

ARCHETYPAL FOUNDATIONS OF THE STUDY OF POLITICAL AND LEGAL ORGANIZATION OF SOCIETY: ANCIENT HERITAGE

Valentin Lyubashits^{*}, Alexey Mamychev^{**}, Tatyana Mordovtseva^{***}, Diana Mamycheva^{****} and Alexey Shirshov^{*****}

Abstract: The subject of this work is a historical and political study of the process of formation and ideological and semantic evolution of the concept of “archetype,” as well as a comprehensive analysis of the formation of the archetypal tradition of knowledge of the foundations of a public power organization. The paper proves that the relevance and importance of the study of archetypal foundations are related to the reconstruction of forms of political and legal organization adequate for society, of sustainable directions of institutional and power development. In addition, it is argued that in the history of political and legal thought there are different traditions of archetypal research, not reducible only to one theoretical and conceptual format - analytical psychology. This opens up new heuristic possibilities in the study of sustainable elements of the sociocultural evolution of public power organization. The methodological and theoretical basis of the research is essentially based on developments in the field of political science, the history of political doctrines belonging to domestic and foreign specialists, as well as to certain provisions of the theory of archetypes and political anthropology. The scientific novelty of the presented conclusions and provisions lies in the systematization and substantive interpretation of the fundamental directions of the development of archetypal traditions, based on various philosophical, philosophical, mythological, religious and other grounds. The paper proves that the idea of a single archetypal tradition, going from Plato to modern social and humanitarian discourse, is erroneous. In reality, there are different ideological and semantic vectors for understanding and interpreting the concept of “archae”, with which the formation of a special direction in the study of the deep foundations of social organization and political and legal thought activity is associated. Accordingly, the latter in the history of political and legal thought determines the inconsistent theoretical and conceptual directions in understanding both the archetypal foundations of the public power organization and the corresponding program provisions that justify the forms and ways of improving this organization. At the same time, it is proved that in this diversity of archetypal traditions it is possible to single out and conceptualize the basic, core ideas, coinciding interpretations, similar forms of cognition of the hidden, essential foundations of society, the state, power, politics.

Keywords: Archetype, antiquity, power, politics, culture, methodology, political organization, political philosophy, traditions, evolution.

* Doctor of Law, Professor, Southern Federal University, Rostov-on-Don, Russia. *Email: kafedra_tgp@mail.ru*

** Doctor of Political Science, Candidate of Legal Sciences, Associate Professor, Vladivostok State University of Economics and Service, Vladivostok, Russia. *Email: mamychev@yandex.ru*

*** Doctor of Cultural Studies, Professor, Taganrog Institute of Management and Economics. *Email: aum.07@mail.ru*

**** Candidate of Cultural Studies, Associate Professor, Vladivostok State University of Economics and Service, Vladivostok, Russia. *Email: mamycheva@yandex.ru*

***** Associate Professor of the Department of Criminal Law and Criminology of the Law School of Far Eastern Federal University. *Email: brahma@bk.ru*

INTRODUCTION

The theoretical and conceptual version of the archetype proposed by K.G. Jung, is, of course, authoritative and famous, however, it is not the only one. Moreover, the theory of Jung's archetype is itself based on several traditions of archetypal research and tries to unite and harmonize them.

The ideological and semantic basis of this paper is that other alternative research projects are possible; they have a significant heuristic potential, not limited to commenting, replicating or reinterpreting the Jungian theory of archetypes. It is the latter that is typical for many research projects in the content of which the "cataloging" of archetypes in this or that sphere is realized by the social system of their reinterpretation with reference to practical goals and tasks. However, critical passages about the authoritative Jungian tradition and, in particular, its modern development vector, do not at all mean that this theory should be rejected. On the contrary, this involves resorting to it and "dialogic cooperation," but the Jungian theory of the archetype is seen as only one of the variants of archetypal research.

In fact, in Antiquity, there were several traditions and directions of interpretation of the archetype. Moreover, the semantic basis of the "archae" was used in many philosophical, philosophical-political, philosophical-religious treatises and so on. In addition, similar ideological and conceptual "foundations" of the archetypal theory developed in the Ancient East. In the Middle Ages and the Modern Age, there were also various directions of archetypal research. Even more "monistic position" formed in the twentieth century, when the theoretical and practical breakthrough of psychoanalysis (Freud's discovery of the collective unconscious), and then analytical psychology for many years formed only one model of interpretation of the theory of the archetype (but we will dwell on this in more detail in the corresponding part of the work).

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The ideological and theoretical foundations of the archetype were formed long ago, much earlier than the very concept of "archetype." And in various philosophical, mythological and religious systems, various traditions are formed and developed as an understanding of archetypal bases, as well as techniques, ways of their comprehension, meaningful interpretation, and substantiation of the role and significance. Undoubtedly, in this diversity it is possible to single out and conceptualize the basic, core ideas, concurrent interpretations, similar forms of cognition of the hidden, essential foundations of society, the state, power, politics, etc. Precisely, in consequence of this circumstance, one can speak of archetypal research as such, although the term "archetype" itself may not be used in many studies. However, once again we emphasize that it is the ideological and semantic orientation, principles and content of these studies that allow us to classify them as "archetypal."

For example, in pre-philosophical ancient Greek thought, the “archae” tradition is formed (Thales, Anaximander, Anaximenes, Heraclitus, etc.); it is the source of the ancient Greek philosophers’ reasoning, but it coincides neither with the Platonic version of archetypes (archae - “beginning” and typos - “pattern”), nor with Aristotle’s interpretation of the initial basics, the initial ontological and epistemological principles. Although Thomism and archetypal discourses in the Middle Ages were based on the legacy of Greek philosophers and, above all, Aristotle’s doctrine, nevertheless, the Augustinian archetypes-ideas or the Absolute-ideas-the beginnings of Aquinas unfold completely different principles of comprehension of the original/primitive images, their meaningful understanding, interpretation of meaning. Scholarly discourses of I. Kant (intellectus archetypus, Urbild - “prototype”), G.V. Leibniz (monads), D.O. Shelling (allegorical formulas), I.M. Snegirev (root concepts), F.I. Buslaev (rooted folk images and motifs), etc., who are rightly acknowledged as authors who made a significant contribution to the theory of archetypes and archetypal research, are still unlikely to be “included” in one tradition of research of both ideological-semantic and conceptual development of the archetype. It is impossible to fit in the same “universal tradition” the various religious and philosophical traditions of the interpretation of the archetype.

Various are epistemological and ontological grounds for the collective unconscious by Z. Freud and K.G. Jung, for collective conscience and collective representations by E. Durkheim and L. Levy-Bruhl, for structures of the imaginary (imaginary community by B. Anderson, for “structured multiplicity” as a condition of life and co-living by K. Hübner, sociology of the imaginary by J. Durand, etc.), for the ideational foundations of the socio-cultural life of the activity of P.A. Sorokin, for original mimic desires and sacrificial mechanisms (which are the hidden basis of all forms of philosophical, religious, political and legal thinking that cause institutionalization and the processes of its evolution) by R. Girard, the original tradition by R. Guénon, the social habitus by P. Bourdieu, etc. And all this ideological and semantic diversity is often combined into one and the same tradition of archetypal research.

THE MAIN PART

1. The concept of “archae” in the pre-philosophical tradition. The ideological and semantic foundations of the “archetype” began to form, as is known, in Antiquity, where, behind every phenomenality, the ancient Greek thinkers saw a certain “beginning”, “primary”, the highest original principle, or, in one word - “archae” (from Greek αρχη: principle, source; Latin: principium).

The first thing to note is that the concept of “archae”, associated with the formation of the archetypal tradition of research, quite complex and polysemantic a concept, expressed different meanings depending on the

semantic context. However, these values were “located” somehow around one ideological core. So, in the pre-philosophical tradition, this word reflected the starting point in the space-time sense.

Within the first philosophical teachings, the “archae” expressed the beginning of all things. For example, Aristotle uses this concept for describing the latter: the “archae” of Thales is water, Anaximander has an apeiron, Anaximenes has air, Pythagoras has a number, Heraclitus has a fire, etc. (Lebedev, 2010). In general, the “arche” is a complex and multifaceted concept reflecting the origins of origin and eternal principles (K. Hübner).

In the context of the first socio-political treatises “archae” was used in the sense of the beginning as the authorities, power, the predominant principle in the organization, and so on. Let us draw attention to such political and legal concepts formed with the help of the “archae”, as “monarchy”, demarchy, polyarchy, oligarchy, etc., in this ideological and semantic context. Let us also note that the demarchy should not be confused with democracy. The latter literally meant power over the people and thus demarchy is different from democracy (the power of the people themselves). As we know, the meaning of the concept of “democracy” is formed on the basis of another Greek word “kratos” - power, and, accordingly, had a different semantic direction and meaning than the concept of “demarchy”. By the way, the Greeks were rather cautious about democracy and initially did not consider the latter as a possible basis for a stable political organization. If, in the Platonic classification, the selected types of states are clearly “subjective” (for example, monarchy means one ruling principle), then with democracy the question was more complex: originally Greek philosophical and political thought could not conceive the people as the basis, the beginning of the polis, only gradually the population turns from a “management object” into a political entity involved in the administration of power.

2. Plato’s teaching about the “eidos”. In general, the tradition of “archae”, as a rule, is associated with the teachings of the ancient Greek philosophers, Plato and Aristotle. One should also point out an important semantic nuance in late antiquity: the “archae” is not only the original principle, something unchanged, invariant in the cosmic or political structure (conditionally speaking, “static interpretation”), but also some initial process, change and return, the eternal alternation of phenomena or processes, etc. (the “dynamic principle”) (Bachinin, 2006). Although, for the sake of justice, even in the original meaning of the “arche”, the idea of “eternal return”, “a stable cycle of repetitions” is laid. Thus, in the Greek myth this process is expressed in creation and its constant reproduction/repetition: “sometime

a certain numinous creature first performed a certain action, and since then this event is identical repeating” (Hubner, 1996).

According to Plato, the concept of “archae” is associated with the doctrine of “eidos”, for which every material thing, human thought activity is preceded by a universal Idea. In the future, these ideological and conceptual positions of Platonic philosophy found development in philosophical anthropology and the philosophy of culture (Marinosyan, 1998). Thus, it was Plato who, for the first time, conceptualized the existence of certain objects (transcendental concepts) that organize and direct a person’s practical activity, perceived by him prior to any individual experience. Plato’s ideas contain the prototypes and pro-forms of the unfolding of all practical activities: “ideas are the prototypes of things themselves, and not only the key to a possible experience, which is the categories. According to Plato, ideas stem from higher intelligence and from here become the property of the human mind, which, however, has now lost its original state and only with difficulty is forced to restore (by means of memories) its old, now very tarnished ideas” (Kant, 1982).

In his philosophical and legal views, Plato pointed to the existence of original Ideas, from which all subsequent things and ideas, human law and order, take their start (Plato, 2005). As we know, Plato believed that these ideas were originally contained in the minds of the Gods before the creation of the world, then they formed a special supersensible world of ideas - eidos, comprehended and revealed in human experience. According to his teaching, the eidos represents archaeo-ideas and archae-values (Greek αρχη - the beginning, τυπος - image, form, pattern) that expressed the highest values of being, the ideals of order, measure, harmony, goodness, justice, order.

The main characteristics of such archaic ideas (eidos) are the following:

- (A) they have supersensory nature;
- (B) they are the cause of all that exists; These ideas have a form-forming character, extend their effect on the functioning of society and people, they give the chaotic formlessness of the earthly elements the appearance and orderliness;
- (C) they are in isomorphism relations with social phenomena and processes, i.e. the latter is a mold, an imprint of the spiritual world, the world of ideas. This isomorphism is relative, but it allows us to talk about the metaphysical and social worlds as related, not alien;
- (D) they act as universals for all single phenomena and processes;
- (E) they act as archae-images of harmony, order, justice, embodied in the state-legal reality.

And, according to Plato, the world of these *archae*-ideas is hierarchical, with the supreme position occupied by the idea of God. This is the absolute original, from which all social forms of good, justice, order, morality, law, and so on are derived. For example, unlike the Sophists, the main idea of justice and order is precisely in the idea of God. Hence some interpretations of some points of the philosophical and legal doctrine of Plato which say that already the ancient Greek texts argued about the formation of rational and legal order, the rule of law, seem too ideologically-charged.

Thus, it is pointed out that already Plato noted in his dialogues: "I see the near death of the state where the law is invalid and under someone's power. But where the law is the ruler over the rulers, and they are his slaves, I see the salvation of the state". In another place, we read Plato's: "If the children ... get used to the rule of law, and ... this habit will be constantly strengthened, this will help to correct the state if anything was wrong". Indeed, torn from the context the quotations seem to fully fit into the modern doctrinal provisions of the rule of law. Nevertheless, in fact, the text refers to the subordination of rulers and all state activities to divine laws, *archae*-norm, the highest "*archae*" image (*eidos*).

Therefore, Plato's entire state-legal reality must be organizationally and normatively subordinated to the divine principles and norms of justice and good taken from the idea of God. At the same time, in the same logic, the essence of the legal structure of society is substantiated. Plato shares the right into *archae*-right (or meta-law) and positive, human right. The first proceeds from the idea of God expresses the ideal, metaphysical law as a perfect legal order, ideal legislation. The second is empirical law, a living right that forms in human life and is only a pale shadow of the ideal law. An isomorphous link is established between them, which should not be interrupted, so as not to harm states and peoples. Ideal right forms directs and organizes earthly state-legal development.

Thus, the human soul, in contact with the divine world, the world of *archae*-ideas (*eidos*), contemplated the ideal ontological essences (primordial beings) that in the born human being formed archetypes (primitive types and forms of knowledge), i.e. certain semantic "clots" of true knowledge that he comprehended and embodied in direct social experience.

3. Archetypal ideas of Aristotle. In the doctrine of Aristotle, the "*archae*" is used in two meanings: the epistemological (the initial scientific, syllogistic, apodictic principles) and ontological (the beginning of existence, the foundation of essence, axiomatic and other principles) (Lebedev, 1979).

Archae made it possible to describe the causes of the cosmic and human order of things (here Aristotle refers to the previous tradition of describing

the “archae” of the early Greek philosophers). Thus, the archetype of God in Aristotle is the primary source, the prime mover of all that exists, the one who gave the impetus to the arithmetically coordinated mechanism of cosmic order (Aristotle, 2015). The archetype of the Father, for example, gave impetus to the formation of the state, the formation of the political community of citizens. As is well known, the Father’s archetype is the starting idea of the patriarchal theory of the origin of the state, where at each stage of development (the family - the clan - the alliance of the clans - the tribe - the tribal union - the state), this archetype is the ideological-semantic and formative cause of the organization of power and political management of the community.

Let us note that the content interpretation of the “archae” by Plato and Aristotle largely shaped the ancient tradition, which interpreted the latter in the ontological sense as some initial principle (the principles of being), and in the epistemological sense - as the principle, the basis, the beginning of cognition of what exists (the principles of cognition). In the future, it is their ideological and conceptual interpretations that would become the “theoretical basis” for subsequent conceptualizations and the use of the term “archetype”. For example, the concept of “archetype” is also used by Plotinus, the Neoplatonist philosopher, in his doctrine of the immortality of the soul, where the latter is interpreted as an eternal form, a transcendental foundation that reveals in the soul of each person the living light of the highest Truth (Plotinus, 1984). According to Plotinus, archetypes are the generative models of all that exists, they are eternal and unchanging, and are associated with a deeper archetype-type of the Divine good: “the ideal and eternal archetype of all things, having its own self-knowledge and irresistibly reigning over everything” (Losev, 1980).

At the same time, although the ancient Greek tradition became the most famous, with a clear ideological and conceptual basis, however, the latter is not an exception. There are other traditions of using the concept of archetype, not directly related to Western European civilizational grounds. Thus, in many civilizations of the Ancient East (Egypt, Babylon, India, China, etc.), the pivotal problems are also the cognition of the very foundations of being, archae-values and archae-principles of the organization of all things, which accordingly form special archetypes of socio-political and legal Organizations and determine the practice of human interaction.

4. Foundations and development of archetypal traditions. For example, many archetypes of the East Asian ecumene (archetypes of the center, cross, harmony, fire, tree, etc.), as well as archetypal symbols, rituals and images (sun, Zodiac, heart, stone, etc.) were not only significant in the

development of ancient states, but also exert their influence on the design and structuring of modern socio-legal and political thought activity. Thus, K.G. Jung repeatedly referred to Oriental teachings, archetypal images and symbols “roaming” from the Eastern to the Western European philosophical tradition, from one religious mythological system to another: “In the great world religions we see the perfection of these images and at the same time their growing envelopment by rational Forms. They appear even in sciences as the basis of some irreplaceable auxiliary concepts such as energy, ether and atom” (Jung, 2016). In basics of all metaphysical research of the past, as R. Genon shows in detail, was the comprehension of hidden primitives, original arcae-norms, arcae-values, original hierarchies, and so on. There were simply different ways and traditions, excellent practices and spiritual paths, different forms and ways of revealing/comprehending the initials (Genon, 2008).

In accordance with the foregoing, it can be noted that the ideological and theoretical foundations of the archetype were formed quite a long time ago, i.e. appeared much earlier than the very concept of “archetype.” For example, S.S. Averintsev notes that “in the domestic science, some thinkers and scientists, regardless of Jung, approached the notion of “archetype”, for example, P.A. Florensky, O.M. Friedenberg, and others (Averintsev, 1980). Moreover, the very idea of the archetype was constantly reproduced in various spheres of scientific research: literary criticism, anthropology, philosophy, sociology, political science, etc. (Averintsev, 2001). The merit of K.G. Jung is, first of all, in the conceptualization of this term and in the formation of the original theory of the archetype.

We believe that the theoretical-conceptual version of the archetype proposed by K.G. Jung, is, of course, authoritative and famous, however, it is not the only one. Moreover, the theory of Jung’s archetype is itself based on several traditions of archetypal research and tries to unite and harmonize them. However, within the framework of this article, we do not aim to show how successful or not the Jungian project has been carried out (there are fundamental studies on this subject (Meletinsky, 2012; Menzhulin, 2002)). We only accept as an ideological and semantic basis that there are possible other alternative research projects with a significant heuristic potential, not limited to commenting, replicating or reinterpreting the Jungian theory of archetypes. The latter is typical for many research projects in the content of which the “cataloging” of archetypes in one or another sphere is realized in the public system of their reinterpretation with reference to practical goals and tasks: “As a result, there appear original collections of “archetypes”-sort of card decks, from which the “Archetypal solitaires” emerge. Primary values, recombined and multiplied by themselves, multiply the ranks of

newly made “archetypes” - national, plot, behavioral, etc.” (Pelipenko & Yakovenko, 1998).

Let us stress once again that the recent critical passages about the authoritative Jungian tradition and, in particular, its modern development vector, do not at all mean that this theory should be discarded (Lyubashits et. al., 2016). On the contrary, this involves resorting to it and “dialogic cooperation,” but the perception of the Jungian theory of the archetype should be treated as only one of the variants, a possible project of archetypal research.

In addition, the existing “linear” installation, broadcast from one modern study to another, is the assertion that “the experience of ancient philosophy boils down to the teachings of Plato about Eidos and they are the ideal visible prototypes of all things and lie at the beginning of the whole line of thinking leading to Concept of an archetype” (Galsanova, 2011). Above we have briefly shown that this is not so. In fact, as we see, in Antiquity there were several traditions and directions of interpretation of the archetype. Moreover, the semantic basis of the “archae” was used in many philosophical, philosophical-political, philosophical-religious treatises and so on. In addition, similar ideological and conceptual “foundations” of the archetypal theory developed in the Ancient East. In the Middle Ages and the Modern Age, there were also various directions of archetypal research (Mamychev et. al., 2016). Even more “monistic position” formed in the twentieth century, when the theoretical and practical breakthrough of psychoanalysis (Freud’s discovery of the collective unconscious), and then analytical psychology for many years formed only one model of interpretation of the theory of the archetype.

CONCLUSION

Thus, we believe that the ideological and theoretical foundations of the archetype were formed quite a long time ago, i.e. appeared much earlier than the very concept of “archetype”. And in different philosophical, mythological and religious systems, various traditions formed and developed as an understanding of archetypal bases, as well as methods and ways for their comprehension, meaningful interpretation, and substantiation of the role and significance. Undoubtedly, in this diversity, it is possible to single out and conceptualize the basic, core ideas, concurrent interpretations, similar forms of cognition of the hidden, essential foundations of society, the state, power, politics, etc. It is in consequence of this circumstance, one can speak of archetypal research as such, although the term “archetype” itself may not be used in many studies. In this respect, it is the similarity of ideological and semantic orientations, principles and content of various studies that allows us to classify them as “archetypal”.

Acknowledgement

The work was carried out with the financial support of the grant of the President of the Russian Federation No. MD-6669.2016.6.

References

- Aristotle, (2015). *Metaphysics*. Moscow.
- Averintsev, S.S. (1980). *Archetypes. Myths of the peoples of the world: an encyclopedia*. Vol. 1. Moscow.
- Averintsev, S.S. (2001). *Symbol. Archetypes. Sofia-Logos. Dictionary (2nd ed.)*. Kiev: Spirit i Littera, pp. 155-161.
- Bachinin, V.A. (2006). *Encyclopedia of Philosophy and Sociology of Law*. St. Petersburg.
- Baranov P.P., Mamychev A.Y., Ovchinnikov A.I. (2016) *Management of the conservative political platform of the transformation public-power organization in Eurasia*. International Review of Management and Marketing. No. 6 (S6). P. 241-246
- Galsanova, O.E. (2011). Interpretation of the Concept of «Archetype»: From Ancient Culture to Culturological Thoughts of the Beginning of the Twentieth Century. *Bulletin of the Buryat State University*, 6.
- Genon, R. (2008). *Symbolism of the Cross*. Moscow.
- Hubner, K. (1996). *The Truth of the Myth*. Moscow.
- Jung, K.G. Instinct, and the Unconscious. Retrieved 10 October 2016 from URL: <http://www.oculus.ru/stat.php?id=52>.
- Kant, I. (1982). *Collected works in 8 volumes*. Vol. 3. Moscow, pp. 283-284.
- Lebedev, A.V. (1979). *On the Original Formulation of the Traditional Thesis THN APXHN YΛΩP EINAI*. Balcanica, Linguistic Research. Moscow, pp. 167-186.
- Lebedev, A.V. (2010). *Archae. New Philosophical Encyclopedia. Institute of Philosophy RAS*. Moscow: Think, pp. 145-156.
- Losev, A. (1980). *The History of Ancient Aesthetics. Late Hellenism*. Moscow.
- Lyubashits, V.Y., Mamychev, A.Y., Vronskaya, M.V. & Timofeeva, A.A. (2016). Socio-economic and Public-power Aspects of State and Society Relations in Modernizing Russia. *International Review of Management and Marketing*, 6, pp. 116-120.
- Mamychev, A.Y., Filippova, M.K., Lyubashits, V.Y. & Shalyapin, S.O. (2016). Prognostic Problems of the Public and Power Organization of the Russian Society: Archetypes and Sociocultural Basis of Functioning and Development. *International Review of Management and Marketing*, 6 (6), pp. 85-89.
- Marinosyan, T.E. (1998). *Archetype as a Concept of Philosophical Anthropology*. Cand. of Philology thesis, author's abstract. Moscow.
- Meletinsky, Y.M. (2012). *Poetics of Myth*. Moscow.
- Menzhulin, V. (2002). *Unspelling Jung: From Apologetics to Criticism*. Kiev.
- Pelipenko, A.A. & Yakovenko, I.G. (1998). *Culture as a System*. Moscow.
- Plato, (2005). *The State*. Moscow.
- Plotinus, (1984). On the Immortality of the Soul. *The Questions of philosophy*, 3, pp. 118-158.