



Article

# The Artistic Concept as the Mental Foundation of Artistic Discourse

Sadoqat Fayziyeva\*<sup>1</sup>

1. PhD student of Tashkent State University, Uzbek Literature and Language named after Alisher Navoi

\* Correspondence: [sadokatfayziyeva08@gmail.com](mailto:sadokatfayziyeva08@gmail.com)

**Abstract:** This article explores the notion of the artistic concept as a fundamental cognitive unit in artistic discourse. It aims to clarify its structure, formation mechanisms, and role within the framework of linguocultural and cognitive approaches. Drawing on interdisciplinary insights from linguistics, cultural studies, and psychology, the article outlines the artistic concept as a product of authorial creativity influenced by national, historical, and emotional value systems. The artistic concept is presented as a multifaceted mental construct with an ideological-semantic core and interpretive fields, shaped through figurative language and literary expression. Through the analysis of scholarly perspectives, the study emphasizes the artistic concept's dual role as both an individual and collective cognitive-cultural entity that mediates between personal authorial intention and shared cultural consciousness.

**Keywords:** Concept, Artistic Concept, Artistic Discourse

## 1. Introduction

In contemporary interdisciplinary scientific fields such as cultural studies, linguistics, cognitive science, and psychology, there remains a strong heuristic interest in exploring mental processes related to the categorization of anthropocentric experience within the framework of value-based conceptualization in discursive environments [1].

Significant attention in linguocognitive and linguopsychological studies of the conceptualization of value-based anthropocentric categories has been given by scholars such as N. D. Arutyunova, S. A. Askoldov, N. N. Boldyrev, I. Yu. Bogatova, A. A. Zalevskaya, A. V. Kravchenko, V. A. Maslova, A. V. Rudakova, and others. Meanwhile, the linguocultural and artistic aspects of this issue have been explored by researchers like N. V. Alexandrovich, A. P. Bakhtin, N. S. Bolotnova, A. V. Kosharnaya, N. A. Kuzmina, D. S. Likhachev, E. F. Nechaeva, G. G. Slyshkin, I. A. Tarasova, and others [2], [3].

Despite the extensive exploration of mental processes in the cognitive domain, as well as the accumulation and categorization of anthropocentric experience, there remains a need for further investigation in the fields of linguocultural studies and linguocognitivism [4]. Topics such as the idiostyle of literary works, the interpretation of poetics, and national and authorial mythologems in artistic language, expressed through literary allusions and the author's worldview in their works, continue to be relevant.

The aim of this article is to clarify the content and structure of the notion of the "artistic concept" as a category of artistic discourse. Scholars adhering to the

**Citation:** Fayziyeva, S. The Artistic Concept as the Mental Foundation of Artistic Discourse. Central Asian Journal of Literature, Philosophy, and Culture 2025, 6(3), 468-472.

Received: 28<sup>th</sup> May 2025

Revised: 18<sup>th</sup> Jun 2025

Accepted: 28<sup>th</sup> Jun 2025

Published: 16<sup>th</sup> Jul 2025



**Copyright:** © 2025 by the authors. Submitted for open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license

(<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>)

linguocultural approach to studying concepts (O. E. Beshpalova, N. S. Bolotnova, N. V. Volodina, S. A. Kosharnaya, D. S. Likhachev, Yu. S. Stepanov) view the concept as a linguocultural phenomenon shaped within the author's creative process, rooted in the national worldview [5]. It involves a mythological interpretation of a perceptual-emotional image, transformed cognitively and emotionally through the use of literary and artistic linguistic tools.

## 2. Materials and Methods

The linguocultural concept originates in the collective cognitive consciousness, reflecting the national value-based worldview, and is driven by historical significance. It is transformed within the individual mental and psychological creativity of the author, manifested through literary and artistic means, and can be regarded as both an authorial and societal phenomenon. Thus, the linguocultural concept, as a shared asset in the context of linguistics and culture, emerges from individual mental activity and represents a product of the author's creative cognitive and psychological work.

The artistic concept, grounded in historical relevance and national mythologems, conveys the author's linguistic worldview and perspective, unfolding through the metaphorical diversity of literary imagery. Emerging within the national value-based cultural sphere and shaped by authorial creativity, artistic concepts, when integrated into global culture, evolve into linguocultural concepts. Not every artistic concept becomes cultural, but all linguocultural concepts are formed through authorial cognitive creativity, historical actualization, and the national value-based worldview. Within the linguocognitive approach (A. A. Zalevskaya, V. I. Karasik, E. S. Kubryakova, Z. D. Popova, I. A. Sternin), a concept is viewed as an operational unit of consciousness with a perceptual-affective component, serving an informational-communicative function and resulting from an individual's cognitive activity. The conceptualization of the informational environment arises from the process of world cognition, encompassing generalization, storage, comprehension, and transformation of information, working with the informational field to form first subjective and then objective knowledge through communicative-cognitive discourse. One of the most precise definitions of a concept is that of E. S. Kubryakova: "A concept is an operational unit of memory, mental lexicon, conceptual system, and language of consciousness, reflecting a holistic worldview and representing a quantum of knowledge. The most significant concepts are expressed in language."

The concept is a category within the cognitive domain of an individual, shaped and functioning within the linguistic discourse through cognitive and communicative realization. Conceptualization, the concept itself, and the conceptual sphere are regarded as part of collective cognitive consciousness, expressed through a combination of objective and individualized discourse.

Most researchers identify the core, near-core zone, proximate, and distant periphery in the structure of a concept. The core serves as the concept's referent or name, while the near-core zone conveys its primary meaning. The proximate periphery includes synonymous variations of the concept's name, whereas the distant periphery communicates its meaning through cognitive metaphors and figurative senses.

## 3. Results and Discussion

However, the structure of a concept is neither universal nor unequivocal. The issue of its heterogeneity has been noted since the inception of cognitive linguistics and is subject to various interpretations. For instance, V.I. Karasik includes figurative, evaluative, and notional components in the concept's structure, viewing it as a multidimensional semantic entity [6], [7]. Z.D. Popova and I.A. Sternin distinguish three main elements in the concept's structure: the image, informational content, and interpretive field. The image represents a universal object code tied to neurolinguistic characteristics and sensory

perception of the notion. The informational content of a concept comprises a minimal set of cognitive connotations that define the key distinguishing features of the conceptualized object or phenomenon [8]. The interpretive field is heterogeneous, encompassing several zones formed by cognitive features that bridge the informational and interpretive components, creating a generalized meaning of the concept. Within the interpretive field, zones such as evaluative, encyclopedic, regulatory, socio-cultural, and paremiological are identified [9].

A concept exists in society solely within discourse. The notion of discourse is multifaceted and serves as an interdisciplinary term. Originally, the word “discourse” (from Late Latin “*discursus*” – reasoning, argument; initially: running about, maneuver, bustle) referred to processes of linguistic activity, such as speech or discussion. In modern linguistics, discourse encompasses the entire textual and dialogic space [10]. As a complex linguistic phenomenon, discourse is studied from various perspectives: structural, communicative, and linguocultural.

Discourse, as a cognitive category of mental space, is a binary system involving two parties: the addresser and the addressee. The realization of discourse encompasses the creation, synthesis, or transmission of an informational message by the addresser, as well as its analysis, perception, and interpretation by the addressee. The distinctiveness of artistic discourse lies in its cultural significance, the variety of its structural organization, and the methods of its communicative realization [11]. The author of an artistic work acts as the creator of a discursive message, while the reader, viewer, or listener serves as the recipient, who processes the work through their psychological and cognitive lens, evaluating, analyzing, interpreting, accepting, critiquing, or ignoring it. V.V. Feshchenko defines artistic discourse as a set of verbal expressions formed through the interaction between the author and the recipient (reader, viewer, or listener) via a work of art, taking into account the aesthetic aspects of creating and perceiving these expressions in various forms and types of art [12].

The central cognitive category of artistic discourse is the artistic concept, understood as an author’s “creation of meaning,” a cognitive synthesis that interprets the informational flows of the mental environment of a national or multinational ethos through individual authorial self-expression. O.V. Bepalova defines the artistic concept as a unit of a poet’s or writer’s consciousness, embodied in a work of art or a collection of works, expressing the individual authorial interpretation of the essence of objects or phenomena [13]. The author, as the addresser, by crafting a conceptual creative message, seeks not only self-expression but also the understanding, evaluation, and acceptance of their work by the addressee – the viewer, listener, or reader. Thus, the author requires recognition and public opinion, which can be classified as discourse. Since this pertains to an artistic work that demands not only comprehension but also aesthetic perception, such discourse is artistic. The artistic concept, as a cognitive category of artistic discourse, is an individual authorial construct within the collective cognitive consciousness, emerging from conceptual notions and the lexical apparatus of a nation [14], [15].

The structure of an artistic concept is a complex and multifaceted system of images and meanings integrated into a cognitive construct that reflects the author’s creative output and emotional-empirical realizations. This artistic-cognitive construct is an individual foundational entity shaped by the author’s talent, cognitive abilities, and level of cultural development. The author’s talent and inspiration act as a kind of “spark” that brings artistic concepts and related aspects of creativity to life within their works. Each artistic concept encompasses an ideological-semantic core, along with subjective and objective interpretive fields that form explanatory structures. As the artistic concept is tied to the national cultural-value worldview, shaped by historical context and the author’s perspective, its structure is heterogeneous. It includes an ideological image and multidimensional cognitive fields that intersect at the subjective levels of the author’s

emotional-empirical creative intentions with objective factors, which together find expression in the artistic text. Yu.V. Stepanov, in his book *\*Constants: A Dictionary of Russian Culture\**, examines the concept as a cultural entity and identifies three main layers in the structure of an artistic cultural concept: 1) the “literal meaning,” or etymology of the concept, its “inner form”; 2) the “passive” or historical layer; and 3) the modern, most relevant layer, which includes the primary authorial cognitive modifiers and meanings of the concept. E.A. Ognëva and I.A. Danilenko distinguish such segments in the concept’s structure as word-forming, form-building, syntactic, associative, and extralinguistic. The latter segment encompasses knowledge of the extralinguistic context related to significant events in the author’s life.

N.S. Bolotnova offers a different perspective, identifying layers in the structure of an artistic concept that are similar but not identical to those of a cognitive concept: the object-conceptual, figurative-symbolic, emotional-evaluative, and associative layers. The researcher emphasizes the pivotal role of the associative layer, which, in her view, activates all other layers of the concept in the perceiving consciousness, integrating them into a cohesive whole. The structure of an artistic concept is complex and diverse. Its variability is determined by the typology of the concept, meaning that artistic concepts of different types have distinct structures. For instance, E.A. Ognëva and I.A. Danilenko identify the dual concept, characterized by a dual-core structure with intersecting nominative fields formed by shared lexical units. They define the dual artistic concept as an authorial dual-core construct created by a writer, existing within a single artistic text or several plot-related texts, where the dyad of the concept’s cores is represented not by synonyms or antonyms but by contextually linked linguistic units.

#### 4. Conclusion

Thus, the artistic concept, as a cognitive category of artistic discourse, is a complex structural-functional construct of authorial creativity, forming the basis of the conceptual sphere of an artistic work and facilitating the development of linguocultural discourse.

The artistic concept serves as the primary cognitive category of artistic discourse and is understood as an authorial mental construct driven by historical, geopolitical, personal, anthropological, or other factors of the mental environment. It is embodied through a verbal-logical form via the artistic-cognitive formation of the author’s creativity. The artistic concept is shaped through the lens of the author’s cognitive structure, employing metaphors, symbols, hyperboles, and other expressive devices. It is created based on widely accessible conceptual notions and the lexical apparatus of collective cognitive consciousness, incorporating the author’s psychological-cognitive sphere. The structure of the artistic concept is multidimensional and variable, encompassing an ideological-semantic core, subjective and objective interpretive fields. The variability of the structure is determined by the typology of the concept.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] N. D. Arutyunova, “Diskurs,” in *Bol’shoy entsiklopedicheskiy slovar’*. Yazykoznanie, Moscow, 2000, pp. 136–137.
- [2] O. E. Bepalova, *\*Konceptosfera poezii N. S. Gumileva v eyo leksicheskom predstavlenii\**, Author’s abstract of PhD dissertation, St. Petersburg, 2002.
- [3] H. Guo, “Osobennosti diskursa khudozhestvennogo proizvedeniya,” *\*Molodoy Uchyonyy\**, no. 20(154), pp. 483–486, 2017.
- [4] V. I. Karasik, *\*Yazykovoy krug: lichnost', kontsepty, diskurs\**, Moscow: Gnosis, 2004.
- [5] E. S. Kubryakova et al., *\*Kratkiy slovar' kognitivnykh terminov\**, Moscow: Moscow State University, 1996.

- 
- [6] E. A. Ognëva and I. A. Danilenko, *\*Dual'nost' khudozhestvennogo kontsepta kak tekstovyy informativnyy kod\**, Moscow: Editus, 2021.
  - [7] Z. D. Popova and I. A. Sternin, *\*Kognitivnaya lingvistika\**, Moscow: AST, 2007.
  - [8] Yu. V. Stepanov, *\*Konstanty: Slovar' russkoy kul'tury\**, Moscow: Shkola "Yazyki russkoy kul'tury", 1997.
  - [9] N. S. Bolotnova, "Assotsiativno-obraznaya struktura khudozhestvennogo kontsepta," *\*Voprosy kognitivnoy lingvistiki\**, vol. 3, pp. 22–29, 2005.
  - [10] A. A. Zalevskaya, "Cognitive psychology and linguistic categories," *\*Kognitivnye issledovaniya yazyka\**, vol. 4, pp. 45–53, 2006.
  - [11] E. F. Nechaeva, "Kultura i kontsept: problema sootnosheniya," *\*Lingvistika i kul'tura\**, vol. 2, pp. 77–84, 2012.
  - [12] I. Yu. Bogatova, "Lingvokul'turnaya spetsifika kontsepta v khudozhestvennom tekste," *\*Filologicheskie nauki\**, vol. 5, pp. 114–119, 2014.
  - [13] A. V. Rudakova, "Kognitivnye osnovy kontseptualizatsii esteticheskogo opyta," *\*Vestnik TGU\**, vol. 18, no. 3, pp. 56–63, 2013.
  - [14] G. G. Slyshkin, *\*Diskurs i kontsept: Sredstva reprezentatsii\**, Moscow: Gnosis, 2004.
  - [15] I. A. Tarasova, "Mythopoetic structures in authorial artistic discourse," *\*Vestnik MGU. Seriya 9. Filologiya\**, no. 6, pp. 79–83, 2010.