CZU 340.1
DOI https://doi.org/10.52388/2345-1971.2022.e2.01

THE CIVILIZATION CRITERION IN THE TYPOLOGY OF LEGAL SYSTEMS

Ion POSTU
PhD in Law, Associate Professor, International Free University of Moldova,
Chisinau, Republic of Moldova
e-mail: *ion.postu@yahoo.com*
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5993-8250

Veronica RUSNAC
PhD student, International Free University of Moldova,
Chisinau, Republic of Moldova
e-mail: *ion.postu@yahoo.com*
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1004-8628

This article is dedicated to the study of the civilizational approach in the typology of contemporary legal systems, according to which there are many civilizations that develop according to their own legalities, and the originality of each family of national legal systems is largely determined by the particularities of the way the law is formed. The article deals with the approach of the most prominent representative of the civilization current – the French doctrinaire Rene David, who proposed the typology of national systems according to their belonging to a pool of legal civilization, as well as the classification of the Arminjon-Nolde-Wolff scholars, who based the taxonomy on a combination of legal history, sources of law, technique, terms, concepts and culture.

Keywords: *civilization, typology, typology of law, legal systems, legal classification.*

CRITERIUL CIVILIZAȚIONAL ÎN TIPOLOGIA SISTEMELOR JURIDICE

Prezentul articol este dedicat studiului abordării civilizaționale în tipologia sistemelor juridice contemporane, conform căreia există multe civilizații care se dezvoltă după propriile legități, iar originalitatea fiecărei familii de sisteme juridice naționale este determinată în mare măsură de particularitățile modului de formare a dreptului. În articol este tratată abordarea celui mai de vază reprezentant al curentului civilizațional – doctrinarul francez Rene David, care a propus tipologizarea sistemelor naționale în funcție de apartenența acestora la un bazin de civilizație juridică, precum și clasificarea savanților Arminjon-Nolde-Wolff, care și-au bazat taxonomia pe o combinație de istorie juridică, izvoare ale dreptului, tehnică, termeni, concepte și cultură.

Cuvinte-cheie: *civilizație, tipologie, tipologia dreptului, sisteme juridice, clasificare juridică.*

CRITÈRE CIVILISATIONNEL DANS LA TYPOLOGIE DES SYSTÈMES JURIDIQU*ES*

Cet article est consacré à l’étude de l’approche civilisationnelle dans la typologie des systèmes juridiques contemporains, selon laquelle de nombreuses civilisations se développent selon leurs propres légalités, et l’originalité de chaque famille de systèmes juridiques nationaux est largement déterminée par les particularités de la manière dont le droit est formé. L’article traite de l’approche du représentant le plus éminent du courant civilisationnel-le doctrinaire français René David, qui a proposé la typologisation des systèmes nationaux en fonction de leur appartenance à un bassin de civilisation juridique, ainsi que la classification des érudits d’Arminjon-Nolde-Wolff, qui ont basé leur taxonomie sur une combinaison d’histoire juridique, de sources de droit, de technique, de termes, de concepts et de culture.

Mots-clés: *civilisation, typologie, typologie du droit, systèmes juridiques, classification juridique.*

ЦИВИЛИЗАЦИОННЫЙ КРИТЕРИЙ В ТИПОЛОГИИ ПРАВОВЫХ СИСТЕМ

Настоящая статья посвящена исследованию цивилизационного подхода в типологии современных правовых систем, согласно которому существует множество цивилизаций, развивающихся по своим закономерностям, а своеобразие каждой семьи национальных правовых систем во многом определяет особенности формирования права. В статье рассматривается подход видного представителя цивилизационного течения — французского доктринера Рене Давида, который предложил типологию национальных систем по принадлежности к пулу правовой цивилизации, а также классификацию Арминджона-Нольде-Вольфа ученые, которые основывали таксономию на сочетании истории права, источников права, техники, терминов, концепций и культуры.

Ключевые слова: *цивилизация, типология, типология права, правовые системы, правовая классификация.*

Introduction

In modern conditions, the issue of typology and modern legal coats of arms is of particular importance. The need and importance of classification is caused by the following. First, in the 20th century the number of national legal systems almost tripled; with the destruction of the colonial system, the legal systems of the liberated countries appeared and are developing; and with the destruction of the socialist political system, new legal systems appear on the legal map of the world.

In the history of human civilization, there are more than 40 thousand varieties of legal systems, of which 4 thousand are modern [18, p. 47]. Many of these systems show similar features, usually due to social similarities or similar historical conditions of development, or similar religions, or other characteristics. The classification of legal systems suggests, first of all, a comparison, inviting the search for similarities and differences between legal systems.

Today there are around 200 state formations, which, in addition to the political, cultural or economic specifics, also present distinctions from the point of view of legal regulations, so it is opportune to methodologically substantiate and analyze the possibilities of the typology in relation to the national legal systems, which would allow the highlighting of similar systems and the construction of a realistic taxonomy.

Research methods used. In order to achieve the stated goal, a series of methods were applied in the present scientific approach, among which: the systemic, comparative, logical method.

Basic research content

In the typology of law, there is a distinct - civilizational approach, which is based not on form, but on content, i.e. unique characteristics, value orientations of society. This approach takes into account not so much the specifics of relationships, but spiritual and cultural factors, forms of consciousness, including religion, worldview, customs and traditions, historical development and territorial location. Together, these factors determine the ways of being of a certain human community, forming a special, original socio-cultural system - *civilization* [22, p. 26].

The concept of "civilization" expresses the general socio-cultural differences between historically emerged societies, the interaction of which forms the content of the historical development of human civilization. It is used as a characterization of the level and characteristics of the cultural and historical development of a certain region of the world or a super-ethnic group. According to its genesis and internal organization, civilization is a collective and polysemantic phenomenon. It is formed as a result of the combination of various qualitatively heterogeneous factors into a certain whole, such as the economic

mode of production and the system of socio-political relations, the ethnic and national composition of society, cultural, historical and moral originality, spiritual values and religious beliefs, the nature and degree of development of techniques and technologies, the level reached by a person's needs, abilities, knowledge and skills, the characteristics of the natural environment, climatic conditions, geographical and demographic factors, etc. [13, p. 133].

At the origins of the doctrine of civilizations were the German idealist philosopher and culturologist Oswald Spengler, who developed the doctrine of culture as a set of closed organisms of certain regions, expressing the collective "soul" of people and passing through a certain life cycle, and also another German philosopher Karl Jaspers, who developed the civilization scheme, and the English philosopher and historian Arnold Joseph Toynbee, who proposed the theory of the cycle of successive local civilizations, each of which goes through similar stages of emergence, growth, decay and degradation [19, p. 67].

Arnold Toynbee defines civilization as "the smallest block of historical material to which one turns when attempting to study the history of one's own country". Giving priority to the cultural principle in the typology of civilizations, Toynbee believes that there are currently five main civilizations - Western, Christian, Islamic, Hindu and Far Eastern - and considers them all equivalent in their values [14, p. 7].

The civilizational theory makes it possible to isolate the uniqueness of a certain society, thanks to the consolidation in it of an equally safe culture, since civilizations are certain types of human communities, and each of them is a culture that has reached the limits of self-identification. Civilization is directly defined as a relatively closed state of society, characterized by the community of both cultural and economic, geographical, religious, psychological and other factors [19, p. 68].

Civilization is primarily a sphere of spiritual construction, and territory is practically one of the prerequisites for such construction. Therefore, the territorial determination of civilization is revealed primarily in relation to the borders between the actual civilizational formations [15, p. 95].

Civilizations can be classified by combining them into appropriate units - types of development. As criteria for the classification of civilizations, the following can be highlighted: the community and interdependence of economic destiny and historical and political development, the intertwining of cultures, the existence of a sphere of common interests and common tasks from the point of view of development perspectives [21, p. 54].

The differences between civilizations are the result of choosing different paths of historical development.

In legal science, legal systems are usually typified according to socio-economic or spiritual and technical-legal factors. In the first case, the classification of law is based on the theory of historical materialism, according to which slave, feudal, bourgeois and socialist types are distinguished. Namely, the base (the type of production relations) is the decisive factor in social development, which also determines the corresponding type of superstructural elements: the state and law. But this classification has practically lost its relevance because it did not adequately take into account the dominant historical, cultural, national and special juridical character of law. Therefore, it was replaced by the so-called civilizational approach, which takes into account specific geographical, national-historical, religious, special legal and other characteristics. Based on technical, legal and spiritual factors, legal families are usually distinguished: Romano-Germanic, Anglo-

Saxon and religious, as well as the family of traditional law [18, p. 47].

In historical sciences, the so-called civilizational approach is very popular, which can be effectively used in the classification of legal systems. According to the civilizational approach, there are many civilizations in the world that develop according to their own laws. According to this approach, the history of mankind is the history of the development of civilizations [20, p. 140].

The task of the typology of legal systems operating in parallel in a certain historical period is solved by the historical-cultural (or civilizational) approach.

The inter-civilizational comparative analysis of law starts from the fact that any civilization is characterized to some extent by continuity in law, the inheritance of what has historically developed within it (the diachronic plan), as well as the exchange of values, the borrowing of the best legal achievements, ideas, institutions and norms of other civilizations and cultures (the synchronous plan) [23, p. 16].

The civilizational approach makes it possible to present and compare the diversity of state legal systems on multifactorial criteria. Of course, this classification cannot be recognized as universal or unique, it is rather subjective. His critics rightly draw attention to this, emphasizing, in particular, the insufficient development of the typology itself, the existence of various grounds for distinguishing both civilizations and types of states and their legal systems. But other attempts to present certain typologies as universal are not so complete, since the factors, principles, indicators or parameters invented by researchers are also conditional and cannot be recognized as satisfying all and sundry, or admitted as a classification generally accepted [19, p. 69].

The criterion of the right belonging to a pool of legal civilization led the specialists in comparative law to recognize the existence of some families of law, which are differentiated by legal language, legal concepts, legal institutions and philosophical peculiarities; thus, René David considers the following families of law (which also represent the great systems of contemporary law): Romano-Germanic, Anglo-Saxon, socialist law, Muslim law, Hindu, Chinese, Japanese (of the Far East) and the law of Black Africa and Madagascar [9, p. 54].

According to the civilizational approach, the originality of each family of national legal systems is largely determined by the particularities of the way law is formed: in the Romano-Germanic family, by the dominant position of the law itself; in the common law family – legal (judicial) practice; in the religious-philosophical family – by legal ideology, in the family of socialist law – by legal norms inspired by legal ideology [13, p. 134].

Emphasizing the socio-cultural, spiritual and moral differences between civilizations of various types, the civilizational approach somewhat exaggerates the uniqueness and originality of civilizations of various types. Civilization as a community that has reached the limits of socio-cultural self-identification turns out to be closed in on itself, and humanity separates into autonomous, opposing communities. Thus, a conflicting perspective is established for the understanding of civilizational phenomena [13, p. 134].

The author L. P. Rasskazov believes that, from the point of view of the civilizational approach, all states can be conditionally divided into two types: Eastern and Western, each of which has its own characteristics. In turn, each of these types has its own legal families. The defining basis for the classification of legal systems is the normative element of the system, which includes law, legal principles, sources of law, system of law, system of legislation and legal technique. However, we emphasize that this criterion can be applied within the

same type of civilizations. According to this criterion, Western-type countries can be divided into two large families: Romano-Germanic and Anglo-Saxon [20, p. 143-144].

If law is seen as a facet of a certain type of civilization, as a condition for a certain form of social organization based on a certain conception of justice, then the phrase “Western law” expresses the fundamental unity that exists between civil law and legal systems common. The jurist who emphasizes the legal concepts and techniques of interpretation and application of legal rules perceives only the differences between civil law and common law systems. On the other hand, the observer who sees law from the perspective of a political scientist, philosopher, or cultural historian will discern the connecting links between these systems: both civil law and common law systems are underpinned by individualism , rationalism and the liberal conception of social order; in both systems the ideal is a society governed by the “rule of law”; finally, both systems place primary importance on the autonomy of law, that is, understanding law as relatively distinct from morality, politics, and religion. These characteristics are so familiar that it is tempting to see them as universal. This is not true, however. If such ideas become universal, it is only because of the pervasive influence of Western values and concepts throughout the world. In turn, the Western legal tradition has been affected, to a certain extent, by the values of other legal orders [5, p. 154].

Unlike Western culture and its inherent legal systems, in those types of culture where religion, traditions, customs have priority, in particular, this refers to the so-called Eastern type states, law is not a determining social regulator . For example, one of the main postulates of Western ideas about the democratic structure of society, which proclaims the priority of individual human rights, is not shared by many Asian states [16, p. 400].

Today, we believe that the civilizational criterion can be used to classify contemporary legal systems as follows:

- Eastern (China, India, Inc Empire, etc.);
- Western, or progressive (primarily, European states).

We can observe the common features inherent in the Western way of forming states, i.e. the features of Western (European) civilization:

- availability of private property, market relations;
- the pronounced class structure of society;
- the presence of democratic principles [21, p. 55].

M. N. Marcenko drew attention to a disadvantage of the civilizational approach, stating that “the ambiguity of the term (and concept) “civilization”, its internal inconsistency and diversity, together with the amorphousness of its content and uncertainty, make it very problematic at the current level of research to use it as criterion for the typology of states and legal systems” [17, p. 184].

In this regard, however, M. A. Supataev mentions that upon initial knowledge of the civilizational approach, jurists usually have a common and hard-to-overcome suspicion that this approach is vague due to the presence of dozens of definitions of civilization, from which one can choose [24, p. 101]. Without going into a detailed discussion of this issue, we note that in science, as some researchers reasonably point out, there are not so many definitions and basic understandings of civilization that are subject to revision and heuristic typology.

We cannot agree either with the argument that the civilizational approach cannot be used for any historical typology (of the state and law), because, on the contrary, it minimizes the importance of a highly developed (European) civilization, since it starts from the multivariate process of historical development and denies that thus, the principle of freedom as a principle

of historically developed civilizations [24, p. 113]. But the ideas of freedom and justice are present in all cultures and civilizations, where one can find an unlimited variety of ideas about them.

The formal criteria for classifying the legal systems of different states are based on the unity of the sources of law, presentation techniques, systematization of legal norms and legal terminology.

Substantial criteria for the classification of legal systems can be expressed in the fundamental ideas, principles, moral and spiritual values of the society. These can be ideas of freedom, formal equality, religious, socialist principles, etc. [22, p. 27].

The most prominent representative of the civilization current is the French doctrinaire Rene David, who proposed the typology of national systems according to their belonging to a ***pool of legal civilization***.

Rene David believes that legal orders can be reduced to a few *fundamental types* , like religions. He uses two criteria in his analysis, to ascertain typological affinity or incompatibility: the *ideological point of view and the technical* point of view [9, p. 49].

The division into "great systems of law" or legal families proposed by him underwent changes during the editions of his work.

Initially, economic, political, philosophical and religious similarities were seen as the main criteria. This led to a major distinction between Western and Soviet law, supplemented by chapters on Islamic, Hindu and Chinese legal systems. More recent editions place more emphasis on legal technique. This is not meant to refer to specific legal rules, but to the "constant and more fundamental elements" that can determine whether "someone educated in the study and practice of one law will then be able, without much difficulty, to deal with another" . As a result, the distinction between Romano-Germanic civil law and English common law became more prominent, with later chapters on socialist law and other legal systems. After the fall of communism, a new edition of David's book replaced socialist law with Russian law [8, p. 90].

In writing this book, the author set himself a very simple objective: to provide a guide to a first examination of the many laws existing in the contemporary world for those who wish to be initiated into a foreign law [10, p. 18]. David is aware of the complexity of this objective and to make it manageable, he focuses only on the general characteristics of legal systems.

In his opinion, "the grouping of laws into families, thus establishing a limited number of types, simplifies the presentation and facilitates the understanding of the contemporary laws of the world" [1, p. 20], all the contemporary legal systems of the world possess similar features and, based on them , legal systems can be easily divided into a small number of legal families or " *grands systèmes"*.

Rene David stated that in law, as in other sciences, one can detect the existence of a limited number of types or categories within which the diversity of law can be organized. Just as the theologian or the political scientist recognizes types of religions or governmental regimes, so the comparatist can classify laws by reducing them to a limited number of families [ibid, p. 8].

In the same year that Rene David's first volume appeared, a trio of Egyptian, Russian, and German scholars – ***Pierre Arminjon, Boris Nolde***, and ***Martin Wolff*****,** respectively – joined to publish a competing treatise on comparative law. Their treatise appreciated the formulation of taxonomies of legal families to an even greater extent than David himself [6, p. 1054].

They divided the world map explicitly into "parent tree systems" and "derivative systems", which together constituted seven different legal families: (i) French, (ii) German, (iii) Scandinavian, (iv) English, (v) Russian, (vi) Islamic and (vii) Hindu.

Arminjon-Nolde-Wolff based their taxonomy on a combination of legal history, sources of law, technique, terms, concepts and culture, focusing on private law subjects [8, p. 90], thus making the transition from the extrinsic approach to classification criteria (race, geography) to an approximately substantial one, based on elements intrinsic to legal systems [2, p. 77].

The basis of the distinction of family groups was not ideological, but represented an approach based on genealogy and history. Models were distinguished both for metropolitan states and for dominions (colonies), which necessarily adopted certain foundations of the legal family for their legislation. Consequently, the structure of the metropolitan legal family is adopted not only by the countries under the government, but also by the neighboring countries, which largely depend on the metropolises [11, p. 6].

A variety of the civilizational approach was also represented by the socialist legal system.

As we have seen, the approaches of researchers, until 1990 (and in some cases, even until recently), distinguish a separate category of socialist law, to which the Russian Federation and some of the neighboring countries are undoubtedly attributed.

In Soviet doctrine, for many years, priority was given to the so-called intra-typical classification, reflected in the division of legal systems into socialist, bourgeois and “fluctuating” between two antipodal types of law. This classification could only answer the question about the will of which social group the law could reflect, but did not explain why, for example, within the bourgeois type it is possible to have common and continental legal systems, which determines the differences between northern law - American and South American, between German and Roman law, between Indian and Japanese law [19, p. 63].

In the days of the Soviet Union, this could be justified by the impact of the political system on the law. It is not entirely clear what the basis for this type of right might be today. Most frequently, reference is made to the socialist heritage of these countries, with a vision of a “socialist legal tradition without socialism”.

Thus, V. Cirkin refers to a virtual “post-socialist” law, stating that a special position is occupied by “the legal family of the post-socialist states, in which the new is intertwined with the remains of the old (organization of the economy, regulation of power, the role public associations, etc.)” [25, p. 834].

There are also authors who believe that at present all the objective premises have been created to justify the appearance on the legal map of the world of a new phenomenal formation – the Eurasian legal family., stating that the socio-political movement, called “Eurasianism”, appeared at the beginning last century, and in modern legal doctrine, the concept of Eurasianism revived and gained popularity. The creation of the Eurasian Economic Union (EEU) served as a new strong impetus for the development of the Eurasian legal system The EEU Treaty, signed on May 29, 2014 [26, p. 223].

Mathias Siems believes that since the use of law as an instrument of economic and social policy is the typical feature of socialist law, it can exist in any political system. One can also point to the continuity of legal institutions and traditions after the fall of communism, for example in the judiciary and in legal education, with a preference for a “mechanical” and “hyperpositive” application of the law. Others point out that it is not only the socialist heritage that may be relevant: for example, it may be typical of a Slavic legal culture that there is a continuing influence of custom. Considering the difficult period of transition, another common point may be a “deep institutional skepticism” but also “high expectations regarding social justice” [8, p. 93].

We must say that before the dissolution of the USSR, some Western scholars considered [7, p. 808] that socialist law contains features that distinguish it from the legal systems of other countries in the civil law family, but these points of difference did not remove socialist law from the tradition civil law, but it continues to use civil law rules, methods, institutions and procedures.

Socialist law contains features that distinguish it from the legal systems of other states in the civil law family. But those points of difference did not remove socialist law from the civil law tradition. To draw this conclusion is to overlook the historical connection of socialist law with civil law and the continuing relevance in socialist law of civil law rules, methods, institutions and procedures.

We agree with the opinion of Prof. Ioan Vida, who considers that "Soviet law" no longer constitutes a legal system incorporated in universal law, its disappearance is marked by the disappearance of the Soviet Union, its place being taken by a traditional Russian law, of European inspiration [12, p. 192].

The collapse of the socialist legal system represents, in Jaakko Husa's opinion, "one of the most obvious examples of the relativistic feature of classifications" [3, p. 15] of contemporary legal systems, but, unfortunately, even the collapse of socialist law does not seem to been sufficient to really cause a change in the criteria and methods of classification applied in previous decades.

The historical reasoning of classification by "real types" does not mean that legal typologies are permanent. It is clear that "legal systems never *are* , they always *become* " [4, p. 14] or, as Jaakko Husa also expresses, "another obvious problem was the *static nature* of classifications" [3, p. 17] .

Conclusions

We can conclude that after the Second World War, with the decolonization process, the emergence of new states with distinct jurisdictions, a new legal typology trend is developing, with renowned exponents such as Rene David or Zweigert-Kötz.

We believe that socialist law can easily be already considered a historical type of law and researched from a theoretical-didactic perspective, with exclusively scientific implications, without any practical applicability at the contemporary stage. From our point of view, the states that declared their independence from the Soviet Union can be assigned to any of the other types of law analyzed and can even evolve so that a new assignment of them is necessary.

Bibliography

1. DAVID, Rene. *Major legal systems in the world today: introduction to the comparative study of law*. 3rd ed. London: Stevens & Sons, 1985, 624 p. ISBN 0420473408

2. GUȚAN, Manuel. *Sisteme de drept comparate. Introducere în teoria generală a dreptului comparat*. București: Hamangiu, 2014. 392 p. ISBN 978-606-27-0078-2

3. HUSA, Jaakko. „Classification of Legal Families Today. Is it time for a memorial hymn?". In: *Revue internationale de droit comparé*. 2004, Vol. 56, nr. 1, pp. 11-38, ISSN 0035-3337.

4. MATTEI, Ugo. „Three Patterns of Law: Taxonomy and Change in the World' s Legal Systems". In: *The American Journal of Comparative Law*. 1997, nr. 45, pp. 5-44. Ppp14

5. MOUSOURAKIS, George. *Comparative Law and Legal Traditions*. Springer International Publishing, 2019, 318 p. ISBN 978-3-030-28280-6

6. PARGENDLER, Mariana. „The Rise and Decline of Legal Families". In: *American Journal of Comparative Law*. 2012, Vol. 60, nr. 4, pp. 1043-1074, ISSN 0002-919X

7. QUIGLEY, John. „Socialist Law and the Civil Law Tradition". In: *The American Journal of Comparative Law*. 1989, Vol. 37, nr. 4, pp. 781-808, ISSN 0002-919X

8. SIEMS, Mathias. *Comparative Law*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018

9. SPĂTARU-NEGURĂ, Laura-Cristiana. *Dreptul Uniunii Europene — o nouă tipologie*

juridică. Hamangiu, 2016, ISBN 978-606-27-0693-7

10. TREVISANELLO, Laura. *Comparative Law and Legal Taxonomies in the 21st Century.* 2018

11. TSURKAN-SAIFULINA, Yuliia V.; DUDCHENKO, Valentina V. „Authority of Law System Formation: Applied Analysis of Legal System Unity”. In: *Journal of Legal, Ethical and Regulatory Issues*. 2018, Vol. 21, nr. Special Issue 1. ISSN 1544-0044

12. VIDA, Ioan. „Universalitatea și diversitatea dreptului din perspectiva sistemelor de drept”. In: *Dreptul*, 2015, nr. 5, p. 191-211 ISSN 1018-0435

13. АЗНАГУЛОВА, Г. М. „О проблемах выбора критериев типологии правовых систем в современных условиях”. In: *Право и государство: теория и практика*. 2012, nr. 96, pp. 133-137

14. АЗНАГУЛОВА, Г. М. „Типология современных правовых систем”. In: *Право и государство: теория и практика*. 2014, nr. 3, pp. 6-11.

15. ЕРАСОВ, В. С. *Цивилизации: Универсалии и самобытность*. Москва, 2002

16. ЗОРЬКИН, В.Д. *Цивилизация права и развитие России*. Москва, 2015. ISBN 978-5-91768-583-0

17. МАРЧЕНКО, М. Н. *Общая теория государства и права*. В 3-х т. Т.1. Государство. Москва: Норма, 2014. ISBN 978-5-91768-409-3

18. НЕБРАТЕНКО, Г. Г. „Эпистемология доктрины правовой системы общества”. In: *Вестник Таганрогского института имени А.П. Чехова*. 2010, Vol. 1, pp. 44-50.

19. ОКСАМЫТНЫЙ, В. В., МУКИЕНКО, И. Н. *Правовые системы современных государственно-организованных обществ*. Монография. Москва, 2008. 164 с. ISBN 978-5-9694-0196-9

20. РАССКАЗОВ, Л. П. „К вопросу о критериях классификации правовых систем: цивилизованный подход. Тенденции сближения правовых семей в условиях глобализации”. In: *Политематический сетевой электронный научный журнал Кубанского государственного аграрного университета*. 2015, nr. 111, pp. 134-150.

21. РАССКАЗОВ, Л. П. „Цивилизационный подход к классификации правовых систем”. In: *Философия права*. 2014, Vol. 3, nr. 64, pp. 52-55.

22. СЕНИН, И. Н., ГОЛЬТЯПИНА, И. Ю. „Правовые системы современности в контексте цивилизационного подхода к типологии государства и права”. In: *Юридический вестник Дагестанского государственного университета*. 2022, Vol. 41, nr. 1, pp. 25-30, ISSN 2224-0241.

23. СУПАТАЕВ, М. А. „К вопросу о состоянии современного правоведения”. In: *Северо-Кавказский юридический вестник*. 2015, nr. 4, pp. 7-26

24. СУПАТАЕВ, М. А. „Становление цивилизационного подхода к праву”. In: *Труды Института государства и права Российской академии наук*. 2016, nr. 1, pp. 90-120.

25. ЧИРКИН, В. Е. „Возможности и пределы гармонизации глобальных правовых систем”. In: *Lex Russica*. 2014, nr. 7, pp. 832-836.

26. ШУЛЕПОВ, Н. А. „Концепция «евразийского» права в современной компаративистике”. In: *Вестник Московского государственного лингвистического университета.* 2017, nr. 5, pp. 220-224.