Фактори формування історичної пам'яті

FACTORS OF THE FORMATION OF HISTORICAL MEMORY: ATHENS AS AN EXAMPLE OF MALE GENERALIZED DEMOCRACY

Avaliani Eka, Machitidze Ivanna

Метою статті є аналіз факторів, які можуть впливати на формування історичної пам'яті (серед цих чинників називаються геополітичні фактори, політична пам'ять тощо). Історична пам'ять може бути сформована через взаємодію кількох основних чинників, тоді як автори цієї статті вважають, що окремі міста (як політичні центри) з їхньою державною системою та політикою, можна вважати чинниками, що зумовлюють культурну ідентичність і формування історичної пам'яті. Класичні Афіни можуть бути обрані як модель такої ситуації.

Ключові слова: *історична пам'ять, політична пам'ять, місто, столиця, система управління, демократичний політичний порядок*

The city is a multi-layer, composite, diverse container of social relations. The capital represents the city's special category, one of its variations, which is proportional or commensurable to such concepts as the state or the city-state (e.g., the Greek *polis* / plural *poleis*) [On the Greek Polis, see 19, 12]. The aspects related to economics, trade, art, education, governing system and politics are closely connected with the phenomenon. Not only social practice and the questions of power or power distribution but those related to human communication, creative (art-related) and technological achievements, self-expression, self-realisation in different forms of culture, and, at the same time, religion, faith are connected with the city-state. These capitals reassured the members of a certain society of their collective identity [For the city-ethnics, the city-community as evidence for the Polis identity see 18] (e.g., the Greek society πόλίς *(*The classical Greek city was equal to the nucleus of a city-dwelling society. The social practice of the citizens of the classical Greek city was connected directly with the city.) – a polis, city, state (city-state), πόλίτής – a citizen, πόλίτεία – related to citizenship) [For the polis and citizenship in general, Aristotle's political thought 8, 245–47] and supplied them with an awareness of their unity and singularity in time and space (i.e. historical consciousness – by creating a shared past) [For the understanding of memory and political identity in early civilizations/Mnemohistory 4, 30–34; 5, 26f. 31].

Athens as a polis and a capital as well, itself can be accepted as a distinct model (i.e., Athens as a distinct model of democracy) (Athens was the first, largest and most fully developed democracy of the classical period, around the fifth century BC), with its independent, autonomous characteristic features (i.e., the democratic political order and power distribution) as an immanent condition for the «model cultures» (For the understanding of an immanent condition for the Model cultures. The term comes from philosophy and means that something immanent is spread throughout something – it's innate, intrinsic and inborn and, in our case, a city, as immanent quality is an essential condition for the definition of model cultures.), it also comprehended as a mini «model» of the social and political organization.

This capital (i.e.., Athens) stays as the hallmark of the statehood as well[On the capital cities as political centers see, 6]. Cities, similar to classical Athens, stay as an example to be imitated for «others», by the then contemporary poleis [For other Greek cities set up democracies, most following the Athenian model... 8, 73–74] or the modern societies.

In our perspective, historical knowledge about cities (similar to classical Athens) is well-collected. We have acquired historical knowledge of the city (through archaeological artefacts, historical monuments, documents etc.,), one which is already known to others (through tradition, myths and legends, historical and literary texts, scholarly works etc.,), thus, this «collection» is considered to be a cultural tradition. We are familiar with this «knowledge» since we have sufficiently experienced it through the historical materials. However, on the other hand, we accepted them as «well-known veracity» because «others» have sophistically experienced them in the form of historical memory [For the understanding Cultural Memory 11, 144f; 17, 837–859], or else in a variety of cultural impacts, because a single cultural tradition has a significant influence on others.The single cultural tradition determines the outcome of something common and thus develops the general historical understanding of the given system (i.e., Athenian polis stands as a model for a new «democratic political order» between the then contemporary and the modern societies).

Therefore, we believe that the certain capitals making meaningful statements about the past, such as classical Athens. This *polis* was exclusively to denote the collective understanding of democracy (or to indicate some political construction).

Identical capitals serve as political models and their ideological values are then combined with political information to produce the specific «political concepts». In addition, they can be considered as factors provoking cultural identity and fostering historical memory.

The multifunctional role and main political designators of these cities are important in modelling the history of «democratic state» and reconstructing governmental lifestyles of other states, which are influenced and conditioned

by them. The cities similar to Athens according to their historical importance, political significance and values can be sorted into one broad system of «models of democracy» [On models of democracy, 20] (For the understanding of an immanent condition for the Model cultures. The term comes from philosophy and means that something immanent is spread throughout something – it's innate, intrinsic and inborn and, in our case, a city, as immanent quality is an essential condition for the definition of model cultures).

Construction of Athenian *polis*, as a symbol of democracy, requires specific methodological approach and research scope. These approaches are developed in the following directions, with some statements below:

1. Outlining *polis'* self-definition, self-evaluation, self-identification, and consideration of self-significance on the regional and transregional extensions.

2. Outlining how images of this *polis* remain in the then contemporary and later historical memory, and how did posterior societies perceive the city?

3. The evaluation of this polis given by the modern society, what impact this polis has on modern historical knowledge. One ought to determine what impetus for modernization or innovation this city gave to the modern world. One ought to learn what forms, models, and categories originated in the city and what values of the city were borrowed by the modern world.

Additionally to the above mentioned methodology, the second approach is based on «mnemohistory» introduced by Jan Assmann. «Mnemohistory» is manifested in its relation to the past – as it is remembered, and it «is reception theory applied to history». This is the «proper way of dealing with the working of cultural memory» and, thus, «mnemohistory investigates the history of cultural memory» [3, 9–19; 2, 87–114]. Assmann defines cultural memory as the «outer dimension of human memory» [4, 19], embracing two different concepts: «memory culture» (*Erinnerungskultur*) and «reference to the past» (*Vergangenheitsbezug*). «Memory culture is the way a society that ensures cultural continuity by preserving, with the help of cultural mnemonics, its collective knowledge from one generation to the next, rendering it possible for later generations to reconstruct their cultural identity. References to the past, on the other hand, reassure the members of a society of their collective identity and supply them with an awareness of their unity and singularity in time and space – i.e. historical consciousness-by creating a shared past» [4,30; 5, 26 f., 31]. This approach would be particularly essential for interpreting historical material related to the distinct features of Athenian democracy and its influence on modern theories on political memory.

The social practice of the citizens of the classical *polis* was connected directly with their city-state. The concept of citizenship born in the bosom of the classical *polis* is analysed through in its direct relation to the typology of society, politico-cultural directions, social practice and mentality. That complex entity represented the heterogeneous specificity and *modus vivendi* of

any *polis* and *polis* community. The *polis* was a power-oriented model, within which the power was distributed among all male citizens [For the origins of the 'open society'1; 26], but not evenly balanced. Citizenship has been considered a major advantage, male citizens had the right to hold a «some» amount of political power. The political conflict would have occurred anyway, over the losing of power or gaining extra privileges. Initially, the king and the councils had the greatest degree of power. Later, power was distributed between oligarchs and democrats. The associations were represented by their agents. The space of political gathering was open to every adult male, where citizens went for elections or to discuss civil cases.

Based on early *polis* data, we assume about the degree of distribution and sharing of power among the male population. According to Homer's *Iliad* there were a military assemblies, whose power was restricted by the king. The general assembly of the full Spartan citizens was called the *Apella* and could only agree or disagree with the decisions of the council of elders (*gerusia*), but their support was needed in declaring war [15, For the limited rights of the assembly, see the text known as the *Great Rhetra,* preserved in Plutarch, *Life of Lycurgus* of Sparta 6]. The first male community which appears in the early stage of the *polis*, consists of groups of the capable male warriors and they more or less can restrict and reduce each other's freedom. In our point of view, this was a «masculine shared political and social space» that what was denoted as Greek *Andreia* (Manliness and Courage) [For the concept of *Andreia* 21; For Courage in Sparta, Politics of «Courage» 8, 37–41]. However, the question may arises, what share of power could remain to a man, those who had «a low rate» of *Courage*?

Athens and Sparta were two essential, contrast and competitive city-states in Greece in V c. BC. Athens was a metropolis, a maritime state with the keen allies, while Sparta was primarily a land based (was more of an agricultural type) in which rural settlements were integrated. The military society with little interest in commercial development. Its value system prioritized the collective over the individual, and discipline and tradition over innovation and self-expression [28, 22–23]. Sparta was a military based society, with coerced collective action based on shared interests linked to survival in vocation and combat, with purposes and values that are more defined and narrow than within civil society. Athens was a mixed community that, along with a military function, had a distinct trade orientation.

«Masculine, shared political and social space» in Sparta was represented by the *Gerusia* (a council of elders), two kings (the reign was hereditary), and by five *Ephor* (elected each year, elite militant representing the military council and controlling the power of the king) [28, 23].

«Masculine, shared political and social space» in Athens was represented by radical democracy. When all adult men took part in the elections. They all were directly involved in the management of the state, i.e., despite differences

in ability, they still may stayed in service of their state. Masculine «dignity» is a mixed notion and generally implies kindness, mercifulness, charity, courage, wisdom, but Greek concept of *Andreia* literally means manliness and courage. Taking the Greek concept of *Andreia* as its starting-point, it sheds new light on the construction of cultural and political identity, and the use of value terms in that process.

Andreia in Sparta was mainly associated with the ability to fight and to the military art. It was a brutal and expansive *Andreia.* It's obvious that all men would not have an equal 'extent and degree' of courage. Therefore, in the Spartan society «the masculine performance space» would have been barred for them. As there were «feeble performers» of Spartan *courage* [For the Semantics of Manliness 10, 25–58], this society immediately discarded them altogether.

Examples of Athenian symbolical «courage» were the Battle of Marathon (took place in 490 BC), the Battle of Salamis (a naval battle 480 BC) [For the impact of democracy on war 24, 65–88]. When the city was waiting for the danger, all the male population according to their capabilities defending Athens (as well as they were involved in other related activities). Some of them were the riders, other hoplites (a citizen-soldiers, armed with spears and shields), the envoys and the boat' rowers [For the understanding democratic elements of courage in Athens 9, 88–109]. The Athenian polis was more than a space for sharing political powers and military duties by a wide proportion of citizens. A defined high-status group operating in accordance with some pattern of law or custom [16, 434]. Athenian's courage was not «performed» only in the battle, their *Andreia* meant and has been extended to such important concepts as are *freedom, justice* and *braveness,* which became the core of democratic political ideology, based on a commitment to equality and freedom [8, 49; 7, 55].

The founder of «liberal-masculine democracy» in Athens was Themistocles (524–459 BC). Due to Themistocles' reasonable decision *polis* has started to build a fleet and made more use of civil law. Therefore, the civic participation had strengthened democratic institutions in Athens. Pericles, an eminent Athenian politician (495–429 BC) [22] was a worthy successor to Themistocles. With the support of Pericles the arts, literature and philosophy flourished in Athens.

Athenians endorsed the use of the principle of self-identification and self-evaluation. For consideration of certain issues such as the pattern of Athenian self-significance, we may appropriately begin with the most famous description of the Athenian character in Thucydides, Pericles' Funeral Oration. S. Forde concedes [16, 434], that «Pericles' speech is given over primarily to praising Athenian greatness, including the empire, and he rates the Athenian character as highly as such things as laws and institutions in attributing the cause of that greatness. Yet when it comes to describing the Athenian

character, «courage» is barely alluded to by Pericles, who speaks instead of the «virtue» of his countrymen, or, more pointedly, of their «daring» [16, n. 4.445]. (Pericles does speak of the «courage» of the Athenians once, when he is developing a specific contrast to the Spartans (2.39.4; cf. 2.39.1). Forde believes that is the sole instance of the direct application of this word to the Athenians in the History). The men who have died, Pericles says, showed a daring that should be the model for those who survive (Thucydides, *P.W.* 2.43.1). The Athenians as a race are characterized by a native daring that allows them, without toil, to be the equal of others who take great pains to cultivate virtue (Thucydides, *P.W.* 2.39.4).

This historical period was a combination of successful trends, on the one hand, there was a creative, genius leader, and on the other hand, the «recipient» was *demos*, capable of receiving and ready to cooperate fruitfully. The greatness of the empire, which made the city of Athens uniquely worth dying for, was built, according to Pericles, by the daring and dutifulness of the present Athenians' ancestors (Thucydides, *P.W.* 2.43.1). Pericles goes so far as to boast that the Athenians have «compelled» every sea and every land to yield access to their daring, enabling them to leave «immortal» monuments of themselves «everywhere» (Thucydides, *P.W.* 2.41.4).

During Pericles time, major democratic institutions have emerged in Athens [For the major democratic institutions in Athens 23; 30]. When the citizens were returning to an Athens ruined by the Persians, and were undertaking to rebuild its walls, the other city-states opposed it, fearing, Thucydides says (*P.W.* 1.90.1), not only the size of the newly enlarged Athenian navy, but the daring the Athenians had displayed in the war as well [16, 435, for Athenian polis how it remained in the then contemporary and later historical memory 16, 433–34] («The Athenians were not alone in viewing their own actions during that crisis as a great watershed in Athenian experience, and in the development of the Athenian character. The Athenian character – in particular its daring side – was formed, or at any rate came into its own, only at the time of the Persian Wars»).

Analyzing these and other historical sources, above mentioned criteria/ characteristics of the Athenian *polis* and citizens epitomize multilateralism of their Ideology, epitomize the vision of self-assessment, as well as, the assessment by the «others». Consequently this helps to universalize and exemplify concept of «Athenian democracy». Therefore, we may refer to the 5th century Athens as a model of «liberal-masculine democracy» [29, 133] (An important aspect was the rule in polis, which wasn't in the hands of an autocratic monarch or a small group of privileged individuals, but in the hands of the Athenian δῆμος (demos – «the people» – meaning adult male citizens). The system of government, applied both to domestic and foreign policy, was called δημοκρατία (demokratia → demos – «the people», kratos – «rule»). The main political institutions were that shared space, where Athenian men were

engaged in political and public activities (the main democratic body of Athens was the assembly/*ekklēsia* → a smaller body/the *boulē*, which decided or prioritized the topics which were discussed in the assembly→ in tandem with all these political institutions were the law courts (*dikasteria*), which were composed of 6,000 jurors and a body of chief magistrates *(archai)* chosen annually by lot [13].

Plato does an interesting parallel between the Greek *Polis* and the man in the *Republic, Politeia*. Generally speaking, Plato discusses the problem of justice. He departs from the question of the nature of justice and injustice of a man to the question of the nature of justice and injustice of a polis (Plato, *Republic,* Book II 369d–435a, Book V, 449a–457d, 472d to Book VI, 503b, Book VIII and IX) and then returns to the justice and injustice of a man. He does a logical connection between the *polis* and man in regard with justice and injustice, as the justice of a man can be more easily understood when one observes the justice of a *polis* as a whole (Plato, the *Republic*, Book II 368d–369b) [14, 181–182]. It is considered that the nature of man in one way or another resembles the nature of the *polis*. What has been found or observed as a composite of elements of the *polis* is expected to be discovered in a man as well. It is expected to exist in the human soul [14, 182]. It is logical that the two should be considered together, thus, the Athenian *Polis* built by men was the same as the nature and character of men.

However, another way to define «masculine» and «daring» is to identify what it looks like (or how it can appear). The important element of masculinity that we will examine is that of sexuality. A man expressed in the Greek classical sculpture, without any kind of sexual shame, demonstrats male genitalia. This was the dignity of his nature and gender. As for women, their bodies only represent forms of ideal proportions, all the signs of erotism and sensualism are discouraged in these sculptures. That is why the woman presented on Greek sculpture is slightly masculine and overly athletic, with their torso, pelvis and foot feet replicating exactly the men's body shapes. the absence (or concealment) of the female genital organ, which is not considered worthy of expression, completely violates the principle of equality in sexual visualization. A breakthrough of these laws is observed in the sculpture of Aphrodite in the later period (by Praxiteles of Athens, who was the most renowned of the Attic sculptors of the 4th century BC. He was the first to sculpt the nude female form in a life-size statue). In a shy pose, a naked goddess with her hand hides the female sexual organ. But Aphrodite is not a mortal woman, so she can be forgiven for a certain dose of «aggressive» sexuality (or unhidden sexuality), which is considered the honor of men.

Athenian mortal women were supposed to stay at home, barefoot (or in delicate slippers), pregnant, out of the public eye. They had to spend much of their time sequestered in the women's quarters in the home, did not exercise, were not allowed to inherit or do business, and were not formally educated.

Consequently, Greek Athens could not have official symbolic images oriented towards feminism (The ruler of Athens, the only goddess, was the virgin Athena, who, as a woman, had no sexual realization, and herself was the fruit of «artificial birth». Athena was believed to have been born from the head of her father Zeus. She was known as Athena Parthenos («Athena the Virgin»). The goddess leaped, wearing armor, from the head of her father, Zeus).

Through the historic memory and tradition Athens became an eternal city. In 1834, independent Greece declared Athens as its capital.The European emigrants, who migrated to the United States, transferred and relocated the Athenian model in different spaces and time, and thus, the second Athena appeared in the state of Alabama (1818), Michigan (1831), New York State (1890), Ohio (1797), Tennessee (1822). Modern world has developed a special attitude towards Athens, towards historic role of the city. This mysterious *Polis* stimulates and prompts the modern democracy.

REFERENCES

1. Andrewes A. Greek Society. Published by Penguin Books, Harmondsworth, 1971.
2. Assmann J. Stein und Zeit.' *Das «monumentale» Gedächtnis der altägyptischen Kultur*. (eds) J. Assmann and T. Hölscher. *Kultur und Gedächtnis,* Frankfurt/M.: Suhrkamp, 1988.
3. Assmann J. *'Kollektives Gedächtnis und kulturelle Identität'. (*eds) J. Assmann and T. Hölscher. *Kultur und Gedächtnis,* Frankfurt/M.: Suhrkamp, 1988. P. 9–19.
4. Assmann J. Das kulturelle Gedächtnis. Schrift, Erinnerung und politische Identität in frühen Hochkulturen. München: Beck, 1992.
5. Assmann J. Ägypten. *Eine Sinngeschichte.* München: Hanser, 1996.
6. Avaliani E. Eternal Cities: Political and Cosmopolitan Centers, International Black Sea University, Tbilisi, 2017.
7. Balot R. K. 'The Freedom to Rule: Athenian Imperialism and Democratic Masculinity, in Enduring Empire: Ancient Lessons for Global Politics'. eds. D. E. Tabachnik and T. Koivukoski, Toronto, 2009.
8. Balot R. K. Greek Political Thought, Malden, MA and Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2006.
9. Balot R. K. 'Democratizing Courage in Classical Athens'. In D. M. Pritchard (ed.) War, Democracy and Culture in Classical Athens, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2010. P. 88–109.
10. Bassi K. The Semantics of Manliness in ancient Greece, in Andreia*, Studies in Manliness and Courage in Classical Antiquity*, R. Rosen and I. Sluiter (eds), Mnemosyne Supplements Online, Volumes 204–407, Volume: 238. Brill, Leiden Boston, 2002. P. 25–58.
11. Borofsky R. Making History. Pukapukan and Anthropological Construction of Knowledge. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1987.

12. Brock R. and Hodkinson S. (eds.). Alternatives to Athens, Varieties of political Organizations and Community in Ancient Greece. Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2008.
13. Cartwright M. Athenian Democracy, in *Ancient History Encyclopedia,* 2014, accessed date 16.11.2017. URL: http://www.ancient.eu/Athenian_Democracy/
14. Chaiyaporn Ch. Plato's Theory of Man in Relation to His Political Philosophy, Ph.D. dissertation, The London School of Economics and Political Science, 1992.
15. Fitzardinge L. The Spartans. Thames and Hudson, London, 1980.
16. Forde S. 'Thucydides on the Causes of Athenian Imperialism'. *The American Political Science Review*, Vol. 80, No. 2, American Political Science Association, 1986. P. 433–448.
17. Friedman J. The Past in the Future: History and the Politics of Identity, *American Anthropologist,* 1992, 94 (4). P. 837–859.
18. Hansen M. H. City-ethnics as Evidence for the Polis Identity. In M. Hansen, and K. Raaflaub (eds.), More Studies in Ancient Greek Polis, Stuttgart, 1996.
19. Hansen M. H. Polis, An introduction to the Ancient Greek City-States. Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2006.
20. Held D. Models of Democracy, Stanford University Press, Stanford, California, 1996.
21. Jakimowitz S. The Concept of Andreia, in Greek Literature from Homer through Aristotle, Cornell University, Ithaca, 1946.
22. Lewis D. M. Pericles, Athenian Statesman, *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 2016. Accessed date 16.11.2017. URL: https://www.britannica.com/biography/Pericles-Athenian-statesman
23. Ober J. Mass and Elite in Democratic Athens: Rhetoric, Ideology, and the Power of the People, Princeton University Press, 1989.
24. Ober J. 'Thucydides on Athens' Democratic Advantage in the Archidamian War'. In D.M. Pritchard (ed.). *War, Democracy and Culture in Classical Athens*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2010. P. 65–88.
25. Plato-The Republic. Translated by D. Lee, second edition (revised), Harmondsworth, 1974.
26. Popper K. *The Open Society and Its Enemies: The Spell of Plato*, vol. 1, London, Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1980.
27. Rosen R. and. Sluiter, I (eds). *Andreia, Studies in Manliness and Courage in Classical Antiquity*, *Mnemosyne Supplements Online,* Volumes 204–407, Volume: 238. Brill, Leiden Boston, 2002.
28. Rubarth S. 'Competing Constructions of Masculinity in Ancient Greece'. *Athens Journal of Humanities and Arts*, Volume 1, Number 1, Published by The Arts & Humanities Research Division of The Athens Institute for Education and Research, Athens, 2014. P. 21–32.

29. Kubala L. The Distinctive Features and the Main Goals of Athenian imperialism. *Graeco-Latina Brunensia* vol.18, 1.Brno, 2013.
30. Stockton D. The Classical Athenian Democracy. Oxford University Press, 1990.
31. Thucydides. *Thucydides.* 4 vols. Charles Forster Smith, trans. Heinemann, London, 1980.

ВПЛИВ СУЧАСНИХ ЗМІ НА ФОРМУВАННЯ ІСТОРИЧНОЇ ПАМ'ЯТІ УКРАЇНЦІВ ТА ПОЛЯКІВ

Добржанський Олександр

Mass media is a powerful means of influence on the formation of the social stereotypes and historical memory in the society. The way the information is presented and the key points are highlighted directly depends on the awareness of the society and formation of the historical memory of the people. Modern social discourse between Ukraine and Republic of Poland on the issue of the historical past namely of the events connected with the opposition between Ukrainians and Poles on the territory of Volyn during the years the Second World war negatively influences on the historical memory.

Key words: historical memory, international conflicts, social and historical stereotypes, Ukraine, Republic of Poland, mass media.

Від подачі інформації, виваженості оцінок щодо історичних подій, міжнаціональних взаємин та протиріч, напряму залежить історична пам'ять нації, суспільний резонанс, який у свою чергу великою мірою здатен впливати на міждержавні взаємини. Тому роль засобів масової інформації (ЗМІ) у поглибленні добросусідських відносин України та Республіки Польща навряд чи може бути переоцінена. Головним завданням ЗМІ сьогодні є не лише інформування про державу-сусіда, але й сприяння нормалізації, розвитку та поглибленню міжнаціональних відносин. Даний напрям досліджень не став предметом окремої наукової розвідки, а досліджувався лише фрагментарно, найчастіше журналістами українських та польських часописів. Отож, запропонована стаття містить елементи наукової новизни.

ЗМІ, які сьогодні є поширеними та доступними для кожного, формують суспільну думку і здатні досить відчутно впливати на неї. Адже разом із фактами, ЗМІ пропонують читацькій (глядацькій) аудиторії свою оцінку події, розставляють на власний смак акценти на тому чи іншому її аспекті, додають певний контекст чи опускають деякі подробиці. Усі ці факти і формують ставлення суспільства до будь-якого явища, загалом, та у міжнародних відносинах, зокрема.