

## PHILOSOPHICAL ASPECTS OF THE PHENOMENON OF GIFT EXCHANGE: FROM DYSTOPIA TO POSTSTRUCTURALISM

<sup>1</sup>Bazasheva S.E., <sup>2</sup>Badmaev V.N., <sup>3</sup>Ismagambetova Z.N., <sup>4</sup>Karabayeva A.G.

<sup>1,3,4</sup> Al-Farabi Kazakh National University (Almaty, Kazakhstan)

<sup>2</sup> Southern Scientific Center of the Russian Academy of Sciences  
(Russian Federation, Rostov-on-Don)

<sup>1</sup>symbat\_erkin@mail.ru; <sup>2</sup>badmav07@yandex.ru; <sup>3</sup>zuchra-50@mail.ru;

<sup>4</sup>alia.karabaeva@yandex.kz

<sup>1</sup>Базашева С.Е., <sup>2</sup>Бадмаев В.Н., <sup>3</sup>Исмагамбетова З.Н., <sup>4</sup>Карабаева А.Г.

<sup>1,3,4</sup> Әл-Фараби атындағы Қазақ ұлттық университеті (Алматы, Қазақстан)

<sup>2</sup> Ресей ғылым академиясының Оңтүстік ғылыми орталығы  
(Ресей Федерациясы, Ростов на Дону)

<sup>1</sup>symbat\_erkin@mail.ru; <sup>2</sup>badmav07@yandex.ru; <sup>3</sup>zuchra-50@mail.ru;

<sup>4</sup>alia.karabaeva@yandex.kz

**Abstract.** One of the little-studied problems in philosophy is the study of the phenomenon of gift exchange. In the history of philosophical thought, this problem has not received sufficient attention. However, in each philosophical concept, many philosophers, depending on the needs of the historical time, addressed this problem. In modern conditions, a few representatives of structuralist and post-structuralist, and then postmodernist philosophy began to pay attention to this problem, such as J. Baudrillard, M. Foucault, J. Deleuze, and others, who consider the gift not only as a form of social connection, but also as a tool for undermining existing structures of power, subjectivity, and cultural norms. The authors of this article ask themselves why this is happening. According to the article's authors, to understand this phenomenon, it is necessary to turn to philosophical interpretations of the gift and gift exchange. This approach not only allows for the analysis of the evolution of this concept in the Western intellectual tradition (from T. More and G. Hegel to post-structuralism) but also enables the identification of its critical potential in understanding modern social processes.

The authors of this article consider various philosophical aspects of the study of the phenomenon of gift exchange, ranging from the utopian and Enlightenment understanding of the gift as an act of service to society to the poststructuralist vision of the gift as a symbolic gesture that undermines the system of equivalent exchange. The philosophical concepts of the gift are analyzed, such as those of T. More, G. W. F. Hegel, D. Diderot, C. Levi-Strauss, M. Foucault, J. Baudrillard, J. Deleuze, and F. Jullien. Particular attention is paid to the various functions of the gift: epistemological, social, moral, political, and deconstructive.

**Keywords:** gift exchange; recognition; structure; symbolic exchange; economic exchange; power; schizoanalysis; Utopia.

---

\* Author-correspondent - Ismagambetova Z.N., zuchra-50@mail.ru;

## *Introduction*

In the context of modern transformations in social relations, the crisis of consumer logic and the growing interest in alternative forms of interaction between people are making the phenomenon of gift exchange increasingly significant as an object of philosophical analysis. A gift that goes beyond utilitarian and market exchange opens up opportunities for rethinking the moral, social, and political foundations of human interaction. The relevance of the topic is also due to the fact that in the philosophy of the 20th–21st centuries, there has been a shift in emphasis in the interpretation of the gift: from its classical understanding as an act of service and manifestation of virtue to the symbolic, political, and deconstructive potential of this act. The relevance of this problem is also determined by the fact that turning to philosophical interpretations of the gift and gift exchange allows not only to analyze the evolution of this concept in the Western intellectual tradition (from T. More and G. Hegel to poststructuralism), but also to identify its critical potential in understanding modern social processes. This makes the study not only theoretically significant but also socially in demand.

**The purpose of this article** is to trace the transformation of the concept of gift exchange in European thought from the era of humanistic utopias to the post-structuralist philosophy of the 20th century.

### ***Objectives of the article:***

1. To reveal the philosophical understanding of the phenomenon of gift exchange in the context of the ideas of T. Hobbes, G. Hegel, and D. Diderot as representatives of classical European thought.

2. Analyze how the concept of gift is rethought in structuralist and poststructuralist philosophy of the 20th century (C. Lévi-Strauss, M. Foucault, J. Baudrillard, J. Deleuze, F. Julien).

## *Methodology*

In the course of the study, the authors relied on a comparative-contrastive approach, based on the collection and analysis of philosophical works by philosophers of the New Age and a number of representatives of poststructuralist and postmodernist philosophy, which allowed the authors to interpret gift exchange as a complex cultural practice, significant for the reproduction of social structures, symbolic communication and the preservation of cultural identity.

In the course of their work, the authors relied on the interpretive analysis of philosophical texts, the conceptual reconstruction of the conceptual apparatus, and a comparative approach that allows them to compare various philosophical positions regarding the nature of the gift, its subjects, functions, and boundaries. The focus is not so much on the gift as a social practice, but on the gift as a philosophical figure capable of revealing hidden mechanisms of interaction between the individual, society, knowledge, and power.

**Research methods:** interpretive analysis of philosophical texts and sources; comparative-contrastive method for determining the contribution to the philosophical understanding of gift exchange.

*The Phenomenon of Gift Exchange in the Context of Western European  
Philosophy: Hobbes, Diderot, Hegel*

In the 16th–17th centuries, profound social, economic, and religious changes occurred in Western Europe. These changes caused a crisis of the traditional social order and gave rise to a desire to comprehend a new model of a just society. The era of modern times, in which Thomas Hobbes lived, was a time of profound social, political and intellectual transformations. In these conditions, the problem of relationships between people becomes especially important, and T. Hobbes suggests considering a gift as an expression of a disinterested act of interaction has a limited meaning, since it comes from the idea of a person as a creature driven primarily by fear, egoism and the desire for self-preservation; therefore, stability and social order arise not from a gift, but from a rational agreement between individuals transferring part of their rights to the sovereign for the sake of security. Hobbes considers gift exchange in his work “Leviathan” as a form of interaction that undermines the stability of the social contract, since it implies action outside the contractual logic of exchange. It can upset the balance of power if there is no immediate equivalent response [4, pp. 257-289].

In contrast, Denis Diderot, on the contrary, considers the gift as a manifestation of morality and mutual respect, integrating it into the framework of enlightenment ethics [9, pp. 351-353]. He actively explored how people interact with each other in the context of morality, ethics, and social order, which can be seen as hidden forms of exchange in society [9, pp. 355-356]. Diderot considers the gift as a form of intellectual gift to society, as a form of moral attitude [9, pp. 360-363; pp. 365-369]. According to the philosopher, gift exchange also performs such a function as the connecting principle of society (intellectual, moral, and emotional exchange). In this case, the gift is the mechanism of the ethics of an enlightened person, and it appears as a voluntary service to reason and truth [9, pp. 376-379]. Another function of the gift is a form of criticism of society, which reveals or shows the perversion of exchanges in conditions of inequality and subordination [9, pp. 381-382]. In our opinion, Diderot considers knowledge, morality, and sensuality as elements of exchange between people. In his philosophy, the gift is expressed through intellectual and moral altruism. Gift here is an act of free participation in the work of enlightenment and moral development [9, pp. 386-388].

In Hegel’s Phenomenology of Spirit, the gift receives a dialectical status - it is an act of recognition, in which one subject sacrifices a part of himself for the sake of recognition by another, and in this gesture, the formation of self-awareness begins. Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel did not write directly about gift exchange, but his dialectical philosophy and the concept of mutual recognition, presented in the work Phenomenology of Spirit, are important for understanding exchange as a mutual act. Recognition between the “I” and the “Other” acts as a form of symbolic gift, where the subject gives a part of himself in order to be recognized and receives a reciprocal act. Here, the gift is not a thing, but an act of recognition as the basis of social ethics [3, pp. 254-256]. Hegel believes that the essence of the gift is in its immateriality. Although Hegel does not directly address the concept of the gift in its traditional or anthropological sense, his concept of recognition (Anerkennung), as outlined in the Phenomenology of Spirit (1807), can be interpreted as the foundation of philosophical gift exchange in the immaterial, symbolic, and ethical dimensions. At the center of

his dialectic of subjectivity is the interaction between two self-consciousnesses, each of which strives for recognition from the other as a necessary condition for its own completion [3, pp. 261-264].

The classical Hegelian scene, the dialectic of master and slave, is not only a struggle for power, but also an existential exchange in which each participant renounces complete autonomy for the sake of establishing a relationship of reciprocity. Recognition here functions as a symbolic gift, not equivalent in nature, but necessary for the existence of the subject as such. Thus, the Hegelian subject is constituted not in isolation, but through the exchange of recognitions, which act as immaterial acts of “gifting oneself” to the Other [3, pp. 273-274]. It is important to emphasize that for Hegel, recognition presupposes a mutual sacrifice of self-sufficiency: each subject must risk oneself by abandoning the original isolation and entering into a relationship based on the recognition of the freedom of the other. Here, the ethical nature of the gift is manifested: in contrast to a simple act of transfer, the gift as recognition presupposes an internal transformation of the subject. In this sense, a gift for Hegel is not a thing or a good, but an act with an ethical-ontological dimension [3, p. 280].

Hegel’s dialectic of recognition lays the foundations for what would later be developed as an ethical theory of mutual recognition in philosophy, where a gift can be a concept through which reflection on social justice, respect, love, and solidarity is carried out. In this vein, recognition can be seen as a performative gift that is not simply transferred, but creates a social reality – status, subjectivity, moral equality [3, pp. 284-289]. Thus, Hegel’s philosophy can be interpreted as the foundation for a philosophy of the gift, where the gift is devoid of a material character but retains the central function: the formation of relationships and meanings through sacrifice, reciprocity, and self-disclosure. It is not measurable, is not subject to return in an equivalent form, but is necessary for the development of man as a subject in the world of the spirit.

### ***The Structuralist Dimension of the Gift: Levi-Strauss***

Unlike previous philosophers, Claude Levi-Strauss, a representative of the 20th century, considers gift exchange as a structure of social order. In the works of Claude Levi-Strauss, especially in “Structural Anthropology”, the gift appears as a universal code underlying social interaction and cultural representation [12, pp. 57-61]. In his works, such as “Elements of the Structure of Kinship”, Levi-Strauss develops the theory of gift exchange, perceiving it as one of the foundations of social ties that structure human societies. Levi-Strauss viewed gift exchange not only as an act of material or symbolic exchange, but also as the basic structure through which social relations are created and maintained. In his philosophical and anthropological theory, gift exchange functions as a way of strengthening kinship and social ties, ensuring the stability of society and cultural integration [13, pp. 73-77].

An important point in Levi-Strauss’s analysis is his concept of exchange as a symbolic act. For him, gift exchange becomes the key to understanding not only kinship relations but also broader social and cultural structures. Exchange here not only creates social ties but also functions as a way of transmitting and transforming symbolic meanings. Not only are material goods transmitted through exchange, but also socio-cultural codes, identities, power relations, and significance. This process of exchange,

as a symbolic act, is important for understanding social dynamics in a broader context [12, pp. 95-98]. Thus, Levi-Strauss expands the concept of gift exchange, making it a major social and cultural category. [12, pp. 112-116; 13, pp. 94-96].

### ***Gift and Power: A Poststructuralist Deconstruction***

Poststructuralist thought radically revises the concept of the gift. In Michel Foucault's *Discipline and Punish*, any acts of giving can be interpreted as forms of power, discipline, and strategic management of bodies [18, pp. 254-260]. The gift becomes an element of the network of power embedded in institutions, rituals, and language. Foucault views power not as sovereign repression, but as a relational network that permeates society. In this context, exchange and giving become part of power relations. The gift is perceived here not as a material object, but as an act that participates in the formation of subjects. For example, confession can be seen as a form of gifting truth, where an individual provides information about themselves in exchange for recognition and definition of their identity.

*Ritual practices and gifting.* Foucault analyzes ritual practices such as marriage, where individuals enter into relationships that define their roles and identities. He notes that in antiquity, family life was seen as the art of being together, creating a new unity. In this context, sexual pleasures within marriage are justified as a way of preserving reason and honor, reflecting the complex relationship between personal practice and social expectations. Although Michel Foucault does not provide a direct theory of gift exchange, his studies of power, subjectification, and discursive practices allow us to consider the gift as a philosophical category. Foucault presents gift exchange as an act through which subjects form their identity and participate in social structures, reflecting the complex relationship between personal practice and social institutions.

Unlike Michel Foucault, Jean Baudrillard radicalizes the theme of the gift in his works, especially in "Symbolic Exchange and Death". In "Symbolic Exchange and Death", Jean Baudrillard argues that modern consumer society destroys the very possibility of the gift. Everything becomes a simulation of exchange, in which the gift is only an illusion concealing the absence of genuine meaning [2, pp. 184-189]. A real gift, according to Baudrillard, is impossible in a society where everything is an exchange of equivalents. For him, the gift becomes a gesture of overcoming the system - the destruction of equivalence, going beyond the framework of commodity thinking. The gift, as a philosophical category for Jean Baudrillard, is not just an act of exchanging gifts or things, but a deeply symbolic process associated with power, duty, and the structure of social relations.

The key element of Baudrillard's philosophy is the distinction between symbolic and economic exchange. Economic exchange is an exchange subject to the logic of equivalence, calculation, and profit. In contrast, symbolic exchange goes beyond rationality: it is based on gesture, ritual, and non-equivalence. Baudrillard argues that in the act of gifting, there is no exchange of "things" as is customary in economics. Something more occurs - an exchange of statuses, debts, challenges, and lives. This is a form of interaction in which the principle of equivalence is violated, and a space of ritual violence, power, and freedom arises. In Baudrillard's thinking, a gift is always a gesture of challenge. Having accepted a gift, a person is obliged to return it - not

necessarily in material terms, but in a symbolic equivalent. Failure to respond to a gift is an admission of dependence, subordination, and loss of status [2, pp. 218-224]. Thus, a gift becomes not so much an expression of generosity as a means of affirming hierarchy. It creates an asymmetrical situation in which one person dominates another through sacrifice. Sacrifice, suicide, revolutionary act – all these forms are considered by Baudrillard as extreme forms of gift, undermining the dominant order. They reveal the fundamental anti-economic nature of symbolic exchange: here, it is impossible to measure, calculate, or balance [2, pp. 236-248].

According to Baudrillard, modern society practically destroys the possibility of a genuine gift. In the era of universal commodification, a gift becomes just another simulacrum: it imitates symbolic exchange, but in fact serves the same economy – attention, image, capital. A gift turns into a marketing tool, a gesture into a self-presentation strategy, and charity into a form of capitalization of morality. Thus, the very essence of a gift as a gesture of loss, as an act free from calculation, disappears. A gift, according to Baudrillard, is not only a philosophical category but also a metaphor for liberation, a gesture that violates the logic of consumption, undermines stable structures of meaning, and returns the possibility of acting outside the system to the subject [2, pp. 257-268].

In the philosophy of Jean Baudrillard, gift exchange appears as a radical alternative to the logic of capitalist rationality. It is a form of symbolic interaction based on challenge, sacrifice, and asymmetry. In a consumer society where everything tends to become a commodity and be exchanged according to the rule of equivalence, the gift itself is in danger of disappearing. However, it is precisely this – as an act of resistance, as a gesture that goes beyond simulation – that remains the possibility of genuine action and the restoration of the lost human dimension.

### *The Gift as Becoming: Deleuze and Jullien*

In Gilles Deleuze, we do not find a direct theoretical analysis of gift exchange, but his philosophy, especially in collaboration with Felix Guattari, offers a completely different perspective on this phenomenon. The gift exchange here goes beyond the social function, acquiring an ontological and political dimension. It is revealed as an event, a becoming, an affective and bodily contact that cannot be reduced to economics or symbolic debt. For Deleuze, the gift is impossible in its traditional understanding as an act of will of the subject. His entire philosophy is a critique of the subject as the center of action. In this vein, the gift becomes a pre- or extra-subjective dynamic. It is not performed by “someone” and is not directed “at someone” – it occurs as pure becoming, as an encounter. This correlates with Deleuze’s concept of the immanent event, described in the work “Difference and Repetition”, where the event is not an action, but a change in intensity, a distribution of affects. In this system, a gift is thought of as a continuation of desire, producing not objects, but connections, differences, and breaks. This makes it possible to think of a gift outside the logic of return or debt [7, p. 156-167].

In “Anti-Oedipus” (1972), Deleuze and Guattari argue that desire is not a lack but a positive, productive machine. Exchange in this logic is not something regulated by rules, but something that is associated with fragmentary flows, machines of the body without organs. The gift here is possible as a redistribution of affect, energy, and



meaning, which cannot be coded. It violates the system of the capitalist codifier, which seeks to translate everything into an equivalent. This is the gift as an anti-ideological gesture, neither utilitarian nor symbolic in the traditional sense, but expressive, creating new modes of communication. One of the key concepts of Deleuze and Guattari – the rhizome (“A Thousand Plateaus”, 1980) – helps to understand gift exchange as a non-linear, decentralized process. The gift does not flow in the vertical of domination (from the giver to the recipient), but is distributed across multiple nodes, like a rhythm, like an infection, like an impulse. The gift in rhizomatic logic is a transfer without beginning or end, without ownership or appropriation. It exists in the form of becomings: becoming-a-woman, becoming-an-animal, becoming-invisible. It is a movement, not a thing [6, p. 265-267].

In Deleuze’s understanding, the ethics of the gift acts as the ethics of becoming. For Deleuze, ethics is not normativity, but the ability to produce difference, to strengthen life. In this sense, gift exchange acquires the status of an ethical act of becoming, in which a person ceases to be himself and enters into contact with the other. This gift is not a transfer of a resource, but a transfer of potential: the ability to be different, diverse, multiple [5, pp. 96-98]. This radically distinguishes Deleuze’s understanding from gift exchange in Mauss or Levi-Strauss. For the latter, it is always a structure, a cycle, a social scheme, and for Deleuze, it is intensity, destructuring, and explosion. Thus, Deleuze’s philosophy allows us to rethink gift exchange as a category that goes beyond traditional ideas. The gift here is not an act of the subject, not a transfer of a thing, and not an obligation, but a spontaneous, non-economic circulation of desire, affect, becoming. It is a gift without debt, without return, without intention. This is a gift as a scattering, as an opening of form, as an opportunity to be different. And in this lies its true philosophical potential.

Unlike Deleuze and Guattari, François Jullien, in his “Treatise on Efficiency”, offers a radically different cultural understanding of the gift, based on Chinese philosophy. For him, the gift is not a sacrifice, but an imperceptible influence, a soft current that undermines Western binary logic [9, pp. 139-142]. If previous philosophers examined the gift in the context of Western philosophy, then, unlike them, Jullien considers Chinese thought as an alternative to Western metaphysics. In his analysis of Chinese philosophy, one can find ideas similar to the gift – especially in the context of indirect action, compliance, and non-conflictual interaction. For Jullien, the gift may not be expressed explicitly, but be built into the very course of events, as “hidden efficiency” [9, pp. 151-153].

In the context of gift exchange, Julien offers a unique perspective, contrasting the Western understanding of the gift as an exchange and obligation with the Chinese approach, where gift exchange is viewed as a principle underlying social and cultural interactions [10, pp. 96-98]. Julien notes that in Chinese philosophy, gift exchange is not limited to a simple exchange of goods or services. He views it as a principle that regulates relationships between people and between a person and the world. This principle is based on mutual respect, harmony, and balancing of forces, which reflects a deep understanding of the interdependence of all things [10, pp. 105-108]. In the Chinese tradition, gift exchange is often perceived as an act aimed at maintaining harmony and order in the world, rather than as a means of achieving personal gain or fulfilling social obligations. This differs from the Western approach, where gift

exchange is often viewed through the prism of economic and social obligations [10, pp. 110-113]. In comparing Chinese and Western philosophies of the gift, Julien highlights several key differences:

- Principle versus obligation: In Chinese philosophy, gift exchange is perceived as a principle regulating relationships, whereas in the Western tradition, it is often viewed as an obligation or duty.
- Harmony vs. Calculation: The Chinese approach emphasizes maintaining harmony and balance, while the Western approach often focuses on calculation and mutual benefit.
- Cosmological context vs. social context: In Chinese philosophy, gift-giving is viewed in the context of cosmology and human interaction with the world, whereas in Western philosophy, it is often viewed in a social context.

Jullien argues that these differences highlight the importance of understanding the gift not only as a social phenomenon but also as a philosophical principle that can enrich our perception of human relationships and interactions. François Jullien offers a deep and multi-layered understanding of gift exchange that goes beyond traditional Western concepts. His work encourages a rethinking of the role of the gift in human relationships and highlights the importance of taking cultural and philosophical differences into account when analyzing social and cultural practices.

Thus, in the course of the study, the authors attempted to assess the philosophical approaches of 7 key authors: Thomas Hobbes, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel, Denis Diderot, Claude Levi-Strauss, Michel Foucault, Jean Baudrillard, Gilles Deleuze and François Jullien, on the basis of which an attempt was made to determine their contribution to the understanding of gift exchange and the definition of its role in socio-cultural communication, as it is rethought depending on the cultural and historical context.

### *Conclusion*

Thus, by comparing and contrasting various philosophical and theoretical approaches to the study of the phenomenon of gift exchange, the authors have determined not only the variability of the understanding of the gift, but also an understanding of its fundamental role in the formation of socio-cultural structures. If, in Hobbes's interpretation, the gift becomes an element of political subordination, then in Diderot's philosophy it acquires an Enlightenment coloring, emphasizing the moral basis of reciprocity. Hegel, in the spirit of dialectics, sees in the gift a moment of recognition and alienation, anticipating modern interpretations. Poststructuralist thinkers, such as Baudrillard, Foucault, Deleuze, and Julien, rethink the gift as a form of power, a simulacrum, a rhetorical strategy, or even as a means of evading rigid binary oppositions. Consequently, gift exchange turns from a simple act of reciprocity into a multi-layered structure reflecting the complexity of the social, political, and philosophical structure of modernity. A comparative analysis of gift-exchange concepts shows that the gift is not only a form of social action, but also a philosophical model that can be used to analyze subjectivity, power, structure, and difference, as well as from the regulated action in Hobbes's theory of the social contract to Julien's philosophy of the "invisible gift," along a path in which the concept of the gift loses its ambiguity and acquires critical power. The gift ceases to be simply an act of generosity – it becomes



a field of philosophical struggle: for recognition (Hegel), for a simulacrum of reality (Baudrillard), for becoming (Deleuze), for cultural multiplicity (Julien). In this sense, gift-exchange turns out to be not only a practice, but also a metaphor for philosophizing itself in the context of cultural, political, and ontological complexity. Thus, tracing the path of the gift from the philosophy of order to the philosophy of difference, we see how gift-exchange becomes a key concept for critically understanding both social structures and the very foundations of philosophical thinking.

### *List of references*

- 1 Baudrillard J. Consumer Society: Its Myths and Structures / translated from French by N. A. Shakhovskaya. – Moscow: Respublika, 2006. – P. 272
- 2 Baudrillard J. Symbolic Exchange and Death / translated from French by N. A. Shakhovskaya. – Moscow: Dobrosvet, 2000. – P. 184-268
- 3 Hegel G. V. F. Phenomenology of Spirit / translated from German by A. G. Berman. – Moscow: Nauka, 1977. – P. 254-280
- 4 Hobbes, T. Leviathan, or Matter, Form, and Power of the Ecclesiastical and Civil State / T. Hobbes; translated from English by A. A. Zaykova. – M.: Canon+, 2001. – P. 257-289
- 5 Godelier M. Gift and Duty: The Social Life of Things / trans. from French by A. I. Grigorieva. – M.: Nauka, 1992. – 288 p.
- 6 Deleuze J., Guattari F. Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia / trans. from French by E. Savelyeva. – Ekaterinburg: U-Factoria, 2004. – P. 89-98
- 7 Deleuze J. A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia / J. Deleuze, F. Guattari; trans. from French by V. M. Lurye. – Yekaterinburg : U-Faktoriya, 2004. – P. 262-267
- 8 Deleuze, J. Difference and Repetition / J. Deleuze; trans. from French by V. M. Lurye. – St. Petersburg : Petropolis, 1998. – 448 p.
- 9 Diderot, D. Conversation between d'Alembert and Diderot // Philosophical Works / D. Diderot; trans. from French and notes by S. L. Goldstadt. – Moscow: Nauka, 1971. – P. 351-388
- 10 Jullien, F. Treatise on Efficiency / trans. from French by A. V. Pogonyailo. – Moscow: Logos, 2005. – P. 139-153
- 11 Jullien, F. Time and the Gift / trans. from French N. Guseva. - M.: Nauka, 2002. - P. 96-113
- 12 Lévi-Strauss K. Structural anthropology / trans. from French E. M. Meletinsky. - M.: Nauka, 1985. - P. 57-116
- 13 Levi-Strauss, K. Elementary structures of kinship / K. Levi-Strauss; lane from French N. A. Shakhovskoy and others - M.: Nauka, 1985. - P. 65-96
- 14 More T. Utopia / trans. from lat. V. M. Lurie. – St. Petersburg: Azbuka-Classik, 2013. – P. 124-128
- 15 Mauss M. Essay on the Gift: Form and Basis of Exchange in Archaic Societies / translated from French by S. Yu. Neklyudova. – Moscow: Nauka, 1996. – P. 137-148
- 16 Foucault M. The Will to Truth: Beyond Knowledge, Power, and Sexuality / translated from French by S. D. Borisenko. – Moscow: Castal, 1996. – 288 p.
- 17 Foucault M. Hermeneutics of the Subject: Lecture Course at the Collège de France, 1981–1982 / translated from French by S. Borisenko. – St. Petersburg: Nauka, 2009. – P. 321-328
- 18 Foucault M. To supervise and to punish: the birth of the prison / translated from French by N. Guseva. – Moscow: Nauka, 1999. – P. 254-260
- 19 Foucault M. The birth of biopolitics / translated from French by S. M. Monakhova. – St. Petersburg: Nauka, 2009. – 352 p.

*Transliteration*

- 1 Baudrillard, Zh. Obshchestvo potrebleniia: ego mif i struktury / per. s frants. N. A. Shakhovskaia. – M.: Respublika, 2006. – S. 272.
- 2 Baudrillard, Zh. Simvolicheskii obmen i smert' / per. s frants. N. A. Shakhovskaia. – M.: Dobrosvet, 2000. – S. 184–268.
- 3 Gegel', G. V. F. Fenomenologiya dukha / per. s nem. A. G. Bermana. – M.: Nauka, 1977. – S. 254–280.
- 4 Gobbs, T. Levafan, ili Materiia, forma i vlast' gosudarstva tserkovnogo i grazhdanskogo / T. Gobbs; per. s angl. A. A. Zaikova. – M.: Kanon+, 2001. – S. 257–289.
- 5 Godel'e, M. Dar i dolg: sotsial'naia zhizn' veshchei / per. s frants. A. I. Grigorieva. – M.: Nauka, 1992. – 288 s.
- 6 Delez, Zh., Guattari, F. Anti-Edip: kapitalizm i shizofreniya / per. s frants. E. Savel'evoi. – Ekaterinburg: U-Faktoriia, 2004. – S. 89–98.
- 7 Delez, Zh., Guattari, F. Tysiacha plato: kapitalizm i shizofreniya / per. s frants. V. M. Lur'e. – Ekaterinburg: U-Faktoriia, 2004. – S. 262–267.
- 8 Delez, Zh. Razlichie i povtorenie / per. s frants. V. M. Lur'e. – SPb.: Petropolis, 1998. – 448 s.
- 9 Didero, D. Razgovor d'Alambra s Didero // Filosofskie sochineniia / per. s frants. i primech. S. L. Goldshtadta. – M.: Nauka, 1971. – S. 351–388.
- 10 Zhiull'en, F. Traktat ob effektivnosti / per. s frants. A. V. Pogoniailo. – M.: Logos, 2005. – S. 139–153.
- 11 Zhiull'en, F. Vremia i dar / per. s frants. N. Gusevoi. – M.: Nauka, 2002. – S. 96–113.
- 12 Levi-Stross, K. Strukturalnaia antropologiya / per. s frants. E. M. Meletinskogo. – M.: Nauka, 1985. – S. 57–116.
- 13 Levi-Stross, K. Elementarnye struktury rodstva / per. s frants. N. A. Shakhovskoi i dr. – M.: Nauka, 1985. – S. 65–96.
- 14 Mor, T. Utopiya / per. s lat. V. M. Lur'e. – SPb.: Azbuka-Klassika, 2013. – S. 124–128.
- 15 Moss, M. Opyt o dare: forma i osnovanie obmena v arkhaiskikh obshchestvakh / per. s frants. S. Iu. Nekliudova. – M.: Nauka, 1996. – S. 137–148.
- 16 Fuko, M. Volia k istine: po tu storonu znaniia, vlasti i seksual'nosti / per. s frants. S. D. Borisenko. – M.: Kastal', 1996. – 288 s.
- 17 Fuko, M. Germenevtika sub'ekta: kurs lektsii v Kollezhe de Frans, 1981–1982 / per. s frants. S. Borisenko. – SPb.: Nauka, 2009. – S. 321–328.
- 18 Fuko, M. Nadzirat' i nakazyvat': rozhdenie tiur'my / per. s frants. N. Gusevoi. – M.: Nauka, 1999. – S. 254–260.
- 19 Fuko, M. Rozhdenie biopolitiki / per. s frants. S. M. Monakhova. – SPb.: Nauka, 2009. – 352 s.

**Базашева С.Е, Бадмаев В.Н., Исмагамбетова З.Н., Карабаева А.Г.**

**Сыйлық алмасу құбылысының философиялық аспектілері: антиутопиядан постструктурализмге дейін**

*Аңдатпа:* Философияда аз зерттелген мәселелердің бірі сыйлық алмасу құбылысын зерттеу болып табылады. Философиялық ой тарихында бұл мәселеге жеткілікті көңіл бөлінбеген. Дегенмен, әрбір философиялық концепцияда көптеген философтар тарихи уақыт талабына қарай осы мәселеге тоқталды. Заманауи жағдайда сыйлықты тек әлеуметтік байланыстың нысаны ретінде ғана емес, сонымен бірге биліктің субъектілік құрылымдары мен мәдени нормаларын бұзудың құралы ретінде қарастыратын Дж.Бодрийар, М.Фуко, Ж.Делез және т.б. сияқты құрылымдық және постструктуралистік,

содан кейін постмодернистік философияның бірқатар өкілдері бұл мәселеге назар аудара бастады. Осы мақаланың авторлары неге бұлай болып жатқанына қызығушылық танытады. Мақала авторларының пікірінше, бұл құбылысты түсіну үшін сыйлық пен сыйлық алмасудың философиялық түсіндірмелеріне жүгіну керек. Бұл тәсіл батыстық интеллектуалдық дәстүрдегі (Т. Мор мен Г.Гегельден постструктурализмге дейін) осы концепцияның эволюциясын талдап қана қоймай, оның қазіргі әлеуметтік процестерді түсінудегі сыни қабілетін анықтауға мүмкіндік береді.

Мақала авторлары сыйлық алмасу феноменін зерттеудің әртүрлі философиялық аспектілері қарастырылады - сыйлықты қоғамға қызмет ету актісі ретінде утопиялық және ағартушылық тұрғыдан түсінуден сыйлықты эквивалентті айырбастау жүйесін бұзатын символдық қимыл ретіндегі постструктуралистік көзқарасқа дейін. Т.Мордағы, Г.В.Ф.Гегельдегі, Д.Дидродағы, Ш.Леви-Стростағы, М.Фукодағы, Дж.Бодрийардағы, Ж.Делездегі және Ф.Жюльендегі сыйлықтың философиялық концепциялары талданады. Сыйлықтың әртүрлі функцияларына ерекше назар аударылады: гносеологиялық, әлеуметтік, моральдық, саяси және деконструктивтік.

**Түйін сөздер:** сыйлық алмасу; мойындау; құрылым; символдық алмасу; экономикалық алмасу; қуат; шизоанализ; утопия.

**Базашева С.Е., Бадмаев В.Н., Исмагамбетова З.Н., Карабаева А.Г.**

**Философские аспекты феномена дарообмена: от антиутопии к постструктурализму**

**Аннотация:** Одной из мало исследованных проблем в философии является исследование феномена дарообмена. В истории философской мысли этой проблеме не уделяли достаточного внимания. Однако, в каждой философской концепции многие философы в зависимости от потребностей исторического времени обращались к этой проблеме. В современных условиях этой проблеме стали уделять внимание ряд представителей структуралистской и постструктуралистской, а затем и постмодернистской философии, как: Ж. Бодрийяр, М. Фуко, Ж. Делёз и др., которые рассматривают дар не только как форму социальной связи, но и как инструмент подрыва существующих структур власти, субъективности и культурных норм. Авторы данной статьи задаются вопросом, почему это так происходит. По мнению авторов статьи, для понимания этого феномена необходимо обращение к философским трактовкам дара и дарообмена. Такой подход позволяет не только проанализировать эволюцию этого понятия в западной интеллектуальной традиции (от Т. Мора и Г. Гегеля до постструктурализма), но и выявить его критический потенциал в осмыслении современных социальных процессов.

Авторы данной статьи рассматривают различные философские аспекты изучения феномена дарообмена — от утопического и просвещенного понимания дара как акта служения обществу до постструктуралистского взгляда на дар как на символический акт, нарушающий систему эквивалентного обмена. Анализируются философские концепции дара, как: Т. Мора, Г. В. Ф. Гегеля, Д. Дидро, К. Леви-Стросса, М. Фуко, Ж. Бодрийера, Ж. Делеза и Ф. Жюльена. Особое внимание уделяется различным функциям дара: эпистемологической, социальной, моральной, политической и деконструктивной.

**Ключевые слова:** дарообмен; признание; структура; символический обмен; экономический обмен; власть; шизоанализ; утопия.

*Received 22.07.2025*

*Accepted 01.09.2025*