

Aristotle's Moral Philosophy: An Experience for Human Flourishing in the Modern Context ¹

A filosofia moral de Aristóteles: uma experiência para o florescimento humano no contexto moderno

Pham KIEN

Associate Professor, PhD

University of Economics Ho Chi Minh City – UEH

E-mail: kienpt@ueh.edu.vn

ORCID: 0000-0001-8024-8679

Abstract

Aristotle's moral philosophy provides a timeless theoretical framework for understanding human development through the lens of eudaimonia, virtue, and practical reason. This study explores the core elements of his moral thought, emphasizing the pursuit of happiness as the ultimate human goal, achieved through a virtuous life guided by reason. By analyzing key concepts such as the middle way, the role of habit in personality development, and the relationship between individual and community well-being, this study highlights the depth and flexibility of Aristotelian ethics. The analysis does not stop at explaining history but also assesses the relevance of this philosophy to solving modern ethical problems, including consumerism, dependence on technology, and social inequality. The results show that Aristotle's emphasis on balance, self-discipline, and rational reflection provides a powerful guide to confronting contemporary moral challenges, promoting a meaningful and fulfilling life. The article emphasizes the enduring value of Aristotle's philosophy in shaping moral discourse and personal development in today's complex world and Vietnam.

Keywords: Vietnan, moral philosophy, eudaimonia, virtue, middle way.

¹ Acknowledgements: This research is funded by University of Economics Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam (UEH)

Resumo

A filosofia moral de Aristóteles fornece uma estrutura teórica atemporal para a compreensão do desenvolvimento humano através das lentes da eudaimonia, da virtude e da razão prática. Este estudo explora os elementos centrais de seu pensamento moral, enfatizando a busca da felicidade como o objetivo humano supremo, alcançado por meio de uma vida virtuosa guiada pela razão. Ao analisar conceitos-chave como o caminho do meio, o papel do hábito no desenvolvimento da personalidade e a relação entre o bem-estar individual e comunitário, este estudo destaca a profundidade e a flexibilidade da ética aristotélica. A análise não se limita a explicar a história, mas também avalia a relevância dessa filosofia para a solução de problemas éticos modernos, incluindo o consumismo, a dependência da tecnologia e a desigualdade social. Os resultados mostram que a ênfase de Aristóteles no equilíbrio, na autodisciplina e na reflexão racional fornece um guia poderoso para enfrentar os desafios morais contemporâneos, promovendo uma vida significativa e plena. O artigo enfatiza o valor duradouro da filosofia de Aristóteles na formação do discurso moral e do desenvolvimento pessoal no mundo complexo de hoje e no Vietnã.

Palavras-chave: Vietnã, filosofia moral, eudaimonia, virtude, caminho do meio.

1. Introduction

The search for a meaningful life has been a core concern of humanity since ancient times, and few thinkers have tackled this issue with as much depth and clarity as Aristotle. Living in the 4th century BC, Aristotle built a moral philosophy that transcended the confines of its time, offering insights into the nature of human happiness while retaining its strong appeal in the present day. Unlike modern moral systems that often prioritize rules, consequences, or personal preferences, Aristotle's approach focuses on the concept of eudaimonia, which is often translated as happiness or holistic development. For him, this is not a fleeting emotion but a state of well-being, achieved through the consistent practice of virtue under the guidance of reason. His philosophy is not a rigid doctrine but a flexible

theoretical framework that encourages people to develop their personality and direct their actions towards a higher goal.

In an era marked by rapid technological advancement, environmental crises, and changing social values, Aristotle's ethology provides a lens through which to evaluate contemporary moral challenges (Sueur, C., Lombard, J., Capra, O., Beltzung, B., & Pelé, M, 2024). The rise of consumerism makes it easy for people to identify happiness with material wealth, while digital culture often distracts attention and weakens self-reflection. Social inequality, meanwhile, raises questions about justice and the common good-problems that Aristotle faced in his time. This study aims to elucidate the fundamental principles of Aristotle's moral philosophy, explore its intrinsic cohesion, and evaluate its applicability to modern life. By focusing on eudaimonia, virtue, and the role of reason, research seeks to clarify how his ideas can lead individuals and society toward a balanced and fulfilling life.

Aristotle's moral philosophy was characterized by its view of man as a rational and social being, with the ultimate goal of realizing his potential through intentional action (Greene, J, 2003). This study begins with an overview of his ethical framework, continues to analyze the main components, and concludes with a reflection on its practical implications in today's world. The study argues that Aristotle's vision of human development, based on moderation and intellectual virtue, offers a convincing alternative to the excesses and uncertainties of modern times, making it an important resource for moral reflection and personal development.

2. Research methods

This study uses a qualitative method, based on the conceptual analysis of Aristotle's moral philosophy as expressed in his major moral works. The main method consisted of a systematic examination of the core concepts-eudaimonia, virtue, the middle way, and practical reason-through a thorough reading of his ideas as they had been understood and interpreted over time. Rather than creating new empirical data, research synthesizes existing knowledge to build a coherent understanding of his ethical system. The analysis applies a historical-comparative lens to place Aristotle's thought in its early ancient Greek

context, while drawing parallels with contemporary moral issues. This dual perspective allows for an exploration of how his philosophy emerged from the social and intellectual environment of ancient Athens and how it could be adapted to address modern difficulties. The method also incorporates a dialectical approach, examining the contradictions in Aristotle's theoretical framework, such as the balance between personal virtue and community welfare, to clarify the richness and complexity of his thought. To assess the relevance of Aristotelian ethics today, the study uses thematic analysis, identifies repetitive motives-such as moderation, self-discipline, and rationality-and applies them to current challenges such as overconsumption, distraction from digital technology, etc. and social justice. This qualitative synthesis ensures a deep and subtle exploration of his philosophy, avoiding superficial generalizations while highlighting its practical implications. The study is interpretive, in order to connect ancient wisdom with modern needs through reasoned reflection rather than imposing assertions.

3. Research results

Aristotle's moral philosophy focused on the pursuit of eudaimonia, which he considered to be the highest good that man could achieve. Eudaimonia is not the same as the conventional notions of happiness in the modern world, which are often associated with fleeting pleasures, material comforts, or personal satisfaction (Knippenberg et al., 2018). Rather, for Aristotle, eudaimonia is a state of good life, a full and meaningful life, where man fully develops his inherent abilities. He argues that every human action is directed towards something good, from eating to maintain health to learning to expand knowledge. However, these good things are only the means, while eudaimonia is the ultimate goal, which is the reason for the existence of all other endeavors. It is not a brief moment of happiness but a lifelong process, a state of active activity that requires constant participation in noble and meaningful deeds.

Human nature, according to Aristotle, is defined by the capacity of reason-the ability to think, consider, and act intentionally. He distinguished man from other animals by this very characteristic, emphasizing that a good life must be one where reason is practiced at

an excellent level. This does not mean that reason completely eliminates emotions or instincts, but rather that it acts as a guide, helping people adjust other aspects of themselves to achieve inner harmony. For Aristotle, reason was not only an instrument of abstract thinking but also the foundation for living a moral life, since only through reason can man realize what is truly good and how to achieve it.

Virtue is the main means by which people move towards eudaimonia. Aristotle divided virtue into two main categories: intellectual virtue and moral virtue. Intellectual virtues, such as wisdom, understanding, and the ability to reason, are developed through education and learning. They are the result of cultivating the mind, helping people understand the world and make sound judgments. Meanwhile, moral virtues, such as courage, generosity, justice, and self-control, are formed through habit and practice. They are not innate qualities that people are born with, but traits that have been honed over time. For example, a person becomes brave not because they are naturally fearless, but because they learn to face fear through repetitive actions, gradually building a resilient personality.

One of Aristotle's most prominent ideas was the doctrine of the middle way, the principle that virtue lies in the balance between the two extremes of surplus and deficiency (Gherasim, I. A, 2017). He does not see the middle way as a fixed average but as a flexible state, depending on the specific circumstances and the individual taking action. For example, courage is the middle ground between recklessness-acting without consideration for danger-and cowardice-avoiding all risks even if it is necessary. Similarly, generosity is the middle ground between extravagance, where one gives beyond one's means, and stinginess, where one retains everything without sharing. The middle way is not a simple formula but an art, requiring acumen to recognize what is the right action in each situation. To achieve the middle way, Aristotle emphasized the role of practical reason, or phronesis. This is the ability to allow people to apply general moral principles to specific situations, making sound decisions based on considerations of circumstances, goals, and consequences. Phronesis is not just theoretical intelligence but a vivid form of intelligence, a combination of experience, understanding, and judgment. For example, a person with

phronesis knows that in a critical situation, courage may require them to take risks, but in another situation, caution is the wiser choice. It is thanks to phronesis that the middle path becomes a living, non-rigid principle, helping people adjust their behavior to match reality. The relationship between the individual and the community is another important aspect of Aristotle's philosophy. He sees humans as innate social beings who cannot live in isolation but need interaction and cooperation with others to fully develop. Eudaimonia, therefore, is not only a personal matter but is also tied to the well-being of the community (Mulgan, R, 1999). A person cannot be truly happy if he lives in a society full of injustice, conflict, or chaos. Thus, virtues such as justice-ensuring fairness in relationships-and friendship-building human cohesion-are indispensable to maintaining a harmonious community. Aristotle believed that personal happiness and the common good are two sides of the same coin, complementing each other in creating a good life (Maricchiolo, F., Mosca, O., Lauriola, M., & Krys, K, 2021). Aristotle also realized that eudaimonia depends not only on individual actions but also on external factors. He called these factors "external goods," including health, property, and social relationships. Although not the essence of happiness, they serve as supportive conditions, giving people the space and resources to practice virtue. For example, a person living in extreme poverty or chronic illness will find it difficult to focus on character development or pursue lofty goals. However, Aristotle did not see these factors as determining everything; He emphasized that even in adversity, a virtuous person can live well by holding fast to his reason and qualities.

Habit plays a central role in the formation of moral virtue, according to Aristotle. He argued that personality is not something fixed from birth but is built through repetitive actions. A person becomes fair by performing just actions, becomes generous by giving meaningfully. This process requires perseverance and self-discipline, as bad habits can also form if people don't pay attention to their behavior. Aristotle saw education and the social environment as important factors in shaping habits, as they provide the context in which people learn and practice virtues from an early age.

Another idea worth noting is the distinction between theoretical life and practical life in Aristotle's philosophy. He considers contemplation-the contemplation of the great and eternal-the highest form of eudaimonia, because it expresses the excellence of reason, the most characteristic faculty of man. However, he also acknowledged that not everyone can live a life entirely for contemplation, and that practical life-where people practice virtues in everyday life-is also a legitimate path to happiness. The balance between these two aspects shows the versatility of his philosophy, which is suitable for both those who pursue knowledge and those who live between social responsibilities.

Aristotle also mentioned the role of joy in his ethic (Akgün, R. C, 2023). He does not deny that joy is part of the good life, but he distinguishes between inferior pleasures-such as satisfaction from material pleasures-and noble pleasures, which come from the practice of virtue and reason. For him, a virtuous person finds joy in doing the right thing, not because of the external reward but because the action itself brings inner satisfaction. This highlights the naturalness of eudaimonia: when people live according to their nature, they naturally feel complete and happy (Annas, J., 1993).

Aristotle's philosophy emphasized that eudaimonia was a personal goal but not separate from the social and cultural context. He believed that law, education, and social institutions played an important role in enabling people to develop virtue. A good society not only provides opportunities to practice ethics but also encourages and celebrates noble qualities. This reflects his view that personal ethics and community ethics are two inseparable factors that together form the foundation for a life worth living. According to Aristotle, happiness or a good life is associated with people performing their specific functions well. He believed that the highest purpose of human life is to be fully aware of one's true nature, to develop one's potentials to the fullest, and thereby to improve oneself. To understand this, however, it is necessary to determine what the nature of man is in his thought.

Aristotle saw man as a unified whole between soul and body. For him, the soul is the element that makes up life, acting as the form of the body. Therefore, every human activity

is essentially an expression of the soul, or in other words, the soul represents the whole person. He distinguished the function of man from that of plants and animals: life is not unique, because plants also live; sensation is also not enough to define, since animals also have this ability. What sets people apart is their ability to act rationally. Reason becomes the core quality, distinguishing humans from other things in nature. Thanks to reason, people can work towards the ultimate goal of happiness (Skrbina, D, 2008). To understand the nature of happiness, Aristotle emphasized that it is necessary to start by discovering the nature of the soul, because happiness is the activity of the soul.

Aristotle divided the soul into two main parts: the irrational part and the rational part. The irrational part is further subdivided into two aspects: an aspect that is common to both man and plants, completely unaffected by reason, and an aspect that deals with desire or desire, which is not completely free from reason but can be regulated and controlled by reason to a certain extent. The rational part also includes two elements: one that is autonomous, which operates independently, and another that follows the guidance of reason, in the same way that a son listens to his father. Thus, a person is considered to be living well when they perform the characteristic function of a human being of acting according to reason, i.e., letting the rational part guide and control the irrational part. This structure of the soul is the basis for Aristotle's conception of virtue and his interpretation of the nature of happiness.

Aristotle realized that all human behavior is directed towards a certain purpose, because man possesses reason and acts under its guidance. He said that all activities, from art, research, to daily actions, are aimed at a good thing. In other words, every rational action has a purpose, and the supreme purpose is goodness. However, since there are many different types of actions, there are also many different kinds of purposes or good deeds. Aristotle distinguished two types of goodness: one is the intrinsic good, which has its own value, and the other is instrumental good, which is only of relative value in the service of the intrinsic good. He ranks good things according to a value scale: at the lowest level are good things that are only instrumental, in the middle are good things that are both

instrumental and intrinsic value, and at the highest level are good things that are completely intrinsic (Gherasim, I. A., 2017).

Aristotle argued that it was happiness. He explained that humans always pursue happiness for themselves, and not for any other reason (Reeve, C. D. C., 2011). Fame, pleasures, thoughts, or talents are all desirable to men, but they do not satisfy them themselves, but because they believe that they will achieve happiness through them. In contrast, no one seeks happiness in exchange for fame or pleasure-happiness is an end in itself, not dependent on anything else. People do not stop at pleasure from pleasures or material things, because these things only lead to disappointment and stagnation if they are seen as the final destination. Happiness is not an innate tendency that everyone naturally possesses, but a good state of life, which requires effort and action (Haybron, D. M., 2008). Living well, according to Aristotle, is when people fulfill their characteristic function-maximizing their potential and improving themselves. If this is not achieved, people will fall into suffering, torment, and become unhappy. Happiness does not depend on luck or fate, nor is it something that can be achieved in a short moment. It is the result of a lifelong striving, not something that children can understand, but for an adult with full life experience. Happiness is the supreme good that man should persistently pursue, and it is manifested in the activity of the soul in accordance with virtue, especially the noblest virtue, which is associated with reason-the highest part of man (Nussbaum, M. C., 1986). Happiness, according to Aristotle, is not something that comes naturally or is achieved by chance, but is the result of a process of persistent effort through the path of virtue (Griswold Jr, C. L., 2008). It is not a transient state but has long-term value, requiring perseverance and determination. Before determining the nature of virtue, Aristotle recognized that in the human soul there exist factors such as emotions, the ability to act, and qualities acquired over time. He argued that virtue is not an emotion or innate ability, but qualities formed through practice, which help people to perform their characteristic function-to live as a rational and moral person (Skrbina, D. (Ed.). (2009).

Virtue, according to Aristotle, is the intermediate state between the two extremes of evil: excesses and inadequacies. If we deviate from the middle path, people will fall into bad habits. He sees the middle as not just a quantitative balance but a regulation of emotions and actions, guided by reason. For example, if the courage is excessive, it will become reckless, but if it is deficient, it will become cowardice; Too much generosity is wasteful, and too little is stingy. Neutrality is not a fixed standard for everyone or every situation, but varies according to individual circumstances and abilities—for example, the level of food that is adequate for one person may differ from another. However, he also noted that there are inherently bad behaviors, such as theft or murder, that cannot be justified by neutrality (Skrbina, D., 2009).

Identifying the middle is a difficult task, requiring acumen to recognize and control emotional or lustful tendencies. Aristotle proposed that in order to achieve the middle, people need to avoid things that are contrary to it and minimize bad tendencies, especially the allure of pleasure. He divided virtue into two categories: intellectual virtues, such as wisdom and wisdom, which are developed through study and time, and moral virtues, such as courage and fairness, which are formed from good habits. Unlike the view of assimilating knowledge with virtue, Aristotle emphasized that reason plays a central role in achieving both types of virtue, helping people to make the right and consistent choices.

Will is also an important factor, because reason distinguishes between good and evil, but will determines action. Virtue is not naturally available but needs to be cultivated from an early age through education and social environment, where law and culture play a role in shaping reason and will. to help people live rightly (Kien, 2025).

Aristotle classified happiness into three forms based on how people conceive of goodness: the first is the happiness of the crowd, the search in pleasure and pastime; the second type is to live as a free and responsible citizen; The third type is the contemplative life of the wise. For him, the most perfect happiness must be associated with the highest virtue, and that is the activity of contemplation.

He argues that contemplation is the highest form of happiness because it represents the optimal functioning of reason-the most superior part of man. It focuses on sublime issues, provides pure and lasting joy, and is less dependent on external circumstances than practical activities. Contemplation is not only continuous and long-term but also autonomous, not requiring as much support from others as other activities. Aristotle saw this as the pinnacle of eudaimonia, although he acknowledged that not everyone attained this state, and that it usually appeared only in those with deep wisdom and experience (Bui, 2025).

4. Contact with today's world and compare with other philosophers

Aristotle's moral philosophy is not only a legacy of antiquity, but also a living source of inspiration, providing practical value to face the complex challenges of today's world. In a modern context, where people are caught up in the vortex of consumerism, digital technology, and global crises such as climate change or social inequality, Aristotle's thought offers a unique perspective on how to live a meaningful life. His emphasis on eudaimonia-happiness as a state of total development-poses a stark contrast to the popular notion that happiness is a material accumulation or short-term pleasure. Instead of running after the outside, Aristotle invites people to turn inward, focusing on cultivating virtue and reason in order to achieve inner harmony, an idea that is especially relevant in an age when imbalance seems to be the hallmark of life.

One of the big problems of the world today is rampant consumerism, where people are caught up in non-stop shopping, looking for satisfaction in new items or luxurious experiences. Aristotle, with his doctrine of the middle way, offered an alternative by encouraging moderation-not so much indulgence in extravagance but also without falling into a state of deprivation. For example, in the use of technology, an Aristotelian can take advantage of a smartphone to connect and learn, but know how to stop before it becomes an addiction or a distraction. This balance not only helps reduce personal pressure but also contributes to limiting the negative impact on the environment, as excessive consumption is accelerating the depletion of natural resources.

Digital technology, with the development of social networks and artificial intelligence, also poses ethical challenges that Aristotle can help solve. Dependence on electronic devices often impairs self-reflection and concentration-elements that he considers to be at the core of a good life. Practical reason, or phronesis, has become an important tool for modern humans to adjust their relationship with technology, knowing when to engage and when to withdraw to protect their mental health. Furthermore, the fragmentation of social relationships in the virtual world can be overcome by adopting Aristotle's view of friendship and community, encouraging people to build real connections instead of following superficial interactions online.

Social inequality and environmental crises are other global issues that Aristotle's philosophy can illuminate. He emphasized that eudaimonia cannot be achieved in a society full of injustice, since personal happiness is closely tied to the common good. In the modern context, this can be interpreted as a call to action to address the wealth gap and protect the environment, as a sustainable community is a necessary condition for each person to develop comprehensively. For example, in Vietnam, where rapid economic development has benefited but also caused pollution and social imbalances, Aristotle's middle school can inspire policies that both promote growth and conserve resources, creating a more harmonious development model.

When comparing Aristotle's moral philosophy with that of other philosophers, differences and similarities emerge markedly, shedding light on his uniqueness in the Western stream of moral thought. Compared to Immanuel Kant, who emphasized duty and universal rules, Aristotle focused on personality rather than individual actions. Kant argued that morality lies in following immutable principles, such as "acting only according to the principle that you might want it to be a universal law," regardless of the outcome or circumstances. In contrast, Aristotle was more flexible, seeing ethics as the art of regulating behavior based on the middle way and phronesis, depending on the specific context. In today's world, Kant's approach may be useful for establishing legal rules against injustice,

but its rigidity is sometimes impractical in the face of complex situations, where Aristotle proved superior thanks to his adaptability.

John Stuart Mill, who represents utilitarianism, offers a different view, defining morality based on maximizing happiness for the masses. For Mill, an action is right if it is in the best interest of the most people, focusing on the consequences rather than intentions or personality. Aristotle, while also concerned with happiness, did not identify it with the synthetic pleasure that Mill pursued. He sees eudaimonia as a state of a virtuous individual, not a calculation of the amount of happiness that Mill proposes. In the modern context, utilitarianism may be appropriate for solving problems such as resource allocation in crisis, but it is easy to ignore personal development, which Aristotle put first. In the face of climate change, for example, Mill may prioritize policies that bring immediate benefits to the majority, while Aristotle will emphasize building self-discipline to maintain long-term sustainability.

Friedrich Nietzsche, another modern philosopher, offered a stark contrast to Aristotle. Nietzsche rejected traditional moral values, upholding the will to power and self-assertion of the individual beyond social norms. He views ordinary happiness as trivial, instead calling on people to surpass themselves to become "superhuman." Aristotle, on the contrary, did not seek escapism from society but emphasized harmony between the individual and the community, with happiness as a result of living well in relationships with others. In today's world, Nietzsche's thought may inspire individuals who want to break boundaries, but his community denial is difficult to apply to issues such as inequality or climate change, where Aristotle offers a more balanced and realistic approach.

Compared to these philosophers, Aristotle's strength lies in the comprehensiveness and practicality of his philosophy. He did not stop at setting rules like Kant, calculating consequences like Mill, or challenging all norms like Nietzsche, but combined reason, emotions, and society into a flexible moral framework. In the modern context, this combination is especially valuable. For example, in the face of a digital crisis, Kant may propose rules for the use of devices, Mill may weigh the general benefits of restricting

technology, and Nietzsche may appeal to the individual to overcome dependence on it. Aristotle, meanwhile, would encourage humans to develop phronesis to self-regulate, find the middle ground between digital connection and spiritual freedom, and maintain social relationships to support this process.

In Vietnam, Aristotle's philosophy can be applied to solve problems such as urban overconsumption and rural environmental degradation. His emphasis on self-discipline and morality is in line with Vietnam's tradition of a simple lifestyle and proximity to nature, while his community vision can promote collective initiatives to protect the environment and reduce inequality. Compared to other philosophers, Aristotle's approach is not only theoretical but also a call to action, encouraging each person to live a life that is both practical and noble in today's volatile world.

4. Discussion

Aristotle's moral philosophy is not only a theoretical system but also a practical guide to living a full life. His concept of eudaimonia challenges modern notions of happiness, which are often narrowed down to immediate gratification or material success. Instead, he proposes a comprehensive vision in which happiness is the result of a well-lived life through the practice of virtue and reason. This approach is particularly relevant in contemporary contexts, where people face imbalances from overconsumption, technological distractions, and social pressures that undermine self-awareness.

Aristotle's Middle Way doctrine provides a powerful tool for navigating the extremes of the modern world. In a consumer society, where surplus is often celebrated, the middle encourages moderation and consideration, helping the individual to stay away from extravagance without falling into a state of deprivation. For example, in the use of technology, the middle way can guide people to maintain digital connectivity without letting it dominate life, finding a balance between participation and separation. His emphasis on habit was also revolutionary, as it showed that personality is not fixed but can be shaped through conscious action, an idea that is consistent with modern behavioral science of habit change.

Practical wisdom, or phronesis, is another aspect that highlights the applicability of Aristotle's philosophy. In a world full of complex choices-from personal lifestyle decisions to social issues like climate change-phronesis offers a flexible approach to making the right decisions. It does not rely on rigid rules but requires reflection, consideration of circumstances, and an understanding of long-term goals, making it a valuable tool for facing the uncertainty of modern times.

Aristotle's philosophy, however, was not without its limitations. His view of eudaimonia assumes that everyone has access to education and the conditions to develop virtue, a condition that is not always practical in today's unequal societies. His dependence on community also poses a challenge in a globalized world, where social relationships are often fragmented by geographical and cultural distances. Moreover, his focus on reason can be seen as ignoring the role of emotions, an increasingly recognized element in modern ethics.

6. Conclusion

Aristotle's moral philosophy is a profound invitation to live a meaningful life through the pursuit of eudaimonia-a state of comprehensive development achieved through virtue and reason. By making happiness the ultimate goal, he not only identifies an ideal but also charts a practical path to achieve it, based on the middle way, habits, and practical wisdom. His philosophy transcends the confines of antiquity, providing a flexible theoretical framework for confronting the moral challenges of the modern world, from the imbalance of consumption to the fragmentation of social relationships.

In a contemporary context, Aristotelian ethics is not just an academic theory but a living guide, encouraging people to seek a balance between material and spiritual needs, between personal gain and community responsibility. Despite its limitations, such as reliance on ideal conditions or a focus on reason, the enduring value of this philosophy lies in its ability to inspire self-reflection and conscious action. For Vietnam and the wider world, Aristotle's vision of a good life is a reminder that true happiness does not come from accumulation but from harmony-with oneself, with others, and with one's surroundings.

Reference

- Adolfo, R. (2023). O rigor do discurso poético segundo Aristóteles. *Polymatheia - Revista De Filosofia*, 16(2), 9–34. Recuperado de <https://revistas.uece.br/index.php/revistapolymatheia/article/view/10564>
- Akgün, R. C. (2023). The necessity and chance in Aristotle's theory of society and ethics. *Karamanoğlu Mehmetbey Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Dergisi*, 6(2), 215-225.
- Annas, J. (1993). The morality of happiness. Oxford University Press.
- Bui, X. D. (2025). Karl Marx's Theory of Productive Forces and their significance for human development in contemporary Vietnam. *Aufklärung: revista de filosofia*, 12(1), 107-118.
- Freitas, J.A. Dr . (2021). SOBRE O SER E SEUS MÚLTIPLOS SIGNIFICADOS NA METAFÍSICA DE ARISTÓTELES . *Polymatheia - Revista De Filosofia*, 11(18). Recuperado de <https://revistas.uece.br/index.php/revistapolymatheia/article/view/5824>
- Gherasim, I. A. (2017). The becoming of the society: Perspectives from Aristotle and JJ Rousseau. In *The Holistic Society: Multi-Disciplinary Perspectives. Proceedings of Harvard Square Symposium* (pp. 333-341). Scientia Moralitas Research Institute.
- Greene, J. (2003). From neural 'is' to moral 'ought': What are the moral implications of neuroscientific moral psychology? *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, 4(10), 846-850.
- Griswold Jr, C. L. (2008). Happiness, tranquillity, and philosophy. *Critical Review*, 10(1), 1-32.
- Haybron, D. M. (2008). The pursuit of unhappiness: The elusive psychology of well-being. Oxford University Press.
- Kien, P. T. (2025). Marxist philosophy and its influence on today's world. *Kalágatos*, 22(1), ek25008-ek25008.
- Knippenberg, L., De Groot, W. T., Van Den Born, R. J., Knights, P., & Muraca, B. (2018). Relational value, partnership, eudaimonia: A review. *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability*, 35, 39-45.
- Maricchiolo, F., Mosca, O., Lauriola, M., & Krys, K. (2021). From ME to WE: A literature review on happiness and well-being focused on relational factors and social interconnectedness. *Psicologia Sociale*, 16(1), 3-25.
- Mechico, R. A. ., & Tomo, A. X. . (2021). Desenvolvimento como processo de busca de Bem-Estar (Sen) e de Felicidade (Aristóteles). *Revista Cacto - Ciência, Arte, Comunicação Em Transdisciplinaridade Online*, 1(2), 45–60. <https://doi.org/10.31416/cacto.v1i2.286>
- Mulgan, R. (1999). The role of friendship in Aristotle's political theory. *Critical Review of International Social and Political Philosophy*, 2(4), 15-32.

- Nussbaum, M. C. (1986). *The fragility of goodness: Luck and ethics in Greek tragedy and philosophy*. Cambridge University Press.
- Reeve, C. D. C. (2011). *Practices of reason: Aristotle's Nicomachean Ethics*. Oxford University Press.
- Santos Tabosa, Adriana. (2021). "A IGUALDADE E A COMENSURABILIDADE NAS TROCAS EM ARISTÓTELES". *Polymatheia - Revista De Filosofia* 3 (4).
<https://revistas.uece.br/index.php/revistapolymatheia/article/view/6530>
- Silva, R. B. B.. (2022). A abrangência do lógos entre Aristóteles e Gadamer. *Polymatheia - Revista De Filosofia*, 14(25). Recuperado de <https://revistas.uece.br/index.php/revistapolymatheia/article/view/6656>
- Silva Barreto, C. ., da Silva, J. W. ., & Vita Baraúna, T. . (2022). Sobre a divisão da alma em Aristóteles. *Polymatheia - Revista De Filosofia*, 15(2), 41–63. Recuperado de <https://revistas.uece.br/index.php/revistapolymatheia/article/view/6669>
- Skrbina, D. (Ed.). (2009). *Mind that abides: Panpsychism in the new millennium* (pp. 1–29). John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Sueur, C., Lombard, J., Capra, O., Beltzung, B., & Pelé, M. (2024). Exploration of the creative processes in animals, robots, and AI: Who holds the authorship? *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, 11(1), 1-12.



KIEN, Pham. Aristotle's Moral Philosophy: An Experience for Human Flourishing in the Modern Context. *Kalagatos*, Fortaleza, vol.21, n. 1, 2024, eK24000, p. 01-17.

Recebido: 02/2024
Aprovado: 04/2024