

UDC 392.6:091

S. V. STOROZHUK^{1*}, I. M. GOYAN^{2*}^{1*}National University of Life and Environmental Sciences of Ukraine (Kyiv), e-mail : sveta0101@ukr.net;

ORCID 0000-0002-7947-6268

^{2*}Vasyl Stefanyk Precarpathian National University (Ivano-Frankivsk), e-mail ivi1970@mail.ru;

ORCID 0000-0003-2548-0488

GREEK «ΦΥΣΙΣ» AS THE BASIS OF GENDER STEREOTYPES

Purpose. Considering the fact that the concept «by nature» formed the basis of diametrically different approaches to the interpretation of the place and role of women not only in Greek society, but determined the gender relations up to this time, the article examines the features of the interpretation of the term «nature» («φύσις») in Greek outlook and the impact of natural-philosophical ideas on the evolution of gender relations of Ancient period. **Methodology** of the study is caused by interdisciplinary approach, involving not only the use of scientific methods such as analysis, synthesis and generalization and so on. Basic principles of philosophical hermeneutics, hypothetical-deductive method and contextual analysis are used at the same time. **Originality** lies in the denial of existing idea in contemporary intellectual discourse that the concept «by nature» is a conceptual prerequisite for ensuring gender inequality. Against this background, it is shown that gender equality and inequalities are both caused by the dominant in the public worldview meta-narrative paradigm and specific features of interpretation of the concept «by nature» (or «nature»). So when nature is seen in physiological or empirical sense, it establishes a pattern of gender inequality. The same can occur in cases of dogmatization and mythologizing of empiricism, which appears on the ideological level as a meta-narrative. However, when the concept of «nature» acquires metaphysical meaning and is viewed as a kind of potentiality that is actualized in the presence of favorable conditions prerequisites of gender equality are emerging. **Conclusions.** Having considered the proposed by Greek philosophy approaches to gender interaction as a kind of stereotypes, we conclude that the development of gender relations in individual historical terms was caused by the specificity of the dominant narrative of life and world order.

Keywords: sex; gender; nature; «φύσις»; «nomos»; myth; virtues; space; state; inequality; coercion

Topicality

Fundamental changes that have taken place in the public consciousness of the postmodern era, would completely destroy the traditional stereotypes about the role of men and women beginning in socio-cultural existence, assured by the idea of gender equality.

However, the destruction process of gender bias and stereotypes occurs not only situationally, but also accompanied by a number of contradictory phenomena. Thus, there has remained distinct up to this day the intention to preserve the traditional patriarchal foundations of social interaction, which is usually supported not only by representatives of «strong» but «weaker» sex.

However, at the level of everyday life and intellectual discourse there has been recorded a kind of «crisis of masculinity» [18], accompanied by a sharp criticism of men. More and more frequently one can hear accusations addressed to the traditionally dominant sex that they do not meet the demands of the time, its image, group identity and values are outdated and do not cor-

respond to the idea of a «real man». At the same time there continue to exist and develop idealized notions of «true (or eternal) love», «true friendship», «image of femininity» and so on. In other words, despite the death of «meta-narrative», which is the main characteristic of the postmodern era, peculiar worldview dogmatism is inherently present in early societies, which usually is the basis of mythological thinking [20, p.13].

Reception of mythological dogmatism regarding the role and importance of femininity and masculinity in social and cultural existence of modern society actualize research, on the one hand, of patterns of gender changes taking place today, and on the other hand, of the ideological and socio-cultural factors that contributed to the development and strengthening of patriarchal aspects of women (or men) in the family and society. At the same time, we believe, that the question of the internal perception of the woman of her own state and the factors that contributed to the change in attitude of both sexes as for

СОЦІАЛЬНА ФІЛОСОФІЯ ТА ФІЛОСОФІЯ ІСТОРІЇ

their places in the world is relevant and timely [29].

Much attention is paid to dogmatism inherent to gender problems, which even today is perceived by society and both sexes, not as a repressive factor, but as quite natural phenomenon that stems from human nature and characteristics of their functions in society.

In other words, the concept of a «real man» and the subordinate place of a woman and the «image of femininity», are manifested in the form of myth or dogmatic «image of the individual» [20, p.13] that is permanently manifested in different historical and socio-cultural periods either as a kind of gender stereotypes, or as a live and natural reality. In our opinion, each of the above cases concerns underlined by Alexander Losev [20, p.13] fetishisation even typical of the ancient thinking concepts «by nature» and gender equality. We come across the understanding of these problems and projects of their decision for the first time in the works of Plato and Aristotle, who make the polar conclusions justifying the concept «by nature». For example, Plato in the Socratic dialogue «Republic» or «Politeia» revealing the image of the ideal state, states about the need for gender equality, which justifies the principle «by nature». It is significant that this concept is interpreted in a broad anthropological dimension by a philosopher, as Plato is talking not about the «nature» of a man and a woman, but the «nature» of a person, that varies little by gender [23, p.145]. It is interesting that the philosopher justifies this idea not only by his own philosophical principles of philosophical concepts, but also on the basis of the observation of natural world, particularly wild-life.

Thus, taking into account the fact that the forces of nature are equally present in both sexes, Plato argues that women can be engaged in the same activities as men can. For example, according to Plato, women can equally with men hold public office, be engaged in military service and national defense as well as get the same education as men do. The woman, according to the philosopher must learn not only music, but also do gymnastics and military affairs (art). However, a philosopher is fully aware that his thoughts can cause confusion, because they are contrary to the customary rules of the Greek so-

ciety [23, p.133].

Unlike Plato, Aristotle, using the same conceptual framework «by nature», develops a more moderate approach. He believes that a man and a woman, as well as slave and free, have a different nature, and therefore the level of social life cannot be equal. For example, in the process of conception a man gives the child a «form» (a soul), and a woman gives only «substance» (a body).

Based on the fact that the soul is «better» by nature, it has a divine origin and determines the «nature» of a person, Aristotle concludes that women and men were separated from each other, while justifying the existence of two different genders [1].

Moreover, according to the philosopher, even giving a birth to a child the woman plays a minimum role because without a man she is nothing more than a «sterile male» [1]. Thus, the philosopher proves, that «femininity should be seen as a natural disadvantage» [1], passive substance, which does not have its own place in the structure of the universe without acquiring a form, i.e. without a combination with masculinity. This combination occurs in the family, which, on the one hand, keeps updated the natural potency of a woman who bears and gives birth to children, but on the other hand – leaving them at the level of casualty, which does not allow women to occupy an important place in the social life, leaving for her only the household sphere [3, p.73].

Despite the natural inequality of men and women, Aristotle is still not inclined to regard the woman as a slave of a man. On the contrary, he is convinced that the domination of men over women, can be compared with the supremacy of a ruler over free citizens in the Republic. Moreover, in the «Politics» Aristotle repeatedly underlines the supremacy of a man over a woman, emphasizing the need for regulation of the rights of women, who make up half of the population of each state [3, p.35].

However, unlike Plato, who proves equal civil rights for men and women, Aristotle holds a more moderate position, leaving women the right to education – music and gymnastics, and housekeeping. In other words, Aristotle revealing features of social and particularly gender relations remains in mythological syncretism

СОЦІАЛЬНА ФІЛОСОФІЯ ТА ФІЛОСОФІЯ ІСТОРІЇ

and dogmatism, which examine the social structure as a kind of a natural reflection of life [26, p.35] or kosmos (natural order) [28]. Accordingly, expansion of women's activity leads to the destruction of cosmic order, it is due to the fact that the woman has virtues different from man: for women silence is a virtue [3, p.34], but it contributes little to political activity. The same true is assentation characteristic for a woman which can be considered as a virtue in family life, while in the political sphere it even leads to the destruction of tyranny [3, p.108].

Overall, Aristotle revealing his own attitude to women does not go beyond the traditional ancient ideas and believes that she has to be limited only to household. Xenophon had these and even more conservative views. According to V. Buzeskula [7, p.26], he reveals a true value of the role and functions of women in ancient society most accurately. For example, the philosopher, using the already mentioned concept «by nature» proves the impossibility of social equality between men and women as inherent virtues and activities are different, though equally important to social life meaning.

So, a woman was created by God for household, that is why God created her more loving to children, more fearful, whereas a man was born for activities «outside the home» because he has the courage. In other words, Xenophon believes that men and women are equally important for the development of the society, and the scope of their activities and social functions are so different that do not require a comparison [19].

Representatives of different genders have different nature, and therefore their activity is manifested in different, but equally important social areas. This intention is rather eloquently highlighted by Homer, who, describing the parting of Hector and Andromache quite clearly shows the place of women in contemporary society.

So you should go into the house, keep busy with your proper work, with your loom and wool, telling your servants to set about their tasks.

War will be every man's concern, especially mine, of all those who live in Troy» [12].

There are also similar words in the «Odyssey». In particular, when Penelope came down to feast gathering and asked the singer to stop a

song about returning Greeks from Troy, Telemachus told her:

«Go back to your quarters. Tend to your own tasks, the distaff and the loom, and keep the women working hard as well. As for giving orders, men will see to that, but I most of all: I hold the reins of power in this house.

«Astonished, she withdrew to her own room. She took to heart the clear good sense in what her son had said. Climbing up to the lofty chamber with her women, she fell to weeping for Odysseus, her beloved husband» [13].

One can come across equally unambiguous assessment of the role and social importance of women in the Greek world in the Homer's assessment of family relations between Alcinous and Arete, he «honors her as no woman is honored on this earth, of all the wives now keeping households under their husbands' sway» [13].

The remarks made is a direct evidence of gender inequality typical of ancient society. The rights and duties of women were usually limited by spheres of family and household there. However, taking into account the remarks of Plato, we can assume that during the Athenian hegemony and formation of classical philosophy, gender situation starts to change fundamentally. The most illustrative evidence of this is dramatic work of that time. For example, in the tragedy «Alkestis» Euripides magnifies Alkestidy's sacrifice for the sake her husband's salvation [14]. Equally glorifying is Iphigenia's patriotism, who sacrificed her life for the salvation of the homeland [16]. However, in «Hecuba» [14] Polyxena gives her life only in order not to get into slavery. Sophocle's 'Antigone' contains the same intention to emancipation [25].

Despite clearly revealed intention of the Greek society of the classical era to release women from external coercion, according to Marx, the Greeks were still 'barbarians in relation to the woman in the heyday of their civilization; education of women was superficial, it was forbidden for them to communicate with the opposite sex, they were so persistently convinced of their imperfections, that eventually they accepted it as a fact.

His wife was not an equal friend to her husband, but was in a position of a daughter»[21, p.251]. According to E. Verdyman, instead, during the days of Alexander Macedonian the

СОЦІАЛЬНА ФІЛОСОФІЯ ТА ФІЛОСОФІЯ ІСТОРІЇ

movement for freedom and certain rights of Greek women appeared as if continuing the thoughts of Marx [8, p.87]. In general, B. Bezeskul agrees with these findings and focuses on the fact that the woman in Greek society was not eligible, and had no rights. However, the researcher is still inclined to believe that on the level of family life, the woman had an equal place with her husband and was hardly aware of her humiliating position [7, p.10]. We come across the subordinate position of women in the Greek society in the researches of P. Bruhl [6], S. Blendel [27] P. Perlman [33] E. Lunn [32] J. Davidson [31] M. Scott [34], etc.

Emphasizing a clear gender inequality of the Greek society, researchers generally do not pay attention to the fact how women perceived the limitation their opportunities, or, in the case of P. Perlman, see it as quite natural, so in the Greek society, despite the high development of democratic relations, special resistance was not observed. Of course, our conclusion reveals only general intentions of the vast majority of the Greek society, since the movement for gender equality is still evident and probably begins in the period of Plato activity. In this context, it is impossible to ignore Aspasia, who was considered to be a guide of Socrates, as she was described in the dialogue «Feast» by the philosopher [23]. Besides, perhaps it is this intention for emancipation became a social and cultural basis of Aristophanes comedy «Women in national assembly» [4] and Ferekrata «Tyranny». Ancient playwrights tried to show the effects of activities carried out against nature in a comic form. Significantly, according to the majority of these researchers the problems of nature, and in particular physiological characteristics of a person, have become a major ground of gender inequality in the Greek society. Perhaps it is because Hippocrates, describing the treatment of female diseases often appeals to pregnancy as the main drug of a sexually mature woman [11]. P. Perlman [33] and S. Blendel [27] explained gender inequality in ancient Greece at the same theoretical background.

Purpose

Considering the fact that the concept «by nature» formed the basis of diametrically different approaches to the interpretation of the place and

role of women not only in the Greek society, but determined the gender relations up to this time, we consider it appropriate to reveal features of its interpretation from the Greek outlook and explicate impact of natural-philosophical ideas on the evolution of gender relations in the ancient period.

Methodology

The methodology of study is determined by the interdisciplinary approach, involving not only the use of scientific methods such as analysis, synthesis and generalization and so on. At the same the basic principles of philosophical hermeneutics, hypothetical-deductive method and contextual analysis are used in the paper.

Main Material Presentation

In the contemporary intellectual discourse there dominates biased assessment of the approaches that justify the uniqueness of gender issues against the background of the concept «by nature». Typically, these approaches show a pattern of «natural» distribution of male and female roles in society, the family.

This distribution is determined by the differences of «nature» (it is usually about the physiological differences) of both sexes, and which leads to the formation of gender determined abilities and needs, at the same time confirming subordinate, dependent role of a woman. According to J. Davidson it is on the basis of this interpretation of «nature» gender relations in the ancient society were formed [30]. C. Blendel [27] and Mr. Perlman [33] came to the similar conclusions, they focus primarily on the fact that gender relations in the Greek society were built on the background of physiological differences. There is no reason to doubt these findings, at the first sight, in fact, according to A. Ahutina, the first natural philosophers studying nature that was termed «φύσις», interpreted it as the world or as something that stands outside the world. Nature in natural philosophy was generally regarded as something inherent to the thing (or phenomenon) [5, p.111].

So, if we take into account the work of Hippocrates (Pseudo-Hippocrates) «On the air, water and ground» [10], the typical description of various areas of human and characteristic dis-

СОЦІАЛЬНА ФІЛОСОФІЯ ТА ФІЛОСОФІЯ ІСТОРІЇ

eases for these areas immediately attracts attention. This gave grounds for the philosopher to assert that the nature («φύσις») of the country or area determines the nature («φύσις») of population, which has its own temperament, character, especially physiology and even a predisposition to certain diseases. We come across similar excursions of the environment in the «History» of Herodotus, who describing in detail features of each area, concludes about characteristics of the population and its physiological and psychological characteristics [9].

It is worth noting that Herodotus, as well as Hippocrates, speaking about the «nature» of the area, and the human nature generated by it, imply not an abstract concept of «nature» or nature in general, but the nature of specific areas, limited in space and specific geographical conditions. The same applies to the characteristics of the nature of the people who inhabit it. Therefore, there is every reason to agree with A. Ahutinym that ancient natural philosophers and thinkers interpreted area as a closed world in which there is a combination of different «natures» that form a new clearly defined human nature [5, p.114]. Therefore, we have the opportunity to suggest that geographical conditions and climate challenges form peculiar metric that provides very specific nature of a person. It is likely, it also concerns not just the role of a natural habitat, but tribal affiliation of a person, i.e. nature of a generation, which is manifested in a person's appearance, in this way being as his appearance – look [5, p.114].

Thus, in case when «nature» («φύσις») of a human is determined by the characteristics physiology and appearance, «nature» of men and women are different, and so quite naturally they take their own place in the socio-cultural dimension. In addition, female is unlikely to be aware of their dependence whose subordination is defined by their nature, as the peculiarities of life are rather dictated by belief in the inviolability of a myth as «symbolically given intelligence of life» [20, p.74] than by external coercion. Thus, the subordination of women in the ancient society is actualized as not a manifestation of gender discrimination, but as logical and intuitively obvious «way her personality».

In fact, when «nature» («φύσις») of a person is seen through the prism of physiological char-

acteristics and appearance, gender inequality is quite legitimate, but it is inequality only in the context of our perception, as within the framework full of mythological dogma, it will not be perceived as inequality but as a definite place and role of each of the genders in the social and cultural existence. However, the latter will always be perceived as a closed Space (order) in space and time that during the Homer period was considered as any systematization or efficient arrangement of parts [28]. Accordingly, the public organization was seen as a cosmic entity that had effectively placed elements.

Rationality of our conclusions would not cause doubt in the case, if the term «φύσις» was static and did not provide other meaningful loading. However, in reality it was not so, because it was used even when it was about free and unlimited self-development of available potentials that determined its key ability (potency). Thus, the term «φύσις» could be sometimes used when it dealt with implemented natural features, which on the anthropological level were manifested in the ability to deal with certain cases. At the same time, according to A. Ahutina, each of the above meanings was actualized according to the context, the understanding of which was determined by the content of «φύσις» [5, p.115].

The set «from the age» gender and social order was seen as obvious without causing any doubt and resistance until the end of the Greco-Persian wars. However, immediately after them significant transformations are outlined in the policy system that led to the weakening of political and economic power of the old aristocracy of «blood» and strengthened the role of the middle strata of the urban society – they begin to participate actively in the political life causing the need for transformation of education, which would facilitate the rise of a new way to «ἀρετή» («charity») [17].

This mission is known to have been undertaken by sophists who for the first time in the ancient discourse actualized dichotomy «φύσις» / «NOMOS» («φύσις» / «νομός» («Nature» / «custom»)) [5, p.116]. Approximately at the same time, there appears «History» by Herodotus, where, alongside with «φύσις» population of a given region, the historian constantly emphasizes its laws. Thus, from the classical era of the Greek culture, world or space is shared and a

СОЦІАЛЬНА ФІЛОСОФІЯ ТА ФІЛОСОФІЯ ІСТОРІЇ

person begins immediately belong to two worlds – social (policy, the life of which is caused by custom and law) and nature (areas). However, according to A. Ahutina, the two independent beginnings mutually determine the characteristics and place of a person in the human world [5, p.116].

Social and cultural transformation of the classical period of ancient Greek culture reached its peak of development in philosophy. For example, going back to Plato and his understanding of the place and role of women in the ancient society, the following words of the philosopher draw attention, «we courageously, and eristicaly, insist that a nature that is not the same must not have the same practices. But we didn't make any sort of consideration of what form of different and same nature, and applying to what, we were distinguishing when we assigned different practices to a different nature and the same ones to the same... Then, the philosopher said, if they differ in this alone, that the female bears and the male mounts, we'll assert that it has not thereby yet been proved that a woman differs from a man with respect to what we're talking about [24, p. 146].

At the same time we should draw attention to the fact that human nature in the «Republic by» Plato is not limited to physiological characteristics and acquires potency content, power that can be actualized under certain circumstances. In other words, «φύσις» within the Platonic idealism, is a kind of pre-logical experience of being (eidos), which is manifested as the true nature («φύσις») of a person.

Depriving «nature» of purely physiological content there forms the foundation for the establishment of metaphysical «nature» («φύσις»), but does not lead it to the understanding as the universal and external as for objects and phenomena of power. Plato, as well as in his predecessors, states «φύσις» is always the nature of «something» that is at the same time subordinate to the common good as the most general ideas. Perhaps it is the reason why Plato states the following speaking about the state: «the same classes that are in the city are in the soul of each one severally and that their number is equal... the private man be wise in the same way and because of the same thing as the city was wise» [23, p.133].

In other words, according to Plato everything is subordinated to Good, potency of which is actualized due to natural (physiological instincts), and as a result education. Accordingly, it is this approach to the understanding of «nature», that opens opportunity for asserting by him preconditions of gender equality. It should be noted that this concept is subsequently presented in the medieval world view and, in particular, philosophy of Gregory of Nyssa. On the basis of words from the Bible «... then God said, «Let us make mankind in our image, in our likeness, so that they may rule over the fish in the sea and the birds in the sky, over the livestock and all the wild animals, and over all the creatures that move along the ground. So God created man in His own image; in the image of God He created him; male and female He created them» (Genesis 1:26, 27), speaks about the unity of the original «image and likeness» of God in a person. The theologian says, «Beauty is divine not in external features, not in the pleasant looking person and not in the shine, but is seen in the ineffable bliss of virtues» [22]. In other words, according to Gregory of Nyssa and Plato, division into gender concerns not spiritual but the physical nature of a person, at the same time the priority of the spiritual over the material is confirmed.

The rise of the spiritual human nature gave Plato the possible to talk about a relative character of the custom, which has the ability both to actualize a natural potency of Eidos (soul) and to slow them down, while justifying the feasibility of gender equality. Despite the rationality of Plato conclusions in the perspective of our time, it was extremely difficult in the light of the then philosophical views to recognize the validity of his conclusions, which clearly showed the creative legacy of Aristotle. As it has been stated, in relation to gender he held a more moderate position in comparison with Plato position. For example, Aristotle believed that the idealism of his predecessors was not able to explain the conditions of living and the appearance of the variety of things. To resolve this issue, the philosopher turns to contemporary natural philosophy, rethinking it conceptually. Thus, unlike his predecessors, Aristotle proves inability of explanatory power of material beginning of the world, as substance by itself does not presuppose move-

СОЦІАЛЬНА ФІЛОСОФІЯ ТА ФІЛОСОФІЯ ІСТОРІЇ

ment, which is the start and the end of the «φύσις» implementation. Furthermore, in the spirit of Plato, Aristotle substantiates the existing world order, which appears as a kind of generalized unity of individual things and its unity, that is kept in integrity due expediency though on a different conceptual framework [5, p.175, 176].

Based on these premises, there is every reason to believe that Aristotle, preserving idea of «something natural» characteristic for natural philosophy or nature of each specific things, shows «φύσις» of integral objects and phenomena on the natural unity of its parts. Thus, coming back to the remarks on human nature, which in this case should be formed on the basis of the nature of its components – features of the body structure, we can assume that no single human nature can exist [1], and so even joint education and training of men and women will precondition different virtues that define the place of both genders in the social structure.

On the other hand, the subordinate role of women could be justified on the background of understanding «φύσις», which according to Aristotle, is the beginning of all this things, generating the movement of the last [5, p.139-140]. As the result, it is clear that the subordinate position of women whose nature was realized primarily in the reproduction of the family, was explained by the that she like the passive substance cannot be the beginning of another person.

This beginning, or form is given by a man who makes the substance, which is implemented by the appearance of a child. However, a woman still remains the basis, passive source of the human race, which on the social level was reconstructed through the family where she acquired her integral place.

Scientific novelty

Having analyzed the gender issues of the ancient society through the prism of the concept «by nature», it becomes quite obvious that its solution depends on the particular interpretation of the meaning of the concept «nature», causing the formation of different views on gender issues. So when nature is viewed in physiological or empirical sense, it establishes a pattern of gender inequality. The same can occur in cases

of dogmatization and mythologizing of empiricism, which appears on the ideological level as a meta-narrative. However, when the concept «nature» acquires metaphysical meaning and is viewed as a kind of potency that is actualized in the presence of favorable conditions preconditions of gender equality are formed.

In contemporary intellectual discourse there was denied the idea that the concept «by nature» is a conceptual prerequisite for ensuring gender inequality. Against this background, it is shown that gender equality and inequalities are caused by the dominant worldview in the public and features meta-narrative paradigm interpretation of the concept «by nature» (or «nature»).

Conclusions

Revealing the features of gender relations in the Greek society, there was identified their dependence by content of the concept «by nature», which at that time was implemented in the term «φύσις» in the intellectual discourse. On this background some aspects of the evolution of the term are shown and it was stressed that its contents was defined by the specific empirical character for a long time. For example, the interpretation of «φύσις» in mythological and natural philosophy period as preconditioned by geographical or physiological (natural) characteristics of external characteristics of things have sustained gender inequality, but did not contribute to discrimination against women, who considered her place in the social structure of being as quite natural.

Social and cultural transformations of the ancient society of the classical period, cause the formation of new ways of acquiring charity, preconditioning rethinking of the concept «nature» in general and «nature» of a person, which appears the result of not only natural, but historically variable customary norms. Trying to overcome the relative nature of a person and the world, Plato offers original concept of emanation of Good, potency of which to varying degrees is manifested in people and society. However, his proposed deductive approach to the world structure has provided ideas about the availability of human nature, as opposed to the nature of men and women.

The inability of the Platonic idealism to explain the contradiction of ontological and meta-

СОЦІАЛЬНА ФІЛОСОФІЯ ТА ФІЛОСОФІЯ ІСТОРІЇ

physical was the main reason for reconsideration of Aristotle's ideas of natural philosophy, on the basis of which he proposed understanding of «nature» («φύσις») as rising of early development of things in the light of expediency, thereby denying the foundations for the establishment of the concept of «human nature» and the implementation of gender equality on social and cultural level.

Explicating proposed by Plato and Aristotle concepts of gender interaction, as a kind of stereotypes we have every reason to believe that the development of gender relations in certain historical terms was due to the originality of the dominant narrative of life and world order.

LIST OF REFERENCE LINKS

1. Аристотель. О возникновении животных [Electronic resource] / Аристотель [пер. с греч., вступительная статья и примечания В. П. Карпова]. – Москва; Ленинград : Издательство Академии наук СССР, 1940. – Кн. 2. – С. 90–125. – Available at: <http://simposium.ru/ru/node/978>. – Title from the screen. – Accessed: 15.12.2016.
2. Аристотель. Нікомахова етика [Electronic resource] / Аристотель [пер. з давньогр. В. Ставнюка]. – Київ : Аквілон-Плюс, 2002. – 480 с. – Available at: http://aelib.org.ua/texts/aristoteles_nicomachean_ethics_ua.htm. – Title from the screen. – Accessed: 15.12.2016.
3. Аристотель. Політика [Electronic resource] / Аристотель [пер. з давньогр. та передм. О. Кислюка]. – Київ : Основи, 2000. – 239 с. – Available at: <http://litopys.org.ua/aristotle/arist.htm>. – Title from the screen. – Accessed: 15.12.2016.
4. Аристофан. Женщины в народном собрании [Electronic resource] / Аристофан // Комедии и фрагменты. – Москва : Ладомир; Наука, 2000. – Available at: http://royallib.com/read/aristofan/genshchini_v_narodnom_sobranii.html#0 – Title from the screen. – Accessed: 15.12.2016.
5. Ахутин, А. В. Понятие «природа» в античности и в Новое время («фюсис» и «натура») / А. Ахутин. – Москва : Наука, 1988. – 208 с.
6. Брюле, П. Повседневная жизнь греческих женщин в классическую эпоху [Electronic resource] / П. Брюле. – Available at: http://royallib.com/read/bryule_per/povsednevna_ya_gizn_grecheshkih_genshchin_v_klassicheskoy_epoxy.html#0. – Title from the screen. – Accessed: 15.12.2016.
7. Бузескул, В. П. Женский вопрос в древней Греции / В. Бузескул. – Харьков : Кн. маг. П. А. Брейтигама, 1905. – 42 с.
8. Вардиман, Е. Женщина в древнем мире / Е. Вардиман. – Москва : Наука, Глав. ред. восточн. лит-ры, 1990. – 335 с.
9. Геродот. История. Кн. 4: Мельпомена [Electronic resource] / Геродот. – Available at: <http://vehi.net/istoriya/grecia/gerodot/04.html>. – Title from the screen. – Accessed: 15.12.2016.
10. Гиппократ, О воздухах, водах и местностях / Гиппократ // Гиппократ Избранные книги. – Москва; Ленинград : Государственное издательство биологической и медицинской литературы, 1936. – С. 275-307.
11. Гиппократ. Про жіночі хвороби [Electronic resource] / Гиппократ [пер. з гр. І. Руднев]. – Available at: <http://bibliograph.com.ua/426hippo/35.htm>. – Title from the screen. – Accessed: 15.12.2016.
12. Гомер. Іліада [Electronic resource] / Гомер [пер. з давньогр. Б. Тена]. – Харків : Фоліо, 2006. – Available at: http://www.aelib.org.ua/texts/homer_iliad_ua.htm#06. – Title from the screen. – Accessed: 15.12.2016.
13. Гомер. Одиссея [Electronic resource] / Гомер. – Харків : Фоліо, 2001. – Available at: http://aelib.org.ua/texts/homer_odyssey_ua.htm#15. – Title from the screen. – Accessed: 15.12.2016.
14. Еврипид. Алкеста [Electronic resource] / Еврипид [пер. з давньогр. А. Содомори] // Еврипид. Трагедії. – Київ : Основи, 1993. – Available at: http://www.aelib.org.ua/texts/euripides_alcestis_ua.htm#01. – Title from the screen. – Accessed: 15.12.2016.
15. Еврипид. Гекуба [Electronic resource] / Еврипид // Трагедии: в 2-х т. – Москва : Наука; Ладомир, 1999. – Т. 1. – Available at: <https://bookmate.com/reader/evHzQc57>. – Title from the screen. – Accessed: 15.12.2016.
16. Еврипид. Ифигения в Тавриде [Electronic resource] / Еврипид // Трагедии: в 2-х т. – Москва : Наука; Ладомир, 1999. – Т. 1. – Available at: http://royallib.com/read/evripid/ifigeniya_v_tavr_ide.html#0. – Title from the screen. – Accessed: 15.12.2016.
17. Йегер, В. Пайдейя. Воспитание античного грека. Книга вторая. Вершина и кризис аттического духа. Софисты [Electronic resource] / В. Йегер [пер. с нем. А. И. Любжина]. – Москва : Греко-латинский кабинет Ю. А. Шичалина, 2001. – 393 с. – Available at: http://www.aelib.org.ua/texts/yeager_paideiya_ua.htm#17. – Title from the screen. – Accessed: 15.12.2016.

СОЦІАЛЬНА ФІЛОСОФІЯ ТА ФІЛОСОФІЯ ІСТОРІЇ

- <http://www.portal-slovo.ru/philology/37472.php>. – Title from the screen. – Accessed: 15.12.2016.
18. Кон, И. Мужчина в меняющемся мире [Electronic resource] / И. Кон. – Москва : Время, 2007. – 496 с. – Available at: http://www.e-reading.club/chapter.php/104262/2/Кон_-_Muzhchina_v_menyayushchemsya_mire.html. – Title from the screen. – Accessed: 15.12.2016.
 19. Ксенофонт. Домострой [Electronic resource] / Ксенофонт [пер. с древнегр. С. И. Соболевского] // Ксенофонт. Сократические сочинения. Киропедия. – Москва : Ладомир, 2003. – Available at: http://www.gumer.info/bibliotek_Buks/Culture/Article/ksen_dom.php. – Title from the screen. – Accessed: 15.12.2016.
 20. Лосев, А. Ф. Философия. Мифология. Культура / А. Лосев. – Москва : Политиздат, 1991. – 525 с.
 21. Маркс, К. Сочинения. Издание 2. / К. Маркс, Ф. Энгельс. – Москва : Прогресс, 1984. – Т. 45 – 474 с.
 22. Нисский, Г. Об устройении человека [Electronic resource] / Г. Нисский. – Available at: http://azbyka.ru/otechnik/Grigorij_Nisskij/ob_usstroenii_cheloveka/#0_6. – Title from the screen. – Accessed: 15.12.2016.
 23. Платон. Держава [Electronic resource] / Платон [пер. з давньогр. Д. Коваль]. – Київ : Основи, 2000. – 355 с. – Available at: <http://litopys.org.ua/plato/plat.htm>. – Title from the screen. – Accessed: 15.12.2016.
 24. Платон. Пир [Electronic resource] / Платон // Платон. Собр. соч. в 4-х т. – Москва : Мысль, 1993. – Т. 2. – Available at: <http://psylib.org.ua/books/plato01/20pir.htm>. – Title from the screen. – Accessed: 15.12.2016.
 25. Софокл. Антігона [Electronic resource] / Софокл [пер. з давньогр. Б. Тена] // Давньогрецька трагедія. – Київ : Дніпро, 1981. – С. 119-166. – Available at: http://ae-lib.org.ua/texts/sophocles__antigone__ua.htm. – Title from the screen. – Accessed: 15.12.2016.
 26. Сумцов, Н. Ф. О свадебных обрядах, преимущественно русских / Н. Сумцов. – Харьков : Типография Л. В. Попова, 1881. – 206 с.
 27. Blundell, S. Vision and Viewing in Ancient Greece / S. Blundell, D. Cairns, N. Rabinowitz // Special issue of Helios – 2013. – Vol. 40, No. 1-2. – 346 p.
 28. Charles, H. K. Anaximander and the Origins of Greek Cosmology / H. Kahn Charles. – New York : Columbia University Press, 1960. – 272 p.
 29. Danylova, T. V. Towards gender equality: Ukraine in the 21st century / T. V. Danylova // Антропологические измерения философских исследований. – 2013. – №4. – P. 43–51.
 30. Davidson, J. Bodymaps: Sexing Space and Zoning Gender in Ancient Athens / J. Davidson // Gender & History. – 2011. – Vol. 23, Iss. 3. – P. 597–614. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-0424.2011.01659.x
 31. Davidson, J. Politics, poetics, and erôs in archaic poetry / J. Davidson // Erôs and the polis. – London : Institute of Classical Studies, University of London, 2013. – P. 5-37.
 32. Lanni, A. Law and Order in Ancient Athens / A. Lanni. – Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 2016. – 294 p. doi: 10.1017/CBO9781139048194
 33. Perlman, P. Gortyn. The First Seven Hundred Years, Part II. The Laws from the Temple of Apollo Pythios / P. Perlman // Even More Studies in the Ancient Greek Polis. – Stuttgart : Franz Steiner Verlag, 2002. – P. 187 – 227
 34. Scott, M. The Rise of Women in Ancient Greece [Electronic resource] / M. Scott // History Today. – 2009. – Vol. 59, Iss. 11. – P. 36-40. – Available at: <http://www.historytoday.com/michael-scott/rise-women-ancient-greece>. – Title from the screen. – Accessed: 15.12.2016.

С. В. СТОРОЖУК^{1*}, І. М. ГОЯН^{2*}

^{1*}Національний університет біоресурсів і природокористування України (Київ), ел. пошта : sveta0101@ukr.net; ORCID 0000-0002-7947-6268

^{2*}Прикарпатський національний університет імені Василя Стефаника (Івано-Франківськ), ел. пошта ivi1970@mail.ru; ORCID 0000-0003-2548-0488

ДАВНЬОГРЕЦЬКА «ΦΥΣΙΣ» ЯК ОСНОВА ФОРМУВАННЯ ГЕНДЕРНИХ СТЕРЕОТИПІВ

Мета роботи. Зважаючи на те, що концепт «за природою» ліг в основу полярно відмінних підходів до тлумачення місця та ролі жінки не тільки у давньогрецькому суспільстві, але визначав гендерні відносини аж до нашого часу, в статті досліджуються особливості тлумачення терміну «природа» («φύσις») в давньог-

СОЦІАЛЬНА ФІЛОСОФІЯ ТА ФІЛОСОФІЯ ІСТОРІЇ

рецькому світогляді та есплікується вплив натурфілософських уявлень на еволюцію гендерних відносин античного періоду. **Методологія** дослідження обумовлена міждисциплінарним підходом, який передбачає використання не тільки таких загальнонаукових методів як аналіз, синтез та узагальнення тощо. Поряд з цим у роботі використані засадничі принципи філософської герменевтики, гіпотетико-дедуктивний та метод контекстуального аналізу. **Наукова новизна** полягає у спростуванні наявної у сучасному інтелектуальному дискурсі думки про те, що концепт «за природою» є концептуальною передумовою утвердження гендерної нерівності. На цьому тлі показано, що утвердження гендерної рівності та нерівності зумовлене пануючим у суспільному світогляді метанаративом та особливостями парадигмального тлумачення концепту «за природою» (або «природа»). Так, коли, природа розглядається у фізіологічному або емпіричному змісті, вона утверджує закономірність гендерної нерівності. Теж може проявлятися у випадках догматизації та міфологізації емпіризму, який проявляється на світоглядному рівні у вигляді метанаративу. Натомість, коли поняття «природа», набуває метафізичного змісту і проглядається у вигляді своєрідної потенції, що актуалізується за наявності сприятливих умов, формуються передумови утвердження гендерної рівності. **Висновки.** Розглянувши запропоновані в давньогрецькій філософії підходи до гендерної взаємодії, як своєрідні стереотипи, приходимо до висновку, що розвиток гендерних відносин в конкретно-історичному вимірі був обумовлений своєрідністю пануючого нарративу буття та світопорядку.

Ключові слова: стать; гендер; природа; «φύσις»; «νομος»; міф; чесноти; космос; держава; нерівність; примус

С. В. СТОРОЖУК^{1*}, И. Н. ГОЯН^{2*}

^{1*}Национальный университет биоресурсов и природопользования Украины (Киев), эл. почта : sveta0101@ukr.net; ORCID 0000-0002-7947-6268

^{2*}Прикарпатский национальный университет имени Василия Стефаника (Ивано-Франковск), эл. почта ivi1970@mail.ru; ORCID 0000-0003-2548-0488

ДРЕВНЕГРЕЧЕСКАЯ «ФЮЗИС» КАК ОСНОВА ГЕНДЕРНЫХ СТЕРЕОТИПОВ

Цель работы. Принимая во внимание то, что концепт «по природе» лег в основу полярных подходов к толкованию места и роли женщины не только в древнегреческом обществе, но определял гендерные отношения до нашего времени, в статье исследуются особенности толкования термина «природа» («фюзис») в древнегреческом мировоззрении и эксплицируется влияние натурфилософских представлений на эволюцию гендерных отношений античного периода. **Методология** исследования обусловлена междисциплинарным подходом, который предусматривает использование не только таких общенаучных методов как анализ, синтез, обобщение и др. Наряду с этим в работе использованы основные принципы философской герменевтики, гипотетико-дедуктивный и метод контекстуального анализа. **Научная новизна** заключается в опровержении имеющейся в современном интеллектуальном дискурсе мысли о том, что концепт «по природе» является концептуальной предпосылкой утверждения гендерного неравенства. С этой целью показано, что утверждение гендерного равенства и неравенства обусловлено господствующим в общественном мировоззрении метанаративом и особенностями парадигмального толкования концепта «по природе» (или «природа»). Так, когда природа («фюзис») рассматривается в физиологическом или эмпирическом смысле, она утверждает закономерность гендерного неравенства. Тоже может проявляться в случаях догматизации и мифологизации эмпиризма который проявляется на мировоззренческом уровне в виде метанаратива. Однако, когда понятие «природа», приобретает метафизического содержания и просматривается в виде своеобразной потенции, актуализируется при наличии благоприятных условий, формируются предпосылки утверждения гендерного равенства, поскольку движение мысли здесь происходит методом дедукции, предусматривая одновременно определенную эманацию в каждом единичном сущем, присущих общему миропорядку аксиологических характеристик. **Выводы.** Рассмотрев предложенные в античной философии подходы к гендерному взаимодействию, как своеобразным стереотипам, делается вывод, что развитие гендерных отношений в конкретно-историческом измерении было обусловлено своеобразием господствующего нарратива бытия и миропорядка.

Ключевые слова: пол; гендер; природа; «фюзис»; «νομος»; миф; добродетель; космос; государство; неравенство; принуждение

REFERENCES

1. Aristotel. *O vznikovenii zhyvotnykh* [About animals occurrence]. Available at: <http://simposium.ru/ru/node/978>. (Accessed 12 August 2016)..
2. Aristotel. *Nikomakhova etyka* [Nicomachean ethics]. Kyiv, Akvilon-Plius Publ., 2002. 480 p. Available at: http://ae-lib.org.ua/texts/aristoteles__nicomachean_ethics__ua.htm (Accessed 12 August 2016).
3. Aristotel. *Polityka* [Politics]. Osnovy Publ., Kyiv, 2000. 239 p. Available at: <http://litopys.org.ua/aristotle/arist.htm>. (Accessed 12 August 2016).
4. Aristofan. *Zhenshchiny v narodnom sobranii* [Women in public gathering]. Available at: http://royallib.com/book/aristofan/genshchini_v_narodnom_sobranii.html. (Accessed 12 August 2016).
5. Akhutin A.V. *Ponyatie «priroda» v antichnosti i v Novoe vremya («fyusis» i «natura»)* [The concept of "nature" in antiquity and in modern times ("physis" and "nature")]. Moscow, Nauka Publ., 1988. 208 p.
6. Bryule P. *Povsednevnyaya zhizn grecheskikh zhenshchin v klassicheskuyu epokhu* [The daily life of women in Greek in classical era]. Available at: http://royallib.com/read/bryule_per/povsednevnyaya_gizn_grecheskih_genshchin_v_klassicheskuyu_epokhu.html#0. (Accessed 12 August 2016).
7. Buzeskul V.P. *Zhenskiy vopros v drevney Gretsii* [Women's issue in ancient Greece]. Kharkov, Kn. mag. P.A. Breytigama Publ., 1905. 42 p.
8. Vardiman YE. *Zhenshhina v drevnem mire* [The woman in the ancient world]. Moscow, Nauka Publ., 1990, 335 p.
9. Gerodot. *Istoriya. Kniga 4: Melpomena* [History. Book 4: Melpomene]. Available at: <http://vehi.net/istoriya/grecia/gerodot/04.html>. (Accessed 12 August 2016).
10. Gippokrat. *O vozdukhakh, vodakh i mesnostyakh. Gippokrat Izbrannyye knigi* [On air, waters and places. Hippocrates Selected Books]. Moscow, Gosudarstvennoye izdatelstvo biologicheskoy i meditsinskoy literatury Publ., 1936. pp. 275-307.
11. Hippokrat. *Pro zhinochi khvoroby* [On the women's disease]. Available at: <http://bibliograph.com.ua/426hippo/35.htm>. (Accessed 12 August 2016).
12. Homer. *Iliada* [Iliad]. Available at: http://www.ae-lib.org.ua/texts/homer__iliad__ua.htm#06. (Accessed 12 August 2016).
13. Homer. *Odisseia* [Odyssey]. Available at: http://ae-lib.org.ua/texts/homer__odyssey__ua.htm#15. (Accessed 12 August 2016).
14. Evripid. *Ifigeniya v Tavride* [Iphigenia in Tauris]. Available at: http://royallib.com/read/evripid/ifigeniya_v_tavride.html#0. (Accessed 12 August 2016).
15. Yevripid. *Alkesta* [Alcestis]. Available at: http://www.ae-lib.org.ua/texts/euripides__alcestis__ua.htm#01. (Accessed 12 August 2016).
16. Evripid. *Gekuba* [Hecuba]. Available at: <https://bookmate.com/reader/evHzQc57>. (Accessed 12 August 2016).
17. Yeger V. *Paydeyya. Vospitaniye antichnogo greka. Kniga vtoraya. Vershina i krizis atticheskogo dukha. Sofisty* [Paideia. Education of the ancient Greeks. Book Two. The top and the crisis of the Attic spirit. Sophists]. Available at: <http://www.portal-slovo.ru/philology/37472.php>. (Accessed 12 August 2016).
18. Kon I. *Muzhchina v menyayushchemsya mire* [A man in a changing world]. 2007. Available at: http://www.e-reading.club/chapter.php/104262/2/Kon_-_Muzhchina_v_menyayushchemsya_mire.html. (Accessed 12 August 2016).
19. Ksenofont. *Domostroy* [Domostroy]. Available at: http://www.gumer.info/bibliotek_Buks/Culture/Article/ksen_dom.php. (Accessed 12 August 2016).
20. Losev A.F. *Filosofiya. Mifologiya. Kultura* [Philosophy. Mythology. Culture]. Moscow, Politizdat, 1991. 525 p.
21. Marks K. *Sochineniya. Izdaniye 2. Tom 45* [Works. Issue 2. Volume 45]. Moscow, Progress Publ., 1984. 474 p.
22. Nisskiy Gr. *Ob ustroyenii cheloveka* [On the dispensation of rights]. Available at: http://azbyka.ru/otechnik/Grigorij_Nisskij/ob_ustroyenii_cheloveka/#0_6. (Accessed 12 August 2016).
23. Platon. *Derzhava* [State]. Kyiv, Osnovy Publ., 2000. 355 p. available at: <http://litopys.org.ua/plato/plat.htm>. (Accessed 12 August 2016).
24. Platon. *Pir* [Feast]. Available at: <http://psylib.org.ua/books/plato01/20pir.htm>. (Accessed 12 August 2016).
25. Sofokl. *Antihona* [Antigone]. Kyiv, Dnipro Publ., 1981. 232 p. Available at: http://ae-lib.org.ua/texts/sophocles__antigone__ua.htm. (Accessed 12 August 2016).
26. Sumtsov N.F. *O svadebnykh obryadakh, preimushchestvenno russkikh* [About wedding ceremonies, mostly Russian ones]. Kharkov, 1881. 206 p.
27. Blundell S. Vision and Viewing in Ancient Greece (edited with Douglas Cairns, and Nancy Rabinowitz), *Special issue of Helios*, 2013, vol. 40, pp. 346.

СОЦІАЛЬНА ФІЛОСОФІЯ ТА ФІЛОСОФІЯ ІСТОРІЇ

28. Charles H. Kahn Anaximander and the Origins of Greek Cosmology. Available at: http://www.nsu.ru/classics/Wolf/Kahn_2.htm. (Accessed 12 August 2016).
29. Danylova T.V. Towards gender equality: Ukraine in the 21st century. *Anthropological Measurements of Philosophical Research*, 2013, no. 4. Available at: <http://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/towards-gender-equality-ukraine-in-the-21st-century>. (Accessed 12 August 2016).
30. Davidson J. Bodymaps: Sexing Space and Zoning Gender in Ancient Athens. *Gender & History*, 2011, vol. 23, pp. 597-614. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-0424.2011.01659.x
31. Davidson J. Politics, poetics, and erôs in archaic poetry. *Erôs and the polis. BICS supplement*, 2013, no. 119, pp. 5-37.
32. Lanni A. Law and Order in Ancient Athens. New York, Cambridge University Press Publ., 2016. 294 p. doi: 10.1017/CBO9781139048194
33. Perlman P. Gortyn. The First Seven Hundred Years. Part II. The Laws from the Temple of Apollo Pythios, Even More Studies in the Ancient Greek Polis. Franz Steiner Verlag Publ., 2002. pp. 187-227
34. Scott M. The Rise of Women in Ancient Greece. *History Today*, 2009, November, pp. 36-40. Available at: www.hlstorytoday.com. (Accessed 12 August 2016).

Dr. phil., prof. V. V. Voronov (Russian Federation) recommended this article to be published

Received: 02 April, 2016

Accepted: 12 Oct., 2016