UDC 81
DOI https://doi.org/10.32782/2710-4656/2026.5/29

Mammadova S. I.
https://orcid.org/0009-0003-9714-7534
Azerbaijan National Academy of Sciences

THE PHENOMENON OF "CONCEPT" IN THE PHILOSOPHY OF LANGUAGE AND THE PARADIGM OF COGNITIVE LINGUISTICS

This research paper analyzes the evolutionary path of linguistics based on Thomas Kuhn's model of scientific revolutions and paradigm theory. It notes that, in keeping with the specific nature of the humanities, the comparative-historical and systemic-structural paradigms did not completely replace each other but, on the contrary, overlapped and paved the way for the emergence of the modern anthropocentric paradigm. According to Cassirer, it is a symbolic space where cultural codes are formed. The main goal of the article is to identify the distinctive features of the logical-rational category of "concept" (conceptus) and the subjective-cultural paradigm of "concept", to conduct a comparative analysis of the forms of objectification of the concept in the internal semantic system of language, and its role in constructing a linguistic picture of the world. In this regard, the primary objective is to determine how universal cognitive units are verbalized and grouped in various forms based on the internal semantic and pragmatic regularities of different languages, as well as to assess the differences in the internal semantic organization of purely rational scientific language and the unique philosophical and lyrical language at the level of linguistic philosophy. As a result of the research and analytical comparisons conducted, it was established that, although universal concepts of a universal nature exist, they are grouped in various forms under the influence of the specific linguistic and cultural factors of each ethnic group. It has been proven that in human consciousness, concepts are linked to one another through "semantic derivation", creating a dynamic discursive process. In the context of Ferdinand de Saussure's principle of the "arbitrariness of the sign", if in scientific language a sign (term) directly defines its meaning, then in conceptual and artistic-philosophical language the field of connotations of a word expands and directly refers to subjective experience and cultural associations.

Keywords: *concept, cognitive linguistics, philosophy of language, anthropocentric paradigm, cultural codes, semantic derivation.*

Introduction. In modern times, the approach to conceptual systems has taken on a more fundamental, multidisciplinary and holistic character at the intersection of philosophy, linguistics and cognitive sciences, and new scientific views and paradigms have emerged on the concept. While in traditional logic and philosophy, concepts were considered as abstract and static structures, far from subjective reality, this view has fundamentally changed within the framework of modern cognitive research and philosophy of language, and new methodological aspects have been formed in philosophy itself. In modern science, when we say "concept", we mean the basic unit of the information structure and mental resources of the brain, which includes the personal experience, sensory perception and acquired knowledge of an individual in his individual consciousness. In other words, a concept is not just a passive reflection of the objective world in our brain. From a modern scientific point of view, a concept is considered a dynamic, constantly updated part of the memory mechanism, internal mental lexicon, cognitive system and internal language of the brain. Concepts are, in essence, components of the spiritual structure that an individual builds about both real reality and abstract and imaginary worlds – a kind of structured knowledge "quanta" of human consciousness. In cognitive processes, they perform the function of "interpreters of meaning" that systematize subjective experience by dividing it into certain categories and classes, and regulate the chaotic flow of information. These elements, which play an important role in the preservation, processing and transmission of information to other individuals, are flexibly transformed, expanded and reshaped in parallel with the intellectual development of a person and the increase in his empirical knowledge.

© Mammadova S. I., 2026
Стаття поширюється на умовах ліцензії відкритого доступу CC BY 4.0

These elements, which play an important role in the preservation, processing and transmission of information to other individuals, are flexibly transformed, expanded and reshaped in parallel with the intellectual development of a person and the increase in his empirical knowledge.

If we proceed from the approach of Thomas Kuhn [9], the creator of the concept of paradigm and the model of scientific revolutions in science, and Palmer [12], who continued his ideas, the science of linguistics has gone through three important stages throughout its development – comparative-historical, system-structural and, finally, the modern anthropocentric paradigm. In accordance with the specifics of the humanities, these paradigms do not completely eliminate each other, but, on the contrary, continue to exist simultaneously, overlapping. If the comparative-historical approach of the 19th century and the Saussurean system-structural paradigm focused on the internal structure of language of the 20th century focused on the pure language unit, the word and the internal mechanisms of language itself, the anthropocentric paradigm formed on the threshold of the 21st century focused scientific attention entirely on the fourfold "Language – Culture – Man – Ethno". In this new cognitive paradigm, language is no longer a closed system in itself, but acts as the main means of understanding man, his cultural codes and ethnic thinking. It is at this level that the sciences of linguoculturology and cognitive linguistics undertake the mission of investigating the phenomenon of the concept not only as an internal semantic unit of language, but also as the main spiritual "quantum" of the cultural memory of the ethnos and the national worldview.

Analysis of Recent Research and Publications. When we look at philosophical treatises and the literature on the history of philosophy, we can see that the practice of applying concepts in many cases is not direct, but hidden – implicit. This topic is extremely relevant for both classical philosophy and modern poststructuralist and cognitive-linguistic research. Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari [4] in their fundamental work "What is Philosophy?" described the phenomenon of the concept as the main creative element of philosophy. According to their approach, the philosopher is not just a seeker of stable truth, but also an artist who creates new planes of thought and concepts. However, filtering this approach through a poststructuralist perspective, Cleir Colebrook claims that in philosophical texts the terms "notion" (notio) and "concept" are sometimes identified and a sharp, impassable boundary is not drawn between them. According to Colebrook, the lack of a deep analysis of the internal semantic differences of these two philosophical categories often leads to methodological confusion in modern cultural studies [1]. From a linguo-philosophical point of view, this confusion arises from the construction of the relationship between the referent – object and the concept – mental meaning in the sign system of language at a purely rational or artistic-individual level. While in the classical structural linguistics paradigm, the signifier – word and signified – meaning relations constitute a stable system, in the poststructuralist philosophy of language, meaning is constantly shifting and being reproduced depending on the context. It is at this point that when we differentiate the semiotic models of cultural concept and meaning relations, that is, the activity of thinking and its product, the "thought", an implicit regularity regarding the internal working mechanisms of consciousness is revealed. According to this regularity, the minimal unit of thought is the cultural concept, and it acts as an internal value-meaning representation of collective empirical experience. In other words, the concept is an internal reflection of the empirical content, generalized and structured in a certain internal way. In contrast, the central unit of consciousness is the meaning of the linguistic unit. Linguistic meaning is the ideal form of the crystallized spiritual experience of society as an objective-historical phenomenon, fixed in a specific linguistic sign.

Task Statement. The main goal of the study is to comparatively analyze the mental-psychological essence of the concept of "concept" in modern cognitive sciences and its structural-ontological nature in philosophical disciplines. In this context, the goal is to determine how universal cognitive units are verbalized and grouped in different forms based on the internal semantic and pragmatic regularities of different languages. The study examines the mechanisms of conveying individual – artistic and philosophical meanings created by subjective consciousness of the language, and analyzes the place of the concept in the linguistic landscape of the world. Thus, the main task of this work is to filter the differences in the internal semantic organization of purely rational scientific language and the unique philosophical-lyrical language through the philosophy of linguistics and to substantiate the concept as a central element of the language-thought-culture triad.

Outline of the Main Material of the Study. From the point of view of theoretical-philosophical linguistics, a concept is not just a psychophysiological cognitive unit, it is a mental and cultural phenomenon objectified in the semantic system of language.

If traditional linguistics perceived language only as a system of formal signs, linguophilosophy considers language as an ontological space where concepts are formed and stored. In this context, unlike the category of "understanding", which is a product of logical-rational activity and whose meaning is completely unambiguous, limited to abstract terms, "concept" also includes the ethnosphere of language, that is, national-cultural experience, symbols, metaphorical associations and emotional-expressive shades. Universal moral values and realities are verbalized and grouped in various ways based on the internal regularities and pragmatic factors of specific languages. From this point of view, the concept is such a "piece of culture" standing at the intersection of language and thought, the study of which at the level of philosophical linguistics promises new heuristic opportunities in understanding the world's linguistic landscape. In recent years, as in world linguistics, the number of studies on both cognitive science and linguopsychological problems of language has been rapidly increasing in the Azerbaijani academic environment. The main objective reason for this trend is the acceptance of the fact that language, rather than being a purely functional system of signs, has the essence of a deep linguopsychological phenomenon. Although discourse, speech, text and words, which are structural units of language, are different linguopsychological categories, they are all programmed to meet the needs of communication. In this context, the study of the phenomenon of "concept" in the philosophy of language and cognitive linguistics paradigm is not only theoretical and methodological in nature, but also serves to determine the boundaries of the cognitive capabilities of language.

At this level, cognitive linguocultology accepts two fundamental semiotic models that regulate the cognitive activity of human consciousness: the logical model of the world – formalizes reality through abstract and rational concepts, and the linguistic model of the world – directly constructs reality and its ethnocultural shades on the basis of concepts. As Gottlob Frege substantiated in the classical philosophy of language, there is a sharp asymmetry between the "meaning" that arises in individual consciousness and the objectified "meaning/value" of the linguistic sign [5]. Meaning is subjective, situational, dynamic, differs on an interpersonal level and rapidly changes from text to text, from epoch to epoch. Linguistic meaning, on the contrary, has a social character, is stable, is included in the collective system and constitutes a permanent invariant layer of the linguistic unit. Since meaning directly expresses the internal relationship between the motives and goals of the subject, it directly gives the word an existential and ethnocultural character. As emphasized in Edmund Husserl's phenomenological paradigm, meaning is the actual value and significance that an object has for a subject [7].

The objective meaning of a linguistic unit does not filter through the direct sensory-perceptual experience of the individual. The semantic structure of a sign is not linear, it conceals a complex retrospective of hierarchical and genetically interconnected meanings extending into the past. The process of a person interpreting reality and giving meaning to an object consists of the assimilation by consciousness of the system of external, subject and semantic relations that the object is included in. Linguistic meaning is the most universal means of transferring – recoding – these complex internal shades of meaning, which cannot be directly observed, are situational and subjective in nature, into a formal lexical structure. From this point of view, the conceptual system is the internal driving force of the semantic development of linguistic units, and linguistic meaning is the product of this movement, which is stabilized in language as a result of discursive-cognitive activity.

To overcome this methodological confusion, modern communicative-cognitive linguistics offers important theoretical tools. Thus, the objective world surrounding us consists of individual manifestations of animate and inanimate nature, and human consciousness systematizes this reality in the form of certain mental images, categories and concepts. The uniqueness of human language lies precisely in the fact that, on the one hand, it actively participates in these general classification processes, providing abstract categories with concrete linguistic names, and on the other hand, it conveys the individual specificity of standard objects and the multitude of variants in the form of special designations. From this point of view, according to the principles of cognitive linguistics, conceptualization is the process of forming abstract ideas, feelings and images in consciousness using concrete linguistic means and transferring them to the language structure.

In the general scientific paradigm, conceptualization is a methodology for introducing certain ontological concepts into the empirical data set. This procedure allows us to put forward scientific hypotheses about the nature and relationships of the hypothesized objects, and to schematize changes in the referent field. Conceptualization at the cognitive level refers to the process of understanding new information and the emergence of new concepts in consciousness.

Within this approach, the concept is perceived as the product of activity aimed at isolating minimal units of human experience, that is, as the smallest, minimal unit of knowledge. At the same time, this phenomenon is not just a static method, but a universal technology that studies how meanings are transferred and can be translated from one discourse to another, as well as from one culture to another. Because the process of conceptualization is inextricably linked to the worldview and individual or collective tendencies that interpret the reality around us – mentality.

Such an inextricable connection of the conceptualization process with human experience and the realities of everyday life was further substantiated by George Lakoff and Mark Johnson [10], who laid the foundations of cognitive linguistics, within the framework of the theory of conceptual metaphors. The authors note that metaphor is perceived by most people as simply a product of poetic imagination or rhetorical ornament, that is, a phenomenon outside ordinary language. Moreover, it is thought to be a purely linguistic phenomenon, not related to thought or action, but only to words. Lakoff and Johnson, in sharp contrast to this traditional philosophical approach, have discovered that metaphorical structures have completely penetrated the inner fabric of everyday life, thought, and action. The ordinary conceptual system on which a person relies both in thinking and in acting is fundamentally metaphorical in nature. The concepts that regulate human cognitive activity are not only intellectual, but also components that govern the most ordinary details of everyday activity. These mental structures directly shape what the subject perceives, how he positions himself in the world, and how he relates to other people. Since communication is essentially based on the same conceptual system, language becomes the richest source of empirical evidence for studying the internal order of this system. Lakoff and Johnson explain this with the famous conceptual metaphor "Argument is war" [10]. Language expressions such as "defending claims", "firing positions", or "demolishing arguments" indicate that thinking automatically operates in this military scenario. This is precisely the essence of the metaphor: understanding and experiencing one kind of experience or object through the prism of another object. This is not a poetic excursion in language, but a technology for the literal conceptualization of reality in consciousness. On the other hand, Deleuze's [3] more individualistic and epistemologically systematic work "Difference and Repetition" opens a different horizon in the context of this differentiation. Here the author examines the qualitative degrees of "similarity" and the quantitative degrees of "equality," which are different degrees of generality, and analyzes the fundamental incompatibility between the category of "repetition" and the concept of "generality." Deleuze has established an important theoretical basis in philosophical literature by revealing three special cases of what he calls the "natural blockade" – limitation in the formation of thinking – nominal concepts, concepts of nature and concepts of freedom.

This triple classification presented by Deleuze is directly parallel to the semantic levels and conceptualization mechanisms of language units in theoretical linguistics mentioned above [3]. The "nominal concepts" emphasized by the author correspond to the meaning structure of proper nouns and individual units that carry a purely nominative function in linguistics. "Concepts of nature" are a family of classical universal categories and common nouns in the cognitive structure of language, the internal semantics of which is based on the principles of homogenization that form the general linguistic picture of the world. The concepts of freedom reflect the pragmatic and discursive level of language. Here, meaning is not frozen, but has a dynamic character based on the volitional experience of the subject.

It is at this point that the conceptualization mechanisms direct us to the paradigm of cultural concepts that regulate the collective belonging of language speakers. In the linguo-philosophical sense, the cultural concept is located at the intersection of the reality of collective culture and the individual internal meanings of the subject. This phenomenon is such a universal cultural component that is objectified in the consciousness of the individual, through which a person enters the value system of the civilization to which he belongs. As Wilhelm von Humboldt justified within the framework of the theory of the internal form of language and the national spirit, the concept is not just a dry statement of a rational concept at any given moment, but its entire historical evolution compressed within the language [6]. These mental structures, which are completely anthropocentric in nature, appear in the internal structure of the language saturated with rich cultural connotations.

In this context, the organization of the general semantic system of the language is described not by a uniform network of logical considerations, but by a spatial "crystal lattice" model arising from the national-linguistic combinatorics of fundamental concepts [2]. The transformation of the initially pure mental

picture of the world into a concrete linguistic structure and the acquisition of the status of an independent "linguistic picture of the world" occurs within the aforementioned combinatorial lattice.

Therefore, the ethnocultural layer of concepts is of particular importance for linguocultology. Even fundamental concepts of universal, universal nature, such as time, space and fate, take on completely specific forms in different languages under the influence of linguistic, pragmatic, geographical and social factors and are verbalized with different semantic shades. As a rule, cultural concepts are organized in the spatial structure in the form of complex associative-semantic networks, ethnically marked. This, regardless of the will of the subject, does not entail frozen concepts within the system of language and thought, but rather a constantly renewed process of living meaning creation.

The conducted analyses show that although universal concepts of universal character (time, space, freedom, etc.) exist, they are grouped and verbalized in different forms under the influence of linguistic, pragmatic and culturological factors specific to each ethnos. In human memory, concepts are not isolated, but are connected to each other through complex hierarchical and associative semantic networks. This networking process occurs through "semantic derivation" in language, which ensures the transition of the concept from a static concept to a dynamic discursive process. According to Deleuze's [4] ontological model, the difference between repetition and generality is essentially of a deep philosophical and ontological nature. The concept of generality homogenizes the object, that is, puts it on the same level as other similar ones. This generality, acting as a representative of the particular, stands in contrast to "repetition", which is a universal expression of unique individuality.

In the conceptual system, repetition acts as the internal logic of the unique and particular. If the logical power of a concept is always manifested in the ability to subordinate the individual to the general class, then again it is an indicator of the inability of that rational concept to explain the individual or its real, logical limit. At the linguistic level, this difference is revealed in a new shade with the "arbitrariness of the sign" described by Ferdinand de Saussure, that is, the principle of the unnecessary connection between the word and the meaning [13]. In scientific language, the sign – the term directly determines its meaning and its semantic field is narrow and clear. However, in conceptual language, the connotation field of the word expands so much that the sign no longer refers to a fixed object, but directly to subjective experience and cultural association.

Conclusions. This study, conducted on both the mental-psychological side of the concept in cognitive sciences and the structural-ontological nature in philosophy, shows that this phenomenon has a centuries-old and very rich historical-philosophical evolution. Over the course of the relevant structural periods, it has found its reflection in different scientific paradigms and texts of different methodological nature.

However, a serious problem still remains at the methodological level: there are sharp differences and dispersion between the semantic meanings that different schools and researchers assign to the term "concept". The most important methodological shortcoming is that even in areas where modern researchers most need such flexible, synthetic and culture-oriented intellectual constructions, the heuristic – new knowledge-producing potential of the concept is still not sufficiently used. This shortcoming is more pronounced at the intersection of philosophy and linguistics. Because the concept is rooted primarily in the internal semantic memory of the language, and its study as a mere abstract philosophical category relegates the living fabric of the language to the background. This heuristic limitation and deficiency is especially evident in the fundamental directions of philosophy, namely the theory of cognition – epistemology – and the philosophy of hermeneutics, which interprets the internal meanings of the text.

If hermeneutics and epistemology move away from the traditional, frozen paradigm of "concepts" and make a transition to the methodology of "concepts" that carry living cultural codes and are enriched by the experience of the individual, the analysis of human cognitive activity will acquire a more effective character. This transition will create conditions for theoretical-philosophical linguistics to read the inner spirit of languages and the linguistic picture of the world not visually, but with deep layers of meaning. The transition from purely formal syntax to conceptual discourse analysis in the analysis of texts will confirm that language is not only a means of transmitting information, but also a repository that preserves the linguistic codes of culture. The future development vector of modern scientific-philosophical research largely depends on the correct assimilation of this hidden heuristic potential of the concept phenomenon, the acceptance of its dynamic nature in the system of language and thinking, and its integration into scientific methodology.

Bibliography:

1. Colebrook C. Understanding Deleuze. Allen & Unwin, 2002.
2. Croft W., Cruse D. A. Cognitive linguistics. Cambridge University Press, 2004.
3. Deleuze G. Difference and repetition (P. Patton, Trans.). Columbia University Press, 1994.
4. Deleuze G., Guattari F. What is philosophy? Columbia University Press, 1994.
5. Frege G. Sense and referenc. *The Philosophical Review*, 57(3), 1948, p.209-230.
6. Humboldt W. On language: On the diversity of human language-structure and its influence on the mental development of mankind. Cambridge University Press, 1999.
7. Husserl E. Logical investigations. Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1975.
8. Jackendoff R. Languages of the mind: Essays on mental representation. MIT Press, 1992.
9. Kuhn T.S. The structure of scientific revolutions (4th ed.). University of Chicago Press, 2012.
10. Lakoff G., Johnson M. Metaphors we live by. University of Chicago Press, 1980.
11. Langacker R.W. Foundations of cognitive grammar: Vol. 1. Theoretical prerequisites. Stanford University Press, 1987.
12. Palmer G.B. Toward a anatomy of cognitive linguistics: Cultural linguistics. University of Texas Press, 1996.
13. Saussure F. Course in general linguistics (P. Meisel & H. Saussy, Eds.; W. Baskin, Trans.). Columbia University Press, 2011.
14. Searle J.R. Speech acts: An essay in the philosophy of language. Cambridge University Press, 1969.

Мамедова С. І. ФЕНОМЕН «КОНЦЕПТУ» У ФІЛОСОФІЇ МОВИ ТА ПАРАДИГМА КОГНІТИВНОЇ ЛІНГВІСТИКИ

У цій дослідницькій роботі аналізується еволюційний шлях лінгвістики на основі моделі наукових революцій та теорії парадигм Томаса Куна. Зазначається, що, відповідно до специфіки гуманітарних наук, порівняльно-історична та системно-структурна парадигми не повністю замінили одна одну, а, навпаки, перекривалися та проклали шлях для виникнення сучасної антропоцентричної парадигми. На думку Кассірера, це символічний простір, де формуються культурні коди. Головною метою статті є виявлення відмінних рис логіко-раціональної категорії «поняття» (concertus) та суб'єктивно-культурної парадигми «поняття», проведення порівняльного аналізу форм об'єктивації поняття у внутрішній семантичній системі мови та його ролі в побудові лінгвістичної картини світу. У зв'язку з цим першочерговим завданням є визначення того, як універсальні когнітивні одиниці вербалізуються та групуються в різні форми на основі внутрішніх семантичних та прагматичних закономірностей різних мов, а також оцінка відмінностей у внутрішній семантичній організації суто раціональної наукової мови та унікальної філософсько-ліричної мови на рівні лінгвістичної філософії. В результаті проведених досліджень та аналітичних порівнянь було встановлено, що, хоча універсальні поняття універсального характеру існують, вони групуються в різних формах під впливом специфічних лінгвістичних та культурних факторів кожної етнічної групи. Доведено, що в людській свідомості поняття пов'язані одне з одним через «семантичну деривацію», створюючи динамічний дискурсивний процес. У контексті принципу Фердинанда де Соссюра про «довільність знака», якщо в науковій мові знак (термін) безпосередньо визначає його значення, то в концептуальній та художньо-філософській мові поле конотацій слова розширюється та безпосередньо стосується суб'єктивного досвіду та культурних асоціацій.

Ключові слова: *концепт, когнітивна лінгвістика, філософія мови, антропоцентрична парадигма, культурні коди, семантична деривація.*

Дата першого надходження статті до видання: 04.09.2026
Дата прийняття статті до друку після рецензування: 18.09.2026
Дата публікації (оприлюднення) статті: 16.11.2026