The comparison between "ideal kingship" in ancient and middle era

Zia Khazaei

Department of Political Science, Zahedan branch, Islamic Azad University, Zahedan, Iran.

Abstract: Political philosophy is part of philosophy in general sense. A political theory by a philosopher is affected by his philosophical attitude towards the universe, the existence, creation structure, and finally cognition the truth. Therefore, in order to understand the political philosophy, at first the philosophical attitude of a philosopher toward a tribe or nation must be allocated. Since in ancient philosophy capturing does not tolerate possessing entire the world so political philosophy is opposed to the policy based on prepotency and sovereignty. Thus, formulating and developing a desirable society is considered as a goal of political philosophy and realization the utopia is not possible through violence. So the nations and peoples who philosophically contemplate always disagree with the policy based on the prepotency and their political ideals were the basis for criticizing the current policies and paved the way for the opposition to the force and domination policy. Iran's ancient civilization along with the philosophical contemplation composed of political philosophy was the foundation of criticizing the politics in the form of ideal kingship and Persian utopia and continued through the end of the Sassanid dynasty and gradually tended to weakness and decline by dominating Iranian element and gradually lost its ideological and philosophical component so that it turned to justifying the policy based on prepotency and hegemony in middle era.

1. Introduction

Generally, philosophy is a rational reasoning untied to religious law. In the other word, when human wants to discuss on the issue like the universe, policies or etc. and just use his own wisdom to proceed the discussion, he really enters into philosophy field. So philosophers want to discover world structure and order or reach the truth via rational contemplation the universe and creatures' order of seniority. Political philosophy is part of philosophy namely the philosopher`s view is influenced by his philosophical perspective. "Farabi's discussion starts with statements on creatures' order of seniority. Accordingly creation system begins with the most perfect order and subsequently and successively the creature will be achieved that is a little imperfect… ", So according to Farabi, the Polis has a kind of order consist to the universe order. The proportion of the first president to Polis is as same as the first cause to the universe (Copleston, Frederick (1999). Human individuals are in the hierarchy of abilities and talents. This is consistent with the order of creation. "Strauss' knows the political philosophy as a part of philosophy as well. In his points of view, philosophy as a searching for wisdom is also searching to gain universal gnosis i.e. the whole gnosis, so "philosophy is an effort to substitute the gnosis to whole for supposition to whole", in Strauss opinion, philosophers knows 'whole' as all things and query to know all things is meant querying to gnosis the divine, the universe and human beings but also to know the nature of anything, natures are overall as a whole. In general, the philosopher aims to search the truth. Political

philosophy is a branch of philosophy that seeks to gain knowledge on politics nature. Political philosophy honestly tries to know both nature of politics and good and correct political order. In general, the philosopher aims to search the truth. Political philosophy is a branch of philosophy that seeks to gain knowledge on politics nature. Political philosophy honestly tries to know both nature of politics and good and correct political order. Bakalis, Nikolaos (2005) pointing out that the Greek thinkers including Homer (Greek poet) faced with the problem of understanding the nature of existence or being issues, refers to some opinions and writes: "On Heraclitus, we have spoken about the possibility that there may be a relationship between his idea about the existence and his political intentions. On Plato, we can ignore the hesitation and undoubtedly say that his political philosophy is clearly a consequence of his philosophical views. So that Plato's political philosophy cannot be got truly without understanding the exemplary ideas". "Plato's views about the city or Polis would not be possible without its philosophical foundation. Because as we know, Plato founded his political philosophy based on his philosophy so, Plato`s political philosophy cannot be understood except by considering the logic of his philosophy ". Therefore, since the political philosophers are influenced by their own philosophical attitude and have special criterion for anything, so they are not justifier for the current status that is why someone know political philosophy as a subject seeks some ideal community. Deliberating the best form of government is considered as an inseparable part of political philosophy." For example,

the meaning and concept of justice in old political philosophy considers the "regulatory that exists in total creation system, and so if the equinox in creation system was percept t by the head of the Polis and imitated in the Polis, it can be said that justice has been met." This is why political philosophers deny the relationship between prepotency in Polis and political community and they cannot be a justifier for current status. The main reason for opposing to philosophy by some Sharia Book writers in the Islamic era relates to this factor. So we can say the reasons and evidence indicates that the Iranians along with other civilized nations like Greeks had the power of philosophical deliberation and thinking and therefore had participated in the Old World culture and civilization.

1.1. Ontological perspectives in ancient Persia thought:

In Aristotelian cosmology of God is described as unmoved impellent of the universe. Cassirer, quoting Aristotle, writes: "God is the ultimate source of movement and he does not move. At first he transfer His own impellent force to the things around him, i.e. to the highest celestial spheres, the force comes down from there and passing through the ranks of the world arrive to our world namely sphere of moon or world under the moon, but at this stage we do not percept that perfection, The higher world, the globe of celestial bodies is made of a indestructible and incorruptible material that is fifth essence or ether and their movements is also eternal (Popkin, R.H. (1999). In our world, everything is exposed to generation and corruption and all the small gestures will lead to tranquility. There is a significant difference between above and beneath world; they are neither made of a same material nor imitate the same movement rules." Thus, on Aristotle, there is a hierarchical order in the universe. This principle is also true in social and political structure of the world. Therefore, there is a natural order (regulation) in political world according to Aristotle and any groups or classes are in their own places and why no one has the right to disturb the natural order. This thinking means to justify class system and each person was settled in his own class and performs the tasks for which he is created. Iranians ontological attitudes are very closely similar to the hierarchical order (class system), which was explained by Aristotle.

"Iranian Aryans' intellectual basis is universe and its time and space circle that is ordered. This order was called "Asha or Arta". Asha or Arta is like the air spreads all over and encompasses all things and aspects of life, whether individual, group, world and all whole universe and life is meant, formed, performed and proceeded in its context, or in other words, According to Iranian and Indian Aryans, Asha and Arta (there is not an exact equivalent in today terminology) were a system or ritual that means that joins all realm of existence world together and rules over all minor and major affairs as well general universal order in great cosmos and in small human world (that is a scene of large cosmos), natural systems, social systems, moral systems and the religious rituals system are all considered as its epiphany in different worlds(Kahn, Charles H. (1979) . On Iranians terminology, truth is justice rather than fine speech as well it is harmonizing with the moral and social system so oppression and lies can disturb and break the rules". In Kenawt`s point of view, the contrast between truth and lie consist three concepts of metaphysics, ethnic and politics: truth in its metaphysical concept is synonym to divine world or system and equivalent to Arta in ancient Persian or Asha in Avestan language, it is a measurement for every truth or rectitude in the world. In political sense, the contrast between truth and lies is as same the conflict between the legitimate king`s advocators and supporters of rebellious and refractory sultan, so Kenavet points that "anyone who tries to overthrown or disobey the sovereign whose parentage (genealogical) letter was confirmed and a religious ceremony was held for him, he will disturb the discipline of divine world and corrupt the Arte and rectitude on which the divine discipline was based. Such a person is pro-lies and evil power slave". We can conclude from this natural order that" in such order, all thing knows his own task and everybody or everything has their own dignity, that is why it is completely different to its new concept of equality and parity." Ruling the thinking of regular and uniform sacred world, in where everyone and everything has a dignity that have been agreed by anyone, creates the belief that violating this framework will have been followed by huge punishment. King is not exceptional from the norm. He also believes obligation to comply with the framework. Hereby, an inner feeling forces the king to determine a limitation for himself.

2.1. The concept of justice in ancient Persia

The concept of Justice in ancient Persia was very close to the concept that ancient Greek people conceive it; Kernford, in Religion to Philosophy, knows Arta or Asha as an excellent regulated life and considered justice as a condition to achieve it (Boyce, Mary (1975). Because "creating and achieving to justice is considered as world's ultimate goal, he also believes that there is a close synonymy between the concepts of Arta and Díkē in Greece." Aristotle defines justice in equality and believed that justice means maintain the existing inequalities in nature. Iranians know the justice meaning as the same and justice in that thought sphere is putting everything in their own place and everyone being engaged to their own work. It is natural that such a conception of justice is influenced

by a philosophical view to the universe and being hierarchy (Schlerath, Bernfried (1987). While the tribes and nations that lack the philosophical view perceive justice differently. Mavardy - Shriah book writer- in Ahkam-Alsultanieh, when speaks about justice , it completely differs to its concept in political philosophy, he writes in this case: "Justice is valid in all occupations and includes a person will be good word, trustee, not operating unlawful action, far from sin, and hypocrisy, equally reliable in consent and anger...". It can be seen, Mavardy viewed justice as other aspect of an official`s truth and honesty and not comparable to justice fact itself in Plato`s point of view and social order or guilds` proportion and classification to each other in Persian Utopia. Of course such a theory of justice, at least in the Sunni Sharia books could not be formulated because their analysis is based on Sharia rules and their implementation therefore the noumenal justice cannot be discussed in detail, that is why the French translator of Ahkam-al sultaniha, use the word of «honorabilite» instead of «Justice» as an equivalent for the fairness.

3.1. King and monarchy in Iranian Thought

Iranians who viewed the existence and being world philosophically, consequently had a political philosophy, it was natural that they focus on the king and monarchy as the highest political entity so according to Persian Utopia ideas, the ideal king is the king selected by Divine and the holder of divine kingship splendor. Iranians viewed king as a God or universal system and so this perception can be considered as philosophical attitude per se. So, in the case, " Shah in ancient Eastern man`s view was a mundane representation of exalted God or he was the God responsible for human social issues or was the God per se like Egypt Pharaohs(Gnoli, Gerardo (1987). On the other hand, Kennedy Eddie knew the unit shah in the earth as a reflection of believing a unitary God in heaven, "if everyone, except the one who was selected by God, enthroned , He would committed a great offense and he would be punished to death penalty, thereby, in fact king was the vice-regent of Ormuzd. Shah was the Ormuzd deputy in earth, but it was not the reason for his dictatorship but for that some task should be designed for him so that ignoring them would lose their divine legitimacy. So in the thought of ideal king, king is sharia owner or in the other word, he is the Sharia exactly or even he is God's representative in the earth. Thus there is a close relationship between the Zoroastrian religion and social system. But the relation is formed in the manner that Shah should imitate the religious rules and commands, the point that Eddie referred to. So, shah should not follow everyone, but everyone should be governed by him and his wills should be complying with reason and wisdom that just can be found in the Zoroastrian religion. Although it

may appear that ignoring everyone`s wills is the main feature totalitarian and authoritarian systems that were in ancient Persia, but we should remember the important point, in the Old World in contrast to the modern world, human wills was not recognized and generally people followed the rules that their origin were determined externally(Gershevitch, Ilya (1964). In the only Old World democracy government located in Athens also the features can be seen, because the Greeks did not recognize human will originality. Shah in Aryan points of view was completely separated from a dictatorship because a dictator make the law consistent with his own will and his will is not bounded to any principal and frameworks, while in Eddie`s note, the king is an executor of God's law without playing any role in its creation. In Persian Utopia and ideals kingship, shah must have a divine splendor otherwise he will not be merit to be king in Iran. Since in Sassanid period literature, if it is referred to splendor, there will be a relationship between the sun, fire, or lighting. Some historians, knows the divine splendor as justifier for despotism and tyranny in Iranian political system, because the king attribute himself to the paranormal in order not to be responsible in front of people and therefore it leads to a kind of tyranny and despotism which not related to the political philosophy of ancient Persia. So in contrast to this view, other groups believe that the divine splendor is not the reason for shah dictatorship, but also bounded him into a legal and ethical framework, so that ignoring it will demolish his divine and in turn public legitimacy. Therefore, ancient Iranian viewed shah philosophically and wisely, since they believed a series of principles and criteria which are appealed to criticize the king. Thus, the Persian utopia and ideal kingship was never a justifier for current status and policy based on sovereignty and hegemony.

4.1. The ideal kingship Persian utopia thought and its effects

Persian utopia ideal kingship thought had politically important consequences. One of them was preparing the way for criticizing current situation and prevents justifying the prepotency based policy. Another impact was paving the way for forming the most important political entity in ancient Persia namely the royal structure. One of the most important distinctions between authoritarian systems and non-authoritarian regimes lies in institutionalization of non-authoritarian system because rule and regulation cannot be the white line between these two systems. Suddenly, we may face with inflation of rules in authoritarian system, but there may be an entity to enforce these laws so they are easily violated. This is an institution that makes the political system continued, sustained and non-personalized and creates the groundwork for the continuation of political systems. Valued look of

ancient Iran community to shah creates some norms and standards from these values and on their context king`s duties were determined, these elements collectively constituted the royal entity. For the reason, some authors remembered them as short time communities because there are neither valued system nor norms and roles based on these values. We face to dynasties in Iran ancient political system that each of them had continued so many centuries meanwhile each dynasty follows other ones from so many aspects.

5.1. Refusing the attitudes of advocates of authoritarian in Iranian monarchy

Analyzing ancient Iran is not consistent with democratic system standards so that Iran was neither a city-state nor a country but it was administered as an empire. Considering the facilities, naturally establishing democracy as same as Athena was not possible. But the society was administered based on public expedient that is the main criterion for democratic systems. But gradually monarchy were weakened in ancient Iran, especially by coming the kings who were inclined to totalitarianism intemperately that its peak was seen during the fourth Hormuz, the son of Anushirvan: "He, under the pretext of protecting the poor community and low class of society, attacked the aristocracy and elites and command to kill them". This manner of governing was not related to ideal kingship situation in Iranian people minds and gradually these kinds of behavior contrasting to Persian Utopia thought value disgrace the royal position so that some ones from out of royal family claimed kingship on Iran. Events happened at the end of the Sassanian kings and continual changing the kings indicated the weakening of the royal authority which two reasons of Muslim Arab and Central Asian Turks invasion to Iran's Persian accelerate the monarchy weakening process in Iran, because Iranian households did not recognize the religious legitimacy of the caliphate system. Their rules were based on rationalism thought and wisely interpretation of the faith.

"By domination of the Turks, first the Ghaznavid and then Seljuk, unprecedented struggles were begun with rationality aspects Persian empire and unity or coordination had been emerged actually and theoretically between Turks kingship and legitimacy system based on apparent sharia." A brief look to part of the structure and culture of Iran namely Iranian philosophical thought that has been manifest in utopian thought and kingship ideas indicates the civilization degeneration; the degeneration was intensified by arrival of the wilderness tribes from outside of Iranian civilization who were recognized as Iranian. Although the Persians were dominated in the invasion, but in each attack they lose great part of their civilization superiority (Sciolino, Elaine. (2000).

6.1. King thought in medieval period

From third to eighth centuries that is interpreted as the medieval period, Muslim`s political thought about the monarchy tended to the side that no sign of ideal kingship thought cannot be seen at all. Of course, it should be noted that political thought is a reflection of social transformation, although the thought influenced the social and political structure. The cause of ideal King tends to monarchy based on the prepotency are numerous which the most important of them relates to weakening and eventually eliminate the powerful aristocracy class from the structure of Iranian society, the class that maintains the unstable balance between the sovereign and other classes and social forces, but with the lack of this class, society lost his balance and therefore the two restriction of wastage and extreme had been considered by political thinkers. Anarchy, dictatorship or prepotency in political system, there was not a third option for them for that; they inevitably had to prefer the oppressive Sultan to and political chaos and irregularity. In this case, "It seems that the Islamic kingdom has three basic characteristics that make up its pillars and distinguish it from other systems of power, especially the ideal kingship in Old Iranian thought. Firstly, Islamic royalty is based on force and dominance, Secondly is religious helper and sharia shelter, thirdly it is largely based on the fatalistic thought". It was important that the Firhi writes about Ibn-Jamaeh`s thoughts," Ibn-Jama`eh word consist of important points of the transformation of political power in the middle period. Islamic thought by falling into a dual puzzle of solution to exit of this deadlock was inevitable to accept Sultan's predominant presence". The political thought based on political sovereignty and prepotency of political sovereignty had been continued till Constitutional Revolution in Iran, during the revolution, Iranian paid attention to ideal system of Persian utopia.

So the most important political thought after Islam was policy-book writing which continued in various forms till the preliminaries of constitutionalist movement was prepared. But the policy book writing was distinguished from the political thought of Persian utopia pointed that: "political thought of Persian utopia, despite the its continuation, was fundamentally distinct from the principal of ideal kingship aspect while the policy book writers formulated a theory by changing the foundation of this concept, that is called " the theory of really existing monarchy."

Table1: Comparison of ideal thought in ancient and medieval period

Comparison of ideal thought in ancient and medieval period	ancient Persia	Medieval period
	1 - The basic element of political thought is Persian utopia ideal kingship thought	1 - The basic element of thought in medieval period was the real existing monarchy
	2 - the Iranians have a philosophical look at the world's existence, and consequently had some kind of political philosophy	2 - The idea of an ideal kingship had been disappeared as a result of weakening and eventually eliminating the strong aristocracy class from the society structure, as a class that maintain the unstable balance between the rulers and other classes and social forces
	3 - The king and the royal entity were the highest ones	3 – Preferring the Sultan to the political chaos and disorder
	4 - Iranian look to king were same as their attitude toward the God and the Universal system.	4 - The royalty bas based on force and dominance
	5 – Persian Utopia thought and Ideal kingship in Iran did not explained the situation and the policy and prepotency based policy	5 – It was based on fatalistic ideas 6 - In the middle time, it was religious helper and sharia shelter

2. Discussions

Ancient Persian civilization had political philosophy along with philosophical deliberation that were continued in the form of Persian utopia ideal kingship thought and the basis for current policies till Sassanid era and gradually tended to degeneration and weakness by dominance of Iranian component and lost its ideological and philosophical elements so that in the middle period turned into a justifier for the policy based on prepotency and hegemony. Since at the time, among three flows of political thought in the Islamic era namely political philosophy, political book writing and sharia book writing, political book writing became a dominant tendency, and this means the end of political philosophy that prepare the way for criticizing the existing political systems. Therefore, in the absence of political philosophy, justifying the status quo and the policy was based on the prepotency that are called as theory of really existing monarchy that indicates the declining the political thought in one hand and strengthening the politics based on the prepotency on the other hand**4.**

12/2/2012

Corresponding Author:
Zia Khazaei
Department of Political Science, Zahedan branch,
Islamic Azad University, Zahedan, Iran.

References

1. Bakalis, Nikolaos (2005). *Handbook of Greek Philosophy: From Thales to the Stoics: Analysis and Fragments*. Trafford Publishing. pp. 26–45 under Heraclitus. ISBN 1-4120-4843-5.
2. Boyce, Mary (1975), *A History of Zoroastrianism, Vol. I*, Leiden/Köln: Brill.
3. Copleston, Frederick (1999). *A history of philosophy*. Continuum International Publishing Group. pp. 310–312.
4. Gershevitch, Ilya (1964), "Zoroaster's Own Contribution", *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* **23** (1): 12–38.
5. Gnoli, Gerardo (1987), "Ašavan", *Encyclopaedia Iranica*, **2**, New York: Routledge & Kegan Paul: 705-706.
6. Kahn, Charles H. (1979). *The art and thought of Heraclitus : an edition of the fragments with translation and commentary*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
7. Schlerath, Bernfried (1987), "Aša: Avestan Aša", *Encyclopaedia Iranica*, **2**, New York: Routledge & Kegan Paul: 694-696.