

УДК 1(091)
DOI:10.17721/sophia.2022.20.12

Vitalii Turenko, PhD, Researcher
Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, Kyiv, Ukraine
ORCID: 0000-0003-0572-9119
e-mail: vitali_turenko@ukr.net

FEATURES OF EXPLICATION OF LOVE BY REPRESENTATIVES OF THE SECOND SOPHISTIC

In the article, on the basis of the problem approach, a historical-philosophical reconstruction of the understanding of love in the movement of the second sophistic is performed. Its features and contribution to the development of the implicit philosophy of love are considered. It is proved that in the movement of the second sophistic, for the first time in historical and philosophical discourse, we can see an explicit thought about love not just as a feeling, but as a huge work, which involves incredible efforts and tensions of the participants in love discourse. The thinkers of the second sophistic also emphasized the rationality of the nature of love, thus such an understanding of love significantly raises it to such a height among all other human feelings. Therefore, love, which is able to know everything around and helps a person to know the Other, is not mercantile or evaluative, but creates in the human soul responsibility for the one she loves. It is revealed that the peculiarity of the explication of love in the second sophistic is also the understanding of love as a phenomenon of power, and the discourse of love as a discourse of war and conquest. It is these sentences that largely determined the course of development of the Renaissance philosophy of love and the emergence of courtly culture. It is shown that it is this school of the history of ancient philosophy that paid great attention to understanding parental love, emphasizing not just the connection and proximity to the animal world, but revealing the timeless depth and meaning of the relationship between children and parents.

Keywords: second sophistic, ancient philosophy, love, human life, nature of love ancient philosophy of love.

The theme of love has always been at the center of philosophical thought since ancient times. In ancient philosophy, understanding the problem of love was relevant in philosophical treatises from Empedocles to Plotinus. At the same time, we can talk about "blank spots" in scientific works devoted to the development of the ancient philosophy of love. Therefore, in this context, the Socratic schools, the Peripatetics, and, undoubtedly, the second sophistic are little studied.

We state the fact that recently a number of fundamental monographs have been published devoted to the study of the second sophistic, such as the works of D. Richter [26], T. Schmidt [27], T. Whitmarsh [28], but the theme of love in they are touched upon only slightly and rather briefly. At the same time, we can note the works of S. Goldhill [22] and A. Richlin [25], which highlight the analyzed issues in the context of understanding the love practices of this time, and also as an aspect of the ethical views of one or another representative of this direction of ancient philosophy.

As early as the 2nd century AC, Flavius Philostratus, in his famous work "Lives of the Sophists", namely about forty people as the second sophistic. Modern scientists have about thirty people who can be attributed to the second sophistic. Realizing that the volume of the article does not allow us to consider the heritage of all its representatives, and also based on the fact that history, geography, military science or literary art (novels) were also at the center of the creative and scientific activities of a number of representatives, we limited ourselves to the works of Aulus Gellius, Athenaeus, Dio Chrysostom, Lucian, Plutarch, Flavius Philostratus, Claudius Aelianus.

With all this, we understand that it is difficult to talk about a consistent and holistic concept of understanding love in the second sophistic, for example, as it was in the classical period, in the context of Corpus Platonicum and Corpus Aristotelicum. But this does not prevent us from showing the specifics and features of the explication of love in this period of the sophistic movement. Therefore, for us, the methodological basis of the study is not so much a chronological as a problematic approach. Hence, the purpose of the presented article is a comprehensive consideration of the phenomenon of love in the second sophistic.

In our opinion, conceptually it is possible to single out two areas of the themes of understanding the ontological aspects of love during the studied period of ancient thought:

1) "cross-cutting", which are present throughout ancient philosophy – the ambivalence of the nature of love (Ath.XIII 14)¹, love gives rise to the desire for beauty (Philostr.VSII 18 (599)), love is "wider" than friendship and promotes unity in society (Ath.XIII 12);

2) "innovative" – love is work (Luc.DDeor. II 2, Ath.XIII 11), Eros has no power over the goddesses Artemis and Athena (Luc.DDeor. XIX 1-2).

Let's consider each of them further separately.

Athenaeus, speaking of the ambivalence of love, emphasizes that Eros has two arrows: "One brings a good lot to us, The other confuses life with turmoil" (τὸ μὲν ἐπ' εὐδαιμονίᾳ τύχῃ, τὸ δ' ἐπὶ συγχύσει βῶ). This idea of Athenaeus is consonant with such his predecessors as Cynic Cercidas (fr.6) and Plato (See: Symp. 203d-204a). Therefore, "with the advent of love, as Y. Riurikov emphasizes, we embark on a path where not only the joys of life increase sharply, but even more its difficulties, its pain, anxieties. This is a completely new stimulus among the stimuli of human behavior, and it throws its reflection on all other stimuli, shifts their balance, changes their proportions dramatically. The simplicity of human life is now disappearing, the birth of love complicates individual life, depriving it of clarity, integrity and clear certainty" [11, p.35].

At the same time, it should be emphasized that in the context of the development of ancient philosophy, the "red thread" was a discussion about the relationship between friendship and love. The legacy of representatives of the second sophistic is no exception in this regard. So, for example, Athenaeus emphasizes that it is not friendship that leads to Eros, but vice versa, and that thanks to him, harmony in the city is possible (See: Ath.XIII 12). thus implicitly saying that friendship is higher than passionate desires, it is higher than any kind of lust. Friendship is higher, because it is she who is able to lead to agreement and keep the world in one or another political system.

¹ Citation of ancient authors is carried out according to the original texts. Therefore, the generally accepted pagination is used.

The consistency of the idea of ancient philosophy about the connection and direct influence of love-friendship on the social system and order is obvious. After all, even Aristotle in *Politics* writes that "Benevolent (friendly) relations are a great blessing for states (after all, in the presence of these relations, fewer strife is possible), and Socrates generally praises the unity of the state, and this unity, as he himself, perhaps, asserts, is the result of benevolent relations (as is known, Aristophanes speaks about this in his speech on love, namely, that those who love, as a result of their strong love, strive for merging, strive to become one from two beings)" (*Polit.* 1262b).

Therefore, both in the classical period and during the second sophistic, thinkers realized: "love goes beyond individual relationships and circumstances, it affects the entire social and cultural life of mankind. It acts as the driving force behind man's creative progress towards a fuller eternal truth, a more worthy eternal virtue, a purer eternal beauty, a profound eternal freedom, and the most eternal forms of social life and institutions. Throughout history, every positive step in this direction has been inspired and "driven by the energy" of love, while the regressive step back from these values has been driven by hatred" [13, p.134].

In addition to the ambivalence of love and its importance for society, in the work of representatives of the second sophistic we can observe a "cross-cutting" theme of the aesthetic nature of love. In particular, Flavius Philostratus writes about the connection between love and beauty ("Ερως, ο του κάλλους πατήρ"), emphasizing that love is the creator of beauty. There is clearly an allusion to Plato's "Symposium" (See: *Symp.*204b). Therefore, one can really say that the path of love is the path of beauty. Love cannot give birth to something ugly. It is the feeling of beauty that arises only on the path of love that is able to make a person a personality, deprives him of various kinds of animal instincts, bestows on him humanity. Consequently, love is an ontological restructuring of human existence, since selfishness is replaced by sacrifice, the stingy become generous, the arrogant is transformed into the humble. This is the beauty and depth of love as a relationship between a loving couple, and regarding the people around us, friends.

In this regard, it would be appropriate to recall the following thought of G.-G. Gadamer "The essence of beauty is not at all in opposition to reality or in contrast to reality. Beauty, no matter how unexpected it may arise, is already like a guarantee that the true does not stay somewhere inaccessible distance, but goes towards us in reality, despite all its chaos and imperfection, all its intractability, all the absurdities, one-sidedness and the fatal mistakes associated with it. This is the ontological function of the beautiful: "to bridge" over the abyss separating the ideal and the real" [3; p. 80].

At the same time, it is especially important to study the creativity of representatives of the second sophistic due to the fact that they not only continued the "cross-cutting" themes of the ancient philosophy of love, but also contributed new ideas for its further development.

So, Lucian in "Dialogues of the Gods" writes about love as a huge work that involves a lot of effort. So in the dialogue of Zeus and Eros we read the following: "I will not refuse love, but I want it to cost me less labor" (*Luc.DDeor.* II 2). We also find something similar in Athenaeus, who, turning to Eros: "Or make it so that, enchanted by him, the labors of love are carried easily and happily" (*Ath.* XIII 11). This understanding of love as labor in an explicit form is an innovation for ancient philosophy. We can say that for an ancient thinker, love is not only a feeling, but an "alloy" of various kinds of elements – care, forgiveness, attention,

responsibility, respect, tenderness, passion, etc. It is in this complexity that he sees that love can well be called a special labor. Indeed, in this context, one can agree with the thought of O. Zubets "the labor of love means that love brings with it many misfortunes, a love story is full of difficulties. Love in itself inevitably puts forward trials, because it goes beyond the existing value-normative system... If love is work, then it must grow, develop, especially pass the test of time. It is not enough just to meet, you also have to fight in order to cherish and grow this love so that it does not lose its healing power" [5, p.5].

Lucian also says that Eros has no power over a number of ancient Greek goddesses (*Luc. DDeor.* XIX 1-2), then, in our opinion, she implicitly also has a number of philosophical meanings. So, in particular, the ancient Greek thinker writes that Eros has no power over Athena, since the latter does not want to love and is terrible in appearance. Perhaps here is an allusion to the well-known thought of the Stoic Hecato of Rhodes, which Seneca quotes: "if you want to be loved, love" (*Sen. Luc.* IX, 6). This also applies to Lucian's maxim about Artemis. But at the same time, he adds in relation to her that she has "her own love" – for hunting. Consequently, he has no power over those who have a different hobby, and who see the meaning of life, their existence in other manifestations of desire, passion, etc.

Summing up, we can conclude that the representatives of the second sophistic both continued the "cross-cutting" themes of understanding the ontological aspects of love in antiquity and introduced some innovative ideas in its development. This makes it possible to talk about the special contribution of the thinkers of this movement in the history of philosophical reflections on love.

Both in early and classical ancient Greek philosophy, and in the movement of the second sophistic, thinkers did not bypass questions concerning the epistemological essence of love – primarily about its reasonableness or unreasonableness. Within the framework of the movement under study, one can see both positive and negative solutions to the problem of the relationship between reason and love.

As for the negative understanding, Flavius Philostratus in the "Lives of the Sophists" emphasizes: "Among the young lovers, not a single retains the mind" (και γαρ δή και νέοι ρώντες αστις αυτών του έχει (*Philostr.* VIII 517)). In some moments, indeed, love makes people "stupid", "blind", and "deaf". Such her manifests itself in the fact that it can be destroyed, which is incompatible with it – pride, vanity, impatience, unforgiveness, envy, lies. However, love is compassionate and always "sees", and "hears" where there is forgiveness, understanding, truth, patience, etc.

Therefore, the Western thinker Z. Bauman correctly notes: "Love is afraid of reason; the mind is afraid of love. One stubbornly tries to do without the other. But when they succeed, expect trouble. Such, in the briefest summary, are the vicissitudes of love. And reason. Separating them from each other means disaster. But in their dialogue, if it happens, an acceptable *modus vivendi* is rarely born. Reason and love speak different, hard-to-translate languages; the exchange of words leads rather to deepening mutual disagreement and suspicion than to true understanding and sympathy. In fact, love and reason are much less likely to exchange opinions than just try to shout each other. Reason expresses itself better than love, and therefore it is painfully difficult, if not impossible at all, to defend its rights" [1, p.204].

At the same time, Athenaeus, quoting Euripides, does not agree with the above thought of Philostratus and emphasizes that Eros is a "child of wisdom" (παιδίευμα

δ'Ἐρως σοφίας) (Ath.XIII 11). Accordingly, love, according to this representative of the second sophistic, cannot exist outside the mind, prudent activity. Without mutual understanding as an attribute, love will be an empty feeling. Being in the middle between Heaven and people, love performs primarily a verbal service. This is precisely its main function and strength. Love is a hermeneutic (δαιμόνιον ἑρμηνεύον), which gives people an understanding of divine truth. It is in this perspective that Plato speaks of erotic knowledge: he means knowledge that begins with love [15, p. 63]. Love seeks knowledge and at the same time possesses it. Indeed, one can speak of "the meaning of love as an intention of cognition, penetration into the essence of the existing other, in a sense of value, thanks to which a person is combined with the spiritual space of freedom and becomes a being for himself" [7, p. 138].

We also find the following in Athenaeus: "Who says that lovers are crazy, Probably, he himself was of a stupid... I myself have now fallen in love with a girl-citharist, Silly, tiny, so am I stupid?" (τίς φησὶ τοὺς ἑρῶντας οὐχὶ νοῦν ἔχειν; ἢ ποῦ τίς ἐστὶ τοὺς τρόπους ἀβέλτερος... ἐγὼ μὲν οὖν καὶ τὸς κιθαριστρίας ἑρῶν, παιδὸς κόρης, οὐ νοῦν ἔχω πρὸς τῶν θεῶν;) (Ath. XIII14). Based on this, we can conclude that in fact, love is a unique and only way to know your neighbour: "no one can know the essence of another person until he loves it. In the spiritual act of love, a person becomes able to see the features and characteristics of a loved one, and even more, she sees potential in him that which is not discovered but must be invented" [2, p. 37].

Such an understanding of love significantly raises it to such a height among all other human feelings. Therefore, love, which is able to know everything around and helps a person to know the Other, is not mercantile or evaluative, but creates in the human soul responsibility for the one she loves.

The reason is an indispensable assistant for love in understanding the Other, because "nature itself, the essence of love, is not in the comprehension and mastery of the object of love, not in the fulfilment of desire, but in the fact that it is the way to comprehend the object of desire, which is always distant and necessarily external in relation to the soul of the lover" [5, p. 364].

Plutarch, as if connecting these maxims, says: "...I understood: the painters have no idea about the god Eros, and indeed everyone who depicts him. After all, Eros is not a man, and not a woman, not a man, not a god, not stupid, not wise Eros, but collects qualities from everywhere, merging all the features in a single image: courage from a man, timidity of a woman, stupidity of a madman, prudence of a man"(Ath. XIII 13). Here one can clearly feel the allusions to the myth of the birth of Eros from Poros and Penia, displayed in Plato's "Symposium".

Consequently, we see that within the framework of the second sophistic, thoughts are heard that both deny and affirm the close connection between reason and love. At the same time, there are thoughts that speak about the ambivalence of love in the epistemological context.

The understanding of love in human life in the context of the heritage of the second sophistic manifests itself in different aspects. Considering their work, in our opinion, the following topics can be especially distinguished:

- ¼ the discourse of love as power over each other;
- ¼ relationships between lovers as a war (struggle, battle);
- ¼ the significance of the eyes for those who love;
- ¼ suffering from loved ones;
- ¼ the love between parents and children.

Let's analyze each of them more carefully.

Lucian writes in "Conversations of the Gods": "Love really owns and leads, as they say, by the nose wherever it wants, and you go wherever it leads you, and unquestioningly turn into whatever it orders. You are a real slave and toy of love" (σοῦ μὲν καὶ πᾶντο οὗτός γε δεσπότης ἐστὶ καὶ ἄγει σε καὶ φέρει τῆς ῥινόσ, φασίν, ἔλκων, καὶ σὺ ἔπη αὐτῶ ἔνθα ἂν ἠγήται σοι, καὶ ἀλλάττη ῥαδίως ἐς ὃ τι ἂν κελεύσῃ, καὶ ὄλως κτῆμα καὶ παιδιὰ τοῦ ἔρωτος σύ γε:) (Luc.DDeor.VI 3).

Therefore, the one who is loved has power and authority. However, "love, as S. Solovyova emphasizes, reigns in a completely different way, then it might seem at first glance. The two power channels of love are tenderness (refusal of pressure, energy that envelops the Other) and passion (an open demonstration of strength presented as a challenge). Tenderness as a type of strength gives rise to the patronizing nature of power in love. With passion in a close circle are sexuality, jealousy, aggression, care, participation, support are associated with tenderness" [12, p.25–26].

Being so strong, love grants power to those who are in its power. Therefore, lovers are able to endure everything. "She (love – V.T.) always lends her shoulder to the Other in order to support him. She is always by his side, no matter how he develops and manifests himself. Love remains with a person in all his wanderings and confusions. She is capable of this only because she believes in everything and hopes for everything because she sees goodness in the Other and hopes that this good grain will manifest itself more and more in him. Her power is like a pillar on which the building of mutual relations rests" [6, p. 107].

At the same time, in the concepts of the second sophistic, one of the main thoughts is the idea of the discourse of love as the discourse of war. As proof, the following quotes can be distinguished:

- 1) "Lovers need not military weapons, but musical ones".
- 2) "Those who do not know love are difficult in the battle to measure the forces with someone who is in love" (ἑρῶντι ἀνδρὶ τίς οὐκ ἐν ἐπιγούσης τῆς καὶς καὶ τοῦ τοῦκ ἂν συμμικτῆ).
- 3) "as in a war, he (a lover –V.T.) has to be ready, in eternal tension, be patient and serve desire, create, hurry, take courage, be resourceful and in the dead end – oh, bitter fate!" (Ath. XIII 14).

In the French thinker D. de Rougemont we find: "Starting from antiquity, poets used military metaphors to describe natural love. The god of love is an archer who shoots deadly arrows. A woman is given to a man who conquers her because he is the most successful warrior. The stake of the Trojan War is the possession of a woman. And one of the oldest novels at our disposal, Theagenes and Chariclea by Heliodorus (3rd century), already tells of the "battles for love" and the "delightful defeat" of one who surrenders under the arrows of Eros, which cannot be avoided" [10, p. 268].

At the same time, in the second sophistic, we encounter the idea of the special importance of the eyes in the discourse of love. This is emphasized by Athenaeus in his "Deipnosophistae" (See: Ath.XIII 16-17). The great importance of the eyes for those who love is due to the fact that according to D.P. Manoussakis: "it is thanks to sight that we are able to know what is ours and what is not" [9, p.38] since we look at the Other as at ourselves. Starting the discourse of love (not falling in love), we recognize ourselves and find ourselves in the Other as in a mirror. When the eyes saw something negative in the Other, it is necessary to look for and correct the same trait in oneself. The object of love is a person who will help us improve our-

selves. No need to look for psychologists, psychoanalysts, or someone who would advise how to live, how to be better. The main thing is the eyes, a look at the soulmate; she is our mirror, able to show all our shortcomings, moreover, without diminishing the strength of her love for us.

Even in antiquity, it was understood that there is "inner vision", which D. von Hildebrand speaks of. It means the ability to see in the beloved person the deep; look with eyes not mercantile, evaluative, but full of hope and faith. Otherwise, according to the German thinker: "By appealing to the "external sight", we can make the lover perceive the humility of the object of love as "slavish obedience", his chastity as stupidity, his principled fidelity as pedantry, or even as a sign of mediocrity, his desire for truth. like arrogance and fanaticism...You can destroy the charm of beauty with some unfortunate joke, saying, for example, that a person has a too long or short nose, that traces of the fading of beauty are visible" [4, p.569].

That is why vision (contemplation, sight), eyes are of key importance in love discourse. The thinkers emphasize that the eyes influence not only the beginning of a love discourse, but also the entire subsequent love story, and also note that the eyes sometimes serve as a means of cognition, a specific form of communication between loving personalities. The very feeling of love for its bearer has a powerful epistemological potential, capable of knowing much better and deeper the Other, the world and oneself.

However, in the second sophistic we can meet not only "rosy" aspects of understanding the relationship of lovers, but also realistic ones, namely, those relating to the meaning of suffering between the object and the subject of love.

So, in particular, Lucian in "Nigrinus" notes such a moment in the discourse of love: "Lovers far from their loved ones remember their actions and words and, spending time in this way, drown out their suffering with self-deception, since it seems to them that their loved ones are with them; some even imagine that they are talking to them, and admire what they have heard before, as if it were said now; occupied with memories of the past, they have no time to be weary of the present" (Luc. Nigr. 7). And, indeed, the object of love most often causes suffering and trials for us.

Therefore, love is the direct perception of the absolute value of a person; in this capacity, she is a reverent attitude towards her, a joyful perception of her essence, despite all her shortcomings, a transfer of the meaning of existence to her beloved person [14, p. 101-102].

The second sophistic is also attentive to the philosophical understanding of parental love. So, Aulus Gellius says that parental love is given by nature: "This nature, already from the very beginning saturated with the substance of the father's seed, also forms a new innate property from the soul and body of the mother. And besides everything else, who can ignore and neglect the fact that (women) who abandon their newborns, refuse them and give them to others to feed, destroy or at least weaken that chain and bond of love with which nature unites parents and children" (Gell.XII20-21).

In turn, Plutarch emphasizes the disinterestedness of parental love in this way: "οὐδὲν γὰρ ἐστὶν οὕτως; ἀτελεῖς οὐδ' ἄπορον οὐδὲ γυμνὸν οὐδ' ἄμορφον οὐδὲ μαρόν, ὡς ἄνθρωπος ἐν γοναῖς ὀρώμενος· ὧ μόνῳ σχεδὸν οὐδὲ καθαρὰν ἔδωκεν εἰς φῶς ὀδὸν ἢ φύσις, ἀλλ' αἵματι πεφυρμένος καὶ λύθρου περίπλεως καὶ φονευόμενῳ μᾶλλον ἢ γεννωμένῳ εὐκίως οὐδενός ἐστιν ἄσπασθαι καὶ ἀνελεῖσθαι καὶ ἀσπᾶσθαι καὶ περιλαβεῖν ἢ τοῦ φύσει φιλοῦντος. διὸ τῶν μὲν ἄλλων ζῶων ὑπὸ τὴν γαστέρα τὰ

οὔθата χαλᾶ τοὺς μαστοὺς, ταῖς δὲ γυναιξὶν ἄνω γεγόνασιν περὶ τὸ στέρνον ἐν ἐφικτῷ τοῦ φιλεῖν καὶ περιπτύξαι καὶ κατασπᾶσθαι τὸ νήπιον, ὡς τοῦ τεκεῖν καὶ θρέψαι τέλος οὐ χρεῖαν ἀλλὰ φιλίαν ἔχοντος" (After all, there is nothing so imperfect, so helpless, naked, shapeless and dirty as a person at his birth. Because, as one might say, nature did not even give him a clear path to the light, covered in blood and dirt, more like a dead man than a newly born one. He is an object that no one would like to touch, lift, kiss, or embrace, except for those who love him with natural love. And therefore, in certain animals the nipples for milk hang down under the belly, and in women, they are high on the chest, and in this way mothers can kiss, hug and caress the child, it can be concluded that the ultimate goal of the birth and upbringing of a child is not a certain self-interest and simple expediency, but love) (Plut.Mor.496a-c).

Similar maxims can already be seen in Aristotle's "Nicomachean Ethics", where he writes: "As for the friendship of relatives, then it obviously has many varieties, but any is due to parental, because on the one hand, parents love children as part of themselves On the other hand, children love their parents, being a part of them. The knowledge of parents that children are from them is deeper than the knowledge of those born that they are from parents, and "the one from whom" the born is more strongly attached to them than the born to his creator. Indeed, what comes out of something is native to the one from whom it comes (for example, a tooth, hair, or whatever – for their owner), but for what comes out, from which it comes out nothing does not mean, or at least means less, (difference) and from the point of view of time, namely: parents love what they have born immediately, and the children of parents – after a certain time, when they begin to think or feel. This also makes it clear why mothers have stronger friendships for children than parents (Eth.Nic 1161b 16-33).

As if confirming the above thought of Plutarch, Dio Chrysostom writes the following: "Indeed, good feelings and respect for parents, even without training, are given to people by nature and for the good deeds rendered by parents; in fact, a child, to the best of his ability, from birth, repays with love and affection to the one who gave birth to him, who feeds him and loves him, and the second and third stages of gratitude and respect are bequeathed to us by poets and legislators: the first inspire us not to deprive our elders of love, consanguineous and responsible for our very existence, and the latter act by coercion and threat of punishment for the disobedient, without clarifying or showing what a parent is and what kind of good deeds they order not to be left unpaid (D.Chr. XII 42-43). As you can see, even in the presented text, Dio Chrysostom emphasizes that not only parental love is a consequence of nature, but also the reverse, the love of children for parents also has a natural root.

Having carried out a systematic analysis of the understanding of the main aspects of love in the works of representatives of the second sophistic on the basis of a problematic approach, we can draw the following conclusions:

1. Representatives of the second sophistic for the first time in the historical and philosophical discourse give an explicit idea of love not just as a feeling, but as a huge work that involves incredible efforts and tension.

2. A feature of the explication of love in the movement of the second sophistic is the understanding of the essence of love as a phenomenon of power, and the discourse of love as a discourse of war and conquest. It was these maxims that largely determined the course of de-

velopment of the Renaissance philosophy of love and the emergence of courtly culture.

3. It was the thinkers of this movement in the history of ancient philosophy who paid great attention to understanding parental love, emphasizing not just the connection and closeness to the animal world, but revealing the enduring depth and meaning of the relationship between children and parents.

References

1. Bauman Z. Individualizirovanoe obshchestvo. Moskva : Logos, 2005.
2. Bratus' B. Lyubov' kak psichologicheskaya prezentatsiya chelovecheskoj sushchnosti, Voprosy filosofii, 2009, №12, s.30–42.
3. Gadamer G.-G. Aktual'nost' prekrasnogo, Aktual'nost' prekrasnogo. Moskva : Iskusstvo, 1991, s.266–290.
4. Gil'debrand D. fon. Metafizika lyubvi. Sankt-Peterburg : Aletejya, 1999.
5. Golovach U. "Eros" bezdomnij abo vichnij podorozhnij u poshukah vtrachenogo rayu, DUH I LITERA, 2002, №10, s.357–368.
6. Gryun A. ZHiti v domi lyubovi. L'viv : Svichado, 2005
7. ZHmir V. Vozlyubi?, Filososfs'ka dumka, 2006, №6, s.125–145.
8. Zubec O. Moral' v zerkale lyubvi, Razmyshleniya o lyubvi. Moskva : Znanie, 1989, s.3–18.
9. Manussakis D.P. Bog poste metafiziki. Bogoslovskaya estetika. Kiiv : DUH I LITERA, 2014.
10. Ruzhmon Deni de. Iskusstvo lyubit' i iskusstvo voevat', Kollezh sociologii. Sankt-Peterburg : "Nauka", 2004, s.267–291.
11. Ryurikov YU. Detstvo chelovecheskoj lyubvi, Filosofiya lyubvi. Moskva : Politizdat T.1. 1990, s.16–35.
12. Solov'eva, S.V. Fenomeny vlasti v bytii cheloveka: avtoref. dis. na soisk. uchen.step. dokt. filosof. nauk. 09.00.11 – social'naya filosofiya. Samara, 2010.
13. Sorokin P. Tainstvennaya energiya lyubvi, Sociologicheskie issledovaniya, 1991, №8, s.121–137.
14. Frank S. L. S nami Bog, Traktaty o lyubvi, Moskva : IF RAN, 1994, s.101–128.
15. YAnnaras H. Filiya, agape i eros v cerkovnoj perspektive, Chelovecheskaya celosnost' i vstrecha kultur. Kiiv : DUH I LITERA, 2007, s.62–67.
16. Aelianus. *Varia Historia*, Ed. R. Hercher, Leipzig. 1820.
17. Apuleius. *The Golden Ass*, being the Metamorphoses of Lucius Apuleius. Stephen Gaselee. London: William Heinemann; New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons. 1915
18. Athenaei Naucratiatae. *Deipnosophistarum libri XV*, rec. G. Kaibel. Lipsiae: Teubner. 1887.
19. Auli Gelli. *Noctium Atticarum*. Libri XX. Post M. Hertz ed. C. Hosius, 2 voll. Lipsiae: Teubner, 1903.
20. Dio Chrysostomus. *Sophista*. Ed. Guy de Budé, Leipzig, 1919.
21. Flavius Philostratus. *ΒίοιΣοφιστῶν*. C. L. Kayser (edit.), 2 vol, Lipsiae, in aedibus B. G. Teubneri. 1871.
22. Goldhill S. Constructing identity in Philostratus 'Love Letters', in E. Bowie and J. Elsner (eds). *Philostratus*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009, pp.287–305.
23. Luciani Samosatensis. *Opera*. Ex recensione G. Dindorff, Paris. 1884.
24. Plutarch. *Moralia*. Gregorius N. Bernardakis. Leipzig. Teubner. 1891.
25. Richlin A. Reading Boy Love and Child Love in the Greco-Roman World, Sex in Antiquity, *Exploring Gender and Sexuality in the Ancient World*. Routledge, 2015, pp.352–374.
26. Richter D.S. *The Oxford Handbook of the Second Sophistic*, Oxford University Press, 2017.
27. Schmidt T. S. *Perceptions of the Second Sophistic and Its Times*, University of Toronto Press, 2011.
28. Whitmarsh T. *Beyond the Second Sophistic: Adventures in Greek Postclassicism*, University of California Press, 2013.

Надійшла до редколегії 30.05.22

В. Е. Туренко, канд. філос. наук, наук. співроб.
Київський національний університет імені Тараса Шевченка, Київ, Україна

ОСОБЛИВОСТІ ЕКСПЛІКАЦІЇ ЛЮБОВІ ПРЕДСТАВНИКАМИ ДРУГОЇ СОФІСТИКИ

У статті на основі проблемного підходу здійснено історико-філософську реконструкцію розуміння любові в представників другої софістики. Розглянуто її особливості та внесок у розвиток імпліцитної філософії любові. Доведено, що в другій софістиці вперше в історико-філософському дискурсі ми можемо побачити експліцитну думку про кохання не просто як почуття, а як величезну роботу, що включає неймовірні зусилля і напруження людей, учасників любовного дискурсу. Мислителі другої софістики також підкреслювали раціональність природи любові, тому таке її розуміння істотно підносить на таку висоту серед усіх інших людських почуттів. Тому любов, яка здатна пізнати все навколо і допомагає людині пізнати Іншого, не є меркантильною чи оціночною, а породжує в душі людини відповідальність за того, кого вона любить. Виявлено, що особливістю експлікації любові у другій софістиці є також розуміння любові як прояву влади, а дискурсу кохання як дискурсу війни та завоювання. Саме ці концепції багато в чому визначили хід розвитку ренесансної філософії кохання та виникнення куртуазної культури. Показано, що саме цей етап софістичного руху приділяв велику увагу розумінню батьківської любові, підкреслюючи не просто зв'язок і близькість до тваринного світу, а розкриваючи позачасову глибину і зміст стосунків дітей і батьків.

Ключові слова: друга софістика, антична філософія, любов, людське життя, природа любові, антична філософія любові.