

M. Vasevych, Graduate student
O. Mykhaylyshyn, Dr. Sc. in Architecture, Prof., research advisor
The National University of Water and Environmental Engineering

GENDER HIERARCHY IN THE HISTORY OF ARCHITECTURE

The complexity of the relationship and interplay of social and architectural spaces raises question about the importance of a multidisciplinary approach. Sociology of architecture allows to trace the social representation within architectural space and, specially, it's gender aspects. The basic gender categories which are masculinity and femininity reveal social collision in architectural field. One of the key fact, that gendered roles are closely related to hierarchical systems in architecture, which for the long time developed in conservative terms. This work is dedicated to historically conditioned gendered roles in architectural space.

Michel FOUCAULT, points that architecture is designed to be a tool for the transformation of individuals, to control their behavior, bring exercises of power, and knowledge to change them. Patriarchal power conceptualized in structure of public and private spaces since primitive societies, and established in Antic ideology, that launched the development of gender division in society, and particularly in architecture. Social relations, according to Pierre Bourdieu, is connected with the physical space and formed by a system of basic oppositions, among which there is significant contrast between male and female [1, p.31-46]. His concept of habitus, as a system of durable acquired dispositions, implies subordination of women to men, although sometimes they may exploit their freedom to initiate social change. Social practices of men and women constructs gendered roles especially through architecture. Spatial organization help to represent gender relations and support dominant male ideology [2, p.73-74]. For example, the masculine connotation of the agora, or market area was underlined by one or two rows of religious statues – herms, which represent the democratic male citizen in his sexual and political autarchy. Women were not allowed to visit male public spaces. Architecture of private houses, maintained the separation of the sexes [3, p.116-119, p.130]. The correlation of masculinity and feminity in architecture is represented by blurred or established boundaries of public and private spaces and interior configuration.

Qualities of male and female have been developed in the morphology of architectural elements. The classical proportions of Doric, Ionic and Corinthian columns were attributed to the human body. And it is apparent, that more ornamented and delicate Ionic and Corinthian columns were derived from the women stature and appearance. The gender symbolism of the column orders also included a hierarchy in the terms of their power representation. In theory, it is often postulated, that Doric column in its meaning as a masculine order was most important and superior to feminine orders. Leon Battista Alberti followed the statement, that Doric order emphasize the highest quality – gravity, while more ornated Corinthian order would be fitting for garden pavilions and interior spaces [3, p. 93-105].

In the monumental XV century treatise "On the Art of Building in Ten Books" Alberti openly refers to the participation of patriarchal authority in the design,

including spatial and subordinate visual inspection system, including the issue of gender identity. His vision of space is grounded in privatization of sexuality, which is understood as female. Alberti divide the architecture into "lineaments", which derive from mind, and "matter" which derives from nature. "Lineaments" are a kind of order lines, that defines "appropriate place" for the building and its parts. Formulated with masculine mind of the architect, the geometric order control feminine materiality of house, that has been appropriated from nature [4, p. 343-360]. In 1537 the architect Sebastiano Serlio in his Seven Books on Architecture described three stage sets, which represent diagrams of masculine and feminine spaces. The first tragic scene illustrates man-made, proportional, ordered architecture, second comic scene shows everyday life, and third, satiric is a scene of nature or garden, place, associated with feminine. Buildings of Alberti, Brunelleschi, Bramante represent strict geometric order, clear masculine logic. It was considered that feminine, embodied in ornament, hid and blur the reality of structure [5, p. 88-98].

For a long time, the architecture has considered as "male" sphere of activity. Patriarchal character of profession and established canons reproduced social order that included the role of man as creator and woman as an enclosed observer. Since Vitruvian man, the perfect man's body has become a model for architectural design, restrained classic architecture was closely linked to the then notions of male self-presentation. Within the period of rising classicism, in seventeenth century, architect Inigo Jones (1573-1652) in his theoretical work promoted the connection between architecture and ideas of masculine nobility. According, to Jones, building should be the embodiment of both masculine and feminine, exterior bearing the public face of dignity and gravity, interior representing emotions, the female domain. [6, p.7-25] Consequently, exterior, the public man space, acted as protection curtain to private feminine space, creating symbolical visual restrict to internal parts of building. At first glance this interior specialization seemingly to give women their own space, but the reality was somewhat more ambiguous in its consequences. This space was not created for the woman herself, but rather it reflects the necessity of imposed rituals. [5, p. 80-83]

Architectural space is not simply a location that provides social relations, but it creates conditions for gender identity. Theoretical background and implementations of the hierarchy of gender relations represent development of masculine approach to architectural space. While public space reveals the male power, private space hides woman. It was assumed, that in historic precedents, architecture was an expression of patriarchal social order that defines standards and rules of behavior, especially for women. Concealment and restriction in architecture of the naturalness, which has female quality, was justified not only by protection of the private sphere of life, but also by denial and fear about the possibilities of women to expand their sphere of influence.

REFERENCES

1. Вильковский М.Б. Социология архитектуры / М.Б. Вильковский. – М.: Фонд "Русский авангард", 2010. – 592 с.

2. Hills H. Architecture as Metaphor for the Body: The Case of Female Convents in Early Modern Italy / H. Hills // Gender and architecture/ edited by Louise Durning and Richard Wrigley, 2000. – New York: John Wiley & Sons Ltd, Baffins Lane, Chichester, West Sussex PO19 1UD, England. – P.67 – 112.
3. Kuhlmann D. Gender Studies in Architecture. Space, power and difference / D. Kuhlmann. – New York: Routledge, 2013. – 288 p.
4. Wigley M. Untitled: The Housing of Gender / Mark Wigley // Sexuality and Space. Ed. Beatriz Colomina. – New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 1992. – P.327-389.
5. Betsky A. Building Sex: Men, Women, Architecture, and the Construction of Sexuality /Aaron Betsky. New York: William Morrow and Company, Inc., 1995. – 236p.
6. Anderson C. A Gravity in Public Places: Inigo Jones and Classical Architecture / Anderson Christy // Gender and architecture/ edited by Louise Durning and Richard Wrigley, 2000.- New York: John Wiley & Sons Ltd, Baffins Lane, Chichester, West Sussex PO19 1UD, England. – P.7-28.