

A.A. Boranbayev¹, J.N. Nurmanbetova¹, K.M. Bolysova^{2*}

¹*L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, Astana, Kazakhstan*

²*Astana International University, Astana, Kazakhstan*

(E-mail: boranbayev88.88@mail.ru, jamilya_nur@mail.ru, kuralai_2702@mail.ru)

Features of the ontological approach to art in philosophy

This article examines art from an ontological perspective. Classical and contemporary philosophical concepts that explain the essence of art, its significance, and its role in human life were considered. The author explored art not merely as an aesthetic phenomenon but as a fundamental manifestation of human existence. The interrelation between art and reality, the existential and metaphysical dimensions of artistic creativity, as well as the epistemological, axiological, and communicative aspects of art, were analyzed. The article discussed the ideas of thinkers such as Plato, Aristotle, Heidegger, and Gadamer regarding the ontological foundations of art and offers new perspectives on its existential significance. At the present stage, the reconsideration of the ontological meaning of art has become an urgent issue. Is art merely a reflection of reality, or does it shape reality itself? What is its relation to being? These questions occupy an essential place in philosophical discourse. Particularly in the postmodern era, the relationship between art and reality has become even more complex. This article conducts an ontological analysis of art, examining its relation to being and truth. Additionally, the ontological foundations of art are explored within the context of Kazakhstani philosophy and culture.

Keywords: art, ontology, being, reality, aesthetics, existentialism, postmodernism, metaphysics.

Introduction

Art is a unique phenomenon that reveals the profound layers of human existence. It is not merely an aesthetic tool depicting beauty but also a means of comprehending reality, understanding being, and grasping the connection between humans and the world. In philosophy, the ontological foundations of art have been studied since antiquity. Plato viewed art as a reflection of the world of ideas, while Aristotle emphasized its cognitive function through the theory of mimesis. Modern thinkers such as Heidegger and Gadamer have interpreted art as a phenomenon that unveils being itself.

The appeal to the ontological analysis of art arises from an interest in its fate in the contemporary world. From a pragmatic standpoint, art may appear to be an ontological phenomenon with no direct connection to life, possessing a seemingly “romantic” character. However, today it is increasingly marginalized within the cultural sphere, overshadowed by scientific and technological creativity.

An ontological approach to art examines its relationship with reality. Some philosophers, such as Plato, considered art merely a shadow of true reality, whereas Martin Heidegger saw it as a means of revealing truth. According to Heidegger, art is a unique experience that unveils hidden aspects of being. Thus, art is not only a subjective aesthetic experience but also an expression of ontological truth.

The ontological dimension of art also encompasses its connection to human consciousness and existence. Existentialist philosophers like Jean-Paul Sartre and Albert Camus viewed art as a medium for expressing existential crises, freedom, and the search for meaning. Additionally, the ontology of art explores

its relationship with time and space: while an artwork is a product of a particular historical era, it may also possess a timeless existence.

In contemporary philosophy, the ontological nature of art is reconsidered in the context of new technologies and virtual spaces. Digital art and AI-generated creations challenge traditional notions of reality and being. Thus, an ontological perspective helps deepen our understanding of art's essence and its role in human life.

For this reason, identifying certain characteristics of the ontological foundations of art becomes a central objective. In this pursuit, it is essential to highlight the distinctive features of an ontological approach to art. The development of the ontological perspective in the history of art philosophy represents a significant area of inquiry. If art and being are considered as distinct realms, it becomes necessary to determine the unique relationship between them. This article examines the differentiation between the concepts of being (Sein) and existence (Seiendes) in relation to the essence of art and explores the possibility of analyzing the relationship between art and the artistic work not only on an ontic but also on an ontological basis.

Clarifying the fundamental characteristics of the ontological approach to art reveals the depth and complexity of the research scope. In this regard, several key aspects must be considered in advancing the ontological understanding of art. These include a deeper examination of the ontological structure of the relationship between art and being, the distinction between the ontic and ontological boundaries of art, and the exploration of the possibility of "purely ontic" or "purely ontological" art, along with their forms of mutual interaction.

In contemporary art, ontological tendencies undergo significant transformations, particularly in movements such as postmodernism, conceptualism, and digital art. Within this context, it is crucial to analyze how these changes shape both traditional and modern cultures. The ontological nature of art cannot be confined to an ontic perspective alone. Art is not merely a social, epistemological, or aesthetic phenomenon; rather, it must be primarily regarded as a mode of revealing being. This underscores the fundamental purpose of art — to uncover the profound connections between being and human existence.

Research methods

The methodological foundation of this study is based on ontological, hermeneutic, phenomenological, and existential approaches. The ontological method considers art as a phenomenon of being, analyzing its connection with reality. This perspective is grounded in Plato's theory of the world of ideas, Aristotle's concept of mimesis, and Heidegger's interpretation of being. The hermeneutic method is employed to explore the understanding and interpretation of artworks, analyzing the semantic structure and epistemological role of art through Gadamer's "hermeneutic circle" and Ricoeur's theory of symbolic interpretation. Additionally, the phenomenological method is applied to investigate subjectivity and perception in art. Based on the phenomenology of Husserl and Merleau-Ponty, this approach examines the role of intuition and lived experience in artistic creativity.

By integrating these methods, this study offers a comprehensive ontological analysis of art, reinterpreting its relationship with being and truth from a new perspective.

Discussion

The ontological foundations of art have been extensively explored in philosophy, aesthetics, and cultural studies. From antiquity to the present, numerous theoretical approaches have emerged on this subject. In ancient philosophy, Plato and Aristotle examined art through the lens of mimesis — the imitation of reality. While Plato criticized art as a mere shadow of the world of ideas, Aristotle viewed it as a cognitive and educational phenomenon that induces catharsis. During the Middle Ages and the Renaissance, art was regarded as a reflection of divine truth, acquiring a theological dimension. Thomas Aquinas linked the ontological significance of art to the divine order of creation.

In modern philosophy, Kant and Hegel explored the autonomy and spiritual essence of art. Kant investigated the ontological foundations of aesthetic judgment, whereas Hegel interpreted art as an expression of the Absolute Spirit. The 20th century, influenced by existentialism and phenomenology, deepened the study of art's relation to human existence. Heidegger perceived art as a mode of revealing truth, while Gadamer emphasized its hermeneutic nature. Sartre and Camus examined artistic creativity as an expression of human freedom and existential experience.

Contemporary research, within the frameworks of postmodernism and structuralism, further complicates the ontological understanding of art. Thinkers such as Deleuze, Derrida, and Baudrillard have

analyzed the intricate relationship between art and reality, emphasizing its simulacral nature. While the ontological dimension of art has been thoroughly explored in philosophy, its reconsideration in the context of contemporary cultural and technological transformations remains a crucial issue.

In Kazakhstani philosophical and cultural discourse, the ontological foundations of art are explored within the contexts of national worldview, traditional aesthetics, and contemporary cultural processes. In Kazakh culture, the ontological basis of art is deeply interconnected with nature, the spiritual realm, and human existence. Music, handicrafts, poetry, and aitys are not merely aesthetic values but also serve as means of understanding the world and expressing national identity. Kazakh philosophers such as Abai, Shakarim, and others have provided profound insights into the essence of art.

During the Soviet period, the ontology of Kazakh art was primarily examined through materialist and Marxist-Leninist methodologies. However, scholars of that era, including A. Margulan, M. Auezov, G. Musabayev, and T. Kakishev, paid significant attention to the historical development and national characteristics of Kazakh art.

Following Kazakhstan's independence, the ontological aspects of Kazakh art have been studied in the context of national self-awareness, the synthesis of tradition and modernity. Kazakhstani philosophers and cultural theorists such as Zh. Moldabekov, D. Kishibekov, G. Yesim, T. Gabitov, A. Kasymzhanov, and others analyze the spiritual, existential, and axiological dimensions of art. They view art as a manifestation of being and explore its role in society and cultural dynamics.

In contemporary Kazakhstani art, a synthesis of traditional and modern philosophical perspectives is evident. Contemporary artists, musicians, theater directors, and filmmakers integrate national identity with global trends, shaping a new ontology of art. For instance, writers such as Askar Suleimenov, Abdizhamil Nurpeisov, and Dauren Kuat address existential and metaphysical themes in their works. Visual artists like Sayat Isembayev, Moldabekov, and Sarsenbi reinterpret the relationship between art and being through innovative forms.

The ontological approach to art is a philosophical stance that considers art as a mode of being. From this perspective, art is not merely an aesthetic phenomenon but also a way of perceiving, understanding, and shaping reality.

Since ontology is the philosophical study of the nature of being, the ontological dimension of art is concerned with its relationship to reality. Plato viewed art as a weak imitation of the world of ideas, while Aristotle considered it as mimesis, a representation that reveals the essence of being. For Heidegger, art is a means of unveiling being itself, whereas Gadamer interpreted it as a cognitive process.

Thus, the ontological foundations of art remain a central topic in philosophical discourse, demanding continuous reconsideration in light of contemporary cultural and technological transformations.

If art is linked to truth, a fundamental philosophical question arises: does art merely represent reality, or does it create a new form of being? Hegel viewed art as a manifestation of the Absolute Spirit, whereas Nietzsche saw it as a medium for human self-expression and individual freedom. Postmodern philosophers such as Baudrillard and Deleuze, however, cast doubt on the ontological foundations of art by conceptualizing it as a simulacrum, a mere copy of reality with no inherent truth.

Existentialists like Sartre and Camus argued that art serves as a means for individuals to explore their authentic existence. According to them, art is not merely an aesthetic or cognitive phenomenon but an existential tool through which human beings confront their anxieties, freedom, mortality, and the fundamental nature of life itself.

One of the key ontological questions examined in this study is whether art exists beyond time or is inherently historical. In classical philosophy, art was often considered a medium for expressing eternal ideas, whereas contemporary thinkers argue that it is inseparable from cultural and historical contexts. This distinction adds to the complexity of understanding the ontological essence of art.

Hegel's insights from over a century and a half ago have become increasingly relevant in contemporary discussions on art. He asserted that modern forms of art, influenced by the intellectual evolution of the spirit, have gradually lost their original significance. Writers now incorporate philosophical reflections into their works, often neglecting the emotional impact on the audience. At the same time, audiences and readers tend to perceive art — even classical masterpieces — through a purely rational lens.

“Indeed, there is hope that art will continue to evolve, but it is no longer the highest necessity of the spirit. We may recognize the perfection of Greek statues, the divine imagery of the Father, Christ, and the Virgin Mary, yet we no longer kneel before them.”

This observation is even more relevant to contemporary art. On the one hand, modern art increasingly gravitates toward rationalism under the influence of broader cultural developments. On the other hand, it has become self-referential, adhering to the principle of art for art's sake. This phenomenon may partially explain the decline in public interest in various forms of contemporary art.

Hegel's assessment remains highly pertinent today. Contemporary art, while striving for intellectual sophistication, has also become increasingly detached from its audience. It has shifted towards greater conceptual abstraction, prioritizing form and technical mastery over direct emotional or existential engagement.

A defining trend in modern artistic thought is the increasing acceptance of subjectivity in interpretation. This tendency has led to the belief that different readings of a single artistic work — whether a painting, a novel, or a theatrical role — are equally valid. In music, this phenomenon is evident in the growing emphasis on the performer's ability to reinterpret a composition, often placing the original meaning and intent of the piece in a secondary position.

Thus, contemporary art is marked by two opposing tendencies: on one hand, it embraces rationalization, making artistic expression more intellectually driven; on the other hand, it has become more complex in form, emphasizing technical mastery while distancing itself from direct engagement with the audience. This dual movement defines the ontological paradox of modern art, highlighting the need for a reassessment of its role in human experience.

The increasing focus on formalism in contemporary art has led to several paradoxical phenomena. For instance, the highly complex musical compositions of the 19th century, once performable only by the greatest musicians, are now accessible in music schools. At first glance, this appears to be a clear sign of progress. However, as the Soviet pianist and educator Heinrich Neuhaus noted, modern performers often find it easier to play technically demanding contemporary pieces than to convey the profound spiritual depth of seemingly simple works by great composers of the past [1].

This demonstrates a crucial distinction: a high level of technical skill does not necessarily constitute true art. Mastery of technique, in itself, is no different from craftsmanship. Similarly, the dominant trajectory of contemporary art does not necessarily lead to the revelation of its ontological essence. Ludwig Wittgenstein, in the early 20th century, remarked on a similar phenomenon:

“Modern cinema relates to old cinema in the same way that a modern automobile relates to a model from twenty-five years ago. It appears ridiculous and awkward in comparison. The improvement in cinema, like the refinement of automobiles, is merely a result of technical progress. But this so-called improvement should not be confused with an evolution of artistic style” [2].

These characteristics prevent contemporary art from fully revealing its ontological foundations. Unlike nature, in which creation appears autonomous, art is fundamentally linked to a creator — the human being. This naturally leads to an anthropological interpretation of art, which views human creativity as the central force in artistic production. However, the history of philosophy presents an alternative, contrasting approach: the ontological perspective. According to this view, the true creator of art is not the individual artist but a higher ontological force, with the artist merely serving as a conduit. Traditionally, this higher force has been identified with God or the divine.

The ontological interpretation of art is prominently found in Plato's dialogues, including *The Republic*, *Ion*, and *Phaedrus*. Among ancient philosophers, Plato developed the most comprehensive ontological theory of art. His ontological stance becomes particularly evident when contrasted with Aristotle's approach. While Aristotle acknowledges three main aspects of art — ontological, epistemological, and aesthetic — his primary focus leans toward the latter two. In contrast, many other ancient thinkers only touched upon the ontological perspective in fragmented ways.

In medieval philosophy, the ontological approach remained dominant, though Western European aesthetics of the time did not produce comprehensive treatises on art. Medieval philosophical works contain only a few dedicated sections on the nature of art. However, what characterizes medieval thought is its inherently ontological mode of reasoning. Unlike later traditions that would explicitly separate ontological, epistemological, and aesthetic dimensions, ancient and medieval thinkers viewed these aspects as an integrated whole. Among them, the ontological aspect played the most decisive role, stemming not from artistic experience alone but from a broader worldview shaped by a sense of cosmic harmony and contemplation.

The gradual rejection of the ontological understanding of art began during the Renaissance. While artists were still considered instruments of divine will, art itself — unlike in the Middle Ages — started to be

perceived primarily as a secular phenomenon. Until the emergence of German classical idealism, no significant development in the ontological perspective on art can be observed.

Kant, Hegel, and Schelling provided profoundly insightful interpretations of art. Although their primary approach was grounded in gnosology (the theory of knowledge), ontological elements were also present, particularly in Schelling's philosophy. From the second half of the 19th century, the ontological approach to art gained new momentum in Russian philosophy. Vladimir Solovyov's teachings, despite being incomplete, can be compared in depth and originality to the works of German idealists. Although Solovyov did not explicitly label his perspective as ontological, he clearly understood that it could not be classified as mere epistemology. His view opposed that of revolutionary democrats like Belinsky, Herzen, and Chernyshevsky, who saw art as a reflection of reality's typical and characteristic features. Instead, Solovyov's approach was closer to Schopenhauer's, as both philosophers considered art a contemplation of Platonic ideas, while science dealt with abstract concepts.

In the 20th century, as art was increasingly interpreted through a pragmatic lens, the ontological approach seemed archaic and less popular than epistemological and aesthetic methods. However, this did not mean its complete disappearance. Instead, ontology in art was often confined to an optical sense — viewing art as a result of humanity's relationship with being. This shift was closely tied to the broader process of the “de-divinization” of the world, and, in relation to art, the “de-divinization” of artistic creation itself. Existence was no longer considered a unified phenomenon but rather as a multiplicity of individual realities.

A crucial figure who advanced the ontological perspective on art in the 20th century — without theological elements — was Martin Heidegger. His philosophy of being remains one of the most significant contributions to modern thought. Traditional ontological views also found continuity in Neo-Thomist philosophy, but Heidegger redefined the understanding of art's ontological status through his distinction between *Sein* (Being) and *Seiendes* (beings). *Sein* (Being) — the fundamental basis of all that exists; the underlying possibility of existence itself. It is not a property of individual things but the very condition of their presence in the world. *Seiendes* (beings) — the individual objects, phenomena, and entities we encounter in everyday life.

Any artwork — whether a painting, a piece of music, a sculpture, or a literary text — exists at the level of *Seiendes*, meaning it is a specific, tangible object. However, its true meaning is revealed only at the level of *Sein*, where it reflects deeper existential truths. Heidegger argued that art is not merely an aesthetic or epistemological construct but a way of disclosing the essence of Being itself.

In art, the distinction between Being (*Sein*) and being-there (*Seiendes*) is particularly evident. A work of art is perceived at the level of *Seiendes* as a physical object (for instance, the material of a sculpture, the pigments of a painting, or the sounds of music). However, its true essence is revealed at the level of *Sein*. According to Martin Heidegger, art discloses Being, guiding us beyond the realm of ordinary objects toward their deeper meaning [3].

Heidegger conceptualizes art as a mode of truth's revelation. In his essay “The Origin of the Work of Art,” he describes art as a phenomenon that unveils reality, bringing it into unconcealment. Through art, we encounter Being from a new perspective and draw closer to its essence.

Thus, as a unique medium of disclosure, art elevates human consciousness beyond the mundane and into the realm of profound meanings. It is not merely an assemblage of objects but a phenomenon through which Being is understood.

Understanding the semantic structure and cognitive function of art is a fundamental concern of philosophical hermeneutics. In this context, Hans-Georg Gadamer's concept of the hermeneutic circle and Paul Ricoeur's theory of symbolic interpretation provide key methodological insights. Both thinkers regard art not merely as an aesthetic phenomenon but as a distinctive form of engaging with reality.

Gadamer places the hermeneutic circle at the core of his philosophy. He describes it as an inherent aspect of cognition, in which a person, possessing prior understanding, approaches a text (or a work of art) with preconceptions. These preconceptions, however, are revised and refined in the process of interpretation. This renders the reception of art a dynamic, interactive process, wherein a continuous dialogue unfolds between the viewer and the artwork. A full comprehension of an artwork begins with situating it within a historical and cultural context, yet its meaning is never confined solely to that context.

Ricoeur's theory of symbolic interpretation plays a crucial role in explaining the multi-layered nature of meaning in art. He considers art a symbolic structure, emphasizing its polysemy. In his view, a work of art is not restricted to a single meaning; rather, it offers each reader, listener, or viewer the opportunity for new interpretations. A symbol, in this sense, is a structure that both conceals deeper meaning and enables its

revelation at various levels. Art, therefore, is not merely a vehicle for transmitting information but a mediator that facilitates human engagement with Being.

By synthesizing Gadamer's and Ricoeur's perspectives, a deeper understanding of the epistemological role of art emerges. While Gadamer frames artistic interpretation within a hermeneutic circle shaped by preconceptions and experience, Ricoeur characterizes meaning as an open-ended symbolic structure that each recipient actively unveils. These perspectives move beyond a univocal conception of meaning, positioning art as an open, dynamic system that invites interpretation rather than prescribing a singular understanding.

From the perspective of the cognitive role of art, the views of Gadamer and Ricoeur describe it as a unique means of engaging with reality. For Gadamer, this is a dialogue between tradition and contemporary perception, while for Ricoeur, it is the understanding of Being through layered symbolism. Thus, art is not only a tool for aesthetic pleasure, but it also serves as a profound philosophical experience that allows individuals to explore both themselves and the world.

The role of perception and experience in artistic creation is a critical subject of study in phenomenology. The phenomenological philosophies of Edmund Husserl and Maurice Merleau-Ponty provide valuable insights into the cognitive and ontological aspects of this process. By examining their perspectives, we can delve deeper into the role of perception and experience in art, thus gaining a better understanding of the creative act and the viewer's reception of it.

In Husserl's phenomenology, perception is understood as a direct mode of consciousness. His idea of "aesthetic consciousness" emphasizes the role of intentional acts in artistic creation: the artist or writer directs the meaning within their consciousness into the artwork. In this process, subjective experience and semantic structures are closely interlinked. Husserl defines intentionality as the "always being directed towards something" by consciousness, meaning that the creative act is grounded in the artist's perception of reality, which is then reshaped in an artistic form. In this regard, perception functions as the foundational element in artistic creation, transforming reality into meaningful structures.

Merleau-Ponty's phenomenology shifts focus to the bodily and perceptual foundations of perception and experience. He argues that humans perceive the world not only through rational consciousness but also through their bodies and sensory experiences. This concept is crucial for understanding the semantic structure in art creation and reception. For Merleau-Ponty, artistic creation is a practical act realized through the sensory connection between humans and the world. For example, a painter senses the visual world through colors and forms and seeks to reconstruct it in their work. This process highlights the intimate connection between perception and experience.

From a phenomenological perspective, artistic creation is a way of elevating experience to the level of meaning. While Husserl describes this as the intentional presentation of meanings in consciousness, Merleau-Ponty emphasizes the decisive role of bodily experience. Thus, the creative act appears as a dialogue between subjective perception and objective reality. The artwork also becomes a phenomenological experience for the viewer or reader, who interprets it not only through visual or textual analysis but through their own sensory experiences and personal history.

In this context, perception is the starting point of artistic creation, while experience forms its content and expressive basis. The phenomenological perspectives of Husserl and Merleau-Ponty demonstrate that art is not merely an aesthetic phenomenon but also a unique form of knowing through perception and experience.

Russian religious philosophy has also contributed significantly to the development of ontological perspectives. Despite these ideas not being accepted by Soviet philosophy due to historical reasons, they are now considered a vital achievement of contemporary national philosophical thought. The primary principle of the teachings of philosophers like Berdyaev, Florensky, Vyacheslavtsev, Bulgakov, Ilyin, and others regarding art is ontologism. Interestingly, some of Florensky's key propositions share remarkable similarities with the ideas of Heidegger, which initially appear unrelated. This reveals the inner depth and intuitive resonance of their philosophical concepts [4].

As is well-known, Soviet art philosophy was largely dominated by Lenin's theory of representation. In this context, an epistemological approach to interpreting art predominated. Overall, the evolution of Soviet aesthetics can be described as a movement from vulgar sociologism to more nuanced epistemological frameworks. This progression can be seen in the works of researchers such as A. Andreev, N. Dmitrieva, A. Zis', B. Sushkov, E. Savostyanov, and others [5].

The history of philosophical doctrines regarding art was often assessed based on their level of acceptance of “progressive” epistemology. Conversely, the ontological approach was often regarded as decadent and regressive. This view is clearly expressed in A. Andreev’s work “Artistic Image and the Peculiarity of Art,” where he states: “The epistemological approach is a phenomenon typical of European aesthetic thought, but Marxism has grounded this theoretical tradition in true scientific foundations” [6].

At the same time, ontological approaches were also studied to some extent within Soviet philosophy, particularly in the works of philosophers such as M. Bakhtin and V. Bibler. However, these studies did not offer a fully comprehensive alternative to the ontological theory of art.

In philosophy, the relationship between inspiration and skill is considered on two levels: ontological (the level of Being) and ontic (the level of existence). Ontology is the branch of philosophy that investigates the deep nature of Being. From this perspective, inspiration and skill are seen as two essential dimensions that reveal the true essence of art. Inspiration, in this view, is the primal and foundational source of art. It is described as a force that originates from the depths of Being, beyond rational thought. While Plato interprets inspiration as the influence of divine spirit (from the world of ideas), Heidegger associates it with the moment of the revelation of Being.

Skill, on the other hand, is the form in which art materializes. If inspiration reveals the essence of art at the level of Being, skill is the means by which it is introduced into the material world. Skill becomes ontologically significant as the method by which Being manifests itself in art. From an ontological standpoint, skill is not only the tool through which inspiration is realized, but also the necessary element that defines the very existence of art. Without inspiration, art becomes a mechanical act, yet without skill, inspiration dissolves into chaos [7].

The ontic perspective focuses on the study of concrete objects and their properties. Here, inspiration and skill manifest in the individual experience of the artist. Inspiration at the ontic level is expressed through feelings, emotions, and intuition. Every artist, musician, or writer experiences it within their own creative process. Skill, from the ontic perspective, is defined by experience, technical abilities, and the mastery of compositional principles. It enables the realization of the creative act. At the ontic level, inspiration serves as the driving force behind creativity, while skill acts as its mechanism of execution. Without one, the other cannot fully bring art to life.

In conclusion, at the ontological level, inspiration and skill are considered phenomena that reveal the existential meaning of art, while at the ontic level, they manifest in the artist’s personal experience in the form of concrete skills and emotions. For art to possess true meaning, inspiration and skill must harmonize as complementary ontological and ontic aspects.

Conclusion

In exploring the ontological perspective on art in philosophy, we can summarize our thoughts as follows: The ontological nature of art is the manifestation of Being. However, ontological art always begins from the ontic level and becomes realized through a process of “overcoming the ontic.” This overcoming starts with the creative subject mastering the technical and content-specific characteristics of their art. Art consists of two levels: ontological and ontic. The interpretation of art occurs through the unique ontological nature of the human being. A person, as both the owner of existence and Being, transforms their inner Being into an external form through art.

An ontological work of art should appear as a unity: it must embody unity in diversity, infinity in limitation. To preserve the ontological nature of an artwork, it must exist not only as a mere being but also as a concrete manifestation of Being. These particularities allow for the distinction between the ontological and ontic approaches to art.

The ontological nature of art reveals that it cannot be reduced to a purely ontic phenomenon. If the ontic approach views art merely as an empirical representation of reality or a social phenomenon, the ontological approach sees art as a manifestation of Being, a tool for uncovering the inner essence of the world and the human being.

From this perspective, the ontological meaning of art lies in its closeness to Being. Art, in essence, is a way of unveiling Being, and artistic creation is a form of engaging with that Being. An artwork is not simply an object or a manifestation of subjective experience; it is, in itself, a phenomenon of Being. Therefore, its understanding demands an ontological approach, not just an aesthetic or epistemological one.

The creative subject (such as the artist, poet, or composer) acts as a carrier of Being. They draw from the ontic world and aim to elevate it to the level of ontological truth. In this sense, creativity reflects the

interaction between Being and time. The ontic and ontological dimensions of art always exist in dialectical unity. That is, the creative process begins with ontic elements and strives towards ontological truth.

The true ontological nature of art prevents it from being reduced to a mere source of aesthetic pleasure. Art is a unique way of revealing the essence of Being, and thus, it cannot be adequately understood as a phenomenon solely dependent on subjective perception.

In conclusion, the ontology of art is being explored at the intersection of national worldviews and contemporary philosophical inquiry. This area remains relevant, continuously evolving as it requires further development within the progress of culture and philosophy.

From the ontological viewpoint, art is not merely a form that depicts beauty, but rather a profound phenomenon that unveils Being, truth, and human meaning. From this perspective, the role of art is not only aesthetic but also philosophical, cognitive, and existential in nature.

References

- 1 Нейгауз Г. Размышления, воспоминания, дневники / Г. Нейгауз. — М., 1975. — 287 с.
- 2 Витгенштейн Л. Философские работы / Л. Витгенштейн. — М., 1994. — 415 с.
- 3 Хайдеггер М. Исток художественного творения / М. Хайдеггер. — М.: Академический проект, 2008. — 136 с.
- 4 Гончаренко Н.В. Гений в искусстве и науке / Н.В. Гончаренко. — М., 1991. — 248 с.
- 5 Лосев А.Ф. Эстетика Возрождения / А.Ф. Лосев. — М., 1998. — 214 с.
- 6 Андреев А. Художественный образ и специфика искусства / А. Андреев. — М., 1981. — 256 с.
- 7 Хайдеггер М. Бытие и время / М. Хайдеггер. — М., 1997. — 416 с.

А.А. Боранбаев, Д.Н. Нұрманбетова, Қ.М. Болысова

Философиядағы өнерге онтологиялық көзқарастың ерекшеліктері

Мақалада өнерге онтологиялық көзқарас тұрғысынан талдау жасалған. Өнердің болмысын, оның мәні мен адам өміріндегі рөлін түсіндіру үшін классикалық және заманауи философиялық тұжырымдамалар қарастырылған. Авторлар өнерді тек эстетикалық құбылыс ретінде емес, адам болмысының түпкі мәнін ашатын феномен ретінде зерделейді. Өнер мен шындықтың өзара байланысы, көркем шығармашылықтың экзистенциалдық және метафизикалық өлшемдері зерттеліп, өнердің танымдық, аксиологиялық және коммуникативтік қырлары сараланған. Мақалада өнердің онтологиялық негіздері туралы Платон, Аристотель, Хайдеггер, Гадамер сияқты ойшылдардың идеялары талданып, өнердің болмыстық маңызына қатысты жаңа көзқарастар ұсынылған. Қазіргі таңда өнердің онтологиялық мәнін қайта қарастыру өзекті мәселеге айналып отыр. Өнер тек шындықты бейнелей ме, әлде ол шындықтың өзін қалыптастыра ма? Оның болмысқа қатысы қандай? Бұл сұрақтар философиялық дискурста маңызды орын алады. Әсіресе, постмодернистік дәуірде өнер мен шындықтың арақатынасы бұрынғыдан да күрделене түсті. Өнерге онтологиялық көзқарас тұрғысынан талдау жасалып, оның болмыс пен ақиқатқа қатысы қарастырылған. Сонымен қатар, қазақстандық философия мен мәдениет контекстінде өнердің онтологиялық негіздері зерделенген.

Кілт сөздер: өнер, онтология, болмыс, шындық, эстетика, экзистенциализм, постмодернизм, метафизика.

А.А. Боранбаев, Д.Н. Нурманбетова, К.М. Болысова

Особенности онтологического подхода к искусству в философии

В данной статье проводится анализ искусства с онтологической точки зрения. Рассматриваются классические и современные философские концепции, объясняющие сущность искусства, его значение и роль в жизни человека. Искусство исследуется не только как эстетическое явление, но и как феномен, раскрывающий глубинную сущность человеческого бытия. Анализируется взаимосвязь искусства и реальности, экзистенциальные и метафизические измерения художественного творчества, а также познавательные, аксиологические и коммуникативные аспекты искусства. В статье рассматриваются идеи таких мыслителей, как Платон, Аристотель, Хайдеггер, Гадамер, касающиеся онтологических оснований искусства, а также предлагаются новые взгляды на его бытийную значимость. На современном этапе переосмысление онтологического значения искусства становится актуальной проблемой. Является ли искусство лишь отражением реальности, или же оно формирует саму реальность? Какова его связь с бытием? Эти вопросы занимают важное место в философском дискурсе. Особенно

в постмодернистскую эпоху отношение искусства и реальности стало еще более сложным. В данной статье проводится анализ искусства с онтологической точки зрения, рассматривается его отношение к бытию и истине. Кроме того, исследуются онтологические основания искусства в контексте казахстанской философии и культуры.

Ключевые слова: искусство, онтология, бытие, реальность, эстетика, экзистенциализм, постмодернизм, метафизика.

References

- 1 Neuhaus, G. (1975). *Razmyshleniia, vospominaniia, dnevniki [Reflections, memoirs, diaries]*. Moscow [in Russian].
- 2 Wittgenstein, L. (1994). *Filosofskie raboty [Philosophical works]*. Moscow [in Russian].
- 3 Heidegger, M. (2008). *Istok khudozhestvennogo tvoreniia [The source of artistic creation]*. Moscow: Akademicheskii proekt [in Russian].
- 4 Goncharenko, N.V. (1991). *Genii v iskusstve i nauke [Genius in art and science]*. Moscow [in Russian].
- 5 Losev, A.F. (1998). *Estetika Vozrozhdeniia [Aesthetics of Renaissance]*. Moscow [in Russian].
- 6 Andreev, A. (1981). *Khudozhestvennyi obraz i spetsifika iskusstva [The artistic image and the specifics of art.]*. Moscow [in Russian].
- 7 Heidegger, M. (1997). *Bytie i vremia [Being and Time]*. Moscow [in Russian].

Information about the authors

Boranbayev Aidarkhan — PhD student, Department of Philosophy, L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, Astana, Kazakhstan, <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-4451-1473>

Nurmanbetova Jamilya — Professor, Doctor of Philosophical Sciences, Academician, L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, Astana, Kazakhstan, <http://orcid.org/0009-0003-7194-8587>

Bolyssova Kuralay — Candidate of Philosophical Sciences, Assistant Professor, “Astana International University”, Astana, Kazakhstan, <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-7505-9187>