Archetypes in the Context of Social and Individual: the Experience of Social-Philosophical Analysis

Zaitseva Natalia Alexandrovna

postgraduate student of the Chair of Philosophy, Sociology and Social and Cultural Management of the State Institution "The South Ukrainian National Pedagogical University. K.D. Ushinsky", Odessa.

Abstract

Understands the archetype in From a socio - philosophical position. Particular attention is focused on the interpretation of the concept of "archetype" in the philosophical concepts of A. Averintsev, M. Eliade, K. Jung. It is noted that the phenomenon of archetype is exploited in those spheres of human spiritual life where there are prototypes and recurrence, in particular in mythology, folklore, art, culture in general. Archetypal images have always accompanied man, they are the source of mythology, religion, and art. In these cultural formations there is a gradual grinding of tangled and spooky images, they become symbols, more and more beautiful in form and general in content. Mythology was the initial way of processing archetypal images. It is shown that K. Jung's individualization is the formation of a single, homogeneous being; insofar as "individuality" encompasses our secret, final and unrealizable uniqueness, it also includes the formation of the Self. Therefore, individualization can be imagined as a "path to self" or "self-realization."

Keywords: archetype, symbol, collective unconscious, self-realization.

Introduction. The present state of social relations requires the development of a new holistic view of the forms we have in the way of interaction of social and unique being based on the identification of archetypes in their bases. Existing research attempts to create, above all, a projection of the identity of social space based on pragmatic relations, which, in essence, conceals the essential characteristics of archetypes for both man and society itself.

In modern research, the hypothetical position of the archetypal foundations of social organizations of varying complexity clearly sounds. Noting that every society conceals leading archetypes, it is particularly emphasized that the invisible archetype, it has a stronger impact on the way people live. A certain historically formed system of archetypes encompasses many aspects of the collective subject's life. Thus, the relevance of research and identification of significant archetypes involved in society is substantiated.

Insufficiently lit parts of the problem. Insufficient development of this topic and its relevance cause the need for a new socio - philosophical analysis of the social and personal bases of archetypes in K. Jung's philosophy, which is a scientific problem in this study.

The purpose of the study is a socio - philosophical analysis of the concept of "archetype" in the context of its social and individual principles and justification of the space of its manifestations.

The main content (research methodology). Archetypal images have always accompanied man, they are the source of mythology, religion, and art. In these cultural formations there is a gradual grinding of tangled and spooky images, they become symbols, more and more beautiful in form and general in content. Mythology was the initial way of processing archetypal images.

We can assume that the human personality consists of two parts: first, it is consciousness and all that is covered by them; second, it is the vague deep regions of the unconscious psyche. If the former can be more or less clearly defined and delineated, then the integrity of the human personality must be declared inaccessible for full description or definition. In other words, each personality contains some infinite and indistinguishable part, because its conscious and observable part does not include a number of factors, the existence of which we are forced, however, to assume, to be able to explain the observed cases. These are unknown factors and form what we call the unconscious. We have no idea about the content of these facts, since we only observe their consequences. We can only assume that they have a psychic nature comparable to the contents of consciousness, although we do not have full confidence in this. But one has to imagine that similarity exists, and we no longer refrain from further development of thought. Since the content of our minds are conscious and perceived only in association with the Ego, therefore, the phenomenon of a voice endowed with a personal character may also belong to the center, but no longer identical with our conscious Ego.

The main content (Discussion). In the socio - historical projection, archetypes, which create myths, religions and philosophies that affect whole peoples and the historical epochs that characterize them, manifest themselves significantly. Although the problem of archetypes is a cornerstone of all European philosophical thought, it has not been the subject of detailed analysis in Ukrainian historical and philosophical literature. At the present stage, there are isolated studies in Ukraine that touch upon the analysis of certain aspects of such a problem, in particular K. Jung's archetypal concept [1]. However, in general, the problem of understanding archetype in the concepts of domestic and foreign authors remains insufficiently explored, and therefore a promising field of historical and philosophical studies.

It is common knowledge that each historical era is based on the typical constants that underlie the spiritual life of human civilization. In different philosophical concepts, they are given different names: "archetypes", "prototypes" [2], "Universals", "invariants", "forms without meaning", "end-to-end information and energy structures. Invariance can be traced in those spheres of human spiritual life where there are prototypes and recurrence, in particular in mythology, folklore, art, culture in general. Even with the indirect description of the myth, it is impossible to avoid words such as "first elements", "primitives", "schemes", "types" and their synonyms, which are reduced to the concept of "archetype". Quite often, the term "archetype" is used to refer to the ascending schemes of representations, and common mythological motives, and pervers, and primordial elements. Much of these concepts relate to each other, for example, the first-person and first-element can be regarded as identical components of the motive.

Archetype theory was introduced into the scientific field by K. Jung. Studying the spiritual state of modern western society, the researcher repeatedly pointed to his painful condition, exaggerated attention to the material, rational side of life. The reason for this condition was "the loss of understanding of the symbolic discourse by Western society. The loss of symbolic perception was a catastrophe on a scale not only of the individual, but of the whole society as a whole" [1, p. 60]. At the personal level, this was embodied in the increase in the number of neuroses and depression, a general sense of the meaninglessness of life, at the social level, in the spread of epidemics of the latest doctrines, which often became political.

K. Jung's significant achievement is the isolation of the phenomenon of the collective unconscious of humanity, which is relayed in the form of archetypes. Archetypes become a concentrated expression of the psychic energy actualized by an object. Images of the collective unconscious, according to the scientist, can be biologically inherited, because myths are embedded in the structure of the human soul. At the same time, archetypes as categories of symbolic thought are moving into figurative language. They are equally present in the minds of the mentally ill, ordinary people and geniuses [4], where they play the role of protecting the mental equilibrium of the individual.

The main results of the study are that the category: "archetype", which is used in various fields of scientific knowledge, is one of the epistemologically capacious, heuristically valuable

and perspective categories of cultural philosophy; in the history of conceptualization of the archetype token, the following historical stages can be distinguished: the cosmocentric (philosophy of antiquity), within which the archetype is interpreted as a cosmic order; theocentric (philosophy of the Middle Ages), within which the term "archetype" is interpreted as a divine idea, a noumenon originally existing in the mind of God; rational-centric (classical philosophy), in which the concept of "archetype" is interpreted in two ways - as a natural (natural) structure and as a form of intelligence; dialogical (non-classical and post-nonclassical philosophy) within which the category "archetype" is interpreted from the standpoint of epistemological pluralism, that is, finds polyphonic sound.

Conclusions. On the basis of the analyzed material it is possible to make certain generalizations and conclusions.

The human personality consists of two parts: first, it is consciousness and all that is covered by them; second, it is the vague deep regions of the unconscious psyche. If the former can be more or less clearly defined and delineated, then the integrity of the human personality must be declared inaccessible for full description or definition. In other words, each personality contains some infinite and indistinguishable part, because its conscious and observable part does not include a number of factors, the existence of which we are forced, however, to assume, to be able to explain the observed cases. These are unknown factors and form what we call the unconscious. We have no idea about the content of these facts, since we only observe their consequences. We can only assume that they have a psychic nature comparable to the contents of consciousness, although we do not have full confidence in this. But one has to imagine that similarity exists, and we no longer refrain from further development of thought. Since the content of our minds are conscious and perceived only in association with the Ego, therefore, the phenomenon of a voice endowed with a personal character may also belong to the center, but no longer identical with our conscious Ego.

Individualization, according to K. Jung, is the formation of a single, homogeneous being; insofar as "individuality" encompasses our secret, final and unrealizable uniqueness, it also includes the formation of the Self. Therefore, individualization can be imagined as a "path to self" or "self-realization."

References

1. Jung, K. G. (1997) On the archetypes of the collective unconscious. Moscow: Center. - 243p.
2. Plato (1994) Collected Works: In 4 vols. Vol. 3. M.: Thought. – 456 p.
3. Jung, K.G. (1991) Archetype and symbol. M.: Renaissance. – 304 p.
4. Averintsev, S. S. (1980) Archetypes// Myths of the peoples of the world: Encyclopedia. T. 1. M. – 556 p.