**PART A**

2) in ii.4 aristotle is considering an objection to his claim that a person becomes excellent through performing the actions that an excellent person performs: for example, that you become just through performing just actions. what’s the objection? what’s aristotle’s reply to it?

Aristotle claims that people become excellent by doing excellent things (Aristotle 114). Then he considers the objection that if people are doing excellent things then they are already excellent (Aristotle 114). Aristotle then responds to this objection by stating a few facts that must hold about the person in question. First, they must be doing these excellent things knowingly (Aristotle 114), meaning that they have to be consciously aware of their actions and not be doing them by chance. Second, they must decide to do so for themselves (Aristotle 114), meaning that they need to make a decision to perform this action by themselves and not prompted by someone else. Third, they must do this action from a firm and unchanging disposition (Aristotle 114), meaning that these actions shouldn’t be out of character or sporadic and should instead be stable and consistent.

3. aristotle claims that every excellence of character is intermediate between two badnesses of character, one badness that’s excessive and another that’s deficient in some quality of which the excellent is the right amoung. answer one or the other of the following. either: (a) give your own example of an excellence that’s intermediate in this respect; be sure to describe the correspondingly excessive or deficient characters.

An example of this could be seen in the excellence of generosity, which is the excellence of giving the right amount of resources to the right people, at the right time, for the right reason, and in the right way. Generosity is the right intermediate between stinginess (the deficit) and extravagant (excess). A generous person donates what is appropriate and needed while being mindful of the receivers and their own circumstances. The deficit of this excellence would be being stingy. A stingy person doesn’t give at all or enough in accordance with what they have or can give. They might not give even when it's reasonable and moral for them to. On the other hand, an excess of this excellence would be someone who is extravagant. An extravagant person gives too much without considering the needs of the receiver or their own personal means. They might give with immoral intentions such as to impress and not to help and this can also lead to wastefulness.

4.

In this essay, I will extend the claim from Aristotle's "Nicomachean Ethics" III.5, where he suggests that a person's character, and whether they are good or bad, depend almost entirely on their own actions and choices. Aristotle argues that an individual is directly responsible for the formation of their own character, through actions which are in their control and voluntary. I will defend his claim against the objection that environmental and external factors greatly mold character by showing that though the external influences are obvious, the significance of personal choice in moral and character development is of paramount importance.

Aristotle says that the actions which a person performs knowingly and willingly mold a person's character; he calls these acts voluntary. He says, "when acting depends on us, not acting does so too" (Aristotle, 1113b8-9) and thus our choices not to act when we could have acted contribute to the kind of person we become. This view underscores personal responsibility and the view that an individual has the power to shape his moral character through his consistent and purposive acts.

Those against the argument could believe that Aristotle has underestimated the role of external factors as one’s upbringing, culture, and socio-economic environment, because, to some extent, these factors are also the grassroots in the formation of one’s character. They limit the amount of choice a person can make, predetermining his values and perception long before he will have to decide anything. For instance, Aristotle himself argues that habituation to a certain mode can affect one's disposition. But he never disclaims his strong view that a human being can make another choice and, accordingly, become a virtuous individual by acting in a way that corresponds to his new choice.

In the case of Aristotle, one can recognise the possibility of external impacts and how it does not automatically devalue the importance of personal choice in the development of virtues and character. That is to say, while Aristotle's ethics place someone within certain behaviors or values, the capacity for reflection, choice, and change itself will continue as an essential component. This is similar to the way that modern psychological understanding of the development of habits and change of behavior sees them: as the power of repeated actions to mold one's character and the power of the person to effect changes of personal significance to him or her, regardless of the previous standing.

It is important to have a nuanced and balanced view that Aristotle is a proponent of personal responsibility in view of the transformative power of the voluntary actions; an acknowledgment of the power of external factors brings a more complete understanding of the character development process. This balanced approach does not take away personal responsibility but locates it within the context of other forces or factors that serve to appreciate the complexity of moral development. Therefore, even though Aristotle is right in emphasizing personal responsibility for the formation of one's character, an incorporation of awareness of environmental and societal influences would contribute to a more wholesome view of ethical behavior.