δούλον ὄν, and Eur. *Iph. Aul.* 1266.

³ Ar. *Pol.* i. 4=1253 B; cf. *Eth. Nic.* viii. xi. 6.

⁴ *Pol.* i. 4=1254 A: ὁ δὲ βίος πράξις, οὐ ποιησις ἐστίν· διὸ καὶ ὁ δούλος ὑπαρέτης τῶν πρὸς τὴν πράξιν. So William Morris: 'We must see industry not simply as a process of production but as a form of association,' etc., simply echoing Aristotle. See A. E. Zimmern, 'Progress in Industry,' in *Progress and History*, ed. F. S. Marvin, Oxford, 1912, p. 212 f.

⁵ *Pol.* i. 5=1254 A: ἐν ἅπασιν ἐμφαίνεται τὸ ἄρχον καὶ τὸ ἀρχόμενον.

⁶ *Ib.* i. 2=1252 A.

⁷ This is just the point at which Aristotle comes within hail of modern systems of 'scientific management,' such as the notorious Taylor system, the inventor of which in his defence thereof (as is pointed out by Zimmern, *loc. cit.*) unconsciously paraphrases Aristotle's defence of slavery.

⁸ *Pol.* i. 5=1254 B: ἐστὶ γὰρ φύσει δούλος ὁ δυνάμενος ἄλλου εἶναι.

⁴ Cf. Ar. *Pol.* iv. (vii.) 7=1327 B for Aristotle's own well-known comparison of Hellenes and Asiatics, the valuelessness of which is shown by comparing what Isocrates says on the same subject (*de Antid.* 293); cf. Plato, *Polit.* 262 D. But Plato's formal profession of faith in this matter is just as uncompromising as Aristotle's (see *Rep.* 470 C).

⁵ *Pol.* i. 5=1254 B.

and that Śūdras, even when emancipated by their master, are not therefore released from servitude, because the state of dependence is innate in them. The perpetual slavery of the Śūdra class is one of the axioms of Brāhmanism, and may be traced back to the *Puruṣasukta* hymn of the R̥gveda (x. 90), in which it is stated that the Śūdra issued from the feet of Puruṣa, the primeval male, feet meaning service. Nārada (v. 25 ff.) gives some further details regarding slavery, and enumerates fifteen kinds of slaves: one born (of a female slave) in his master's house, one bought, one received by gift, one obtained by inheritance, one maintained during a general famine, one pledged by his rightful owner, one released from a heavy debt, one made captive in war, one won in a stake, one offering himself for a slave, an apostate from asceticism, one enslaved for a stipulated period, one becoming a slave for maintenance, one enslaved on account of his connexion with a female slave, and one self-sold. The difference between these various slaves and the class of hired servants, according to Nārada, lies in this, that the former, but not the latter, do impure work, such as removing urine and ordure, attending their naked master, handling cows, cleaning the house and the road. The first four in the above enumeration of fifteen slaves, likewise an apostate from asceticism and one self-sold, can never be released from slavery except by the favour of their owners, but the others may obtain their release by giving a compensation in money or providing a substitute. One intending to emancipate his slave has to take from the slave's shoulders a jar with water and smash it, sprinkling his head with the water, and thrice declaring him free. One superior in caste cannot be the slave of his inferior, nor is it legal slavery when a man has been sold after having been captured by robbers, or has been enslaved by force. Here it should be observed that the ancient Hindu law contains important relics of the practice of selling children for slaves which obtained amongst ancient societies. Thus it is stated by Vasiṣṭha (xv. 2) that the father and the mother have power to give, to sell, and to abandon their son, and the son bought is generally mentioned among the various substitutes for a real legitimate son. It is true that Apastamba (ii. 13. 11) does not recognize the right to buy or sell a child, and the secondary sons generally were abolished in the more recent lawbooks, excepting the adopted son (*dattaka*; see art. ADOPTION [Hindu]). Adoption itself may be regarded as the survival of an archaic institution which owed its origin to the principle of slavery, whereby a man might be bought and sold, given and accepted, or relinquished in the same way as a cow or horse. The statements of the lawbooks on the subject of slavery are corroborated by the historical records, and V. A. Smith in his *Early History of India* observes that prædial and domestic slavery of a mild form seems to have been an institution in most parts of India from very remote times. In the time of J. A. Dubois (in India, 1792-1823), the Pariahs 'were looked upon as slaves by other castes, and treated with great harshness' (see art. PARIAS). Under British rule, slavery was not abolished at once, but gradually. Regulation x. of 1811 prohibited the importation of slaves from foreign countries into the British territories. This rule was by Regulation iii. of 1832 extended to the provinces which subsequently came into the possession of the British Government. Later on was passed Act v. of 1843 prohibiting all officers of Government from recognizing slavery. And it was finally abolished in 1860 by the Indian Penal Code, which declared the equality of all men, and provided punishment for buying or selling any person as a slave.

LITERATURE.—G. Bühler's and J. Jolly's trr. of Sanskrit law-books in *SBE*, Oxford, vols. ii. vii. xiv. xxv. xxxiii.; G. Sarkar, *The Hindu Law of Adoption*, Calcutta, 1891; V. A. Smith, *The Early History of India*, Oxford, 1904. J. JOLLY.

SLAVERY (Jewish).—Slavery was one of the features of ancient and mediæval Jewish life, and there is a large crop of Jewish legislation on the subject. It is noteworthy that among the Jews treatment of the slave was never debasing or cruel. The Mosaic legislation, with its insistence upon the rights possessed by the bondman or bondwoman and its consequent limitation of the master's power over them, inculcated the duty of clemency in the master—a virtue which colours their mutual relations in all subsequent epochs. Besides this, the Jew at every turn was confronted with such injunctions as those in Dt 5¹⁵ 15¹⁵, where the law of kindness to the slave is brought home to the Israelite by the duty to recollect how much his own ancestors had suffered during their serfdom in Egypt.

1. In OT literature.—Gn 14¹⁴ speaks of Abram 'arming his trained men, born in his house, three hundred and eighteen.' These 'trained men' were most probably hereditary slave property. That such slaves were, even in this early epoch, something more than the chattels of ancient Greece and Rome is evidenced by Gn 17²³, where 'all that were born in his [Abraham's] house, and all that were bought with his money' underwent the rite of circumcision—a clear proof that the master owed some sort of family obligation to the slave. Similarly in Ex 12⁴⁴ the circumcised slave, by becoming a member of the family, and thus sharing its religious duties and privileges, is permitted to eat of the Passover. But the fountain-head of ancient Jewish slave legislation is Ex 21²⁻²⁷. A clear distinction is here drawn between the Israelitish and the non-Israelitish bondman or bondwoman, a distinction which held in all succeeding ages. An Israelite could buy a fellow-Israelite for six years only. In the seventh year he automatically received emancipation, unless he voluntarily decided to remain. Gentile slaves, however, whether male or female, could gain their freedom only if they had previously been the victims of certain specified acts of cruelty by the master. In the year of jubile¹ all Israelite slaves together with the children born to them during serfdom were, according to Lv 25^{39f.}, to be liberated without exception; but, if the children were born of a Gentile mother, then they, like her, must remain in slavery (Ex 21⁴). According to Lv 25^{50f.}, the Hebrew slave of a non-Hebrew master had also to be freed in the year of jubile, although he should previously be redeemed, if possible, by his kindred or by his own money, the redemption price being reckoned in accordance with the number of years that had still to elapse before the arrival of the jubile. That the traffic in slaves led to numerous abuses, religious, moral, and economic, is seen from Jer 34⁸⁻²², where the princes, priests, and people of Judah are divinely warned of the dire punishment which will overtake them as a result of their breach with the ordinances of the Mosaic slave legislation. There are numerous points, both of resemblance and of contrast, between the Mosaic slave laws and those of the Code of Hammurabi.²

2. In Rabbinic literature.—The status, rights, privileges, and manumission of slaves are subjects of elaborate discussion in the Talmud as well as in the subsequent mediæval code-books, such as—to mention the two principal ones—the *Mishneh Tôrah* of Maimonides (*q. v.*) and the *Shūlhān 'Arākh* of Joseph Qaro (*q. v.*). From Lv 25³⁹, 'And if thy

¹ See art. FESTIVALS AND FASTS (Hebrew), § I. iv. z.

² See art. LAW (Babylonian), vol. vii. p. 318.