Saryn

CORRESPONDING AUTHOR: Dinara Saikeneva, saiken.eva.d@gmail.com, Oriental Studies Department, Kazakh Ablai Khan University of International Relations and World Languages (Almaty, Kazakhstan).

Almira Naurzbayeva[1]

[1] *Kurmangazy Kazakh National Conservatory (Almaty, Kazakhstan)*

Dinara Saikeneva[2]

[2] *Ablai khan University of International Relations and World Languages (Almaty, Kazakhstan)*

The Semiotic Potential of Mythology: Post-Metaphysical Version

Abstract

Myth has been and continues to be an enigma to science, and its interest has led to an endless number of theories, concepts, and new questions. One of them is the phenomenon of myth when it is infinite through its semantic interpretation of the world without giving up its symbolic character. If for a long time the concepts of "myth" and "logic" were conceptually opposed, the linguistic paradigm of cultural philosophy, born in the womb of postmetaphysics, has opened the possibility of fully thinking through the logic of myth.

In Friedrich Nietzsche's philosophy, myth is total – it is in language and style, among the means of logical constructions of his texts, etc., because for him the existence of the world itself is semiotic. The phenomenology of Edmund Husserl, Martin Heidegger, spoke about the myth in the key of finding and recreating their primary meanings as the reference concepts of ontology. The philosophy of symbolic forms by Ernst Cassirer, as well as the apology of the logic of myth by Alexey Losev, Yakov Golosovker are considered in terms of justification of the symbolic nature of myth as a manifestation of the symbolic language of sacral character.

The "mythology" term used in this work does not claim to be a concept, but its legitimacy is based on the teaching of Claude Levi-Strauss, "charged" ideas of existential philosophy, which contributed to the discovery of the phenomenon of "handiness" as manifestations of immediate sensitivity to the world as existence. The ideas about the sacred nature of the symbol, which are further developed in this article, served as a basis for the possibility of speaking about mythology as a method of encoding the sacred, which is particularly significant and peculiar in the symbol. It is assumed that the symbolic exists in the space of the sacred, whose loss transforms it into a sign.

Keywords: myth, postmetaphysics, mythologique, mythological thought, semiotics, symbolism.

Introduction. Within the classical paradigm of scientific knowledge of scientific knowledge, the terms "myth" and "logic" are at odds with their conceptual meanings. Meanwhile, the postmetaphysical discourse of science recognizes behind myth its form of "rationality" and behind logic its alternative, non-classical forms. Postmetaphysics has had a significant impact on the humanitarian sphere as a whole and on the formation of its philosophical and scientific discourse. Therefore, myth has been recognized as a fundamental cultural phenomenon in the postclassical period and, accordingly, has become the object of study and current issues of the language of cultural forms.

As you know, the most scientific approaches to the study of myth, its historical and cultural interpretations, and each time open new aspects of this phenomenon and questions about its knowledge in one or another methodological key. In this regard, the myth, which serves as an object of study in various fields of socio-humanistic science, opens new frontiers of research interest in the semiotic dimension due to the recognition of the symbolic nature of its language. In this context, it would also be appropriate to question the semiotic character of myth in terms of the phylogenesis of culture as an iconic process.

"Mythologiques" – under this name was published a four-volume work of the famous French scientist and founder of structural anthropology Claude Levi-Strauss [Levi-Strauss, 2006]. This title of the book of the scientist, who developed models of analysis that attributed to him logical forms of mythological thinking, influenced the use of the term "mythology" as applied to the object of study in this article. But in contrast to its use by Claude Levi-Strauss as the name of the cycle of his works, the meaning of which can presumably be associated with the totality of the scientist's ideas, the article attempts to prove the validity of the interpretation of "mythologiques" as a conceptual concept.

Because of the multi-valued components of the word "mythologique" – "myth" and "logic"– and the variability of their semantic compatibility in the paradigmatic dimensions of science, there is also a need to establish its scientific correctness as a concept. The focus of these problems determines the circle of theoretical and methodological foundations for the study of this topic. The theoretical and methodological core of the research consists of ideas of representatives of post-metaphysical philosophy (Friedrich Nietzsche, Martin Heidegger, Hans-Georg Gadamer, Ernst Cassirer, etc.), concepts of theorists of various aspects of myth, mythological thought (Alexey Losev, Yury Golosovker, Vyacheslav Ivanov, Vladimir Toporov, Claude Levi-Strauss).

"Mythologique" can be seen in different aspects of its understanding: and as a doctrine of myth associated with the study of so-called mythological thought, that is, the thinking of the people of archaic culture, which is entirely consistent with the ideas of structural anthropology Claude Levi-Strauss. Not to the structural method itself in the approach to the analysis of the logic of myth, where totemic codes are distinguished as logical forms and their relationships are studied, their combinatorics, hypothetically the structure of myth itself can be positioned, for example, as a special kind of logic of the principles of coding its nuclear semantic interpretations.

In this context, the cultural semiotic theories about the ritual origin of the myth should also be taken into account (Vyacheslav Ivanov, Vladimir Toporov). Vladimir Toporov [Toporov, 1995] believed that in the bowels of the proto-myth, an intermediate form between ritual and myth, a language as such was formed, in which there was a connection between the signifier and the signified, expressed in sound: the ritual gave its important characteristics and was the basis for the formation of language as a sign system.

The peculiarity of the "wordless" ritual is that it exists as a particular form of organization of the sacred world: ritual and sacrality are mutually dependent. Hence the assumption that ritual is the original form of the system of symbolic forms that establishes the semantic core of the sacred. Myth has the same property when understood in its own sense. Sacrality is a property of the hierophany of the world, anchored in the properties of a sign designed to establish an algorithm that supports key information. Therefore, both the ritual as an action and the myth as a word have the property of a sacral sign that carries in itself an original semiotic potential, similar to the value of the module in information systems.

As noted by Alexey Pyatigorskiy [Pyatigorskiy, 1996], the myth is based on the intention of the text. The culture is the result of the sum of the detached consciousness, which in one way or another is represented in the signs of the cultural text. Like the thread of Ariadne, this consciousness leads to the luminosity in which the face of the desired image of culture manifests itself, which is first purified in the myth and then subjected to intellectual interpretation. This state was considered by Edmund Husserl as "the original natural form of culture, which has its universal practical framework – when the world is recognized as a universal horizon and thematized in a mythologically meaningful way" [Husserl, 309]. This universal practical frame of myth is hidden in a special way in every form of cultural language, with the help of which the image of the world is "written". In the phenomenology of cognition, the image of the world appears as a constitutive element of being: it has a creative character, it presents itself as a process of creation of the world, which objectifies it in symbolic form.

The phenomenological doctrine of myth also articulates the idea of its meaning, based on the Aristotelian definition of myth as action, interpreted under the aspect of logical category. The question of whether mythology can be considered as the basis of the semiotic process of the language of cultural forms also influenced the aim of this work.

Thus, the aim of the study is to demonstrate the specificity of the symbolic property of the logic of myth, which is the basis of the universal method of encoding cultural forms and has the potential for meaning variability.

Methods. Man, first attempting to enter into an invisible dialogue with nature, takes the first step in his human form of existence by creating his own everyday world, which is both given (fixed) and transient (changing). This world appears, on the one hand, as a particular topos whose appearance can only be guessed at in "description," "naming,"

"signifying." The myth, then, is a kind of universal "topography" of being in the world. The mutability of the world of being correlates with the change of the structure of the topos, as a result of the confusion caused by the invisible chronos, whose description is subject to human language, but only in the symbolic form of its meaning inherited from the archaic myth. Is it not so that the linguistic space itself appears as an infinite interpretation of the sign, which Michel Foucault [Foucault, 152–153] calls "topological space," and behind it, there is an infinite equipment and generation of meanings.

Ancient man inscribed himself on the face of the natural world, trying to master its language and to know its mystery in signs. All these manipulations have formed a culture of syncretism, in which the dialogue with nature – a projection of the world of nature and the example of the natural world on itself. Perhaps this can be called the mythological "rationality" of human consciousness, which has not exhausted the need for dialogue but has used only one of the possibilities of his situation. On this basis, human language arises, through which the people now create together their existential world in a possible dialogue among each other, which gets each time its new "humanized" sense.

At the same time, the necessity of dialogue with the natural world does not end, and the law never ends, no matter how one tries to distance oneself from it, to place oneself above it, to hide under the power of culture or to oppose it with culture. Culture, as the strangeness of human existence, cannot separate itself from nature, and its own being is impossible outside the space of the world of being and human being. Man himself is in constant confrontation with the fact that man in his consciousness at a certain stage of his history "divided" the opposite sides of his understanding of the world, calling them "culture" and "nature," which once were in the logical harmony of the mythological world view.

The French anthropologist Claude Levi-Strauss referred to mythological thinking as "wild thinking" and pointed out the peculiarity that the strategy for knowing the universe is to recognize both its physical and semantic properties. In connection with this conceptual framework, he develops the idea of "zuhandenheit" (handiness) as a fundamentally intelligent activity of the mediation process between nature and culture, "which in speculation could be the science we prefer to call 'primary' rather than primitive" [Levi-Strauss, 126]. Of course, mythology is not science in the classical sense. Mythology expresses the attitude of life toward the world of being.

In Martin Heidegger's ontological interpretation, handiness is considered in the work "Being and Time" as an "ontological-categorical determination of Being as it is 'in itself'. "Handiness is 'existent' by virtue of its existence" [Heidegger, 91]. For handiness is characterized by its everydayness, its invisibility, by which its essence is found when no other finished weapons (tools, etc.) are at hand. The meaning of handiness of Martin Heidegger in this interpretation finds its similarity in the idea of Claude Levi-Strauss about the long work of the "disinterested" mind of the man

of the traditional society, which discovers the means that the Greeks meant by the term "techne" in the next available ones through the efforts of the mind.

"However, the gradual desacralization of the world, in which the entire cosmos is considered a sacred space, leads to its secularization and to the birth of the concept of "reality" in the womb of the totality of history, that is, to the domination of the culture of linear discourse. In this situation, the mythological is no longer the inner impulse for the intensity of the world. As Hans-Georg Gadamer stated, "in order to recognize myth as a vital condition of every culture, it required only one step, which Nietzsche took in his second 'Untimely Meditation.' Culture can develop only in a horizon defined by myth. The disease of modernity is a historical disease, and it consists, in his opinion, in the destruction of this closed horizon by transgression of history, that is, by habituation to thinking under the sign of new and new values" [Gadamer, 25].

Metaphysics, dealing with abstract categories of "pure mind" and ignoring dialectics, could not convince in defining the essence of existence. This was one of the signs of the crisis of metaphysical discourse, in which myth and reality proved to be concepts with antinomic meanings and transcended with reality, and culture and nature were at the opposite poles of value-oriented metaphysics. Myth was placed on the periphery of the epistemological coordinates of science as a narrative of archaic knowledge about the world of primitive thought.

Postmetaphysics, which critically understands its predecessor, in turn updates myth and its new reading as a form of life, that is, it seeks a "new ontology" in the infinite, according to Nietzsche's definition, "interpretability of the world": myth returns to the forefront of culture and its humanitarian thought. Myth acquires the status of an object of multiple cognitive interest, both as a form of consciousness, as a mode of thought, and as the language of culture.

Results and Discussion. In his work "Dialectics of Myth," Alexey Losev asserts the purely ontological character of myth. He considered it as an immediate manifestation of being itself and established the supremacy of myth over logic, which follows myth. "It is always the case that what is provable and deducible is based on what is unproven and self-evident; and mythology is mythology only when it is unproven, when it cannot be proven and is not to be proven. Thus, among the philosophical constructions, which are to realize the scientific experience in the new philosophy, there is a very definite mythology" [Losev, 412] – wrote the philosopher, proving the immutability of mythology in the world of understanding, in the image of the world of scientific knowledge. This is evident in the examples given by Alexey Losev of the coexistence of the scientific knowledge of Newtonian homogeneous space and the principles of Einstein's theory of heterogeneous spaces, which would not have been possible if science had rejected the myths "associated with werewolfism". In this way, the scientist expressed the idea that science does not arise from myth but is itself mythological, in the symbolic nature of the world expressed through the language of concepts, rather than in principles, approaches, revealed patterns, etc., which distinguishes science

from myth. If we also explain Alexey Losev's ideas about the symbol as the eidos of the world, we can assume that mythology is a way of representing the world through the language of the world itself and not through concepts about it."

If Alexey Losev developed questions of dialectics of myth, then Yury Golosovker focused on the study of logic of myth, which, in his opinion, does not obey the laws of formal logic. He describes mythological thought as a creative cognitive activity with its own logic, which is determined by the imagination operating in the space of meaning. "The imagination of the myth creator, which scientifically, a priori, oedipally knows or unconsciously anticipates what will later be known and even scientifically recognized, cannot think its elementary concepts or its images only formally, as a mathematician does. Since imagination does not separate itself from its images and concepts of their content, there are no concepts in myth" [Golosovker, 74].

The concept of Yury Golosovker connects with the position of Aleksandr Losev the understanding of the paradigmatic basis of mythologique as it is thought with its special logic – "enigmatic" (enigma from ancient Greece – a riddle) with its own mythological semantics in the mode of dialectical logic. A detailed interpretation of this position of the scientist can appear in the following formula: a sign – a riddle, meaning – interpretation, its revelation or understanding. In the generalization of both positions there is a thesis: myth – the world as it is, its imprint with the hidden keys to reveal its riddles. The language of myth is not mentioned, but all the essential elements are present: logic, semantics, paradigms, keys that point to the symbolic basis of this phenomenon. The ability to express the "language of being" is the main characteristic of the semiotics of myth: myth is directed both to the real and to the transcendent, whose integrity is preserved by the signs of the sacred world.

Ernst Cassirer, a prominent representative of post-Kantian philosophy, in his Philosophy of Symbolic Forms [Cassirer, 2011] considered myth as an autonomous symbolic form of culture, as a system that represents a certain way of modeling the world around it. Even though the methodological bases of the representatives of two different philosophical systems differ, the ideas of Ernst Cassirer regarding the recognition of the symbolic nature of language were connected with the thoughts of Friedrich Nietzsche, whose texts are deliberately mythological, since life itself manifested itself for him as a myth-making and semiotic process.

An example of this is the manipulation of Friedrich Nietzsche in the game of meanings with the name of the protagonist of his philosophical works. Trying to "restore" the authentic name of his hero by rejecting his naming by the Greeks – "Zoroastr" – which associated him with the term "astron" (star), the philosopher showed the way how the signs of fire were elevated in cloning to the divine light of the stellar and intelligent cosmos. Thus, the transition from mythology to Socratic logic took place. It is not a coincidence that this at first sight philological step of Nietzsche goes back to his intention to establish the fundamental logic of the language of myth, in which he looked for a form identical with his reflection of thoughts.

On the basis of the concept of Gaston Bachelard about the "Prometheus complex" as the Oedipus complex of the mental life, i. e. about the "will to intellectuality" inherent in man, the essence of the reincarnation of Zarathustra in the Zoroastr of the Hellenistic world can be explained. He brings, like Prometheus, the fire of knowledge, i. e. the secret of the celestial deities. The fire gets its mythologically defined niche because it is realized in the human world as a "more public than natural being" [Bachelard, 23]. Of course, the analysis of the mythological intertext must not be limited to an inventory of the mythically connoted structures without uncovering their historical semantics: through the diachronic reconstruction of the worldview of the periods of mythopoetic proto-conceptualization, it is possible to discover the structures and semantic potential of the mythological intertext [Chystiak, Kochinska, 605].

Zarathustra is a conceptual figure of Friedrich Nietzsche's philosophy, paradigmatically, not historically related to Prometheus. But if the name Zarathustra has its genuine "history" of prophecy, the fate of the mythical Prometheus and the origin of his name remain a mystery for which he and the myth have no absolute arc. We can, however, allow some relatively verifiable conjectures: Zarathustra and Prometheus are linked by a topos that represents the East, more specifically Central Asia, in a culture where Indo-Aryan and Turkic-Mongol traditions were intertwined with antiquity.

That the mythological origins of Prometheus come from the East is supported by facts of cultural history. European scholars have based their works on the premise that Central Asian nomads introduced fire-related metal production skills to the Western world. Prometheus is organically integrated into the Greek pantheon because of his belief in the magical power of fire. In the space of the archaic paradigm, the myth of Prometheus is etiological and is meant to "explain" the sacred function of fire as a sign of its divine origin. The origins of the mythical thief of fire – "the birthplace of iron" Scythia. "The connection of shaman – hero – blacksmith is confirmed by both Indo-European and Turkic-Mongolian sources. This proves that the original technical skills of man were sacred religious-mythological representations" [Cardini, 87].

Apart from its cultural-historical content, this statement by the Italian scholar supports the idea that myth is potentially dormant because of the universality of the symbols of the system of its language. A symbolic myth is always a sacred world characterized by a certain logic of its understanding. Thus, Claude Levi-Strauss, turning to the problem of mythological thinking, which is actively discussed in the science of the 20th century, concluded that the logical mechanisms of mythological thinking produce iconic systems. On the one hand, such thinking has its own logical peculiarity, which the scientist sees in metaphor, logical "bricolage" on the sensual level, and on the other – in the ability to generalize, classify, analyze. Thus, myth is inherent in symbolism, which is in balance between idea and image, "ideal" and "real." On this peculiarity of the myth, its symbolic character, which uses the rhetoric of the language of both scientific and unscientific argumentation, Sven Hroar Klempe remarks [Klempe, 216]. To refute the theory of "illogical" mythological thinking, Claude Levi-Strauss proposes to consider the "Neolithic paradox" as "the mastery of the great arts of civilization: pottery, weaving, agriculture,

and domestication of animals," not to mention the "processing of natural copper by forging, which appeared several thousand years before metallurgy and already required very advanced technical skills" [Levi-Strauss, 124–125].

The "Neolithic paradox" as a fact of cultural history illustrates the strategy of "independence" of mythological thinking, its ontological nature "handiness" – attitude of immediate sensitivity to the surrounding world, to its materiality. According to Martin Heidegger's fundamental ontology, the thing is the very presence of the world, the world is present in things as its own being, i. e. the thing is part of being. The anthropological version of the mythological thinking of Claude Levi-Strauss and the thinking of Martin Heidegger about the phenomenology of the thing have passed the point of the ontological "dimension" of the sacred world. There are well-known considerations of Martin Heidegger about the cup as things which are real by their "capacity" [Martin Heidegger, 1993]. But as soon as the cup appears as an object, its materiality is replaced by the meaning of filling this vessel with any substance. While the "cupness" of the cup is enclosed in an offering. Such understanding of the matter is lost because the thinking is in the closed dimension of the sacred, because "the openness of being has not approached man". The sacred is meaningful because it is thought in the immediate proximity of being. Man of the new epoch has lost the sacred character of being and the alienation from its foundations has surrounded him with the profane world. The thing becomes an object with forgotten sacred semantics. The world of forgotten sacrality represents an existing being, without phenomenal differences, without ontological meaning. Mythology, on the other hand, focuses on the meaning of the sacred object as the guardian of the meaning of existence.

Conclusion. Modern science broadens its areas of interest and progressively impacts the emergence of new cultural practices. It is open to compatibility with different dimensions of the world and forms of its being, which is typical of the discourse of postmetaphysics to "overcome" the strict limits of the method. This speaks to the fact that postmetaphysics sought a tangible, living being in philosophy and found it in myth because there nature is not opposed to culture.

Semiotics, having secured the possibility of playing "different degrees of reality of being itself," i. e. the latent potential of mythology, has abandoned the subordination of metaphysics to rationality and its "doctrines" about the homogeneous space of being, and has revived the scientific legitimacy of myth as a cultural text, narrative, worldview, etc. The myth appears as an idea expressed through the language of symbols, excluding a clear interpretation. It knows and signals, in the sense of "signifies," the concealment of being.

The postmetaphysical humanitarian discourse has found in mythology, in the symbolism of myth, a strategy for overcoming the metaphysics of rationality and its language. For this reason, the philosophy of culture and the "linguistic" turn of science have revived the interest in myth. In the object of scientific analysis, the questions about learning the language of cultural forms endowed with internal connections to myth, its logical

structures, and symbolic foundations, were actualized. The ontological image of the world, which is not linear in the structure of its vision, is reflected and projected in the logic of myth, whose semiotic discourse serves the revelation of things encoded in its symbolic language.

This paves the way for uncovering the diversity of the language of different cultural forms, the potential of their meaning-making. For culture is not fixed once and for all but becomes a sign text in its infinite variety and variability of meanings.

The results of this study, the conducted analysis of the basic concepts of the philosophy of myth, mythological language, have both theoretical and practical applicability and research perspective. Also in the practice of teaching and study of disciplines in the philosophy of culture, semiotics, cultural anthropology, phenomenology will apply the theoretical and methodological part of this article. The article also has its practical significance in the conceptual underpinning of the study in the field of ethnosemiotics.

Авторлардың үлесі

А. Б. Наурзбаева – мақаланың негізгі мәтінін жазу, аңдатпаларды, дәйексөздерді іздеу, зерттеу тұжырымдамасын негіздеу, зерттеуді жоспарлау, талдау жүргізу.

Д. К. Сайкенева – ХХ ғасыр зерттеушілерінің еңбектерінде мифтің символдық табиғаты туралы сұрақ қою, салт бойынша еңбектерді талдау, мақаланы аудару, мақаланы және дереккөздер тізімін рәсімдеу, хат-хабар үшін автор.

Вклад авторов

А. Б. Наурзбаева – написание основного текста статьи, аннотации, поиск цитат, обоснование концепции исследования, планирование исследований, проведение анализа.

Д. К. Сайкенева – постановка вопроса о символической природе мифа в трудах исследователей ХХ века, анализ трудов по ритуалу, перевод статьи, оформление статьи и списка источников, автор для корреспонденции.

Contribution of authors

A. B. Naurzbayeva – writing the main text, the abstract, searching for the quotations, substantiating the study concept, planning the research conducting the analysis.

D. K. Saikeneva – study of the symbolic character of myth in the works of researchers of the XX century, analysis of works related to rituals, translation of the article, formatting of the article and reference, author for correspondence.

References

Bachelard, G. Psikhoanaliz ognya [*orig. Russian:* The Psychoanalysis of Fire]. – Moscow: Progress, 1993. – 176 p.

Cardini, F. Istoki srednevekovogo rytsarstva [*orig. Russian:* The Origins of Medieval Knighthood]. – Sretensk: MTSIFI, 2000. – 352 p.

Cassirer, E. Fenomnologiya poznaniya // Filosofiya simvolicheskikh form [*orig. Russian:* The Philsosophy of Symbolic Forms]. – Moscow: Akademicheskiy Proekt, 2011. – 398 p.

Dmytro, Ch.; Kobcinska, O; Mosenkis, Iu. Mythological Intertext in Maeterlinck's Pelléas and Mélisande // Litera: Journal of Language, Literature and Cultural Studies. – 2021. – No. 2 (31). – PP. 605–618. – DOI: 10.26650/LITERA2021-87144.

Foucault, M. Drugie prostranstva [*orig. Russian:* Other Spaces] // Intellektualy i vlast: Izbrannye politicheskie stati, vystupleniya i intervyu [*orig. Russian:* Intelligience and Authority. Selected Articles, Speaking and Interview]. – Moscow: Praksis, 2006. – PP. 191–204.

Gadamer, H. G. Aktualnost prekrasnogo [*orig. Russian:* The Relevance of Beauty]. – Moscow: Iskusstvo, 1991. – 371 p.

Golosovker, Ya. E. Logika mifa [*orig. Russian:* The Logic of Myth]. – Moscow: Main Editors Office of Oriental Literature of Nauka, 1987. – 218 p.

Heidegger, M. Bytie i vremya [*orig. Russian:* Being and Time]. – Kharkov: Folio, 2003. – 503 p.

Husserl, E. Krizis evropeyskogo chelovechestva i filosofiya [*orig. Russian:* The Crisis of European Humanity and Philosophy] // Kulturologiya. XX vek. Antologiya. – Moscow: Yurist, 1995. – PP. 297–330.

Klempe, S. H. Mythical Thinking, Scientific Discourses and Research Dissemination // Integrative Psychological and Behavioral Science. – 2011. – No. 2 (45). – PP. 216–222. – DOI: 10.1007/s12124-011-9160-0.

Lévi-Strauss, C. Mifologiki: Syroe i prigotovlennoe [*orig. Russian:* Mythologiques: The Raw and The Cooked]. – Moscow: Flyuid, 2006. – 399 p.

Lévi-Strauss, C. Pervobytnoe myshlenie [*orig. Russian:* Primary Thought] / tr. A. N. Ostrovsky. – Moscow: TERRA, 1999. – 392 p.

Losev, A. F. Iz rannikh proizvedeniy [*orig. Russian:* Early Works] // Dialektika mifa [*orig. Russian:* Dialectics of Myth]. – Moscow: Pravda, 1990. – 655 p.

Nietzsche, F. Polnoye sobraniye sochineniy. V 13 tomakh. Tom 1. Chast 1. Rozhdeniye tragedii. Iz naslediya 1869–1873 gg. [*orig. Russian:* The Complete Works. In 13 Volumes. Volume 1. Part 1. The Birth of Tragedy. From the Legacy of 1869–1873]. – Moscow: Kulturnaya revolyutsiya, 2012. – 416 p.

Pyatigorskiy, A. Mifologicheskie razmyshleniya. Lektsii po fenomenologii mifa [*orig. Russian:* Mythological Thinking. Lectures on the Phenomenology of Myth]. – Moscow: Yazyki russkoy kultury, 1996. – 288 p.

Toporov, V. O rituale [*orig. Russian:* About the Ritual] // Arkhaicheskiy ritual v folklornykh i ranneliteraturnykh pamyatnikakh [*orig. Russian:* Archaic Ritual in Folklore and Early Literary Monuments]. – Moscow: Nauka, 1988. – PP. 7–60.

Альмира Наурзбаева

Құрманғазы атындағы Қазақ ұлттық консерваториясы (Алматы, Қазақстан)

Динара Сайкенева

Абылай хан атындағы Қазақ халықаралық қатынастар және әлем тілдері университеті (Алматы, Қазақстан)

Мифологияның семиотикалық әлеуеті: постметафизикалық нұсқа

Аңдатпа

Миф ғылым үшін жұмбақ және солай болып қала береді, оған деген қызығушылық теориялардың, тұжырымдамалардың және жаңа сұрақтардың шексіз жиынтығын тудырады. Оның бірі – миф құбылысы, егер өзінің символдық табиғатымен ажыраспаса, ол әлемде семантикалық түсіндіру шексіздігін жасырады. Егер «миф» және «логика» ұғымдары ұзақ уақыт бойы концептуалды қарама-қарсы көзқараста болса, онда постметафизика аясында дүниеге келген мәдениет философиясының лингвистикалық парадигмасы мифтің логикасы туралы жан-жақты пайымдау мүмкіндігін ашады.

Фридрих Ницше философиясындағы миф бір тұтас – ол тіл мен стильде, оның мәтіндерінің логикалық құрылымдары құралдарының қатарында және т.б., өйткені ол үшін әлемнің өзі семиотикалық болып келеді. Эдмунд Гуссерлдің, Мартин Хайдеггердің феноменологиясы онтологияның негізгі ұғымдары ретінде олардың бастапқы мағыналарын табу және қайта құру кілтіндегі миф туралы айта бастады. Эрнст Кассирердің символдық формаларының философиясы, Алексей Лосевтің, Яков Голосовкердің мифтік логикасын, мифтің символдық табиғатын негіздеу аспектісінде яғни оның айқын қасиеттілігін символдық тілді манифесттеу ретінде көрсетеді.

Мифологика-бұл жұмыста қолданылатын ұғым терминнің мәртебесін талап етпейді, бірақ оның заңдылығы экзистенциалды философия идеяларымен «зарядталған» Клод Леви-Стросстың ілімдерімен негізделген, бұл «қол асты» құбылысын әлемге тікелей сезімталдықтың көрінісі ретінде ашуға ықпал етті. Осы мақалада символдың қасиетті табиғаты туралы идеялар мифология туралы әңгіме жүргізу мүмкіндігін символдағы қасиетті, ерекше маңызды және заттық кодтау әдісі ретінде негіздеді. Символдық қасиет кеңістікте бар және оның жоғалуы оны белгіге айналдырады деген болжам бар.

Тірек сөздер: миф, постметафизика, мифологика, мифологиялық ойлау, семиотика, символдық.

Альмира Наурзбаева

Казахская национальная консерватория имени Курмангазы (Алматы, Казахстан)

Динара Сайкенева

Казахский университет международных отношений и мировых языков имени Абылай хана (Алматы, Казахстан)

Семиотический потенциал мифологики: постметафизическая версия

Аннотация

Миф был и остаётся загадкой для науки, порождающей своим интересом к нему бесконечное множество как теорий и концепций, так и новых вопросов. Один из них – в чем кроется феномен мифа, если он бесконечен своей семантической интерпретацией мира, при этом не расстающийся со своей символической природой. Если понятия «миф» и «логика» долгое время находились в некоторой концептуально противоположной диспозиции, то языковая парадигма философии культуры, рождённая в лоне постметафизики, открыла возможность всемерно рассуждать о логике мифа.

Миф в философии Фридриха Ницше тотален – он в языке и стиле, в числе средств логических построений его текстов и т. п., поскольку для него само существование мира семиотично. Феноменология Эдмунда Гуссерля, Мартина Хайдеггера заговорила о мифе в ключе поиска и воссоздания их первичных значений как опорных понятий онтологии. Философия символических форм Эрнста Кассирера, как и апология логики мифа Алексея Лосева, Якова Голосовкера, рассмотрены в аспекте обоснования знаковой природы мифа как манифестирующего бытие символическим языком его осязаемую сакральность.

Мифологика – понятие, используемое в данной работе, не претендует на статус термина, но легитимность его обосновывается учением Клода Леви-Стросса, «заряженным» идеями экзистенциальной философии, которые содействовали раскрытию феномена «подручности» как проявления непосредственной чувственности к миру как сущему. Разворачиваемые далее в данной статье идеи о сакральной природе символа служили обоснованием возможности вести разговор о мифологике как о способе кодирования сакрального, особо значимого и вещного в символе. Делается предположение, что символическое бытует в пространстве сакрального, потеря которого преобразует его в знак.

Ключевые слова: миф, постметафизика, мифологика, мифологическое мышление, семиотика, символическое.

Авторлар туралы мәлімет:

Альмира Бекетовна Наурзбаева –
философия ғылымдарының докторы, Құрманғазы атындағы Қазақ ұлттық консерваториясының әлеуметтік-гуманитарлық пәндер кафедрасының профессоры (Алматы, Қазақстан)

ORCID ID: 0000-0002-4604-6835
email: naurzbaeva_a@mail.ru

Динара Кайратовна Сайкенева –
PhD, Абылай хан атындағы Қазақ халықаралық қатынастар және әлем тілдері университетінің шығыстану кафедрасының қауымдастырылған профессоры (Алматы, Қазақстан)

ORCID ID: 0000-0002-0333-188X
email: saiken.eva.d@gmail.com

Сведения об авторах:

Альмира Бекетовна Наурзбаева –
доктор философских наук, профессор кафедры социально-гуманитарных дисциплин Казахской национальной консерватории имени Курмангазы (Алматы, Казахстан)

ORCID ID: 0000-0002-4604-6835
email: naurzbaeva_a@mail.ru

Динара Кайратовна Сайкенева –
PhD, ассоциированный профессор кафедры востоковедения Казахского университета международных отношений и мировых языков имени Абылай хана (Алматы, Казахстан)

ORCID ID: 0000-0002-0333-188X
email: saiken.eva.d@gmail.com

Authors' bio:

Almira B. Naurzbayeva –
Doctor of Sciences in Philosophy Study, Professor, Social and Humanitarian Disciplines Department, Kurmangazy Kazakh National Conservatory (Almaty, Kazakhstan)

ORCID ID: 0000-0002-4604-6835
email: naurzbaeva_a@mail.ru

Dinara K. Saikeneva –
PhD, Associate Professor, Oriental Studies Department, Kazakh Ablai Khan University of International Relations and World Languages (Almaty, Kazakhstan)

ORCID ID: 0000-0002-0333-188X
email: saiken.eva.d@gmail.com