

УДК 304:101.1(091):326

ZAKHARCHUK O.I.

Postgraduate student of Philosophy
of Humanities Department
of Philosophical faculty

Kyiv national University of Taras Shevchenko
(Kiev, Ukraine) Zaharchuk.1991@mail.ru

THE ISSUE OF SLAVERY IN THE CONTEXT OF HISTORICAL AND PHILOSOPHICAL CONCEPTION

У статті здійснено аналіз філософських поглядів на історичне рабство. Проаналізовано розуміння рабства мислителями Античності, Середньовіччя, Відродження та Нового часу. Зазначено, що в античному світі воно було міцно закарбоване у суспільній свідомості та не викликало жодних сумнівів щодо своєї легітимності. В Середньовіччі вперше в історії філософської думки оформиться ідея духовного рабства. У Відродженні проблема рабства набуде морально-етичного забарвлення, тоді як у Новий час вона представлена в соціально-економічному аспекті. Марксизм розглядає рабство як головну форму експлуатації поряд із кріпосним правом та найманою працею.

Ключові слова: раб, рабство, рабська свідомість, власність, свобода волі виробничі відносини, експлуатація.

The issue of slavery acquires its relevance even at the early stages of human society development, especially in the making of slaveholding when this phenomenon penetrates into the public consciousness and obtains the legitimate nature with time. It is known from the history of West European civilization development that the phenomenon of slavery was finally completed in the ancient Greek society which was reflected in works of famous ancient Greek philosophers Plato and Aristotle. For example, in Plato's philosophic 'State' and 'Laws' the ancient sage offers the following society project which, in his invincible belief, foresees the existence of three basic classes, namely: philosophers who must govern the state, 'a social class representing the idea carrier, the idea, contemplator, the specific guide into the material world..' [8, p. 813]; warriors whose main task is defending the state and maintaining the order within it, 'they physically perform what is reasonably and spiritually ordered by philosophers, they are deprived of the private property right, they should live in concord, without any self-interest, including private life..' [8, p. 821]; and farmers, craftsmen and traders, that is, all those who are compelled to deal with economic activity. 'All classes must be arranged in such way these aristocratic philosophers would have an unconditional possibility to immerse into the perfect world..' [8, p. 818]. Meanwhile, Plato leaves such a social category as 'slaves' on the other side of social stratification, reducing a slave to a simple material thing, an 'instrument of labor', able to speak. Modification for the upper classes should be provided by commons, along with

The issue of slavery in the context of historical and philosophical conception

slaves. For example, the well-known expert on antiquity A.F. Losev notes on this issue that Platonism in social sense is the philosophy of monks, police and slave novices. Although Plato says nothing about slavery, but it is obvious that his third class is virtually little different from slavery, however, Plato's understanding of slavery, given in his 'Laws', is not congruent to real slavery which existed in classic Greece. As aptly remarked A.F. Losev, 'Platonism requires the existence of monks, police and slaves. Moreover, Platonism categorically forbids any other social classes except these three..' [8, p. 823]. With that, Plato considers that slavery is not a social class, but even the whole state can be slave, namely, the state with tyrannical regime. And if a separate person is similar to such state, the same regime will reign within this person, and his or her soul will be overfilled with hopeless slavery and weak will, and those parts of it which were the most decent, will remain in captivity. Such soul is a slave's one [12, p. 334].

According to Plato, free citizens must not undertake craft, and these are slaves who must perform all physical work. Moreover, land property shall be transferred by right of succession to slaveholders, and slave should conduct all activities associated with ensuring the city-state economy functioning. Next to slaves, such labor shall be performed by foreigners (and free people shall be engaged in spiritual work). And to make it easier for slaves to submit, they should not be compatriots, but vice versa, if possible, they should speak as different languages as it is possible [12, p.528]. In these words the philosopher stated that possessing slaves is a difficult task. It has been repeatedly proven by occurrence of frequent riots which became common. So many disasters happen in states having a large number of slaves who speak the same language. Only two ways remain: first, for slaves to submit better, they must not be compatriots to each other, but rather, they should speak as different languages as it is possible; secondly, slaves shall be properly educated, not only for their own sake, but for one's own honor [12, p.528].

Like Plato, Aristotle also considers slavery as a fully natural phenomenon, stressing that society cannot function as one integral unit without the existence of master and slaves in it. 'It is obvious that some people are free by their nature, and the others are slaves, and being slaves is both useful and fair for these latter ones' [3, p. 691]. With that, Aristotle links the issue of slavery with property, stating that 'a slave is some certain animated, 'living' property' [3, p. 689], which, moreover, has a status of a family member. Moreover, Aristotle follows the opinion diffused at the time: a slave shall totally depend on his or her master just because this slave is unable to be responsible for his or her actions. 'The ability to decide is absolutely not inherent to a slave' [3, p. 703]. As a person belonging to another man by his or her nature, remains a human being while also being a slave. 'All those who differ from the others as considerably as soul differs from body and man from beast (it happens to everyone whose activity delas with the use of physical power, and it is the best they can share), these people are slaves by their nature; for them it is better to submit to such power..' [3, p. 690]. The slaves' activity is to use their physical power, and it is the best they can do, for by nature they are slaves,

and must obey to their master. Aristotle believed that nature arranged it so that the very physical organization of free men differs from the physical organization of slave society: a slave has a stronger body capable of performing the required physical labor, and free people are not able to perform this kind of labor, but on the other hand, are suitable for political life [3, p. 691].

Thus, the sage offers the fuller understanding of slavery based on a strictly defined conception: according the Aristotle, a slave by nature is a person belonging to another rperson and mastering his or her mind only to such extent which allows him or her to apprehend orders only, for this mind itself is not subject to such person [3, p.691]. The philosopher did not permit any transfer from a slave to a free man, and from a free man to a slave. Thus, Stagiritis operates with the concept of 'slavery' as a separate social category. In the Middle Ages, the issue of slavery is considered both in social and spiritual contexts, i.e., in the light of human existence attitude to transcendental, which was quite consistent to theocentric world outlook of that time. Moreover, criticism of social slavery was inherent to some medieval sages. For example, the famous representative of patristic, Aurelius Augustinus (Hipponensis), whose philosophy was a symbiosis of classical and Christian doctrines, divided people into two categories, dominants and subordinates, masters and slaves. Life is a sin, and this sin manifests itself just in exploitation of man by man, in submission, control, governing and slavery. Due to the old Adam which reflected the sinfulness of human nature, slavery became a common event in human life. And, although slavery is contrary to the initial nature of man, it becomes natural due to man's sinfulness.

Speaking about the slavery origins, Augustinus sees them in sin. 'Sin is the first cause of slavery, under which a person is subject to another person by virtue of his or her status; and this happens not otherwise than by justice of Heaven, for God does not lie and He can distribute various penalties in accordance with sinners' guilt'[1, p.348]. However, the sage stressed that it was better to be a man's slave than a slave to desire, because, for example, the desire to reign ravages the souls of mortals in a rather cruel way. 'But by nature with which God created a man initially, there is no man's slave and no slave to desire. However, a slavery given as punishment is determined by virtue of the same law which requires to keep the natural order and denies to violate it; for there would be no guilt against this law, and there would be nothing to punish by the command of slavery'[1, p.348]. In the other words, in distinction from Aristotle, Augustinus carried scales from mind will to human will believing that a man cannot be considered as a moral creature at all without the freedom of will. With it, Augustinus justifies social slavery, especially as a consequence of military captivity for wars, in his opinion, do not contradict to God's commands. Thus, Augustinus was the first in the history of philosophical conception to formulate the notion of spiritual slavery.

Another representative of medieval philosophy and theology Foma Akvinskiy in his work 'The Theology Sum', describing the society social structure, noted that the division into classes comes from God, this is the way he recognized the social hierarchy. And a reason for such class hierarchy is the division of labor

‘the ones must farm a field, the others, houses, and some people, being free from human trouble, should devote themselves to spiritual work for the salvation of the rest’ [2, p. 171]. In his analysis of the issue of labor the theologist stressed that labor was a believer’s inalienable ‘attribute’, and back-breaking labour, say, physical work, is a ‘slave’s business.’

The age Renaissance amends the consideration of the issue of slavery in its own way. For example, the famous representative of Northern Renaissance Erasmus of Rotterdam stated in his polemics with Martin Luther that ‘there are plenty of places in holy books which seem to directly speak on the presence of free will in a man but some places seem to deny it....’ [14, p.229-230]. And in this context the philosopher gave the following understanding of a free will: ‘free will shall mean the strength of a man’s desire by means of which the man can approach to eternal salvation or turn his back on it’ [14, p.230].

Speaking about the old Adam considered by Augustinus as a direct reason of slavery, Erasmus of Rotterdam stresses that ‘the meaning of the old Adam is too exaggerated and, thus, people wish to show that even the miraculous powers of human nature are so much spoiled that the man itself is capable of nothing....’ [14, p.284]. In return, Martin Luther in his response to Erasmus of Rotterdam issues his treatise ‘On Free Will’ in which he says that ‘Only the Lord is free’, quoting the Apostle Paul [9, p.367]. The man itself for Luther is a ‘creature whose will is burnt with a lightning’ [9, p. 308]. The human will ‘is somewhere in the middle, between God and the devil, like a beast of burden. If God possesses a man, he will readily go to a place God wishes him to go... And if evil spirits possesses it, he will readily go to a place these spirits wish his to go’ [9, p.332]. M. Luther concludes that ‘Free will without God’s bliss is not free in any way, but is always a captive and a slave of the evil for it cannot turn to the good by itself’ [9, p.333]. Erasmus of Rotterdam responds to Martin Luther in another work of his the following words, ‘But you did not eliminate the tyranny of princes, bishops, theologians and monks... you awakened it. All they do becomes suspicious immediately! What earlier could be considered in this or that way, nobody opens his face now! Slavery which you were going to eradicate is now doubled’ [13, p.580-581].

Thus, the issue of slavery in medieval and Renaissance philosophy was considered through the lenses of the issue of free will, thus, it acquired not only social, but also spiritual, moral and ethical tone.

The interest to the existence of slavery through its categorical denial will be revived by the Modern Age philosophers. For example, the well-known representative of the 16th century Thomas Hobbes in his book ‘Leviathan’ noted that ‘nature created men equal with respect to physical and mental abilities’ [5, p. 150], that is, all people are physically and spiritually equal to each other, and also equal in using skills and power. On the one hand, this equality gives a possibility to achieve the equal level of wealth in society, and on the other, it is a stimulus to enmity. In ‘Leviathan’, the author notes that natural equality of man entitles anyone to everything, everyone has the right to do whatever he or she wishes and

to possess whatever he or she wants to possess and could receive, and to benefit from this [5, p. 151].

In natural state, a man possesses the absolute freedom. 'The man does not face obstacles to performing acts inclined to by will, wishes and disposition' [5, p.155], that is, freedom, being an absence of compulsion inherent to natural state. A man is a social not by wish but by necessity, and someone always wants to rule the others in the society, playing a key role, thus, making his or her own plans and intentions come true. Speaking of despotic power, the author notes that such a right to rule the others is provided not by victory but by loser's own consent loser, and not because he is a loser, but that he comes and surrenders to a winner [5, p.210-211]. Thus, the one who gets freedom really only gets a delay in making a decision on his punishment. And, having made a decision to save the life of this subdued person, his service is already mandatory for he obtained the physical freedom. 'As slaves working in prisons or in chains work not because of duty, but in order to avoid gu'rds' cruelty' [5, p.211]. Similarly, the master's power covers everything possessed by the servant, and the master can freely dispose of all this. This applies to the work of both servants and their children. The similar idea existed in antiquity, concerning the master's ownership to slaves and their work for, as is generally known, a slave had the status of a thing in antiquity, and a newborn child belonged not to parents but automatically passed into the master's possession. 'As a servant gets his life from a master and under agreement of submission, i.e. the agreement binding a servant to acknowledge himself responsible and consider himself the principal for all the master's deeds.' [5, p.211]. And even if the master kills or enchains him in case of disobedience, thus punishing him, all these actions are justified, and this master can not be accused of injustice, as the servant authorized his master by himself.

Talking about the citizens' freedom, Hobbes gives a distinction between freedom in natural state and in social state. 'The subjects' freedom is a freedom to do things not set forth in accordance with power' [5, p. 217]. In such case we deal with subjects' freedom. In his comparison of subjects' freedom and sovereign's right, the author notes that 'the subject's freedom combines with the sovereign's unlimited power of. But this must not be construed as if this freedom cancels or limits the sovereign's power over his subjects' life and death... Everything this higher representative would do with respect to his subjects and for any reason, cannot be considered injustice or illegality in its own sense, since every subject is a culprit of each act committed by the sovereign. Thus, the sovereign is entitled to do anything with the sole limitation – being the Lord's subject himself, he should follow the laws of nature due to it'[5, p. 218].

Another author of philosophical era of the Modern Age, John Locke in his work 'Two Treatises of Government', thinking on freedom, man and nature, stated that 'slavery is such the unworthy and pathetic human condition, so contrary to noble manners and love of freedom of our people, so it is hard to imagine that an Englishman, moreover, a gentleman would engage in defending it' [7, p.10].

Talking about the social contract, the author analyzes the notion of freedom and statehood stressing that natural human freedom is that a the man is free from any superior power on earth and that he or she does not submit to another man's will or legislative power and is governed solely by laws of nature. 'The human freedom shall submit to that legislative power which is established, according to everyone's will, in common creative work, but not to someone's will reign or limitation of any laws, except those which will come into effect by the stated legislative authority in accordance with trust shown to it' [7, p.142]. That is, a free man is not born a slave, for such man slavery is, vice versa, a disgusting form of existence. 'When we are told that we are all inborn slaves destined to remain in this slave status, and that we have nothing to do with it, we just have to trust their words. We enter this life and become slaves at once, and we cannot escape one until we don't get rid of another. I am sure that neither Holy Scripture nor common sense don't tell us this, in spite of all chatter about Godly law, according to which supposedly Godly authority ordered us to submit to another power lawlessness. The most wonderful future for mankind which they were lucky to see just now' [7, p.11].

According to Jean-Jacques Rousseau, beside government property regulation, the state should pursue an active moral and educational work. Spoilage of habits as a consequence of civilization is an irreversible process, and return to the 'natural state' is impossible. Luxury, debauchery, slavery – they all represent not a consequence of civilization but rather a consequence of antagonistic private property. Therefore, we have to accept these realities as existing facts and focus our efforts on political and civic and moral education of citizens. Jean-Jacques Rousseau notes that we must raise citizens from slaves, and that we need to teach people to live with dignity. 'A man is born free, but he is in chains everywhere. Someone thinks that he is the lord over the others, which does not prevent him from being a slave, even to a greater extent than they are' [15, p.152]. Slaves in shackles lose everything, including the desire to get rid of them, they begin loving slavery. 'A slave who became such during war, or conquered people owe nothing to the master, except the obedience until the compulsion ends. Taking the equivalent of his life, the winner did not show any mercy: instead of killing the vanquished, without any benefits, he killed him with use for himself. He got no authority over him combined with power; the state of war between them continues, as before, their relations themselves are the result of this state, and the use of the law of war does not represent any peace treaty. They made a deal, so be it; but this deal does not lead to the extinction of the state of war, but rather provides its continuance' [15, p.158-159].

In considering this question, Rousseau pays the special attention to the master's moral standards. 'A man as a social being should be self-sufficient, have moral freedom which makes a person the real master of himself' [15, p. 165].

Talking about freedom and slavery, the sage stated the following, 'Under the social agreement, a man loses his or her natural freedom and the unrestricted right to what tempts him or her and what he or she might take hold of; he or she acquires

public freedom and ownership to everything he or she possesses. In order not to err in determining this compensation we must strictly distinguish between natural freedom limited only by an individual's physical strength, and social freedom limited by general will, and to distinguish between ownership, which is only a result of use of force or the right of the one who came first, and property, which can be based only on a legal document. To everything that has already been said about the man's acquisition rights and social status, we could add moral freedom, the only one making a man a master to himself; for acting only under the influence of desire is slavery, and obeying the law, set for us by ourselves is freedom [15, p. 164-165].

Views of the representatives of German classical philosophy represent a contribution into the development of the issue of slavery which is not less interesting. For example, the founder of German idealism focuses on the fact that 'there is nothing more terrible when one man's actions must obey another man's will... A man who depends on another man, is not a man already' [6, p. 291]. Kant also stands up for freedom of conscience, thought and speech.

G. W. F. Hegel offered a curious understanding of the nature of slavery. Hegel marked out two opposite forms of consciousness, namely, self-consciousness, the essence of which is being-for-oneself, and dependent consciousness, the essence of which is living for someone else; the first one is a master, and the second one, a slave [4, p.103]. According to Hegel, a slave sense obtains its first push to release through dread of death. 'The consciousness internally dissolved in this dread, it trembled, and the whole inviolable in it shuddered. But this purely general movement is a simple totality of self-consciousness, absolute negativity, pure being-for-oneself' [4, p.105]. The consciousness becomes being-for-oneself. A master satisfies his desires and consumes things processed by a slave, modifying them and giving them a new shape. A slave works and in this work he creates himself, develops his identity and comes to being-for-oneself, the awareness of himself as of an independent ego. Thus, this being-for-oneself acquires itself in work, which seems to be 'another's' at first glance. However, the master's self-consciousness becomes consumer and is dependent no less than the slave's one. Therefore, 'The reign has shown that its essence is reversed to what it wants to be, just as slavery in its existence becomes rather the opposite to what it is directly' [4, p.106].

While Hegel considers the notion of slavery through the lenses of the notion of conscience, considering it a necessary condition of forming the human self-conscience, representatives of 'historical materialism', for example, are strongly attached by social and economic context. It is known that Karl Marx paid much attention to the issue of historical slavery. For example, the classical author stressed in his 'Capital' that 'at slave labor even that part of working day during which a slave only reimburses the cost of his or her own living means, during which this person factually works for himself or herself, is a work for a master. All such person's work is the unpaid work.' [10, p. 550]. According to Marx, the essence of social relations between manufacture owners and direct manufacturers

is manifested in exploitation, for 'Wherever a part of society possesses a monopoly on the means of production, a worker, whether free or not, has to join the working time in order to secure himself.' [10, p.246]. Marx was writing that 'a slaveholder buys its manpower like he buys a horse. Losing a slave, he loses a capital which he has to reimburse with a new salary on a slave market.' [10, p. 276]. But, having bought and lost a slave who had descendants, a slaveholder received all this slave's descendants for free as new slaves, i.e., in this case, the slaveholder's capital increased. 'The capital developed into a compulsory treatment forcing the working class to perform more work than required by a narrow circle of his own living needs.' [10, p.319].

Thus, the analysis of philosophical opinions on historical slavery allows making the following conclusions: in the ancient world, it was firmly coined in social conscience and gave rise to no doubts concerning its legitimacy. For the first time in the history of the philosophical conception, the notion of spiritual slavery is formed in the Middle Ages. The issue of slavery acquires moral and ethical tone in the age of Renaissance. Whereas the philosophers of the Modern Age point up social and economical principles of slavery and speak with its categorical censure which will find its additional substantiation in Marxism.

Список використаних джерел

1. *Augustinus A. De Civitate Dei.* – SPb.: Alataya; K.: UTSIMM – Press, 1998. – V.4. – 585 p.
2. *Akvinskiy Foma. The Theology Sum. P. II-I. Issues 1-48.* / translation from Latin, editing and comments by S.I. Yeremeyev. – Kyiv: Elga; Nika-Center, 2006, 576 p.
3. *Aristotle. Politics/ Aristotle. Politics. Metaphysics. Analytics* / Aristotle; [translation from ancient Greek]. – M.: Eksmo; SPb.: Mingrad, 2008. – 960 p., p. 683 – 880
4. *Hegel. Phenomenology of Spirit. Works, V. IV* Translation by G. Spet, Moscow, 1959.
5. *Hobbes T. Leviathan or The Matter, Forme and Power of a Common Wealth Ecclesiasticall and Civil* / T. Hobbes; translation from English. – K.: Dukh I Litera, 2000. – 606 p.
6. *Kant. I. Grounding for the Metaphysics of Morals.*// I. Kant. Works in 6 volumes. M., 1963-1966. V. 4. P. 1
7. *Locke John. Two Treatises of Government* / J. Locke; translation from English. – K.: Publishing House of Solomyia Pavlychko 'Osnovy', 2001. – 265 p.
8. *Losev A. F. Essays on Classical Symbolism and Mythology* / Authors: A. A. Takho-Godi; Gen. Ed. A. A. Takho-Godi and I.I. Makhan'kova. – M.: Mysl', 1993. - 959 p.
9. *Luther M. De Servo Arbitrio* / Luther // Erasmus of Rotterdam. Philosophical works: [additions]. – M., 1986. p. 290-545
10. *Marx, K. Capital: Critique of Political Economy. V. 1.* / K. Marx, F. Engels. Works. – 2nd issue. – V. 23 – M.: State Publishing House for Political Literature, 1960. – p.784
11. *Plato State.* / Plato. State. Laws. Politician. / Preface by E.I. Temnova. – M.: Mysl', 1998.- 798 p. / State p. 63 – 382
12. *Plato Laws.* / Plato. State. Laws. Politician. / Preface by E.I. Temnova. – M.: Mysl', 1998.- 798 p. / State p. 383 - 716
13. *Rotterdam E. Hyperaspistes I* / Erasmus of Rotterdam // Erasmus of Rotterdam. Philosophical works. – M., 1986. p. 546-593
14. *Rotterdam E. Diatriba Sul Libero Arbitrio* / Erasmus of Rotterdam // Erasmus of Rotterdam. Philosophical works. – M., 1986., p. 218-289

15. Rousseau J.-J.. *Treaties* / J.-J. Rousseau. – М. Nauka, 1969. – 697 p.

REFERENCES

1. Augustinus A. *De Civitate Dei*. – SPb.: Alataya; K.: UTSIMM – Press, 1998. – V.4. – 585 p.
2. Akvinskiy Foma. *The Theology Sum. P. II-I. Issues 1-48*. / translation from Latin, editing and comments by S.I. Yeremeyev. – Kyiv: Elga; Nika-Center, 2006, 576 p.
3. Aristotle. *Politics/ Aristotle. Politics. Metaphysics. Analytics* / Aristotle; [translation from ancient Greek]. – М.: Eksmo; SPb.: Mingrad, 2008. – 960 p., p. 683 – 880
4. Hegel. *Phenomenology of Spirit. Works, V. IV Translation* by G. Spet, Moscow, 1959.
5. Hobbes T. *Leviathan or The Matter, Forme and Power of a Common Wealth Ecclesiasticall and Civil* / T. Hobbes; translation from English. – K.: Dukh I Litera, 2000. – 606 p.
6. Kant. I. *Grounding for the Metaphysics of Morals*.// I. Kant. *Works in 6 volumes*. М., 1963-1966. V. 4. P. 1
7. Locke John. *Two Treatises of Government* / J. Locke; translation from English. – K.: Publishing House of Solomyia Pavlychko 'Osnovy', 2001. – 265 p.
8. Losev A. F. *Essays on Classical Symbolism and Mythology* / Authors: A. A. Takho-Godi; Gen. Ed. A. A. Takho-Godi and I.I. Makhan'kova. – М.: Mysl', 1993. - 959 p.
9. Luther M. *De Servo Arbitrio* / Luther // Erasmus of Rotterdam. *Philosophical works: [additions]*. – М., 1986. p. 290-545
10. Marx, K. *Capital: Critique of Political Economy. V. 1.* / K. Marx, F. Engels. *Works*. – 2nd issue. – V. 23 – М.: State Publishing House for Political Literature, 1960. – p.784
11. Plato *State*. / Plato. *State. Laws. Politician*. / Preface by E.I. Temnova. – М.: Mysl', 1998.- 798 p. / *State p.* 63 – 382
12. Plato *Laws*. / Plato. *State. Laws. Politician*. / Preface by E.I. Temnova. – М.: Mysl', 1998.- 798 p. / *State p.* 383 - 716
13. Rotterdam E. *Hyperaspistes I* / Erasmus of Rotterdam // Erasmus of Rotterdam. *Philosophical works*. – М., 1986. p. 546-593
14. Rotterdam E. *Diatriba Sul Libero Arbitrio* / Erasmus of Rotterdam // Erasmus of Rotterdam. *Philosophical works*. – М., 1986., p. 218-289
15. Rousseau J.-J.. *Treaties* / J.-J. Rousseau. – М. Nauka, 1969. – 697 p.

ЗАХАРЧУК О.И., аспирантка кафедры философии гуманитарных наук философского факультета, Киевского национального университета имени Тараса Шевченко

(Киев, Украина) zaharchuk.1991@mail.ru

ПРОБЛЕМА РАБСТВА В КОНТЕКСТЕ ИСТОРИКО-ФИЛОСОФСКОЙ МЫСЛИ

В статье осуществлен анализ философских взглядов на историческое рабство. Проанализировано понимание рабства мыслителями античности, Средневековья, Возрождения и Нового времени. Отмечено, что в античном мире оно было крепко запечатленное в общественном сознании и не вызывало никаких сомнений в своей легитимности. В Средневековье впервые в истории философской мысли оформится идея духовного рабства. В Возрождении проблема рабства приобретет морально-этической окраски, тогда как в Новое время она представлена в социально-экономическом аспекте. Марксизм рассматривает рабство как главную форму эксплуатации наряду с крепостным правом и наемным трудом.

Ключевые слова: раб, рабство, рабское сознание, собственность, свобода воли производственные отношения, эксплуатация.

The issue of slavery in the context of historical and philosophical conception

ZAKHARCHUK O.I., *Postgraduate student of Philosophy of Humanities Department of Philosophical faculty Kyiv national University of Taras Shevchenko (Kiev, Ukraine) Zaharchuk.1991@mail.ru*

THE ISSUE OF SLAVERY IN THE CONTEXT OF HISTORICAL AND PHILOSOPHICAL CONCEPTION

The article presents the analysis of philosophical opinions on historical slavery. The understanding of slavery by the sages of Antiquity, the Middle Ages and the Modern Age has been analyzed. It was stated that in the ancient world, it was firmly coined in social conscience and gave rise to no doubts concerning its legitimacy. For the first time in the history of the philosophical conception, the notion of spiritual slavery is formed in the Middle Ages. The issue of slavery acquires moral and ethical tone in the age of Renaissance, whereas the Modern Age represents it in the social and economical aspect. Marxism considers slavery as the main form of exploitation together with serfdom and wage labor.

Keywords: slave, slavery, slave sense, property, freedom of will production relations, exploitation.