

UDC 81.821.08

*М.Н. Азимова (Худжанд, Республика Таджикистан)***Понятие как термин когнитивной семасиологии**

*Аннотация:* В данной статье рассматривается термин «понятие» как фундаментальная категория когнитивной семасиологии. Исследование изучает теоретические основы когнитивного подхода к значению, прослеживая возникновение и развитие термина «понятие» от математической логики до его современного статуса в когнитивной лингвистике. Особое внимание уделяется различению между лингвистическим значением и ментальным понятием, а также семантическим процессам, лежащим в основе терминологической полисемии в различных профессиональных областях. В статье показано, что понятие, как единица ментальных ресурсов, обладает более широким содержанием, чем лингвистическое значение, и служит основным средством представления когнитивных процессов в языке.

*Ключевые слова:* понятие, когнитивная семасиология, значение, полисемия, терминология, лингвистическая семантика, когнитивная лингвистика

---

*M.N. Azimova (Khujand, Tajikistan Republic)***Concept as the Term of Cognitive Semasiology**

*Abstract:* The given article dwells on the term “concept” as a fundamental category of cognitive semasiology. The study explores the theoretical foundations of cognitive approach to meaning, tracing the emergence and development of the term “concept” from mathematical logic to its current status in cognitive linguistics. Special attention is paid to the distinction between linguistic meaning and mental concept, as well as to the semantic processes underlying terminological polysemy in various professional domains. The article demonstrates that concept, as a unit of mental resources, possesses broader content than linguistic meaning and serves as the primary means of representing cognitive processes in language.

*Key words:* concept, cognitive semasiology, meaning, polysemy, terminology, linguistic semantics, cognitive linguistics

## 1. INTRODUCTION

One of the main approaches to the study of meaning is the new cognitive approach. The study of language from the point of view of how it reflects the surrounding world is linked with numerous problems concerning the study of history, culture, and literature of different peoples, their mentality, national character, peculiarities of thinking, and psychology – all these phenomena are considered to be the object of research of cognitive semasiology.

The comparative semasiology formed in the middle of the 20<sup>th</sup> century is represented by several trends. The latest trend of comparative study of lexical semantics is cognitive, which concentrates its attention on the reflection of peculiarities of cognitive processes in languages.

The problems of how the human being accepts the surrounding world, how he perceives it in his mind, and how he represents this cognitive activity and reality in his language are at the center of linguistic research at the present stage of the development of language science. As all these tasks are tinged with mental processes and notions, the term “concept” becomes the basic object of research in cognitive linguistics.

The main purpose of the article is to analyze the theoretical foundations of the term “concept” within cognitive semasiology, to distinguish between linguistic meaning and mental concept, and to examine the manifestation of semantic processes – particularly polysemy – in terminological systems across various professional domains.

The genesis of the article stems from the need to systematize and synthesize the diverse interpretations of the term “concept” that have emerged in linguistic scholarship since the 1990s. The research is motivated by the increasing importance of cognitive approaches in contemporary linguistics and the necessity to clarify the relationship between mental representations and their linguistic expressions.

The functions of the article are: (1) to provide a comprehensive overview of the theoretical foundations of cognitive semasiology; (2) to establish clear conceptual distinctions between meaning and concept; (3) to analyze the semantic processes affecting terminological systems; (4) to identify prevailing research trends in lexical semantics based on a review of scientific publications; and (5) to contribute to the further development of cognitive-terminological research methodology.

## 2. METHODS AND MATERIALS

This study employs a comprehensive set of research methods appropriate for theoretical linguistic analysis. The primary method is theoretical analysis and synthesis, which involves examining and integrating existing scholarly works on cognitive linguistics, semasiology, and terminology. Descriptive method is utilized to characterize the term “concept” and its various interpretations across different scientific traditions. Comparative analysis allows for the distinction between linguistic meaning and mental concept, as well as for the examination of terminological polysemy across different professional domains. Contextual analysis is applied to examine the usage of terms within scientific publications. Additionally, lexico-semantic analysis is employed to investigate the structural and semantic characteristics of terminological units.

The materials for this study consist of two main categories. The first category includes foundational theoretical works on cognitive linguistics and semasiology by leading scholars such as E.S. Kubryakova [7; 8], I.V. Arnold [4], G.B. Antrushina [3], and E.V. Rakhilina [10]. These works provide the theoretical framework for understanding concept as a cognitive category and for analyzing semantic structure.

The second category comprises scientific publications from the period 2000–2010, including articles from journals and collections such as “Theory and Practice,” “Aspects of Language,” “English for Special Purposes,” “Discovering the World,” and “Focus on Language.” These materials include analyses of lexico-semantic groups of terms in various professional domains: military affairs, banking, economics, medicine, and taxation. Specific attention is given to works examining translation problems of English terminology, including O.S. Ahmedova’s study of economic terms and S. Starodub’s analysis of frequently confused words.

The reference base also includes contemporary studies in comparative linguistics by M.N. Azimova [1; 2] and B.P. Ashrapov [12; 13; 14; 15], which provide insights into cross-linguistic semantic analysis and terminological equivalence.

### 3. MAIN RESULTS

The term, having appeared as a notion of mathematical logic, was admitted into psychology, philosophy, and cultural studies, and thus became basic in cognitive linguistics since the 1990s. In spite of its wide usage, the term “concept” has not yet acquired a unique interpretation and therefore varies in the concepts of different scientific trends. The founder of the semantico-cognitive trend, E.S. Kubryakova, considers that a concept is a unit of mental and psychological resources of our mind and of that informative structure which reflects the knowledge and experience of a human being [7; 8].

The essential difference between meaning and concept is linked with their inner volume and content. Meaning is the unit of semantic space of the language, i. e., the element of the system of meanings of a concrete language. As for the concept, it is a phenomenon of mental (thinking) character, which is the main way of expressing thinking processes. The content of the concept is wider than that of meaning because “concepts keep their structure, never losing the features within the history of the people” [7: 45].

Analysis of periodical publications of scientific character published since 2000 till 2010 illustrates that the articles are dedicated to polysemy and homonymy, the problems of change of meaning and its typology, and the articles containing the notions “concept” and “language picture of the world.” Most of the articles investigate terms. The linguist E. Belyavskaya notes that the reason for the study of terms within recent years is linked with the spread of scientific-technical terms beyond the spheres they were previously peculiar to and the appearance therefore of new meanings which lead to polysemy.

The semantic way of term formation remains actual and very productive. Terminological polysemy is caused by the appearance of two denotations – objects and notions.

The journal “Theory and Practice” from 2006 to 2010 analyzes lexico-semantic groups of terms which refer to the following branches: military and banking affairs, economy, medicine, and others. Besides, the articles regard the problems which occur while translating English terms, taking into consideration that the English language has the potential for polysemy due to its unlimited correlating possibilities of words in the language, particularly nouns. For example, in O.S. Ahmedova’s article “Lexico-semantic Problems while Translating Economic Terms from the English Language,” the semantic way of translating English tax and customs terms into other languages is examined, as there is often common non-terminological meaning beside the terminological. The author points out that in different branches of economy, in case of polysemy, the term can be used in different lexico-semantic meanings. For example: bill – 1) налог; счет; 2) банк; вексель; 3) юрид.: законопроект. Tax bill – счет на уплату налогов.

Terminological meaning is distinguished on the basis of its special function, as for tax and customs terminology while dividing the common and functional semantics in the process of polysemy.

The articles which may attract our attention are published mainly in such columns as “Aspects of Language,” “English for Special Purposes,” “Discovering the World,” and “Focus on Language.” The articles are devoted to problems of synonymy, polysemy, homonymy, and antonymy. The author of the article “The Words Which Are Often Confused,” S. Starodub, points out that the words are identical in written form, but the meaning is different. For example, quite and quiet, suit and suite. They are identical in pronunciation, close in spelling, but quite different in meaning. Some words are quite different, but they can be mixed easily, as they are close in meaning: baby, infant; or job – work. There are articles published in the column “English for Special Purposes” which deserve particular attention for presenting the summary of the most essential problems of lexicology and semasiology.

Thus, in the article “Translation and Style,” the question of change of meaning of the word is touched upon: metaphor as one of the types of change of meaning is described as a semantic process of associating two referents, one of which in some way resembles the author. Metonymy is a shift of names between things that are known to be in some way or other connected in reality.

For example: paper – бумага; paper – документ, газета, научная работа.

It is often met in political vocabulary, when the place of some establishment is used not only for the establishment itself or its staff but also for its policy, for example: the White House, the Pentagon.

Besides metaphor, the author describes metonymy and models of transfer based on related notions: spatial, temporal, logical, quantitative. The columns “Discovering the World” and “Focus on Language” are the columns where you can find articles dedicated to the etymology of this or that word or word combination. The author of the article “Crazy English” published in this column recommends using some facts of history.

Thus we may conclude that as the basis of the selection of the material for this thematic column, the principle “knowing the peculiarities of the language” or “its nature” is vital.

#### 4. DISCUSSION

The analysis presented in this study reveals several important theoretical and methodological issues concerning the status of “concept” in cognitive semasiology and its relationship to linguistic meaning.

##### 4.1. THE CONCEPT-MEANING DISTINCTION: THEORETICAL IMPLICATIONS

The findings confirm that the distinction between concept and meaning, as articulated by Kubryakova [7; 8], is fundamental for understanding the cognitive turn in semantics. Concept, as a unit of mental resources, encompasses not only linguistic knowledge but also encyclopedic, cultural, and experiential knowledge accumulated throughout the history of a people. This broader scope explains why concepts cannot be reduced to mere linguistic meanings – they represent the intersection of language, thought, and culture. The implication for linguistic theory is significant: if concepts are the primary units of thought, then language study must engage with cognitive processes, not merely with formal semantic structures.

However, this distinction also raises methodological challenges. How can researchers access mental concepts if they are not directly observable? The analysis of linguistic expressions – particularly terminological systems – provides one pathway, as language offers the most systematic externalization of conceptual structures. Yet, as Korlyakova [6] notes, experimental methods may be necessary to fully capture the cognitive dimensions of meaning.

#### 4.2. TERMINOLOGICAL POLYSEMY AND COGNITIVE PROCESSES

The analysis of terminological polysemy across various professional domains reveals that semantic change in terminology is not arbitrary but reflects underlying cognitive processes. The examples of *bill* in economics and *paper* in general usage demonstrate that polysemy arises from the human capacity to perceive relationships between different referents – whether based on similarity (metaphor) or contiguity (metonymy). These cognitive mechanisms, as described in the “Translation and Style” article, are universal, but their linguistic manifestations vary across languages, creating challenges for translation and cross-linguistic terminology management.

The persistence of the semantic method of term formation, noted in the analysis of publications from 2000–2010, indicates that languages continue to rely on metaphorical and metonymic extension to create new terminology. This finding supports the cognitive linguistic view that language is not an autonomous system but is grounded in general cognitive processes.

#### 4.3. THE ROLE OF CONTEXT IN DETERMINING MEANING

The analysis of words frequently confused (*quite / quiet*, *suit / suite*, *baby / infant*) underscores the importance of context in disambiguating meaning. While these words may share formal features (spelling, pronunciation, or semantic proximity), their actual meanings are determined by their usage in specific linguistic and situational contexts. This observation aligns with the findings of Falileev [11] regarding the connotative aspects of phraseological units and with the work of Azimova [2] on equivalence and non-equivalence in phraseology. The implication for lexicography and language teaching is that presenting words in isolation is insufficient; learners must encounter them in authentic contexts to grasp their full semantic potential.

#### 4.4. CROSS-LINGUISTIC PERSPECTIVES AND TRANSLATION CHALLENGES

The translation problems identified in O.S. Ahmedova’s analysis of economic terminology highlight the practical significance of cognitive-semantic research. When a term like *bill* corresponds to multiple equivalents in another language, the translator must access not only the linguistic meaning but also the underlying conceptual structure and the specific professional context. This challenge is compounded when terms migrate across professional domains, acquiring new meanings while retaining old ones. The comparative studies by Ashrapov [12; 13; 14; 15] on Tajik, Chinese, and English demonstrate that such translation challenges are universal and require systematic cross-linguistic analysis.

#### 4.5. RESEARCH TRENDS AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

The review of publications from 2000–2010 reveals that while interest in concept and cognitive approaches has grown, much research remains focused on traditional semantic problems (polysemy, homonymy, synonymy) within terminological systems. This suggests that cognitive semasiology has not yet fully integrated with terminology

studies, despite their obvious relevance to each other. Future research should pursue deeper integration, examining how terminological systems reflect the conceptual structures of professional communities and how these structures evolve over time.

## 5. CONCLUSION

This study has examined the term “concept” as a fundamental category of cognitive semasiology, tracing its theoretical foundations and analyzing its manifestation in linguistic research and terminological systems.

The research has established that concept, as a unit of mental resources, possesses broader content than linguistic meaning, encompassing the full range of knowledge and experience accumulated by a people throughout their history. This distinction between meaning and concept is essential for understanding the cognitive turn in contemporary linguistics and for developing adequate methodologies for semantic analysis.

Thus, the cognitive approach to semasiology, with concept as its central category, offers a rich framework for understanding the relationship between language, thought, and reality. While challenges remain in defining and operationalizing the concept, its heuristic value for linguistic research is undeniable.

## ЛИТЕРАТУРА

1. *Азимова М.Н.* Синтаксические и семантические особенности прилагательных в английском и таджикском языках / М. Н. Азимова, Т. А. Салимова // Вестник Педагогического университета. 2023. №2(103). С. 12–16. EDN JXBVIY.
2. *Азимова М.Н.* Сопоставительный анализ эквивалентности и безэквивалентности фразеологизмов // Stephanos. 2023. №6(62). С. 21–29. DOI 10.24249/2309-9917-2023-62-6-21-29; EDN QKFAVF.
3. *Антрушина Г.Б.* Лексикология английского языка: Учебное пособие для студентов / Г.Б. Антрушина, О.В. Афанасьева, Н.Н. Морозова. М.: Дрофа, 1999. 288 с. EDN VSZOYW.
4. *Арнольд И.В.* Семантическая структура слова в современном английском языке и методика ее исследования. Л.: Просвещение. 1966. 192 с.
5. *Батдыева Т.Б.* Семантическая структура слова в современном английском языке // Синтез науки и общества в решении глобальных проблем современности: сб. статей Международной научно-практической конференции: В 3 ч. Ч. 1. Уфа: Омега Сайнс, 2017. С. 22–24.
6. *Корлякова А.Ф.* Значение слова: методы описания (на материале лингвистического эксперимента) // Евразийский гуманитарный журнал. 2020. №4. С. 49–56.
7. *Кубрякова Е.С.* В поисках сущности языка: Когнитивные исследования / Ин-т. языкознания РАН. М.: Знак, 2012. 208 с.
8. Краткий словарь когнитивных терминов / Под общ. ред. Е.С. Кубряковой. М.: Филол. фак. МГУ, 1997. 245 с.
9. *Кузнецова Н.О.* Лексикология английского языка: Учебное пособие. Красноярск: Сибирский федеральный университет, 2024. 136 с. EDN IENLGA.
10. *Рахилина Е.В., Плунгян В.А.* О лексико-семантической типологии // Глаголы движения в воде: лексическая типология. М.: Индрик, 2007. С. 9–26.
11. *Фалилеев А.Е.* Коннотативный аспект фразеологических единиц в английском политическом тексте // Инженерные технологии и системы. 2008. №3. С. 167–168.

12. *Ashrapov B.P.* A Comparative Analysis of the Morpho-Syntactic Peculiarities of English Preposition On and Its Equivalents in Tajik and Chinese // *Stephanos*. 2025. №3(71). P. 24–33. DOI 10.24249/2309-9917-2025-71-3-24-33; EDN FDSQYD.
13. *Ashrapov B.P.* On the Issue of the Usage of Certain Tajik Interjections and Their English and Chinese Equivalents: A Comparative Pragmatic and Semantic Analysis // *Stephanos*. 2026. №1(75). P. 20–27. DOI 10.24249/2309-9917-2026-75-1-20-27; EDN MFWABE.
14. *Ashrapov B.P.* On the Issue of the Usage of Certain Tajik Modal Particles and Their English Equivalents // *Stephanos*. 2025. №6(74). P. 21–30. DOI 10.24249/2309-9917-2025-74-6-21-30; EDN VLOVQZ.
15. *Ashrapov B.P.* The Level of Usage of Some Measure Words Quantifying Time and Distance in Tajik, Chinese and English // *Stephanos*. 2025. №2(70). P. 19–24. DOI 10.24249/2309-9917-2025-30-4-19-24; EDN UKPMFM.

## REFERENCES

1. Azimova M.N. & Salimova T.A. Syntactic and Semantic Features of Adjectives in English and Tajik. *Herald of the Pedagogical University*. 2023. No2(103), pp. 12–16. EDN JXBITY.
2. Azimova, M.N. Comparative Analysis of Equivalence and Non-equivalence of Phraseological units. *Stephanos*. 2023. No6(62), pp. 21–29. DOI: 10.24249/2309-9917-2023-62-6-21-29. EDN QKFAVF.
3. Antrushina G.B., Afanasyeva O.V., & Morozova N.N. (1999). English Lexicology: Textbook for students. Moscow. Drofa Publ. 288 p. EDN VSZOYW.
4. Arnold I.V. (1966). Semantic Structure of the Word in Modern English and Methods of Its Investigation. Leningrad. Prosveshchenie Publ. 192 p.
5. Batdyeva T.B. Semantic Structure of the Word in Modern English. In: Synthesis of Science and Society in Solving Global Problems of Our Time: Collection of Articles / The International Scientific and Practical Conference: In 3 parts. Part 1. Ufa. Omega Science Publ. 2017, pp. 22–24.
6. Korlyakova A.F. Word Meaning: Methods of Description (based on linguistic experiment)]. *Eurasian Humanitarian Journal*. 2020. No4, pp. 49–56.
7. Kubryakova E.S. (2012). In Search of the Essence of Language: Cognitive Studies / Institute of Linguistics RAS. Moscow. Znak Publ. 208 p.
8. Kubryakova E.S. (Ed.). (1997). Brief Dictionary of Cognitive Terms. Moscow. Philological Faculty of Moscow State University Press. 245 p.
9. Kuznetsova N.O. (2024). English Lexicology: Textbook. Krasnoyarsk. Siberian Federal University Press. 136 p. EDN IEHLGA.
10. Rakhilina E.V. & Plungyan V.A. (2007). On Lexico-semantic Typology. In: Verbs of Movement in Water: Lexical Typology. Moscow. Indrik Publ. 2007, pp. 9–26.
11. Falileev A.E. Connotative Aspect of Phraseological Units in English Political Text. *Engineering Technologies and Systems*. 2008. No3, pp. 167–168.
12. Ashrapov B.P. A Comparative Analysis of the Morpho-syntactic Peculiarities of English Preposition on and Its Equivalents in Tajik and Chinese. *Stephanos*. 2025. No3(71), pp. 24–33. DOI: 10.24249/2309-9917-2025-71-3-24-33; EDN FDSQYD.
13. Ashrapov B.P. On the Issue of the Usage of Certain Tajik Interjections and Their English and Chinese Equivalents: A comparative Pragmatic and Semantic Analysis. *Stephanos*. 2026. No1(75), pp. 20–27. DOI: 10.24249/2309-9917-2026-75-1-20-27; EDN MFWABE.

14. Ashrapov B.P. On the Issue of the Usage of Certain Tajik Modal Particles and Their English Equivalentents. *Stephanos*. 2025. No 6(74), pp. 21–30. DOI: 10.24249/2309-9917-2025-74-6-21-30; EDN VLOVQZ.
15. Ashrapov B.P. The level of Usage of Some Measure Words Quantifying Time and Distance in Tajik, Chinese and English. *Stephanos*. 2025. No 2(70), pp. 19–24. DOI: 10.24249/2309-9917-2025-30-4-19-24; EDN UKPMFM.

*Сведения об авторе:*

Матлуба Нуриддиновна Азимова,  
доктор филол. наук  
профессор  
факультет иностранных языков  
Худжандский государственный университет  
имени академика Б. Гафурова

Matluba N. Azimova,  
Dr. of Philology  
Professor  
Faculty of Foreign Languages  
Khujand State University named  
after academician B. Gafurov