

Abstract

This diploma thesis deals with philosophical thoughts of Aristotle and Jean-Jacques Rousseau and their views about science and art. It attempts to answer the question whether, from their perspectives, science and art proceed from human nature or not. Their opinions are very different. According to Aristotle science is a part of human nature because it comes out of natural human desire to understand. In the same way he considered art as integral to humans because it is derived from natural human ability to imitate. But according to Jean-Jacques Rousseau science and art make human nature worse. He claimed that we can't learn about human nature by observing people around us, but only after we understand how humans lived before they were changed by progress. He didn't include science and art in his description of the original human way of life because every new discover is, in his opinion, a part of destructive process of loosing simplicity of past times. The difference between Aristotle's and Rousseau's perception of human nature consisted, in my opinion, also in the fact that Aristotle made his convictions on the basis of his observations of the world unlike Rousseau who created the idea of the original human nature in his mind first and then criticized the world for it's differences from his hypothesis. Although, the purpose of this diploma thesis is not to defend nor falsify their statements about science, art and human nature, but impartially highlight the differences between their perceptions of this problem.