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The Garden of Delights:  
Visualisation of Happiness in Christianity and Postmodernism
inertia but the result of an ultimate intellectual exercise, social (friendship) and political action (λάθε βιώσας) that necessitates determination in order to overcome internal fights. Also, pleasures, which lead to eudaimonia, are strongly related to the Ancient Greek virtues which, according to Epicurus, are not influenced by external contextual factors. The reason is that these virtues are not the end but the way to reach this end and especially the end that leads from pleasures to eudaimonia.

Through the epicurean thought, a number of critical issues, which define the present’s problematic nature, are reconsidered, while they also orientate our thought and actions towards the direction of surpassing the moral, social and political dead ends, which constitute the negative aspects of the social and political system. The contemporary requests regarding the man’s self-achievement and freedom as autonomy are mediated through the promotion of Epicurus’ rebellious anthropology.

**Ineta Kivle**

**Choice to be Happy: Rhythm of Flourishing in Aristotle’s Ethics**

The current study is centred on concepts of choice and rhythm in the context of happy life viewing human flourishing as a particular way of harmony. In this case, rhythm is used as a conceptual tool and a methodological instrument giving a possibility to actualize ancient cognitions of happy and self-sufficient life in connection with the global society of the XXI century.

Life in an ancient polis makes rhythm and correlations among various strata: constitution of human soul, choice to live appropriate life, self-flourishing, organization of the polis and the order of cosmos. Aristotle does not talk about rhythm in the context of happiness directly, his contribution in the development of concept of rhythm mainly concerns poetry and rhetoric, however, rhythm as an order, harmony, measure, recurrence, correspondence gives a possibility to view eudaimonia in comparison with a problematic feasibility to reach contemplative happiness in the XXI century. Rhythm of life is changed at times from harmonic to uncontrolled directions not only by growing dynamism and speed, but also by elements included in activities of flourishing. In ancient philosophy they are activities of human soul, education, faculty of deliberation, elements of structure of state; in the XX-XXI centuries they are elements of a constructed world of functionality – a position in professional networks, conformity with strategic objectives, etc. Elements show not only inner dynamics of human, but they also discover social structures maintained by rhythmic pulsations of all included parts. If life develops into continuity of the individual and the social, a question arises about human potentialities to make the free and right choice for self-flourishing. Aristotle writes: “Choice seems to relate to the things that are in our own power”. What kinds of things and activities are in our own power and are happiness and rhythm among them? What kinds of elements are included for reaching happiness? Does human have potentiality to change these elements and choose others? How to make the right choice? These questions form bridges between ancient and current cultural environments. Aristotle's answer is that for different persons there are natural different choices changing in every particular situation. However, any right choice explores continence, deliberation, practical wisdom and rational principle. Eudaimonia (“must be some kind of contemplation”) differs from other forms of happiness: eudaimonia is the highest good for a human being having an indwelling spirit and a state of contemplative reason. The difference between happiness, pleasure and eudaimonia can be considered by identification of limits of human choice – those that are in our own power and intensity and harmony of rhythm.
Regardless of differences between Ancient polis and globalization of the XX-XXI centuries, in both of them individual happiness is viewed in connection with the social order or global structures where people find themselves in crossroads and their choices determine their further lives. Ancient ethics gives a very clear view on happiness and harmonic life; contemporary theories dedicated to the concept of happiness refer to global changes of social environment of XX-XXI centuries: consumer society of homo faber. Regardless of human aspirations to live an unhurried life, the speed of rhythm requires finding a more appropriate way of life making resonance between dynamics of age and the inner constitution of human.

Višnja Knežević

Eudaimonia, Pleasure and the Defeat of Particularity

In the times where the predominant description of the world has become that of the so-called “post-truth” reality, all the questions on the possibilities of leading a fulfilled life, the life of εὐδαιμονία, seem to have become irrelevant, if not unattainable. This is due to the reason that εὐδαιμονία, as such, intrinsically involves a connection with the truth and the universal. On the other hand, the concept of a fulfilled life should not exclude subjective happiness. The latter has always been intertwined with the concept of pleasure. However, what the contemporary worldview has to offer is not at all the compound of pleasure and truth, the dialectics of particular and the universal. Instead, it is a paradigm of life led by undifferentiated particular pleasures, to be desired and pursued for the sole purpose of their being pleasant. Paradoxical as it may seem, the issue is not a new one. The actual dictate of hedonism is but a contemporary reflection of the ancient, Cyrenaic and Epicurean ethics.

First I will point out the differences between the two types of hedonism, the Cyrenaic and the Epicurean one, focusing on their actual relevance. Then I will critically discuss the hypothesis, proposed, inter alia, by Marcuse that hedonism, if reflected, represents a historical request for material affirmation of particularity. Rather, it may be more accurately described, both historically and theoretically, as a manifestation of the desire for asylum at the times of crises – a realm, which it never transcends. Moreover, I will endeavor to show that, in contrast to the times when Marcuse has written his famous essay on the critique of hedonism, the status, albeit not the essence of hedonism, has changed. Today, it has become a predominant ideology, with the sole aim of alienating the individuals from the knowledge of the truth of their situation. In the context of Platonic terminology, it has become the discourse of the Cave. Finally, founding my argument on Plato’s distinction between true and false pleasures from the *Philebus*, I will point out that, deprived of the need for truth and reflection, rather than the affirmation or *fluorit* of particularity, hedonism represents its defeat, whose final outcomes may well be outlined in the morbid imagery of de Sade.

Marianna Koshkaryan

The Ideal of Happiness in Classical Greek Poetry, Plato and in the Contemporary World

In any era, to speak about happiness, or the social ideal of happiness, is a quite difficult task.