

Aristotle, Martin, and Grube: “Ajaws”, “Kings”, “Reges”, and the Unified Theory of Politics

Christopher Binetti

Independent Scholar

Abstract:

This paper applies the new concept of the Unified Theory of Politics, which states that any polity with writing can be compared with any other polity with writing, regardless of culture, place, and time. In this paper, we will look at political terms for rulers, particularly those for monarchs, to compare them and correct equivalences that do not make sense. The most distinct Civilization in the world is Mesoamerica. Its most well-known literate civilization is the Mayan civilization. Martin and Grube are the experts on the political institutions of the Classic Mayans. They are, in fact, the ones who best show the ability to compare the Mayan monarchy to other monarchies from across the world. However, they mistranslate a crucial term, the core problem, the core problem this paper attempts to solve. Martin and Grube translate "ajaw" and its variants as "king". The title for a more vigorous ruler, "kaloomte" and its variants, does not seem to be translated into a particular term by Martin and Grube. Their book is the most thorough look at Mayan political regimes, offices, and titles, though Coe and Houston also have something to say. The equation of "ajaw" with "We need analytically-comparable terms tong" seems uncontested. To compare rulers from different cultures, times, and places using unified typically comparable terms. In this paper, it will be argued that an "ajaw" is not "king". Instead, an "ajaw" can be described as a legitimate ruler, a sovereign, or a monarch. In working towards this conclusion, this paper will argue that the term "king" should be used sparingly in historical-comparative studies and, if possible, in common parlance. Not only is "jaw" an inappropriate synonym for "king", but even the term "rex", which is usually translated as if unproblematic as "king" really should not be so translated. This is true essentially in ordinary equations with "king". Some of these equations are comparable but never equate to "king". This paper uses Aristotle and the Unified Theory of Politics to develop a political taxonomy of monarchies that resolves the above problem and allows for cross-cultural analysis of thirty-seven distinct monarchical offices.

Keywords:

political taxonomy; Aristotle; Unified Theory of Politics; Comparative Politics; Political Theory; History and Politics

I. Introduction

This paper applies the new concept of the Unified Theory of Politics, which states that any polity with writing can be compared with any other polity with writing, regardless of culture, place, and time. In this paper, we will look at political terms for rulers, particularly those for monarchs, to compare them and correct equivalences that do not make sense.

The most distinct Civilization in the world is Mesoamerica. Its most well-known literate civilization is the Mayan civilization. Martin and Grube are the experts on the political institutions of the Classic Mayans. They are, in fact, the ones who best show the ability to compare the Mayan monarchy to other monarchies from across the world. However, they

mistranslate a crucial term, the core problem this paper attempts to solve. Development is a systematic and continuous effort made to realize something that is aspired. Development is a change towards improvement. Changes towards improvement require the mobilization of all human resources and reason to realize what is aspired. In addition, development is also very dependent on the availability of natural resource wealth. The availability of natural resources is one of the keys to growth in an area. (Shah, M. et al. 2020)

Martin and Grube translate "ajaw" and its variants as "king". The title for a more vigorous ruler, "kaloomte" and its variants, does not seem to be translated into a particular term by Martin and Grube. Their book is the most thorough look at Mayan political regimes, offices, and titles, though Coe and Houston also have something to say about this. The equation of "ajaw" with "king" seems to be uncontested.

To compare rulers from different cultures, times, and places as the Unified Theory of Politics demands, we need analytically comparable terms. In this paper, it will be argued that an "ajaw" is not "king". Instead, an "ajaw" can be described as a legitimate ruler, a sovereign, or a monarch. In working towards this conclusion, this paper will argue that the term "king" should be used sparingly in historical-comparative studies and, if possible, in common parlance. Not only is "ajaw" an inappropriate synonym for "king", but even the term "rex", which is usually translated as if unproblematic as "king", really should not be so translated. This is true essentially down the line of ordinary equations with "king". Some of these equations are comparable but never really equate to "king".

II. Review of Literature

2.1 What is a “King”?

To get at how to compare culturally-distinct terms to “king”, this paper must delve into the trickier-than-it-seems issues of “what is a king”? Is a “king” simply a monarch, usually male, with a concomitant term of “queen”? Or is it a specific kind of monarch? Is “kingship”, as properly understood, the same as the Greek term “basileia”, found in Aristotle, or other notions of “kingship” as is usually suggested or is something else?

To start with the word “king” in English is a Germanic word that originally meant chieftain and at times ruler in a broad sense, like “prince”. Early “kingship” in the Germanic sense had little in common with the common medieval-modern conception of “kingship”. Germanic “kings” only became “kings as we would recognize today when the petty chieftainships of the Germanic peoples met not one, but at least two distinct influences from the Mediterranean world.

By the time that the Germanic “kings” were in intimate contact with the Mediterranean world, the Romans had been without a traditional monarch for many years. The Romans in fact had killed Caesar for wanting to bring back the office of “rex”, which is usually translated simply as “king” because this is the equation that developed in later Roman and early medieval times.

The term “rex” was a normatively-bad term in Roman times, even a pejorative. It was so bad that Roman monarchs for centuries pretended not to be monarchs just to avoid being called “reges” (“rex is the singular”).

Augustus took over eventually after Caesar was murdered for trying to be a "rex". He insisted that he was no monarch, and took many different republican offices and titles. He refused to take an official, singular title that would have made it clear to all Romans that he was not really restoring the Roman Republic, but bringing back a monarchy. So, the people called him simply something like "person or wielder of power", or imperator. That is how we got the word and, eventually, the office of "emperor."

The term "emperor" is over-used as well and its use across cultures is also a problem; however, there is an easy culturally-independent translation for "emperor" that avoids any such problems. "Emperors" could be "kings", but the offices were not the same. In the Eastern Roman Empire (the Byzantine Empire), the "emperor" often called himself "basileus", but the two terms were different. In fact, the term “basileus” was not viewed by the Byzantines as equivalent (or even comparable) to the medieval Latin-Western formula of “rex-king”.

An “emperor” is a type of universal ruler. While “emperors” and “caliphs” are not equivalent or interchangeable, they are comparable. They are both types of universal rulers and can be compared as such, while also being irreducibly they. Amongst universal rulers, all of which are monarchs of one sense or another, only one is indisputably a religious more than a temporal ruler, and this is the Pope. All other universal monarchical rulers are universal sovereigns.

In the Middle Ages, the formula of “rex-king”, or more simply “king” was understood to not be a universal ruler. However, the “king” was a particular sovereign. So, a “king” was not necessarily an “emperor” and even usually subordinate in rank to (if not a vassal of) an “emperor”. A “king is thus not comparable to any universal ruler, be it an “emperor”, a “caliph”, a “shahanshah”, a “khagan”, “negusa negest ” or a “Huangdi” .

2.2 Bringing in Aristotle and Machiavelli

Obviously, not all rulers are monarchs. Presidents and prime ministers are not monarchs, unless they are dictators. In fact, Machiavelli, an heir in many ways to Aristotle, divides rulers into republican and monarchical rulers. This division helps us to expand the basic Aristotelian political taxonomy above. Aristotle makes it clear that dictators (or “tyrants”) are both monarchs and illegitimate. Thus, dictators may take on republican titles but are in fact monarchs. In assuming illegitimate authority, they also cut themselves off from legitimate monarchy, which Aristotle calls “basileia” and which is usually (incorrectly) translated as “kingship”. Republican leaders are something other than monarchs for both Aristotle and Machiavelli .

If a “king” in the medieval-modern sense is not a universal ruler and is neither a republican ruler nor a dictator/tyrant/illegitimate monarch, then it clearly is either equivalent to

the set of all particular legitimate monarchs, equivalent to a sub-set of all particular legitimate monarchs, or lastly, a type of a sub-set of particular legitimate monarchs.

When Aristotle talks of “basileia”, he excludes as true “basileia” what is usually translated as “barbarian kingship”. In other words, he rejects the form of “kingship” that most accords to the etymological origins of our words “king” and “kingship”. Thus, this kind of “kingship” is not the “civilized” rulership of the city, but a rural type at least originally incompatible with the ancient state. Tables 1 and 2 illustrate these points on Aristotelian political taxonomy, both in basic terms and as expanded with the help of Machiavelli.

Table 1. An Aristotelian Approach to the Political Taxonomy of Monarchy- The Basics

Cultural Area	Legitimate monarchy/ legitimate monarchs	Illegitimate monarchy/ illegitimate monarchs
Greek	“Basileia”/”basileus”	Tyranny/ tyrant
Non-Greek	Barbarian “kingship”/ barbarian “king” (not a true “king”	Dictatorship/dictator

Table 2. Machiavelli’s Expansion of the Basic Aristotelian Political Taxonomy

Fundamental Type of Rulers	Legitimate rulership/ legitimate rulers	Illegitimate rulership/ illegitimate rulers
Republican	President, prime minister, consul, meddix	Dictator (in practice, monarchical)
Monarchical	“King”, “basileus”, “khan”, “ajaw”, and many others	Tyrant

This means that “basileia”, as understood by Aristotle, does not mean “kingship” in its original Germanic sense and that “basileus” does not mean “king” before the Germanic “kings” founded or seized their states. This is in accordance with the Unified Theory of Politics, which states that we can compare all polities (usually equivalent with states or confederations of states) with writing with each other, across culture, time, and place. However, the Germanic “kings” did not form polities or states with writing until they were already under the effects of Mediterranean influence. As a result, by the time we see Germanic “kingship” it is no longer that of the rural chieftain, but a hybrid of true Germanic “kingship” and major Mediterranean influences.

2.3 Defining “Medieval-Modern” “Kingship”

At least two such influences, as has been stated above, acted upon the Germanic rulers. First of all was, as has been explained, the old pejorative “rex”, which no Roman would accept as one’s ruler. For the Romans, particularly in the Latin West, “rex” was a foreign, if not barbarian (or even barbaric) title. They must have thought: Why not give the barbarians the term “rex”?

However, the Romans had never lived under a “rex” in their lifetimes. Romans had avoided monarchs for almost 500 years (from 509 BC-31 BC) and avoided “reges” for about 500 years after that, when Odoacer overthrew the Roman “emperor” and called himself “rex”, beginning something close the medieval-modern notion of “kingship”. In the almost 1000 years since their last “rex”, the Romans had lost all real understanding of the term, so that the reconstructed “rex” was really a different term. Yet, it no longer was a title for a stateless chieftain either. These “rex-kings” were either true “reges” nor true Germanic “kings”, but a new hybrid form.

Very quickly, a second major Mediterranean influence came into the picture. The Church was still developing, but it was a strong enough force by the early 400’s, when the Vandal “kings” (who were still not quite “rex-kings” but really just warlords) started to attack and conquer Roman North Africa. Augustine of Hippo was there and made it clear that any Germanic group with long-term success would have to incorporate Christian ideas of monarchy, not just age-old “regal” traditions and chieftainship. This proved to be a challenge, since later Germanic “kings” tended to be Arian rather than Nicene, while their Roman subjects were Nicene.

A brutal warlord named Clovis of the Franks conquered most of Roman Gaul and converted himself and all of his nobles to Nicene Christianity. He also formed an alliance with the regional leader of the Chalcedonian Church, the most important of divisions of Nicene Christianity in those days. This regional leader would eventually become a religious monarch. This regional religious leader would become a universal monarch and we know this leader, the Bishop of Rome, as the Pope to this day.

The fusion of Nicene Christianity (rather Catholicism) with Germanic “kingship” as already modified by the “regal” tradition of ancient Rome gave the medieval-modern conception of “kingship”, which is sometimes wrongfully called “Germanic kingship”, that we know today. As a result of this fusion of Mediterranean influences, Roman and Christian, with Germanic ideas, our conception of “kingship” is clearly incompatible with either ancient “kingship” or “rex-ship” and ancient chieftainships unadorned by Mediterranean influences.

2.4 Particular Urban Sovereigns

Thus “rex” does not, for historical-comparative purposes mean “king”. The “king” is not merely a tribal chieftain now in charge of state, like a “khan”. Nor is he an urban ruler of city and its countryside, which is not only ultimately what “rex-ship” is, but also “basileia”. Again, “basileia” in Aristotle is not “kingship”. Nor is the widely-used, Semitic political term “malik” and all of its variants the same as king. The term at times was applied to “emperors” and at other times to local urban rulers, and at still other times, just about everything in between. “Malik” in general best accords with an urban rulership similar to “rex-ship” or “basileia” and may even be comparable to these, but is clearly not to be equated with them. “Malik” and its variants were primarily, but not exclusively, urban, as well as having cultural contexts that would distinguish “malik-ship” from “rex-ship” and “basileia”. That said, “basileia” in the Aristotelian sense is roughly comparable to “rex-ship” and “malik-ship.”

What do we mean by “urban” here, as opposed to “rural”? “Khans” in the Turkic and Mongolian cultural context ruled over groups that we could call “tribal”. However, historically, a

fairer and more general way of describing their subjects would be as “rural”. “Khans” are to the countryside what “reges” are to the city. The city, the urban area, gives the “rex” his power, both ideologically and practically, while the countryside does the same for the “khan”.

This group of titles and offices/institutions form what we might want to colloquially call “urban kingship”. Of course, since true “kingship” combines “rural kingship” (really rural “rulership”) and “urban kingship” (really “urban rulership”), we cannot use “urban kingship” for this group. These titles and institutions are all monarchical, legitimate, and sovereign. They are also all particular rather than universal. Since a dictator (tyrant) cannot be legitimate in Aristotelian terms, it cannot be a sovereign. Since sovereigns are monarchs, we can simply “particular legitimate urban sovereign monarchs” to “particular urban sovereigns”. Obviously, this group is a sub-set of “particular sovereigns”

Not all legitimate particular urban rulers were “particular urban sovereigns”. There were particular urban rulers, usually multiple officials holding the same office at the same time. The most famous version of this group is found in Rome- this is the consulate and its officials were the famous Roman consuls. The meddix (meddices) were important magistrates of a clearly urban nature in ancient Italy, but distinct from the consul not just substantively but also culturally. They were Oscans. As a result of the ancient republican offices, we must be clear to separate the larger group of “particular urban rulers” from the smaller group of “particular urban sovereigns”.

Since "reges" are in the "particular urban sovereigns" category and "kings" are in a hybrid category, they logically cannot be either equivalent or even comparable. This should theoretically solve the problem quickly and decisively, as we said that the "problem" was simply proving that "ajaws" were not "kings". We must simply prove that "jaws" are particular urban sovereigns to prove that they are not "kings, since "jaws" logically cannot be in both a hybrid category and in a non-hybrid category.

2.5 What is an “Ajaw”?

In order to prove Martin and Grube, we must only show that “ajaws” are -states analogous to (or comparable with) “reges” and similar types of monarchs. We have, in short, only to prove “ajaws” to be “particular urban sovereigns”. Let us begin by examining what “ajaws” were not. They were not found outside of the Mayan world. “Kaloomtes” could theoretically be non-Mayan, for the ruler of Teotihuacan, who was not Mayan, seems to have been referred to as a “kaloomte”. However, only Mayans could be “ajaws”. At the very least, only Mayan cities had “ajaws”.

“Ajaws” ruled over city-states. Those city-states could be quite complex, but usually geographically small. There was an area of countryside around the main city, something comparable to a “contado” in the medieval Italian sense. However, there were small settlements, towns or even cities, which were both part of the polity and vassals at the same time. These vassals were “sajals”. Each “sajal” was a subordinate monarch (not a sovereign). However, when the Classic Mayans were in decline, the ruler at Seibal used the title of “sajal” rather than “ajaw”. This is similar to how “emirs” and even “sultans” in the Islamic World, or “grand dukes” in the

modern Latin West, were rulers of sovereign states would not use the title of sovereigns for themselves.

There were numerous variations on the term “ajaw”, which at least implied variations of power. This is comparable to how “rajas” in India, in the Central Civilization, attempted to make themselves sound more powerful by calling themselves “maharajas”, despite both being particular sovereigns (though not strictly “particular urban sovereigns”). Despite this title inflation, “ajaws” rarely became “kaloomtes”, which were closer to, but not quite, universal sovereigns.

There were “ajaws” who were vassals of other “ajaws”, but who were sovereign in their own city-states, a type of vassal-“kings” (who were actually not real "kings"). "Ajaws" ruled city-states and thus were essentially urban rulers. Since they were not universal rulers or even quasi-universal rulers like the "kaloomtes", "ajaws" were particular urban sovereigns". Thus, “ajaws” were comparable to “reges” and thus not true “kings”.

On the surface, this argument should be decisive. Since "ajaws" are clearly more closely related to "reges" as opposed to "kings", they are not true "kings". However, Martin and Grube are not the premier political historians of the Mayans for nothing. They would argue that this paper has demonstrated that modern-medieval "kingship" is distinct from most forms of ancient "kingship", which is comparable to "rex-ship". They would also concede that Mayan "ajaw-ship" is not medieval-modern “kingship. However, they would argue that “ajaw-ship” is not just comparable with “rex-ship” but can be equated with “rex-ship”. Since “rex-ship” is distinct from true kingship, they might call it “ancient kingship” and thus argue that the phrase “ancient Mayan kings and queens” is still defensible.

III. Result and Discussion

3.1 Comparing Monarchical Titles and Offices from Across the World

Setting aside the issue of gender and whether “ancient kingship” and “ancient queenship” are really one institution, which is not the focus of this paper, there are several reasons why “ancient kingship” is not an appropriate term for “particular urban sovereigns”, which form a real, self-contained group as shown above. Firstly, some “ancient kings” are just not comparable to “reges” or ajaws”. “Reges” and “ajaws” are both “particular urban sovereigns”, but “shahanshahs”, often called “kings of kings” are not. The “shah” is particular, but not urban, and the shahanshah, the “king of kings”, is a universal sovereign’s title. Ironically, “shahs” are comparable but not equivalent to true “kings” and “shahanshahs” are comparable but not equivalent to “emperors. The second pair is part of the universal sovereign category. The first pair is a dyad belonging to the particular hybrid sovereign” category”.

We have already met the term "malik". These terms, we have argued, are predominantly "particular urban sovereigns". Related terms such as the Sumerian “lugal” and “ensi” are similar, though they both have complicated histories. “Sharrum” is the Akkadian term, normally translated as “king” but , it is in a different cultural context. We have already looked at

“basileus”. However, what about nswt and pharaoh? These are clearly terms for “ancient kings” and the “ancient kingship” as a concept and institution that they embody would theoretically be critical to understanding “ancient kingship in general”.

“Nswt” is not the only ancient Egyptian term for “king” that modern scholars identify. In common parlance, etymologically-unrelated term “pharaoh”, which in ancient Egyptian is more like “per`aa”, refers originally to the “house” or palace of the “nswt”. In common parlance, we would never call a “pharaoh” a “king”; however, scholars identify and equate “nswt” and other terms with “king” and so ironically, the common parlance and not the scholarly tradition gets it right. Egyptian “kings” are not truly “kings”.

The simplest way to prove this is by explaining that the “nswt” was not an urban sovereign nor a hybrid sovereign. Since medieval-modern “kingship” is a hybrid form and ancient “kingship” in the form seemingly supported by Martin and Grube is essentially urban, then, the “nswt” and its historical dependent, the “pharaoh” cannot be a “king” in either sense. Logically, since neither term can be either type of “king”, we can decisively conclude that neither is a type of “king”.

What kind of “sovereign” is the “nswt”, and thus the “pharaoh”? It is not rural form of sovereign like the “khan”. Neither are universal sovereigns. Sometimes they seem equated to Near Eastern urban forms, but only in Akkadian, the language of those forms. These forms are neither urban, rural, nor hybrid. They are national forms in a way that medieval-modern “kings” sometimes, but not always approach. Egyptian “rulership” was not influenced by three types of thought- urban, rural, and religious. It was a single national ideology- deeply religious in such a fundamental way that it was not a fusion but really a singular all-encompassing tradition. There is no way to parse the pieces of Egyptian “kingship” as opposed to true “kingship”, that is medieval-modern kingship. As a result, it is the first truly national form of kingship, in which all political ideas are in one institution, not in a fusion, but in a fundamental union that simply is not the case true “kingship”. Table 3 illustrates this paper’s points on bases of and levels of power for legitimate sovereigns.

Table 3. Bases of Power and Levels of Power for Legitimate Sovereign Monarchs with Examples

Base of Power	Subordinate	Particular	Strong Particular	Universal
Rural		Khan		Khagan
Urban	Sajal	Ajaw, Rex, Basileus, Malik	Kaloomte	
Hybrid	Grand duke	King		Emperor
Unique		Nswt	Pharaoh	

3.2 “Reges”, “Ajaws”, and “Kings”

Since all “ancient kingships” are not in the same category, in fact some are more related to “medieval-modern kingship” than to each other, we cannot in good faith have a category called “ancient kingships” in our Aristotelian political taxonomy. Thus, when Martin and Grube refer to “ancient Mayan kings and queens” (they actually would use the term “ancient Maya kings and queens”), they are no more accurate than if they simply called them “kings and queens”. “Ancient kingship” as a category in political taxonomy simply does not exist.

However, let us suppose that Martin and Grube would counter once again, saying that since “reges” and “ajaws” have not been separated, that they are still to be equated. Let us suppose that they would want to call them “ancient particular urban kings”. This calls the question- are “ajaws” really to be equated or simply comparable to “reges”.

The stakes are significant, since Martin and Grube have many centuries of tradition supporting the equation of “rex” with “king”. Since we have already admitted that “rex” and “ajaw” are comparable, we must prove that they are, notwithstanding both being “particular urban sovereigns”, not equivalent (or to be equated). Otherwise, they will still keep on saying that “ajaws” are “kings”, even though we have already shown logically that this is not true.

What is a “rex”? This is just as fundamental to this paper than “What is an ajaw?” or “What is a king?” What “rex” really a monarchical term? There were, after all, religious officials with the word “rex” in their titles under the Republic. “Rex”, like “raja” comes from an old Indo-European term that means to make straight, like a literal ruler (the measuring instrument) in English. “Rex” more recently evolved from the verb “regere”, which means to “make straight” or “to rule”. While “rex, like “raja”, usually is considered a monarch, a sovereign in fact, even by this paper, there is no real certain that anyone ever really equated “rex” and “basileus” until after the fall of the “reges” to the early Republic in 509 BC.

In fact, the title “lauchme” (lucumo in Latin) was likely the substantive but not etymological predecessor for “rex”. The title “lauchme” was not clearly monarchical either, but was sometimes used as a republican or quasi-republican term. The terms “lauchme” and “rex” both seem to be monarchical at times and republican at other times, or more confusingly, quasi-republican, quasi-monarchical at the same time.

As anomalous as this dyad appears to me, there is some similarity to it found in the “ensis” of the Early Bronze Age in ancient Mesopotamia. They are usually viewed as monarchs, but rarely if ever as “kings”, because they were usually balanced out by what we would call republican institutions and even sometimes elected (and not just by a few high nobles like true “kings” and “emperors” in medieval Germany). “Ensis” are monarchical, but with a quasi-republican nature. “Lauchmes”/ “lucumos” and “reges” are likely similar.

Thus, while “reges” are best thought of as sovereigns, and thus a type of monarchs, they are not clearly not republican figures. “Ajaws” are clearly not republican figures. They are the model of despotic, even “tyrannical” kingship. They are not bound by any checks and balances and when they fall, it is far bloodier than the fall of the Tarquins in Rome in 509 BC. The whole system had to begin to crumble before the despotic, “tyrannical” jaws began to share power with

other leaders, which Coe and Houston, and yes, even Martin and Grube, seem to both acknowledge and bemoan in their works.

Thus, “reges” are not “ajaws” substantively, though they are still roughly comparable. This brings up an important distinction between two different conceptions of the monarchy/republic distinction. When we say “republican” institutions, this means not only that there is a check and balance system, but that this is acknowledged by the ruler, even a monarch, as the case. A “monarchy” in this case can thus be a “republic”. Modern “constitutional monarchies” can thus be republics in this sense, as opposed to the conception whereby “monarchies” and “republics” are opposites.

However, medieval-modern “kings” lose their power over time, in a way that these ancient “constitutional monarchs” did not. These rulers were more like transitions between monarchy and republics rather than being a transition between powerful monarchs and figureheads, which is the case with medieval-modern “kings”. Thus, it is clear that “kings” are neither “reges” nor “ajaws”. Table 4 illustrates the above points about quasi-republican monarchy.

Table 4. Quasi-republican monarchs and true monarchs, with examples

Degree of monarchy	Ancient	Medieval-modern
Quasi-republican monarchs	Lauchme, rex (with real power), ensi	King as constitutional monarch (with no real power)
True monarchs	Basileus, ajaw (with real power), lugal	King as absolute monarch (with real power)

3.3 Conclusion- Aristotelian Political Taxonomy and the Unified Theory of Politics

The project of this paper is to prove that Martin and Grube, and Coe and Houston, are wrong to call “ajaws” “kings”. This has been proven. However, if “ajaws” are somewhat comparable to “reges” and neither are comparable to medieval-modern “kings”, then how should we classify these three monarchical offices. “Ajaws” and “reges” and different kinds of “particular urban sovereigns”, with “ajaws” approaching “tyrannical” monarchy in Aristotelian terms, while “reges” combine republican aspects with something akin to ancient “basileia” in Aristotelian terms. Both are of an innately urban nature because these are based in cities.

The “king” is a middle-level sovereign monarch. It is not as powerful as a “universal sovereign”, like an “emperor”. It is also not as powerful as a class of “particular sovereign” with more prestige than a middle-level ruler but not quite a universal ruler. We have already encountered this concept with the “kaloomte”, which is to the “ajaw” as the “tsar” would be to the “king”, if they were in the same cultural area. “Tsar” comes from Caesar and it was an attempt to claim something similar to an “emperorship”, but it was instead viewed as between “king” and “emperor”. This led to Peter the Great declaring himself “emperor” (imperator), though most people still viewed the Russian “emperor” as a “tsar”, between a “king” and an “emperor”. A “tenno” in Japan, wrongly translated “as “emperor” in English, is of the same class of an exalted “particular sovereign”, above the rank of “king”.

The “king” was a hybrid office, combining religious, rural, and urban ideologies. The Ethiopian title of “negus”, which is the “particular” version of “negusa negest”, is of the correct rank to be analogous and comparable to “king”, but it lacks the clear urban tradition that “king” does through its partial incorporation of “rex”. Thus, “negus” and “king” are comparable, but cannot be equated.

Of the thirty-seven offices and titles that we have analyzed, none of them equate to “king”, except for itself. There are translations of “king”, but none of the thirty-seven distinct concepts that we have explored truly equate to “king, again except for itself. Thus, if we look at “kingship” a broader conception or institution, we should not equate medieval-modern “kingship” to “basileia” or any other form “kingship” as it usually translate. So, what we should call the broad family of institutions that in English is wrongly called “kingship”?

Finally getting rid of quotations, kingship is a hybrid form of particular sovereign monarchical rulership that combines religious, rural, and urban ideologies and which occupies a middle position of power, lower than that of a tsar or emperor but above a grand duke or other theoretically subordinate ruler. In Aristotle's political taxonomy, monarchy is essentially either legitimate or illegitimate. Thus, legitimate monarchy is in the family of rulership, which includes particular monarchy and universal monarchy. Within particular monarchy, we have particular sovereign monarchy and within that, particular urban sovereign monarchy, particular hybrid sovereign monarchy (which includes true kingship), particular rural sovereign monarchy, and the unique Egyptian sovereign monarchy as referenced above. The thirty-seven offices are summarized in Table 5 .

Table 5. A Summary of the Political Taxonomy of Rulers (with Thirty-Seven Examples)

Name of ruler	Universal, strong particular or Particular	Sovereign, Subordinate, Religious monarch, Illegitimate, or Republican	Urban, rural, hybrid, or unique	Cultural area
King	Particular	Sovereign	Hybrid	Latin West
Ajaw	Particular	Sovereign	Urban	Mesoamerica
Rex	Particular	Sovereign (quasi-republican)	Urban	Latin West
Emperor	Universal	Sovereign	Hybrid	Latin West (and Greek East)
Nswt	Particular	Sovereign	Unique	Ancient Near East
Pharaoh	Strong particular	Sovereign	Unique	Ancient Near East
Huangdi	Universal	Sovereign	Rural	Eastern

				Civilization
Shahanshah	Universal	Sovereign	Rural	Ancient Near East
Khagan	Universal	Sovereign	Rural	Islamic World (and Eastern Civilization)
Negusa negest	Universal	Sovereign	Rural	Ethiopia
Pope	Universal	Religious monarch	Urban	Latin West
Caliph	Universal	Sovereign	Unique	Islamic World
Tsar	Strong particular	Sovereign	Rural	Greek East
Tenno	Strong particular	Sovereign	Rural	Eastern Civilization
Kaloomte	Strong particular	Sovereign	Urban	Mesoamerica
Shah	Strong particular	Sovereign	Rural	Ancient Near East
Maharaja	Strong particular	Sovereign	Rural	Central Civilization
Raja	Particular	Sovereign	Rural	Central Civilization
Ensi	Particular	Sovereign (quasi-republican)	Urban	Ancient Near East
Lauchme (Lucumo)	Particular	Sovereign (quasi-republican)	Urban	Latin West
Lugal	Particular	Sovereign	Urban	Ancient Near East
Sharrum	Particular	Sovereign	Urban	Ancient Near East
Malik	Particular	Sovereign	Urban	Ancient Near East
Basileus	Particular	Sovereign	Urban	Greek East
Wang	Particular	Sovereign	Rural	Eastern Civilization
Negus	Particular	Sovereign	Rural	Ethiopia
Sultan	Strong particular	Subordinate	Rural	Islamic World
Khan	Particular	Sovereign (can be subordinate)	Rural	Islamic World (and Eastern Civilization)
Emir	Particular	Subordinate	Rural	Islamic World
Sajal	Particular	Subordinate	Rural	Mesoamerica
Grand duke	Particular	Subordinate	Rural	Latin West

Dictator	Particular	Illegitimate	Urban	Latin West
Tyrant	Particular	Illegitimate	Urban	Latin West
President	Particular	Republican	Hybrid (but different from earlier type of hybrid)	Latin West
Prime minister	Particular	Republican	Hybrid (but different from earlier type of hybrid)	Latin West
Consul	Particular	Republican	Urban	Latin West
Meddix	Particular	Republican	Urban	Latin West

Since in common parlance, these political-taxonomic categories will rarely all be needed at the same time, what is the singular term for an institution where a single ruler rules (theoretically or in practice)? This would be legitimate monarchy or true monarchy, as opposed to illegitimate monarchy, tyranny, or dictatorship. Legitimate monarchy would be the likely preferred term from an Aristotelian perspective.

IV. Conclusion

In conclusion, an *ajaw* is not a king. A *rex* is not a king and an *ajaw* is not a *rex*. Yet, all of these would be seen as legitimate monarchs in one sense. We can argue whether Aristotle would actually view *ajaws* as legitimate monarchs, due to their tyrannical and despotic behavior; however, this is a debate perhaps for another paper. Legitimate monarchy is the broad form of rulership that includes kingship, *rex*-ship, and *ajaw*-ship.

What this paper shows is that the Unified Theory of Politics allows us to compare different titles, offices, and institutions across culture, time, and place. However, it only allows us to do this if we can use the proper terms needed to compare units across culture, place, and time. Using the proper terms for comparison allows to understand comparable and analogous institutions across culture, place, and time without the biases that come with conventionally assigning terms to non-equivalent terms. Only by getting the political terminology right can we get the political taxonomy right. Once we do so however, we can make a universal political taxonomy for monarchy, which is the first step in creating a general universal political taxonomy, as part of the project of the Unified Theory of Politics.

References

- Afsaruddin, Asma. 2023. "Caliph." Encyclopedia Britannica. October 10. Accessed March 10, 2024. <https://www.britannica.com/topic/caliph>.
- Aristotle, ed. W.D. Ross. 1957. Aristotle's *Politica*. Oxford: Clarendon Press (Perseus edition).

- Aristotle. 1944. *Aristotle in 23 Volumes, Vol. 21*, translated by H. Rackham. London, U.K. and Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press and William Heinemann Ltd. .
- Aristotle. 1984. *The Politics*, trans. by Carnes Lord, First Edition. . Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Bawden, Charles R. 2024. "Genghis Khan." *Encyclopedia Britannica*. March 7. Accessed March 11, 2024. <https://www.britannica.com/biography/Genghis-Khan>.
- Binetti, Christopher. 2016. *A Better Place to Be: Republicanism as an Alternative to the Authoritarianism-Democracy Dichotomy* . College Park: University of Maryland-College Park (dissertation).
- Binetti, Christopher. 2020 (unpublished book manuscript). "Finding a Better Place to Be for Italians- From Oppression in Europe to A Minority in America."
- Binetti, Christopher. 2022. "A Better Place To Be- Reclaiming History for Political Theory." Conference Paper. Boston: Northeastern Political Science Association. 1-26.
- Binetti, Christopher. 2023. "Machiavelli's Republic: A Better Place to Be." *Polit Journal: Scientific Journal of Politics* (Prospective scholarly article) 9-19.
- Binetti, Christopher. 2024. *Calakmul and Cremona: Marriage Alliances, War and Disaster in Historically-Independent Civilizations* . Newark, New Jersey: Rutgers-Newark (Thesis).
- Boatwright, Mary Taliaferro, David Gargola, Noel Lenski, and Richard J.A. Talbert. 2012. *The Romans: From Village to Empire: A History of Ancient Rome from Earliest Times to Constantine*, First Edition. Oxford, U.K.: Oxford University Press.
- Bondi, Sandro Filippo. 1999. "The Course of History." In *The Phoenicians*, by Sabatino Moscati, 30-46. New York, New York: Rizzoli International, Publications, Inc.
- Calkins, P. B. , Subrahmanyam, Sanjay, Dikshit, K.R. , Wolpert, Stanley A. , Spear, T.G. Percival, Thapar, Romila , Srivastava, A.L. , Raikar, Sanat Pai, Schwartzberg, Joseph E. , Alam, Muzaffar, Champakalakshmi, R. and Allchin, and Frank Raymond. 2024. " India." *Encyclopedia Britannica*. " Encyclopedia Britannica. March 7. Accessed March 10, 2024. <https://www.britannica.com/place/India>.
- Coe, Michael D. and Stephen Houston. 2022. *The Maya: Tenth Edition*. London: Thames & Hudson.
- Copley, Gregory R. 1998. *Ethiopia Reaches Her Hand Unto God : Imperial Ethiopia's unique symbols, structures and role in the modern world*. Alexandria, Virginia: Defense & Foreign Affairs, part of the International Strategic Studies Association.
- Cornell, Tim. 2016. "Rex." *Oxford Classical Dictionary*. March 7. Accessed 10 2024, March. <https://oxfordre.com/classics/view/10.1093/acrefore/9780199381135.001.0001/acrefore-9780199381135-e-5566> .
- Dunleavy, Patrick. 2024. "Prime minister." *Encyclopedia Britannica*. March 10. Accessed March 10, 2024. <https://www.britannica.com/topic/prime-minister>.
- Encyclopaedia Britannica, The Editors of. 2024. "Emir." *Encyclopedia Britannica*. March 3. Accessed March 10, 2024. <https://www.britannica.com/topic/emir>.
- Encyclopaedia Britannica, The Editors of. 2024. "Pharaoh." *Encyclopedia Britannica*. February 26. Accessed March 10, 2024. <https://www.britannica.com/topic/pharaoh>.
- Encyclopaedia Britannica, The. 2024. "Emperor." *Encyclopedia Britannica*. March 5. Accessed March 10, 2024. <https://www.britannica.com/topic/emperor-title>.

- Encyclopaedia Britannica. 1998. "Tennō." Encyclopedia Britannica. July 20. Accessed March 9, 2024. <https://www.britannica.com/topic/tenno>.
- Encyclopaedia Britannica. 2023. "Maharaja." Encyclopedia Britannica. December 27. Accessed March 10, 2024. <https://www.britannica.com/topic/maharaja>.
- Encyclopaedia Britannica. 2023. "Shāh." Encyclopedia Britannica. December 7. Accessed March 10, 2024. <https://www.britannica.com/topic/shah>.
- Encyclopaedia Britannica. 2023. "Tsar." Encyclopedia Britannica. December 15. Accessed March 10, 2024. <https://www.britannica.com/topic/tsar>.
- Encyclopaedia Britannica. 2024. "Grand duke." Encyclopedia Britannica. March 10. Accessed March 10, 2024. <https://www.britannica.com/topic/grand-duke>.
- Encyclopaedia Britannica. 2024. "Khan." Encyclopedia Britannica. January 30. Accessed March 10, 2024. <https://www.britannica.com/topic/khan-title>.
- Encyclopaedia Britannica. 2024. "President." Encyclopedia Britannica. March 7. Accessed March 10, 2024. <https://www.britannica.com/topic/president-government-official>.
- Frye, Richard N., Dietz O. Edzard, Wolfram Th. von Soden (along with other contributors). 2024. "History of Mesopotamia." Encyclopedia Britannica. February 15. Accessed March 11, 2024. <https://www.britannica.com/place/Mesopotamia-historical-region-Asia>.
- Grummond, Nancy Thomson de. 2015. "Ancient Italic people." Encyclopedia Britannica. November 12. Accessed March 18, 2024. <https://www.britannica.com/topic/ancient-Italic-people>.
- Harper, Douglas. 2018. "King." Online Etymology Dictionary. December 7. Accessed March 2024, 11. <https://www.etymonline.com/word/king>.
- Harper. 2020. "Rex." Online Etymology Dictionary. December 12. Accessed March 10, 2024. https://www.etymonline.com/word/rex#etymonline_v_13003.
- Harper. 2023. "Sultan." Online Etymology Dictionary. October 4. Accessed March 11, 2024. <https://www.etymonline.com/word/sultan>.
- Harper. 2024. "Negus." Online Etymology Dictionary. March 7. Accessed March 11, 2024. Titles and epithets in Ancient Egypt.
- Holler, Dick, "Abraham, Martin and John" (1968). Performed by Dion DiMucci. Vocal Popular Sheet Music Collection. Score 5574. <https://digitalcommons.library.umaine.edu/mmb-vp-copyright/5574>.
- Joyce, George. 1911. "The Pope." The Catholic Encyclopedia, New York: Robert Appleton Company, online edition. Accessed March 11, 2024. <https://www.newadvent.org/cathen/12260a.htm#IV>.
- Keightley, David N. , Chen, C.S. , Liu, J.T.C. , Chan, H. , Zürcher, E. , Dull, J.L. , Silbergeld, J. , Young, E.P. , Wilbur, C. M. , McKnight, B. E. , Hsu, C. , Rawski, E. S. , Lieberthal, K.G., Lewis, J.W., Feuerwerke, A., White, L., Franke, H., 2024. "China, DeWoskin, K.J. , Hucker, C.O. , Twitchett, D.C. , Elman, B., and Suzuki, C." Encyclopedia Britannica. March 11. Accessed March 11, 2024. <https://www.britannica.com/place/China>.
- Kostiner, Joseph. 2024. "Monarchy." Encyclopedia Britannica. February 21. Accessed March 11, 2024. <https://www.britannica.com/topic/monarchy>.
- Leeming, David Adams. 2005. The Oxford Companion to World Mythology. Oxford and New York : Oxford University Press.

- Lundström, Peter. 2024. "Titles and epithets in Ancient Egypt." Pharaoh.se. Accessed March 11, 2024. <https://pharaoh.se/ancient-egypt/titles-and-epithets>.
- Machiavelli, Niccolo, trans. by Harvey C. Mansfield and Nathan Tarcov. 1996. *The Discourses on Livy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Publisher.
- Martin, Simon and Grube, Nikolai. 2008. *Chronicle of the Maya Kings and Queens: Second Edition*. London: Thames & Hudson.
- McDonald, Katherine. 2015. *Oscan in Southern Italy: Language Contact in a Fragmentary Corpus*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.
- Müller, Hans-Peter. 1999. "Malik." In *Dictionary of Demons and Deities in the Bible, Second Extensively Revised Edition*, by Karel, Bob Becking, and Pieter W. van der Horst van der Toorn, 538-542. Leiden, The Netherlands, Cambridge, U.K., and Grand Rapids, Michigan: Brill Academic Publishers and William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.
- Sarris, Peter. 2011 (online edition, January 19, 2012). *Empires of Faith: The Fall of Rome to the Rise of Islam, 500-700*. Oxford: Oxford Academic Books, found online at <https://doi.org>.
- Shah, M. et al. (2020). The Development Impact of PT. Medco E & P Malaka on Economic Aspects in East Aceh Regency. *Budapest International Research and Critics Institute-Journal (BIRCI-Journal)*. P. 276-286.
- Vaissière, Étienne de la. 2017. "Khagan." *Encyclopædia Iranica*, online edition. August 25. Accessed March 10, 2024. <http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/khagan>.
- Wagenaar, Jan A. 1999. "King." In *Dictionary of Demons and Deities in the Bible, Second Extensively Revised Edition*, by Karel, Bob Becking, and Pieter W. van der Horst van der Toorn, 483-486. Leiden, The Netherlands, Cambridge, U.K., and Grand Rapids, Michigan: Brill Academic Publishers and William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.
- Wagensonner, Klaus. 2020. "Between History and Fiction — Enheduana, the First Poet in World Literature ." In *Women at the Dawn of History*, by Edited by Agnete W. Lassen and Klaus Wagensonner, 38-45. New Haven, Connecticut: Yale Babylonian Collection, Yale University.
- Waley, Daniel and Trevor Dean. 2013. *The Italian City-Republics, Fourth Edition*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Yarnell III, Malcolm B. 2020. "Christology in Chalcedon: Creed and Contextualization." *Southeastern Theological Review* 5-27.