ТАНЫМ ТЕОРИЯСЫ
ТЕОРИЯ ПОЗНАНИЯ
THEORY OF KNOWLEDGE

Ye.K. Chongarov[1], K.S. Bagasharov[2*], N.E. Tutinova[3]

[1] Kazakh Russian Medical University, Almaty, Kazakhstan
[2] Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Almaty, Kazakhstan
[3] Buketov Karaganda National Research University, Karaganda, Kazakhstan
(E-mail: yerzhanalemkulov@gmail.com; kudaiberdi1981@gmail.com, nurtut86@mail.ru)

New perspectives on the application of Jacques Derrida's deconstruction

The study describes Derrida's deconstructive analysis as a method, directed to search for contradictions and prejudices, to discover the unconscious in the system, and to reveal the insufficiency of basic assumptions. The new vision of the concept of deconstruction has been analysed. Language is considered through the prism of structuralism and deconstruction. Derrida's deconstructive approach aims to preserve the structural integrity of writing while challenging the notion of inherent meaning. In Western traditional philosophy and cultural theory, the concept of being and the relation of the subject to the objective world are conceptualised primarily in terms of presence. The results of this study are significant and can be used in different courses of the Contemporary European philosophy. Information of article has new perspectives, because it can be applicated in new scientific projects directed to study linguistic philosophy. Through research methods, the study discovered new aspects of linguistic philosophy, and theory of deconstruction.

Keywords: culture, phenomenology, semiotics, linguistics, language, development, logical structure of the text, progress, existentialism, binary structure.

Introduction

For over two thousand years, European tradition, language research, philosophical and empirical theories of language have not been distinguished in a clear manner, resulting in a lack of clarity regarding the boundaries between these distinct areas of study. The issues pertaining to language are explored in a multitude of scientific theories and disciplines, including linguistics, logic, semiotics and hermeneutics. The field of logic is concerned with the structure of language. In contrast, the field of linguistics employs an empirical approach to the description of natural languages, eschewing any idealisation. The study of language within the discipline of linguistics is a creative process that generates the world of text. Thus, linguistics plays a significant role in the development of a general theory of language.

Language represents a fundamental means of communication and acts as a pivotal element within the broader system of interpersonal relations within society. The diversity of language demonstrates not only the richness of cultural expression, encompassing material and spiritual aspects, but also the complex historical interrelation with other types of culture, its intrinsic origins and, perhaps most importantly, its unique character, originality and aesthetic value. It can be reasonably assumed that language can act as a semantic bridge between scientific disciplines such as sociology and cultural studies. Therefore, the process of deconstruction, the theory introduced by French philosopher Jacques Derrida, can be employed to address a multitude of linguistic and cultural issues. Derrida considers that the entirety of the world can be understood as an infinite text. Subsequently, the scientist posits that "nothing exists outside the text". The reality of the world is

---

* Corresponding author's e-mail: *kudaiberdi1981@gmail.com*

perceived as a game of ideas, with the structure of the text acting as a framework. The book, as a written text, is understood as a closed system, where the structuredness of the text prevents the revelation of the framework of reality itself. The text simplifies reality and limits the monologism of the writer.

The French poststructuralist seeks to identify novel forms of discourse and text organisation that diverge from the conventional and challenge the established order. Of particular importance is the opposition to the total construction of the book, which is perceived as a closed circle.

Relevance of the topic

20th-century philosophy underwent many turning points, one of which was the method of deconstruction proposed by French philosopher Jacques Derrida. His works, in particular *De la grammatologie* (*Of Grammatology*) (1967), *La Voix et le Phénomène* (*Speech and Phenomena*) (1967), *Margins of Philosophy* (1972), *Dissemination* (1972), and others [1], laid the foundation for a concept that is not simply a critique of text, but a critique of the foundations of Western metaphysics, logicism, presence ('présence') [2], and the authority of the logos. In the 21st century, where digitalisation, globalisation, multiculturalism, media and text overload call into question traditional forms of knowledge, meaning, authorship and truth, deconstruction offers tools that can be extremely useful. For example:

- in linguistics: how to understand meaning in conditions of polysemy, translation processes, and automatic text analysis;

- in cultural studies/cultural criticism: how to analyse hegemony, structures of power, and marginalisation through texts and discourses;

- in discourse philosophy: how to rethink the concepts of truth, authority, origin, and identity;

- in new media and digital culture: where 'text' is increasingly perceived not only as linear literary, but as multimodal, multimedia, hypertext — and where the boundaries between speech, writing, log and visual are blurred.

It should be emphasised that deconstruction is not simply an analysis of text — it is an approach that asks questions, reveals aporias, tensions, and shadow structures that the text usually tries to hide or forget.

This article may be useful:

1. For philosophers and theorists — for developing methodology, revising metaphysical assumptions, and critiquing traditional binary oppositions (e.g., speech/writing, presence/absence, nature/culture).

2. For linguists — in studies of meaning, translation, interlingual and intercultural interpretation, and formal theories of language.

3. For cultural studies scholars, sociologists, literary scholars — in the analysis of discourses of power, identity, marginalisation, gender, colonialism, subalternity.

4. For researchers of media and digital cultures — in the analysis of hypertexts, multimodal texts, networks of meaning, memes, visual and digital media.

5. For interdisciplinary fields — where the humanities intersect with philosophy, politics, law, and ethics.

Thus, researching new perspectives for applying Derrida's deconstruction is not merely of historical interest, but a practical necessity in today's world, where questions of meaning, truth, and authorship are becoming increasingly ambiguous.

Together with above mentioned aspects, we set up the following objectives in the article: to reveal the linguistic approach to the solving of culture philosophy problems; to show spheres of culture where deconstruction can be applicated; to reveal the new perspectives of deconstruction: how it can be used in modern culture, in discourse philosophy, in new media and digital culture, in cultural studies/cultural criticism, in decision of interdisciplinary fields problems. Within epoch of globalization and informatization, it is necessary to reinvestigate new phenomena of the cultures and new instruments of culture problems decision. To modernize lectures, given to students and graduate students, it is necessary to reveal new aspects of Derrida's Deconstruction in contemporary culture.

Materials and methods

The following research methods are used to analyse and demonstrate the prospects for the application of deconstruction: literature review—collection and systematisation of existing research on deconstruction and its applications in various disciplines, including recent articles indexed in *Scopus*; textual analysis—detailed analysis of Derrida's key texts (e.g., *Of Grammatology*, *Speech and Phenomena*, *Margins of Philosophy*) and contemporary texts where deconstruction is applied; phenomenological analysis—study of experience, perception of meaning, authorship, presence/absence in textual and cultural experience; comparative studies—

comparative analysis of the application of the method in different disciplines, traditions (continental vs. analytical philosophy, Western vs. non-Western cultures) and among 21st-century thinkers; deduction and generalisation—deriving general patterns and principles from observed cases, forming conclusions on the possibilities and limitations of the method. The following sections of this article examine specific applications of the method of deconstruction in solving problems of contemporary philosophy (in discourse and text).

Discussion and Results

Deconstruction is the practice of analysing an artwork and the theory of literature. It emerged in the USA and Europe in the second half of the 20th century. J. Derrida was the first to provide a theoretical justification for deconstruction. The works of the French philosopher were instrumental in shaping poststructuralist ideas and establishing the foundational theoretical principles of deconstructivist literary analysis. Derrida's deconstructive analysis is a method aimed at searching for contradictions and prejudices, at discovering the unconscious in the system, and at revealing the insufficiency of basic assumptions. Derrida's philosophy unearths the exotic, the marginal and the bizarre in the text.

The project of "deconstruction" is a cornerstone of contemporary cultural thought, which is defined by the advent of new concepts, ideas and modes of philosophising. The contemporary era is distinguished by the exponential expansion of scientific influence, which can be found in all aspects of human activity. Deconstruction is undoubtedly one of the most significant contemporary philosophical schools, having provided invaluable insights into the complexities of language and contemporary culture. The linguistic approach to cultural philosophy is one of the most important tenets of contemporary Western cultural theory. Many cultural schools of the 20th and 21st centuries have placed the problems related to language at the centre of their attention. Language is the object of study of both structuralism and poststructuralism. The key figure of poststructuralism is the French cultural scientist J. Derrida. He is a philosopher who reflects on the problems of the modern state of the theory of culture and other humanities.

The scientist asserts that it is necessary to deconstruct the conventional approach to writing, which is based on the use of the alphabet and the linear order of text organisation.

The one of the significant problems in contemporary culture is philosophy of language and text, and the idea of totality problems of the structure and text.

The idea of meaning of "book", as argued by the French philosopher, is the idea of totality. The true meaning of the concept of writing, however, cannot be associated with any totality or systematicity. Hence, the true meaning of the concept of writing is alien to the idea of meaning of the book, which is cultivated in Western metaphysics. The deconstruction of the idea of the book should reveal the superficiality of the text itself, as well as reveal the true meaning and significance of the notion of writing, the French cultural critic believes. Nevertheless, it may appear peculiar to define the act of denoting the signifier of the signified as a mere doubling. Derrida postulates that it is necessary to broaden the concept of writing so that it encompasses the full spectrum of linguistic expression. In Western culture, language is defined in terms of action, thought, movement, and consciousness. Writing is a phenomenon that exists beyond the boundaries of the signified and the signifier. Regardless of whether it is a literal inscription or not, it is an inscription nonetheless. Derrida posits that an inscription is associated with writing when it is entirely incongruous with the established order of voice. The Western concept of language, the scholar determines, allows for the existence of a linguistic realm that does not align with its intrinsic nature. Speech will have to undergo a functional transformation to align with the evolving characteristics of writing. Derrida's metaphor of "The Death of Speech" represents a transformation in the very nature of speech, which will subsequently assume the roles of source and ground. The aim of deconstruction is to introduce specific definitions of language and writing that will expand the boundaries of the concept of writing and allow writing to transcend the boundaries of language. In this way, we have sought to illustrate how the Western philosophical tradition, in its context of metaphysics, has portrayed writing, and to propose a conceptualisation of it that emerges from deconstruction. By focusing on the construction of new writing, we have demonstrated that the objective of deconstruction is to dismantle the representation of writing based on the binary opposition of speech/writing. By elucidating another aspect of Derrida's concept of writing, we have established that writing should not be perceived as the external surface of the signified, but should encompass language in its entirety and integrity.

Emphasis placed on structure and text. One of the most intriguing aspects of Derrida's approach to writing is the emphasis placed on structure and text. The philosopher argues that, within the historical development of Western European metaphysics, the notion of an ontological and axiological centre, which assumes various forms (Absolute, Logos, Truth, God, Essence, World Spirit, etc.), serves as the foundation for

onto-theo-telio-logocentrism. In turn, this logocentrism or phonocentrism seeks to derive the infinite variety of present reality from one absolutely simple and comprehensive foundation or first principle. Derrida perceives the superiority of Hegel's philosophy over Plato's in its capacity to imbue Western metaphysics with dynamism and mobility. This contrasts with Plato's conception of the absolute as an immobile and self-identical entity. Western metaphysics is based on the idea of wholeness, totality, and inner completeness of the absolute centre. In this centre, which is the ultimate foundation of being, the whole phenomenal world is laid in a coiled form. When realised, it unfolds what is embedded in it. Hegelian philosophy is characterised by negation or withdrawal. Derrida demonstrates that this negation is not a mere negation in essence, but a crucial test that must be passed in order to return to the lost world of totality, where all differences are absorbed into unity. Hegelian negation has one major disadvantage: it does not lead beyond the absolute. This is because the process of dialectical synthesis, which includes the stage of negation, does not go beyond the absolute. For Hegel, every other is "its own other". Hegel's philosophy is defined by the will to knowledge. This is the will to master absolute truth, which contains in itself the aspiration to break through the vicarious world of phenomena into the noumenal world. In deconstruction, Derrida identifies the objective of liberating himself from the absolute, which he defines as the essence of logocentrism. To achieve this, the philosopher introduces the concept of différance. Consequently, the concept of Différance calls into question the very notion of truth — logos — as a self-subsistent entity. It prompts us to consider the possibility that the centre, in retreating into the past or slipping away into the future, may no longer occupy a fixed position. Deconstruction would permit the actual world to manifest as a multitude of indications of its existence, and the universe would become a purely phenomenal entity. This world contains a distinction that is not the source of expedient development; rather, it acts as a source of aimless kaleidoscopic movement of a multitude of heterogeneous and heteronomous instances. In this context, the French scientist does not permit either synthesis or assimilation. The multitude of heterogeneous and heteronomous instances appear to be engaged in an endless struggle for power, akin to the actions of certain centres of power. Derrida offers a critique of structuralism, seeking to dismantle the notion of static, unified, and absolute structures. In Western metaphysics, the concept of dynamics is employed in opposition to that of statics. Dynamics may be understood as a dialectical process of development of the absolute. The scientist posits that this absolute is, in fact, the very concept of logocentrism, which must be deconstructed. As a result of the deconstruction process, the development process becomes non-dialectical. The concept of purposiveness of development, the idea of a cause of emergence, and the notion of an ordering centre in this development are all rendered meaningless. In the process of deconstruction, Derrida arrives at a notion of development in which there is a becoming without unity, the content of which is multiplicity without truth.

In contemporary philosophy, especially in the field of text and discourse theory, the question remains relevant: what is the role of the author, the centralised subject, the source of meaning? Traditional approaches tend to attribute a certain authoritative function to the author — he 'gives' meaning. Deconstruction offers a different view: meaning never belongs entirely to the author; the text 'speaks' beyond the author's intentions and contains traces of other discourses and other texts, which complicates the simple model of author → text → reader. Through "textual analysis" of Derrida's classic texts, especially *Of Grammatology* (1967), we can see how he shows that the words 'to write' (écrire) and 'speech' (parole) already intersect, and that the priority of speech over writing (in the metaphysics of presence) is constitutively undermined. Derrida introduces the concept of "trace" — the mark, the imprint of the absent, as that which makes pure authorial meaning impossible.

A phenomenological analysis of the reading experience shows that the reader is constantly confronted with gaps, failures, interlinear meanings, and instability of meaning. This is consistent with the deconstructive idea of "undecidability" — the impossibility of finally deciding what meaning the text wants to 'say'. Comparative studies allow us to compare how different traditions (continental philosophy, analytical philosophy of text, philosophy of language) respond to this problem. Analytical philosophy often retains the idea of stable meaning and the author as the guarantor of meaning; deconstruction shows that even analytical texts contain aporias, irremediable ambiguities, and hidden assumptions. Thus, applying deconstruction to the theory of text and discourse allows us to rethink the problem of authorship and the centre, and move towards a model of decentralisation of meaning, where meaning is a process rather than an object.

Construction/deconstruction of binary oppositions in philosophical discourse

Many philosophical traditions use a variety of binary oppositions: presence/absence, body/soul, nature/culture, reason/sensibility, etc. These pairs are often hypostatised with one side elevated to the rank of dominant. Deconstruction is a way of showing that these oppositions are not neutral and that the subordinate

term ('absence', 'culture', 'sensuality') plays a role in the very structure of meaning, although it is often ignored. In Derrida's texts (*Margins of Philosophy*, *Dissemination*), he often returns to the 'deconstruction of binaries', revealing that one side cannot exist without its opposite and that they are mutually dependent. For example, the logic of presence presupposes the logic of absence, and vice versa. Textual analysis of specific philosophical discourses (e.g., analysis of contemporary philosophers working with identity, culture, technology) through deconstruction can reveal hidden hierarchies and shadow moments: e.g., when 'nature' is opposed to 'technology,' but 'nature' itself is no longer neutral, it is populated with cultural meanings and traces. Through deduction and generalisation, we can conclude that deconstruction frees philosophy from dogmatic binaries and opens up space for more flexible, differentiated thinking.

Deconstruction of the category 'speech/writing'

One classic example is the deconstruction of the opposition between speech and writing. Traditionally, speech was considered to have priority because it is a direct expression of thought, whereas writing is secondary and derivative. Derrida questions this hierarchy, showing that writing is constitutively present in speech (within its traces of writing) and that the very act of speech already presupposes written-structural moments. A textual analysis of fragments from *La Voix et le Phénomène* (1967) demonstrates how the idea of the direct presence of the voice is destroyed under the pressure of reflection on the sign, symbol, and trace. Deconstruction here functions not simply as a reading of the text, but as an intervention: it shows that this binary division cannot be removed, but it can be folded, revealing its internal tension and instability [3]. The reader understands that "speech" and "writing" are not pure terms; they are always already intersected. From this point of view, the problem of the "source of meaning" shifts: there is no pure voice, no pure writing—there are only textual interactions, a chain of differences. Thus, deconstructive analysis allows us to reconsider the fundamental categories of the philosophy of language and text.

Language as a network of differences and traces: deconstruction in linguistics

In linguistics, especially in semiotics and sign theory, one of the central tasks is to understand how a sign conveys meaning. Structuralism (Saussure et al.) proposed a model in which the meaning of a sign is determined through a system of differences (structures). Deconstruction, however, shows that this model is unstable in itself: difference is never complete, it always implies further differences and traces.

The article "Derrida and Language: Deconstruction" examines how deconstruction challenges the dominant idea of stable meaning: "meaning can be attributed to other meanings... the structures... are stereotyped... deconstruction... meaning can be reconstructed" [4]. This approach can be applied to the problems of translation, ambiguity, polysemy, and computer text analysis (e.g., in NLP), where algorithms usually rely on stable lexical meanings. Phenomenological analysis of the perception of meaning in speech/text shows that language is perceived as "living", changing, ambiguous, and that the reader/listener "adds meaning" and "completes" the meaning based on the context and traces of other meanings. Comparative studies between Western linguistics and the linguistic traditions of Asia or Africa show that the concept of "single meaning" is often imposed by the Western European model. Deconstruction helps to rethink such translations and show that meaning in different cultural contexts is already embedded in different "traces".

Deconstruction in cultural studies, identity, power and marginality

Cultural studies and cultural criticism often take the position of analysing power, hegemony, and marginality. Deconstruction provides a powerful tool: by deconstructing dominant discourses, it reveals their shadow elements, aporias, and implicit exclusions. For example, the discourse of gender, race, and colonialism can be analysed through the deconstruction of binary categories (centre/periphery, master/subordinate, normal/other). At the same time, phenomenological analysis of the perception of the cultural 'other' and textual analysis of cultural products (literature, cinema, multimedia) can reveal how dominant systems of meaning structure exclusions. A review of contemporary literature shows that such approaches are already being applied: the article "The Deconstructive Method in Philosophy and Its Applications in the Arab-Islamic Heritage: Mohamed Arkoun as a Model" demonstrates how deconstruction is used for critical analysis of the Islamic intellectual heritage, revealing internal contradictions and opportunities for upgrading. Another example is architecture: the article "Extending Derrida's Theory of Deconstruction: A Philosophical Critique of the Deconstruction Style in Contemporary Architecture" criticises the superficial appropriation of deconstruction in architecture and proposes a deep philosophical approach to the textuality of space [5]. This shows that cultural artefacts (buildings, space) can be viewed as "texts" and subjected to deconstruction. Another direction is "ethical deconstruction": the article "Immanent Ethics and Deconstruction" explores how deconstructive ethics can be understood as immanent ethics, revising morality not as an external code, but as

embedded in the textuality of responsibility [6]. Thus, deconstruction becomes an instrument of cultural criticism aimed at liberating fields of meaning from rigid hegemonies.

Jacques Derrida and modernity: réception and criticism

Derrida died in 2004, but his legacy is actively discussed and criticised. The article "Deconstruction Overflowed: Doing Undoing from Philosophy's Outer Edge" examines how deconstruction goes beyond philosophy and becomes a "practice of removal, unfolding" that influences other disciplines [7]. In the article "Derrida and Policy: Is Deconstruction Really a Social Science?", author Martin McQuillan considers the possibility of applying deconstruction to politics and social practice. He questions whether politics as such can be "deconstructed" and how this would affect the philosophy of decision-making [8]. Some critics, on the contrary, argue that deconstruction has exhausted itself and must be overcome [9]. This is "post-deconstruction" rhetoric. However, the present article argues holds promise for the further development of deconstruction—not as a dogma, but as a strategic tool.

Specific thinkers and trends

Jean-Luc Nancy, Gilles Deleuze, Jacques Lacan, Paul de Man — already in the 20th century, they interacted with a criticised deconstruction, expanding it in dramatic directions. In the 21st century, thinkers working at the intersection of philosophy and technology, digital humanism, and biopolitics are showing interest: deconstruction of "life" (bio-deconstruction), deconstruction of networks, algorithms, data, media, "artificial intelligence as text". For example, a special issue of the journal *Angelaki* features a collection of articles on "Derrida: Ethics in Deconstruction", which discusses the connection between deconstruction and responsibility, sovereignty, and the living [10]. Works such as "Naturalising Deconstruction" also show attempts to integrate deconstruction into cognitive research or scientific approaches, overcoming the opposition between "anti-deconstruction" and "scientific approach" [11]. Thus, contemporary thinkers apply deconstruction as a strategy rather than a dogma, adapting it to the tasks of media culture, ethics, politics, and data.

Synthesis and generalisation: deduction and generalisation of conclusions

The following generalisations can be deduced from the cases and methods described above:

1. The method of deconstruction is not a fixed technique, but a strategy of critical intervention in texts, discourses and structures [12], which requires flexibility, attention to context and the ability to transfer the burden of meaning to the margins.

2. Deconstruction is useful where traditional binary oppositions (centre/periphery, presence/absence, nature/culture) create logical, ethical, or cultural tensions [13]; deconstruction can expose these tensions and offer more subtle, decentralised models.

3. In the humanities and cultures of the digital age, deconstruction takes on new forms [14]: text becomes multimodal, medial; data and algorithms become part of the "text"; identities and subjectivities are not fixed but fluid. Consequently, the method of deconstruction can be modernised (but not "neutralised") for these polyform fields.

4. The limitations of the method are no less important [15]: the inability to provide definitive solutions, the risk of slipping into relativism, the complexity of the method, its resistance to practical disciplines. Therefore, its application must be accompanied by methodological self-awareness, possibly integration with other approaches (e.g., critical theory, pragmatism, empirical methods).

5. The prospects for the development of deconstruction lie in its heterogeneous application, interdisciplinarity, and constant self-critical renewal [16]. Deconstruction may become not a "final theory" but a flexible paradigm that adapts to new challenges in culture, technology, and politics.

Conclusion

In this article, we have demonstrated how Jacques Derrida's method of deconstruction can be applied to solving current problems in contemporary philosophy (in the textual and discursive spheres), linguistics, and cultural studies, as well as how it is used or can be modernised in the 21st century. Using methods such as literature review, textual and phenomenological analysis, comparative studies, deduction, generalisation, we have shown that deconstruction remains a powerful critical tool capable of revealing hidden structures of meaning, revising binaries, and deconstructing hegemonic discourses. Nevertheless, it is important to consider its weaknesses: it does not offer ready-made solutions, sometimes seems abstract and difficult to read, and can be misunderstood or oversimplified. From the point of view of the future, its strength lies in its flexibility, its ability to transition between disciplines, its combination with other methods, and its constant self-reflection. Ultimately, deconstruction may become not a "method-setting" but a constant philosophical prac-

tice—an activity aimed at revealing hidden meanings, responsibility, decentralisation, and innovation. In an era when meaning, authorship, identity, and power are increasingly fluid, new perspectives on the application of deconstruction seem not only relevant but almost necessary.

References

1 Lawlor, L. (2015). Jacques Derrida. *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. E.N. Zalta (Ed.). (Spring 2015 ed.). Retrieved from https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2015/entries/derrida/.

2 Deconstruction (n.d.). In *Encyclopædia Britannica*. Retrieved from https://www.britannica.com/topic/deconstruction.

3 Schultz, W., & Fried, L.L.B. (Eds.). (1992). *Jacques Derrida (Routledge Revivals): An annotated primary and secondary bibliography*. Routledge. Retrieved from https://www.routledge.com/Jacques-Derrida-Routledge-Revivals-An-Annotated-Primary-and-Secondary-Bibliography/Schultz-Fried/p/book/9781138204065.

4 Yegen, C., & Abukan, M. (2014). Derrida and Language: Deconstruction. *International Journal of Linguistics*, *6 (2)*, 37. https://doi.org/10.5296/ijl.v6i2.5210.

5 Teimouri, S., Mostafavi, S., & Bakhtiarian, M. (2021). Extending Derrida's Theory of Deconstruction: A Philosophical Critique of the Deconstruction Style in Contemporary Architecture. *Wisdom and Philosophy*, *17 (66)*, 127–150. https://doi.org/10.22054/wph.2021.53878.1878.

6 Parsa, M. (2024). Immanent Ethics and Deconstruction. *Angelaki: Journal of the Theoretical Humanities*, *29 (1–2)*, 263–274. https://doi.org/10.1080/0969725X.2024.2322298.

7 Briggs, R. (2023). Deconstruction overflowed: Doing undoing from philosophy's outer edge. *Symposium: Canadian Journal of Continental Philosophy*, *27 (1)*, 119–141. Retrieved from https://espace.curtin.edu.au/handle/20.500.11937/96381.

8 McQuillan, M. (2008). Derrida and policy: Is deconstruction really a social science? *Derrida Today*, *1 (1)*, 119–130. https://doi.org/10.3366/E1754850008000110.

9 Wood, D. (1987). Beyond deconstruction? *Royal Institute of Philosophy Supplements*, *21*, 175–194. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1358246100000355.

10 Stocker, B. (2024). Derrida: Ethics in deconstruction. *Angelaki: Journal of the Theoretical Humanities*, *29 (1–2)*, 1-2. https://doi.org/10.1080/0969725X.2024.2322247.

11 Roden, D. (2005). Naturalising deconstruction. *Continental Philosophy Review*, *38*, 71–88. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11007-005-9004-z.

12 Karpenko, A. (2013). The contemporary paradigm of philosophical reflection of deconstruction. *Skhid*, *6 (120)*, 163–166. https://doi.org/10.21847/1728-9343.2012.6(120).16711.

13 Bernardo, M. (2023). Deconstruction as deconstruction of humanisms in Derrida. *Revista Filosófica de Coimbra*, *64 (5)*. https://doi.org/10.14195/0872-0851_64_5.

14 Florentsen, P. (1996). Deconstruction, philosophy, and literature: Readings of Jacques Derrida. *Orbis Litterarum*, *51 (2)*, 67–98. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-0730.1996.tb00001.x.

15 Garg, D.S. (2021). Jacques Derrida's deconstruction: An overview. *International Journal for Research Publication and Seminar*, *12 (2)*, 93–100. Retrieved from https://jrps.shodhsagar.com/index.php/j/article/view/127.

16 Soltani, F. (2022). Dismantling strategy in post-structural criticism and undermining mechanisms. *Dirasat: Human and Social Sciences*, *49 (5, Suppl. 1)*, 395–408. https://doi.org/10.47015/49.5suppl.1.

Е.К. Чонгаров, Қ.С. Бағашаров, Н.Е. Тутинова

Ж. Деррида деконструкциясын пайдаланудың жаңа перспективалары

Мақалада Ж. Деррида философиясының аз зерттелген мәселелері қарастырылған. Авторлар деконструкция саласындағы тіл мәселесін, сондай-ақ батыс метафизикасының қатысу проблемаларын ашады. Француз философының идеялары жаңа аспектіде талданған. Еуропалық мәдени философиядағы жазу концепциясын зерттеудің жаңа тәсілдері талданды. Дерриданың деконструкция теориясы мәтіннің жаңа құрылымын іздеу және жазудың жаңа мағынасы мен ұғымын құрастыру ретінде көрсетілген. Постқұрылымшылар мәтінінің логикалық құрылымы жаңаша талданды. Логоцентризмнің концепциясы мен мағынасы жаңа қырынан зерттелді. Мақаланың мақсаты — қазіргі батыс мәдениетінің жаңа философиялық және феноменологиялық аспектілерін деконструкция призмасы арқылы талдау, сондай-ақ қазіргі философияның проблемаларын анықтау. Мақалада көрсетілген материалдар маңызды және қазіргі еуропалық философияның түрлі курстарында пайдаланыла алады. Сонымен қатар мақаланың ақпараты жаңа перспективаларға ие, себебі лингвистикалық философияны зерттеуге бағытталған жаңа ғылыми жобаларда қолданыла алады. Авторлар мақалада зерттеу әдістерін қолдана отырып, лингвистикалық философияның және деконструкция теориясының жаңа аспектілерін анықтаған.

Е.К. Чонгаров, К.С. Багашаров, Н.Е. Тутинова

Новые перспективы применения деконструкции Ж. Деррида

В статье рассмотрены малоизученные проблемы философии Ж. Деррида. Авторы раскрывают проблему языка в сфере деконструкции, а также проблемы западной метафизики присутствия. Идеи французского философа проанализированы в новом аспекте. Проанализированы новые подходы к исследованию концепции письма в европейской культурной философии. Теория деконструкции Деррида показана как поиск новой структуры текста и конструирование нового значения и понятия письма. По-новому проанализирована логическая структура текста постструктуралистов. По-новому проанализирована концепция и значение логоцентризма Цель статьи — проанализировать новые философские и феноменологические аспекты современной западной культуры через призму деконструкции, а также выявить проблемы современной философии. Материалы, представленные в статье, являются значимыми и могут быть использованы в различных курсах современной европейской философии. Информация статьи обладает новыми перспективами, поскольку может быть применена в новых научных проектах, направленных на изучение лингвистической философии. В статье авторы, используя исследовательские методы, обнаружили новые аспекты лингвистической философии и теории деконструкции.

Ключевые слова: культура, текст, семиотика, понятие письма, поструктурализм, язык, значение письма, логическая структура текста, деконструкция, феноменология, экзистенциализм, бинарные структуры.

Information about the authors

Chongarov Yerzhan — Candidate of Philosophical Sciences, Associate Professor of Kazakh Russian Medical University, Department of Social Studies, Almaty, Kazakhstan, http://orcid.org/0009-0009-9435-7345

Bagasharov Kudaiberdi — PhD, Associate Professor of Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Department of Religious and Cultural Studies, Almaty, Kazakhstan, http://orcid.org/0000-0003-0051-9163

Tutinova Nurgul — PhD, Associate Professor, Scholar Secretary of Karaganda National Research University named after academician Ye.A. Buketov, Karaganda, Kazakhstan, https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3476-7328