

**ФИЛОСОФСКИЕ НАУКИ**  
**PHILOSOPHICAL STUDIES**DOI: 10.12731/2077-1770-2023-15-2-44-63  
UDC 122

Original article | Social and Political Philosophy

**HISTORICAL AND PHILOSOPHICAL REPRESENTATION  
OF THE MALE GENDER REGIME IN THE PROCESS  
OF WOMAN'S SOCIAL STATUS TRANSFORMATION*****I.V. Malimonov, L.G. Korol', I.G. Sin'kovskaya,  
D.V. Rakhinskiy, Yu.S. Shepeleva***

*This article is devoted to the process of formation of the modern egalitarian status of women, the study of the contradictory nature of this process. As a result of the research, the factors contributing to the establishment of egalitarian status of women in the modern socio-cultural system based on the values of equality and complementarity of rights and duties of men and women in the private and public spheres are identified and described. The relevance of this research is due to the need to understand the causes and principles of the formation and existence of modern egalitarianization trends. The analysis of philosophical works of various historical epochs allows us to state the presence of masculine dominance in pre-industrial and industrial formations and the representation of the secondary social status of women in relation to the status of men. Based on the analysis of the views of ancient philosophers, philosophers of the Middle Ages, Renaissance and Modern times, a conclusion is made about the dominance of the idea of priority of men in relation to women in social relations. The formation of women's gender equality within the framework of the transformation of family functional and value bases is considered as a dynamic process that reflects the multi-dimensional changes in socio-economic social relations of the second*

*half of the XIX century. The purpose of the research is to consider the philosophical understanding of the gender status of women in various historical periods as a representation of the muscular gender regime.*

**Keywords:** *egalitarian status; gender roles; social control; masculine dominance; socio-economic formations; gender regime; patriarchal blindness*

**For citation.** *Malimonov I.V., Korol' L.G., Sin'kovskaya I.G., Raikhinskiy D.V., Shepeleva Yu.S. Historical and Philosophical Representation of the Male Gender Regime in the Process of Woman's Social Status Transformation. Sovremennye issledovaniya socialnyh problem [Modern Studies of Social Issues], 2023, vol. 15, no. 2, pp. 44-63. DOI: 10.12731/2077-1770-2023-15-2-44-63*

Научная статья | Социальная и политическая философия

## ИСТОРИКО-ФИЛОСОФСКАЯ РЕПРЕЗЕНТАЦИЯ МУЖСКОГО ГЕНДЕРНОГО РЕЖИМА В ПРОЦЕССЕ ТРАНСФОРМАЦИИ СОЦИАЛЬНОГО СТАТУСА ЖЕНЩИНЫ

*И.В. Малимонов, Л.Г. Король, И.Г. Синьковская,  
Д.В. Рахинский, Ю.С. Шепелева*

*Данная статья посвящена процессу формирования современного эгалитарного статуса женщины, исследованию противоречивого характера этого процесса. Цель исследования – рассмотреть философское осмысление гендерного статуса женщины в различные исторические периоды как репрезентацию маскулинного гендерного режима. Актуальность данного исследования обусловлена необходимостью понимания причин и принципов формирования и существования современных эгалитаризационных тенденций. Анализ философских произведений различных исторических эпох позволяет констатировать наличие в доиндустриальных и индустриальных формациях маскулинного доминирования и репрезентацию вторич-*

ности социального статуса женщины по отношению к статусу мужчины. На основании анализа взглядов античных философов, философов эпохи Средневековья, Возрождения и Нового времени сделан вывод о доминировании идеи приоритета мужчин по отношению к женщинам в социальных отношениях. Формирование гендерного равенства женщины в рамках трансформации семейных функционально-ценностных основ рассматривается как динамический процесс, отражающий многоплановые изменения в социально-экономических общественных отношениях второй половины XIX в. В результате исследования определены и описаны факторы, способствующие утверждению в современной социокультурной системе эгалитарного статуса женщин, основанного на ценностях равенства и комплементарности прав и обязанностей мужчины и женщины в приватной и публичной сферах.

**Ключевые слова:** эгалитарный статус; гендерные роли; социальный контроль; маскулинное доминирование; общественно-экономические формации; гендерный режим; патриархальная слепота

**Для цитирования.** Малимонов И.В., Король Л.Г., Синьковская И.Г., Рахинский Д.В., Шепелева Ю.С. Историко-философская репрезентация мужского гендерного режима в процессе трансформации социального статуса женщины // *Современные исследования социальных проблем*. 2023. Т. 15, № 2. С. 44-63. DOI: 10.12731/2077-1770-2023-15-2-44-63

## Introduction

The problem of forming the egalitarian status of a modern woman is one of the most significant in the social and humanitarian Sciences. The image of a modern woman presented in the mass consciousness contains an important contradiction. On the one hand, today women occupy a worthy place in the system of socio-economic relations and many professions that were previously considered purely male have become female in the modern world. For example, major changes have occurred in the political management system, traditionally led by men. We can observe the active and successful actions of women in various sectors (politics,

financial market, services, education and upbringing system, etc.). And we can better understand that the traditional family pattern, in which duties were divided between a man and a woman, ceased practically to exist: «The modern economic conditions characterized by prevalence of brainwork over physical one allow the woman to turn from a cook and laundress into a competitive unit in the labor market and force to reconsider usual division of labor between sexes» [18, p. 629]. And now: «It is probably difficult to find out in the modern accepted forms of relations between a man and a woman... all of us are familiar with the family, the socio-cultural transformations taking place are reflected in the family, both in the social institute as a whole, and in the relations within each individual family» [3, p. 126].

But one cannot but note the negative consequences of such changes, expressed in increase: «the number of families with serious deviations in the functioning system. Relationships in such families are characterized by global family dissatisfaction, anxiety, excessive neuropsychiatric tension, material problems» [2, p. 237].

However, modern society, quickly absorbing economic transformations, nevertheless does not exclude a time lag in the socio-cultural sphere which is very different from serious changes in both the moral and ethical and cultural substrates [16]. And the image of a modern woman still contains a number of traditional, traditionally recognized female characteristics: defenselessness, weakness, dependence, indecision, passivity, readiness to submit. But quite recently, the typical idea of the position of women in society was considered absolutely normal. It was thought that women could not participate in social life because their nature, their brain could not function like men's [8].

This problem is reflected in all spheres of human life: economy, politics, culture, science, sports, medicine, education, etc. This is confirmed by a lot of both documentary and artistic sources of information (paintings, manuscripts, books), on the basis of which we can argue that all relations between men and women developed on the basis of dialectical laws (basis-superstructure), forming a corresponding system of relations “master – servant”. The established hierarchy of relations,

denoted through a gender regime (a set of rules and norms that creates strong expectations regarding gender relations and assigns certain rights and responsibilities to men and women) [23], was formed under the influence of objective socio-economic processes and acted as a necessary condition for the distribution of responsibilities in socio-economic formations. With the collapse of the primitive communal system and the emergence of the institution of private property, there was a major reformatting of the content of the distribution of gender roles. The result of this reformatting was to strengthen the importance of the social role of men in the spheres of life.

Further regulation of the existing system of relations took place by strengthening or weakening social control, which was ideologically formalized through the legitimization of masculine (male) dominance. Such legitimization was initially based on the physical strength of men, and later took shape in the practice of economic dependence and socio-cultural suppression of women, entrenched in the regulatory systems of various social institutions. So, at a certain period in a number of cultures have spread phenomenon, reflecting the domination of men over women: sati (the practice of self-immolation (voluntary or forced) of widow on the husband's funeral pyre), female infanticide (the practice of killing female infants), dauri (practice of premarital agreement about the size of the bride's dowry), kuvada (the practice ceremonial imitation of a man a female birth). In particular, the latest practice was based on the distortion, substitution of truly "natural, natural" female functions (the ability to bear children) with "social-male" ones (creating the pattern of "social" birth of a child by a man) and focused on depriving a woman of independence and affirming a gender order of male dominance, which is not a simple reflection of natural reality, but is ideologically or culturally constructed.

### **Statement and analysis of a problem situation**

The practice of male domination has spread not only in the everyday sphere, but also formed the basis of the entire system of scientific worldview. The idea of a man's superiority over a women runs the "red thread" in the works of the greatest philosophers of different eras. Being typi-

cal representatives of the “masters” class, they promoted and broadcast this idea in the scientific world. Thus, the development of philosophy in different historical periods reflected and recorded changes in gender status under the influence of dominant socio-economic factors. At the same time, this reflection contained imprints of the subjectivity of male philosophers, depending on their personal life experience, or some specific benefit from the transmitted idea. And if in the considering other problems the philosopher could cope with his subjectivity, expressing an objective judgment, then unfortunately, we do not observe this in the problem of woman’s subordination. Accordingly, the dependent, subordinate position of women was traditionally considered absolutely natural and was supported by scientific and philosophical views.

The origins of affirming the gender dependence of women on men can be found even in ancient Greek philosophy, which became a kind of scientific basis for a number of separate directions in the course of social and humanitarian Sciences. An excellent example of this dependence is the statement of the founder of the first school of philosophy, Thales of Miletus, that he is grateful to fate for the birth of human beings, and not animal creatures, the Hellenes, and not barbarian, man, not woman. Thus, a woman was opposed to a man, being in the same row with barbarians and animals, and the scientific ideology of the patriarchal gender regime was born.

Further, the greatest philosopher of Antiquity Aristotle in his works derives the main postulate of gender perception of the socially subordinate position of women: «According to our statement, in every living creature, first of all, you can see the power of the master and political. The soul dominates the body as a master, and the mind over your aspirations – as a statesman. It is clear from this how natural and useful it is for the body to be subordinate to the soul, and for the part of the soul subject to affects to be subordinate to the mind and the rational element of the soul, and vice versa, which harm always occurs in an equal or inverse ratio. The same situation remains valid in relation to man and other living beings. Thus, domestic animals by their nature stand higher than wild ones, and for all domestic animals it is preferable to be sub-

ordinate to humans: in this way they join their good (soterias). So is the man in relation to the woman: the first by nature is higher, the second is lower, and now the first rules, the second is subordinate. The same principle must inevitably prevail in all of humanity» [5, p. 583]. Such philosophical judgments were the result of stable social patterns, based initially on the existing distribution of the responsibilities of the sexes, enshrined in the social norms of the ancient world, whose welfare was based on the exploitation of slaves. Thus, in the judgments of Aristotle, a woman appears as a «half-man», i.e. an intermediate link between a man (man) and an animal, «some natural flaw» [5, p. 84]. He places them lower than men in his hierarchical structure of social structure and does not stop blaming the female sex for the inability to reason, draw rational, well-founded conclusions: «A female is a female due to the lack of certain qualities. We should consider the character of a woman as suffering from a natural flaw» [6, p. 90].

Similar judgments in his speech «Against Neera» are expressed by the Athenian orator Demosthenes, who quite clearly defines the set of pragmatic functions of women of different social status in relation to men: «We have hetaerae for pleasure, concubines for everyday carnal satisfaction, and wives for the birth of legitimate children and for the faithful protection of household property» [10, p. 281].

The representation of the gender order in the discourse of ancient philosophers can be explained by the prescription of social processes of male (best!) or women's (worst!) qualities, which justified the inequality of men and women in social relations. And marriage was declared a union of certain opposite entities (qualities), where each had its own functions and roles: instrumental (male) and expressive (female).

The system of attitudes towards women that developed in the ancient era determines its perception in the Middle Ages, while the tradition of discrimination against women's position in society is also justified by religious dogmas. Thus, the theologian St. Augustine the Blessed wrote: «And it is impossible to doubt, according to the natural order of men, it is better to dominate women than women over men» [6, p. 16].

And now let's have a laugh with Erasmus of Rotterdam: «Men were born for the affairs of government, and therefore should have received a few extra drops of reason necessary for the maintenance of manhood; on this occasion, the man turned to me for guidance, as, indeed, he always does, and I immediately gave him worthy advice: to marry a woman, a cattle dull and stupid, but funny and sweet, so that she would season and sweeten the dreary importance of the male mind with her stupidity. It was not for nothing that Plato hesitated as to whether a woman should be classed as intelligent or unintelligent, in order to point out that stupidity was an inherent characteristic of her gender. Even if a woman wants to be considered clever, no matter how hard she tries, she will be doubly stupid, like a bull that is led to the lists in spite of reason, for every inborn vice is only made worse by trying to hide it under the guise of virtue. The Greek proverb correctly says: a monkey always remains a monkey, even if it is clothed in purple; so a woman will forever be a woman, in other words, a fool, no matter what mask she puts on herself» [11, p. 24]. The reasons for the humor of E. Rotterdam are “masking” of the shortcomings of the corresponding society – the Renaissance. However, his attitude to women is accompanied by an allegory – it is natural for him on the basis of legitimized culture of male domination.

Continuing a number of philosophical views of this era, let us turn to the opinion of Michel Montaigne: «Everyone knows that there are not so many good women, not thirteen to a dozen, and especially not many good wives. After all, marriage is fraught with so many thorns that it is difficult for a woman to keep her attachment unchanged for many years. Although men are a little higher in this respect, it is not easy for them either» [20, p. 643]. This opinion is organically intertwined with the opinion of another prominent philosopher Francis Bacon: «If a wife considers her husband wise, she is bound to him by the best ties – those of chastity and obedience» [7, p. 368]. Or: «he one who has a wife and children has given hostages to fate, for the family is an obstacle to the accomplishment of great enterprises, both virtuous and malicious. There is no doubt that the best undertakings that have brought the greatest benefit to society came from unmarried and childless people, who, as



if with their affections and their wealth, have merged with society and endowed it» [7, p. 368-369].

Founded in Antiquity and broadcast throughout the Middle Ages, philosophical ideas regarding the status of women have changed little in Modern times. Thus, while studying the works of T. Hobbes, we still see the man's dominant attitude toward women: «A family, which is not part of any state, is itself a small monarchy in relation to the rights of the supreme power, regardless of whether the family consists of a person and his children, or from a man and his servants, or from a man and his children and servants together. In all these cases, the father or master is the sovereign» [13, p. 158].

The greatest philosopher of the Enlightenment, J.J. Rousseau, who it would seem, discerned and understood the essence of the problem of discrimination against women, exclaiming: «Will a man turn your companion of his life into a servant? Would he deprive himself of the greatest pleasure of being in the society of a well-bred woman? Is it possible that in order to completely enslave a woman, he will teach her not to perceive anything and will not give her any knowledge? Would he turn her into a living automaton? Of course, no!» [22, p. 555]. However, completely – that's the key word! A kind, diligent, fair master may even feel sorry for his servants. But he can't completely get rid of his master's habits. And what do we see further: «Therefore, when raising women, it is necessary to keep in mind their relationship with men. Like men, to be useful to them, to earn their love and respect, to educate them at an early age, care for them in adulthood, give them advice, comfort, make their life easy and pleasant – these are women's responsibilities at all times, and all this should be taught to women since childhood» [22, p. 556].

These weak attempts by J.J. Rousseau to “protect” a woman and her social status were continued in the works of the outstanding representative of German philosophy, G. Hegel: «According to Kant's barbarian conception, marriage is the mutual provision of the genitals, and in addition the whole body: or the opinion that it is possible to force marriage» [14, p. 338]. Here it is a damning assessment of degrading male behavior, given by a man of the New Age! But suddenly (and suddenly whether!?), we read also with him: «Women can be educated, but for higher sciences

like philosophy, and for some works of art that require the universal, they are not created. Women may have wit, taste, and grace, but they are not perfect». Or read on: the difference between a man and a woman is the same as the difference between animal and plant: the animal is more in line with the nature of man, the plant is more on the nature of women» [15, p. 199]. And here the Hegelian “plant” has very little left to another, but already quite modern and familiar concept – “vegetable”, i.e. a person who is completely dependent on others in his life activity, due to a serious violation of cognitive and regulatory functions. In another way, this condition is now called vegetative, that is, plant.

In subsequent philosophical works of the mid-19th century, a similar view on this problem is demonstrated. So, referring to the works of A. Schopenhauer, we see the same position of male superiority: «... they stand as one closed whole against the whole male, possessing thanks to the natural superiority of bodily and spiritual forces, possesses all the earthly goods: this is their common enemy, which must be overcome and subdued in order to possess it, and achieve the possession of the earthly goods» [24, p. 77]. Stereotypically describing the personal qualities of women Schopenhauer writes: «She is instinctively sly, but at the same time, from lack of understanding and small intelligence, she is quarrelsome, capricious, vain, addicted to glitter, pomp and tinsel; in relations with each other, she shows more constraint, secrecy and hostility than men in relations with each other. Women do not have a true vocation for music, poetry, or art in general; even the most brilliant female representatives have never created anything truly great and original in the artistic field; they are even less able to surprise the world with a scientific creation with lasting virtues. This is explained by the fact that a woman is always and in everything doomed only to mediate domination through the man whom alone she owns directly... Women in all respects – the second weaker gender below men... By their very nature, women are undoubtedly bound to obey; this is evident from the fact that any one of them – once she is placed in an independent position – voluntarily surrenders herself to the care of a lover or confessor, if only some man will rule over her» [21, p. 147].

Another prominent representative of the gender theory of male dominance in society is L. Feuerbach. About the position of women in society, the philosopher speaks quite traditionally – she should be a wife and mother, because only in these roles can her abilities fully manifest themselves. «A woman represents the flesh, a man is the spirit, i.e., a man is the head, a woman is the belly of humanity» [12, p. 161]. The bodily difference between a man and a woman, the difference in feelings, is considered as the opposition of the spirit and the flesh. “What is love?” asks Feuerbach and answers: «The unity of thought and being. Being is a woman, thinking is a man» [12, p. 178].

The above examples of philosophical views are only a small fraction of the ideas that existed both in the mass consciousness and in the intellectual environment about the role and place of women in society. And here we can see that even the most educated, progressive-minded members of society, among whom we undoubtedly include philosophers, have demonstrated (and not always!) only individual attempts to understand this problem against the background of the prevailing discriminating male thinking, free or involuntary whose followers they are.

The first significant changes in relation to the subordinate status of women can be observed only from the second half of the XIX century. And the most important reason for these changes was the understanding of the relationship between dependent women’s status and the specifics of socio-economic formations. In this regard, it is only in the conditions of the formed capitalist system that the relative, but nevertheless, economic and social independence of women from men has become possible. And the clearest example of such changes is the awareness of researchers of these problems of the relationship of the process of the very origin of the basis of family and marriage relations – monogamy with the development of socio-economic relations (private property). Thus, the founder of historical determinism, F. Engels, in his works, notes the victory of private over public property: «Since private property was concentrated primarily in men, the monogamous family – “this is the domination of the husband with a definite goal the birth of children whose origin from a certain father is not subject to doubt, and this indis-

putability of origin is necessary, because children in time as direct heirs must take possession of the father's property» [19, p. 65].

The ideologist of the New Time A. Bebel, among the characteristics of the capitalist formation, highlights the independence of women: «woman of the new society is completely independent in social and economic terms... she is the mistress of her own destiny, she chooses for her activities such areas that correspond to her desires, abilities and inclinations, and under the same conditions, she acts just like a man» [9, p. 43].

The above examples of philosophical views are only a small proportion of ideas about the role and place of women in society that existed both in the mass consciousness and in the intellectual environment, which led to the launch of the process of forming the egalitarian status of women. The development (first very cautious, and then more and more rapid) of this process led, as the authors had previously noted to: «egalitarianization deeply penetrated the consciousness of modern people, which is accompanied by an increase in the freedom of partners in constructing the forms and norms of family-marriage relations while weakening social control over young families» [17, p. 64].

## Conclusion

Thus, we can state the beginning of the process of forming the egalitarian status of women. But why did it take philosophers of various historical eras more than two thousand years to accept it? The reason for this, apparently, is the need of the majority of men of different social groups (peasants, workers, intellectuals, politicians, philosophers to own a woman. After all, owning a woman is the easiest, most pleasant, most natural, necessary, profitable possession in the history of mankind. And the opinions of New Age philosophers and contemporary gender researchers «have convincingly shown that, one way or another, the political attitudes of regimes that support conservative ideology, with all the differences in cultural grounds, in time and space, in the “women's question” had exactly this common denominator – the establishment of control over women» [1, p. 6].

And here we can define the origin, development and destruction of one of the most important misconceptions in the history of the development of

civilization, namely “patriarchal blindness”, which can be defined as a universal model where young people obey their elders, women obey men; as a way of distributing power in the family, where husbands determine the position of their wives based on their basic interests, permanent and strong, ignoring other, different points of view. And this manifests itself in numerous representations of the understanding of the family in different countries, different eras, schools as the dominance of the ideology of masculine power.

### References

1. Aivazova S.G. Gendernyy diskurs v pole konservativnoy politiki [Gender discourse in the field of conservative politics]. *Zhenshchina v rossiyskom obshchestve* [Woman in Russian Society], 2017, no. 4, pp. 3-13. <https://doi.org/10.21064/WinRS.2017.4.1>
2. Aysner L. Yu., et al. *Aktual'nye psikhologo-pedagogicheskie, filosofskie, ekonomicheskie i yuridicheskie problemy sovremennogo rossiyskogo obshchestva* [Current psychological, pedagogical, philosophical, economic and legal problems of modern Russian society]. Ul'yanovsk: Zebra Publ., 2019, vol. 4, 490 p.
3. Aysner L. Yu., et al. *Aktual'nye psikhologo-pedagogicheskie, filosofskie, ekonomicheskie i yuridicheskie problemy sovremennogo rossiyskogo obshchestva* [Current psychological, pedagogical, philosophical, economic and legal problems of modern Russian society]. Ul'yanovsk: Zebra Publ., 2021, vol. 6, 293 p.
4. Aristotle. *O proiskhozhdenii zhivotnyh* [On the origin of animal]. Moscow: AN SSSR, 1940, 252 p.
5. Aristotle. *Politika* [Policy]. Moscow: Mysl Publ., 1983, 830 p.
6. Augustine A. *O supruzhestve i pokhoti* [About marriage and lust]. Moscow: RAS Publ., 1994, 187 p.
7. Bacon F. *Opyty ili nastavleniia npravstvennye i politicheskie* [Essays or Counsels, Civil and Moral]. Moscow: Mysl Publ., 1978, vol. 2, 592 p.
8. Baikalova N.S. Gender features in female political discourse: the construction of Hillary Clinton's political image. *Journal of Siberian Federal University. Humanities & Social Sciences*, 2021, no. 14(4), pp. 584-591. <https://doi.org/10.17516/1997-1370-0030>

9. Bebel A. *Zhenshchina i sotsializm* [Woman and socialism]. Moscow: Gospolitizdat Publ., 1959, 592 p.
10. Demosthenes. *Rechi* [Speeches]. Moscow: Pamiatniki istoricheskoi mysli Publ., 1994, vol. 2, 624 p.
11. Erasmus Roterdamus. *Pokhvala gluposti* [In praise of folly]. Moscow: Gosudarstvennoe izdatel'stvo khudozhestvennoï literatury, 1960, 168 p.
12. Feuerbach, L. *Sochineniia* [Works]. Moscow: Nauka Publ., 1995, vol. 2, 425 p.
13. Gobbs T. *Leviathan* [Leviathan]. Moscow: Mysl Publ., 1991, vol. 2, 731 p.
14. Hegel G. Ienskaia real'naia filosofiiia [Jena Realphilosophie]. *Raboty raznyh let* [Works of Different Years]. Moscow: Mysl Publ., 1970, vol. 2, 668 p.
15. Hegel G. *Filosofiiia prava* [Philosophy of right]. Moscow: Sotsekgiz Publ., 1934, vol. 7, 384 p.
16. Oprea I.M. Family and the Challenges of the Contemporary Society. *Astra Salvensis*, 2019, no. 7 (14), pp. 195-200.
17. Malimonov I.V., Sin'kovskaya I.G., Korol' L.G., Rakhinskiy D.V. Brachnyy vozrast i ego rol' v transformatsii brachnogo povedeniya sovremennoy molodezhi [The marriageable age and its role in the transformation of the marital behavior of modern youth]. *Sovremennaya nauka: aktual'nye problemy teorii i praktiki* [Modern Science: Actual Problems of Theory and Practice], 2017, no. 9-10, pp. 63-66.
18. Malimonov I.V., Rakhinskiy D.V., Sinkovskaya I.G., Korol L.G. Global changes of family unit in modern Russia. *Astra Salvensis*, 2018, no. 6 (12), pp. 623-633.
19. Marx K., Engels F. Proiskhozhdenie sem'i, chastnoï sobstvennosti i gosudarstva [The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State]. *Sochineniia* [Works]. Moscow: Gosudarstvennoe izdatel'stvo politicheskoi literatury Publ., 1961, vol. 21, pp. 28-178.
20. Montaigne M. *Opiti* [Essays]. Moscow: TERRA Publ., 1991, vol. 2, 715 p.
21. Pertsev A.V. Shopengauër: zhizn' filosofa i filosofiiia zhizni [Schopenhauer: philosopher's life and philosophy of life]. *Homo philosophans*. St. Petersburg: Sankt-Peterburgskoe filosofskoe obshchestvo Publ., 2002, no. 12, pp. 140-159.

22. Rousseau J.J. *Izbrannyye sochineniia* [Selected works]. Moscow: Gosudarstvennoe izdatel'stvo politicheskoi literatury Publ., 1991, vol. 1, 852 p.
23. Sainsbury D. Gender and welfare state regimes. New York: Oxford University press Publ., 1999, 255 p.
24. Schopenhauer A. *Aforizmy zHITEISKOI mudrosti* [Aphorisms of Worldly Wisdom]. St. Petersburg: Azbuka-Attikus Publ., 2012, 256 p.

### *Список литературы*

1. Айвазова С. Г. Гендерный дискурс в поле консервативной политики // Женщина в российском обществе. 2017. № 4. С. 3-13. <https://doi.org/10.21064/WinRS.2017.4.1>
2. Айснер Л.Ю., Гончаревич Н.А., Ерахтина Е.А. и др. // Актуальные психолого-педагогические, философские, экономические и юридические проблемы современного российского общества: коллективная монография. Ульяновск, Издательство «Зебра», 2019. Выпуск 4. 490 с.
3. Айснер Л.Ю., Наумов О.Д., Вяткина Г.Я. и др. Актуальные психолого-педагогические, философские, экономические и юридические проблемы современного российского общества: коллективная монография / Выпуск 6. Ульяновск: Зебра, 2021. 293 с.
4. Аристотель. О возникновении животных. М.: Изд-во АН СССР, 1940. 252 с.
5. Аристотель. Политика. М.: Мысль, 1983. 830 с.
6. Августин А. О супружестве и похоти // Трактаты о любви. сб. текстов. М.: РАН, 1994. 187 с.
7. Бэкон Ф. Опыты или наставления нравственные и политические. Сочинения в двух томах. М.: Мысль, 1978. Т. 2. 592 с.
8. Baikalova N.S. Gender Features in Female Political Discourse: the Construction of Hillary Clinton's Political Image // Journal of Siberian Federal University. Humanities & Social Sciences, 2021, no. 14(4), pp. 584-591. <https://doi.org/10.17516/1997-1370-0030>
9. Бебель А. Женщина и социализм. М.: Госполитиздат, 1959. 592 с.
10. Демосфен. Речи: в 3-х т. М.: Изд-во «Памятники исторической мысли», В 3т. 1994. Т. 2. 624 с.

11. Роттердамский Э. Похвала глупости. М.: Государственное издательство художественной литературы, 1960. 168 с.
12. Фейербах Л. Сочинения. М.: Наука, 1995. 425 с.
13. Гоббс Т. Левиафан. Избранные произведения. М.: Мысль, 1991. Т. 2. 731 с.
14. Гегель Г. Иенская реальная философия // Работы разных лет. М.: Изд-во «Мысль», 1970. В 2 томах. Т.1. 668 с.
15. Гегель Г. Философия права. полное собр. соч.: в 14 томах. М.: Соцэкгиз, Т. 7: Философия права. 1934. 384 с.
16. Oprea I.M. Family and the Challenges of the Contemporary Society // *Astra Salvensis*, 2019, no. 7 (14), pp. 195-200.
17. Малимонов И.В., Синьковская И.Г., Король Л.Г., Рахинский Д.В. Брачный возраст и его роль в трансформации брачного поведения современной молодежи // Современная наука: актуальные проблемы теории и практики. Серия Познание. 2017. № 9-10. С. 63-66.
18. Malimonov I.V., Rakhinsky D.V., Sinkovskaya I.G., et al. Global changes of family unit in modern Russia // *Astra Salvensis*, 2018, vol. 6(12), pp. 623-633.
19. Маркс К., Энгельс Ф. Происхождение семьи, частной собственности и государства // Сочинения. Изд-е 2-е. М.: Государственное издательство политической литературы, 1961. Т. 21. С. 28-178.
20. Монтень М. Опыты. М.: ТЕРРА, В 3 кн. 1991. Кн. 2. 1991. 715 с.
21. Перцев А.В. Шопенгауэр: жизнь философа и философия жизни // Серия «Мыслители», Homo philosophans. Выпуск 12 / Сборник к 60-летию профессора К.А. Сергеева. Санкт-Петербург: Санкт-Петербургское философское общество, 2002. С. 140-159.
22. Руссо Ж.-Ж. Избранные сочинения. М.: В 3т. Государственное издательство художественной литературы, 1961. Т. 1. 852 с.
23. Sainsbury D. Gender and welfare state regimes. New York: Oxford University press, 1999, 293 p.
24. Шопенгауэр А. Афоризмы житейской мудрости. Санкт-Петербург: Азбука-Аттикус, 2012. 256 с.



**DATA ABOUT THE AUTHORS**

**Igor' V. Malimonov**, Senior Lecturer, Department of Modern Educational Technologies; Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology

*Siberian Federal University; Siberian Institute of Business, Management and Psychology*

*79, Svobodny Av., Krasnoyarsk, 660041, Russian Federation; 7A, Moskovskaya Str., Krasnoyarsk, 660037, Russian Federation*

*igonet70@mail.com*

*SPIN-code: 3277-2969*

*ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7909-0816>*

*Scopus Author ID: 57204505313*

**Liudmila G. Korol'**, Candidate of Biological Sciences, Assistant Professor, Department of Medical and Biological Bases of Physical Culture and Health Technologies; Assistant Professor, Department of Philosophy, Social and Humanitarian Sciences

*Siberian Federal University; V.F. Voino-Yasenetsky Krasnoyarsk State Medical University*

*79B, Svobodny Av., Krasnoyarsk, 660041, Russian Federation; 124, Karla Marksa, Str., Krasnoyarsk, 660021, Russian Federation*

*SPIN-code: 1843-9511*

*ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7664-1814>*

**Irina G. Sin'kovskaia**, Candidate of Sociological Sciences, Assistant Professor, Department of Social Work and Sociology; Assistant Professor, Department of Sociology

*Reshetnev Siberian State University of Science and Technology; Siberian Federal University*

*69, Lenina Str., 660037, Krasnoyarsk, Russian Federation; 79, Svobodny Av., Krasnoyarsk, 660041, Russian Federation*

*SPIN-code: 7250-7223*

*ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8591-2073>*

**Dmitry V. Rakhinsky**, Doctor of Philosophy, Professor, Department of Public Health and Healthcare; Professor, Department of Civil Law and Procedure

*V.F. Voino-Yasenetsky Krasnoyarsk State Medical University;  
Krasnoyarsk State Agrarian University*

*1, Partizana Zheleznyaka Str., Krasnoyarsk, 660022, Russian Federation; 117, Lenina Str., Krasnoyarsk, 660017, Russian Federation  
SPIN-code: 1326-9486*

*ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4971-7523>*

*ResearcherID: AAN-2106-2020*

*Scopus Author ID: 57202820440*

**Yuliya S. Shepeleva**, Senior Lecturer, Department of Public Health and Healthcare

*V.F. Voino-Yasenetsky Krasnoyarsk State Medical University*

*1, Partizana Zheleznyaka Str., Krasnoyarsk, 660022, Russian Federation*

*SPIN-code: 9928-3788*

*ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2092-5532>*

*ResearcherID: ABH-9135-2020*

## **ДАННЫЕ ОБ АВТОРАХ**

**Малимонов Игорь Васильевич**, старший преподаватель кафедры современных образовательных технологий; доцент кафедры психологии

*Федеральное государственное автономное образовательное учреждение высшего образования «Сибирский федеральный университет»; Автономная некоммерческая организация высшего образования «Сибирский институт бизнеса, управления и психологии»*

*пр. Свободный, 79, г. Красноярск, 660041, Российская Федерация; ул. Московская, 7А, г. Красноярск, 660037, Российская Федерация*

*[igonet70@mail.com](mailto:igonet70@mail.com)*

**Король Людмила Геннадьевна**, кандидат биологических наук, доцент кафедры медико-биологических основ физической культуры и оздоровительных технологий; доцент кафедры философии и социально-гуманитарных наук  
*Федеральное государственное автономное образовательное учреждение высшего образования «Сибирский федеральный университет»*; *Федеральное государственное бюджетное образовательное учреждение высшего образования «Красноярский государственный медицинский университет имени профессора В.Ф. Войно-Ясенецкого» Министерства здравоохранения Российской Федерации*  
*пр. Свободный, 79Б, г. Красноярск, 660041, Российская Федерация; ул. Карла Маркса, 124 г. Красноярск, 660021, Российская Федерация*

**Синьковская Ирина Георгиевна**, кандидат социологических наук, доцент кафедры социальной работы и социологии; доцент кафедры социологии  
*Федеральное государственное бюджетное образовательное учреждение высшего образования «Сибирский государственный университет науки и технологий имени академика М.Ф. Решетнева»*; *Федеральное государственное автономное образовательное учреждение высшего образования «Сибирский федеральный университет»*  
*ул. Ленина, 69, г. Красноярск, 660037, Российская Федерация; пр. Свободный, 79, г. Красноярск, 660041, Российская Федерация*

**Рахинский Дмитрий Владимирович**, доктор философских наук, профессор кафедры общественного здоровья и здравоохранения; профессор кафедры гражданского права и процесса  
*Федеральное государственное бюджетное образовательное учреждение высшего образования «Красноярский государственный медицинский университет имени профессора В.Ф. Войно-Ясенецкого» Министерства здравоохранения Россий-*

*ской Федерации; Федеральное государственное бюджетное образовательное учреждение высшего образования «Красноярский государственный аграрный университет» ул. Партизана Железняка, 1, Красноярск, 660022, Российская Федерация; ул. Ленина, 117, г. Красноярск, 660017, Российская Федерация*

**Шепелева Юлия Сергеевна**, старший преподаватель кафедры философии и социально-гуманитарных наук  
*Федеральное государственное бюджетное образовательное учреждение высшего образования «Красноярский государственный медицинский университет имени профессора В. Ф. Войно-Ясенецкого» Министерства здравоохранения Российской Федерации ул. Партизана Железняка, 1, Красноярск, 660022, Российская Федерация*

Поступила 06.04.2023

После рецензирования 26.04.2023

Принята 03.05.2023

Received 06.04.2023

Revised 26.04.2023

Accepted 03.05.2023