

What Do You Take From The "Golden Mean" of Aristotle?

Post by "smoothiekiwi" of February 9, 2022 at 3:02 PM

Wow, you answer really quick 😄

[Quote from Nate](#)

Epicurus' pursuit of pleasure is distinguished from Aristotle's pursuit of excellence. Aristotle thought that an excellent person would necessarily enjoy happiness, whereas Epicurus recognized that an excellent person is only "happy" when enjoying the fruits of their excellence. Excellence, itself, is not the motivating goal. Pleasure is the goal.

Good point, and one I agree to. Epicurus's stance was simply different from Aristotle's.

[Quote from Cassius](#)

And taken on that broad level, I don't think there is a way under the Epicuran view of nature that such a mechanism could function. As "golden mean" is frequently used, the result is a word game implying that it is generally possible to solve problems by looking for extremes, and (so to speak) adding them together and dividing by two. I don't think Epicurus would say that the world works that way in regard to pleasure or anything else either.

Yep, agree on that- Epicurus would disagree on that. How could in a world of atoms be a "perfect middle ground"?

[Quote from Kalosyni](#)

Humans are not mathematical equations

The Pythagoreans want to have a talk with you 😊

[Quote from Kalosyni](#)

And this messiness is also why we can't make absolute rules about things

Well, that's exactly the point Aristotle makes- that there's no absolute virtue, because everything is dependent on the context. A man who invites a woman to dance is brave; the same man who charges across the battlefield into machine gun fire is foolish... doesn't that

mean that virtue is always dependent on the context?

And thanks to the answers and that you took the time to think about such a question 😊