

ABSTRACT

The thesis deals with the question of the inequality of people in Aristotle from the point of view of the different conception of their nature. First, he gives an explanation of the paradigmatic form of the nature of *man as a man* and the goal of his life in the form of *eudaimonia*, in which he tries to show the interconnection of the two basic characteristics of man, i.e. the animal having reason (*zōon logon echon*) and the political animal (*zōon politikon*). The thesis then shows that this nature of man (especially in the context of virtue) is diametrically opposed to that of other entities. Gradually, he deals with individual deficient forms of human nature (slaves, women and barbarians) and identifies the basic assumption of their inferior status in their lack of participation in reason. The author of the thesis sees the reasons for postulating such a conception of human nature mainly in Aristotle's general method of investigation, which is based on a specific approach to phenomena, and in the way of looking at human existence in general. In the last (critical) part of the thesis, the author, following the reflections of Jacques Rancière, identifies Aristotle's political philosophy as a case of para-politics, which relies on the theory of human nature as the basic argumentative substrate for the unequal position of the members of the *polis*. Aristotle's specific way of absencing the *dēmos* (typically in the case of farmers' democracy), the fundamental need for external goods for the development of virtue, and the impossibility of explaining the nature of artisans (*banausoi*) reveals the theory of nature as a mere ideological tool justifying the position of power of the wealthy elite, and thus that Aristotle's conception of nature as such does not live up to the claim to universality.