

<https://doi.org/10.26565/2226-0994-2026-74-29>
УДК 1:930.25

Oleksii Pavlenko, Yevhen Kordiumov

THE ARCHIVE THAT DOES NOT RELEASE

This article offers a philosophical analysis of the archive as a specific space of contemporary publicity in which the loss of orientation occurs not due to a lack of information, but because of an excess of recognition and repetition. It is argued that under conditions of digital media the archive ceases to function as a passive repository of memory and becomes an active environment that retains the subject in the present, depriving them of the possibility of return, reinterpretation, and a change of trajectory. In this regime, the past does not recede or age; instead, it is continuously reproduced, assuming the form of permanent presence. Central to the analysis is the distinction between memory as an orienting resource and the archive as a trap. Particular attention is paid to the phenomenon of post-truth, which is interpreted not as the distortion of facts or the triumph of fabrication, but as a condition in which truth loses its navigational function and becomes an acoustic environment that fixes the subject at the point of recognition. Within this framework, cancel culture appears not as a moral sanction or an act of exclusion, but as a form of archival paralysis, whereby the subject remains visible yet deprived of a future.

The methodological framework of the study is structured around the mythological figures of Hades, Tiresias, and the Sirens, reinterpreted not as metaphors but as analytical models of contemporary publicity. Hades emerges as a structure of time without a horizon, in which truth exists without action; Tiresias figures expert knowledge that requires sacrifice yet bears no responsibility for consequences; and the Sirens function as an aggressive rhetorical interface of the archive, transforming the past into a seductive present. Their song is interpreted as a rhetoric of completion, in which truth no longer opens a path forward but abolishes the need for movement altogether.

In conclusion, the article demonstrates that a philosophical analysis of the archive makes it possible to identify new forms of public violence that operate not through prohibition or coercion, but through a soft, almost caring retention within the past. The study argues for the necessity of restoring a navigational distance between knowledge and trajectory as a condition for the possibility of a future within contemporary publicity.

Keywords: *archive, post-truth, publicity, memory culture, rhetoric, navigation, Sirens.*

Contemporary publicity increasingly faces not a scarcity of information, but an inability to return. Words once spoken, gestures once recorded, positions once taken do not recede into the past and do not settle into memory. They continue to persist – as if time had ceased to perform its function. The past does not withdraw; it accumulates, resurfaces, reasserts itself again and again, transforming from experience into verdict [Derrida, 1995; Fisher, 2014].

The philosophical difficulty lies not in the existence of the archive itself. The archive is a necessary condition of culture, a means of preserving memory and continuity. The problem arises when the archive ceases to be a background and begins to act – when it ceases to store and begins to hold [Derrida, 1995]. In this regime, the past no longer opens a path – it blocks it. It blocks return and re-interpretation. A change of position becomes not merely difficult, but structurally precluded.

Truth in such a space acquires a particular, unsettling quality. It no longer orients or liberates, but fixes. This is not a matter of falsehood or the substitution of facts, but of a form of post-truth in which factual accuracy coexists with the loss of futurity [Han, 2017; Fisher, 2014]. Truth here does not require proof, because it is already preserved; yet precisely for that reason it permits no exit. It does not call forward – it holds in place.

This situation becomes especially acute within digital publicity. Here archiving occurs automatically, without pause or selection, and the past returns not according to the logic of

© Pavlenko O. S., Kordiumov Y. V., 2026.



This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0.

understanding, but according to the logic of coincidence, intensity, and repetition [Chun, 2016; Dean, 2010]. The algorithm retrieves not what calls for interpretation, but what is easiest to activate. The archive ceases to be a repository and becomes a mechanism that continuously produces the present out of what has already passed [Zuboff, 2019].

Under such conditions, cancel culture reveals itself not as a particular excess or moral anomaly, but as a symptom of a deeper malfunction of public temporality [Brown, 1995; Norris, 2023]. Exclusion here is enacted not through conflict or overt violence, but through the impossibility of return. The subject is not expelled from publicity – they become stuck within it. They remain visible, recognizable, identifiable, yet deprived of the possibility of moving beyond the already fixed image [Butler, 2009].

It is precisely this situation – an archive from which there is no return – that defines the problem field of the present study. The issue is less about memory than about movement; less about accuracy than about direction. The question is whether continuation remains possible where the past no longer releases, and where truth ceases to be a passage and becomes a stopping point [Virilio, 2006].

The relevance of a philosophical analysis of the archive and the loss of navigation is determined by the transformation of contemporary publicity, in which memory increasingly ceases to function as an orientation and instead becomes a means of retention. Digital media generate a paradoxical regime of time: the subject is continuously updated, yet this updating leads neither to forward movement nor to an exit beyond what has already been lived and recorded [Chun, 2016]. On the contrary, it sustains a state of immobility in which the past returns again and again under the guise of the present.

In this regime, the archive ceases to be a passive repository and becomes an active environment. It lives not through preservation, but through reproduction [Kittler, 1999]. What has passed does not recede – it is retrieved, voiced, polished, and returned to circulation. Memory loses distance and begins to function as a force of attraction. Thus emerges a specific form of post-truth in which accuracy does not liberate, but holds [Han, 2017]. Truth no longer opens a path – it fixes. It does not lead forward, but encloses within the familiar.

The mythological figure of the Sirens allows this logic to be grasped with particular clarity. Their song is neither falsehood nor deception. The Sirens do not invent – they remember. They sing of what has already happened, and therein lies the danger [Homer, 1996; Blanchot, 1982]. The listener recognizes themselves. Recognition replaces movement. The ship comes to a halt not because it has lost its course, but because the course no longer seems necessary. In this sense, the archive ceases to be a background and becomes an interface – something that brings dead data to the surface and endows it with voice, melody, and seduction [Derrida, 1995; Kittler, 1999]. The Sirens do not merely “sing the past”, they curate it. The algorithm is a Siren that has optimized its repertoire based on your clicks. It sings you your own “Troy”, but in a version guaranteed to trigger a dopaminergic response – recognition [Chun, 2016; Dean, 2010].

This problem becomes especially acute within digital publicity, where algorithms amplify precisely what is repeatable, confirmed, and emotionally reinforced [Zuboff, 2019; Han, 2017]. The archive here exists not as memory, but as habit. It remains alive only insofar as it is reproduced again and again – through feeds, reminders, “memories”, returns to what was once said [Chun, 2016]. In such a regime, cancel culture appears not as an exception, but as a symptom: the subject becomes stuck in the archive of their own traces, where each return to the past appears as an update, yet in fact deprives one of the possibility of returning to the future [Brown, 1995; Norris, 2023].

Yet the experience of crisis and war reveals another, opposite type of Siren. Not the one that lulls through recognition, but the one that tears one out of any archive. The air-raid siren does not sing of the past and does not offer meaning. It does not address memory – it addresses the body [Butler, 2009]. It is a sound that does not hold, but interrupts; does not fix, but compels movement. Not the sweet voice of recognition, but the sharp call of the present, in which the

future may not arrive. Here media become visible not as habit, but as rupture – as an intrusion of reality that cannot be ignored [Virilio, 2006].

It is precisely in this tension – between the Siren of the archive and the Siren of threat – that the boundary of contemporary publicity emerges. A boundary between fixation in the recognizable and the possibility of choosing a path again. Between life reduced to repetition and life restored to vulnerability [Fisher, 2014].

In this context, a philosophical analysis of Hades as archive and of the Sirens as its aggressive interface acquires particular significance. The issue is not a mythological metaphor or a literary embellishment, but an attempt to think the conditions under which publicity becomes a space from which there is no return [Derrida, 1995; Agamben, 1998]. The investigation of this zone – between memory and movement, between recognition and action, between lived experience and its archival regeneration – becomes essential for understanding new forms of violence. A violence enacted not through prohibition or coercion, but through a gentle, almost caring retention within the past [Butler, 1997; Girard, 1986].

The problematics of the archive, memory, and the loss of subjectivity has a wide-ranging tradition of philosophical and interdisciplinary reflection. In various theoretical contexts, it has been developed as an analysis of archival power, technologies of inscription and reproduction, media regimes of memory, as well as a critique of post-truth, algorithmic governance, and cultural forms of being stuck in the past [Foucault, 1972; Derrida, 1995; Kittler, 1999]. Studies of language and performativity have demonstrated that speech is capable not only of describing reality but also of fixing the subject in a particular position [Bourdieu, 1993; Butler, 1997]; work in media theory and critiques of digital platforms have identified repetition, updating, and habit as key mechanisms of contemporary publicity [Chun, 2016; Dean, 2010].

At the same time, in most existing approaches the archive is considered either as a structure of storage, or as an instrument of power and control, or as a field of ideological conflict [Derrida, 1995; Foucault, 1972]. Far less frequently is the archive conceptualized as a space of lost navigation, in which return becomes problematic not because of prohibition, but because of the seduction of recognition. Similarly, the figure of post-truth is most often described in terms of distortion or manipulation of facts, whereas its connection to recognition, nostalgia, and the pleasurable fixation of the past remains insufficiently clarified [Han, 2017; Fisher, 2014].

The mythological figures of Hades and the Sirens have traditionally been interpreted either in eschatological or symbolic terms – as images of death, temptation, or dangerous knowledge [Homer, 1996; Vernant & Vidal-Naquet, 1988]. Yet their potential as models of media publicity, archival retention, and rhetorical paralysis has scarcely been mobilized in the analysis of contemporary forms of public violence and cancel culture. And yet it is precisely in these figures that the distinction becomes especially clear between memory as orientation and the archive as trap, between a truth that leads and a truth that arrests [Blanchot, 1982; Derrida, 1995].

This underexplored zone – between the archive as repository and the archive as active interface, between the voice of the past and the possibility of movement into the future – constitutes the problem field of the present study.

The aim of the article is to provide a philosophical analysis of the archive as a space of lost navigation, in which publicity confronts not a prohibition on return, but its gradual cancellation through recognition, affirmation, and repetition. The study seeks to clarify how, under contemporary media conditions, the archive ceases to be a passive past and begins to function as an active force of retention, transforming truth into a form of paralysis [Chun, 2016; Dean, 2010].

To achieve this aim, the article pursues the following analytical tasks: first, to establish the distinction between the archive as repository and the archive as interface operating through reproduction and updating [Derrida, 1995; Kittler, 1999]; second, to analyze the figure of Hades as a model of publicity without action, where voice is separated from participation and movement is impossible [Agamben, 1998]; third, to examine the figure of the Sirens as a rhetorical and media mechanism that transforms the past into a seductive present [Blanchot,

1982; Chun, 2016]; fourth, to demonstrate how these mythological structures relate to contemporary regimes of post-truth, algorithmic amplification, and cancel culture [Han, 2017; Norris, 2023; Zuboff, 2019]; and finally, to delineate the threshold at which truth ceases to liberate and begins to hold [Butler, 1997; Butler, 2009].

The methodology of the article is structured not as a linear movement toward a conclusion, but as navigation within a space of heterogeneous analytical regimes. The study relies on a combination of philosophical, media-theoretical, and rhetorical analysis, functioning not as interchangeable tools, but as different ways of maintaining a course within the complex field of public experience. Hermeneutic analysis is employed in working with mythological and philosophical texts that register extreme situations of the loss of movement, return, and living presence [Homer, 1996; Vernant & Vidal-Naquet, 1988]. Discursive and rhetorical analysis makes it possible to trace how recognition, repetition, and identification operate as forms of symbolic retention of the subject within the archive [Bourdieu, 1993; Butler, 1997]. A media-theoretical perspective is used to conceptualize archives, algorithms, and regimes of updating as structures of habit and post-truth in which the past is continuously reproduced under the guise of the present [Chun, 2016; Dean, 2010; Kittler, 1999]. Phenomenologically oriented description serves to register shifts in the experience of time, memory, and bodily vulnerability, especially under conditions of crisis and threat [Butler, 2009; Virilio, 2006].

The article translates the figures of Hades and the Sirens from the register of metaphor into that of methodological models. Such a shift makes it possible to see in the archive not a repository of antiquities, but a performative environment in which the subject loses their path not due to a lack of information, but due to an excess of “recognition”, which transforms the structure of publicity into a space of irreversible presence [Derrida, 1995; Chun, 2016].

If the Sirens can be understood as the aggressive interface of the archive – the frontend that seduces the living with the voice of the past – then Tiresias in Hades represents its ultimate backend: expert knowledge devoid of flesh and freed from participation [Derrida, 1995; Kittler, 1999]. His speech does not engage, transform, or console. It communicates conditions – and in doing so reveals the ontological status of truth within a space from which there is no return [Agamben, 1998].

Unlike contemporary algorithmic systems, which generate predictions instantly and “for free”, Tiresias demands blood. The archive of Hades does not speak on its own. For it to speak, the living must intervene bodily, transgressing the boundary between life and death. Truth here is not retrieved as data; it emerges as the result of extraction. Blood becomes the medium of speech – the price of access to knowledge that cannot be neutral [Blanchot, 1982].

This moment fundamentally distinguishes the prophecy of Tiresias from the logic of Big Data and expert analytics. Algorithmic knowledge requires no sacrifice, presupposes no loss, and bears no responsibility for its consequences. It exists as truth without cost [Zuboff, 2019; Han, 2017]. Tiresias, by contrast, marks an opposing regime: truth that becomes possible only through loss and therefore cannot be articulated without remainder. This is not information for orientation within a world of comfort, but knowledge for survival under conditions of catastrophe [Butler, 2009].

Tiresias is a navigator without a path. He knows the trajectory, but cannot traverse it. His knowledge is absolutely precise and absolutely inapplicable to himself. In this sense, he becomes a figure of the contemporary expert voice: one that sees outcomes, predicts consequences, discerns threats – yet remains within a space of non-action [Foucault, 1972]. His truth does not save or liberate; it merely delineates the limits of possible damage.

The encounter with Tiresias marks a shift of regime. Before Hades, Odysseus still seeks a path; after it, he manages losses. Heroism is nullified here. In its place emerges a cold logic of survival, in which choice is measured not by virtue, but by the scale of inevitable damage [Agamben, 1998]. This is not navigation in the strict sense, but catastrophe management – a form of action that arises after the loss of the illusion of salvation [Virilio, 2006].

For this reason, the episode with Tiresias forms a necessary threshold before the encounter with the Sirens. Both speak truth, but demand different modes of listening. Tiresias requires blood in order to communicate a bitter truth that allows movement forward. The Sirens require life in order to sing a sweet truth that abolishes movement itself. If Tiresias embodies knowledge as a condition of survival, the Sirens represent knowledge as a form of suicidal rapture – a truth from which there is no return [Blanchot, 1982; Fisher, 2014].

After Hades, space changes not topographically, but rhetorically. Nothing is yet visible, yet speech is already present. If in the realm of the dead truth was sparse, difficult to access, and required payment, here it sounds on its own – without request, without condition, without addressee. The Sirens do not enter into dialogue. They do not ask and do not answer. They utter. This is precisely their rhetorical specificity [Bourdieu, 1993; Butler, 1997]. The Sirens do not persuade and do not command. They do not appeal to the will and do not demand consent. Their speech is structured as total assertion, in which the distinction between what is said and what is true collapses. They do not offer interpretation – they present a completed meaning.

The song of the Sirens contains no call in the ordinary sense of the word. There is no imperative “stop”. Stopping arises as a side effect of recognition. The Sirens sing neither of the future nor of the possible – they sing of what has already been. Of deeds, sufferings, names. Of the past presented as the final truth about the subject [Homer, 1996]. This is a rhetoric not of discovery, but of fixation. In the Homeric text, the Sirens claim to know everything that has happened on earth. This formula is decisive: it is not a matter of partial knowledge or perspective, but of completion [Blanchot, 1982]. Their truth requires no continuation. It leaves no gap between knowledge and assent. To hear it is to accept that further differentiation is superfluous. Thus, the Sirens embody a specific form of rhetorical power: the power of truth that does not admit response [Bourdieu, 1993; Butler, 1997]. This is not falsehood and not manipulation. On the contrary, it is precisely the accuracy and completeness of their speech that makes it lethal. Truth here ceases to be a means of orientation and becomes a form of retention. It does not lead – it halts.

If in Hades truth belonged to the dead and spoke only after sacrifice, with the Sirens it becomes autonomous and aggressive. They bring the archive to the surface, turning the past into a sounding surface [Derrida, 1995]. Speech is archived and simultaneously actualized, yet this actualization does not lead to action. It produces an effect of presence in which the subject becomes stuck [Fisher, 2014].

The Sirens are not merely the voice of the archive, but its rhetorical interface. They give data the form of melody, and memory the form of enjoyment. The past ceases to be heavy and distant; it becomes sweet, recognizable, intimate. Yet it is precisely this proximity that renders return impossible. The archive no longer releases, because it is no longer perceived as past [Chun, 2016; Dean, 2010].

In this regime, rhetoric loses its navigational function. It no longer maintains the distance between word and action, between knowledge and decision. On the contrary, it collapses them. Truth sounds as though it has already said everything. Any attempt at movement after it appears redundant or even erroneous [Virilio, 2006].

For this reason, it is crucial that Odysseus does not refuse to hear. He does not oppose the song with silence and does not defend himself against truth. His gesture is directed not against the content of speech, but against its effect. He deprives the rhetoric of the Sirens of its ability to become a trajectory. To hear – yes. To follow – no [Detienne & Vernant, 1978].

This rupture between listening and movement marks the limit of public truth. Where truth claims completeness, where the past is finally recognized and fixed, publicity loses its future. Speech ceases to be an address and becomes the last word. Truth from which one cannot return ceases to be a condition of navigation and becomes a form of violence – not because it is false, but because it is irreversible [Agamben, 1998; Butler, 2009].

In Homer, the Sirens sing. Their song is structured as a perfect rhetorical loop: repetition, caress, recognition, the promise of completeness. They do not convey anything new – and

therein lies their power. They return what has been said, lived, suffered, but return it in such an acoustic form that the distinction between memory and the present collapses [Kittler, 1999]. Sweetness here is not an aesthetic effect, but a structural one. It arises where meaning no longer demands effort.

The rhetoric of the Sirens is a rhetoric of recognition without risk. It contains no rupture, no tension, no possibility of error. Words are chosen so as neither to wound nor to propel forward. They caress the ear because they are already attuned to the one who listens. This is a speech in which the subject hears not the Other, but themselves – purified of doubt, of incompleteness, of the future [Brown, 1995].

The Sirens are archival beings. They neither live nor die; they reproduce. Their song is an endless replay, a perfectly mastered track of the past. In this sense, they do not seduce – they extract. They drain from the living the remainder of movement, turning memory into motionless enjoyment. The archive speaks in their voice, but speaks in such a way that one wishes to remain [Derrida, 1995; Fisher, 2014].

Today, this rhetoric no longer sings. Today, it howls.

Contemporary sirens do not soothe the ear – they tear it apart. Their sound is sharp, piercing, stripped of melody. Yet the function remains the same. It is still the archive that intrudes into the lives of the living, pulling them out of time and dragging them into a regime of immediate response. Only now it is not the sweet song of recognition, but the wail of alarm – one that cannot be ignored and from which there is no refuge in interpretation [Virilio, 2006; Han, 2017].

And yet the difference is fundamental. The siren of alarm does not archive the past – it interrupts the present. It does not invite one to remain – it commands one to survive. In this sense, it is an anti-Siren, a harsh antipode to the Homeric seduction. Its sound does not so much drain the desire for the future as it burns away illusion. It restores to the body its mortality, and to the subject its vulnerability [Butler, 2009; Agamben, 1998].

But the sirens of the archive – those that operate in public speech, in media space, in the endless repetition of biographies, statements, “we remember everything” – function differently. They take not only joy, but truth itself. For truth, transformed into endless repetition, ceases to be an orientation. It decays on the shore alongside the bodies of those who listened too long [Fisher, 2014; Derrida, 1995].

A shore strewn with bones is not a punishment for error. It is a byproduct of a rhetoric that cancels movement. The archive does not kill directly. It halts. It renders the future unnecessary, because the past appears exhaustive. The body remains, but direction disappears. The subject is still alive, but no longer proceeds [Dean, 2010; Chun, 2016].

It is here that the singularity of Odysseus becomes visible – not as a hero, but as a navigator. His polytropicity lies neither in cunning nor in deceit. It lies in the ability to open the archive without remaining within it. He hears the song, yet does not take it for final meaning. He allows truth to sound without turning it into a place of dwelling [Detienne & Vernant, 1978].

Bound to the mast, he preserves a distance not between himself and the voice, but between knowledge and trajectory. This is decisive: truth is not rejected, but neither does it become a home. The archive is opened – and immediately closed. Nothing is taken except orientation. Nothing is lost except the illusion that one can remain and still continue the journey [Blanchot, 1982].

In this gesture lies an extreme form of navigation. Not deafness and not submission, but endurance. The capacity to pass between knowledge and paralysis, between archive and death, between the sweet song and the howl of alarm. Polytropicity here appears not as a character trait, but as an ontological skill: the ability not to allow rhetoric – even true, even complete, even affirming rhetoric – to become a shore [de Certeau, 1984].

The rhetoric of the Sirens reveals what often escapes contemporary discussions of post-truth. The problem lies not in the disappearance of truth, nor in the triumph of falsehood. On the contrary, the Sirens sing the truth. They sing everything that has been. This is precisely what

makes them deadly [Blanchot, 1982]. Post-truth arises not where facts are replaced by fiction, but where truth ceases to perform a navigational function and becomes an acoustic environment. In the regime of post-truth, truth no longer indicates direction – it surrounds. It sounds from all sides, repeats, intensifies, returns as echo. It cannot be refuted, because it does not require argumentation. It is recognized. Recognition replaces differentiation, and repetition replaces movement. In this sense, post-truth is not a crisis of knowledge, but a crisis of orientation [Bourdieu, 1993; Norris, 2023].

The culture of memory is integrated into this structure not as an antidote, but as its infrastructure [Derrida, 1995; Fisher, 2014]. The archive no longer preserves the past at a distance – it is constantly present in the present. Statements, gestures, photographs, fragments of biographies do not age or settle; they resurface, are updated, and reproduced [Chun, 2016]. Memory ceases to be a labor and becomes an environment. This is precisely the logic of the Sirens: the past does not release because it continuously sounds [Blanchot, 1982]. In this regime, truth does not liberate, but fixes. It holds the subject at the point of recognition: “you are what you did”, “you are what is remembered about you”, “you are the archive” [Bourdieu, 1993; Butler, 1997]. Return becomes impossible not because the path is closed, but because the past is presented as a completed whole that does not admit reworking. In this context, cancel culture appears not as an act of condemnation, but as a form of archival paralysis: the subject remains visible, yet is deprived of a future [Norris, 2023; Brown, 1995].

Post-truth here does not distort facts, but deprives them of temporal structure [Han, 2017]. Everything becomes simultaneously actual; everything sounds now. The distinction between “was” and “is” collapses, and with it the possibility of movement disappears. Truth, deprived of distance, becomes a trap [Virilio, 2006]. The archive in this regime ceases to be a neutral repository. It becomes a performative environment in which memory acts rather than merely persists [Derrida, 1995; Kittler, 1999]. The archive does not wait for a request – it initiates address, it calls [Dean, 2010].

The polytropicity of Odysseus once again proves decisive [Detienne & Vernant, 1978]. He does not destroy the archive and does not refuse memory. He does not seal his ears forever and does not declare truth false. His gesture is more radical and more precise: he introduces a rupture between hearing and following. Truth may be heard, but must not become a place of dwelling. Memory may be opened, but must not turn into a shore [de Certeau, 1984].

Thus, the culture of memory and post-truth converge at a single point: where truth ceases to be a condition of movement and becomes an environment in which movement is impossible. The archive does not punish – it cancels the path. This is why the analysis of the Sirens is neither allegory nor metaphor, but a diagnosis of the contemporary public condition: a condition in which truth does not release, memory does not age, and return becomes structurally impossible [Foucault, 1972; Fisher, 2014].

Conclusion. An archive from which there is no return does not resemble a prison and does not operate as prohibition. It does not close doors or erect walls. It does something far more subtle: it eliminates the very necessity of exit. In this regime, the past ceases to be something that can be reworked, forgotten, or surpassed. It becomes an environment – dense, viscous, recognizable. One in which it is easy to breathe and impossible to move.

Hades, in this reading, is not a place of the dead, but a form of time deprived of extension. Here everything has already happened and therefore cannot be completed. The shades neither suffer nor resist – they simply persist. Their misfortune lies not in death, but in the fact that there is nowhere left to return. The archive here does not preserve – it holds. It does not threaten – it stabilizes. And precisely for that reason it cannot be exited without breaking the very logic of recognition.

The Sirens bring this logic to its limit. Their song does not seduce crudely and does not deceive. It does something far more dangerous: it abolishes the necessity of the future. It is truth spoken as if everything has already been said. A completeness in which there is no room for

continuation. The rhetoric of the Sirens is a rhetoric of completion: it contains no question, no rupture, no “not yet”. To hear it is to agree that the path is no longer needed.

This is the true meaning of post-truth. Not the substitution of facts, nor the triumph of fiction, but the transformation of truth into an acoustic environment. Truth here does not lead or liberate – it sounds. It surrounds. It returns. It intensifies as echo. It is recognized before it is understood, and thus it paralyzes. It is truth without exit, memory without aging, knowledge without trajectory.

In such a space, cancel culture appears not as an exception, but as a form of stoppage. The subject is not expelled from publicity – they become frozen within it. Their past is not condemned – it is recognized as final. The archive does not punish – it fixes. And in this fixation, the most important thing disappears: the possibility of becoming otherwise without denying who one has been.

The gesture of Odysseus, bound to the mast, ceases in this context to be an episode of cunning or heroism. It becomes a gesture of extreme philosophical precision. He does not block his ears and does not reject truth. He allows it to sound – and at the same time deprives it of the power to become a place of dwelling. Truth is heard, but not inhabited. The archive is opened, but not accepted as a home. A gap is preserved between knowledge and movement – the only space in which navigation remains possible.

It is here that the central threat of contemporary publicity becomes clear: not the loss of truth, but the loss of the ability to leave it. Where truth ceases to be a passage and becomes an environment, the path ends before it begins. The archive does not kill – it halts. It renders the future superfluous, because the past appears exhaustive.

But stoppage is not the end.

Beyond the songs of the Sirens, silence does not follow. Another sea begins. A sea in which there is no longer the temptation to remain, but no safe route either. Where the archive no longer holds, navigation returns – in its harshest form. Not as a search for meaning, but as a choice between losses. Between the monster and the whirlpool. Between guaranteed sacrifice and the risk of disappearance.

It is precisely there that the next step of the analysis proceeds: into a space where truth no longer paralyzes, memory no longer holds, and the path continues – at a cost that can no longer remain unpaid.

REFERENCES

- Agamben, G. (1998). *Homo sacer: Sovereign power and bare life*. Stanford University Press.
- Blanchot, M. (1982). Literature and the original experience. In *The space of literature* (A. Smock, Trans.; pp. 209–247). University of Nebraska Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1993). Language and symbolic power (G. Raymond & M. Adamson, Trans.). Harvard University Press.
- Brown, W. (1995). *States of injury: Power and freedom in late modernity*. Princeton University Press.
- Butler, J. (1997). *Excitable speech: A politics of the performative*. Routledge.
- Butler, J. (2009). *Frames of war: When is life grievable?* Verso.
- Chun, W. H. K. (2016). *Updating to remain the same: Habitual new media*. The MIT Press.
- de Certeau, M. (1984). *The practice of everyday life* (S. Rendall, Trans.). University of California Press.
- Dean, J. (2010). *Blog theory: Feedback and capture in the circuits of drive*. Polity.
- Derrida, J. (1995). *Archive fever: A Freudian impression* (E. Prenowitz, Trans.). University of Chicago Press.
- Detienne, M., & Vernant, J.-P. (1978). *Cunning intelligence in Greek culture and society* (J. Lloyd, Trans.). University of Chicago Press.
- Foucault, M. (1972). *The archaeology of knowledge* (A. M. Sheridan Smith, Trans.). Pantheon Books.
- Fisher, M. (2014). *Ghosts of my life: Writings on depression, hauntology and lost futures*. Zer0 Books.
- Girard, R. (1986). *The scapegoat* (Y. Freccero, Trans.). Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Han, B.-C. (2017). *Psychopolitics: Neoliberalism and new technologies of power* (E. Butler, Trans.). Verso.

- Homer. (1996). *The Odyssey* (R. Fagles, Trans.). Penguin Classics.
- Kittler, F. A. (1999). *Gramophone, film, typewriter* (G. Winthrop-Young & M. Wutz, Trans.). Stanford University Press.
- Norris, P. (2023). Cancel culture: Myth or reality? *Political Studies*, 71(1), 145-174. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00323217211050404>
- Vernant, J.-P., & Vidal-Naquet, P. (1988). *Myth and tragedy in ancient Greece* (J. Lloyd, Trans.). Zone Books.
- Virilio, P. (2006). *Speed and politics: An essay on dromology*. Semiotext(e).
- Zuboff, S. (2019). *The age of surveillance capitalism: The fight for a human future at the new frontier of power*. PublicAffairs.

Pavlenko Oleksii S.

PhD Student, Educational and Scientific Institute Philosophy,
Cultural Studies, Political Science
V. N. Karazin Kharkiv National University
4, Maidan Svobody, Kharkiv, Ukraine
E-mail: oleksii.pavlenko97@gmail.com
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0006-6301-8285>

Kordiumov Yevhen V.

PhD Student, Educational and Scientific Institute Philosophy, Cultural Studies, Political Science
V. N. Karazin Kharkiv National University
4, Maidan Svobody, Kharkiv, Ukraine
E-mail: kordumov.e.v@gmail.com
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0009-6775-8821>

Authors Contribution: All authors have contributed equally to this work

Conflict of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest

The article was received by the editors 16.02.2026
The article is recommended for printing 04.04.2026

The article was revised 26.03.2026
This article published 25.05.2026

АРХІВ, З ЯКОГО НЕМОЖЛИВО ПОВЕРНУТИСЯ

Павленко Олексій Сергійович

аспірант, ННІ філософії, культурології, політології
Харківський національний університет імені В. Н. Каразіна
майдан Свободи, 4, Харків, 61022, Україна
E-mail: oleksii.pavlenko97@gmail.com
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0006-6301-8285>

Кордюмов Євген Вікторович

аспірант, ННІ філософії, культурології, політології
Харківський національний університет імені В. Н. Каразіна
майдан Свободи, 4, Харків, 61022, Україна
E-mail: kordumov.e.v@gmail.com
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0009-6775-8821>

АНОТАЦІЯ

У статті здійснюється філософський аналіз архіву як специфічного простору сучасної публічності, в якому втрата орієнтації відбувається не через брак інформації, а через надлишок упізнавання та повтору. Показано, що в умовах цифрових медіа архів перестає функціонувати як

пасивне сховище пам'яті й перетворюється на активне середовище, яке утримує суб'єкта в теперішньому, позбавляючи його можливості повернення, переосмислення й зміни траєкторії. Минуле в цьому режимі не віддаляється й не старіє, а безперервно відтворюється, набуваючи форми постійної присутності.

Центральним для аналізу є розрізнення між пам'яттю як орієнтиром і архівом як пасткою. Особлива увага приділяється феномену постістини, яка інтерпретується не як викривлення фактів або домінування вигадки, а як стан, у якому істина втрачає навігаційну функцію й перетворюється на акустичне середовище, що фіксує суб'єкта в точці впізнавання. У такому контексті культура скасування постає не як моральна санкція чи акт виключення, а як форма архівного паралічу, за якої суб'єкт залишається видимим, але позбавленим майбутнього.

Методологічну рамку дослідження формують міфологічні фігури Аїда, Тіресія та Сирен, які переосмислюються не як метафори, а як аналітичні моделі сучасної публічності. Аїд постає як структура часу без горизонту, де істина існує без дії; Тіресій – як образ експертного знання, що потребує жертви, але не бере відповідальності за наслідки; Сирени – як агресивний риторичний інтерфейс архіву, який перетворює минуле на спокусливе теперішнє. Їхня пісня інтерпретується як форма риторики завершеності, в якій істина не відкриває шлях, а скасовує потребу руху.

У підсумку показано, що філософський аналіз архіву дає змогу виявити нові форми публічного насильства, які здійснюються не через заборону чи примус, а через м'яке, майже турботливе утримання в минулому. Стаття обґрунтовує необхідність відновлення навігаційної дистанції між знанням і траєкторією як умови можливості майбутнього в сучасній публічності.

Ключові слова: архів, постістина, публічність, культура пам'яті, риторика, навігація, Сирени.

Внесок авторів: всі автори зробили рівний внесок у цю роботу

Конфлікт інтересів: автори повідомляють про відсутність конфлікту інтересів

Стаття надійшла до редакції 16.02.2026

Стаття рекомендована до друку 04.04.2026

Переглянуто 26.03.2026

Опубліковано 25.05.2026

Як цитувати / In cites: Pavlenko, O., & Kordiumov, Y. (2026). The archive that does not release. *The Journal of V. N. Karazin Kharkiv National University, Series Philosophy. Philosophical Peripeteias*, (74), 302-311. <https://doi.org/10.26565/2226-0994-2026-74-29>