

STANISLAV ORIKHOVSKY ON THE IDEAL FORM OF STATE GOVERNMENT

Ruslana Mnozhynska

Candidate of Philosophy Sciences,

Associate Professor at the Department of Philosophy and Cultural Studies,

Kyiv National University of Technology and Design, Ukraine

e-mail: ruslanamnozhynska@gmail.com, orcid.org/0000-0001-8459-3496

Summary

The article focuses on the fact that one of the first, in the national Renaissance philosophical thought, who considered the issue of the ideal form of government was Stanislav Orikhovsky. In works of a socio-political nature, he devoted a lot of space to the problems of the state: its essence, the origin of state power, forms of government, the structure of society, relations between the state and the church. The ruler, in his opinion, should be Enlightened monarch, «philosopher on the throne», who cares about the «common good», peace and harmony in the state, observes laws, natural law, is just, brave, courageous, protects subjects and borders from external and internal enemies, cares about the education and upbringing of his people.

Attention is also drawn to the fact that, developing his theory of the state, S. Orikhovsky thoroughly studied the theoretical heritage of not only ancient thinkers – Plato, Aristotle, Cicero, but also Thomas Aquinas, Augustine, Erasmus of Rotterdam. But he used their ideas creatively, critically. Orikhovsky's views on the essence of the state, its tasks and internal structure are the pinnacle of the socio-political doctrine of the thinker. Orikhovsky presented his recommendations on the better ordering of the state system in a separate treatise entitled «Dialogue on the execution of Polish states», which cites a number of duties not only of citizens to the state, but also vice versa – of the state to citizens. In his concept of the state, S. Orikhovsky defended the need to protect the interests of wide social strata.

It was found out that Orikhovsky developed his theory of the state, moreover, thanks to the introduction to scientific circulation and analysis of foreign-language primary sources, this study deepens the understanding of the development of domestic philosophical and political thought and refutes a number of stereotypes in their interpretation.

Key words: state, power, society, choice, God, antiquity, religious tolerance, providentialism, secular.

DOI <https://doi.org/10.23856/5838>

1. Introduction

The main purpose of the article is to clarify S. Orihovsky's views on the state and its leader, on the role of provincialism in history, on the relationship between church and state. The author elucidates the views of the thinker on the problems of the state: its essence and the origin of state power, forms of government, and the structure of society.

In developing his theory of the state, S. Orikhovsky thoroughly studied the theoretical heritage of not only ancient thinkers – Plato, Aristotle, Cicero, but also Thomas Aquinas, Augustine, Erasmus of Rotterdam. He used their ideas creatively, critically. Orikhovsky's views on the essence of the state, its task and the internal structure are the summit of the socio-political theory of the thinker. Orichovsky made his recommendations on better

regulation of the state system in a separate treatise entitled «The Dialogue on the Execution of the Polish State», which imposes a number of duties not only of citizens before the state, but vice versa – the state of citizens. S. Orikhovsky defended the need to protect the interests of the broad social strata in his state conception. At the same time, he understands the state as an association of only free people.

First of all, to clarify the methodological principles important for further studies on the theological and philosophical heritage of the Ukrainian Renaissance humanists. In addition, due to the introduction into scientific circulation and analysis of foreign sources of primary sources, this study greatly deepens the notion of the development of domestic philosophical and political thought and refutes a number of stereotypes and false representations when interpreted, which are available in religious studies and historical and philosophical writings.

In the course of the study, Orikhovsky developed his theory of the state, headed by an enlightened monarch, «philosopher on the throne», who cares about the «common good», peace and harmony in the state, adheres to the laws of natural law.

2. The problem of reconstructing interrupted historical and intellectual traditions

Today, there is a problem of reconstructing interrupted historical and intellectual traditions, which is relevant in view of the need to ensure the continuity of cultural inheritance, the connection between the «past» and the «present», their embrace into one, that is, the achievement of historical understanding that makes history working. The meaning of the latter lies in the continuous influence of the «past» culture, including philosophy, on the «present». After all, we strive to comprehend the previous periods of development of philosophical and political thought not only for the sake of their knowledge, but also to search for solutions to the real problems of our time and our people.

Philosophical culture of Ukraine in the first half of the sixteenth century. is one of the most interesting and little-explored topics in the history of Ukraine's development. It was during this period that the foundations were laid for the formation of Russian early modern thought in its various manifestations – rationalistic and mystical; Renaissance-humanistic and Reformation ideas were formed, which later functioned and developed within the framework of the Ukrainian Baroque culture.

The purpose of this scientific research is to consider one of the important aspects of the activity of the great Ukrainian-Polish thinker of the first half of the sixteenth century, the main representative of the «Catholic Rus» – S. Orikhovsky, who significantly influenced the further development of spiritual, cultural and religious processes not only in Ukraine but also in Poland. All this has not yet been studied sufficiently, although the need for this kind of knowledge is great. This determines the relevance of the topic, and also the fact that, given Ukraine's European choice, it is important to overcome outdated nihilistic stereotypes, including prejudice against the inability of our thinkers to philosophical and theological comprehension of reality. This should help us overcome the tendency to enslave our theological tradition, so actively cultivated in the era of militant atheism. There is still an opinion that among the main Christian denominations in Ukraine – Orthodox, Catholic, Protestant and Uniate – national, state-building has always been and is only Orthodox. As for the «Catholic Rus» – Ukrainians of the Catholic religion, to which S. Orikhovsky belongs, they are still being mentioned to the general public Almost nothing is known. Meanwhile, from the point of view of national ideology, «Catholic Rus» probably produced no less for Ukrainian culture than Greek Catholics or even Orthodox, and produced perhaps no less cultural forces for both Ukrainian material culture and spiritual culture.

In order to perform the tasks, scientific research was based on both general scientific and special methods of cognition. The main was the structural-functional approach, which made it possible to explore the views of the thinker on the state political system.

Thanks to the introduction to scientific circulation and the analysis of foreign-language primary sources, this study significantly deepens the understanding of the development of domestic philosophical and political thought and refutes a number of stereotypes and misconceptions in their interpretation, which are available in historical and philosophical works.

Today, there is a problem of reconstructing interrupted historical and intellectual traditions, which is relevant in view of the need to ensure the continuity of cultural inheritance, the connection between the «past» and the «present», their embrace into one, that is, the achievement of historical understanding that makes history working. The meaning of the latter lies in the continuous influence of the «past» culture, including philosophy, on the «present». After all, we strive to comprehend the previous periods of development of philosophical and political thought not only for the sake of their knowledge, but also to search for solutions to the real problems of our time and our people (*Lytvynov, 2000:79*).

3. Philosophical culture of Ukraine in the first half of the sixteenth century

Philosophical culture of Ukraine in the first half of the sixteenth century. is one of the most interesting and little-explored topics in the history of Ukraine's development. It was during this period that the foundations were laid for the formation of Russian early modern thought in its various manifestations – rationalistic and mystical; Renaissance-humanistic and Reformation ideas were formed, which later functioned and developed within the framework of the Ukrainian Baroque culture.

There is still an opinion that among the main Christian denominations in Ukraine – Orthodox, Catholic, Protestant and Uniate – national, state-building has always been and is still only Orthodox. As for the «Catholic Rus» – Ukrainians of the Catholic religion, to which S. Orikhovskiy belongs, almost nothing is known about them to the general public. Meanwhile, from the point of view of national ideology, «Catholic Rus» did for Ukrainian culture, Probably, no less than the Greek Catholics, or even the Orthodox, and produced no less cultural forces than they did for both Ukrainian material culture and spiritual culture (*Lytvynov, 2000:77*).

This theme in the culture of Ukraine in the first half of the sixteenth century. – little studied. Recently, a number of fundamental studies have appeared, which consider certain problems of Ukrainian humanism and some provisions of the general analysis of human philosophy of the Renaissance. These are, in particular, the works of D. Nalyvaiko, V. Nichyk, V. Lytvynov, Y. Stratiy, P. Kraliuk, M. Kashuba, I. Paslavsky, V. Horsky, O. Matkovska, B. Krysa, V. Liubashchenko, who work in the field of history of national philosophical thought and spiritual culture in general. As regards, in particular, such an outstanding figure as Stanislav Orikhovskiy, his socio-political heritage is considered partly in the works of D.S. Nalyvaiko, V.D. Lytvynov, P. Kraliuk and some Polish researchers. The article is aimed at studying views on the state political system, one of the important aspects of the activity of the prominent Ukrainian-Polish thinker of the first half of the sixteenth century, the main representative «Catholic Rus» – S. Orikhovskiy, which significantly influenced the further development of spiritual and cultural processes not only in Ukraine but also in Poland. All this has not yet been studied sufficiently, although the need for this kind of knowledge is great. This determines the relevance of the topic, and also the fact that, given the European choice of Ukraine, it is important to overcome outdated nihilistic stereotypes, including prejudice against the inability of our thinkers to political and philosophical comprehension of reality, so actively cultivated in the era of militant atheism.

One of the first, in the national Renaissance philosophical thought, who considered the question of the ideal form of government was Stanislav Orikhovskiy.

In works of a socio-political nature, he devoted a lot of space to the problems of the state: its essence and origin of state power, forms of government, the structure of society, relations between the state and the church. The ruler, in his opinion, should be an enlightened monarch, a «philosopher on the throne», who cares about the «common good», peace and harmony in the state, observes laws, natural law, is just, brave, courageous, protects subjects and borders from external and internal enemies, cares about the education and upbringing of its people.

Substantiating his state-legal views, he borrows a lot from ancient political theories. This gave grounds for some researchers to consider him a «Platonist» and deduce from Plato his understanding of the state, others to rank him among the «Aristotelians», given the similar title of Aristotle's work «Politiya». In fact, Orikhovskiy was not an ardent supporter of either one. He saw well that Plato created an abstract scheme of an ideal state, and understood that in his conception of the state, Aristotle, in fact, reproduced the modern social relations of the Greek polis states. He took from their teachings only that which corresponded to his own ideas about the ideal state organization. Rethinking the political theories of both prominent Greek philosophers, he also borrowed a lot from Cicero's conception of the state, which was the best compromise between the method of Plato and Aristotle. Thus, Orikhovskiy's thesis that «the state is an assembly of citizens united by common law and common good» showed obvious similarities with Cicero's definition of the state, according to which it is «an assembly of a people united by law and common good»; is the most perfect form of universal human justice, based on the subordination to it of the personal interests of all individuals, that is, all citizens of the state, all its social classes, on the stable balance of these interests, which is the «common good», the welfare of the whole state (*Cicero, 1998:227*).

Developing his theory of the state, S. Orikhovskiy thoroughly studied the theoretical heritage of not only ancient thinkers – Plato, Aristotle, Cicero, but also Thomas Aquinas, Augustine, Erasmus of Rotterdam. But he used their ideas creatively, critically. Thus, according to the above-mentioned two Christian scholars, the state is a means for realizing the moral and religious goals of the individual. And Orikhovskiy, contrary to them, claims that it has its own goal. Sometimes it even seems that he literally repeats some of the reasoning of Thomas Aquinas, particularly when he sees in the state the perfect education by which eternal salvation can best be attained.

But, considering this thesis in the context of all Orikhovskiy's work, one can see that his understanding of the state is much deeper and wider than the idea of it as an intermediary on the way to eternal salvation. In the socio-political works of S. Orikhovskiy, one can also notice the influence of the mysticism of Pseudo-Dionysius, which, however, he interpreted quite freely. Perhaps most of all this influence was manifested in his concept of hierarchy. Clergy, The king and nobility are the best flower in an ideal system, which is a reflection of the order prevailing in the heavenly hierarchy: «A well-arranged kingdom is a picture of the kingdom of God.» The human kingdom, therefore, is built, according to Orikhovskiy, on the model of the kingdom of God (*Orikhovskiy, 1984:12*).

4. Orikhovskiy's views on the essence of the state, its tasks and internal structure

Orikhovskiy's views on the essence of the state, its tasks and internal structure are the pinnacle of the socio-political doctrine of the thinker. Orikhovskiy presented his recommendations on the best ordering of the state system in a separate treatise entitled «Dialogue on

the Execution of the Polish State», where he cites a number of duties not only of citizens to the state, but also vice versa – of the state to citizens. The originality and ordinariness of his reform plan lay even in the fact that that he called for the return of the system in Poland that existed under his ancestors. If we take into account the fact that during the Renaissance all the achievements of previous generations were rejected unconditionally, even despite their obvious validity, these views of Orichowsky, as the Polish researcher J. Lichtenstzul writes, «are worthy of all approval» (*Lichtenstzul, 1939:58*).

Special emphasis on the pages of the «Dialogue» was made by the thinker on the close connection between moral progress and work for the state; safeguarding its integrity, which, in his opinion, was equal to caring for one's own salvation. In his concept of the state, S. Orikhovsky defended the need to protect the interests of wide social strata. At the same time, he understands the state as an association of only free people: «The state is a union of many houses, settlements, cities, counties, lands, free people, who are alone, the most glorious birth, the will of the clearest, justice the most praiseworthy, and the courage of the most glorious supremacist, chosen by the free voice of free people, for the common good are voluntarily subjected» (*Orikhovsky, 1984:22*).

Stanislav Orikhovsky was one of the first in European philosophical thought to deny the divine origin of power and state. Thus, he approached the problem of the state from secular rather than theological positions, which was a significant step towards the liberation of political science from theology (*Cicero, 1998:225*).

S. Orikhovsky wrote that the formation of the state entailed the need for mutual support, because a person cannot live alone in the world, and not least «because of our innate gänge», and therefore people need each other. Sometimes his reasoning on this topic is similar to that of Aristotle (*Cicero, 1998:225*). But despite the fact that Orikhovsky readily quotes the thoughts of Aristotle, Plato and other ancient philosophers, His view of the state does not coincide with theirs. Thus, for example, Aristotle had two foundations for the emergence of the state – the highest necessity and free will. Instead, Orikhovsky has the will of the individual dependent on the living conditions and the innate instinct for social life (*Lichtenstzul, 1939:58*). The latter thought, by the way, is more similar to Platonova, who wrote that «the state arises as a result of an innate desire for living together, when each of us cannot satisfy himself, but needs much more... People come together to live together and help each other...» (*Orikhovsky, 1972:57*).

Ukrainian Renaissance humanists, as well as Western European humanists, well assimilated the political theories of ancient philosophers, especially Plato, Aristotle, Cicero, whose works dealt with the «best» state system. But appealing to ancient authorities did not mean simply reproducing their ideas. There was a rethinking taking into account the regional tasks of that time. For example, S. Orikhovsky, like Aristotle, distinguishes four forms of government: monarchy (system, in which one rules), oligarchy (the power of a group of powerful citizens), democracy (a system in which everyone rules) and, finally, politics. The latter form is especially interesting for us, because it is the subject of a thorough analysis by the Ukrainian author. The starting point of our thinker's reasoning was a negative attitude towards the first three forms of the state and a commitment to the fourth, politics. He even wrote a separate treatise about it entitled «Quincunx, or the Model of the Polish State...» (1564), in which he frankly says that he builds his theory taking into account the experience of different nations – from the most ancient (ancient Greeks and Romans) to modern ones (Venetians and others) (*Lichtenstzul, 1939:58*).

Being well acquainted with the theories of the state of ancient thinkers, first of all, Plato and Aristotle, Stanislav Orikhovsky to a certain extent depended on them, His division of society into classes is very similar to the ideal of the ancients, but not identical. Thus, for example,

dividing the whole society into 6 classes (priests, king, gentry, merchants, artisans, peasants), Orikhovsky, like Aristotle and the Italian humanist K. Salutati, declares that only the first three estates should participate in the government, councils, executive bodies. The state is a combination of free, and the peasants are not free. The first three classes are citizens, and the rest are useful. The former are masters and the latter are servants. Each class, according to the thinker, should do its own thing. Kmets should feed the state, artisans should dress, merchants should enrich, gentry should defend, king should rule, kaplan should teach. Otherwise, the state will perish from internal strife – which, as is known, Plato wrote (*Lytvynov, 2000:77*).

Both in the era of distant antiquity and in subsequent eras, thinkers were fascinated by the image of an ideal leader of the state, a philosopher-politician capable of combining wisdom, justice, moderation and eloquence, necessary in order to be able to persuade listeners, and therefore lead the people. For him, the interests of the state should stand above his personal, as well as the interests of both his own and any other political party, since such a statesman is well aware of the common good, the interests of the whole state and the best ways to ensure and protect them. Plato's saying – «kings should philosophize, and philosophers should reign» (*Plato, 1994:101*) became winged and exists in the lexicon of social and political figures to this day. Much pondered the image of the ideal ruler Cicero, in particular, in the treatise «On the State» (*Orikhovsky, 1984:19*).

5. Conclusions

The humanists of the Renaissance sincerely believed that social progress was possible if there was a «philosopher on the throne» in power, that is, an ideal ruler – intelligent, kind, who cared about the welfare of his subjects, their education and upbringing. Such power of the ruler will be limited by law, and he himself will acquire and maintain it exclusively by peaceful means, through his own valor and faithful, sincere and intelligent advisers. Humanists especially liked the idea of the ancient Greek philosopher Plato, who associated the possibility of an ideal social system in the state, as we have said, with the condition that philosophers would become kings or kings would philosophize.

Orichowsky tried to create an example of an ideal ruler of a new type, such as he would like to see him – educated, intelligent, caring about the welfare of citizens, and not about his own well-being. Such, according to the thinker, was the Polish king Sigismund the Old, to imitate whom he advises the young king Sigismund Augustus: «citizens will respect the king if he does not care so much about anything else during his reign, as a public well-being». The real embodiment of an enlightened monarch is seen by Orikhovsky precisely in Sigismund the Old, who allegedly is a real «philosopher on the throne»: wise, just, courageous, meek, and therefore earned «fame, honor and state.» These views are concentrated in the treatise «Exhortation ...», where Sigismund is described as an ideal king, the kind of whom Plato allegedly dreamed of when he wrote: «Happy are those states where either philosophers rule or rulers philosophize» (*Orikhovsky, 1984:12*). The thinker also approves of the extraordinary actions of the king, which bring benefits for the state, such as, for example, the marriage of Augustus with the daughter of the «Roman emperor Ferdinand», because it brought «unprecedented benefits to the Polish state – ties with the whole of Europe, reconciliation with German princes, etc.» (*Lichtensztul, 1939:58*). After all, the queen, Orikhovsky emphasizes, should worry not so much about his wife for herself as about the queen for the state.

To convince the king of the importance of choosing the right mentor, Orikhovsky resorts to analogies from ancient and modern times. Outstanding rulers, he writes, became famous, glorious, immortal only because they had wise, intelligent tutors: Alexander the Great – Aristotle,

Pausanias – the poet Simonides, Periander of Corinthe – Thales of Miletus, Pericles – Anaxagoras of Clasimene, Dion – Plato, Sigismund the Old – Dlugosz. At the same time, Orichowski warns the king to avoid talkers, whisperers, gossipers, praisers, sycophants; flattering, cunning, insidious. Such people, Orikhovsky wrote, do not bring light to the lost, not knowledge to the ignorant, not hope to those who have lost it, but on the contrary: extinguish that light, destroy hope in the souls of people and uproot it. The thinker places special emphasis on such a category of unworthy advisers as flatterers in general and courtiers in particular, who are not engaged in important state affairs, but only «cut the caftan, invent costumes, make mashkars, play, jester, pushing at court.» He compares such courtiers with a beautiful, dressed up lady at the royal.

If no person, according to Orikhovsky, is born a king, then the pretender to the throne, equal among equals, must surpass the general public in his moral qualities: virtue, courage, courage, honesty, humility. The thinker attached great importance to these virtues. Kings deprived of this, he wrote, turn out to be weak, manipulated and not respected, they are called Sardanapales. In such rulers, valor was considered a gange, shyness was considered an oddity, chastity – foolishness, thrift – miserliness. Orikhovsky's thoughts about the qualities of a perfect ruler largely coincide with the thoughts of Plato, Aristotle, Erasmus of Rotterdam, N. Machiaveli, J. Pontano, A. F. Modrzewski, T. Mora, with whose works he was well aware. There are even direct references to the works of some of them. The thinker used borrowed ideas creatively, critically, meaningfully (*Lichtensztul, 1939:58*). But, unlike Machiaveli, who advises the queen to be cruel and treacherous in achieving her goal, Orikhovsky believes that the king should earn the favor and favor of his subordinates, take care of their respect and favor, because without this there can be no strong power of kings (*Plato. 1994:101*).

Like Cicero, Orichowski teaches the king that the sciences, in particular, philosophy, should not only teach the mind, but also be attractive, should cheer both the mind and the heart. He is convinced that the main goal of humanitarian education is to exercise the soul, that is, to ennoble a person internally, to «humanize» (humanize), to cure the soul (*Orikhovsky, 1984:1*).

The foundations of not only Renaissance, but also modern theories of state and law were laid by many generations of European scholars, starting from Greek and Roman thinkers, and among them one of the leading places belongs to Orikhovsky. Among subsequent generations of Ukrainian statesmen and politicians, Yuri Nemyrych, Pylyp Orlyk, Teofan Prokopovych dealt with the problem of an ideal ruler. There is reason to believe that they were familiar with Orikhovsky's reasoning in this regard.

The article examines one of the important aspects of the activity of the great Ukrainian-Polish thinker of the first half of the sixteenth century, the leading representative of the «Catholic Rus» – S. Orikhovsky, who significantly influenced the further development of spiritual, cultural and religious processes not only in Ukraine but also in Poland. All this has not yet been studied sufficiently, although the need for this kind of knowledge is great. This determines the relevance of the topic, and also the fact that, given Ukraine's European choice, it is important to overcome outdated nihilistic stereotypes, including prejudice against the inability of our thinkers to philosophical and theological comprehension of reality. This should help us overcome the tendency to enslave our theological tradition, so actively cultivated in the era of militant atheism.

As a result, it should be noted that the future of the topic is due to the fact that the study of this problem is a necessary component of political, religious, historical and philosophical research, since thematic transformations express the most significant processes that took place in the social life of Ukraine of the XVI century. are still little explored. Among the issues that S. Orikhovsky tried to solve, there were many relevant for Europe of that time, and even today

(the problem of choosing the head of state, tolerant relations between church and state, moral and ethical views, interfaith relations).

The consequences of the study open up prospects for future studies on similar issues and can be used in the practice of teaching normative courses and special courses in political science, history of Ukrainian philosophy, religious studies, as well as in the publication of fundamental works and university textbooks.

References

1. Cicero. (1998) *Pro derzhavu*. Kyiv: *Apriori*. [in Ukrainian]
2. Lichtensztul J. (1939) *Poglądy filozoficzne i prawne Stanisława Orzechowskiego*. Warszawa : *Polski Instytut Sztuki i Nauki Ameryki*. [in Polish]
3. Lytvynov Volodymyr. (2000) *Renesansnyi humanizm v Ukraini (Idei humanizmu epokhy Vidrozhennia v ukrainskii filosofii XV – pochatku XVII stolittia)*. Kyiv: *Osnovy*. [in Ukrainian]
4. Orikhovsky Stanislav (2004). *Pratsi*. Kyiv : *Dnipro*. [in Ukrainian]
5. Orikhovsky St. (1972) *Wybór pism*.Warsawa : *Industria*. [in Polish]
6. Orikhovsky St. (1984) *Policja Królestwa Polskiego*. Warsawa : *Industria*. [in Polish]
7. Plato. (1994) *V 473 CD. Politicica*. Cambridge : *Cambridge University Press*. [in English].