



DOI: 10.22363/2618-897X-2025-22-4-786-801

EDN: EZSZVZ

Research article / Научная статья

The Archetypal Invariant of Cyclicity: Syntax, Myth and Gender as Topological Models of Continuity Based on the Example of Proto-Turkic Contacts and the Cult of Osiris

Assiya R. Nurdubaeva 

Temirbek Zhurgenov Kazakh National Academy of Arts, Almaty, Republic of Kazakhstan

✉ 01nurasya@gmail.com

Abstract. This interdisciplinary study investigates the universal archetypal principle of cyclicity, which manifests synchronously in historically and geographically unrelated systems. The research is grounded in a historical review that confirms the probable presence of Proto-Turkic groups within the polyethnic nomadic confederations of the Scythian-Siberian world in the Near East (7th–4th centuries BCE). Consequently, a hypothesis is advanced about potential channels for the transmission of deep, structural-topological models, moving beyond mere superficial lexical patterns (cf. “Өcipic” in Kazakh — ‘cultivation’). The central focus of the analysis is the structural isomorphism of three distinct phenomena: the syntactic structure of the clitic “sw” in Late Egyptian, the mythological narrative of “death and rebirth” in the Osiris myth, and the social institution of the nomadic Turks (Kazakhs) — the clan system “Zheti Ata” (Seven Forefathers). The study analyzes these three systems as implementations of a single invariant — the principle of “reflexivity” and “closure.” This invariant is modeled using the topological figure of a torus (T^2), where the topological rupture, represented as “death,” functions not as a destructive force but as a constitutive element that ensures the system’s integrity and continuity. Thus, the subject’s position in the mythological narrative, syntax, and social organization of the clan emerges not merely as a linguistic phenomenon but as a fundamental code for organizing the spatiality of being, constructing a unified complex of “topological grammar.” The methodology of “cultural topology” enables the revelation of this deep kinship, demonstrating how culture encodes universal archetypes within its multi-level texts.

Key words: Proto-Turks, Scythian-Siberian world, syntax, Late Egyptian language, clitic, Osiris, Zheti Ata, archetype, cyclicity, topology, torus

Article history: received 10.08.2025; accepted 10.10.2025.

Conflict of interests: the author declares that there is no conflict of interests.

For citation: Nurdubayeva, A.R. 2025. “The Archetypal Invariant of Cyclicity: Syntax, Myth and Gender as Topological Models of Continuity Based on the Example of Proto-Turkic Contacts and the Cult of Osiris.” *Polylinguality and Transcultural Practices*, 22 (4), 786–801. <https://doi.org/10.22363/2618-897X-2025-22-4-786-801>

© Nurdubayeva A.R., 2025



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License
<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/legalcode>

Архетипический инвариант цикличности: синтаксис, миф и род как топологические модели непрерывности на примере прототюркских контактов и культа Осириса

А.Р. Нурдубаева 

Казахская национальная академия искусств им. Темирбека Жургенова, Алматы, Республика Казахстан

✉ 01nurasya@gmail.com

Аннотация. Настоящее междисциплинарное исследование обращено к универсальному архетипическому принципу цикличности, который проявляется синхронно в исторически и географически не связанных системах. Исследование основано на историческом обзоре, подтверждающем вероятное присутствие прототюркских групп в составе полиэтничных кочевых объединений скифо-сибирского мира на Ближнем Востоке (VII–IV вв. до н.э.). В этой связи выдвигается гипотеза о возможных каналах трансляции глубинных, структурно-топологических моделей, а не только поверхностных лексических паттернов ср. «Өсіріс» в каз. яз. — ‘взрачивание’. Центральным объектом анализа становится структурный изоморфизм трех разноуровневых феноменов: синтаксической структуры клитика «sw» в позднеегипетском языке, мифологического нарратива «смерти и возрождения» в мифе об Осирисе и социального института кочевых тюрков (казахов) — родовой системы «Жеті ата». Автором проанализированы эти три системы как реализации единого инварианта — принципа «возвратности» и «замыкания». Данный инвариант моделируется с помощью топологической фигуры тора (T^2), где топологический разрыв, репрезентируемый как «смерть», выступает не разрушительным, а конституирующим элементом, обеспечивающим целостность и непрерывность системы. Позиция субъекта в мифологическом нарративе, синтаксисе и социальной организации рода, таким образом, предстает не только как лингвистический феномен, но и как фундаментальный код организации пространственности бытия, выстраивающий «топологическую грамматику» в единый комплекс. Методология «топологии культуры» позволяет выявить это глубинное родство, демонстрируя, как культура кодирует универсальные архетипы в разноуровневых текстах.

Ключевые слова: прототюрки, скифо-сибирский мир, синтаксис, позднеегипетский язык, клитик, Осирис, Жеті Ата, родовая система, архетип, цикличность, топология, тор

История статьи: поступила в редакцию 10.08.2025; принята к печати 10.10.2025.

Конфликт интересов: автор заявляет об отсутствии конфликта интересов.

Для цитирования: Нурдубаева А.Р. Архетипический инвариант цикличности: синтаксис, миф и род как топологические модели непрерывности на примере прототюркских контактов и культа Осириса // Полилингвильность и транскультурные практики. 2025. Т. 22. № 4. С. 786–801. <https://doi.org/10.22363/2618-897X-2025-22-4-786-801>

Introduction

Written sources record a large-scale invasion of nomads, referred to by the general term ‘Scythians,’ into Asia Minor. According to Herodotus, this campaign lasted 28 years (c. 653–625 BC), during which they reached the borders of Egypt, where they were stopped by Pharaoh Psamtik I; some of them may have settled in the Sharuchen region [1. P. 78–80]. Historical analysis indicates the probable

presence of Proto-Turkic groups within the multi-ethnic nomadic associations of the Scythian-Siberian world in the Middle East in the 7th–4th centuries BC [2. P. 45–47]. It should be noted that traditional historiography identifies the ‘Scythians’ with Iranian-speaking peoples, while a number of researchers, including Yu. Zuev, point to the polyethnic nature of the Scythian-Siberian world, admitting the participation of eastern, Proto-Turkic groups from the Central Asian region, such as the Pazyryk culture of Altai, in the campaigns [2. P. 45–47]. Indirect evidence confirms their presence: finds of characteristic three-bladed arrowheads of the Scythian type in Palestine (Megiddo), which have direct analogies in Altai monuments [3. P. 155]. Assyrian and Babylonian archives mention mercenaries called ‘Cimmerians’ (Gimirrai) and ‘Scythians’ (Iškuza), who were integrated into the military structures of the states in the region [4. P. 89–91]. The biblical narrative (Book of Jeremiah, 50–51), which names ‘Ashkenaz’ (associated with the Scythians) among the enemies of Babylon, also emphasises the significance of the Scythian threat.¹ These data create the historical prerequisites for the hypothesis of intensive cultural contacts, under which bilingualism and language interference could have arisen, including the potential influence of Proto-Turkic elements on the linguistic structures of local civilisations.

The key hypothesis is that the historical interaction between Proto-Turkic (with a dominant cyclical archetype) and ancient Egyptian (with a dominant linear archetype) cultural codes may have led to a structural shift that materialised simultaneously in language, myth and social structure. This interaction was not a borrowing of vocabulary, but rather an encounter and synthesis of two archetypal models of existence: cyclical (Proto-Turkic), where time and genealogy are understood as a closed loop of eternal return; and linear (late Egyptian).

The problem: developing this hypothesis in the context of fragmentary historical evidence appears to be a difficult task. The assumption of a structural, and not just lexical, influence of Proto-Turkic groups on the cultural systems of Ancient Egypt is consciously made in the absence of direct and unambiguous historical evidence, since there is a chronological gap between the formation of the core of the myth of Osiris in the 24th–22nd centuries BC, recorded in the most ancient texts [5. P. 23–25], and the period of presumed contacts in the 7th–4th centuries BC [2. P. 45–47], makes the hypothesis of direct borrowing of the mythological plot impossible to prove. Similarly, direct linguistic evidence of Proto-Turkic presence in the region remains limited and controversial [4. P. 50]. Therefore, under these circumstances, the proposed approach does not claim to establish a causal relationship in its classical, historical-genetic sense. Instead, the direction is positioned as one of the possible ways of analysis, shifting the focus from the

¹ “The Book of the Prophet Jeremiah.” 2015. The Bible. The Books of the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments. Moscow: Russian Bible Society, pp. 854–918. Print. (In Russ.)

question ‘was there direct borrowing’ to the question ‘are there structural isomorphisms, that can be identified and modelled, and what is their epistemological potential’. The right to exist of this hypothesis is provided by the very nature of intercultural contacts in the Scythian-Siberian world, which, as historiography convincingly demonstrates, was fundamentally polyethnic and transcultural [2. P. 48–50; 4. P. 92–95]. In such ‘intercultural scenes,’ the transmission of ideas could take place not through texts, institutionalised education, and document genesis, but through practices, rituals, non-verbal codes, and structural patterns of thinking, which were materialised in language, social structure, and mythology synchronously, but did not always leave a clear trace of authorship in such borrowings. Therefore, this analysis treats its central hypothesis as a heuristic tool, proposing a topological model as a rigorous analytical apparatus for comparing heterogeneous systems — syntax, myth, and social institution. The value of this approach lies not in providing definitive proof of historical influence, but in demonstrating a deep structural kinship which, once revealed, opens up new perspectives for understanding the universal mechanisms of cultural code organisation and the archetypal foundations of human thought in the context of intercultural dialogue.

Method: ‘Cultural topology’ is an analytical method and is used as a rigorous analytical tool for identifying invariant structural relationships in heterogeneous cultural systems. Unlike classical structural analysis, which fixes static hierarchies, the topological approach focuses on the dynamics of meaning generation — the identification of internal connections, transitions, and points of condensation of meaning in the cultural field [6. P. 45]. The topological turn in the humanities was a response to the exhaustion of linear, hierarchical, and binary models of culture inherited from structuralism and classical anthropology. Space and social connections ceased to be understood as fixed ‘forms’ or stable ‘positions’; instead, attention focused on processes of connectivity, transitions and continuous deformations, and how meaning and form change while maintaining internal integrity.

The research methodology is implemented as a sequential procedure: 1. Identification of a structural archetype — identification of a recurring abstract pattern: ‘the principle of return and closure through rupture’ in multi-level cultural texts. 2. Construction of a formal model — description of the archetype by means of topology, where the topological properties of the figure — connectivity, continuity, dimension — become operational concepts [7. P. 12–15]. 3. Verification of the model — checking isomorphism on the material: the myth of Osiris, where there is a linear sequence → topological rupture (death) → closure in a loop (eternal kingdom) [8. P. 158]; and comparison of syntax as a ‘loop’ in inflected SVO and agglutinative SOV systems with the final form of the clitic ‘sw’ as a linear SVO construction when closed with a reflexive pronoun similar to the agglutinative nature of the Turkic system of pronoun affixes [9. P. 42]; also cited is the revival

as a social institution of the nomadic tribe ‘Zhetiata’² — a form of the social model of the Kazakhs that has survived to the present day, which functions as a linear genealogy → rupture (death of an individual) → cyclical revival through the memory of the nomadic tribe into a new cycle of the tribe [2. P. 67–70].

4. Interpretation — the establishment of a single structural invariant that manifests itself at various levels of the cultural system. This approach allows us to view culture as a holistic semantic field [8. P. 33], where grammatical, mythological and social structures reveal a deep structural kinship expressed in the language of topological invariants.

Results and Discussion

The myth of Osiris is a fundamental theological construct of ancient Egyptian thought, integrating the concepts of power, world order (Maat) and eternal life. The reconstruction of the narrative is based on the corpus of the Pyramid Texts (24th–22nd centuries BC) [5. P. 15–20] prior to Plutarch's account [10. p. 230], which reflects a later tradition. A structural analysis of the myth reveals key elements: the dynamics of the sacred cycle: 1) establishment of order (Osiris) → 2) disruption (Seth) → 3) restoration (Horus).

The topology of the myth's transformation considers the dismemberment and subsequent reintegration of the god's body [8. P. 210]. As J. Assmann notes, the myth functions as a ‘cultural memory’ that encodes the principles of legitimising power through the cyclical model of ‘death-rebirth’ [8. P. 158]. Each ruling pharaoh is identified with Horus the ruler, while his predecessor actualises the archetype of Osiris — the departed ancestors, which correlates in the Kazakh system with the institution of ‘aruaqtar’ — Kazakh. ‘ancestors’, which exists in the social systems of the nomadic Turkic tribes to this day.

The mythological narrative is a complex semiotic system in which bodily integrity, cosmic order and social organisation are linked by isomorphic relationships. The cyclical structure of myth, in the words of M. Eliade, creates ‘sacred time of eternal return’ [11. P. 51], which explains its influence on subsequent Mediterranean mystery cults.

Intercultural context and methodological challenge. Intensive contacts between nomadic peoples and the civilisations of the Near East, recorded in the

² Zheti Ata is a traditional Kazakh clan system based on seven generations of genealogy. The term translates as “seven ancestors” and represents a social institution that regulates marital relations, mutual assistance, and clan identity.

Key features: Genealogical structure: Accounting for seven generations of ancestors on the male line.

Exogamy: Prohibition of marriages within the same zheti ata to preserve genetic diversity.

Social organisation: The system defines clan responsibilities, inheritance and collective responsibility.

1st millennium BC, created conditions for cultural exchange through various channels of interaction: A.I. Ivanchik notes that military mercenary service in the armies of Assyria and Babylon required functional bilingualism, while trans-continental trade also created the conditions for everyday language contact and cultural assimilation [4. P. 89–91; 3. P. 155]. Direct linguistic evidence of Proto-Turkic influence remains problematic, although etymological analysis of the onomastics of Scythian leaders sometimes reveals non-Iranian elements [4. P. 50], and O.O. Suleimenov's lexical hypotheses³ also require further analysis and rigorous verification.

The main methodological challenge is related to chronological inconsistency: the basic elements of the myth of Osiris are recorded in the Pyramid Texts of the 24th–22nd centuries BC. [5. P. 15–20], but the hypothesis of its origin under Proto-Turkic influence in the recording of official contacts in the absence of a large body of information is not convincing at this stage, but suggests increased attention to archaeological materials that could explain other time periods of contact. For now, we note the agglutinative mechanism in Egyptian syntax, which was used in the analysis. As J. Assmann demonstrates in his work “Death and Salvation in Ancient Egypt”, the sacred texts of Egypt were constantly reinterpreted in the process of ‘cultural memory’ [8. P. 158]. We assume that contact with the bearers of the cyclical archetype of culture could have intensified the process of semiotic ‘closure’ of the already existing paradigm of Time as an ‘arrow’. Cyclicity in Egyptian culture can be traced in the theological formalisation of the concept of eternal return, but as a grammaticalisation of the return movement of order in syntax, namely the appearance of a special grammatical form of the clitic ‘sw’ in Late Egyptian [9. P. 42]. The presence of the loop of ‘death and rebirth’ in mystery cults implies categories of continuity, which can be traced in the myth of Osiris, ensuring the transmission of sacred identity — name, title, ritual — as eternal return.

If we simultaneously refer to the system of the Kazakh nomadic tribe ‘Zhetiata’, the continuity of the tribe's life is achieved through blood kinship and genealogical memory, where biological reproduction and social tradition become material carriers of the tribe's immortality, where the tribe operates with the sacred numerical model ‘7’, — the most archaic type of time calculation, and where the institution of ancestors, titles and rituals are also involved [12. P. 45–47]. In ‘Zhetiata’, the carrier of subjectivity becomes the clan itself as a supra-individual organism, where the individual death of the forefather 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 is compensated not by ritual, but by the biological and social fact of the birth of a new member of the clan, who is symbolically showered with ‘arpa’ grain in the cradle: ‘...a new member of the clan, who, when laid in the cradle, is traditionally sprinkled with arpa grain ...’ [13. P. 78], as well as the god Osiris [14. P. 128], is a ritual that

³ Suleimenov, O.O. 2025. *I know!* Almaty: Service Press. P. 9.

becomes a conduit for Growth in its mysteries. The collective will for self-preservation and the continuation of the human race replaces the divine omnipotence of mythical figures with objects in profane practices.

Syntactic transformation as a reflection of cultural shift. The initial state of Egyptian culture was characterised by a linear model, where the syntax of the inflectional SVO system correlated with the concept of direct inheritance of power and transitive action linking the heterogeneity of space and time. Death was perceived as a break in cosmological continuity, compensated for by a funeral cult, but not yet integrated into the cyclical structure [8. P. 158]. Possible contact with the Proto-Turkic groups, who held a cyclical worldview, could have created conditions for semiotic ‘closure.’ And as J. Assmann notes, Egyptian culture demonstrates an ability for structural transformations through ‘cultural memory’ [8. P. 45]. In our opinion, this is expressed in the grammaticalisation of the aforementioned reflexive clitic ‘sw’, which creates a syntactic loop for the inflectional system: SVO + ‘sw’ → S-V-[SELF]. The essence of this transformation is that the linear chain S (subject) → V (action) → O (object) ‘closes’ into a ring $S \rightarrow V \rightarrow [S]$, and the action, instead of being directed outward toward the object, returns to the subject itself. The linguistic mechanism described by J. Černi and S.I. Groll [9. P. 42] provides a transition from a linear construction ($S \rightarrow V \rightarrow O$) to a cyclical one ($S \rightarrow V \rightarrow [S]$), where the action returns to the subject or its trace, as a clitic. This syntactic transformation is isomorphic to changes in the theological and social spheres of Egyptian society. As M. Eliade shows, archetypal structures demonstrate remarkable stability in the transition from the sacred to the profane sphere [11. P. 210], and the institution of the clan, taken as a synchronous system in the system of the rebirth of the human race — “Zhetiata” represents a sociologised version of the myth of eternal return, where biological reproduction becomes the practical embodiment of the metaphysical concept of continuity. The clan system allows for ‘eternal life’ and exists in society as an embodied mechanism of cultural reproduction of the nomadic logic of the clan. This system demonstrates the fundamental ability of human consciousness to translate archetypal structures from the sacred to the social sphere: in the very mechanism of desacralisation, where myth is transformed into a code of conduct and organisation of society, and the nomadic way of life preserves this.

The linguistic dimension of the hypothesis: syntax as a worldview matrix. A key aspect of the study is the consideration of syntax as a cultural metaphor. In the Proto-Turkic SOV model, grammatical structure becomes not only a means of communication [15. P. 87], but also a way of organising the cosmological space described by language. The mobility of the subject’s position in the structure of the Turkic agglutinative group reflects a fundamentally different concept of subjectivity — not fixed, but distributed and restored through a system of affixes. Topological analysis of medieval Orkhon texts demonstrates a unique phenomenon:

grammatical constructions with the SOV/OVS order, with frequent omission of the sacred Subject-Creator, create the effect of the presence of a transcendent Observer of processes from outside. This approach correlates with the concept of the ‘non-own point’ in Merleau-Ponty’s phenomenology of perception [16. P. 245]. And as demonstrated by the analysis of Bilge-khan’s cosmogonic formula in runic inscriptions [15. P. 50], the syntactic organisation of the utterance creates a sacred vertical of the universe, where the grammatical order of the utterance reflects the cosmological principle of reversibility or ‘spherical’ organisation of space-time. This approach is developed in works on the topological anthropology of language [17. P. 48].

Syntactic transformation in Late Egyptian — from linearity to cyclicity draws attention to the fact that an additional quality of the system is introduced into Late Egyptian syntax, such as structural transformation, which differs from the classical linearly structured inflectional SVO system, since the possibility of syntax dynamics is added with the construction of the clitic ‘sw’, as (SVO + sw). According to J. Cherni, this clitic occupies a position after the verb and functionally marks the return of the action to the subject [9. P. 42]. This syntactic mechanism creates the effect of grammatical closure, transforming the linear structure into a cyclical one. Within the framework of the proposed analysis, the clitic ‘sw’ is interpreted as a topological operator that provides a transition from a linear configuration to a closed one. This transformation is of particular interest in a comparative analysis with the Turkic syntactic model SOV, where the return position of the subject is provided by a system of affixes [15. P. 87]. The syntactic shift under consideration may reflect a deeper cultural process — the transition from a linear concept of time to a cyclical one, which finds parallels in the evolution of the myth of Osiris. Both syntactic systems — Turkic SOV and Late Egyptian SVO + sw — implement a single archetypal invariant of cyclical closure, using different grammatical means: agglutinative morphology in the first case and cliticization in the second.

Syntax acts not only as a linguistic mechanism, but also as an archetypal invariant — a fundamental principle of the organisation of spatiality in the description of the sacred World. The key thesis of the study is that the mechanism of return is created by means of syntax, forming a ‘topological grammar’ that underlies various cultural texts [8. P. 158]. Therefore, there is a structural difference between the linear SVO model characteristic of inflectional languages and the cyclic SOV(S) model of agglutinative systems. Late Egyptian syntax demonstrates a unique transformation: the integration of the clitic ‘sw’ into the SVO + sw construction creates a mechanism for the subject to encounter itself, which is functionally analogous to reflexive affixes in Turkic languages [9. P. 42].

This syntactic isomorphism manifests itself at different levels of culture: in mythological narrative, as the miraculous gathering into wholeness of the primary

body and the resurrection of Osiris, which has the same mechanism in the social institution of the clan system ‘Zhetiata’, which gathers the clan body in 7 generations and in the seventh legitimises its clan, when the future determines the past of such a clan, which is reflected in the way this mechanism is described in the type of language comprehension: in the grammatical structure (SVO + sw / SOV + S).

The clitic ‘sw’ is a linguistic embodiment of reciprocity, which is confirmed by monuments of the Late Egyptian language, such as the papyrus (Petersburg 1115), where there is a construction with the verb *dd* demonstrating a complete cycle of utterance [18. P. 15]. And syntax becomes a code in which the archetypal principle of cyclicity is fixed. The morphosyntactic coding of reflexivity acting through the clitic ‘sw’ is not just a grammatical change, but the embodiment of a mechanism of semantic closure, creating a ‘topological grammar’ of continuity on the stage of events that have the coherence and integrity of their formulas of representation. For example, ‘sw’ — the clitic pronoun ‘this’ — as an object acts as a rigidly fixed state after the verb: ‘to his brother’ — complement, — this is the structure V (verb) + sw (clitic-object), thus representing the syntactic mechanism that later, in Coptic, agglutinates in the form of a verbal suffix — ‘f’ within the SOV structure [8. P. 42].

The technology of transition from myth to grammar in this analysis assumes that the mythological level, based on the resurrection of Osiris, transforms his subjectivity in the grammatical ritual of speech in all spheres of representation and reflection in the surrounding world, which gives Osiris the ‘function of continuity’, written down and pronounced in a special Formula. Example: ‘*dd.n.f sw*’ — ‘he said ‘this’, which is a standard illustration of a grammatical phenomenon of the Late Egyptian language — the use of the clitic pronoun ‘sw’ in a postverbal position, thereby proving its functioning, which is described in detail in the grammar of J. Černi and S.I. Groll [9. P. 42]. The clitic ‘sw’ is a grammatical prototype of the same idea: the return of the subject to itself, and the evolution from Late Egyptian to Coptic is the fixation of the mechanism of closure in the structure of the language of the agglutinative type.

The etymology and semiotics of the theonym ‘Osiris’ according to O. Suleimenov’s hypothesis is a hypothesis of structural correspondence. The problem of the etymology of the theonym *Wsir* — Osiris remains controversial in Egyptology. As J. Černi notes, there is no generally accepted Afro-Asiatic etymology of the name [19. P. 51]. Therefore, this linguistic uncertainty allows us to consider alternative hypothetical reconstructions. It is necessary to note the special intuition of O.O. Suleimenov [12. P. 9], which served as the impetus for this reconstruction. The hypothesis suggests a possible connection with the Proto-Turkic lexical base: the combination of ‘*Өс*’ (growth) and, possibly, the second part as ‘*epic*’ — Kazakh ‘*fabric base*’, which could have formed the sacred formula of the ritual itself. There are ritual complexes of Osiris’ ‘*grain mummies*’, which are

linen shells filled with barley, where the fabric itself symbolises the sacred body of the god, and the sprouting grain visualises the concept of rebirth [20. P. 78], which demonstrates a structural correspondence with the proposed etymology. Despite linguistic differences, there is a functional similarity: in both cultures, barley is a symbol of fertility, and its ritual use in life cycle ceremonies reproduces the connection with the concept of rebirth.

Archaeological finds from Dendera show the multi-layered structure of these artefacts, where grain layers alternate with fabric layers [21. P. 112], which further confirms the semantic connection between ‘fabric’ and ‘growth’ in the funeral ritual. Material analysis confirms the use of selected barley (*Hordeum vulgare*) and fine flax [22. P. 45], which created a symbolic field corresponding to the reconstructed formula of ‘growth-fabric’ and, with it, the ‘Law of Sprouting’ itself. This semantic reconstruction correlates with the function of Osiris as the ‘deity of continuity’ and cyclical rebirth. A structural analysis of the myth conducted by M. Eliade reveals a universal pattern of ‘rupture’ and ‘restoration,’ where the ritual dismemberment and subsequent reintegration of the god's body create a semiotic closure of the cosmological cycle [11. P. 210].

This topological invariant can be observed as a direct correspondence in the Zhetiata clan system, where the death of an individual ancestor is overcome, since the gathering of ancestral memory into a metaphysical unified body of ‘seven generations’ occurs each time in a sacred ritual in all situations of blessing ‘bata’ in Kazakh culture.

The proposed interpretation allows us to consider the institution of Osiris' resurrection not only as a chthonic deity, but also as the embodiment of the principle of spatial and temporal reversibility, as a structurally homologous organisation similar to the functioning system of nomadic clan topology. The social structure of Zhetiata as a model of distributed subjectivity is a cyclical system of maintaining tribal identity through the mechanism of collective subjectivity of the seven fathers. In contrast to the European model of a fixed subject, where, in the words of E. Benveniste, ‘the linguistic ‘I’ exists only as an act of speech’ [23. P. 254], in the of the Turkic tradition, subjectivity is realised as a network structure. The Zhetiata system implements a model of distributed subjectivity, which, following J.-L. Nancy, can be characterised as an ‘intermittent subject’ — that is, an intermittent, pulsating presence that arises not as a given, but as an effect of network relations [24. P. 15]. The ontological status of each of the seven ancestors of the ata is constituted not by itself, but exclusively through its position in the sevenfold holistic and closed numerical structure of the clan — the zheti. It is this configuration of seven generations that forms the collective ‘resurrected body’ of the clan. This transition from the individual ‘face’ to the clan structure finds theoretical confirmation in the concept of G. Deleuze and F. Guattari, who consider the ‘face’ of the subject not as an emblem of an autonomous subject, but as a

‘surface of coding power’ [7. P. 181], which is also reflected in the Turkic spatial orientation system [25. P. 81]. In the Turkic linguistic and social system, this manifests itself in a unique phenomenon: the sacred centre of subjectivity is not fixed to an immovable ‘I’, but is also distributed among affixes in the syntactic chain of the SOV+S order. This model demonstrates a fundamental difference from the paradigm of inflectional languages with their fixed syntactic position of the subject, offering instead of a linear hierarchy a cyclical organisation of distributed subjectivity, where identity is not given but is endlessly reproduced through a network of relationships and grammatical connections.

The topological model, which becomes the only form of proof, is characterised by the qualities of non-Euclidean anthropology of language and involves considering speech models as dynamic topological configurations of meaning formation. In this paradigm, subjectivity is realised not as a fixed position, but as a process of continuous movement along the syntactic chain of the central position, which in an agglutinative system can be occupied by almost all units: $S \rightarrow O \rightarrow V \rightarrow S$. This approach finds deep parallels in M. Merleau-Ponty’s non-linear phenomenology, where bodily perception is organised not according to the laws of straight perspective, but as a ‘folded surface’ [16. P. 245], in which the near and the far, the centre and the periphery constantly change places. This casing of the system lays the foundation for understanding dynamic structures. And the formalised model of syntax clearly demonstrates the transition of the subject from the centre to the periphery, followed by closure in a ring structure, by means of the subject affix at the end as SOV+S. A looped organisation of time arises within the SOV syntax, which correlates with P.A. Florensky’s concept of ‘reverse perspective’ — in which space is understood not as an abstract capacity, but as a semantic field organised from the inside out, where the point of convergence is not ‘in the depths,’ but in the viewer himself [26. P. 45]. Just as in an icon or sacred image, the point of convergence creates the effect of meaning radiating from the inside out, so too in the Turkic syntactic model SOV, the semantic centre of gravity is shifted from the beginning of the utterance to its end. The subject, being named at the beginning, seems to ‘dissolve’ in the process of speech development, only to return to itself through a series of objects and actions, ending with a reflexive affix. This configuration directly correlates with Heidegger’s understanding of Dasein as being-in-the-world: the subject does not precede the world, but reveals itself only through involvement in it, through movement towards objects and back to itself [27. P. 112]. Thus, the topological model, combining SOV syntax, reverse perspective, and the phenomenology of being-in-the-world, reveals the non-Euclidean nature of linguistic consciousness, where identity is not given but is constantly reproduced through cyclical movement along a grammatical and semantic loop.

In agglutinative languages, there is also a zero position of the subject (\emptyset), which does not mean its absence, but its distribution in the grammatical structure,

which further characterises the gathering of the subject position in sacred texts — hymns and symbolic formulas of the Turks. As anthropologist Y.V. Chezlov, in traditional societies, ‘the individual is a function of the clan, not an autonomous source of action’ [15. P. 54], which implies the variability of subject positions in Turkic languages and reflects a clane perspective, where subjectivity is realised as a collective rather than an individual phenomenon.

The cognitive-topological paradigm in linguistics suggests a perspective in analysis for non-linear linguistics, where grammatical rules are understood as topological invariants. The fundamental contribution of G. Lakoff and M. Johnson [28. P. 45] demonstrates how linguistic metaphors shape conceptual systems of spatial understanding. In cultures with a dominant SOV order, the metaphor ‘time as a circular resource’ is stable, reflecting the cyclical movement of the subject, while in SVO languages, the linear metaphor ‘time as an arrow’ prevails [6. P. 158]. These differences not only mark cultural features of temporal perception, but also correlate with neurocognitive patterns of information processing.

The topological model of a torus (T^2) is used as a structural archetype, which is the result of the choice of connectivity configuration qualities and the choice of a basic model that would correspond to the qualities of its reproduction, which is determined by its unique topological properties corresponding to the structure of the archetype of ‘eternal return.’ As Yu.M. Lotman notes, stable cultural patterns can be interpreted through fundamental topological models [6. P. 158]. The torus as a figure is a two-dimensional surface formed by the rotation of a circle around a non-intersecting axis, which is visually similar to a bagel. The key properties of a torus are topological continuity and closedness, as well as the presence of a fundamental break — a ‘hole’ as a constituent element — and the duality of the surface of events, which preserves the dichotomy of life/death in a circular return. According to G. Deleuze, it is these properties that make the torus an ideal model for describing cyclical processes, where the discontinuity serves as a necessary condition for continuity [7. P. 45]. The torus model can be used to analyse the ancient Egyptian myth of Osiris and the genealogical structure of ‘Zhetiata,’ demonstrating the universality of the archetype of cyclical regeneration.

The topological model of the torus (T^2) has its own axiomatics and scope of application: it is a three-dimensional body, a model in three-dimensional space, characterised by the presence of a ‘hole’ as a different ontological zone, where rupture and closure represent two different but dialectically linked entities, ensuring continuity through succession in the cycle of ‘death-rebirth’. The rupture is overcome through ritual/myth. The torus model is based on three structural elements that find parallels in the works of Yu.M. Lotman on the semiosphere [6. P. 95] and G. Deleuze on folded spaces [7. P. 67], where there are

1. The axis of time/genealogy — a linear sequence that forms the framework of the process.

2. A closed loop — a cyclical path that transforms linearity into eternal return.

3. A topological gap — a structural element that ensures the closure of the system.

Such an application of the topological model to the myth of Osiris, as shown by M. Eliade's arguments, reveals the fundamental nature of the archetype of eternal return for mythological consciousness [11. P. 73]. In the myth of Osiris, a linear axis can be identified: 'Osiris → Death → Horus.' A hypothetical use could also be the Möbius strip (Osiris → Horus), which would eliminate the topological gap that exists as a likeness to the dismemberment of Osiris' body, since the Möbius strip is a two-dimensional surface in three-dimensional space with the key property of one-sidedness. The rejection of the Möbius strip in favour of the torus is not simply a replacement of a geometric figure, but a change in the analytical paradigm: a transition from a flat model of paradox to a three-dimensional model of complex continuity, where rupture (death) and existence in another capacity (Osiris in Duat) are not 'errors' of the system, but constitutive elements of its integrity and stability over time in a multidimensional state. Tor allows us to include in the analysis of the sacred/otherworldly dimension a separate but related sphere, which makes it an adequate tool for describing the myth of Osiris.

Three-dimensionality and division of ontological spheres: the outer circumference of the Torus as a large circle models the cycle in the world of the living: a linear sequence of rule (Osiris-king → Set-usurper → Horus-king); while the inner 'hole' of the Tor models the afterlife (Duat) – or another ontological sphere where Osiris ends up after severing ties (death). One can see movement along the axis of time/genealogy, which is not movement along a flat ribbon, but a turn along a three-dimensional spiral, passing through another realm of existence (Duat) and returning to the original plane, like the world of the living on a new turn — this demonstrates the inclusion of three-dimensionality in the analysis. But another parameter or dimension is needed, as a fourth dimension — it is time that acts as a closing parameter, since Thor visualises a 'loop of time' where the system is not simply cyclical, but spiral. Each new pharaoh, becoming Horus, does not copy the first Horus, but actualises the archetype in a new historical context. The past — Osiris continues to exist in a 'parallel' dimension — inside the torus, constantly influencing the present or the outer surface, thereby creating a model of temporal multidimensionality.

The topological model of "Zhetiata" as a torus is an apparatus for analysing generational continuity, since the genealogical structure of Zhetiata demonstrates structural isomorphism with the cycle of Osiris, which becomes particularly evident when applying the topological model of a closed torus configuration (T^2). This model offers a rigorous heuristic apparatus for analysing how a system based on the archetype of eternal return incorporates rupture (death) not as a negation, but as a constitutive element of its integrity.

Decomposition of the “Zhetiata” structure into elements of the torus. The linear axis as the axis of time/genealogy is an open straight line on which seven generations of ancestors are located: $\text{Ata-1} \rightarrow \text{Ata-2} \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow \text{Ata-7}$. This axis represents an objective chronological sequence that forms the framework of family history [29. P. 45–47]. The topological gap as the ‘death of an individual’ represents a systemic gap — a ‘hole’ in the fabric of continuity of the family line. The position of the seventh ancestor, Ata-7 , or ‘bala’ — the son of the clan — is of particular significance, as it is the only status that is not followed by a new link in the previous linearity [29. P. 48], since what follows is a repetition of the entire scenario of the creation or revival of the previous structure. The loop closes with the birth of ‘Bala’ — the son of the clan and the father of a new clan. The birth of the eighth descendant after ‘Bala’ takes place, which represents a topological closure. The system completes a small circle of the torus, transforming ‘Bala’ into the starting point of a new sevenfold chain: $\text{Bala} \rightarrow \text{Tup-ata-1}$ [29. P. 51].

The visualisation of the torus model for the “Zhetiata” clan system involves a large circle of the torus, which represents the cyclical movement of clan identity, embodying the principle of eternal renewal of the ‘seven ancestors’ in a spiral. The small circle of the torus is a turn passing through the ‘hole’, and the trajectory of transition from the end of the previous sevenfold chain (Ata-7) to the beginning of a new one (Ata-1 of a new clan) can only occur through the son of ‘Bala’. This turn passes through the zone of rupture ‘death/oblivion,’ similar to the internal space of the torus [7. P. 45]. Institutionally, the ‘hole’ of the torus is the ontological space of ‘death’ and oblivion, which the system does not deny, but uses for renewal: the individual dies, but the genus, passing through the spatially arranged ‘hole,’ is reborn in a new cycle [11. P. 73], and all structural elements confirm the isomorphism between the “Zhetiata” clan system and the topological model of the torus, demonstrating the universality of the archetype of eternal return.

The topological model of the torus demonstrates a mechanism of transformation in which the system functions through a rupture rather than in spite of it. Death in this configuration represents not an end point, but a necessary transition — a ‘dive inward’ that ensures cyclical rebirth. This pattern manifests itself both in the myth of Osiris — the transformation of a living ruler into the eternal lord of the underworld — and in the “Zhetiata” system, where the renewal of the clan occurs through the change of generations. The conditional line of genealogy, passing through a topological gap, closes into a complete loop, ensuring the continuity of the system.

Conclusions

1. Transmission of structural archetypes. Historical contacts between Proto-Turkic groups could serve as a channel for the transmission not so much of specific cultural elements as of deep structural archetypes of the organisation of existence.

Syntax, mythology and clan organisation appear as isomorphic realisations of a single code of ‘reversibility’ permeating different levels of the cultural cosmos.

2. **The topology of the torus as a metamodel.** The figure of the torus (T^2) demonstrates heuristic power as a universal model for analysing cyclical continuity. From the Egyptian myth of Osiris to the Kazakh system of ‘Zhetiata’ as a topological configuration and logic of the Tor model, which clearly reveals the mechanism of integrating ‘discontinuity’ into integrity, where language becomes a topological imprint of world understanding.

3. **Four-dimensional identity.** The proposed model of identity in four dimensions — grammatical, symbolic, ritual, and signal — allows us to view culture as a dynamic ecosystem of meanings, where meaning circulates continuously between levels of organisation.

4. **Methodology of processuality.** Shifting the focus from static structures to the transformation and movement of meaning in the mental structures of thinking through language opens up the possibility of modelling culture as a multi-dimensional space without rigid coordinates — an analogue of a nonlinear dynamic system.

5. **Prospects for verification.** The hypothesis of direct linguistic influence requires further verification; the main contribution of this work is the development of a methodological apparatus for identifying structural isomorphisms that offer a new language for dialogue between disciplines. The study opens up prospects for a topological approach in the humanities, where culture is understood as a multi-layered system with an immanent geometry of meaning.

References

1. Herodotus. 1972. *History*. Translated from ancient Greek by G.A. Stratanovsky. Moscow: Nauka. 600 p. Print. (In Russ.)
2. Zuev, Yu.A. 2002. *Early Turks: essays on history and ideology*. Almaty: Dyke-Press. Print. (In Russ.)
3. Olkhovskiy, V.S., and G.L. Evdokimov. 1994. *Scythian sculptures of the 7th-3rd centuries BC*. Moscow: Nauka. Print. (In Russ.) EDN: RURVXV
4. Ivantchik, A.I. 1993. *Cimmerians in the Middle East*. Moscow: University publications. 210 p. Print. (In Russ.)
5. *The Pyramid Texts*. 2019. Translated and commented by A.S. Chetverukhin. St. Petersburg: Nestor-Istoriya. 400 p. Print. (In Russ.)
6. Lotman, Yu.M. 1996. *Inside Thinking Worlds*. Moscow: Languages of Russian Culture. 464 p. Print. (In Russ.) ISBN: 5-7859-0006-8 EDN: YSTFSX
7. Deleuze, G., and F. Guattari. 1987. *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press. 610 p. Print.
8. Assmann, J. 2005. *Death and Salvation in Ancient Egypt*. Moscow: Cornell University Press. 456 p. Print. (In Russ.)
9. Černý, J., and S.I. Groll. 1993. *A Late Egyptian Grammar*. 4th edition. Rome: Pontificio Istituto Biblico. 786 p. Print.
10. Plutarch. 2000. *On Isis and Osiris*. Translated and commented by N.N. Trukhina. Moscow: Aletheia. 320 p. Print. (In Russ.)

11. Eliade, M. 1959. *The Sacred and the Profane: The Nature of Religion*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich. 256 p. Print.
12. Alimbay, N. 2015. *Zhety Ata: the Clan-tribal System and the Social Structure of the Kazakhs*. Almaty: Kazakh University Press. 256 p. Print. (In Kaz.)
13. Kaliyev, A. 1995. *Kazakh Folk Customs and Rituals*. Almaty: Kazakhstan. 215 p. Print. (In Russ.)
14. Griffiths, J.G. 1980. *The Origins of Osiris and His Cult*. Leiden: E.J. Brill. 340 p. Print. <https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004378582>
15. Johanson, L. “The Structure of Turkic.” *The Turkic Languages*. Edited by L. Johanson & É.Á. Csató. London: Routledge, 1998, pp. 30–66. Print.
16. Merleau-Ponty, M. *Phenomenology of Perception*. Translated from French. St. Petersburg: Nauka, 1997. 528 p. Print. (In Russ.)
17. Nurdubayeva, A.R. 2025. “Syntax as topology: the spherical model of culture in the Turkic tradition.” In: *Visual Identity and Cultural Heritage: Preservation and Promotion : proceedings of the International Scientific Conference (Almaty, April 22, 2025)*. Edited .by A.R. Nurdubayeva; Temirbek Zhurgenov Kazakh National Academy of Arts. Almaty: KAZNAI Publishing House, pp. 19–49.
18. “Papyrus Petersburg 1115.” 1985. *Late Egyptian Texts*. Edited by S. Groll. Cairo: Egyptian Museum Press, pp. 12–18. Print.
19. Černý, J. 1976. *Coptic Etymological Dictionary*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 388 p. Print.
20. Ikram, S. 2015. *Divine Creatures: Animal Mummies in Ancient Egypt*. Cairo: Cairo University Press. 210 p. Print.
21. Bonhême, M.-A. 2005. *Les “momies” de grain d’Osiris*. Paris: Éditions de la Sorbonne. 180 p. Print.
22. Sheikh, A.G. 2018. “Botanical Analysis of Osirian Relics.” *Journal of Archaeological Science*, vol. 45, pp. 40–48. Print.
23. Benveniste, E. *General Linguistics*. 1974. Moscow: Progress. 448 p. Print. (In Russ.)
24. Nancy, J.-L. 2000. *Being Singular Plural*. Stanford: Stanford University Press. 208 p. Print. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9781503619005>
25. Nurdubayeva A.R. 1998. *Kiiz uy: the structure of spatiality*: dissertation for the degree of Candidate of Architectural Sciences: 18.00.11. Moscow: MARCHI (Moscow Architectural Institute (Academy)). 178 p. Print. (In Russ.)
26. Florensky P.A. 2000. *Reverse perspective*. Collected Works. Articles and studies on the history and philosophy of art and archeology, pp. 41-89. Moscow: Mysl. Print. (In Russ.)
27. Heidegger M. 2015. *Being and Time*. Translated from German by V.V. Bibikhina. Moscow: Academicheskyy Proekt. 460 p. Print. (In Russ.)
28. Lakoff, G., and M. Johnson. 1980. *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 276 p. Print.
29. Nurdubayeva A.R. 2022. “Spatiality of the seven-generation exogamous system “zhety ata” as the basis of the hypersphere in traditional ideas of the Kazakhs.” *Kazakh culture and philosophy in the Turkic world: collection of articles dedicated to the 75th anniversary of prof. Gabitov T.Kh*, pp. 45–52. Almaty: Kazakh University. Print. (In Russ.)

Bio note:

Assiya R. Nurdubayeva is a Candidate of Architectural Sciences, Kazakh National Academy of Arts named after Temirbek Zhurgenov, 127 Panfilova St, 050000, Almaty, Republic of Kazakhstan. SPIN-code: 1209-4776. ORCID: 0000-0002-4036-6838. E-mail: 01nurasya@gmail.com