

UDC 176(470+44)V. M. PETRUSHOV^{1*}, I. V. TOLSTOV^{2*}^{1*}Ukrainian State University of Railway Transport (Kharkiv, Ukraine), e-mail vnpetrushov@gmail.com, ORCID 0000-0003-3279-2180^{2*}Ukrainian State University of Railway Transport (Kharkiv, Ukraine), e-mail tollivan12@gmail.com, ORCID 0000-0001-5511-1670**THE ANTROPOLOGY OF GENDER BY VASIL ROSANOV AND THE ETHICS OF SEXUAL DIFFERENCE BY LUCE IRIGARAY**

Purpose. The purpose of the article is to compare the anthropology of gender by Vasil Rozanov and the ethics of sexual difference by Luce Irigaray, to identify similarities and distinctions between these theories, and to assess their role in the development of the gender studies. **Theoretical basis** combines the comparative method and the gender approach, which is based not only on describing the difference of statuses, roles and other aspects of men's and women's lives, but also on overcoming the androcentrism in the contemporary world. **Originality** of the work consists in the fact that, in the context of the gender studies, the special philosophical and anthropological comparison of the gender concepts by Rozanov and Irigaray were carried out for the first time. This allowed reckoning Rozanov's theory in essentialism, and Irigaray's theory in anti-essentialism. The article also reveals the similarity in the anthropology of gender by Rozanov and the ethics of sexual difference by Irigaray in terms of sexuality concept, analyzes and details their main ideas. **Conclusion.** The important similarity between Rozanov's and Irigaray's concepts is the assertion of female subjectivity as equivalent to male one. The female equivalent of sexuality by Rozanov manifests itself in the concept of "cunnentrism", but by Irigaray, it is in the metonymy of "two lips". The methodological basis of their concepts is the insuperable opposition of "masculine" and "feminine". Rozanov seeks to identify "masculine" and "feminine", but Irigaray rather concentrates on their radical distinction. According to Rozanov, sexual differences are determined biologically or metaphysically, which defines their eternal and unchanging nature. In turn, Irigaray argues that phallogocentric culture is the condition of sexual differences, which may be overcome with changing linguistic structures. The fundamental similarity of the anthropology of gender and the ethics of sexual difference is that not only "masculine", but also "feminine" principles are sexualized in them. Thus, Rozanov in his style and attention to physicality is surprisingly close to the modern gender anthropology and may be regarded as its forerunner. At the same time, the influence of Irigaray's philosophical concepts on the contemporary gender studies is that she was the first to point out the need to create a woman's other discourse that respects sexual difference and revealed the problematical character of singling out the distinctions between the female different and any other different in it.

Keywords: gender studies; androcentrism; sexual difference; Rozanov; "cunnentrism"; Irigaray; metonymy of "two lips"

Introduction

Philosophical anthropology is one of the few sciences that, setting the logic of the conceptual analysis of humanitarian problems, constantly emphasizes that a person is not an abstract being, but a living, full of feelings and desires personality, who bears a "generic imprint" of sexual duality and understands him/herself either a man, or a woman. In this regard the conclusion of V. Rozanov (1995) that gender is the human soul, and everything else in a person is the expression and development of the mystery of gender could be viewed as the central anthropological postulate. L. Irigaray would agree with this conclusion, which asserts that:

Sexual difference is one of the questions or even the Question over which

our epoch is struggling with. After all, every epoch, according to

Heidegger, thinks about one thing. Only about one. And for our time, perhaps this One is precisely the sexual difference. The One, which if it is covered by thought, it will bring "salvation"? (Irigaray, 2004, p. 13)

Thus, the deep awareness of the most important circumstance that the gender problem conceals the metaphysical secret of human existence in itself, is the foundation of the anthropology of gender by V. Rozanov and the ethics of sexual differences by L. Irigaray.

Why in the article we consider the concepts of two seemingly different philosophers?

Before everything else, Rozanov (1995) is one of the first Russian philosophers in the Silver Age, who turned to a gender problematics. His book "In the World of unclear and unresolved", devoted to the problem of gender, was published in 1901, two years earlier than "Sex and Character" by O. Weininger 1903, and Freud's "Three Essays on the Theory of Sexuality" were published only in 1905. Thus, we can assume that it was Rozanov who had actualized the topic of gender in the public consciousness at the beginning of the XX century.

In turn, Irigaray gained popularity thanks to her studies on gender theory, which have a significant influence on the contemporary philosophical thought, not only in France but also throughout the world. In books "Speculum of the Other Woman" 1974, "This Sex Which is Not One" 1977, "An Ethics of Sexual Difference" 1984, she rethinks the ideas of Freud, Lacan and others, penetrating the philosophical discourse in the most radical way, creates a new heuristic field for the anthropological and gender studies. She currently heads the Humanitarian and Linguistic Department at the National Center for Scientific Research (CNRS) in Paris.

Secondly, it is connected with the development of a new trend in social sciences – gender studies, the formation of which has led to the distinction between two categories: gender as a set of biological characteristics of a man and a woman and "gender" as a set of cultural-linguistic patterns, which regulate the social behavior of men and women (Korkh, & Khmel, 2014). The methodology of a study on gender is not just a description of the difference in statuses, roles and other aspects of the men's and women's lives, but also the analysis of power and dominance that are approved in society through gender roles and relationships, as well as overcoming the androcentrism of the contemporary world.

Within the framework of these studies, there are two methodological approaches to gender and sex: essentialism and anti-essentialism (Zherebkina, 2007). A vivid representative of the first approach can be considered V. Rozanov, according to which gender differences are determined biologically and/or metaphysically, which determines their eternal and unchanging nature. In turn, L. Irigaray argues that gender differences are culturally determined and can be overcome together with changes in linguistic structures. Therefore, her ethics of sexual difference can be attributed to the second anti-essentialist approach.

The methodological basis for the study was made by Rozanov (1990; 1995; 1999) and Irigaray (1985; "This Sex Which is Not One", 1985; 1993; 2004), as well as articles (Battistutta, 2018; Coetzee, & Halsema, 2018; Galtsin, 2015; Szopa, 2018), which represent some peculiarities in the concepts of these philosophers.

Purpose

Taking into account the foregoing, the purpose of the article is to compare the anthropology of gender by V. Rozanov and the sexual differences by L. Irigaray, to identify similarities and distinctions of these concepts, to assess their role in the development of gender studies.

Statement of basic materials

The irreconcilable opposition to the concepts of "male" and "female" is the methodological foundation of the Rozanov's concept of gender. The philosopher wrote that gender originally consists of a male and female principle. The nature of a person for Rozanov (1990) is gender, the essence of a person is her/his "cunnentrism", the fact that the essence is either males or females (p. 28). The ideals of a man and a woman, their main qualities, in fact, are predicates of the genital organs: the man – solid, direct, strong, persistent; a woman is characterized by tenderness, softness, tolerance, nebulosity, fluidity, blurriness, pliability.

The philosopher understands the sexual instinct as an expression of the metaphysical desire for unity, the merging of two opposing poles, and marriage as their metaphysical integrity. Intensity of sexual attraction demonstrates in Rozanov's concept the degree of dominance of one of the foundations in a person – male and female – over another. In other words, the more in a person, for example, male, the stronger her/his attraction to the external female, and vice versa. After all, according to Rozanov, the female base, although the opposite of the male one, is not less sexual, and the equivalent of her sexuality is "cunnentrism".

Gender for Rosanov is cosmic, mystical, ecstatic and indescribable. A human being and everything in nature has sex. Everything in life has sex, life itself is realized on the basis of sex, at the expense of sex and in the form of sex: "where there is no sex – the mineral begins ... "the breath of life" and "soul is immortal", which revived the red clay ... the first human being – and it was penetration or breathing into the mineral of sex. And human being became a living creature" (Rozanov, 1999, p. 215).

Gender as a physiological function of the organism in the concept of a thinker has raised to religious, metaphysical heights, and the person himself is close to the mysterious another noumenal worlds. All sacred – earthly and heavenly, the bottom and the top of being are woven together in a single wreath of life; the higher a person rises up, the deeper her/his roots grow down. Gender in a man exists originally, it is her/his source of being and, of course, primal in any way. After all, even in order to think, one must first be born (Galtsin, 2015).

In his book "In the World of Unclear and Unresolved" Rozanov (1995) showed that gender is sacred, and the family is a religion. In the family for him spiritual and animal, sacred and carnal, religious and daily meanings are merged inextricably, mystically. In the family Rozanov is primarily interested in the interweaving of the physical and the spiritual, the togetherness of spirit and the flesh, the mutual attraction and the fusion of heterogeneous and unlike. In fact, speaking about the sacredness of sex and marriage, Rozanov always speaks about sacredness of holy copulation in the bosom of a family, the sacramentality of coitus' and genitalia. In his opinion, the existing religious practice is inadequate. Birth of a child, not to mention conception, are facts of purely personal life of parents, but death is given exclusively social meaning: burial, obituaries, etc. According to Rozanov, everything should be the other way around: namely, birth and copulation must be given the main social importance, they should be held in temples. Moreover, the whole world for him is one cosmic coition of everything with all – the rage of

ANTHROPOLOGICAL PROBLEMS IN THE HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY

countless copulations, which usually people just do not notice, as they do not notice the seeds of trees and plants, which are scattered on the ground in the height of summer, without thinking at all that myriad attempts to conceive a new life are around them.

Based on his own anthropology of gender, Rozanov offers his understanding of the future development of European civilization, which is due to the growing unnatural reciprocal oppression of male and female, the emergence of a "third psyche – not masculine and not feminine", sodomic in its essence. The future of this civilization is the very illusive future of the "third gender", which the nature does not know and tolerate..:

There will never be children. There will never be home, "households" – only in the sense of a room ... One vineyard and no vine ... Thus, the type of social life will be destroyed, destroyed not in the domestic, but in the psychological root, that is, more deeply. This is a destruction where nothing grows. Simultaneously, the type of history will also be destroyed. It will have the head, and the body will be cut off. The future is not necessary for anyone who has no descendants – the future is complete, general. The further fate of mankind appears from the point of view of not the interests of this humanity, but the interests of the group of these singles, ... among humanity, but against humanity, denying its very root.

(Rozanov, 1990, p. 137)

Against such a scenario of the development of European civilization, the French philosopher L. Irigaray, who, unlike Rozanov, believes that gender is not something understandable and naturally conditioned, tied to the anatomy, but a phenomenon of language and culture, that are androcentric in nature and targeting a person. Therefore, the existing world of culture and language is feasible on behalf of the male subject, from the point of view of a male perspective, where the female is understood as "other" and "alien", and is often ignored at all (Coetzee, & Halsema, 2018). Irigaray opposes such androcentrism, criticizing the concepts of Freud and Lacan, the vivid representatives of this tradition, for their claim to the universality of theories, which in essence are nothing but the implementation of a "correct" description of a woman in patriarchy from the standpoint of a man. They define a woman by a negative analogy. The main definition of a woman is an "shortcoming", which means that a woman essentially lacks something. She is a gender that does not have its own sexual organ, which is castrated, invisible. This gender aims at all its thoughts on obtaining the only possible sexual organ – phallus, that is, the main feature of the female is envy for penis.

ANTHROPOLOGICAL PROBLEMS IN THE HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY

Irigaray responded to such a phallogocentric discourse with her concept of "two lips" as metonymy of women's experience. It would be wrong to see in this concept biological analogies, as it is often done. This is rather an ironic response to Freud's and Lacan's obsession with phallus, and not to the definition of a female nature. Instead of anatomical analogies its metonymy, which refers to physicality, it is necessary to understand morphologically (Aristarkhova, 1998). This approach opens up opportunities for a new woman who has almost nothing more common with the understanding of femininity as a negative appendix to her husband. She ceases to be gender that does not have her own sexual organ.

Thus, a woman has no single sexual organ. There are at least two of them, but they can not be identified as singular (Irigaray, 1985, p. 27).

In other words, a woman, in the Irigaray's phrase, is always "more than one". One is the "male" principle, phallic, logocentric, symbolizing the Divine essence. In the language of geometric symbols, one is a point that symbolizes integrity, indivisibility, the root cause, self-sufficiency, and peace. The "female" principle is a dynamic principle.

One can not say about a woman that she is closed or open – she is not defined, not completed, she is an unfinished form [...]. The incompleteness of her form, morphology makes it possible at any time to become someone else, but this does not mean that she sometimes is explicitly "nothing" (Irigaray, 1985, p. 284).

It should be noted that "male" and "female" principles are not bad or good values. One is by no means better or worse than the other. The "male" and "female" principles are the principles of building the world, which have long been equally endowed with divine attributes in symbolic thinking. The world is an endless string of changes in the states of rest and formation, statics and dynamics.

So, "female" is more than one, but why not two? First, because for the formation as a principle can not be given a boundary. Otherwise, formation becomes its opposite – peace, appeasement. Secondly, the principle of formation – it is always the principle of multiplicity, infinite dividing. In her text, Irigaray associates this principle of multiplicity with the multiplicity of erogenous zones in a woman. What should be understood under the "multiplicity" as a characteristic of "feminine"? If the "male" principle is the principle of self-sufficiency of one, then the "female" principle as the principle of multiplicity is the principle of openness to change, mobility, variability, and fluidity. Bifurcation of the female genital organ creates an obvious contrast to a single solid, visible penis/phallus, frozen in its erection. We constantly face the real and symbolic consequences of this contrast in the texts of Irigaray. Thus, "solidity" contrasts with the "fluidity" of the female, the uniformity with the diversity, and the appropriating penetration (male) point of view is a tactile sense. The "fluidity" of a woman should be understood not only as distinct from a man, but also in itself, without any contrasts. What is liquid, is flowing, that is subject to a constant uncontrolled process of change, in which there is neither beginning nor end. Thus, the "new woman" is the difference in herself, it is fluid, diverse and multivocal.

However, a woman does not know all the possibilities inherent in her sexuality; she can neither define nor realize them. Shackled by the sexuality and language given by men, she is unable to recognize those fragments of herself that are usually hidden or only partially manifested. Therefore, viewing women's in independent of male concepts requires the reorganization of language and culture, as well as the sexual desire in terms of not marriage, but positivity, based on the creation of women's own and independent genealogy.

ANTHROPOLOGICAL PROBLEMS IN THE HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY

Irigaray constantly experiments with the language, she tries to describe "feminine" with the language of the associations, confronting unconnected, avoiding direct quotations and systematicity. With her texts, she as if tells us: "Oh, what how you think that the "female" principle is a principle of material and physical! Let it be. I do not mind. But then receive in your use a purely "feminine" text – boldly associative, logically unstructured, emotional, and so on". At the same time, it must be remembered that this is only a stylistic method. The Irigaray's goal is the knowledge of the "female" in itself. Therefore, she reflexively distances herself from her own letter, trying again and again to reveal the peculiarities of the "female" as her own physical, does not obey the logic of one single, self-sufficient, far from becoming, "male" principle.

According to the Polish researcher K. Szop (2018), in order to realize a similar style of writing, an appropriate subject of philosophizing is needed. Irigaray gives the name of this subject – hysteric. For her, it is important that the hysterical woman is the embodiment of the overcome and transformed by the body consciousness. The concept of hysteric is necessary in order to think about the "points" of going beyond the boundaries of male identity, the purely "male" logocentric principle of a single "I". "Female" in the Irigaray's interpretation is intermittent, heterogeneous, devoid of localization in one place. "Female" is an incarnated movement, the very life, fluid and diverse. It is pointless looking for "centers" in it, because there are many such in its body, they are auto-erotic, although this does not mean that they can not be related to each other on the basis of something in common. The specificity of the "female", as if Irigarey insists, eludes here, because "female" is the principle of "not one, but not two", the principle of diffusion, decentration, and not generalization, the bringing of a certain set to something single.

Recognizing the need for equality requirements that contemporary feminist movements put forward, Irigaray, however, sees in them a certain danger. If they lead to the equalization of women and men only in the sense that women become like men, then we are talking only about a new trap, the next stage of a large-scale operation aimed at suppressing any difference (Danylova, 2013). In this case, everything can be presented more gracefully, so that women can entertain the illusion themselves that they have achieved rights that had not been there before. However, if these rights only envisage for women to become more and more like men, then, as Irigaray says, it is not about dismissal, but about the loss of the feminine gender.

The refusal to recognize differences in the discourse of universal equality on the basis of human homogeneity is something Irigaray disagrees with:

When women demand something, it can often be based on the requirement of equal rights, but it is risky and can destroy women ... Any action is a mistake if the entity is equal to one, and not two, if it is reduced to uniformity and ignores the other like another. (Irigaray, 1993, p. 130)

It is likely that the only form of equality with which Irigaray agrees is the existing insurmountable difference between genders becomes obvious and ensures the right to exist. True equality can only be due to the assumption of differences, but they should not be immediately transformed into domination/subordination relations.

ANTHROPOLOGICAL PROBLEMS IN THE HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY

Thus, Irigaray proceeds from the conviction that the revival and continuation of the human race is impossible without the creation of a female, which is still unrecognized by contemporary culture. Therefore, it is necessary to create a plural, pluralistic female subjectivity, which does not require anything external and no "other" for its implementation and satisfaction, involves decentralization of phallogocentric discourse, and hence the discovery of new physical – feminine – spaces in culture and language.

Originality

The *originality* of the work consists in the fact that, in the context of the gender research, the special philosophical and anthropological comparisons of the gender concepts by Rozanov and Irigaray were carried out for the first time. This allowed reckoning Rozanov's theory in essentialism, and Irigaray's theory in anti-essentialism. The article also reveals the similarity of the anthropology of gender by Rozanov and the ethics of sexual difference by Irigaray in terms of sexuality concept, analyzes and details their main ideas. This allowed Rozanov's gender anthropology to be considered as close to contemporary gender studies and their forerunner, and the ethics of gender differences by Irigaray as the fundamental theoretical basis for these studies.

Conclusions

Philosophical and anthropological study of the relationship between male and female in the works of V. Rozanov and L. Irigaray showed that the ideas of these philosophers can be called as conceptual confrontation to the androcentrism of the contemporary culture. The important distinction between Rozanov's and Irigaray's concepts is the assertion of female subjectivity as equivalent to male one. The female equivalent of sexuality by Rozanov manifests itself in the concept of "cunnocentrism", but by Irigaray, it is in the metonymy of "two lips". The methodological basis of their concepts is the insuperable opposition of "masculine" and "feminine". Rozanov seeks to identify "masculine" and "feminine", but Irigaray rather concentrates on their radical distinction. According to Rozanov, sexual differences are determined biologically or metaphysically, which defines their eternal and unchanging nature. In turn, Irigaray argues that phallogocentric culture is the condition of sexual differences, which may be overcome with changing linguistic structures. The fundamental similarity of the anthropology of gender and the ethics of sexual difference is that not only "masculine", but also "feminine" principles are sexualized in them.

Thus, Rozanov in his style and attention to physicality is surprisingly close to the modern gender anthropology and may be regarded as its forerunner. At the same time, the influence of Irigaray's philosophical concepts on the contemporary gender research is that she was the first to point out the need to create a woman's other discourse that respects sexual and revealed the problematical character of singling out the distinctions between the female different and any other different (for example, national, post-colonial, racial, etc.) in it.

REFERENCES

- Aristarkhova, I. (1998). "Etika polovogo razlichiya" v kontseptsii Lyusi Irigari. *Sotsiologicheskii zhurnal*, 3(4), 191-200. (in Russian)
- Battistutta, F. (2018). The Energy of Ethics/The Ethics of Energy. A Dialog with Irigaray, Varela and Jullien. *Relations. Beyond Anthropocentrism*, 6(2), 321-327. doi: 10.7358/rela-2018-002-batt (in English)
- Coetzee, A., & Halsema, A. (2018). Sexual difference and decolonization: Oyèwùmí and Irigaray in dialogue about western culture. *Hypatia*, 33(2), 178-194. doi: 10.1111/hypa.12397 (in English)

ANTHROPOLOGICAL PROBLEMS IN THE HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY

- Danylova, T. (2013). Towards Gender Equality: Ukraine in the 21st century. *Anthropological Measurements of Philosophical Research*, 4, 43-51. doi: 10.15802/ampr2013/19775 (in English)
- Galtsin, D. (2015). The Divine Feminine in the Silver Age of Russian Culture and Beyond: Vladimir Soloviev, Vasily Rozanov and Dmitry Merezhkovsky. *Pomegranate: The International Journal of Pagan Studies*, 17(1-2), 14-50. doi: 10.1558/pome.v17i1-2.26503 (in English)
- Irigaray, L. (1985). *Speculum of the other woman*. G. Gill, Trans. New York: Cornell University Press. (in English)
- Irigaray, L. (1985). *This sex which is not one*. C. Porter, & C. Burke, Trans. New York: Cornell University Press. (in English)
- Irigaray, L. (1993). *Sexes and Genealogies*. G. Gill, Trans. New York: Columbia University Press. (in English)
- Irigaray, L. (2004). *Ethiqua de la difference sexuelle*. A. Shestakov, & V. Nikolaenkov, Trans.; I. Aristarkhova, & V. Miziano (Eds.). Moscow: Khudozhestvennyy zhurnal. (in Russian)
- Korkh, O., & Khmel, V. (2014). Transcendental aspects of gender. *Anthropological Measurements of Philosophical Research*, 5, 69-76. doi: 10.15802/ampr2014/25045 (in Ukrainian)
- Rozanov, V. (1990). *Uedinennoe* (Vol. 2). Moscow: Pravda. (in Russian)
- Rozanov, V., & Nikol'yukina, A. N. (Ed.). (1995). *Sobranie sochineniy. V mire neyasnogo i nereshennogo. Iz vostochnykh motivov* (Vol. 6). Moscow: Respublika. (in Russian)
- Rozanov, V., & Nikol'yukina, A. N. (Ed.). (1999). *Sobranie sochineniy. Vo dvore yazychnikov* (Vol. 10). Moscow: Respublika. (in Russian)
- Szopa, K. (2018). Feminist philosophy and autobiography: The case of Luce Irigaray. *Autobiografia. Literature. Culture. Media*, 10, 25-36. doi: 10.18276/au.2018.1.10-03 (in Polish)
- Zherebkina, I. (2007). *Subektivnost i gender. Gendernaya teoriya subekta v sovremennoy filosofskoy antropologii*. St. Petersburg: Aleteyya. (in Russian)

LIST OF REFERENCE LINKS

- Аристархова, И. Л. "Этика полового различия" в концепции Люси Иригари / И. Л. Аристархова // Социологический журнал. – 1998. – № 3 (4). – С. 191–200.
- Battistutta, F. The Energy of Ethics/The Ethics of Energy. A Dialog with Irigaray, Varela and Jullien / F. Battistutta // Relations. Beyond Anthropocentrism. – 2018. – Vol. 6, No 2. – P. 321–327. doi: 10.7358/rela-2018-002-batt
- Coetzee, A. Sexual Difference and Decolonization: Oyëwùní and Irigaray in Dialogue about Western Culture / A. Coetzee, A. Halsema // Hypatia. – 2018. – Vol. 33, Iss. 2. – P. 178–194. doi: 10.1111/hypa.12397
- Danylova, T. Towards Gender Equality: Ukraine in the 21st century / T. Danylova // Антропологічні виміри філософських досліджень. – 2013. – Вип. 4. – С. 43–51. doi: 10.15802/ampr2013/19775
- Galtsin, D. The Divine Feminine in the Silver Age of Russian Culture and Beyond: Vladimir Soloviev, Vasily Rozanov and Dmitry Merezhkovsky / D. Galtsin // Pomegranate: The International Journal of Pagan Studies. – 2015. – Vol. 17, Iss. 1-2. – P. 14–50. doi: 10.1558/pome.v17i1-2.26503
- Irigaray, L. *Speculum of the Other Woma* / L. Irigaray ; Trans. by G. C. Gill. – New York : Cornell University Press, 1985. – 416 p.
- Irigaray, L. *This Sex Which Is Not One* / L. Irigaray ; Trans by C. Porter & C. Burke. – New York : Cornell University Press, 1985. – 222 p.
- Irigaray, L. *Sexes and Genealogies* / L. Irigaray ; Trans. by G. C. Gill. – New York : Columbia University Press, 1993. – 192 p.
- Иригарей, Л. Этика полового различия / Л. Иригарей ; [пер.: А. Шестаков, В. Николаенков ; науч. ред. И. Аристархова ; ред. В. Мизиано]. – Москва : Художественный журнал, 2004. – 184 с. – Серия: Архив XXI века.
- Корх, О. М. Трансцендентні світи гендеру / О. М. Корх, В. В. Хміль // Антропологічні виміри філософських досліджень. – 2014. – Вип. 5. – С. 69–76. doi: 10.15802/ampr2014/25045
- Розанов, В. В. Уединенное. – Москва : Правда, 1990. – Т. 2. – 712 с. – Серия: "Из истории отечественной философской мысли", приложение к журналу "Вопросы философии".
- Розанов, В. В. *Собрание сочинений. В мире неясного и нерешенного. Из восточных мотивов* / под общ. ред. А. Н. Николукина. – Москва : Республика, 1995. – Т. 6. – 463 с.
- Розанов, В. В. *Собрание сочинений. Во дворе язычников* / под. общ. ред. А. Н. Николукина. – Москва : Республика, 1999. – Т. 10. – 464 с.
- Szopa, K. Feminist philosophy and autobiography: The case of Luce Irigaray / K. Szopa // Autobiography. Literature. Culture. Media. – 2018. – Vol. 10. – P. 25–36. doi: 10.18276/au.2018.1.10-03

ANTHROPOLOGICAL PROBLEMS IN THE HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY

Жеребкіна, И. Субъективность и гендер. Гендерная теория субъекта в современной философской антропологии / И. Жеребкіна. – Санкт Петербург : Алетей, 2007. – 307 с. – Серия: Гендерные исследования.

В. М. ПЕТРУШОВ^{1*}, І. В. ТОЛСТОВ^{2*}

^{1*}Український державний університет залізничного транспорту (Харків, Україна), ел. пошта vnpetrushov@gmail.com, ORCID 0000-0003-3279-2180

^{2*}Український державний університет залізничного транспорту (Харків, Україна), ел. пошта tollivan12@gmail.com, ORCID 0000-0001-5511-1670

АНТРОПОЛОГІЯ СТАТІ В. РОЗАНОВА ТА ЕТИКА СТАТЕВОЇ ВІДМІННОСТІ Л. ІРІГАРЕ

Метою статті є порівняння антропології статі В. Розанова та етики статевої відмінності Л. Ірігаре, виявлення подібностей та відмінностей цих концепцій, оцінка їхньої ролі у становленні гендерних досліджень. **Теоретичний базис** об'єднує компаративістський метод та гендерний підхід, основою якого є не просто опис різниці статусів, ролей та інших аспектів життя чоловіків та жінок, а й подолання андроцентризму сучасного світу. **Наукова новизна** полягає, в тому, що в статті вперше в контексті гендерних досліджень було зроблено спеціальне філософсько-антропологічне порівняння концепцій статі Розанова та Ірігаре. Це дозволило розанівську концепцію зарахувати до есенціалізму, а концепцію Ірігаре – до анти-есенціалізму. У статті також виявлена схожість антропології статі Розанова та етики статевої відмінності Ірігаре в аспекті поняття сексуальності, проаналізовані та детально зіставлені їхні основні ідеї. **Висновок.** Спільним в концепціях Розанова та Ірігаре є утвердження жіночої суб'єктивності, яка є рівноцінною чоловічій. Жіночий еквівалент сексуальності у Розанова проявляється в понятті "самочності", а у Ірігаре – в метонімії "двох губ". Методологічною основою їхніх концепцій виступає непереможна опозиція "чоловічого" та "жіночого". Розанов прагне до ототожнення "чоловічого" та "жіночого", а Ірігаре більше зосереджується на їхній радикальній відмінності. За Розановим гендерні відмінності детерміновані біологічно або метафізично, що визначає їхній вічний та незмінний характер. У свою чергу Ірігаре стверджує, що гендерні відмінності обумовлені фалоцентричною культурою та можуть бути подолані разом зі зміною мовних структур. Принципова ж схожість концепцій двох філософів полягає в тому, що в них сексуалізовано не лише чоловіче, а й жіноче начало. Таким чином, Розанов у своїй стилістиці, акцентованій на увазі до тілесності, напрочуд близький теперішній гендерній антропології та може розглядатися як її предтеча. Разом з тим вплив філософських концепцій Ірігаре на сучасні гендерні дослідження полягає в тому, що вона вперше вказала на необхідність створення жіночого іншого дискурсу, який поважає статево відмінність, та показала проблематичність виділення відмінності жіночого іншого від будь-якого іншого в ньому.

Ключові слова: гендерні дослідження; андроцентризм; статева відмінність; Розанов; "самочність"; Ірігаре; метонімія "двох губ"

В. Н. ПЕТРУШОВ^{1*}, И. В. ТОЛСТОВ^{2*}

^{1*}Украинский государственный университет железнодорожного транспорта (Харьков, Украина), эл. почта vnpetrushov@gmail.com, ORCID 0000-0003-3279-2180

^{2*}Украинский государственный университет железнодорожного транспорта (Харьков, Украина), эл. почта tollivan12@gmail.com, ORCID 0000-0001-5511-1670

АНТРОПОЛОГІЯ ПОЛА В. РОЗАНОВА И ЭТИКА ПОЛОВОГО РАЗЛИЧИЯ Л. ИРИГАРЕ

Целью статьи является сравнение антропологии пола В. Розанова и этики полового различия Л. Иригаре, выявление сходства и различия этих концепций, оценка их роли в становлении гендерных исследований. **Теоретический базис** объединяет компаративистский метод и гендерный подход, основой которого является не просто описание разницы в статусах, ролях и иных аспектах жизни мужчин и женщин, но и преодоление андроцентризма современного мира. **Научная новизна** заключается, в том, что в статье впервые в контексте гендерных исследований было предпринято специальное философско-антропологическое сравнение концепций пола Розанова и Иригаре. Это позволило розанов-

ANTHROPOLOGICAL PROBLEMS IN THE HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY

скую концепцию причислить к эссенциализму, а концепцию Иригаре – к анти-эссенциализму. В статье также выявлено сходство антропологии пола Розанова и этики полового различия Иригаре в аспекте понятия сексуальности, проанализированы и сопоставлены их основные идеи. **Вывод.** Важным сходством концепций Розанова и Иригаре является утверждение женской субъективности равноценной мужской. Женский эквивалент сексуальности у Розанова проявляется в понятии "самочности", а у Иригаре – в метонимии "двух губ". Методологической основой их концепций выступает непреодолимая оппозиция "мужского" и "женского". Розанов стремится к отождествлению "мужского" и "женского", а Иригаре больше сосредотачивается на их радикальном различии. Согласно Розанову, гендерные различия детерминированы биологически или метафизически, что определяет их вечный и неизменный характер. В свою очередь Иригаре утверждает, что гендерные различия обусловлены фаллоцентричной культурой и могут быть преодолены вместе с изменением языковых структур. Принципиальное же сходство антропологии пола Розанова и этики полового различия Иригаре заключается в том, что в них сексуализировано не только мужское, но и женское начало. Таким образом, Розанов в своей стилистике, акцентированном внимании к телесности, удивительно близок нынешней гендерной антропологии и может рассматриваться как ее предтеча. Вместе с тем влияние философских концепций Иригаре на современные гендерные исследования состоит в том, что она впервые указала на необходимость создания современного другого дискурса, уважающего половое различие, и показала проблематичность выделения отличия женского иного от всякого другого иного в нем.

Ключевые слова: гендерные исследования; андроцентризм; половое различие; Розанов; "самочность"; Иригаре; метонимия "двух губ"

Received: 19.10.2018

Accepted: 12.03.2019