

Aristotle's Inner Logic of Justice: Based on the *Nicomachus Ethics*

Wang Shu

School of Philosophy, Southeast University, Nanjing, China

Abstract. Aristotle discusses the issue of justice in Volume V of the *Nicomachan Ethics*, including the connotation of justice, several types of justice, and the relationship between justice and willing behavior. Aristotle seems to have no rules and regulations in his discourse, but in fact, he has his inherent logic. Aristotle first provides a specific explanation of justice and divides it into overall justice and specific justice. Overall justice is related to virtue, reflecting more of an individual's quality and possessing individuality; The specific justice is closely related to the life of the city-state, and is also the main object of discussion by the Aristocrats. The purpose of discussing justice is also for the overall happiness of the city-state. It is not difficult to see the city-state nature of the justice it discusses, and natural justice and agreed justice are closely related to the evolution of the city-state. Finally, Aristotle brought justice back to the individual, exploring the relationship between justice, injustice, and willful behavior, returning to individuality, which is also the individuality in the city-state. It can be said that Aristotle's theory of justice is interpreted along the internal logic of individuality, city-state, and individuality. However, at the same time, city-state cannot represent complete justice and happiness, so justice ultimately returns to the soul quality of the individual. Justice is the manifestation of individual virtue in the city-state, and city-state and individuality complement each other to achieve the goal of justice - the happiness of the political community.

Keywords: Justice; Policy justice; City-state nature.

1. Aristotle's Theory of Justice

In Plato's *Republic*, the theory of justice occupies an important position and proposes the four virtues of wisdom, bravery, moderation, and justice. Aristotle was also influenced by this and systematically expounded the virtue of justice in the *Nicomachan Ethics* and *Politics*. *The Nicomachean Ethics* focuses on the study of the virtue of justice, while *Politics* focuses on the relationship between justice, legislation, and polity, and the specific practice of justice in the city-state.

1.1. Research status

Many scholars study Aristotelian justice from different dimensions. Firstly, some scholars study the status and enlightenment of Aristotle's justice thought in the social system. Burger's detailed comb of the specific content of the Aristotelian view of justice in *Aristotle's Dialogue with Socrates: On the "Nicomachean Ethics"*[1]; Douglas, Den Uyl and Douglas Rasmussen elaborated in detail the theory of justice rights derived from natural purposes in the *Liberty and Nature: An Aristotelian Defense of Liberal Order*[2]. McIntyre believes that Western society must rebuild virtue if it wants to get rid of moral crisis[3]. Xu Fangping[4], Pan Ziyao[5], Tang Yuanjun[6] made a detailed discussion of the thought of justice and proposes that the establishment of a just character is based on the observance of the law and the respect for ethical virtues. It has reference significance for the current "rule by law" and builds a modern social community. The above scholars discuss Aristotle's thought of justice from its origin and connotation, and then discuss its theoretical significance for building a harmonious ethical society.

Secondly, it studies Aristotle's thought of justice from the perspective of virtue. Charles M. Young argues that "justice is the first virtue of the human individual" and "justice is part of the whole virtue" in *Aristotle's Justice*[7]. In *The Neo-Aristotle Opposition to Justice*, David Wiggins pointed out that "the concept of equality in a just and good government" is the establishment of an equal government, and it needs to be based on the good system of the state and the integrity of the individual, to achieve a high degree of correspondence between individual justice and general justice. So far, individual



justice and general justice are all based on the law thinking of human virtue. On the contrary, the human subject of virtue needs the improvement of individual "justice" thinking consciousness and the establishment of the whole social justice law, which forms a perfect opportunity to build the "fairness and justice" of a harmonious ethical society. "Equity and justice" seek to achieve a state of balance that can serve as a basis for the enforcement of rights[8]. Huang Xianzhong argues that justice is the sum of all virtues in Aristotle's view. It is the most perfect virtue, and the three structures of ethical virtue prove that the justice of Aldrich is ethical virtue[9].Huang Manzhong believes that Aristotle regards justice as a kind of virtue, the discipline of just behavior as the source of just virtue, and the middle way as the ideal state of just virtue[10].

Thirdly, analysis of justice thought from the perspective of the mean ethics. Yu Shilin wrote in *a Comparison between Confucius' The Doctrine of the Mean and Aristotle's Mean* that the Mean was understood in Aristotle's works as a virtue related to human emotions and behaviors, seeking and choosing the middle way. Maintaining a kind of moderation and harmony reflects the unremitting pursuit of social justice[11]. In *A Brief Analysis of Aristotle's View of Justice*, Wang Jiayao believes that Aristotle's theory of justice contains the essence of "the mean", and the theoretical premise of his view of political justice is the view of the mean[12]. In other words, Aristotle's view of justice is "a view of justice based on the mean".

Some scholars study the classification of justice thought. Wang Lumei divides the thought of justice into three aspects: political justice, legal justice and ethical justice[13]. Pan Jianshu and Yu Qingdong summarized and analyzed the basic concepts of Aristotle's views on political justice, economic justice, and legal justice in a *New Exploration of Aristotle's Views on Justice*[14]. Ma Jiesha believes that Aristotle divides justice into overall justice and specific justice. Special justice includes distributive justice, corrective justice and restorative justice[15]. Sun Wenkai believes that Aristotle divides justice into abstract justice and specific justice. Specific justice only includes distributive justice and corrective justice[16]. Yan Cunsheng argues that Aristotle divides justice into: legislative justice and judicial justice, distributive justice and corrective justice, and he believes that corrective justice is close to judicial justice[17]. A common feature of them is to start from the theory of justice itself and introduce the classification of justice under different criteria.

In *Aristotle's Nature, Justice, and Rights in Aristotle's "Politics*, Fred Miller connects the principles of justice with the "legitimacy" of rights, elaborating precisely on the relationship between justice and individual rights[18].In Collins's *Justice and the Dilemma of Moral Virtue in Aristotle's Nicomachean Ethics* - the legal basis of justice as summarized in the book[19]. The profound discussion of the relationship between justice, virtue and legislation is made In *Aristotle: Political Philosophy* written by R Kraut[20], and in *Reading Aristotle's Ethics: Virtue, Rhetoric, and Political Philosophy* written by Tessitore[21].

The content of Aristotle's justice is complicated and the system is huge, and his roundabout explanation makes justice appear to be a loose system without internal logic. Therefore, by sorting out the connotation of the theory of justice in *Nicomachus Ethics* and *Political*, this paper classifies and analyzes the internal logic and the clues followed by the continuous evolution of the concept of justice.

1.2. The connotation of justice

Aristotle discussed the nature and scope of justice at the beginning of Volume V. He said, "As for justice and injustice, we must first understand what they are about, what kind of moderate quality justice is, and which two extremes it is between. We will continue to follow the steps of the previous volume in our research.[22]" Although Aristotle did not clearly define justice, it is not difficult to see the two connotations of justice. Firstly, justice is a quality, and secondly, justice is a moderation. At the same time, Aristotle also pointed out the research method on justice, which is the same as the previous volume, but justice is more complex than the previous virtues. Therefore, it is not only necessary to explore justice as a whole, but also to discuss justice with substantive significance, and

explore it from multiple factors. Below, we will discuss the connotation of Aristotle's so-called justice in detail.

Firstly, justice is a quality. Aristotle emphasized, "When all people speak of justice, they refer to a quality that propels a person towards doing the right thing, makes them do things fairly, and is willing to do just things.[22]" Not only fairness, but injustice is also a personal quality. As a personal quality, justice cannot be separated from virtue, so "justice is often regarded as the foremost virtue" and "justice is the sum of all virtues". The justice here is also known as the most complete and overall virtue, which refers to the virtue reflected in the process of interacting with people, that is, "a person with just virtue can not only apply his own virtue, but also his neighbor's virtue[22]." In this sense, justice is a virtue about others, a kindness towards others, promoting the interests of another person, and a personal quality of being a member of a community that interacts with others.

Secondly, justice is a form of moderation. As mentioned earlier, justice is a personal quality, and so is injustice. When discussing justice, Aristotle inevitably incorporates injustice into the discussion, and obtains justice through injustice. He talked about two types of injustice in the *Nicomachean Ethics*, one is the lawbreaker, and the other is the greedy and unequal person. Based on the second type of injustice, Aristotle pointed out that there is a certain correlation between injustice and the amount of demand for good and evil things, and the so-called inequality includes two situations: one is to demand too much for good things, and the other is to demand less for truly bad things, which is inequality. It is not difficult to see that this inequality itself contains a moderate degree, that is to say, injustice itself contains a moderate degree, and justice itself, as the opposite of injustice, also contains a moderate degree. This moderate degree is not only mentioned here, but also explained in the specific justice discussed later, including corrected justice and distributive justice that Aristotle wanted to express.

1.3. The classification of Justice

Regarding the classification of justice, Aristotle first divided it into two categories: overall justice and specific justice. When discussing the connotation of justice earlier, we mentioned overall justice. However, Aristotle's opening discussion on the connotation of justice, namely "a moderate" and "the moderate between which two extremes", has to be explained through specific justice. In a certain sense, specific justice belongs to the overall justice, but it is also a special kind of justice that Aristotle wants to study. As Aristotle himself said in the *Nicomachean Ethics*, "What we need to study is justice as a part of virtue, and we all believe that such justice exists." The injustice we are studying is also in this specific sense[22]. At the same time, he also clearly pointed out: "In addition to overall injustice, there is another specific form of injustice." He shares the same name with the overall injustice because its definition is the same as the overall injustice[22]. So since the meaning of injustice is like this, the meaning of justice is also like this. Apart from the overall meaning of morality, justice also has another meaning, which is specific justice. Aristotle further divided specific fairness, mainly including fairness in distribution and fairness in correction [Note: There is also controversy over Aristotle's specific division of justice here. This paper believes that Aristotle divided it into two types: distributive justice, corrective justice]. "The specific fairness and its corresponding behavior can be divided into two categories. One category is fairness manifested in the distribution of honor, money, or other separable common wealth (which a person may receive an equal or different share). The other category is fairness that plays a corrective role in private transactions. "[22]

Firstly, there is justice in distribution. As mentioned earlier, the concepts of justice, injustice, and equality are related. Therefore, "there is clearly a moderate relationship between inequality and equality, which is equality.[22]" This indicates that justice contains equality, and precisely because the connotation of justice also includes moderation, justice must be equal and moderate. Therefore, it must involve four items, because both moderation and equality contain two items: "As moderation, it involves two extremes (too much and too little); as justice, it involves certain specific individuals.[22]" So the principle of distribution is necessary for the equal and proportional relationship between two people and two things, so in order to maintain equality and follow

moderation, fairness in distribution is necessary. When explaining the fairness of distribution, Asher emphasized that "fairness lies in proportionality" and "fairness is an ordinary quantity". For example, if two people are represented by A and B, and the divided items are represented by C and D, then this proportional relationship should be expressed as $A : B = C : D$. Of course, Aristotle also mentioned that the fairness of distribution should be based on some kind of distribution, so the distribution methods between different political systems are different. For example, the well-known democratic system is based on free identity, while the oligarchic system is based on wealth, etc. Overall, distributive justice is a proportional relationship presented based on the principles of distribution (i.e., a form of entitlement), in order to satisfy the moderate and equal connotations contained in justice.

Next is the fairness of correction. Correctional justice is "justice in private transactions that are voluntary or against will[22]." The fairness of correction can be divided into two types, corresponding to two types of private transactions: voluntary and against the will. Transactions made out of will include buying, selling, mortgaging, storing, renting, etc., while transactions made against will involve secrecy, such as theft, adultery, perjury, etc., as well as violence, such as killing, robbery, insulting, etc. The fairness of correction, like the fairness of distribution, cannot be separated from moderation. If the fairness of distribution is the moderation between the extremes of too much and too little, then the fairness of correction is the moderation between gain and loss. Unlike the proportional relationship presented by distributive justice, corrective justice is more of an arithmetic equality, which in a sense is a moderate balance between gains and losses in transactions that go against will. This justice requires the power of intermediaries, and this gain and loss is reflected relative to the original quantity or share of both parties, with the aim of enabling both parties to achieve a state of balance before injustice. Simply put, for example, when both A and B start trading, they both hold property worth C, and in an unfair transaction, A only pays a share of C-N. After the transaction, A occupies an additional C - (C-N), which becomes C+N, while B becomes C-N, resulting in this unfairness. The intermediary, also known as the judge mentioned earlier, needs to correct this type of unfairness and restore it to a state of balance between the two parties, which is the fairness of correction.

2. The purpose of discussing fairness

Aristotle explored the issues of virtue, goodness, and happiness in the entire volume of the *Nicomachan Ethics*. He believed that all things have the purpose of seeking goodness, and the ultimate goal of life is to seek the ultimate goodness and ultimately obtain happiness. Therefore, the chapter on righteousness in Volume V of the *Nicomachan Ethics* is also in line with its main theme. Justice is not only the justice of the individual, but also the justice in the city-state. The purpose of political science is the happiness of the political community, and the purpose of justice is to maintain this happiness. Aristotle also said in Volume V of the *Nicomachan Ethics*, "In one of these senses, we tend to create and maintain political communities." The behavior of happiness or its constituent components is regarded as just. Therefore, it is necessary to talk about the whole picture of political justice to illustrate the purpose of Aristotle's theory of justice.

2.1. Political justice

Political justice, also known as political justice, is defined by Aristotle in the *Nicomachean Ethics*: "We are exploring both justice itself and political justice. Political justice is the justice between people who live together self-sufficient, achieve equality through proportion or quantity." Political justice includes the following characteristics.

1) Justice belongs to the human race. "Justice exists among those who are able to enjoy what is good in themselves, and can enjoy more or less of it. Some beings, such as God, cannot enjoy more of this kind of good. There are also some beings, who are incurable evil beings, even the least of this kind of good is harmful to them. Others can share this kind of good within a certain limit. Therefore, justice is human's[22]." This passage clearly points out that justice does not belong to God or other beings.

If justice belongs to God, God is the most abundant good and a perfect being, pushing it to the extreme. In this case, there is no need for justice to exist. This is similar to Anselm's proof of God's existence, which is already an unparalleled perfect existence and cannot add new good. Similarly, other beings who have not yet evolved to realize the conditions for the emergence of justice, such as the limited availability of material resources, such as natural resources, cannot enjoy justice. Therefore, justice only exists in humans, and justice belongs to humans.

2) Political justice only exists among citizens. As mentioned earlier, justice belongs to individuals, but political justice only exists among citizens. Aristotle emphasized in his definition of political justice that it is "justice among people who live together in self-sufficiency, achieve equality through proportion or equality in quantity.". There is no political justice among those who are not self-sufficient and do not have equality in proportion and quantity, only a certain analogical sense of justice. He mentioned in "The Nicomachan Ethics" that "justice between masters and slaves, as well as between parents and children, is not political justice, but rather similar to it. Because there is no strict injustice to what belongs to oneself[22]." In Aristotle's view, both slaves and underage children are in a subordinate relationship, where slaves belong to their masters and children belong to their parents. Therefore, there is no legally adjustable mutual relationship, and thus there is naturally no political justice, nor does it fall within the scope of political justice. Therefore, political justice only exists between equal individuals whose mutual relationship is protected by law and governed by regulation, that is, political justice only exists between citizens.

To sum up, first of all, Aristotle shows the characteristics of political justice, and then reveals the differences between political justice and similar justice in two aspects. Political community rather than community, and equality becomes one of the differences between political justice and similar justice. Then, he clarified the role of law on political justice, so whether the applicable objects are regulated by positive law becomes another important difference between the two kinds of justice, that is, he stressed that the existence and realization of political justice completely depend on law.

In addition to explaining that political justice is human and only exists among citizens, whether political justice is natural or agreed upon has also become a focal point of Aristotle's interpretation of political justice. The following will discuss this issue in detail.

2.2. Natural justice and agreed justice

"Some political justice is natural, while others are agreed upon. [22]" Aristotle provides the answer at the beginning of Chapter 7 of Volume V of the Nicomachan Ethics. This is mainly explained in two points.

Firstly, it is a fair interpretation of nature. Firstly, natural justice is effective for everyone, and not all justice is predetermined. Aristotle believed that the reason why people believe that all justice is agreed upon is because all the justice we can see is changing, and natural things should remain unchanged. For example, if something has a certain property, it does not matter where it is located. It all has such a property, and justice has always been variable, so it is not natural. But Aristotle believed that justice is a variable and worth pondering proposition, and also has certain limitations in order for this proposition to come true. He refuted this by stating that justice would be immutable if it were with God. If we delve deeper into this natural justice, perhaps it can be said that this nature has a congenital nature, similar to the innate ability of human logic, which existed in the souls of humans. It is precisely because of this ability that a certain kind of nature is innate. Therefore, even if political justice is variable, it is also subject to certain limitations, and there must be justice out of nature. Secondly, natural justice dictates what is already important [23]. Because Aristotle initially proposed that the fairness of the agreement was not important, but once it was established, it became important. Therefore, a deduction here may lead to the opposite of natural fairness and agreed fairness, which stipulated what was particularly important from the beginning and naturally had variability within certain limits.

Secondly, regarding the fairness of the agreement. The previous text also mentioned that "it is not important whether the fairness of the agreement was initially determined in this way or that way, but once it is determined, for example, if the prisoner's ransom is one mina and one goat should be offered instead of two sheep during the sacrifice, it becomes very important. Moreover, the fairness of the agreement is for specific things... [22] "The fairness of agreements mostly relies on the law making certain provisions on specific matters, and there will be different standards in different applicable environments. At the same time, Yashi emphasized that different forms of government can also affect the changes in the fairness of agreements, and in a certain sense, there is the best political system. So, as a form of political justice, since it is artificially formulated, will it be influenced by the power of the natural Logos? Can it be said that it is generally governed by the power of the natural Logos, and in fact, is it also natural? This may reflect a relationship between the city-state and the individual, where natural justice is more of a personal nature. It is a kind of justice that is considered from the perspective of the Logos ability of human nature itself, and it is an innate and important regulation. The agreed justice is more inclined towards the level of the entire city-state. Although it is also influenced by Logos, it is a kind of justice that arises due to the specific needs of specific situations in the city-state life, and has different unity in different places. Therefore, Asher believed that natural justice and agreed justice are both political justice, and only when individuals and city states complement each other within a certain range can political justice be achieved. Individuals are individuals in a political community, and city states are city states composed of individuals. The concept of city-state will be discussed in detail in the following text, and it will be introduced here first.

3. Justification of fairness, injustice, and willingness to act

3.1. Justice, injustice, and voluntary behavior

"Whether an action is fair or unjust depends on whether it is intentional or against will[22]. " This raises questions, including Kant and others, about whether a certain behavior is unfair if it is not for a bad purpose but results in a negative outcome? Asher gave a clear answer: if a person is within their ability and is aware of it, that is, out of will, then it is an unjust behavior. If it is out of chance or coercion, that is, out of ignorance, etc., even if it causes a bad result, it cannot be said that this behavior is unjust. Therefore, he believes that there are three types of harm in social behavior: accident, negligence, and injustice. If the harm is due to ignorance, then it is a negligence (or can be said to be a mistake). If injury is something unexpected, then we can say it is an accident. But if the harm is intentional, it can be divided into two situations: the first is that the perpetrator did not consider it beforehand, and we say that this behavior is unfair, but we cannot say that the perpetrator is an unjust person; The second type is that if the perpetrator has considered and intentionally engaged in harmful behavior in advance, we can also say that he chose to engage in such behavior, then not only is this behavior unfair, but the perpetrator is also an unjust or bad person.

3.2. Receive fair and unjust treatment and willingness to act

The content of this section can be combined with the discussion of "self injustice" in the book. Aristotle mainly raised three questions. (1) Does a person voluntarily bear injustice? (2) Do all those who bear injustice bear injustice? (3) Is it possible to impose injustice on oneself [24]? Regarding the first question, Aristotle ultimately gave a negative answer through certain assumptions. The answer to the second question is also negative, because enduring injustice from others is not the same as inflicting injustice on oneself. Therefore, not all people who suffer from injustice bear injustice. And regarding the third question, Ashikaga replied again. He believes that whether it is universal justice or special justice, people cannot impose injustice on themselves. Four points are listed to support this viewpoint: firstly, the act of imposing justice on oneself is inherently unacceptable in city-state law; Secondly, a person cannot have both justice and injustice at the same time, that is, the perpetrator and victim of justice are the same person; Again, no one will choose to harm themselves out of will;

Finally, imposing injustice on oneself does not harm the interests of others, and is not inherently unjust, so it cannot be said to be an injustice. So, people cannot impose injustice on themselves against Logos.

4. The Inner Logic of Justification

At this point, the nature and classification of Aristotle's justice, as well as his discussion of the purpose of justice and the relationship between justice and willful behavior, have been discussed in the order described in the *Nicomachean Ethics*. Although the initial reading may seem disorganized, there is actually an inherent logic. The V volume of the *Nicomachean Ethics* discusses justice as a logical chain that starts with individuality, rises to city-state status, and returns to individuality. Before discussing the specific internal logic, let's first talk about the concept of a city-state.

4.1. City-state nature

The concept of a city-state is mainly discussed in Aristotle's other work "Political Science". The reason why the concept of a city-state is mentioned when discussing fairness or justice is because Aristotle explicitly emphasized in *Politics* that "justice is based on the interests of the city-state." [4] And the city-state holds an important position in Aristotle's theory of justice, and it is also an indispensable part in his theory of justice. Only in the process of gradual evolution of the city-state can people gradually become political and form a political community. At this point, the justice mentioned above begins to emerge and has a practical effect, and specific justice truly emerges. He said, "City states not only exist for a living, but should also exist for a good life. [25]" In Aristotle's view, although the concept of city-state interests and national interests is mentioned, the foundation of the city-state is not an economic community, nor is it a community community. Instead, it emphasizes more on the foundation of a moral community. Based on this, as a moral righteousness, it is precisely because of the emergence of the city-state that it has a refuge. It is the political community composed of the city-state that, for the happiness of the political community and the pursuit of the highest good, the purpose of justice is manifested, and justice also carries the color of the city-state. The so-called good life of Aristotle must also have this meaning, and this moral color is precisely where Aristotle's wisdom lies, and it is also in line with the main idea of the *Nicomachean Ethics*.

4.2. The Inner Logic of Justification

The above discussion illustrates the important position of city-state in the theory of justice, and city-state is also an important part of Aristotle's theory of justice. Below is a specific explanation of the inherent logic of Aristotle's theory of justice: individuality——city-state——individuality. Firstly, Aristotle defined the connotation of justice at the beginning of his discourse, explaining that justice, as one of Plato's four virtues, is a personal quality. It is precisely because justice is a personal quality that it is a virtue, and the overall justice discussed by Aristotle is also such a virtue. This kind of justice is "the most complete", a virtue about others, and a quality possessed by individuals. The best people not only have virtue in their own behavior, but also in their behavior towards others. This is the overall virtue, and it is also a manifestation of the individuality of justice. Secondly, concrete justice, as a special kind of justice, although included in the overall morality, is indeed the key point mentioned by Aristotle. Specific justice includes fairness in distribution and fairness in correction, both of which are produced in the specific city-state life to maintain the interests of the city-state. In order to reconcile the stability of the city-state organization and promote the happiness of the political community, whether it is fairness in distribution and correction based on proportion or the quantity of shares, it ultimately is to maintain the interests of all citizens. It is precisely because the purpose of justice is to promote the happiness of the political community, political justice can only be achieved in the city-state. Therefore, city-state justice is discussed by Aristotle when discussing justice. It accounts for a considerable proportion. Whether political justice is natural or predetermined is closely related to the evolution of the city-state. The natural part is a reflection of human nature, while the

predetermined justice is the justice that people pursue for a better life after the birth of the city-state. It is not difficult to see that the city-state character runs through these chapters. However, if the discussion of justice ends abruptly, it loses its main meaning and charm.

Finally, Aristotle discusses the issues of justice, injustice, willful behavior, receiving fair and unjust treatment, and self injustice, which are precisely a return of city-state nature to individualism as mentioned earlier. The main theme of Nicomachan ethics is the pursuit of goodness in all things, the pursuit of virtue, the ultimate good, and happiness. Although justice belongs to political science, justice is not just a matter of city-state. The justice and happiness of a city-state require every individual in the city-state to possess a quality of justice, which requires them to pursue and realize personal goodness. This is not only the purpose of ethics, but also requires the participation of individual rationality. In his discussion of this, Aristotle The strong speculative color reflected in the fair interpretation of these issues in the end is precisely the embodiment of rational guidance, which is also a sublimation here. The previous text also discusses that both agreed and natural justice are influenced by the human soul logic, just like Plato proposed the theory of soul recollection, which is an externalization of the individual soul, closely connected to people's lives, and the city-state and individualism permeate each other and work together, Individuals are individuals in a city-state, and a city-state is composed of individuals in order to achieve true justice and happiness. As Marx said, "Every individual person can only consider themselves as an owner or possessor if they are a member of this community and a member of it.[26]"

5. Concluding remarks

The previous text, based on the content of Volume V of the Nicomachan Ethics, elaborates in detail on the internal logic of Aristotle's theory of justice through the interpretation of the connotation, classification, purpose, and willingness behavior of justice. This is a logical loop that starts with individual qualities and then rises to the level of justice in the city-state, and finally returns to the level of individual soul. The logical deduction of Aristotle's concept of justice starts from the concrete moral virtue, proceeds to the whole virtue which is closely connected with law-abiding, the sum of all virtues, and finally transitions to a normative standard which is practiced by the city-state order and individual principles. It reveals the complementary relationship between individuals and city-states to promote justice. However, in fact, the volume on justice is precisely because of its unique argumentative logic, which makes it consistent with the entire Nicomachan Ethics. Aristotle's return to the individual soul in his theory of justice is precisely in politics. The bridge between learning and ethics is built, emphasizing that justice itself is also a virtue. Justice is not only the content that political science needs to explore, but also requires the cultivation of personal morality. It also requires people to pursue the highest good and happiness in order to achieve it. In this way, political science and ethics are cleverly connected through justice, and appear naturally connected throughout the book.

References

- [1] Burger. R. Aristotle's Dialogue with Socrates: On the "Nicomachean Ethics, University of Chicago Press, 2009.
- [2] Rasmussen, Douglas, B. and Den Uyl. Douglas, J. Liberty and Nature: An Aristotelian Defense of Liberal Order, La salle 1991.
- [3] MacIntyre, A, C. Whose justice? Which Rationality, Gerald Duckworth & Co Ltd, 1996.
- [4] Xu Fangping, Yang Li. On Aristotle's Thought of Justice and Its Enlightenment. Shandong Trade Union Forum. 2017(23).
- [5] Pan Ziyao. Aristotle's Thought of Justice and Its Modern Enlightenment. Literature and History Exposition (Theory). 2016(10).
- [6] Tang Yuanjun. The Enlightenment of Aristotle's Just Thought on Building a Harmonious Socialist Society. Journal of Chongqing University of Education. 2007(20).
- [7] Young, CM. Aristotle on Justice . The Southern .Journal of Philosophy ,1989(27):233-249.
- [8] David Wiggins. The Neo-Aristotle Opposition to Justice. Ideas, 1998(113).

- [9] Huang Xianzhong. *Theory of Justice Virtue: A Study of Aristotle's Justice Thought*. Beijing: The Commercial Press, 2009.
- [10] Huang Manzhong. Aristotle's View of Just Virtue and Its Contemporary Enlightenment . *Journal of Party and Government Cadres*.2010(6).
- [11] Yu Shilin. a Comparison between Confucius' The Doctrine of the Mean and Aristotle's Mea. *Journal of Peking University (Philosophy and Social Sciences)*,2003(6):16-22.
- [12] Wang Jiayao.A Brief Analysis of Aristotle's View of Justice. *New Theoretical Exploration*, 2008(4):378-379.
- [13] wang lumei, *Aristotle's Thoughts on Justice*, Jiangxi Normal University, 2011.
- [14] Pan Jianshu, Yu Qingdong. A new exploration of Aristotle's view on justice. *Journal of Heilongjiang University of Education*, 2007(8):9-11.
- [15] Ma Jiesha, *Aristotle's View of Justice and its Enlightenment*. *Academic Exchange*, 2006(1):49-53.
- [16] Sun Wenkai. The theoretical and practical basis of Aristotle's classification of Justice. *Journal of Henan Normal University (Philosophy and Social Sciences Edition)*, 2009(4):95-99.
- [17] Yan Cunsheng. *History of Western Legal Thought*. Changsha: Hunan University Press, 2005.
- [18] Fred D. Miler Jr. *Nature, justice and Rights in Aristote's "Politics."* New York: Oxford Universily Press, 1995.
- [19] Aristide Tessitore, *Justice and the Dilemma of Moral Virtue in Aristotle's Nicomachean Ethics" In Aristotle and ModernPolitics: The Persistence of Political Philosophy*. Notre Dame University Press, 2002.
- [20] R Kraut, *Aristotle: Political Philosophy*, , New York: Oxford University Press. 2007.
- [21] Aristide Tessitore. *Reading Aristotle's Ethics. Virtue, Rhetoric, and Political Philosophy*. Albany: SUNY Press,1996.
- [22] *Aristotle: The Nicomachus Ethics*, Beijing: Commercial Press, 2003.
- [23] Gaojiankang. Who is righteous? What kind of nature—— Natural Justice in Chapter 7 of Volume 5 of the *Nicomachan Ethics*. *Modern Philosophy*, 2015 (03): 76-82.
- [24] Xu Lijie. On the Three Definitions of Justice in Volume V of *Nicomachan Ethics*. *Foreign Philosophy*, 2022 (01): 56-94.
- [25] *Aristotle Political Science*. Beijing: Commercial Press, 1983.
- [26] Karl Marx, Frederick Engels, *Collected Works of Marx and Engels (Volume 8)*, London, Lawrence & Wishart,1977.