ON THE CORRELATION BETWEEN THE TERMS "CONCEPT" AND "NOTION" IN COGNITIVE ONOMASIOLOGY AND LINGUOCULTURAL STUDIES

Sayfullaeva Zumradkhon Nuritdinovna
Master's Student
Bukhara State University,
Bukhara, Uzbekistan
Scientific Supervisor:
V. A. Anatolevn , (PhD)
Doctor of Philological Sciences, Associate Professor,
Bukhara State University,
Bukhara, Uzbekistan
Scientific Consultant:
T. P Troshkina (PhD)
Candidate of Philological Sciences, Associate Professor,
Kazan Federal University,
Kazan, Russian Federation

Abstract: The article examines the correlation between the terms *concept* and *notion* within the frameworks of cognitive onomasiology and linguocultural studies. Although these terms are frequently used interchangeably, their theoretical status varies significantly depending on disciplinary perspective. The study analyzes major interpretative approaches in Russian cognitive linguistics, linguocultural research, and philosophy of language, highlighting both convergences and divergences. Particular attention is paid to the role of conceptual structures in the process of nomination and to the distinction between logical abstraction and culturally marked mental representation. The findings demonstrate that while the notion traditionally refers to a logically structured cognitive abstraction, the concept functions as a broader category encompassing cognitive, cultural, evaluative, and symbolic dimensions. The article argues that integrating cognitive and linguocultural approaches enables a more comprehensive understanding of conceptual structures underlying linguistic nomination.

Keywords: concept, notion, nomination, cognitive onomasiology, linguocultural studies, representation, cognitive linguistics.

1. Introduction

Nomination—the process of assigning linguistic form to mental content—is a complex and multidimensional phenomenon. It involves the interaction of perception, categorization, abstraction, and verbalization. Contemporary cognitive linguistics views nomination not as a mechanical labeling process but as a dynamic mental operation grounded in conceptual organization.

According to E. S. Kubryakova, the act of nomination is typically preceded by the selection of conceptual structures from the conceptual system, which are subsequently integrated into a unified gestalt[1]. This observation raises a fundamental terminological issue: what precisely is selected in this process—*notions*, *concepts*, or other types of mental representations? [1]

The terms *concept* and *notion* have become central in cognitive linguistics, yet their correlation remains controversial. In Russian linguistic scholarship, the term *concept* gained

1847

prominence relatively recently, though its roots trace back to S. A. Askoldov's early twentieth-century work "Concept and Word"[2]. Since the 1980s, influenced by English-language cognitive science, the term has been widely adopted in Russian academia, often replacing or overlapping with the traditional term *notion*.[2]

The aim of this article is to analyze the theoretical status of the terms *concept* and *notion* in cognitive onomasiology and linguocultural studies and to evaluate the prospects for integrating these approaches.

The hypothesis is that the term *concept* represents a broader and more flexible category than *notion*, and that its integration with traditional logical terminology allows for a more nuanced understanding of nomination processes.

2. Literature Review

Before the rise of cognitive linguistics, onomasiology focused primarily on the relationship between object, notion, and name. The central question concerned how reality is reflected in mental abstraction and subsequently encoded in language.

The classical model presupposed a triadic structure:

object → notion → linguistic sign.

This model emphasized the logical dimension of abstraction. A notion was understood as a mental construct capturing essential features of an object. Philosophers, logicians, and linguists jointly investigated the structure and content of notions as cognitive tools.

The formation of a notion presupposes the prior formation of representation. As E. G. Belyaevskaya observes, representation is a reproduced image of an object reflecting its various attributes, whereas a notion constitutes a higher-level cognitive category revealing essential properties and their interrelations[3]. Thus, in traditional epistemology, representation precedes notion.[3]

The term *concept* entered Russian linguistics actively in the late twentieth century. Although it is etymologically derived from the Latin *conceptus* ("that which is conceived"), it acquired specific theoretical connotations within cognitive linguistics.

Scholars have proposed three major interpretative positions:

1. Equivalence of concept and notion (e.g., A. P. Babushkin).
2. Differentiation between concept and notion (e.g., N. N. Boldyrev, V. A. Maslova, Yu. S. Stepanov).
3. Identification of concept with meaning or sense (e.g., R. I. Pavilionis, D. S. Likhachev)[4]

Boldyrev distinguishes between the logical volume and content of a notion, arguing that a concept primarily corresponds to the content dimension and includes the conceptual component of lexical meaning[5]. Maslova emphasizes that while a notion contains essential features of an object, a concept encompasses the totality of culturally accumulated knowledge expressed through lexical, phraseological, and paremiological means[6].

In linguocultural studies, the concept acquires an explicitly cultural dimension. Yu. S. Stepanov famously described the concept as a "concentrate of culture in human consciousness"[7]. Unlike cognitive linguists, who treat almost every lexical unit as evidence of an underlying concept, linguocultural scholars restrict the term to culturally significant mental formations.

For instance, concepts such as *eternity*, *law*, *love*, or culturally specific notions like Russian *avos'* are considered emblematic of collective mentality.

This divergence between cognitive and cultural perspectives reveals methodological tension regarding scope and function of the term.

3. Methodology

The study employs a theoretical-comparative method combining:

1. Terminological analysis of definitions proposed in cognitive linguistics and linguocultural studies;
2. Comparative examination of conceptual models in nomination theory;
3. Analytical synthesis aimed at integrating disciplinary perspectives.

Primary sources include works by Kubryakova, Boldyrev, Maslova, Stepanov, Askoldov, and others.

4. Results

The analysis reveals that the notion is traditionally characterized by logical structure and abstraction. It is defined by essential features and serves as a tool of rational categorization.

The concept, in contrast, demonstrates broader semantic range. In cognitive linguistics, it is described as an operational unit of memory and mental lexicon—a structured quantum of knowledge[8]. It may include:

sensory imagery,
evaluative components,
cultural associations,
emotional overtones,
symbolic references.

Thus, while the notion is primarily logical, the concept is multi-layered.

Cognitive linguistics treats the concept as a generic term for various knowledge structures, including schemas, frames, scripts, and notions. Kubryakova characterizes the concept as a superordinate category encompassing multiple types of mental representation[9].

In linguocultural studies, however, the concept is selective and culturally marked. Not every lexical unit qualifies as a concept; only those embodying cultural memory or value are included.

Within cognitive onomasiology, nomination presupposes conceptual selection and integration. Conceptual structures are activated prior to verbalization. The concept thus functions as the immediate cognitive basis for naming.

The notion, although logically structured, lacks the dynamic, context-sensitive features necessary to explain semantic variability in discourse.

5. Discussion

The findings indicate that the divergence between *concept* and *notion* reflects broader epistemological orientations. The notion belongs to the logical tradition of categorization; the concept emerges within a cognitive-paradigmatic framework emphasizing mental representation and experiential grounding.

Cognitive linguistics broadens the analytical scope by recognizing individual, collective, verbalized, and non-verbalized conceptual structures. This flexibility resolves apparent contradictions such as universal versus culturally specific, linguistic versus non-linguistic, individual versus collective.

1849

Linguocultural studies, by contrast, restrict the term *concept* to culturally salient formations, highlighting emotional and symbolic dimensions. This limitation enhances cultural specificity but narrows theoretical generality.

The integration of these perspectives appears promising. The notion may be interpreted as a subtype of concept characterized by logical abstraction. Representation and schema may serve as more elementary conceptual forms. In this hierarchical model:

representation → notion → culturally marked concept.

Such a synthesis preserves analytical precision while acknowledging cultural complexity.

From a philosophical standpoint, Demyankov observes that linguists aim to reconstruct human conceptual standards based on language use, whereas philosophers seek to uncover universal conceptual essences[10]. Despite methodological differences, both disciplines share the objective of understanding human mentality.

6. Conclusion

The analysis demonstrates that the terms *concept* and *notion* are not interchangeable, despite partial overlap. The notion represents a logically structured abstraction focusing on essential features. The concept constitutes a broader cognitive category encompassing evaluative, cultural, emotional, and symbolic components.

In cognitive onomasiology, the concept functions as the immediate basis for nomination, enabling integration of diverse mental structures into linguistic expression. In linguocultural studies, the concept embodies culturally significant knowledge and collective memory.

The most productive approach lies not in rigid differentiation but in hierarchical integration. The notion may be viewed as one structural variant of concept within a broader cognitive system. Such integration allows for a comprehensive understanding of mental representation and linguistic nomination.

Future research may focus on empirical modeling of conceptual hierarchies and cross-disciplinary methodology linking cognitive science, linguistics, and cultural studies.

REFERENCES

1. Kubryakova, E. S. (2004). *Language and Knowledge.* Moscow: Languages of Slavic Culture, p. 317.
2. Askoldov, S. A. (1997). Concept and Word. In *Russian Philology Anthology*, pp. 267–280.
3. Belyaevskaya, E. G. (1991). *Semantic Structure of the Word*, p. 62.
4. Babushkin (1996); Likhachev (1997); Boldyrev (2002); Pavilionis (1976).
5. Boldyrev, N. N. (2002). Structure and Formation Principles of Evaluative Categories.
6. Maslova, V. A. (2004). *Cognitive Linguistics*, pp. 27–28.
7. Stepanov, Yu. S. (1997). *Constants: Dictionary of Russian Culture*.
8. Kubryakova et al. (1997). *Brief Dictionary of Cognitive Terms*.
9. Kubryakova (2004), p. 318.
10. Demyankov, V. Z. (1997). Philosophical Interpretation of Conceptual Structures.