“Life of Excellence: Living and Doing Well” by Aristotle

About the author… Aristotle (384-322 B.C.) studied at Plato’s Academy for twenty years. After a few years in Macedonia as a tutor to the future Alexander the Great, Aristotle returned to Athens and established his own school, the Lyceum. His presentation of courses was encyclopedic. Unlike Plato, Aristotle had an abiding interest in natural science and wrote extensively in physics, zoology, and psychology. Much as Socrates had been charged with impiety, so also Aristotle was charged—in large measure due to his former relationship with Alexander. Unlike Socrates, Aristotle fled Athens, “lest,” as he is quoted, “the Athenians sin twice against philosophy.” His work in logic was not significantly improved upon until the development of symbolic logic in the twentieth century. The central concepts of his poetics and ethics still remain influential. Charles Darwin once wrote, “Linnaeus and Cuvier have been my two gods… but they were mere schoolboys [compared to] Aristotle.”

About the work… In the *Nicomachean Ethics*,¹ Aristotle argues that

---
what we seek is *eudaimonia*, a term translated in this reading as “happiness.” *Eudaimonia* is better expressed as “well-being” or “excellence of performing the proper function.” When Aristotle explains human virtue, he is not discussing what we now refer to as (Victorian) virtue. He is clarifying the peculiar excellence of human beings in the same manner as we often speak of the peculiar excellence attributable to the nature of a thing. For example, a tool is useful in *virtue* of the fact that it performs its function well. Aristotle’s purpose in the *Nicomachean Ethics* is not just to explain the philosophy of the excellence for human beings but also to demonstrate specifically how human beings can lead lives of excellence as activity in accordance with practical and theoretical reason.

**From the reading...**

“...human good turns out to be activity of soul in accordance with *virtue*, and if there are more than one *virtue*, in accordance with the best and most complete.”

**Ideas of Interest from the Nicomachean Ethics**

1. According to Aristotle, what is happiness (*eudaimonia*)? How does Aristotle’s definition of happiness differ from the account given by most people?

2. What does Aristotle mean when he writes that the good for man is self-sufficient?

3. How does Aristotle prove that the final good for human beings is “activity of the soul in accordance with [the best and most complete] virtue”?

1925.

Reading For Philosophical Inquiry: A Brief Introduction
4. Explain and trace out some examples of Aristotle’s Doctrine of the Mean.

5. What is the difference between theoretical and practical knowledge? Which kind is the more important for Aristotle?

6. According to Aristotle, how are the habits and character of excellence in human beings attained?

7. What is the relation between the passions and the virtues according to Aristotle?

8. In the *Nicomachean Ethics*, does Aristotle trace out a method whereby human beings can change their character? If so, what are the main outlines of his program for change?

The Reading Selection from the *Nicomachean Ethics*

**Book I [The Good for Man]**

**1 [All Activity Aims at Some Good]**

Every art and every inquiry, and similarly every action and pursuit, is thought to aim at some good; and for this reason the good has rightly been declared to be that at which all things aim. But a certain difference is found among ends; some are activities, others are products apart from the activities that produce them. Where there are ends apart from the actions, it is the nature of the products to be better than the activities. Now, as there are many actions, arts, and sciences, their ends also are many; the end of the medical art is health, that of shipbuilding a vessel, that of strategy victory, that of economics wealth. But where such arts fall under a single capacity—as bridle—making and the other arts concerned with the equipment of horses fall under the art of riding, and this and every military action under strategy, in the same way other arts fall under yet others—in all of these the ends of the master arts are to be preferred to all the subordinate ends; for it is for the sake of the former that the latter are pursued. It makes no difference whether the activities themselves are the ends of the...
actions, or something else apart from the activities, as in the case of the sciences just mentioned. . . .

2 [The Good for Man]
If, then, there is some end of the things we do, which we desire for its own sake (everything else being desired for the sake of this), and if we do not choose everything for the sake of something else (for at that rate the process would go on to infinity, so that our desire would be empty and vain), clearly this must be the good and the chief good. Will not the knowledge of it, then, have a great influence on life? Shall we not, like archers who have a mark to aim at, be more likely to hit upon what is right? If so, we must try, in outline at least to determine what it is. . . .

5 [Popular Notions of Happiness]
Let us resume our inquiry and state, in view of the fact that all knowledge and every pursuit aims at some good...what is the highest of all goods achievable by action. Verbally there is very general agreement; for both the general run of men and people of superior refinement say that it is happiness, and identifying living well and doing well with being happy; but with regard to what happiness is they differ, and the many do not give the same account as the wise. For the former think it is some plain and obvious thing, like pleasure, wealth, or honour; they differ, however, from one another—and often even the same man identifies it with different things, with health when he is ill, with wealth when he is poor; but, conscious of their ignorance, they admire those who proclaim some great ideal that is above their comprehension. Now some thought that apart from these many goods there is another which is self-subsistent and causes the goodness of all these as well. . . .

7 [Definition of Happiness]
Let us again return to the good we are seeking, and ask what it can be. It seems different in different actions and arts; it is different in medicine, in strategy, and in the other arts likewise. What then is the good of each? Surely that for whose sake everything else is done. In medicine this is health, in strategy victory, in architecture a house, in any other sphere
something else, and in every action and pursuit the end; for it is for the
sake of this that all men do whatever else they do. Therefore, if there is an
end for all that we do, this will be the good achievable by action, and if
there are more than one, these will be the goods achievable by action.

So the argument has by a different course reached the same point; but we
must try to state this even more clearly. Since there are evidently more than
one end, and we choose some of these (e.g., wealth, flutes, and in general
instruments) for the sake of something else, clearly not all ends are final
ends; but the chief good is evidently something final. Therefore, if there
is only one final end, this will be what we are seeking, and if there are
more than one, the most final of these will be what we are seeking. Now
we call that which is in itself worthy of pursuit more final than that which
is worthy of pursuit for the sake of something else, and that which is never
desirable for the sake of something else more final than the things that
are desirable both in themselves and for the sake of that other thing, and
therefore we call final without qualification that which is always desirable
in itself and never for the sake of something else.

Now such a thing happiness, above all else, is held to be; for this we choose
always for itself and never for the sake of something else, but honour,
pleasure, reason, and every virtue we choose indeed for themselves (for if
nothing resulted from them we should still choose each of them), but we
choose them also for the sake of happiness, judging that by means of them
we shall be happy. Happiness, on the other hand, no one chooses for the
sake of these, nor, in general, for anything other than itself.

From the point of view of self-sufficiency the same result seems to follow;
for the final good is thought to be self-sufficient. Now by self-sufficient
we do not mean that which is sufficient for a man by himself, for one who
lives a solitary life, but also for parents, children, wife, and in general for
his friends and fellow citizens, since man is born for citizenship. But some
limit must be set to this; for if we extend our requirements to ancestors
and descendants and friends’ friends we are in for an infinite series...the
self-sufficient we now define as that which when isolated makes life de-
sirable and lacking in nothing; and such we think happiness to be; and
further we think it most desirable of all things, without being counted as
one good thing among others—if it were so counted it would clearly be
made desirable by the addition of even the least of goods; for that which
is added becomes an excess of goods, and of goods the greater is always
more desirable. Happiness, then, is something final and self-sufficient, and
is the end of action.

...[H]uman good turns out to be activity of soul in accordance with virtue,
and if there are more than one virtue, in accordance with the best and most complete.

But we must add “in a complete life.” For one swallow does not make a summer, nor does one day; and so too one day, or a short time, does not make a man blessed and happy.

13 [Kinds of Virtue]

Since happiness is an activity of soul in accordance with perfect virtue, we must consider the nature of virtue, for perhaps we shall thus see better the nature of happiness. . . .

Virtue too is distinguished into kinds in accordance with this difference; for we say that some of the virtues are intellectual and others moral, philosophic wisdom and understanding and practical wisdom being intellectual, liberality and temperance moral. For in speaking about a man’s character we do not say that he is wise or has understanding but that he is good-tempered or temperate; yet we praise the wise man also with respect to his state of mind; and of states of mind we call those which merit praise virtues. . . .

Book II [Moral Virtue]

1 [How Moral Virtue is Acquired]

Virtue, then, being of two kinds, intellectual and moral, intellectual virtue in the main owes both its birth and its growth to teaching (for which reason it requires experience and time), while moral virtue comes about as a result of habit, whence also its name ethike is one that is formed by a slight variation from the word ethos (habit). From this it is also plain that none of the moral virtues arises in us by nature; for nothing that exists by nature can form a habit contrary to its nature. For instance the stone which by nature moves downwards cannot be habituated to move upwards, not even if one tries to train it by throwing it up ten thousand times; nor can fire be habituated to move downwards, nor can anything else that by nature behaves in one way be trained to behave in another. Neither by nature,
then, nor contrary to nature do the virtues arise in us; rather we are adapted by nature to receive them, and are made perfect by habit.

Again, of all the things that come to us by nature we first acquire the potentiality and later exhibit the activity (this is plain in the case of the senses; for it was not by often seeing or often hearing that we got these senses, but on the contrary we had them before we used them, and did not come to have them by using them); but the virtues we get by first exercising them, as also happens in the case of the arts as well. For the things we have to learn before we can do them, we learn by doing them, e.g., men become builders by building and lyre-players by playing the lyre; so too we become just by doing just acts, temperate by doing temperate acts, brave by doing brave acts. . . .

Again, it is from the same causes and by the same means that every virtue is both produced and destroyed, and similarly every art; for it is from playing the lyre that both good and bad lyre-players are produced. And the corresponding statement is true of builders and of all the rest; men will be good or bad builders as a result of building well or badly. For if this were not so, there would have been no need of a teacher, but all men would have been born good or bad at their craft. This, then, is the case with the virtues also; by doing the acts that we do in our transactions with other men we become just or unjust, and by doing the acts that we do in the presence of danger, and being habituated to feel fear or confidence, we become brave or cowardly. The same is true of appetites and feelings of anger; some men become temperate and good tempered, others self-indulgent and irascible, by behaving in one way or the other in the appropriate circumstances. Thus, in one word, states of character arise out of like activities. This is why the activities we exhibit must be of a certain kind; it is because the states of character correspond to the differences between these. It makes no small difference, then, whether we form habits of one kind or of another from our very youth; it makes a very great difference, or rather all the difference. . . .

5 [Moral Virtue Is Character]

Next we must consider what virtue is. Since things that are found in the soul are of three kinds—passions, faculties, states of character—virtue must be one of these. By passions I mean appetite, anger, fear, confidence, envy, joy, friendly feeling, hatred, longing, emulation, pity, and in general the feelings that are accompanied by pleasure or pain; by faculties the
things in virtue of which we are said to be capable of feeling these, e.g., of becoming angry or being pained or feeling pity; by states of character the things in virtue of which we stand well or badly with reference to the passions, e.g., with reference to anger we stand badly if we feel it violently or too weakly, and well if we feel it moderately, and similarly with reference to the other passions.

Now neither the virtues nor the vices are passions, because we are not called good or bad on the ground of our passions, but are so called on the ground of our virtues and our vices, and because we are neither praised nor blamed for our passions (for the man who feels fear or anger is not praised, nor is the man who simply feels anger blamed, but the man who feels it in a certain way), but for our virtues and our vices we are praised or blamed.

Again, we feel anger and fear without choice, but the virtues are modes of choice or involve choice. Further, in respect of the passions we are said to be moved, but in respect of the virtues and the vices we are said not to be moved but to be disposed in a particular way.

For these reasons also they are not faculties; for we are neither called good nor bad, nor praised nor blamed, for the simple capacity of feeling the passions; again, we have the faculties of nature, but we are not made good or bad by nature; we have spoken of this before. If, then, the virtues are neither passions nor faculties, all that remains is that they should be states of character.

Thus we have stated what virtue is in respect of its genus.

---

From the reading...

“The life of money-making is one undertaken under compulsion, and wealth is evidently not the good we are seeking; for it is merely useful for the sake of something else.”

---

6 [Disposition to Choose the Mean]

We must, however, not only describe virtue as a state of character, but also say what sort of state it is. We may remark, then, that every virtue or excellence both brings into good condition the thing of which it is the ex-
cellence and makes the work of that thing be done well; e.g., the excellence of the eye makes both the eye and its work good; for it is by the excellence of the eye that we see well. Similarly the excellence of the horse makes a horse both good in itself and good at running and at carrying its rider and at awaiting the attack of the enemy. Therefore, if this is true in every case, the virtue of man also will be the state of character which makes a man good and which makes him do his own work well.

How this is to happen...will be made plain...by the following consideration of the specific nature of virtue. In everything that is continuous and divisible it is possible to take more, less, or an equal amount, and that either in terms of the thing itself or relatively to us; and the equal is an intermediate between excess and defect. By the intermediate in the object I mean that which is equidistant from each of the extremes, which is one and the same for all men; by the intermediate relatively to us that which is neither too much nor too little—and this is not one, nor the same for all. For instance, if ten is many and two is few, six is the intermediate, taken in terms of the object; for it exceeds and is exceeded by an equal amount; this is intermediate according to arithmetical proportion. But the intermediate relatively to us is not to be taken so; if ten pounds are too much for a particular person to eat and two too little, it does not follow that the trainer will order six pounds; for this also is perhaps too much for the person who is to take it, or too little.... Thus a master of any art avoids excess and defect, but seeks the intermediate and chooses this—the intermediate not in the object but relatively to us.

If it is thus, then, that every art does its work well—by looking to the intermediate and judging its works by this standard (so that we often say of good works of art that it is not possible either to take away or to add anything, implying that excess and defect destroy the goodness of works of art, while the mean preserves it; and good artists, as we say, look to this in their work), and if, further, virtue is more exact and better than any art, as nature also is, then virtue must have the quality of aiming at the intermediate. I mean moral virtue; for it is this that is concerned with passions and actions, and in these there is excess, defect, and the intermediate. For instance, both fear and confidence and appetite and anger and pity and in general pleasure and pain may be felt both too much and too little, and in both cases not well; but to feel them at the right times, with reference to the right objects, towards the right people, with the right motive, and in the right way, is what is both intermediate and best, and this is characteristic of virtue. Similarly with regard to actions also there is excess, defect, and the intermediate. Now virtue is concerned with passions and actions, in
which excess is a form of failure, and so is defect, while the intermediate
is praised and is a form of success; and being praised and being successful
are both characteristics of virtue. Therefore virtue is a kind of mean, since,
as we have seen, it aims at what is intermediate.

Virtue, then, is a state of character concerned with choice, lying in a mean,
\textit{i.e.}, the mean relative to us, this being determined by a rational prin-
ciple, and by that principle by which the man of practical wisdom would
determine it. Now it is a mean between two vices, that which depends on
excess and that which depends on defect; and again it is a mean because
the vices respectively fall short of or exceed what is right in both passions
and actions, while virtue both finds and chooses that which is interme-
diate. Hence in respect of its substance and the definition which states its
essence virtue is a mean, with regard to what is best and right and extreme.

But not every action nor every passion admits of a mean; for some have
names that already imply badness, \textit{e.g.}, spite, shamelessness, envy, and in
the case of actions adultery, theft, murder; for all of these and suchlike
things imply by their names that they are themselves bad, and not the
excesses or deficiencies of them. It is not possible, then, ever to be right
with regard to them; one must always be wrong. Nor does goodness or
badness with regard to such things depend on committing adultery with
the right woman, at the right time, and in the right way, but simply to do
any of them is to go wrong. It would be equally absurd, then, to expect
that in unjust, cowardly, and voluptuous action there should be a mean, an
excess, and a deficiency; for at that rate there would be a mean of excess
and of deficiency, an excess of excess, and a deficiency of deficiency. But
as there is no excess and deficiency of temperance and courage because
what is intermediate is in a sense an extreme, so too of the actions we have
mentioned there is no mean nor any excess and deficiency, but however they are done they are wrong; for in general there is neither a mean of excess and deficiency, nor excess and deficiency of a mean.

7 [The Mean Illustrated]

We must, however, not only make this general statement, but also apply it to the individual facts. For among statements about conduct those which are general apply more widely, but those which are particular are more genuine, since conduct has to do with individual cases, and our statements must harmonize with the facts in these cases. We may take these cases from our table. With regard to feelings of fear and confidence courage is the mean, of the people who exceed, he who exceeds in fearlessness has no name (many of the states have no name), while the man who exceeds in confidence is rash, and he who exceeds in fear and falls short in confidence is a coward. With regard to pleasures and pains—not all of them, and not so much with regard to the pains—the mean is temperance, the excess self-indulgence. Persons deficient with regard to the pleasures are not often found; hence such persons also have received no name. But let us call them “insensible.”

With regard to giving and taking of money the mean is liberality, the excess and the defect prodigality and meanness. In these actions people exceed and fall short in contrary ways; the prodigal exceeds in spending and falls short in taking, while the mean man exceeds in taking and falls short in spending. . . . With regard to money there are also other dispositions—a mean, magnificence (for the magnificent man differs from the liberal man; the former deals with large sums, the latter with small ones), and excess, tastelessness and vulgarity, and a deficiency. . . With regard to honour and dishonour the mean is proper pride, the excess is known as a sort of “empty vanity,” and the deficiency is undue humility; and as we said liberality was related to magnificence, differing from it by dealing with small sums, so there is a state similarly related to proper pride, being concerned with small honours while that is concerned with great. For it is possible to desire honour as one ought, and more than one ought, and less, and the man who exceeds in his desires is called ambitious, the man who falls short unambitious, while the intermediate person has no name. The dispositions also are nameless, except that that of the ambitious man is called ambition. Hence the people who are at the extremes lay claim to the middle place; and we ourselves sometimes call the intermediate person ambitious and sometimes unambitious, and sometimes praise the ambitious man and
sometimes the unambitious. . . .

With regard to anger also there is an excess, a deficiency, and a mean. Although they can scarcely be said to have names, yet since we call the intermediate person good-tempered let us call the mean good temper; of the persons at the extremes let the one who exceeds be called irascible, and his vice irascibility, and the man who falls short an inirascible sort of person, and the deficiency inrascibility.

Book X [Pleasure; Happiness]

6 [Happiness Is Not Amusement]

. . . what remains is to discuss in outline the nature of , since this is what we state the end of human nature to be. Our discussion will be the more concise if we first sum up what we have said already. We said, then, that it is not a disposition; for if it were it might belong to some one who was asleep throughout his life, living the life of a plant, or, again, to some one who was suffering the greatest misfortunes. If these implications are unacceptable, and we must rather class happiness as an activity, as we have said before, and if some activities are necessary, and desirable for the sake of something else, while others are so in themselves, evidently happiness must be placed among those desirable in themselves, not among those desirable for the sake of something else; for happiness does not lack anything, but is self-sufficient. Now those activities are desirable in themselves from which nothing is sought beyond the activity. And of this nature virtuous actions are thought to be; for to do noble and good deeds is a thing desirable for its own sake.

Pleasant amusements also are thought to be of this nature; we choose them not for the sake of other things; for we are injured rather than benefited by them, since we are led to neglect our bodies and our property. . . . Happiness, therefore, does not lie in amusement; it would, indeed, be strange if the end were amusement, and one were to take trouble and suffer hardship all one’s life in order to amuse oneself. For, in a word, everything that we choose we choose for the sake of something else—except happiness, which is an end. Now to exert oneself and work for the sake of amusement seems silly and utterly childish. But to amuse oneself in order that one may exert oneself, as Anacharsis puts it, seems right; for amuse-
ment is a sort of relaxation, and we need relaxation because we cannot work continuously. Relaxation, then, is not an end; for it is taken for the sake of activity.

The happy life is thought to be virtuous; now a virtuous life requires exertion, and does not consist in amusement. And we say that serious things are better than laughable things and those connected with amusement, and that the activity of the better of any two things—whether it be two elements of our being or two men—is the more serious; but the activity of the better is ipso facto superior and more of the nature of happiness. And any chance person—even a slave—can enjoy the bodily pleasures no less than the best man; but no one assigns to a slave a share in happiness—unless he assigns to him also a share in human life. For happiness does not lie in such occupations, but, as we have said before, in virtuous activities.

7 [Happiness Is the Contemplative Life]

If happiness is activity in accordance with virtue, it is reasonable that it should be in accordance with the highest virtue; and this will be that of the best thing in us. Whether it be reason or something else that is this element which is thought to be our natural ruler and guide and to take thought of things noble and divine, whether it be itself also divine or only the most divine element in us, the activity of this in accordance with its proper virtue will be perfect happiness. That this activity is contemplative we have already said.

Now this would seem to be in agreement with what we said before and with the truth. For, firstly, this activity is the best (since not only is reason the best thing in us, but the objects of reason are the best of knowable objects); and, secondly, it is the most continuous, since we can contemplate truth more continuously than we can do anything. And we think happiness has pleasure mingled with it, but the activity of philosophic wisdom is admittedly the pleasantest of virtuous activities; at all events the pursuit of it is thought to offer pleasures marvellous for their purity and their enduringness, and it is to be expected that those who know will pass their time more pleasantly than those who inquire. And the self-sufficiency that is spoken of must belong most to the contemplative activity. For while a philosopher, as well as a just man or one possessing any other virtue, needs the necessaries of life, when they are sufficiently equipped with things of that sort the just man needs people towards whom and with whom he shall act justly, and the temperate man, the brave man, and each of the others is...
in the same case, but the philosopher, even when by himself, can contem-
plate truth, and the better the wiser he is; he can perhaps do so better if he
has fellow-workers, but still he is the most self-sufficient. And this activity
alone would seem to be loved for its own sake; for nothing arises from it
apart from the contemplating, while from practical activities we gain more
or less apart from the action.

. . . And what we said before will apply now; that which is proper to each
thing is by nature best and most pleasant for each thing; for man, therefore,
the life according to reason is best and pleasantest, since reason more than
anything else is man. This life therefore is also the happiest.

8 [The Contemplative Life]

But in a secondary degree the life in accordance with the other kind of
virtue is happy; for the activities in accordance with this befit our human
estate. Just and brave acts, and other virtuous acts, we do in relation to
each other, observing our respective duties with regard to contracts and
services and all manner of actions and with regard to passions; and all of
these seem to be typically human. Some of them seem even to arise from
the body, and virtue of character to be in many ways bound up with the
passions. Practical wisdom, too, is linked to virtue of character, and this
to practical wisdom, since the principles of practical wisdom are in ac-
cordance with the moral virtues and rightness in morals is in accordance
with practical wisdom. Being connected with the passions also, the moral
virtues must belong to our composite nature; and the virtues of our com-
posite nature are human, so, therefore, are the life and the happiness which
correspond to these. The excellence of the reason is a thing apart, we must
be content to say this much about it, for to describe it precisely is a task
greater than our purpose requires. It would seem, however, also to need
external equipment but little, or less than moral virtue does. Grant that
both need the necessaries, and do so equally, even if the statesman’s work
is the more concerned with the body and things of that sort; for there will
be little difference there; but in what they need for the exercise of their
activities there will be much difference. The liberal man will need money
for the doing of his liberal deeds, and the just man too will need it for the
returning of services (for wishes are hard to discern, and even people who
are not just pretend to wish to act justly); and the brave man will need
power if he is to accomplish any of the acts that correspond to his virtue,
and the temperate man will need opportunity; for how else is either he or
any of the others to be recognized? It is debated, too, whether the will or
the deed is more essential to virtue, which is assumed to involve both; it is surely clear that its perfection involves both; but for deeds many things are needed, and more, the greater and nobler the deeds are. But the man who is contemplating the truth needs no such thing, at least with a view to the exercise of his activity; indeed they are, one may say, even hindrances, at all events to his contemplation; but in so far as he is a man and lives with a number of people, he chooses to do virtuous acts; he will therefore need such aids to living a human life.

But, being a man, one will also need external prosperity; for our nature is not self-sufficient for the purpose of contemplation, but our body also must be healthy and must have food and other attention. Still, we must not think that the man who is to be happy will need many things or great things, merely because he cannot be supremely happy without external goods; for self-sufficiency and action do not involve excess, and we can do noble acts without ruling earth and sea; for even with moderate advantages one can act virtuously (this is manifest enough; for private persons are thought to do worthy acts no less than despots—indeed even more); and it is enough that we should have so much as that; for the life of the man who is active in accordance with virtue will be happy...

From the reading...

"Happiness, therefore, does not lie in amusement; it would, indeed, be strange if the end were amusement; and one were to take trouble and suffer hardship all one's life in order to amuse oneself."

Related Ideas

Archelogos Projects (http://www.archelogos.com) Over fifty classical philosophers are constructing a complete database of arguments drawn from the works of Plato and Aristotle in order to demonstrate the complex interconnections of inferences.

Literature on Aristotle (http://ethics.acusd.edu/theories/aristotle) Literature on Aristotle and Virtue Ethics A survey on Internet resources on Arist-
“Life of Excellence: Living and Doing Well” by Aristotle

totle and virtue ethics, including RealAudio lectures and interviews.

From the reading...

“If happiness is activity in accordance with virtue, it is reasonable that it should be in accordance with the highest virtue; and this will be that of the best thing in us.”

Topics Worth Investigating

1. Clarify as much as possible Aristotle’s distinction between practical knowledge and theoretical knowledge. Does an understanding of this distinction help account for why persons who know certain habits or behaviors are harmful, still persist in those behaviors? Relate your analysis to a defense of the Socratic paradox.

2. Explore the similarities of Aristotle’s theory of the development of habits and character with the James-Lange theory of emotion. Do you think a change of actions precedes a change in states of mind, at-
titudes, or thoughts or do you think states of mind usually precede actions in our attempts to change our behavior? How do the cognitive behaviorists stand on this issue? Would the psychoanalytic approach to human behavior entail a different account of behavioral change?

3. Aristotle’s ethics is considered to be a teleological system of ethics since he is concerned with action conducive to the good of human beings rather than action considered right independently of human purpose. The rightness of actions is said to judged by their purposes. Bentham’s hedonistic calculus is also a teleological system. Since Aristotle regards ethics as a branch of political or social science and since Aristotle asserts that political science studies the good for man, could Aristotle be considered an early adherent of utilitarianism? Discuss this possibility by referring to the main tenets of both ethical systems.

4. Aristotle’s theory of ethics is difficult to resolve in terms of moral obligations of human beings. A second major approach to ethics is sometimes called a duty ethics or a deontological ethics. Should the rightness of human actions be based on laws, principles, or rules of moral behavior? The deontologists believe ethics should be based on duty and rights, and those ethical theories are often based on social-contract theory. Explore the possibility that socially-based moral laws and principles are incompatible with the moral well-being of the individual. Where would the existentialist stand on this issue?
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