

<https://doi.org/10.62837/2025.5.167>

HAJIYEVA SAKINA KAMAL
AZERBAIJAN STATE OIL AND INDUSTRY UNIVERSITY
Zeynalova_sekine@mail.ru

THE LINGUISTIC LANDSCAPE AND CONCEPT OF THE WORLD

Keywords: language, language centres of the world, concept, culture

Language is the main tool for shaping human knowledge about the world and for human existence. In the process of activity, as a reflection of the objective world, a person records the results of cognition through words. This accumulated knowledge reflected in language is referred to in various concepts such as “linguistic worldview,” “language representation of the world,” “language model of the world,” and “linguistic landscape of the world.” (Since the last expression is most commonly used in specialized literature, we will refer to it – A.A.).

The semantic, language-coded worldview of the world becomes outdated to some extent over time. However, since there is no alternative language means, old oppositions are traditionally revived, and new meanings emerge based on old ones.

The linguistic landscape of the world shapes the type of relationship a person has with the world (nature, animals, oneself). It defines a person’s behavior norms in the world and their attitude toward the world. Each natural language reflects a specific way of understanding and conceptualizing the world. The meanings expressed in it form a unified system of viewpoints, creating a kind of collective philosophy that becomes "absolute" for all speakers of that language.

Thus, the role of language is not only in conveying information but also in organizing what is to be conveyed. The worldview, which can be called knowledge about the world, forms the basis of both individual and social consciousness. Language meets the requirements of the cognitive process. The conceptual worldview of the world can vary among individuals. These individuals can be from different historical periods, social and age groups, fields of scientific knowledge, etc. People speaking different languages in similar conditions may have close or even similar conceptual worldviews, while speakers of the same language may have different worldviews. This means that the conceptual landscape of the world includes universal, national, and individual components in unity.

Although the concept of "concept" has been used by a number of scholars (A. Wierzbicka, Y.S. Stepanov, R.M. Frumkina, and others) for quite some time, a unified definition of it still does not exist. The first to study the concept in world linguistics was S.A. Askoldov. He believed that the main function of concepts is

substitution, because they are the product of thinking, and in the thinking process, concepts substitute a large number of objects belonging to the same type.

A concept can substitute both real objects and certain aspects of non-material or real actions. D.S. Likhachov, developing Askoldov's idea, considers the concept as "the logical expression of meanings used in the oral and written speech of language users" [4, p. 281]. Thus, based on the research of Askoldov and Likhachov, the process of concept formation can be understood as a simplification of the perceived colorful reality to its minimal form.

In linguistic literature, the concept is discussed in various ways. The variety of definitions of the notion stems from this. Most linguists consider the concept as a combination of an external categorical association and an internal, logically organized semantic structure. At the core of the concept lies the model of the basic meaning of the word, an invariant that unites all meanings of the word. In this case, we can speak about central and peripheral zones of the concept. The peripheral zone may contain new derivative meanings that move away from the central one. Both the external and internal aspects are part of the core, the base element of the concept.

For the internal structure, it represents "all the prototypical meanings of the given word," while for the external structure, it acts as "a model for categorizing all of its meanings" [7, p. 3]. While living, communicating, and acting in the world of "notions," "images," "fields," and "ideas," a person also lives and communicates in the deeper level of existence — the world of concepts. They think and act within that conceptual world as well.

The words "concept" and "notion" are similar only in their internal form. However, "concept" and "notion" are terms used in different sciences. The term "concept" began to be widely used in linguistics from the late 20th century and has primarily found its place in cultural studies. The main difference of a concept is that, although it is used in the study of both language and culture, it belongs neither strictly to language, nor to culture, nor even to the intersection of both. A concept is a mental unit, an element of consciousness.

A concept is linked to knowledge that reflects the existing features of an object. It is richer in content and directly connected to the cultural world. Concepts combine ideas that have formed at different times and in various historical periods. At this point, it is worth recalling Y.S. Stepanov's definition of a concept. He states: "A concept is like a clot of culture in a person's consciousness — it is what enters human mentality from culture. On the other hand, it is what allows a person to enter culture and, in some cases, even influence it" [6, p. 40].

Unlike notions, concepts can be both thought and felt. If this is possible, then concepts are also the objects of emotions — such as liking, disliking, and other feelings — and these emotions do not contradict one another. Instead, they reveal the diversity of ways in which concepts are formed.

Thus, the process of forming concepts involves reducing the perceived results of reality to the limits of human memory and aligning them with culturally accepted values expressed and internalized through religion, ideology, art, and other domains.

Since a concept is a unit of culture, it must include an evaluative component. It is precisely this evaluative element that distinguishes a concept from other mental units. A concept is a structural element of consciousness where the values of a society are formed.

A concept can be viewed as a model or construct that substitutes the object of research and is created to study it. The set of concepts allows for modeling a value system. Only those events that are subject to evaluation in real life serve as a foundation for the formation of a concept. After all, in order to evaluate an object, a person must "process" it internally, and this moment of internal reflection and evaluation is when a concept forms in the mind of a culture bearer.

The following characteristics of a concept are distinguished:

1. A concept is a mental representation that defines the relationship between objects;
2. A concept is an ideal image;
3. A concept is always expressed through language [1, p. 9–11].

Concepts exist both in the individual consciousness of a linguistic personality and in the collective consciousness of a linguistic group. They are units of informational structure that reflect consciousness and human experience.

Experience shapes consciousness. Consciousness and experience can be both collective and individual. Therefore, we can speak of both individual and collective concepts. Collective concepts may relate to micro-groups, macro-groups, national, civilizational, or universal human levels.

Both types of concepts are of interest to researchers. However, it should be noted that individual concepts are richer and more diverse than collective ones, since "collective consciousness and experience are nothing but a conditional derivative of the individual consciousness and experience of the separate members within the collective" [5, p.16]. This derivation occurs through the reduction of all the uniqueness found in individual experience, while individual concepts themselves contain more elements.

On the other hand, collective concepts are also of interest because they form shared knowledge (images, beliefs, assumptions, etc.) within the collective consciousness.

One of the main issues of conceptology is the relationship between concepts and language units. The fact that the word and the concept share a common plane of expression creates a certain scientific intrigue, which results in a paradoxical idea — that a concept is both a word and not a word. The description of specific

concept-words from a nation's culture may be directly related to the concepts of that culture.

When describing a word's relation to other words, we indirectly obtain a partial explanation of the word in question.

In the communication process, the activation of a concept primarily occurs through linguistic signs. Certain linguistic units are capable of expressing the concept more fully and generally. These units are considered the name of the concept. However, this name is not the only means of activating the concept. Any concept can be realized through different forms of signs, and it is this ability that characterizes it. "The more diverse the potential sign expressions of a concept are, the older the concept is, and the higher its cultural value within a given linguistic community" [5, p.18].

As long as it exists, a concept can lose some of its associations with specific language units and gain new ones. Thus, the concept is a unit aimed at integrating scientific achievements in the fields of culture, consciousness, and language. This is because it belongs to consciousness, is rooted in culture, and is materialized through language [5, p.9].

Concepts hold an important place in collective linguistic consciousness, which makes their study extremely significant.

To fully understand a concept, it is necessary to construct a model that reflects its structure. The study of this structure shows that "the initial empirical image first appears as the concrete sensory content of the concept; then, as it is coded and understood, it gradually becomes a complex, multidimensional sign of the concept" [3, pp. 111–112]. From this, it follows that the structure allows the exchange of information about the concept and the activation of related words.

A concept has a complex structure. On one hand, it includes "everything typical of the structure of an idea" [6, p.43]; on the other hand, it includes "everything that makes it a cultural phenomenon" [6, p.43]—such as etymology, history, modern associations, evaluations, and more.

In the concept of understanding, volume (the number of objects included in that concept) and content (the set of general and essential features of the concept) are distinguished.

In the science of culture, the term concept is used to refer to content. Thus, the term concept becomes a synonym of meaning. A concept can be considered the semantic plan of a word. Based on this, it can be assumed that a concept includes "all communicative meaningful information besides object reference" [2, p.4]. This shows the place of the given sign in the lexical system of the language.

The semantic composition of a concept includes all paradigmatic information related to the expressive function of the linguistic sign. Another component of the semantics of a linguistic concept is the "cognitive memory of the

word,” which consists of the semantic characteristics accumulated in the system of meanings and associations of the linguistic sign [8, p.45].

So, to what extent do abstract (empty) concepts exist for people belonging to a specific culture?

To answer this question, Y.S. Stepanov puts forward the following hypothesis: "Concepts exist in different layers in different forms, and in these layers, they are perceived differently by members of the given culture" [6, p.48].

In the first layer, that is, in the actual feature, the concept "exists as a means of mutual understanding and communication for all who use that language" [6, p.48]. Since the concept is a means of communication, in this layer it becomes part of both the structure of communication and the thinking process.

In the second layer, or in additional "passive" features, the concept "exists as real only for certain social groups" [6, p.48].

The third layer, or the internal form, is only recently being addressed by researchers. However, this does not mean the concept does not exist in this layer. "Here, the concept exists as the foundation upon which the other layers are built and maintained" [6, p.48].

From what has been stated, we can conclude that the question of the existence of a concept is closely linked to the issue of its content, and the issue of content is in turn closely connected to the methodology used to determine that content.

Since the structure of a concept includes layers, and "these layers are the result of different historical periods of cultural life" [6, p.49], it is likely that there must be several methods for studying concepts.

For example, when analyzing phraseological units and metaphors as concepts, one can observe significant differences in various aspects—from the approach used to analyze them, to the analytical methods and the tools employed. Therefore, it is not possible to speak of a single unified approach, method, or principle that applies to all concepts.

For instance, when analyzing the worldview expressed through phraseological units, features such as pejorativity and anthropocentricity can be distinguished. The anthropocentric nature of the worldview is reflected in its orientation toward humans—that is, humans appear as the measure of all things.

Examples include:

ağzının içində, alınının altında, bir addımlıqda (meaning "very near"),

bağdan ayağı, ağız dolusu (meaning "a lot"),

göz deyir ("it's dark"),

bir göz qırpımında ("very quickly"), etc.

The meanings of many basic words and phraseological units are shaped based on an anthropocentric perception of the world.

For example:

hasarın başı ("top of the fence"),
süfrənin boğazı ("narrow part of a tablecloth"),
stolun ayağı ("table leg"),
məhlənin ayağı ("end of the street"),
suyun (bulağın) başı ("source of water"),
addımbaşı ("every step"), and so on.

These kinds of normative units form the national-cultural worldview of a language, reflecting people's daily life, traditions, behaviors, and their relationships with the world and with each other.

The linguistic picture of the world is created through various colors. Among the most vivid are, in our opinion, mythologemes, figurative-metaphorical words, connotative words, and others. Our understanding of the world partially depends on the linguistic worldview. Each specific language has its own national and unique system, and it is this very system that shapes the worldview and perception of reality of its speakers.

Language reflects a simplified picture of the world, and this picture arises primarily as a response to human practical needs—it serves as a necessary cognitive foundation for adapting to the world. Pragmatic egocentrism structures activity in such a way that it is optimally arranged in the human cognitive space, providing maximum convenience. In this framework, humans perceive all things through themselves, extending themselves into the surrounding world and measuring it through personal experience (e.g., “gözü dolusu” – eyes full, “əlini qoynuna qoymadan” – without hesitation, “ürəyi yerindən çıxır” – heart jumps, “bir ayağı burda, biri orda” – restless, etc.). Even when people become spiritually disconnected or prioritize different values, the anthropocentric view is preserved in the linguistic worldview.

In every linguistic worldview, there may logically be unexplained accidental standard gaps (lacunae). For example: “badam gözlü” (almond-eyed), “püstə ağızlı” (pistachio-mouthed), “çinar boylu” (plane tree-tall), etc. When complete imagery is used as a standard and no comparison basis is indicated, the focus shifts to the emotional attitude—either approving or disapproving—of the speaker.

Thus, the study of the linguistic picture of the world is closely linked to the study of the conceptual worldview. It reflects the relationship between humans and the world, the conditions of their existence, and portrays different worldviews of human perception alongside the general image of the world.

REFERENCES

1. Бабушкин А.П. «Возможные миры» в семантическом пространстве языка. Воронеж, 1998

2. Варкачев С.Г. Методологические основания лингвоконцептологии. //Теоретическая и прикладная лингвистика. Воронеж, 2002
3. Гумбольдт В. Язык и философия культуры. - М., 1985
4. Лихачев Д.С. Концептосфера русского языка // Известия РАН. Серия литературы и языка. Т.52. 1983, № 1
5. Слышкин Г.Г. От текста к символу: лингвокультурные концепты в сознании и дискурсе. М., 2000
6. Степанов Ю.С. Константы: Словарь русской культуры. М., 2001
7. Газетдинова Р.Р. Языковой концепт как базовый термин лингвокультурологии. Уфа, 2001
8. Яковлева Е.С. О понятии «культурная память» в применении к семантике слова // ВЯ. 1998, № 3

S.K.HACIYEVA

DÜNYANIN DİL MANZORESİ VA KONSEPT XÜLASƏ

Dünyanın dil xəritəsi insanların dünya ilə üç növ münasibətini formalaşdırır, onların davranış normalarını və dünyaya münasibətlərini müəyyən edir. Dildə ifadə olunan mənalara bütövlüklə yeganə baxış sistemini – yəni dil daşıyıcısının fərdi və ictimai şüurunun əsasını təşkil edən dünyanın konseptual xəritəsini yaradır. "Konsept" termini altında dilçilərin əksəriyyəti sözlərin ilkin mənalara başa düşür. Məqələdə konsept anlayışına dair mövqelər nəzərdən keçirilir və onların xarakterik xüsusiyyətləri müəyyənləşdirilir və xarakterizə olunur.

Açar sözlər: dil, dünyanın dil xəritəsi, konsept, mədəniyyət

С.К. ГАДЖИЕВА

ЯЗЫКОВАЯ КАРТИНА МИРА И КОНЦЕПТ РЕЗЮМЕ

Языковая картина мира формирует тип отношения человека на мир, определяет нормы его поведения, отношение к миру. Совокупность значений, выраженных в языке, образует единую систему взглядов, т.н. концептуальную картину мира, которая лежит в основе индивидуального и общественного сознания носителей языка. Под концептом большинство лингвистов понимает модель первичного значения слова. В статье рассматриваются основные взгляды на концепт, выделяются и характеризуются его характерные особенности.

Ключевые слова: язык, языковые центры мира, концепция, культура

Rəyçi: dosent F.Ə.Hüseynova