Zoran Dimić
University of Niš (Serbia), Faculty of Philosophy,
Department of Philosophy
ORCID: 0000-0002-2325-9969

Music, Leisure and Politics

DOI: 10.14746/rfn.2024.25.4

Res Facta Nova. Teksty o muzyce współczesnej 25 (34), 2024: 55–63.

INTRODUCTION

In the context of the political reading of aesthetic problems, this paper will deal with the function of art in the establishment, arrangement, and profiling of the political community, focusing primarily on music. Our goal will be to show that the philosophy of art, i.e., the philosophy of music, can equally be understood as a political philosophy precisely because of the close intertwining of politics and aesthetics, i.e., music and political power in analyzing the mentioned phenomena. As is generally known, ancient philosophers were still concerned with the function of art (music, poetry, visual arts) in managing the political community. Philosophical consideration of the political foundations and function of art and music to form a public education is clearly found in Plato (*Republic*, *Laws*) and Aristotle (*Politics*)[1]. The aesthetic, especially music, is politicized again in modern times through the problematization of civil liberties (Jean-Jacques Rousseau)[2]. We can discuss the beginning of a specifically modern political philosophy of art with Kant and his followers (Friedrich Schiller). In the background of such a presentation of the philosophy of music as a political philosophy, there would be a difference between ancient and modern forms of political philosophy in which the focus is on the just order of the community, and the focus on the mutual confrontation of freedom and power as they face each other. Our goal in this work will be to focus on ancient thoughts about the relationship between politics and music. Since we intend to make the relationship between music, leisure, and politics the central problem here, we will pay the greatest attention to how Aristotle sees the connection between these concepts.

ANCIENT GREEK THOUGHTS ON MUSIC

It is commonplace when one is thinking about the power of art, specifically music, to point to its magical power and authority over people, gods, animals,

[1] Here, you will find a general reviews of Plato's and Aristotle's thoughts on the role of music: M.B. Schoen-Nazzaro, *Plato and Aristotle on the Ends of Music*, "Laval théologique et philosophique" 1978, vol. 34, no. 3, pp. 261–273; L. Stamou, *Plato and Aristotle on Music and Music Education: Lessons from Ancient Greece*, "International Journal of Music Education" 2002, vol. 39, issue 1, pp. 3–16.

[2] The detailed overview of this problem can be found here: G. Zöller, *Musikalische Macht*, "Musik-Konzepte, Neue Folge", ed. U. Tadday, Sonderband Musikphilosophie 2007, vol. XI, pp.152–166.

and inanimate things. The visual depictions of biblical scenes by Renaissance artists have a substantial effect on believers, strengthening their faith in the Christian God, probably even more strongly than it would have happened if they had been able to read the scriptures. Orpheus' playing prompts the ruler of the realm of the dead to release Eurydice, Ampion raises the walls of Thebes with his lyre, and the poetic words of the Greek poets Mimnermus, Simonides, Sappho, Homer, and Hesiod have an almost stunning effect on the listeners. Mythic magic has always given inspiration and motives for works of different types of art. From their magical beginnings in spiritualism and magic to their modern interpretations, contemporary works of art, poetry, music, and other arts have been closely related to bewitchment and enchantment.

The Pythagorean knowledge of mathematics enabled them to relate the height and length of the musical interval to the proportions of the length of the string. The history of music theory shows that the Pythagoreans played a significant role in forming the first musical scales known in Western European culture. This interest of theirs corresponds, of course, with the general Pythagorean obsession with numbers and harmony. The beneficial effect of music on the human psyche has always been known in various cultures, in the West and especially in the East. In modern times, in Western European medicine, music is increasingly taken as a legitimate therapeutic tool in the treatment of certain mental illnesses. The Pythagorean insight into the power of music as a means of cleansing the soul is undoubtedly based on similar knowledge. As we can see from the above, the immediate context of these Pythagorean insights is not mathematical but directly concerns their teaching about leading a particular way of life. One of the most exciting views on Pythagoras and his teachings was left to us by Plato in the *Republic*. There, he says that "Pythagoras was unusually loved because he passed on to his followers a way of life [*'odós tis bíou*] which is still called *Pythagorean* and by which they think they differ from other people" [*Republic* 600b]. From this, we learn that Pythagoras established a special Pythagorean way of life, according to which and in accordance with which people lived within the Pythagorean association. We understand the full meaning and significance of this attitude of Plato only with a broader insight into the context of its appearance. Namely, at that point, Plato criticizes Homer and his poetry in the context of presenting his educational theory. However, based on Iamblichus' citation of parts of Aristoxenus's writings on the Pythagorean principles, we get a more complete impression of the deeper meaning of the significance of music for the Pythagoreans. Our attention is particularly drawn to the following testimony: "As Aristoxen says, the Pythagoreans used medicine to cleanse the body, and music to cleanse the soul"[3]. The Pythagoreans connected harmonic relations in music directly with the spiritual harmony of human life. Music is understood here as a kind of mental hygiene and therapy of a human being. However, according to the teachings of the Pythagoreans, music is essential not only for our micro-spiritual world but also through its relationship with astronomy, i.e., the harmony of the movements of the heavenly bodies. It is also connected with the acoustics of the celestial spheres, which are inaccessible to our ears. Thus, we can understand music as a connection that directly unites the microcosm and the macrocosm. In this sense, it directly concerns our limited human world and the infinite cosmos.

Music has always been equally capable of leading and seducing. Because of this, it has not only been appreciated and respected since ancient times but also considered suspicious and dangerous. Philosophers were mainly concerned with evaluating and limiting the power of poetry, theatre, and visual arts in the lives of individuals and their mutual coexistence within the community. When it comes to music, Socrates testifies to this very well in the *Republic*, where he speaks very precisely about the censorship of different musical genres, tonalities, and instruments, all with the goal of a just organization of the state and the human soul (*Republic* 398a-400a). In an ideal constitution [*politeia*], encouraging and happy music should be nurtured, not plaintive and overly passionate melodies. In the eighth book of his *Politics*, Aristotle talks about different musical genres in the context of learning about the constitution and education [*paideia*]. Conditionally speaking, he puts his

[3] H. Diels, *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker I*, Berlin 1922, p. 467 (translated by the author).

philosophy of music in the context of political philosophy (*Politics*VIII.3-7, 1337b27-1338a; 1339a11-1342b35)[4].

In a way, at the beginning of Western European philosophy, art and music, in all their forms referred to above, were already integrated into classical political philosophy. Music, poetry, and fine arts belong to the subject area of philosophical reflection on what is the correct action. In this sense, they use education as a tool for the political forming of citizens, i.e., as instruments of education and training of people. Although it may not seem so at first glance, even the Pythagorean reflection on the essence of music moves within the same framework.

However, the most significant ancient reflections on music's ethical and political aspects can be found in Plato and Aristotle. Like some later thinkers, Plato profoundly notes where music's most significant strength lies. Namely, it does not act indirectly through imitation [*mimesis*], but does the exact opposite, directly leaving an immediate mark with its "deepest penetration into the interior of the soul"(*Republic* 401d). Given that it is not burdened by bad imitation, music becomes a counterpart to gymnastics; while the former deals with the education of the soul, the latter is responsible for the education of the body (*Republic* 376e). It is important to stress here that the music referred not only to what it is in its contemporary meaning.

THREE DIFFERENT FIELDS OF MUSIC IMPLEMENTATION

Like Plato, Aristotle clearly sees music's educational function in the human community. He also subjects music to political and educational criteria when he excludes from the education of citizens the learning to play the music that he considers for slaves, as well as the use of specific ethically problematic instruments, tonality (harmonies), and measures (rhythms) (*Politics* VIII.6, 1340b40a-1342b35). The basis of the strict rules for teaching music, which would be suitable for the future free citizen, is the understanding that education consists of the proper habituation in rejecting the bad and rejoicing over the good, thus creating and strengthening the corresponding virtues. Due to its strong influence on mental formation, Aristotle notes that music deserves the special attention of those who deal with political issues: "When we listen to such music, our mental mood changes" (*Politics* VIII.6, 1340b40a11). For Aristotle, the basis of the effect of music on the soul is the circumstance that the feelings shown in musical imitation are closely related to the corresponding real feelings.

Aristotle defines the place of music in the constitution by understanding the essence of education, that is, in agreement with the understanding of man as a political animal. In his analysis of music, he observes that it has a triple function for citizens: the first one is related to dance and entertainment, the second one is educational, closely related to shaping character, and the third one is related to entertainment in a state of leisure. Aristotle pays equal attention to each of these functions. First, he says: "Today, most people do it for enjoyment" (*Politics* VIII.6, 1337b30). Aristotle would like to underline here that music combined with dance is a source of enjoyment for many people. Since music and dance generally played a vital role in the daily and ritual life of ancient peoples, the enjoyment accompanying them has always been an integral part of their relationship to the phenomena and problems that define them. In this, we can see their cathartic role. Music and dance, accompanied by enjoyment, have served people since ancient times as a kind of respite from the exhausting daily struggle to maintain life. These are the moments when people understand music and "put it together with drink and dance" (*Politics* VIII.4, 1339a16). This kind of relaxation from everyday stresses, the persistent effort to obtain food, and the struggle to preserve security enabled people to more easily deal with all the problems that marked their everyday lives. Bearing this understandable human need in mind, Aristotle does not rush to condemn this sensual use of music and dance but expresses an open understanding of it. This use of music as a companion to the human need for enjoyment is simply a part of normality. As such, it benefits the community because it enables people to relax from the strenuous and harsh life that most people lived not only in ancient times but especially in long periods of prehistory.

[4] *Politics* is cited from the bilingual, ancient Greek-English edition: Aristotle, *Politics*, Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge 1932. Unless otherwise noted, all translations of quotations are by the author.

Aristotle designates another function of music as educational, concerning character formation and human personality. The following two quotations explain in more detail what Aristotle means here: "It is clear, then, that music provides a certain education that should be given to youth not because it is useful or necessary, but because it is beautiful and worthy of a free man" (*Politics* VIII.3, 1338a15). Further, he adds: "Music should be understood as a means of developing virtue, which, like gymnastics, develops certain features of the body, can educate certain character traits, accustoming people to true and pure joy" (*Politics* VIII.3, 1338a20). This function of music is as clear as the previous one. Since music has always been a part of our lives, people constantly discuss what kind of music is best for developing desirable character and personality traits. Aristotle also does not present the second function of music here as something indisputable and clearly defined but only describes the controversies that accompany it. First, there needs to be a complete agreement among the community members about the desirable character traits that should be developed. Also, the views on this differ among members of different communities. What desirable character traits for members of one community are not the same for members of another community. At the same time, there is no less disagreement about which music, which rhythms and harmonies, members of a community should listen to for music to fulfill its educational function. In addition, Aristotle also raises the dilemma of what music should look like as a particular educational subject and whether children who attend school should learn to perform music themselves or only listen to it. If we accept that children should learn to perform music themselves, the dilemma is: "What songs and rhythms should they learn, and what instruments should they learn to play? There are also differences to be made" (*Politics* VIII.6, 1341a2). So, many dilemmas open up when we consider the educational function of music, and it is also challenging to reach an agreement on them.

The third field of music application concerns the time a person spends in leisure. Aristotle indicates its application: "The ancients introduced it to spend their leisure time nicely. Its purpose is entertainment during leisure time, and this, as it seems, is its application" (*Politics* VIII.3, 1338a22). Namely, understanding leisure is significant for human development since it is the part of a day that man does not dedicate to hard work and maintenance of everyday life. Aristotle points out that we will spend that time best if we "learn something to fill our free time" (*Politics* VIII.3, 1338a11). For this reason, Aristotle points out that music was introduced as a teaching subject in ancient times to bring to man what other activities could not. For example, gymnastics is helpful for health and physical strength, drawing is proper for evaluating works of art more efficiently, and musical skill is essential because it brings fun to a person during leisure hours. In order to make a clear distinction from the first function of music, it should be pointed out here that Aristotle is referring to elegant music "worthy of a free man" (*Politics* VIII.3, 1338a30), where pleasant music performed by musicians accompanies conversations between guests. The critical difference between the first function related to enjoyment and the one aimed at entertainment is that the latter is not accompanied by dance. The music performed by musicians at classy parties serves more as a kind of decoration that should bring a higher tone to the conversations the interlocutors have or the poetry they recite and make the atmosphere even more pleasant for all of them. This kind of custom is more difficult for us to understand today since our time does not know this kind of use of live music. Namely, today, we are very inclined to treat music as a kind of aesthetic decor for our everyday life by, for example, letting it stand in the background while we talk with our guests or while we relax in the living room, reading newspapers, watching TV. However, this kind of use of live musicians in the modern world can only be part of some rare, almost bizarre situations in the lives of wealthy people. However, when Aristotle talked about it, it was a common practice at all feasts organized by members of the nobility in the age of archaic Greece and by members of the city elite in the classical era.

Aristotle ends his interpretation of the triple function of music in the political community with the final discussion in the eighth book of *Politics*[5]. He is talking here about whether the music programme as

[5] For a more detailed critical view of these three functions, see D.J. Depew, *Politics, Music and Contemplation*, [in:] *A Companion to Aristotle Politics*, ed. D. Keyt, F.D. Miller, Oxford 1991, pp. 367–374.

a curriculum in the school should include the learning of all harmonies and rhythms or should some choice be made, bearing in mind that certain melodies and rhythms affect the audience in a precisely defined way. Referring to the viewpoints of other philosophers, which, unfortunately, we cannot identify from his writings, he presents the division of melodies into those that educate, encourage work, and arouse passion. A corresponding type of harmony naturally accompanies each of these melodies. Aristotle further analyzes the different effects of each type of melody in the text. Although at times it seems that in certain situations, he prefers one type of melody over others, Aristotle, by his overall approach to *Politics*, avoids labelling certain types of melodies as the best or ideal while altogether rejecting others. As in other places in *Politics*, in the analysis of education, he is not inclined to idealize certain things and absolutely reject or even forbid others.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF MUSIC IMPLEMENTATION COMPLEXITY

Aristotle's discussion of the relationship between music and politics takes place in the context of the question of what musical education children receive at school, that is, what kind of music should be listened to. In addition to considering the teaching aspects of music education, Aristotle naturally analyzes here the broader effects of music on the citizens of the political community. What is the specificity of his approach to this problem? What is the essence of how Aristotle sees music's role in the political community?

Aristotle underlines all the functions of music. Although it sometimes seems that he is personally inclined to put the educational character of music in the foreground, he does not do so on the whole. Aristotle looks at every aspect of music and every function of it not only from a musical or artistic point of view but, above all, its overall function for the political community and citizens. Therefore, he summarizes his consideration of music: "Music is rightly classified in all three areas and seems to belong to each of these" (*Politics* VIII.4, 1339b17). Thus, Aristotle is not inclined to label, for example, music that is listened to in a state of leisure at feasts as less significant than educational music with the task of forming character. Also, he cannot claim that even the music accompanying play and dance and that serves for enjoyment and relaxation from a busy everyday life is less worthy. Precisely, as he claims in the previous quotation, all these musical functions have the same right to be called music. The lack of inclination to value-grade the different uses of music in any way lies precisely in Aristotle's previous determination of the purpose of education in the political community. Since music is a part of education, and at the same time, the essence of education is determined by the fact that it has an essentially political character, i.e., that its essence always remains open to debate and cannot be strictly declared, the question of the role of music in the political community cannot be determined in some normative and doctrinal way. Based on what Aristotle claims in the eighth book of *Politics*, there is no way to prescribe to the citizens what music to listen to, that is, which of the functions of music should only be exercised and which should be ignored.

The following sentence of Aristotle best exemplifies this: "We believe that playing music brings not one but many benefits. In the first place, it is education and catharsis of feelings; in the third place, music serves entertainment, relaxation, and rest from effort" (*Politics* VIII.6, 1341b35). Looking at music not only from professional artistic frameworks but also not from narrow class prejudices, Aristotle, in the seventh and eighth book of *Politics*, manages to grasp the significance of music in the political community in a complex and comprehensive way, keeping in mind first of all the practical benefits it brings to the members of political community. So, Aristotle's perspective is not subject to only one aspect that a specific type of music carries in itself, or only one function that it carries with it, but looks at it comprehensively, first of all keeping in mind the real benefits of the citizens. Suppose the phenomenon of music, i.e., the problem of teaching music as a school subject, is viewed in such a way. In that case, all three functions of music mentioned above must be considered equally important. In the first but not the most important place, like gymnastics that shapes the body of students, music shapes their character. The corresponding rhythms and melodies form one

type of personality, while others form a different type of character. This is a function of music that has long been noted in the entire European civilization, and according to this insight, different types of music are chosen for different occasions, that is, different educational purposes.

The function of music related to play and dance is no less critical, that is, the enjoyment accompanying these actions. In the quotation above, Aristotle finally explains to the end what this is really about. The function, which he designates as cathartic, i.e., the one that aims at purification and liberation from certain feelings, is equally essential for the daily life of the political community members. Since dance was connected to many ritual actions but also to many other everyday situations in which it signified the celebration of something or simply satisfying the need for sensual enjoyment, this type of use of music represented an essential component in people's lives in all forms of human association.

MUSIC AND THE POLITICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF LEISURE

Given that it concerns the time we spend in leisure, the third type of function of music aims to bring people fun, relaxation from their busy everyday lives[6]. Even though this kind of understanding of music could perhaps be objected to, that it views music as something lower and secondary, which only needs to beautify the atmosphere in which we spend our leisure time, and that, in this sense, it is somewhat less valuable, Aristotle very clearly and precisely assigns a significant place to it. Since people's way of life in the political community is most often related to hard daily work, the human need to relax and have fun at the end of the day is deeply understandable. This use of music frees the citizens from tension and nervousness, which certainly accompany the ordinary day of most people. Aristotle does not see this function of music as any less important than, for example, the educational function that deals with some, conditionally speaking, higher aspects of people's lives.

However, we realize the whole political meaning of using music in leisure only when we first understand its broader meaning in Aristotle's understanding of politics. Aristotle's statements can serve us best in this regard[7]. In his short discussion on education at the end of the seventh and throughout the eighth book of *Politics*, Aristotle explicitly explains leisure's political meaning[8]. At the same time, as it is commonly known among researchers of Aristotle's *Politics*, the seventh and eighth books are where Aristotle describes the best constitution according to his wishes[9]. So, he does not criticize a realistic polis from political practice or an ideal polis like Plato's, whose criticism he devotes a lot of space to in *Politics*, but simply presents us with his idea of what a polis should look like[10]. The role of leisure becomes clear to us only when we understand how Aristotle answers the question about which state arrangement [*politeia*] would most suit citizens to be happy. In several places in Book VII of *Politics*, Aristotle clearly expresses himself and, for example, at one point he says: "It is clear that for many reasons it is necessary for all to share alike in ruling and being ruled in turn" (*Politics* VIII.13, 1332b25). So, for Aristotle, there is no dilemma as to whether it is better for political community members to participate in government actively or to be passive subjects. He obviously believes that the form of

[6] For a more detailed critical view of the concept of leisure in *Politics*, see P. Destrée, *Education, Leisure, and Politics*, [in:] *The Cambridge Companion to Aristotle's Politics*, ed. M. Deslauriers, P. Destrée, Cambridge 2013, pp. 301–323. Carnes Lord also stresses the role of leisure in the subject of politics. See in detail: C. Lord, *Education and Culture in the Political Thought of Aristotle*, Ithaca–London 1982, pp. 40–41.

[7] Here, you will find the very complex treatise regarding the relationship between leisure and politics in Aristotle's philosophy: J. T. Snyder, *Leisure in Aristotle's Political Thought*, "Polis, The Journal for Ancient Greek Political Thought" 2018, vol. 35, pp. 356–373.

[8] Some authors do not recognize the political aspects of leisure. They set the problem of leisure in the context of Aristotle's understanding of contemplation. For example, see the following paper: J. Owens, *Aristotle on Leisure*, "Canadian Journal of Philosophy" 1981, vol. XI, no. 4, pp. 722–723.

[9] About the meaning of the seventh and eighth books of *Politics*, see in detail: A. Neschke-Hentschke, *Die uneingeschränkt beste Polisordnung*, [in:] *Aristoteles Politik*, ed. O. Höffe, Berlin 2001, pp. 169–170.

[10] Aristotle devotes the most significant part of the second book of *Politics* to the criticism of existing real cities, that is, to various authors who dealt with theoretical considerations in political philosophy. A good overview of the contents of the second book and its place within the entire *Politics* can be found here: R. Kraut, *Aristotle's Critique of False Utopias* (II 1–12), [in:] *Aristoteles Politik*, ed. O. Höffe, Berlin 2001, pp. 59–75.

government in which the ruler is always one and the same (e.g., monarchy or tyranny) is less good. This is precisely why, in such a state system, it is "government for the sake of the ruler" and where citizens alternate in power "for the sake of the subject". Therefore, Aristotle indicates the first and second forms of government: "Of these the former is what we call the rule of master, the latter is the government of free men" (*Politics* VIII.13, 1333a4).

This tendency of Aristotle to show more affinity to the kind of government that produces free people rather than subjects directly determines the place of education, leisure, and music in his understanding of politics. All these three phenomena play an essential role in political practice; Aristotle, according to his idea of the best state organization, does not leave it to chance and fate but is in favour of clearly defining their framework: "Now nobody would dispute that the education of the young requires the special attention of the lawgiver" (*Politics* VIII.1, 1337a6). If, as Aristotle suggests, our goal is for government to be in the interest of the one over whom it is ruled, i.e., if our goal is to rule over free people and not rule over slaves, then we must organize education in the polis accordingly. Aristotle clearly states this in the following: "But since we say that the goodness of a citizen and ruler are the same as that of the best man, and that the same person ought to become a subject first and a ruler afterwards, it will be important for the legislator to study how and by what courses of training good men are to be produced, and what is the end of the best life" (*Politics* VII.3, 1333a11).

Therefore, it is up to the legislator and those who rule a state to determine how citizens should be educated to be free. This is precisely the immediate context in which, according to our understanding, Aristotle's statements about the political aspects of leisure and music should be interpreted. Namely, Aristotle assigns an unusually high place to leisure by proposing the outlines of the best state constitution. He expresses this clearly when he says leisure is "the first principle of all things" (*Politics* VIII.3, 1337b31). How should this be understood? Why should leisure be "the first principle of all things" in determining the way of political governance in Aristotle's idea of the best state constitution?

The role of leisure in the political life of citizens in Aristotle's best state organization becomes more apparent when we look at how he understands the life of citizens. Namely, this is divided into: "business and leisure, and war and peace, and our actions are aimed some of them at things necessary and useful, others at things noble" (*Politics* VII, 13 1333a34). In order to fully understand what the legislator should focus the goal of education on, we must consider the following statement by Aristotle: "A man should be capable of engaging in business and war, but still more capable of living in peace and leisure; and he should do what is necessary and useful, but still more should he do what is noble" (*Politics* VII, 13 1333b2). Based on this, it then becomes clear how legislators and politicians should educate citizens: "These then are the aims that ought to be kept in view in the education of the citizens both while still children and at the later ages that require education" (*Politics* VII, 13 1333b5). Based on these insights, Aristotle continues his criticism of the glorification of those legislators, typically considered the greatest among the Greeks, such as the Spartans, who educated citizens through laws without having "view to all the virtues", but only on some, e.g., courage and warrior skills (*Politics* VII, 13 1333b9). Here, Aristotle expresses his criticism of those who praise the Spartan legislators very explicitly: "In praising the Spartan constitution they express admiration for the aim of its founder on the ground that he framed the whole of his legislation with the view to conquest and to war" (*Politics* VII, 13 1333b14). If our goal were to rule over subjects and slaves, then such a legislator and such laws would be desirable. However, as the political practice in Sparta further showed, it did not end well. Namely, the citizens of Sparta stopped being happy over time. Constant warfare and getting used to permanent danger cannot bring happiness to the members of a polis.

Arguably, Aristotle was keen to praise only the government over free people. Here, he delivers some arguments: "To govern freemen is nobler and more conjoined with virtue than to rule despotically" (*Politics* VII, 13 1333b33). Thus, we see that one of the reasons for this praise is virtue; that is, Aristotle claimed that one of the aims of governing within his best constitution is that the citizen should possess different virtues. The second reason we find further:

"The same ideals are the best both for individuals and communities, and the lawgiver should endeavor to implant them in the souls of mankind" (*Politics* VII, 13 1333b37). Therefore, it is clear that the lawgiver and the statement should aim not only to ensure that the citizen possesses just one virtue, for instance, bravery in Sparta, but also as many as possible. Thus, Aristotle claims, "The lawgiver is to blame because he did not educate them (citizens) to employ leisure" (*Politics* VII, 13 1334a8). The second significant aim should be not just the happiness of one or a few citizens but as many as possible. Consequently, Aristotle frames education, leisure, and politics in the same context: "And since it appears that men have the same end both collectively and individually, and since the same distinctive aim must necessarily belong both to the best man and the best government, it is clear that the virtues relating to leisure are essential; since, as has been said repeatedly, peace is the end of the war, leisure of business" (*Politics* VII, 13 1334a11).

To summarize, it is obvious what exactly Aristotle wanted to underline. In the best possible polis, it is up to the statement and lawgiver to cultivate different virtues within the citizens. In order to be free, the citizens should practice leisure. However, they can only practice it if the whole political life is well settled by the statement and lawgiver. Suppose the statement and lawgiver want to develop the virtues significant for leisure. In that case, they should firstly take care of those critical for the business: "For many of the necessaries must needs be forthcoming to give us the opportunity for leisure" (*Politics* VII, 13 1334a18).

However, it does matter how we spend our free time, i.e., how we complete our free time. Not all free time is good free time. Aristotle clearly states his position on this: "For war compels men to be just and temperate, whereas the enjoyment of prosperity and peaceful leisure tend to make them insolent" (*Politics* VII, 13 1334a28). This is precisely the context in which music became an important political topic for Aristotle since he saw it as one of the most appropriate ways to spend free time. Aristotle devotes the last few paragraphs at the end of the eighth book of *Politics* to explaining what kind of music would be best to listen to if we strive for our government's goal of creating free citizens.

CONCLUSION

Aristotle cares equally about preserving and nurturing all three functions of music in educating political community members. Since he considers all aspects of people's lives in the political community to be equally important, including the sensory and material, as well as the moral and spiritual, he cannot allow any of the functions of music to dominate at the expense of the other two. For Aristotle, using modern terminology, the cognitive aspects of personality are just as crucial as the conative ones or the social and emotional ones. Also, enjoyment's sensory and material aspects are just as important as the spiritual and aesthetic aspects. Therefore, I find it very significant that he refuses to prioritize any of the mentioned functions of music because he considers all three functions necessary for the development of a happy member of the political community. However, why is leisure so important to Aristotle? Its role in the political life of citizens in the best state constitution is to confirm citizens' freedom. Namely, if the government in the polis does not work in the interest of all citizens and does not produce freedom for all, then it turns its citizens into slaves who spend their whole lives in hard work. The fact that legislators and politicians rule to produce enough leisure for their citizens is precisely the most significant proof that it is a government over free citizens and serves the interests of all, not just the one who rules. Leisure, that is, free time, actually constitutes the political being of a free citizen, to the same extent that the absence of leisure constitutes the political being of subjects and slaves in, for example, monarchy or tyranny. Undoubtedly, music and art occupy a very important place in Aristotle's overall perception of human beings. However, in this paper, I wanted to emphasize that for Aristotle, the political role of music in the constitution of free people is still its most important role. In the best constitution, it becomes crucial how the citizens spend their free time in leisure because a wrong choice would lead to their idleness. Hence, music becomes essential because, as Aristotle suggests, precisely music and philosophy are good ways for citizens to practice their free political being.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aristotle, *Politics*, Loeb Classical Library, Harvard University Press, Cambridge 1932.

Depew David, J., *Politics, Music and Contemplation*, [in:] *A Companion to Aristotle Politics*, ed. David Keyt, Fred D. Miller, Jr. Blackwell, Oxford 1991.

Destrée Pierre, *Education, Leisure, and Politics*, [in:] *The Cambridge Companion to Aristotle's Politics*, ed. Marguerite Deslauriers, Pierre Destrée, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2013.

Diels Hermann, *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker I*, Weidmann, Berlin 1922.

Kraut Richard, *Aristotle's Critique of False Utopias* (II 1–12), [in:] *Aristoteles Politik*, ed. Otfried Höffe, Akademie, Berlin 2001.

Lord Carnes, *Education and Culture in the Political Thought of Aristotle*, Cornell University Press, Ithaca–London 1982.

Neschke-Hentschke Ada, *Die uneingeschränkt beste Polisordnung*, [in:] *Aristoteles Politik*, ed. Otfried Höffe, Akademie, Berlin 2001.

Owens Joseph, *Aristotle on Leisure*, "Canadian Journal of Philosophy" 1981, vol. XI, no. 4, pp. 713–723.

Schoen-Nazzaro Mary B., *Plato and Aristotle on the Ends of Music*, "Laval théologique et philosophique" 1978, vol. 34, no. 3, pp. 261–273.

Snyder Jacob T., *Leisure in Aristotle's Political Thought*, "Polis, The Journal for Ancient Greek Political Thought" 2018, no. 35, pp. 356-373. https://doi.org/10.1163/20512996-12340172

Stamou Lelouda, *Plato and Aristotle on Music and Music Education: Lessons from Ancient Greece*, "International Journal of Music Education" 2002, vol. 39, issue 1, pp. 3–16. https://doi.org/10.1177/02557614020390010

Zöller Günther, *Musikalische Macht*, „Musik-Konzepte, Neue Folge", ed. Ulrich Tadday, Sonderband Musikphilosophie 2007, vol. XI, pp. 152–166.

SUMMARY

Zoran Dimić

Music, Leisure and Politics

Ancient philosophers were clearly concerned with the function of art (music, poetry, visual arts) in managing the political community. Philosophical consideration of the political foundations and function of music to form a public education is found in Plato (*Republic*, *Laws*) and Aristotle (*Politics*). Since we intend to make the relationship between music, leisure, and politics the central problem here, we pay the greatest attention to how Aristotle sees the connection between these concepts. Aristotle cares equally about preserving and nurturing all three functions of music in educating political community members. Therefore, he refuses to prioritize any of the functions of music because he considers all three functions necessary for the development of a happy member of the political community. In this article, we specifically stress the function of leisure. Its role in the political life of citizens in the best state constitution is to confirm citizens' freedom. Namely, if the government in the polis does not work in the interest of all citizens and does not produce freedom for all, then it turns its citizens into slaves who spend their whole lives in hard work. The fact that legislators and politicians rule to produce enough leisure for their citizens is precisely the most significant proof that it is a government over free citizens and serves the interests of all, not just the one who rules. Leisure, that is, free time, actually constitutes the political being of a free citizen, to the same extent that the absence of leisure constitutes the political being of subjects and slaves in, for example, monarchy or tyranny. In the best constitution, it becomes crucial how the citizens spend their free time in leisure because a wrong choice would lead to their idleness. Hence, music becomes essential because, as Aristotle suggests, music and philosophy are good ways for citizens to practice their free political being.

Keywords

music, leisure, politics, citizen, government, constitution, polis