Abstract. The article shows basic methodological principles and approaches of understanding the concept of Carl Jung’s archetypes of collective unconscious namely the eight functional model of extended Jungian analyst J. Beebe compared with cultural archetypes in metaanthropological tradition. The given results of analysis in article making possible to understand does the personification of cultural images happening and how does it relate to the cultural archetypes. Particular attention is paid to the works of Ukrainian and Western researchers that reveal the philosophical and anthropological aspects of culture and determine the specific formation of human beings in the cultural existence. Based on J. Beebe’s dialogical approach, metaanthropological dimensions of human being are matching with the corresponding level of cultural identity, thus defines the universal archetypes persons of culture. The results are obtained in the study actualizing metaanthropological approach to understanding the importance of archetypal persons not only in Ukrainian culture, but also in the world and they are also actualizing the problem of structural overcoming crisis of cultural identity on the example of modern Ukraine.
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1. Introduction
Given the fact that the term «archetype» is interpreted by most European researchers in the field of Jungian psychoanalytic tradition, cultural significance of this concept has left beyond the western scientific thought. Thus, issues topic of this research is understanding the category of «archetype» in the context of cultural human existence and updating the constructive ways of overcoming the crisis of cultural identity.

For the most of Western researchers the term of «archetype» has practical significance because it has been successfully used in psychoanalytic practice and is seen more as a dark side of the human psyche, which plays a leading role in the formation of the whole person. Therefore, the problem of cultural identity crisis as well as any other of its forms is characterized by western philosophers as loss of ego-identity and linked to unconscious nature of man - the archetypes of collective unconscious. For example, an American psychiatrist and psychoanalyst Mardi J. Horowitz, has paying attention to the unconscious aspect of identity, determines its function as the formation of patterns of behavior that components of human cultural experience: «A metaphor of «push-pull-revise» helps us pay attention to the internal complexity of self-identity structure and experience. Unconsciously, enduring self-organization results from generalizations made from past experiences, generalizations that are like making a map, the pattern on the map then pushed out to organize the stream of thought and experience [4]». As we can see, J. Horowitz actually identifies the identity and function of archetypes. If understand more in detail what exactly the role of archetype is in the human psyche, we can hardly claim that archetype is responsible for the formation of certain patterns of human behavior only.

German scientist C. Roesler considering archetype in the light of analytical psychology raises serious questions whether is it possible to interpret this phenomenon as a pattern which is inherited genetically, or its existence being conditioned by cultural rights: «However, it must be concluded that there is still no firm scientific foundation for the claim that complex symbolic patterns (as for example the myth of the hero) can be transmitted in a way that every human individual has access to them [5]». The scientist concludes that it is possible to allocate at least four
different definitions of «archetype» within the meaning of Carl Jung: «The first is a biological definition, according to which the archetype was considered as an inborn pattern of perception and behavior. The second definition is an empirical-statistical one based on Jung’s work with the word association test, according to which the archetype is the nucleus of the categories of complexes noted by him in different individuals. A third definition views archetypes as transcending any particular time, place or individual and whose real nature can never become conscious. Finally, there is a cultural-psychological understanding of the archetype which differentiates between the archetype-as-such and its concrete manifestations which are culturally determined [6, p. 543].» During this research the «archetype» will be consider in a cultural-psychological sense, because this is its integrating definition in the context of the crisis of cultural identity.

2. Materials and methods

If we determining the cultural identity as symbols, traditions and values that creates the image of culture and then we can say that the problem of cultural identity is not only a problem of intercultural communicative space forming. The crisis of cultural identity is also the problem of internal image forming that image which will fit the cultural human existence. At certain stage of human being its internal image can be changed not only by the culture but also the cultural images can be transforming by personality. So the crisis of identity in cultural terms can be defined not only as a problem of identification of human «I-ness», but as a changing of cultural images.

For understanding how do the transformation of individual internal image depends on the cultural image in which it exists we apply the concept of «archetype». The research of culture through the prism of archetype is left in Western philosophy remain within the psychoanalytic tradition and have more individually oriented character but as for the Ukrainian philosophy, there are many works in which the category of «archetype» has been a foundation of cultural co-creative and actualizes the problem of overcoming the crisis of cultural identity.

Particularly noteworthy are the works of Ukrainian researchers as S. Krimsky and N. Khamitov, which are not only interpreted the concept of «cultural archetypes» but are determined directly the archetypes of Ukrainian culture.

In S. Krimsky’s article «Archetypes of Ukrainian culture», culture has been defined as an ethno-creative power [9, p. 92] and analyzes its vision through the prism of the so-called «prototype»: «Then deeper the level of mental investigation, then more intense the pushing to the forefront of universal archetypes of individual experience [9, p. 97]». The philosopher connects a prototypes of individual experience with the concept of the archetype of culture, which he reveals not a dive in the past but as driving force of culture which is targeting its future transformation [9, p. 98]. Overall S. Krimsky provides fundamental concept of cultural archetypes, because it reveals the profound role of images in the creation of culture.

The researcher also attempts to classify cultural archetypes and identifies it at the following types: the archetype of philosophy of heart [9, p. 100], the archetype of wisdom [9, p. 104], the archetype of nature [9, p.105] and the word [9, p.106]. S. Krimsky became not only one domestic philosopher which attempted to identify archetypes of Ukrainian culture.

In nowadays researching methods of culture through the archetypes successfully deployed in meta-anthropology as the doctrine of archetypes as foundation of culture [10, p. 207]. Meta-anthropological researching of culture is heuristically valuable for our research because it let to expand Jungian model of archetypes and offer the universal model of archetypal personas in culture. As do we know, the philosophy of meta-anthropological teaching has been based on three dimensions of human being they are «trivial », «limited» and «under limited» being [10 p. 207-212]. So, there are three levels of cultural identity according to each measurement: «individual», «personal» and «under personal».

The main goal of the research is comparison of existing in Western philosophy advanced Carl Jung’s models of collective unconscious archetypes and the cultural archetypes, which are determined in the modern Ukrainian philosophy. Also, comparison of meta-anthropological dimensions of human being and appropriate levels of cultural identity that helps identify the universal archetypal personas that are reflect the processes of myths staying in culture.
3. Results

For displaying these processes we should applied to the phenomenon of myth personification that generates so-called archetypal persons which was defined by N. Khamitov: «Archetypal persons distinguished at the artistic phenomenon of transcendent they are relevant to the culture. These persons are considered as an ontological phenomena – a relatively independent authors and works that generates them [11, c. 101]». Philosopher explains a need for such personification: «... In fact, archaic mythology don’t know the idea of imagination the image for her fused to reality, there is no category of image and prototype in its culture. The emergence of personalized participants in myth marks the extinction of archaic mythology and transition of it in religion [11, p. 84, 94]. ... because the freedom of myth can become a destructive force for the other cultures and become a form of national narcissism, but religion seeks for overcoming it [11, p. 94]», so mythical images of culture personified by necessity and eventually concentrating in symbols of religion.

N. Khamitov interprets archetypes of Ukrainian culture by sharing Ukrainian and Slavic mythology and highlighting the peculiarities of Ukrainian mythology and culture: «The specifics of Ukrainian mythology and the culture lies in the triple synthesis – coupled with Slavic mythology Catholic and Orthodox Christianity currents [7, p.143]». Determining the Ukrainian culture and mythology as a combination of Christianity and paganism, philosopher provides such archetypes of Ukrainian culture as personalism [12, p.145], tolerance and synthetic worldview [7, p. 148] cordocentrism [12, p. 146-147], deeply optimistic view [7, p. 149] and light apocalyptic [7, p. 149]. The concept of «archetypes of Ukrainian culture», N. Khamitov defines as: «Archetypes of Ukrainian culture – ideological and existential foundations which are underlying the creation of cultural expressions of the Ukrainian nation and its perception [7, p. 265]». However, the identity of the modern Ukrainian culture reflected not only in the genesis of archetypes of Ukrainian culture, but also in understanding what is the myth and what is the role of it for the cultural creation.

The philosopher not only gives the definition of «cultural archetypes», but also makes it comparative analysis, featuring it from the archetypes of the collective subconscious in Jungian tradition: «Cultural archetypes – 1) ideological and existential foundations which are underlying the significant cultural work of any representative by the local culture and its perception. 2) ideological and existential foundations of culture as a global phenomenon. Cultural archetypes standing like a development of archetypes of the collective unconscious in the field of culture creation and existence of what it produces. Archetypes of collective unconscious co-exists in the being of each human next to the archetypes of culture in the extent to which express the realities that are not determined, or not entirely determined by consciousness, ideology and culture. Thus the concept of «cultural archetypes» is a specification of the concept of «archetypes of collective unconscious» and can’t be reduced to it [8, p. 263-264]».

Although initial archetypes are all common images of collective unconscious, they are perpetually constant and may vary due to individual consciousness, but still remain primary, about the life experience of the individual. It has been confirmed by the definition of myth in Jungian tradition, because C. Jung became the first philosopher which comprehended the myth as a manifestation of archetypes: «What do we meant by «archetype», can be explained through its relationship with the myth, secret teachings tale. ... Myths are first of all psychic phenomena that is reveal the deep essence of the soul [14, p. 99]». So the myth in the sense of Carl Jung is a manifestation of the underlying mental processes manifested in human existence and reflected the archetypes of the collective unconscious. His definition of «myth» although reveals the nature and relationship of archetypes, but does not specify its value in creating of culture.

So, the myth can be defined as a metamorphosis of the human spirit, manifested in archetypes of culture through their personification. Under these conditions, the myth goes beyond of something mystical and magical and personified in concrete personalities that can changing the culture archetypes and even creating them. But in order to really understand what's exactly the difference between the cultural archetypes and Carl Jung’s archetypes of collective unconscious, we propose to refer the results of Western scholars research, which reveal the mythological component of psychoanalysis.
For example, Jungian analysts C. Bo Nielsen and H. Urhøj in their article «Typology of creating characters», analyzing J. Beebe’s eight functional model of psyche which is an enhanced model of Carl Jung’s archetypes of collective unconscious. Researchers seek to reflect the mechanism of creating the images that resonate with certain personality types. They are representing the eight functional model as a tool to overcome different conflicts between the cultural traditions: «We believe that typology gives a tool to identify the dynamics of traditional conflicts that gives resonance to human beings because we all share the typology structure [1, p. 42]». C. Bo Nielsen and H. Urhøj showing how can be practically operates J. Beebe’s eight functional model by providing an example of creation the sixteen different characters of «Star Wars».

In our opinion, the heuristic value of J. Beebe’s model is laying in dialogical principle of typology the manifestation of collective unconscious archetypes. The researcher identifies the following opposite archetypal couples: Hero / Heroine, Mother / Father, Puer / Puella, Anima / Animus, opposite person, Senex / Witch, Trickster and Demonic Personality. Each of archetype based on the manifestation of the positive or negative aspects as noted by the authors, forming to opposite couples proposed by J. Beebe: «Archetypes are bi-polar they all have a «positive» and «negative» end [1, p. 37]».

**J. Beebe’s eight-functional model**
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Figure 1 shows a set of function-attitudes that are rooted in the structure of the psyche and created an archetypal qualities which are corresponding to each of the eight archetypes. Figure 2 displays opposite archetypes of function-attitudes the human psyche, which are incompatible with the ego-identity, but they are an integral part of the functioning human psyche as a personality [2, p. 42]. As we can see the model of archetypes interaction based on four defined by J. Beebe positions of individual consciousness, which are the center of human personality: the superior function, the inferior function, the shadow of the superior function, the shadow of the inferior function [3].

C. Bo Nielsen and H. Urhøj describing J. Beebe’s model compiled by them: «All the functions operate in tandems and in his SPINE and ARMS concept, Beebe defines the vertical SPINE to express the ego’s relation to self and reflecting the personal integrity and the horizontal ARMS to express the relation to others [1, p. 39]». As author of the model notice: «By «shadow», a term Jung deliberately left imprecise, I mean having the same function but the opposite attitude. So, for example, when the superior function is introverted feeling, its shadow is extraverted feeling, the inferior function is extraverted thinking, and the shadow of the inferior function is introverted thinking [3]».

C. Bo Nielsen and H. Urhøj have proved that proposed by J. Beebe eight functional psyche model makes possible to establish a link between the images that arise in individual consciousness and images of culture in which a person is. However it’s necessary to notice that although the model reflects the relationship between the archetypes of the collective unconscious and culture, it has certain limitations. First of all J. Beebe’s psyche model is individually oriented, because it defines certain psychological types as the specific manifestation of individual consciousness only. Secondly, this model makes possible to determine the causes of the crisis of identity at the individual level only as under J. Beebe’s statement, the problem lies in relations between the I and its shadow. The third, proposed model of archetypes doesn’t display certain psychological types of personality to general cultural level, because the author sees its purpose like identifying the roles, or...
in another words, the images which arising in the minds of both healthy and mentally ill people and identifies a person. Despite the fact that J. Beebe’s researching results reveal the mythological component of psychoanalysis, they are still insufficiently revealing the aspect of individual cultural life.

The essence of J. Beebe’s dialogical approach lying in developing of the «dialogical self» concept, scientist presents the function of archetype like a balance between conscious and unconscious structure of the human psyche. Based on the dialogical principle of individual consciousness operation we have an opportunity to determine the dialogical principle of cultural archetypes balancing in the context of the crisis of cultural identity.

Application of the dialogical principle of typology for correlation the meta-anthropological dimensions of human being and appropriate levels of cultural identity, conceptualizes more universal model of cultural archetypes in human existence. Thus, we can identify certain archetypal persons that are universal for any culture. As the result we getting a model that in contrast to the eight functional psyche model isn’t based on opposite pairs, but based on the complementarily between different levels of cultural human being and patterns of its behavior that are concentrated in nine universal archetypal persons.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trivial dimension of human being</th>
<th>Limited dimension of human being</th>
<th>Underlimited dimension of human being</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Savage</td>
<td>Warrior of Light</td>
<td>Saint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everyman</td>
<td>Hero</td>
<td>Sage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader</td>
<td>Messiah</td>
<td>God-man Androgynous</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual</th>
<th>Personal</th>
<th>Underpersonal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cultural</td>
<td>cultural</td>
<td>cultural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>identity</td>
<td>identity</td>
<td>identity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 3. Archetypal persons of Culture**

If try to understand identified archetypal persons in the context of Ukrainian cultural archetypes which are allocated by domestic researchers, will have the opportunity to determine how does change the cultural identity in contemporary Ukraine.

By correlating individual level of cultural identity and trivial dimension of human being we can identify such archetypal person as «Savage». The basis of this archetypal person in our opinion is archetype of nature. Archetype of nature in Ukrainian culture is manifested by S. Krumskyi as an organic natural and social communication: «... native land – it is not just a native soil but also social ground ... [9, p. 105]».

It is necessary to understand that the archetypal person of «Savage» can be understood not only like a person which is on primitive culture development stage, but one of that as Jung notes: «...just faced with unconscious this person stopped to realize itself. .. And then she forgets herself and doing things that do not recognize itself [14, p. 112]. Savage do not incline to an objective explanation of the most obvious things. He always feels the need to adapt all of external experience to emotional events [14, c. 99]». The specific of «Savage» archetypal person manifestation is that such person has no desire for independent and critical thinking, has no pursuit of the objective world feeling. So, these people can become a subject of action for other people which guided by the will of authority.

At the trivial dimension of human being, where won the personal level of cultural identity, responsible archetypical person of «Everyman». In everyman awakened archetype of deep optimism that is evident in the fundamental irony of demonic forces, contributing to the preservation of Ukrainian culture in numerous twists and turns of the story: «The deep optimism is
also evident in the self-irony and specific Ukrainian humor, which has external and internal orientation [7, p. 149].

Turning to the comparison of the last dimension of identity in trivial life – underpersonal, we can define such archetypal person as a «Leader». Leader is the manifestation of the archetype of Ukrainian culture such as personalism, because: «Personalism is individualism, which lost its negative features, out of the elements, where it was a way of life and thinking which was contrary to rational social order [12, p. 145]». The most prominent manifestation of archetypal person of leader in Ukrainian culture was phenomenon of the Cossacks. But today image of Cossack still resonates with socio-cultural space of Ukraine, confronting imperial consciousness and speech symbol of freedom and independence of Ukrainian people.

In the limited dimension of human being individual level of cultural identity generated by archetypal person of «Warrior of Light». It is important to realize that in the cultural dimension the warrior – is not a man with fire and sword, that’s the man with the heart. Therefore, the archetype of cordocentrism and philosophy of the heart, in our opinion, is awakened by archetypal person of «warrior of light». The honorable warriors of light in Ukrainian culture became the prominent figures that being a people of limited being solved internal contradictions through the dominant of «heart», because as notes N. Khamitov: «...cordocentrism indicate the prevalence of sensory and existential under the rational discourse. This archetype tune with such features of Ukrainian national psychology as sentimentalism, sensitivity, love of nature [7, p. 149]». In the cultural dimension of modern Ukraine archetypal person of «warrior of light» awakened by creativity of such masters as G. Skovoroda, L. Ukrainka, T. Shevchenko, P. Yurkevych, L. Kostenko.

Turning to the archetypal person of «Hero», which corresponds to the limiting dimension of human being with personal level of cultural identity, it should be noted that of course not every warrior became a hero in cultural dimension, only warriors of light becoming a heroes. So the bright apocalyptic archetype, in our opinion, is revealed archetypal person of «Hero». N. Khamitov defining the cultural archetype of light apocalyptic like a metaphysical experience as «the end of the world» and creating of better life [13, p. 380]. This makes possible to characterize the hero as precursor of spiritual transformation.

The last archetypal person at the limited dimension of human existence, is a «Genius», shown by underpersonal cultural identity. The element of «Genius» in our opinion is the archetype of the word, because as S. Krumskyi notes: «The word acts as a «sword of the Spirit» and in this sense goes through the history of Ukrainian literature. Word in Ukrainian culture, according to the common Christian position and is treated as «Logos» and at the more specifically understanding about human language – as a means of apostolic mission [9, p. 106]». In other words archetypal person of genius appears in someone who understands the language of God, but can only interpret it because is not the same as God. Transformation of interpretation God’s language to direct expression occurs in the archetypal person of «Sage», which will be discussed later.

Archetypal person of genius, which concentrates in cultural archetype of «Word», universalizing Ukrainian culture by bringing it at the space of cultural plurality. On this occasion, N. Khamitov notes: «Genius is ethno-cultural manifestations, but the works of genius always goes to the world level [8, p. 282]».

In underlimited dimension of human being individual level of cultural identity concentrated in the archetypal person of «Saint». As noted by N. Khamitov: «In most of the cultures holiness is the highest sacrifice serving ideas, combined with the manifestation of altruism towards the neighbor and farther [10, c. 322]». We can say that archetypical person of «Saint» is a manifestation of the archetype of ideological tolerance and synthetic worldview in Ukrainian culture. Worldview tolerance reveals the ability of the Ukrainian people to take in the culture the mental guidelines of other people and their cultures [7, p. 148]. Synthetic worldview N. Khamitov defined as the removal of contradictions between ideological tolerance and personalism [7, p. 148]. Thus archetypical person of Saint brings Ukrainian culture in the dimension of ideological unity of mankind, overcoming the limits of a multicultural environment.

Human with a personal level of cultural identity in dimension of underlimited being is tangent to the archetypal person of «Sage», which certainly correlated with such archetype of Ukrainian culture as wisdom. The archetype of wisdom S. Krumskyi interprets as a concept of
wisdom of the world, linking it with anthropocentrism in Ukrainian culture: «Anthropocentrism, which was generally inherent to Ukrainian national ideology, reinforced by ideological archetype of the wisdom of the world, which was seen as a book like a text of God. In other words, the real thing interpreted not only in their natural status, but also as symbols, signs of God’s Wisdom [9, p. 102]». In meta-anthropological tradition «Sage» defines as a person which is staying alone in harmony of its unity with the world «…loneliness of sage is paradoxical quality of personality that combines itself with the world. As the wise man gets lonely ownership of his individual harmony [10, p. 227]». It is no accident that the archetypical person of sage, in our opinion, awakens in a human with a personal level of cultural identity, because wisdom as the union of a man harmony with the world remains within his personality.

The last archetypal person is «Messiah, the God-man, or Androgynous», which is crystallizing in under limited dimension of human being and underpersonal cultural identity. It should be noted that this person is a synthesis of all these archetypes of culture and therefore the archetypal personas. Messiah or God-man, by definition of N. Khamitov called like universal archetypal person: «This is an archetype-standard, which measured by the other archetypes, archetypes of historical periods in culture. The standard-image of this archetype for the Christian culture is Jesus Christ [11, p. 102]».

4. Conclusions

The defined model of archetypal persons in article justifies the assertion that cultural identity is a certain internal image of the personality and experience of the crisis of cultural identity is a transformation of this image, that is a changing of cultural archetype personification at the meta-anthropological dimensions of human being. Based on the fact that at the meta-anthropology mythology defined as the limited being of art [11, p. 75], we can say that thanks to the archetypal persons appears a possibly to understand why do exactly resonate those or other works of art in contemporary socio-cultural space of Ukraine. Heuristic value of defined archetypal personas in culture is lying in the perspective of further scientific researching the crisis of cultural identity not only in Ukrainian culture but also in the world, because the gotten results allows to:

1. Show plasticity and organic co-existence of different levels and projects of cultural identity;
2. Comprehend the reasons of changing the cultural archetypes and how this process affects to the experience and dealing with the crisis of cultural identity;
3. Describe the reasons of changing the cultural paradigms at the different eras;
4. Determine what kind of symbols dominates in culture today and why.
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