

CULTIVATING DIGNITY IN JEAN-JACQUES ROUSSEAU'S SOCIAL-ETHICAL CONCEPTION: GENDER ASPECT

У статті проаналізовано особливості гендерного підходу до виховання гідності людини у соціально-етичній концепції видатного французького філософа доби Просвітництва Ж.-Ж. Руссо. Методологічною основою гендерної диференціації в його системі виховання гідності людини стали принципи етичного раціоналізму, утилітаризму, механіцизму, деїзму та сентименталізму. Жінки і чоловіки не є, і не можуть бути однаково організованими ні за характером, ні за темпераментом, ні за обов'язками, оскільки це суперечить закону природи. Виховання на засадах розуму повинно враховувати статеві відмінності, проте принципи та умови такого виховання мають бути спільні. Жінка і чоловік створені одне для одного, залежать одне від одного та потребують взаємного визнання гідності, цінності себе в очах іншого (іншої). Найкращою нагородою для жінок і чоловіків за гідні почуття та поведінку є взаємна повага, гармонія у стосунках, сімейне щастя.

Ключові слова: людина, гідність, соціально-етична концепція, сім'я, гендерний підхід, виховання, свобода, любов, щастя, закон природи.

“It’s no good for a person to be alone” [5, p. 385] – we cannot but agree with these wise words belonging to the prominent French Enlightenment philosopher Jean-Jacques Rousseau. His social-ethical conception is aimed at answering the question, why some people become unhappy in their family life, and others, on the contrary, lead by the principles of the worthy way of life, achieve stable happiness and harmonic relationship in their family life. Rousseau answers to this question applying the innovatory, for the Enlightenment Age, gender approach to cultivating dignity. Methodologically the gender differentiation in his system of education and fostering dignity is based on the principles of ethical rationalism, utilitarianism, and mechanism. Deism and sentimentalism should be mentioned as well, being methodologically important for deep understanding Rousseau’s ideas.

The aim of our research is the analysis of the gender approach to cultivating dignity in Jean-Jacques Rousseau’s social-ethical conception. The amount of theoretical-methodological works on the given issue, namely by I. Goyan [1], O. Gryshchuk [2], I. Ostapets’ [3], focusing on some relevant aspects, allows claiming the gender perspective on the idea of dignity as having considerable heuristic potential.

The following quotation represents the general idea of Rousseau’s point of view on the dialectics and the gender approach to fostering dignity, according to the principle of hermeneutic circle: “Social correlation between sexes is miraculous. This correlation entails the unified moral personality to whom a woman serves as the eye, and a man – as the hand, but they are mutually depended so that the woman learns from the man what to see, and the man learns from the woman how to act. If a woman could be up to the principles the way a man does, and a man, in his turn, could realize the details the way a woman does, not depending on each other they would live in the constant hostility, and their communication would be impossible. But in the harmony they have, they strive for the common goal, and it’s not easy to define who does more; either follows the impulse provided by the other; either submits and both are sovereigns” [5, p. 407].

Comparing men and women, Rousseau follows the mechanistic approach: everything not concerning sex is the same for men and women: “the same organs, needs, abilities” as for the machines constructed according to one pattern and different only in the “degree of action” [5, p. 386]. But everything concerning sex is different for men and women. The philosopher mentions that it is difficult to define what specifically is relevant to either sex. But surely the general characteristics refer to the species, and specific – to the sex. Nature’s being able to “create two creatures so much alike, but organized in such different ways” is one of the nature’s miracles [5, p. 386].

According to Rousseau, this natural similarity and difference should influence the moral side; and this conclusion is evident and experientially proved, and shows the uselessness of the disputes over the advantages or equality of the sexes: “They are equal in those aspects which are common; but those aspects which are different cannot be compared. Both a perfect woman and a perfect man cannot be similar either in the face or in the intellect; perfection has no degree” [5, p. 386].

Both sexes are naturally presupposed to co-act in order to reproduce offspring, but in different ways. This natural difference evokes the first substantial difference in moral relationship of a couple. A man should be active and strong, and a woman – passive and weak: “it’s necessary that the one (he) desire and have power, and the other (she) reveal little resistance” [5, p. 386]. This principle entails that a woman has been created to attract a man. The man should be attractive to her as well, but it’s not as necessary: his dignity reveals itself in his strength; he attracts her by being strong. It’s not the law of love, but the law of nature preceding the love itself [5, p. 386–387].

Rousseau claims that if a woman has been created to attract and to submit, she has to be likeable for a man instead of challenging him; her power lies in her charm; she has to use it to make the man feel his power and act. The most effective means to provoke this power is to make it necessary by means of resistance. In this case desire is accompanied by ambition, and the latter celebrates victory won with the help of the former. This is actually “the source of the attack and defense, the courage of his and the diffidence of hers, the modesty and timidity which the nature armed the weak one with in order to subjugate the strong one” [5, p. 387].

Unlike a female animal prompted to copulate by the natural instinct, but stopped by this instinct as well when the need to be inseminated is satisfied, a woman is led by her natural timidity. It’s timidity that prevents her from lust [5, p. 387]. Rousseau writes: “The Supreme Being intended to support the dignity of a human species; giving unlimited dispositions to individuals, He gives them the law regulating these dispositions, for them to be free and to be in charge of themselves; making them victims of excessive passions, He accompanies these passions with the mind to control them; letting a woman into the power of unlimited desires, He endows her with timidity to restrict them. Additionally, He awards individuals for the appropriate usage of these abilities with the love of virtue emerging when this virtue becomes the behavioural rule” [5, p. 388].

Regardless of the woman’s desires, she naturally pushes a man away and protects herself. But to be conquered she has to let him do it. “The most free and pleasant act of all doesn’t permit any real violence: it is unacceptable either by nature or by mind”, writes Rousseau. The nature endowed the weakest one (the woman) with as much strength as she “needs to resist, if there is desire”; and for the mind a “real violence” is not only disgusting and unworthy, but “contradicting the set aim” – to win the woman’s trust and sympathy [5, p. 388]. There is nothing worse for a man than the woman humiliated and abused by him.

According to Rousseau, a man is stronger and acts as “a sovereign” only externally, since a woman always controls the situation, and here “the strong one fully depends on the weak one”. It happens not because of his politeness or kindness, but “due to the inalterable law of nature endowing a woman with more power to evoke desire than a man to satisfy it, thus making the latter dependant on the good attitude of the former, and forcing him to strive for being likeable for her in order to make her let him be stronger” [5, p. 388]. The most pleasant aspect here is his doubt whether she submits out of her weakness or out of the free will. And the woman’s trick here lies in her ability not to dissipate his doubts [5, p. 388]. The woman’s strength and power over the man lies in her weakness.

This situation illustrates how the natural world conditions the moral one: “Women have their power not because men want it like that, but because the nature created it this way” [5, p. 389]. And they cannot be deprived of this power even abusing it. If they could ever lose

it they would have lost it long ago [5, p. 389]. Since sexual differences is the variety of natural inequality [4, p. 560], men and women cannot be equal. Sexual difference provides inequality between the sexes: “The male proves his male status in certain moments; whereas the female remains female for the whole life or at least during her youth” [5, p. 389]. Everything in her life reminds her about her sex: periods; the need to be careful while pregnant; quiet life to raise her children; patience and self-control to bring them up; constant active position and bond connecting the children and their father. Due to the woman the children love their father. Unlike women, men take care of the family due to their social duty, cultivated by women’s love: “So much love and care is needed to embrace the whole family! And finally, it should not be her natural striving, otherwise the human species would decay” [5, p. 389–390].

Rousseau disapproves of the adultery as of the injustice regardless of the sex of the culprit. Though, comparing the degree of consequences for the family, he differentiates between the man’s and woman’s responsibility. In spite of some gender discrimination on this point, he tries to prove that “the woman’s infidelity does more harm to the family: it disconnects the family and breaks all the natural ties; thrusting on her husband the children who are not of his fatherhood, she betrays both, and her infidelity is burdened by perfidy” [5, p. 390].

According to Rousseau, the worst in this situation is not only regarding his wife with distrust and disrespect, but doubting the parenthood of his children. The family turns into the group of open or secret enemies and tends to its decay [5, p. 390]. Only trust is the cement making a family solid and “enhancing the soul” of its every member [5, p. 470].

Rousseau is convinced that to preserve and confirm her dignity and power in her family, a woman needs not only to be truthful but to have such a reputation in her husband’s eyes as well as everyone else’s; it is important for her to be modest, careful, and be virtuous in her mind as well as in the eyes of the whole world” [5, p. 390]. For a man to love his children he needs to respect their mother. Rousseau claims even the appearance to be a woman’s duty, and her honour and reputation to be as important as virtue [5, p. 390].

Rousseau rejects any declamations on the “equality of the sexes and their duties being the same” as empty and meaningless. He regards them as an incorrect attempt to generalize on the basis of some isolated facts, when “the exceptions are presented as the disproof of the well-substantiated general laws” [5, p. 390]. Mentioning Plato and his ideal state, Rousseau remarks that Plato’s wish to erase any social diversities between men and women is nothing but his attempt to redirect the women’s energy towards fulfilling absolutely different functions, not connected with their special nature: “Having deprived the state of the private family life and not knowing what to do with women, he had to turn them into men” [5, p. 391]. He accuses Plato of forgetting “such sweet natural feelings substituted by an artificial feeling not actually possible without them, as if the natural connection were no longer needed to form social connections; as if the love for the neighbour were no longer the basis for the love we are due to feel for our state; as if the heart were tied to the Homeland not via family; as if a good citizen were not formed out of a good son, a good father, and a good husband!” [5, p. 392]. An artificial love will never substitute this sincere natural feeling, the love as the exchange of the energies of two physically different but spiritually close people.

As far as it seems obvious, that both men and women are not and cannot be equally organized either by their characters or their tempers, they shouldn’t be equally raised. Rousseau claims: one who wants to be happy “has to follow one’s nature” [5, p. 391]. Be yourself. Neither sex is deprived of drawbacks, since both have been created by God, the perfect Creator. What is a disadvantage for the male sex, is an advantage for the female sex, its “distinctive feature”, since women are different from men and vice versa. Rousseau wisely warns men and women: “don’t let these imaginary drawbacks disappear, be afraid to destroy them” [5, p. 392].

To those who regard the differences in the upbringing of men and women as the discrimination entailing that the women are raised in such a way for the men to rule them easily and preserve their dominant position over them, Rousseau replies: “Try raising them as men – the latter will eagerly agree to it. The more women will want to be like men, the less they will be able to rule them; and then men will truly become sovereigns” [5, p. 393].

All the skills, common for both sexes, are not equally distributed between them, but if taken together are mutually balanced. A woman is worthy being a woman, she will not be that valuable as a man; defending her rights she will win; but demanding the men’s rights she will always lose. Similarly, a man is worthy only as a man. Developing masculine features in a woman, ignoring those which are natural, means doing her harm. Trying to be like a man she will not become the one, but will lose herself. Rousseau asks: “don’t make a good man of your daughter, trying to spot the nature’s mistake; turn her into a good woman and be sure it will be better for her and for us” [5, p. 393]. It doesn’t mean that the upbringing should be limited to developing some narrow functions: a man is not a draught animal, and a woman is not an automatic machine. Commenting on this issue, Rousseau praises women: “the nature, having endowed women with the wit so nice and flexible, wants them to think, to judge, to love, to comprehend, to decorate their mind like their figure; these are the tools given to them to compensate for their weakness and to enable them to rule our (male) strength. They need to learn” [5, p. 393]. A man and a woman are created for one another, depend on each other and need mutual recognition of each other’s dignity and value for the other. According to the law of nature, women, both for themselves and for their children, depend on men’s judgments (the same can refer to men): “if they are worth respecting – they need to be respected; it is not enough to be beautiful – they need to attract; it is not enough to be clever – they need to be regarded as such; their honour depends on their behaviour as well as their reputation” [5, p. 394]. Concerning reputation as the external display of dignity, it is different for men and women. A man acting honestly depends on himself only, regardless of the public opinion; whereas a woman acting honestly fulfills only the half of her task: her reputation is not less important. So, the women’s upbringing should consider this aspect: “public opinion is the virtue’s grave for a man, and its throne for a woman” [5, p. 394]. Since a small girl realizes she’s being talked about, she needs to be admired, unlike boys who need more independence and adventures and do not worry about being talked about [5, p. 395].

Though every woman wants to be liked, but there is a big difference between the wish to attract a worthy man and the wish to attract “a worthless person who disgraces their sex” [5, p. 394]. Neither nature, nor wit can force a woman to like feminine features in a man, as well as she shouldn’t become masculine in order to win men’s love. Trying to behave as the opposite sex distracts a person from fulfilling his/her vocation. One must be insane to love the insane, and everyone receives what they are worth. There would not be “empty men”, if women were not eager to create them and attract this “emptiness” [5, p. 394].

According to Rousseau, a woman should be taught everything concerning men, and vice versa. Thus, women need to learn how to attract men, evoke their love and respect, raise and take care about them when they are small, advise and comfort, when they have grown up, make their life nice and sweet – “these women’s skills should be cultivated since the childhood” [5, p. 394].

The first stage of girls and boys’ upbringing (before the teen age) should be natural, open, free, but clever and considering the gender needs. That is why everything limiting and oppressing nature does harm to a child and reveals bad taste [5, p. 396]. And here Rousseau refers to the upbringing principles in the Ancient Greece, where both girls and boys took up gymnastics, participated in military games, played, competed, and were admitted to public events. After getting married, a young person obtained important family duties. Such Greek women gave birth to the healthiest, the strongest, and the worthiest men. Their families

cultivated such ancient values as morality and beauty [5, p. 396]. Life, health, wit, and the appropriate upbringing should be primary. Children of both sexes have many common activities and games, but they have their own tastes and goals in these activities, distinguishing one sex from the other: boys wish to win and to achieve, to investigate new space, to master a new craft; whereas girls combine things creatively and methodically, bring order to their space, decorate dolls, etc. [5, p. 397].

Sober mind is natural for both sexes equally. Though, girls reveal their wit earlier and are more obedient than boys [5, p. 398]. The obedience of girls should be supported by their upbringing: “they should be controlled every minute” [5, p. 399], be taught to stop their games in the middle if necessary (the need to do something else, to obey the time schedule). The result of such methodical upbringing is the development of self-discipline and patience the women need so much in their adult life [5, p. 400]. Rousseau believes that “the most important feminine quality is submissiveness, because she has been created to submit to an imperfect creature of a man”. The desire to dominate made no woman happy, because the result of such attitude is the loss of a man in his masculine role. Rousseau warns: “women’s stubbornness multiplies men’s misfortune” [5, p. 400]. Arguing, women “forget themselves”; “they are often right in their complaints, but they are always wrong in their wrangles”. That is why the philosopher believes that everyone needs to preserve the tone peculiar to their sex: “too humble a man can irritate a woman; but if the man is not a monster, her submissiveness not only calms him down, but sooner or later triumphs over him” [5, p. 400].

It is obvious that Rousseau considers wisdom a very important woman’s feature. It serves as the compensation for the lack of strength; without her wisdom a woman would be not a friend but a slave to a man; due to this advantage she remains equal to him and submitting to him rules him. Everything plays against her: the man’s drawbacks, her timidity and weakness; she relies only on her art of behaving and her beauty. Though “beauty fades in the course of time, and the habit diminishes its influence” [5, p. 401]. That is why Rousseau puts forward the following principle: “one may shine due to her clothes, but only personality attracts” [5, p. 402]. Woman’s wit is practical; it teaches how to find the means to achieve the set goal, but it does not teach how to set this goal [5, p. 407].

Rousseau instructs men: “seek the middle in everything, including beauty. Prettiness, unlike the beauty, does not fade in the course of time; it is alive and after thirty years of marriage the honest pretty woman attracts her man the way she did in the first day they met” [5, p. 444].

Thus, there are two principles influencing the upbringing of girls: “public opinion” and consciousness as “inner regulative feeling”: “Feelings without public opinion do not provide her with the spiritual subtleness decorating good morality with social honour; and public opinion without feelings breeds only false and immoral women substituting virtue with appearance” [5, p. 414]. So, it is important to develop wit as the mediator between the two factors. Being submitted to her husband’s judgment she has to win his respect; she has to not only evoke his love for her personality, but win his approval of her behaviour; she has to justify his choice in front of the society and praise the man by the honour given to his wife. Dependent on her consciousness and on public opinion, she needs to learn how to balance these two aspects. Thus she becomes the judge; she decides when to submit to them. It can be done well only if the wit has been developed [5, p. 415].

According to Rousseau, the woman’s wit has the inborn art of controlling any situation, which would be called an intuition nowadays: “This art is based on subtle and constant observations of what is going on in men’s hearts. Can this art be learned? No, it is inborn: all of them master it; no man is endowed with it. This is a distinguishing female feature. Self-control, clairvoyance, detailed observation are learned by women; the ability to use all of these is their talent” [5, p. 417].

Rousseau mentions: “every age and position has its duties. It is important to love them. Respect your dignity and you will always be a good lady. One should correspond to one’s nature; we tend too much to vindicate people’s expectations” [5, p. 419]. He believes that a girl is best raised in her family, whose life scenarios project the image of her future family: she learns how to love her home, to take pleasure in raising children [5, p. 421]. She subconsciously returns to her family traditions and even in her old age loves what she loved in her childhood [5, p. 467–468].

Creating the image of the future spouse is very important in a girl’s upbringing: he should be virtuous and worthy; she needs to be taught how to recognize him, to love him for herself; only such a person can make her happy [5, p. 426]. She should be well aware that “all advantages of her sex depend not only on her morality, but on her husband’s morality” as well, who “should serve to her the way he serves to virtue” [5, p. 426]. Being worthy means “having noble pride and dignity, respecting oneself and demanding that from others” [5, p. 475].

Epochs pass, but natural relationships do not change, thus, the concept of dignity and worthiness is invariant: “to be one’s master is always noble <...> purity should be the most pleasant virtue for a beautiful woman with a noble soul” [5, p. 424–425]. Material things are subject to change: positions, prosperity. These unsteady things should not define the dignity of a person one wants to marry: “only personality remains the same and is carried everywhere; a marriage can be happy or unhappy only due to interpersonal relationship” [5, p. 434]. Happy marriage requires personal equality and similarity [5, p. 444]. Honest heart needs love and respect: “everyone loves what they consider worthy” [5, p. 466]. So, in Rousseau’s ethical conception, the most important aim of upbringing of both sexes is to make girls and boys ready for their future family life, teach them to recognize a worthy person and to love her/him to justify the happiness they will be given [5, p. 431]. “It is natural that women judge men’s dignity, similarly to the way men judge women’s dignity” [5, p. 431]. A worthy woman can decorate a man’s life as well as a worthy man “raises a woman’s value” [5, p. 433].

To summarize, Rousseau’s social-ethical conception of the gender approach to cultivating dignity presupposed the elimination of sex discriminations being incompatible with “the law of nature” and the humanistic ideas of human dignity. Given sexual differences, there cannot be any equality between the organization and duties of the sexes. Rousseau disapproves both: limiting the women’s sphere to the family circle only as well as the attempts to make them similar to men. Social prejudices should be rejected, whereas natural aspects should be preserved in culture. Neither sex has drawbacks, since what is a disadvantage for one, is an advantage for the other. A woman is valuable as a woman. Trying to become a man she will not succeed, but will lose herself. Violating one’s nature one becomes unhappy.

It has been experientially proved that the so-called “stronger sex” “depends on the weaker one completely” according to “the law of nature”. A woman is capable of embracing the family. Unlike women, men take care of the family due to their social duty, cultivated by women’s love. Female wisdom is a very important natural feature, due to which she keeps herself equal to her man and submitting to him, rules and builds up their happy family. The upbringing should consider sex diversities preserving common principles for both sexes. A man and a woman are created for each other, depend on each other, need mutual recognition of each other’s dignity and value for the other.

1. Гоян І. М. Аксиологічне конструювання гендерних відносин. *Gender Studies: Learning, Research, and Practice* : Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference “Gender Studies: Learning, Research, and Practice” and the Workshop for Young Researchers “Gender Studies: Education, Gender Equality, Democracy, and Peace” (April 16–20, 2018) / Ed. O.V. Avramenko, T.V. Lisova. Kropyvnytskyi : KOD Publishing House. P. 156–158.

2. Гришук О. В. Людська гідність у праві: філософські проблеми. Львів : Львівський державний університет внутрішніх справ, 2007. 428 с.
3. Остапець І. Сутність і механізм реалізації свободи в соціально-філософській концепції Ж.-Ж. Руссо. *Вісник Львівського університету. Філософсько-політологічні студії*. 2014. Вип. 5. С. 16–24.
4. Руссо Ж.-Ж. О причинах неравенства. *Антология мировой философии* : в 4 т. Москва : Мысль, 1970. Т. 2. С. 560–567.
5. Руссо Ж.-Ж. Эмил, или О воспитании. *Педагогические сочинения* : в 2 т. / под ред. Г. Н. Джибладзе; сост. А. Н. Джурицкий. Москва : Педагогика, 1981. Т. 1. 656 с.

The article deals with the gender approach to cultivating dignity within the social-ethical conception of the prominent French Enlightenment philosopher Jean-Jacques Rousseau. Methodologically the gender differentiation in his system of education is based on the principles of ethical rationalism, utilitarianism, deism, and sentimentalism. Men and women are not and cannot be organized equally. Neither their characters, nor temperaments and duties can be equal, since it would contradict the laws of nature. Rational upbringing has to consider sex differences, but the principles and conditions of such upbringing should be common. A man and a woman are created for each other, depend on each other, need mutual recognition of each other's dignity and value for the other. The best award for men and women for their worthy feelings and behaviour is the mutual respect, harmonic relationship, and the happy family.

Keywords: human being, dignity, social-ethical conception, family, gender approach, upbringing, freedom, love, happiness, law of nature.

УДК 111.1: 101.9 “Вітгенштайн”

Тарас Матвійчук

ОСОБЛИВОСТІ ОНТОЛОГІЇ ЛЮДВІГА ВІТГЕНШТАЙНА

У статті проаналізовано основні положення онтології, що була представлена Людвігом Вітгенштайном у “Логіко-філософському трактаті”. Визначено вихідні методологічні принципи, що зумовили особливості онтології Людвіга Вітгенштайна.

Ключові слова: світ, факти, мова, реальність, логічна форма, стан справ.

Під впливом фундаментальних відкриттів у науці та філософії, які відбулися на початку двадцятого століття, класичні уявлення та підходи до розуміння реальності зазнавали суттєвих змін. У філософії проходив процес переосмислення своїх завдань та методів для їхнього розв'язання. Особливої актуальності набула проблема співвідношення науки і філософії, перерозподіл їхніх предметних сфер та переосмислення методологічних принципів.

Людвіг Вітгенштайн у “Логіко-філософському трактаті” висловив низку оригінальних ідей, що стали теоретичною основою для кількох наступних філософських течій. Метою даної статті є артикулювати та проаналізувати особливості онтології, представлені Л. Вітгенштайном в ранній період його творчості. Актуальність теми обґрунтовується двома аргументами: по-перше це постійне зацікавлення з боку істориків філософії, яке зумовлене потребою надати більш вичерпну та детальну інтерпретацію філософським поглядам Л. Вітгенштайна. Такий інтерес пов'язаний зі складністю та неоднозначністю висловлених ним ідей, і як результат, з різноманітністю їх майбутніх інтерпретацій. На сьогодні існують різні традиції прочитання та розуміння філософії Л. Вітгенштайна [13, с. 23]. Крім того не зникає загальний теоретичний та практичний інтерес до його ідей. Л. Вітгенштайн за допомогою логічної аналітики сконструював оригінальну онтологію. Окреслення меж та інструментів пізнаваності світу, співвідношення реальності та мови, розуміння природи логічних законів – ці та інші проблеми, досліджувані Л. Вітгенштайном, знаходять свою актуалізацію в рамках сучасної логіки, когнітивістики, математики, лінгвістики та багатьох інших дисциплін.

Проблематика онтології “Логіко-філософського трактату” розглядалася різними науковцями. Зокрема такими як: А. Грязнов, А. Синиця, В. Лекторский, В. Уровцев, Г. Балута, Г. Бергман, Г. Х. фон Врігт, Є. Смирнова, М. Козлова, Р. Рортрі, Р. Сушко,