Available online at www.jlls.org

JOURNAL OF LANGUAGE
AND LINGUISTIC STUDIES

ISSN: 1305-578X

Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies, 22(1), 1-13; 2026

Epistemic Prerequisites Of Investigating The Complex Concept WORD / LANGUAGE / SPEECH As A Fragment Of Naive And Scientific English Pictures Of The World

Iryna Kolegaeva[a] , Natalia Bigunova[b] , Nina Kravchenko[c] , Valeriia Smagliy[d]

[a] *Odesa I.I. Mechnikov National University, Ukrain, Email: irina_kolegaeva@ukr.net*

[b] *Odesa I.I. Mechnikov National University, Ukraine, Email: natalbig@ukr.net*

[c] *Odesa I.I. Mechnikov National University, Ukraine, Email: nkravchenko1717@gmail.com*

[d] *Odessa National Maritime University, Ukraine, Email: valeriya.smagliy@gmail.com*

APA Citation:

Kolegaeva, I, Bigunova, N, Kravchenko, N, Smagliy, V, (2026). Epistemic Prerequisites Of Investigating The Complex Concept WORD / LANGUAGE / SPEECH As A Fragment Of Naive And Scientific English Pictures Of The World, *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies, 22*(1), 1-13; 2026.

Abstract

The article presents an overview of the theoretical foundations underlying a linguocognitive study of the complex concept WORD / LANGUAGE / SPEECH as a fragment of the English-language naïve and scientific worldviews. The inseparable relationship between cognitive and mental processes and their verbalization through language determines the linguocognitive perspective of the research and reveals its close connection with psychology, neurolinguistics, and cultural studies.

The notion of a worldview (or picture of the world) is interpreted here in its dual form—as both a naïve and a scientific worldview. The survey of theoretical sources provides a rich foundation for scientific inquiry into the status of language as a bio-cultural phenomenon and into the problem of human phylogeny, which explains the emergence of language as a defining feature of humankind. The study also highlights the bodily rootedness of human cognition—and consequently of speech—in interaction with the social dimension of communicative activity.

The results confirm the heuristic value of distinguishing the triadic concept WORD / LANGUAGE / SPEECH and of differentiating between naïve and scientific pictures of the world, as these approaches clarify how linguistic knowledge is conceptualized across cognitive and cultural strata. The discussion outlines the potential of extending this framework through corpus-based, cognitive-discourse, and neurolinguistic methods, emphasizing its interdisciplinary applicability. The conclusion stresses that naïve and scientific worldviews, while distinct in epistemological depth, jointly shape a unified model of English linguistic consciousness in which cognition, language, and worldview interrelate as integral components of human understanding.

Keywords*: concept, glottogenesis, language, naïve / scientific worldview, phylogenesis, speech, word.*

1. The Introduction

The formation of Homo sapiens is inseparable from the evolutionary origin of language (glottogenesis). These long and complex processes have attracted the attention of numerous scholars. The anatomical development of the human speech apparatus and the parallel growth of the brain constitute the biological foundation of language.

The role of the bodily factor in mental processes – specifically in the perception and conceptualization of the environment – is reflected in the theory of grounded cognition. The emergence and progressive advancement of human civilization would have been impossible without mechanisms for recording and exchanging information within collective activity. The most universal tool enabling this exchange is human language, which is examined from various perspectives by cognitive linguistics, the philosophy of language, and semiotics.

This research aims to reveal how both ordinary speakers and linguists conceptualize the phenomenon of linguistic communication — what they know about language, its structure, and its functioning. Such knowledge forms a corresponding concept, interpreted here as a discrete semantic unit of collective consciousness that reflects an element of the ideal world and is preserved in the national memory of native speakers as a shared substrate of meaning.

In our view, this semantic unit of collective consciousness varies considerably depending on the composition of the social or professional group under study. Hence, we put forward the following hypothesis: the interpretation of the phenomenon of language – together with the inseparable phenomena of word and speech – differs substantially in the conceptual and linguistic worldviews of the average language user and of the professional linguist. These differences should therefore be reflected in the verbalization of two variants of a single, integrated concept – WORD / LANGUAGE / SPEECH.

2. Aims, Methods and Material

This article outlines the general prerequisites for a comprehensive study of the verbalized concept WORD / LANGUAGE / SPEECH, as well as the two nominative fields representing the naive and scientific English-language worldviews that serve as its analytical focus. The primary aim of the research is to compare these two versions of worldview and to demonstrate the absolute anthropocentrism underlying both linguistic and cognitive constructions. Special attention is paid to how the scope and depth of a speaker's thesaurus affect their perception and verbalization of the world.

The material discussed in this article encompasses major publications that explore the neurolinguistic, semiotic, cognitive, sociological, and linguocultural dimensions of the complex concept WORD / LANGUAGE / SPEECH. The research follows the methodological framework of the modern cognitive linguistic paradigm, guided by the key methodological principles of expansionism, explanatoriness, anthropocentrism, and functionalism. These principles together ensure that the analysis integrates interdisciplinary perspectives and links linguistic phenomena to mental and social processes.

The theoretical significance of the broader study lies in its contribution to the fields of linguosemiotics, cognitive linguistics, linguocultural studies, and theoretical lexicography. Most importantly, the work introduces a new theoretical approach that substantiates the coexistence of two distinct modes of linguistic comprehension – one typical of ordinary speakers and the other of professional linguists. By identifying how the size and organization of a speaker's lexical and conceptual inventory influence their ability to access and use general versus specialized linguistic resources, the study contributes to refining the theory of linguistic communication and enriches our understanding of how knowledge is distributed and verbalized across different cognitive strata of society.

3. Language as a bio-cultural phenomenon

The uniqueness of humankind as a biological species – and what distinguishes it from all other living beings – lies primarily in the possession of a second signal system**,** namely linguistic ability. As Kravchenko (2013, p. 97) observes, "as human beings, we are who we are thanks to our immersion in the flow of joint activities with others. For humans, a unique feature of such activities is linguistic behavior (or simply, language), without which our existence is inconceivable." Similarly, Maturana (1978, p. 29) famously stated: "We, humans, occur in language, and without it we cannot be understood."

The problem of glottogenesis**, o**r the evolutionary origin of language, is investigated across numerous scientific disciplines. Researchers have sought to identify in primates the cognitive, neurological, and social characteristics whose development laid the foundation for the emergence of human language (Givón, 2002; Fenk-Oczlon & Fenk, 2002). Studies in the history of glottogenesis suggest the symbiotic nature of human language, which functions simultaneously as a biological and a sociocultural entity (see Enfield & Levinson, 2006; Lala et al., 2000). This has led scholars such as Evans and Levinson (2009, p. 431) to describe human language as "a bio-cultural hybrid, a product of cultural co-evolution over the past 400,000 years."

Examining the evolution of human speech capacity, Fitch et al. (2005) argue that the key to explaining the difference between humans and other species lies in identifying what is special about the human ability to produce and interpret speech. They regard this as a uniquely dedicated learning capacity, one absent in all other primates. This ability involves meaningfully articulating sound patterns that were initially perceived auditorily. Merker (2009) notes that although some birds and mammals display rudimentary vocal imitation, only humans have developed full vocal training**,** or what he calls "the tuning of the brain."

Pinker and Jackendoff (2005) provide valuable observations on sound imitation and phonetic mastery, noting that this ability develops only at a specific age during first-language acquisition. Only a small proportion of adults who learn a second language later in life succeed in imitating its phonetic nuances. Meanwhile, auditory speech perception begins in infancy: newborns prefer speech sounds to non-speech stimuli, which correlates with neurobiological evidence showing that the brain engages distinct neural circuits for processing spoken versus non-spoken sounds (Hauser & Fitch, 2003). Givón (2002, p. 19) further adds that literate individuals develop a visual recognition area for written words in the left hemisphere, specialized for differentiating graphic images.

The biological basis of language, described by Lenneberg (1991, p. 87), includes the anatomical evolution of the speech apparatus**,** particularly the lowering of the larynx and its right-angle bend relative to the trachea, which enabled articulate speech. Simultaneously, the auditory system evolved to perceive sounds within the speech frequency range, supported by neural pathways dedicated to speech analysis (Evans & Levinson, 2009, p. 434). Hockett (1960) emphasized the role of the auditory-vocal channel, anatomically optimized for rapid, asymmetrical signal transmission—where comprehension is roughly four times slower than production (Levinson, 2003, p. 28).

Human language thus arose from a combination of biological preconditions and cognitive development. As Penn (2009, p. 463) notes, certain precursors for linguistic behavior existed only in humans, including neural mechanisms linking articulatory gestures with conceptual representations – that is, the linguistic sign as "a system of connections between the idea of articulatory gestures (the external form of the sign) and the idea of a corresponding element of external reality (its meaning)" (Calvin & Bickerton, 2000, p. 93).

Evans (2014, p. 26) argues that language emerged as a result of cooperative intelligence and external environmental pressures that stimulated its development over two million years ago. Its hybrid character manifests in two ways. First, the bodily foundation of cognition, emphasized in Barsalou's (2003) *theory of grounded cognition*, affirms that perception and conceptualization depend on embodied experience. Second, the biological system of the human organism is fine-tuned to specific linguistic structures, while these structures themselves are products of historical and cultural evolution (Evans & Levinson, 2009, p. 446).

Language is also inherently social. As Burlak (2012, p. 19) remarks, most researchers regard language as a social phenomenon that organizes human life through group interaction. The biological dimension reappears even here, notably in the role of mirror neurons, which in humans are widely distributed across cortical areas and play a central role in empathy and the anticipation of others' actions (Chernygovskaya, 2006, p. 86).

The cultural and social dimensions of this hybrid are equally crucial. Although the ability for language acquisition is innate, its realization depends on specific developmental and environmental conditions. Lenneberg (1991, p. 18) observed that a child's linguistic capacity can develop only in the presence of a linguistic social environment and within a critical period. Phonetic acquisition is most plastic up to about five years of age, grammatical development continues until roughly twelve, while lexical learning remains open-ended (MacWhinney, 2005). For second-language learning, these windows are sensitive rather than critical (Zhabotynska, 2018, p. 108).

Chomsky (1980) maintained that humans are not predisposed to learn any particular language, but rather possess a universal capacity for language learning — a claim supported by the immense diversity of human languages and the fundamental ability to acquire any of them.

4. Language as a social phenomenon

Pagel (2000) notes that humanity currently speaks between five and eight thousand languages, though prior to Western colonization there were approximately 15,000**,** and he estimates that in earlier epochs there may have been as many as half a million. Despite this vast diversity, language serves as a universal reflection of human nature. Pinker (1994, p. 187) aptly describes language as "a window into human nature," revealing the profound and universal qualities of human thought and emotion. In turn, metaphors – those "logically anomalous" linguistic forms – serve as enduring traces of ancient syncretic thought (Pimenov, 2004, p. 72).

Although language preserves the vestiges of past states, it remains a dynamic and self-renewing system. Linguistic phenomena have neither constant nature nor constant form: they are subject to continuous change, and the linguistic system as a whole is inherently variable. Similarly, McMurray and Wasserman (2009, p. 460) define language succinctly as "behavior that develops in culture and evolves with it."

However, as Buniyatova (2018, p. 35) reminds us, language change does not occur uniformly across all structural levels. Some, such as grammar, are more conservative and evolve at a slower pace, often marking the final stage in the formation of a literary norm. Pikhtovnikova (2018, p. 155) echoes this view, noting that "the lexical layer of the English language demonstrates high dynamism, while its grammatical structure remains relatively stable." In terms of linguosynergetics, she refers to these processes as "different speeds" within the megasystem of language.

The study of linguistic evolution – its mechanisms and directions – therefore provides essential insight into contemporary usage, informing both general linguistics and cognitive linguistics (Iraide, 2004). Yet, as Manakin (2008, p. 5) argues, linguistic evolution should not obscure the underlying continuity of language and world structure:

"At the level of deep awareness of the symmetry between language and the world lies the ancient idea of the unity of all being – visible and invisible, material and ideal, physical and metaphysical."

This position resonates with Stepanov's (2001, p. 921) assertion that "language reflects the millennial knowledge of the world, and the world itself is mirrored in language; in this sense, the world and its linguistic reflection form a single, unified reality." In alignment with this, cognitive linguistics views language as "a repository of world knowledge—a structured system of semantic categories enabling both the assimilation of new experience and the preservation of old" (Geeraerts & Cuyckens, 2012, p. 4).

Thus, language operates as a social, historical, and cognitive system, simultaneously preserving inherited meanings and adapting to the communicative needs of changing societies. Its dual nature – anchored in both continuity and transformation – makes it an inexhaustible source of data for understanding the interaction between human cognition, culture, and the collective evolution of thought.

5. Language and Cognition

According to the leading principle of anthropocentrism in the modern humanities, understanding the unity of the universe and the central position of the human being within it is crucial. As Boldyrev (2019, p. 343) observes:

"The world around us is a network of relationships. At the center of this relationship is the person, their consciousness, and its interaction with the world. The main role in this interaction belongs to linguistic communication: the person learns about the world, communicates with it, and navigates it primarily by means of language."

Reflecting on the philosophical foundations of modern linguistics, Manerko (2008, p. 118) maintains that cognitive-discursive linguistics brings us closer to understanding the nature of cognition and knowledge, as well as the mechanisms of human thinking – since all of these manifest through linguistic activity. Indeed, linguistic activity constitutes one of the key manifestations of human cognition and cannot be separated from perception, attention, or categorization (Wierzbicka, 2010).

Radbil (2013, p. 30) highlights the close interdependence of cognition and verbal expression, noting that "no matter how rich and diverse the world may be, a person perceives and understands only those phenomena for which there are verbal designations." Similarly, Kirilina (2009, p. 67), reviewing trends in modern cognitivism, points out that postmodern linguists "recognize the world as accessible only through linguistic forms, since reality is always mediated by discursive practice." However, this claim may be overly categorical: many phenomena are indeed perceived by humans without being linguistically labeled and thus are not necessarily mediated by discourse.

Recent neurolinguistic studies also challenge the idea of strictly localized speech centers in the brain, suggesting instead that language is distributed across cortical regions – just like memory or abstract thinking. Barsalou (2011, p. 6) differentiates between "dynamic information processing (on-line processing)" – including perception, categorization, and inference – and "long-term processing (off-line processing)," encompassing memory, language, and thought. In this framework, language operates as a mental phenomenon, a dynamic and distributed cognitive process.

Fauconnier (1999) metaphorically describes language as "the tip of the cognitive iceberg": we perceive only its visible portion – the words – while the larger mass of conceptual structure remains submerged within common sense and implicit cognition. Smith (1989, p. 501) adds that concepts enable people to transfer past experience to new contexts; though life situations never recur identically, the conceptual knowledge accumulated through language allows the reuse of prior insights.

Consequently, language should not be viewed merely as a mirror of reality, but as a powerful instrument of cognition. Kharitonchik (2009, p. 421) emphasizes that "the essence of language lies in expressing human thought as a product of cognitive activity," a view echoed by Tsurikova (2009, p. 79), who describes language as both a fundamental capacity of the human brain and the primary medium for transmitting knowledge.

Luria (1978, p. 37) expressed this duality poetically in his seminal work *Language and Consciousness*:

"The great advantage of a person endowed with language is that the world is doubled. A human being possesses two worlds: one of directly perceived objects and another of images, relations, and qualities denoted by words. These images can be named arbitrarily, independent of their physical presence."

This "double world" naturally leads to the central role of the speaker, who, as Manaenko (2013, p. 282) observes, "as a thinking subject establishes connections, linking certain entities." The notion of *speaker* here should be interpreted broadly, as a collective designation for the linguistic community. As Levitsky (2004, p. 69) notes, "the meanings of linguistic units derive from conceptual schemas that are fixed in, and operate within, the collective consciousness of the language's speakers."

Many scholars (Barsalou, 2011; Zwaan, 2004) argue that an adequate psychological description of lexical meaning must include encyclopedic knowledge – the broad, culturally embedded information associated with a word. Cruse (2002) similarly claims that lexical items serve as gateways to encyclopedic knowledge. Expanding on this, Boldyrev (2019, p. 169) writes:

"Language is a means of preserving and acquiring knowledge about the surrounding world. The linguistic system itself embodies a certain vision of reality, offering an understanding of its essence and phenomena. Accordingly, each linguistic sign functions as a semiotic device for compactly storing and transmitting both encyclopedic and linguistic information."

In this respect, Morris's (1966, p. 82) remark on semiotics remains strikingly relevant:

"There is nothing far-fetched in asserting that the concept of the sign may be as fundamental to the human sciences as the concept of the atom is to physics or the cell to biology."

Thus, cognition, consciousness, and language form an integrated triad – biologically grounded, socially mediated, and symbolically expressed – through which human beings not only reflect but also construct their world.

6. Language and the Picture of the World

Mechkovskaya (2018, pp. 379–381) identifies a fundamental distinction between two entities associated with word semantics: lexical meaning and scientific concept. Lexical meanings are represented in explanatory dictionaries, whereas the contents of scientific concepts are captured in encyclopedic ones. This distinction thus corresponds to the division between the linguistic and scientific pictures of the world.

Susov (2007, p. 30) elaborates on the dual orientation of language: on one hand, it refers to objective reality, and on the other, it creates "a world of images built between reality and the human mind," forming a structured body of knowledge that together constitutes a model – or picture – of the world. Similarly, Maslova (2008, p. 56) defines this picture as "a secondary existence of the world, recorded and realized in a specific material form—language." Alefirenko (2005, p. 13) approaches the issue from another perspective, distinguishing between a mental (logical) picture of reality and its linguistic embodiment, noting that each language "transforms the results of mental activity in its own way, creating additional meanings and nuances."

The study of worldviews and world models remains central in contemporary linguistics, linguocultural studies, and ethnopsychology. As Mechkovskaya (2004, p. 379) recalls, following Wilhelm von Humboldt, philosophy after 1835 established the notion that each language represents a unique interpretation of the world—what she terms the horizontal (diatopic) or ethnospecific diversity of worldview, later referred to as "pictures of the world."

Our present analysis focuses exclusively on the English-language worldview, making this horizontal dimension less relevant. Instead, we draw upon Mechkovskaya's concept of vertical differentiation, which distinguishes naïve, scientific, philosophical, and religious worldviews. It is within this framework that we explore the verbalized complex concept WORD / LANGUAGE / SPEECH, viewed as a fragment of both the naïve and scientific English pictures of the world.

Polinichenko (2007, p. 244) similarly emphasizes that the concept *language* must be studied in relation to the types of consciousness in which it manifests – namely, *everyday linguistic consciousness* and *specialized scientific consciousness*. This distinction underpins the analysis of how speakers conceptualize language depending on their cognitive and cultural background.

When examining speaker consciousness, it is essential to consider internal speech – the unvoiced, subjective form of linguistic processing. Zhinkin (1982, p. 93) defines it as neither wholly discrete nor fully continuous, but as a unique "subjective code" that exists below the threshold of articulation. In parallel, Pinker (1994, p. 82) employs the term mentalese, describing it as an internal "language of thought" whereby knowing a language means being able to translate mental representations into verbal sequences.

While the realm of internal consciousness (*lingua mentalis*) remains inaccessible to observation, our study addresses externalized language (*lingua vocalis*), focusing on how the concept WORD / LANGUAGE / SPEECH is verbalized within the nominative field we have developed.

Boldyrev (2019, p. 32) distinguishes between thematic concepts, which represent scientific knowledge, and operational concepts, which reflect everyday cognition. Yet we view these not as distinct entities but as differing depths of comprehension of the same underlying phenomenon – the complex concept WORD / LANGUAGE / SPEECH.

Selivanova (2010, p. 488) likewise contrasts the naïve and scientific pictures of the world: the former presents a simplified, schematic interpretation of reality, while the latter synthesizes empirical research and the accumulated worldview experience of humankind. Maslova (2004, p. 68) remains skeptical of the naïve worldview, regarding it as "claiming absolute truth, yet capable of deviating indefinitely from what science regards as objective reality."

As Berestnev (2009, p. 143) observes, language has ceased to be merely an object of study—it has become a key source for understanding human cognition. Prykhodko (2016, p. 50) adds that "words through which information about reality is transmitted reflect not the object itself, but the image shaped in the speaker's mind." From this it follows that tracing meaning from word to concept reveals the speaker's vision of the world, and hence, the difference between naïve and scientific verbalizations of the same referent.

This perspective allows us to view explanatory and specialized dictionaries as valuable instruments for reconstructing these differing conceptualizations. By comparing the interpretations of the same lexical units across general and scientific dictionaries, we can identify two distinct yet interrelated worldviews – the naïve and the scientific – each reflecting varying depths of theoretical understanding.

In our framework, the term *concept* refers to the complex concept WORD / LANGUAGE / SPEECH, encompassing the nuclear concepts *word*, *language*, and *speech*. Each contributes to the structure of the whole and is analyzed in two dimensions: as a fragment of the *naïve picture of the world* and as a fragment of the *scientific picture of the world*.

7. Language and Concept

The study of concepts represents a relatively recent but rapidly developing branch of philological research. In Wierzbicka's (1999, p. 18) formulation, "a concept is an object from the world of the *Ideal* that has a name in language." In other words, a concept constitutes a dispersed mental formation that, while "scattered among linguistic signs," is realized through various verbal means (Слышкин, 2004, p. 42).

Prykhodko (2013, p. 16) notes that a defining feature of any concept is the presence of multiple "entrances" to it – different linguistic pathways through which the concept can be accessed and expressed. Consequently, it may be realized at several linguistic levels, including lexemes, idioms, phrases, and sentences. This multidimensionality confirms the complex semiotic nature of conceptual structures in language.

Lakoff and Johnson (1999, pp. 103-110) identify several levels of conceptual embodiment, with the highest – *the level of the cognitive subconscious* – governing the structuring of mental operations and enabling all conscious human experience. This level encompasses every process associated with linguistic activity: phonetics, morphology, syntax, semantics, and discourse. Cognitive linguistics thus views the language system not merely as a code, but as an embodied reflection of human thought.

A number of scholars, including Harder (2003) and Tomasello (2003), emphasize that the experiential orientation of cognitive linguistics implies the inherently social and cultural nature of cognition. Language emerges not in isolation but through continuous interaction within a speech community. For this reason, Berthele (2001) insists on closer integration between cognitive linguistics and sociolinguistics, while Evans (2012) highlights the discipline's intersection with cognitive psychology and the so-called "brain sciences," particularly cognitive neuroscience.

For a researcher investigating the conceptual structure of a given language, lexicographic sources play a central role. Explanatory dictionaries serve as empirical repositories for identifying nominative units that represent the target concept. However, as Boldyrev (2000, p. 35) observes, dictionary definitions of the same lexeme often differ across sources—demonstrating that "the content of a concept can never be completely fixed, since each word captures only a fragment of its conceptual characteristics." This is especially relevant to polysemous lexemes, which are frequently divided into sememes differently by various dictionaries, reflecting diverse interpretive traditions rather than objective discreteness.

These observations underscore the necessity, in conceptual research, of constructing a nominative field – a network of lexical units that name the concept itself and the phenomena associated with it. Such a field represents a semantic continuum, within which one can identify localized "semantic clusters" (Приходько, 2013, p. 177). As Prykhodko explains, this notion arose from the recognition that lexical meaning lacks rigid boundaries; hence, words connected by shared semantic components can be organized into fields (ibid., p. 176).

Polinichenko (2007, p. 243) further remarks that the concept *language* possesses "sufficient semantic density" and a high degree of nominative diffusion, reflected in the extensive number of secondary meanings attached to its core term. Our own data confirm this observation: the analyzed lexemes *word*, *language*, and *speech* form densely interconnected semantic networks that both overlap and diverge across naïve and scientific worldviews.

Thus, studying the verbalized concept involves tracing these connections and identifying how linguistic signs encode various dimensions of human understanding. In this way, the field approach not only

reveals the internal organization of a concept but also demonstrates the dynamic relationship between language, cognition, and culture – the very triad through which the world is conceptualized, named, and continually reinterpreted.

8. Results

The results of this theoretical investigation demonstrate the methodological and cognitive advantages of distinguishing both the triad WORD / LANGUAGE / SPEECH and the two interpretive levels of the English worldview – the *naïve* and the *scientific*.

First, isolating the triadic concept allows for a comprehensive understanding of linguistic communication as an integrated phenomenon encompassing three interdependent dimensions: the *word* as a minimal semantic and nominative unit, *language* as a systemic and social structure, and *speech* as a processual and individual realization of that system. Their joint examination makes it possible to trace the continuum between cognition, linguistic code, and communicative act, thus providing a more precise framework for exploring the anthropocentric nature of linguistic knowledge.

Second, differentiating between naïve and scientific worldviews reveals significant epistemic contrasts in how language is conceptualized and verbalized. The *naïve* picture reflects experiential, associative, and value-based interpretations, while the *scientific* one demonstrates abstraction, generalization, and systematicity characteristic of professional metalinguistic reflection. Establishing this dual perspective has proven essential for identifying how linguistic knowledge functions both as everyday cognitive content and as a formalized object of scholarly description.

Finally, the integration of these two perspectives contributes to a fuller reconstruction of English linguistic consciousness. The comparison of their respective nominative fields highlights overlapping semantic structures and shared conceptual cores, confirming that naïve and scientific cognition represent two complementary modes of perceiving and structuring linguistic reality rather than mutually exclusive categories.

9. Discussion

The discussion section outlines the methodological implications and potential directions for further research arising from the analysis. The formation of a nominative field for the triadic concept *WORD / LANGUAGE / SPEECH*, grounded in lexicographic data, has proven to be an effective tool for mapping the boundaries of the linguistic worldview. It allows researchers to identify how lexical meanings, idiomatic expressions, and paraphrastic definitions encode collective linguistic experience.

Further investigation should extend this approach through the use of corpus-based and cognitive-discourse methods. These would make it possible to trace how the triadic concept is represented in authentic English discourse, particularly in educational, scientific, and media texts. Expanding the data beyond lexicography will enrich the empirical base and demonstrate how dynamic social and cultural contexts influence the evolution of linguistic conceptualization.

In addition, integrating psycholinguistic and neurolinguistic evidence would deepen the understanding of how speakers process and internalize these conceptual units at the mental level. This interdisciplinary perspective would link language system analysis with cognitive mechanisms, reflecting the epistemic unity of linguistic, psychological, and cultural dimensions.

Hence, the theoretical and methodological framework proposed here – combining the triadic conceptual model with the naïve/scientific dichotomy – provides a promising foundation for future comparative and applied studies in cognitive linguistics, lexicography, and language education.

10. Conclusion

The study confirms that language is not merely a communicative tool but a bio-cultural phenomenon rooted in both human cognition and social interaction. The analysis of theoretical and lexicographic sources has revealed that cognition, communication, and linguistic representation constitute interdependent elements of a unified anthropocentric continuum.

The complex concept WORD / LANGUAGE / SPEECH serves as a focal point for understanding how linguistic knowledge is organized and transmitted within a speech community. The distinction between naïve and scientific pictures of the world illuminates the dual nature of this conceptualization – one grounded in collective everyday experience, the other in analytical and theoretical reflection.

Ultimately, these findings support the conclusion that the naïve and scientific worldviews are not oppositional but complementary. Their interplay enables a deeper comprehension of how English speakers conceptualize and verbalize the fundamental phenomena of word, language, and speech—not merely as linguistic constructs but as instruments of cognition, culture, and worldview formation.

References

1. Alefirenko, N. F. (2005). Spornye problemy semantiki [Controversial problems of semantics]. Moscow: Gnozis.
2. Barsalou, L. (2003). Situated simulation in the human conceptual system. Language and Cognitive Processes, 18(5–6), 513–562.
3. Barsalou, L. (2011). Grounding knowledge in the brain's model systems. In Book of abstracts: The Third Conference of the Scandinavian Association for Language and Cognition (SALK III) (pp. 3–13). Copenhagen: University of Copenhagen.
4. Berestnev, T. I. (2009). K probleme yazyka mental′nykh prostranstv: obraz sveta s kognitivnoi tochki zreniya [On the problem of the language of mental spaces: the image of light from a cognitive perspective]. In Horizons of modern linguistics: Traditions and innovations (pp. 143–160). Moscow: Languages of Slavic Cultures.
5. Berthele, R. (2001). A tool, a bond or a territory: Language ideologies in the US and in Switzerland (LAUD Paper 583). Essen, Germany: Linguistic Agency, University of Duisburg.
6. Boldyrev, N. N. (2000). Kognitivnaya semantika: Kurs lektsii po angliiskoi filologii [Cognitive semantics: A course of lectures in English philology]. Tambov: Tambov University.
7. Boldyrev, N. N. (2019). Yazyk i sistema znanii: Kognitivnaya teoriya yazyka [Language and the system of knowledge: Cognitive theory of language]. Moscow: YASK.
8. Buniyatova, I. R. (2018). Yazykovaya izmenchivost′: problemy interpretatsii [Linguistic variability: Problems of interpretation]. In Doctrina multiplex, veritas una. Uchyen′ bagato, istina odna: A collection of scientific papers (pp. 28–44). Kyiv: Borys Grinchenko Kyiv Metropolitan University.
9. Burlak, S. A. (2012). Proiskhozhdenie yazyka: Fakty, issledovaniya, gipotezy [The origin of language: Facts, research, hypotheses]. Moscow: Alpina Digital.
10. Calvin, W. H., & Bickerton, D. (2000). Lingua ex machina: Reconciling Darwin and Chomsky with the human brain. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
11. Chernygovskaya, T. V. (2006). Zerkal′nyi mozg, kontsepty i yazyk: Tsena antropogeneza [The mirror brain, concepts, and language: The cost of anthropogenesis]. I. M. Sechenov Physiological Journal, 92(1), 84–99.
12. Chomsky, N. (1980). On cognitive structures and their development: A reply to Piaget. In M. Piattelli-Palmarini (Ed.), Language and learning: The debate between Jean Piaget and Noam Chomsky (pp. 36–52). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
13. Cowie, A. P. (2001). Homonymy, polysemy, and the monolingual English dictionary. Lexicographica, 17(1), 40–60. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110915018.40
14. Cruse, D. A. (2002). Aspects of the microstructure of word meaning. In Y. Ravin & C. Leacock (Eds.), Polysemy: Theoretical and computational approaches (pp. 30–51). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
15. Enfield, N. J., & Levinson, S. C. (2006). Roots of human sociality: Cognition, culture, and interaction. Oxford: Berg.

16. Evans, V. (2012). Cognitive linguistics. WIREs Cognitive Science, 3(2), 129–141. https://doi.org/10.1002/wcs.1163
17. Evans, V. (2014). The language myth: Why language is not an instinct. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
18. Evans, N., & Levinson, S. C. (2009). The myth of language universals: Language diversity and its importance for cognitive science. Behavioral and Brain Sciences, 32(5), 429–492. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X0999094X
19. Fauconnier, G. (1999). Methods and generalizations. In T. Janssen & G. Redeker (Eds.), Cognitive linguistics: Foundations, scope, and methodology (pp. 95–124). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
20. Fenk-Oczlon, G., & Fenk, A. (2002). The clausal structure of linguistic and pre-linguistic behaviour. In T. Givón & B. Malle (Eds.), The evolution of language out of pre-language (pp. 215–229). Amsterdam: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/z.107
21. Fitch, W. T., Hauser, M. D., & Chomsky, N. (2005). The evolution of the language faculty: Classifications and implications. Cognition, 97(2), 179–210. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2005.02.005
22. Geeraerts, D., & Cuyckens, H. (2012). Introducing cognitive linguistics. In D. Geeraerts & H. Cuyckens (Eds.), The Oxford handbook of cognitive linguistics (pp. 3–24). Oxford: Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199738632.013.0001
23. Givón, T. (2002). The visual information-processing system as an evolutionary precursor of human language. In T. Givón & B. Malle (Eds.), The evolution of language out of pre-language (pp. 3–50). Amsterdam: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/z.107.02giv
24. Harder, P. (2003). The status of linguistic facts: Rethinking the relation between cognition, social institution and utterance from a functional point of view. Mind and Language, 18(1), 52–76. https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-0017.00217
25. Hauser, M. D., & Fitch, W. T. (2003). What are the uniquely human components of the language faculty? In M. Christiansen & S. Kirby (Eds.), Language evolution (pp. 158–181). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
26. Hockett, C. F. (1960). The origin of speech. Scientific American, 203(3), 89–96. https://doi.org/10.1038/scientificamerican0960-88
27. Iraide, I. A. (2004). What's cognitive linguistics? A new framework for the study of Basque. ASJU: International Journal of Basque Linguistics and Philology, 38(1–2), 3–31.
28. Kharitonchik, Z. A. (2009). O nominativnykh resursakh yazyka, ili k diskussii o kontseptual′noi integratsii [On the nominative resources of language, or toward a discussion of conceptual integration]. In Tendentsii sovremennoi lingvistiki: Traditsii i innovatsii [Horizons of modern linguistics: Traditions and innovations] (pp. 412–422). Moscow: Languages of Slavic Cultures.
29. Kirilina, A. V. (2009). Kognitivnaya nauka i novaya epistema gumanitarnogo znaniya [Cognitive science and the new episteme of humanitarian knowledge]. In Tendentsii sovremennoi lingvistiki: Traditsii i innovatsii [Horizons of modern linguistics: Traditions and innovations] (pp. 66–75). Moscow: Languages of Slavic Cultures.
30. Kravchenko, A. V. (2013). Ot yazykovogo mifa k biologicheskoi real'nosti: Pereosmyslyaya poznavatel'nye ustanovki yazykoznaniya [From the linguistic myth to biological reality: Rethinking the cognitive attitudes of linguistics]. Moscow: Manuscript Monuments of Ancient Rus'. ISBN 978-5-9551-0633-5.
31. Kubryakova, E. S. (1993). Vozvrashchayas' k opredeleniyu znaka [Returning to the definition of the sign]. Voprosy yazykoznaniya, 4, 18–28.
32. Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1999). Philosophy in the flesh: The embodied mind and its challenge to Western thought. New York: Basic Books.
33. Lala, K., Odling-Smee, J., & Feldman, M. (2000). Niche construction, biological evolution, and cultural change. Behavioral and Brain Sciences, 23(1), 131–175. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X00002417
34. Lenneberg, E. H. (1991). An invitation to cognitive science. Cambridge, MA: Basil Wiley and Sons.
35. Levinson, S. C. (2003). Space in language and cognition: Explorations in cognitive diversity. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511613609
36. Levitsky, V. V. (2004). Rol′ kategorial'noi semantiki v obespechenii funktsionirovaniya nominativnykh edinits sovremennoi angliiskoi rechi [The role of categorical semantics in ensuring

the functioning of nominative units of modern English]. Zhytomyr Ivan Franko State University Journal, 17, 66–70.
37. Luria, A. R. (1978). Yazyk i soznanie [Language and consciousness]. Moscow: Moscow State University Press.
38. MacWhinney, B. A. (2005). A unified model of language development. In J. Kroll & A. De Groot (Eds.), Handbook of bilingualism: Psycholinguistic approaches (pp. 49–67). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
39. Manaenko, G. N. (2013). Sintaksicheskie osnovy organizatsii informatsii v tekste [Syntactic bases of information organization in the text]. In Language and culture in the age of globalization: A collection of scientific works (pp. 278–288). Saint Petersburg: Herzen State Pedagogical University.
40. Manakin, V. M. (2008). Movy svitu: Zahal′na symetriya universumu [Languages of the world: General symmetry of the universe]. Scientific Notes: Series Philological Sciences (Linguistics), 75(1), 3–9.
41. Manerko, L. A. (2008). Kognitivnaya lingvistika i filosofskie osnovaniya sovremennoi yazykoznacheskoi nauki [Cognitive linguistics and philosophical foundations of modern linguistic science]. In The cognitive studies of language (pp. 105–121). Moscow: Linguistic Institute of the Russian Academy of Sciences.
42. Maslova, V. A. (2004). Lingvokulturologiya [Linguoculturology]. Moscow: Academy.
43. Maslova, V. A. (2008). Kognitivnaya lingvistika [Cognitive linguistics]. Minsk: Tetra Systems.
44. Maturana, H. (1978). Biology of language: The epistemology of reality. In G. A. Miller & E. Lenneberg (Eds.), Psychology and biology of language and thought (pp. 28–62). New York: Academic Press.
45. McMurray, B., & Wasserman, E. (2009). Variability in languages, variability in learning. Behavioral and Brain Sciences, 32(5), 460–472. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X09990934
46. Mechkovskaya, N. B. (2004). Semiotika. Yazyk. Priroda. Kul'tura [Semiotics. Language. Nature. Culture]. Moscow: Academy.
47. Mechkovskaya, N. B. (2018). Filosofiya yazyka i kommunikatsii [Philosophy of language and communication]. Moscow: FLINTA.
48. Merker, B. (2009). Returning language to culture by way of biology. In M. Tallerman (Ed.), Language evolution: Biological, linguistic, and philosophical perspectives (pp. 139–158). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
49. Morris, C. W. (1966). Foundations of the theory of signs. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
50. Nikitin, M. V. (2009). O sootnoshenii znaka i znacheniya [On the relationship between sign and meaning]. In Tendentsii sovremennoi lingvistiki: Traditsii i innovatsii [Horizons of modern linguistics: Traditions and innovations] (pp. 161–168). Moscow: Languages of Slavic Cultures.
51. Pagel, M. (2000). The history, rate, and pattern of world linguistic evolution. In C. Knight, M. Studdert-Kennedy, & J. Hurford (Eds.), The evolutionary emergence of language (pp. 391–416). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
52. Penn, D. C., Holyoak, K. J., & Povinelli, D. J. (2009). Universal grammar and mental continuity: Two modern myths. Behavioral and Brain Sciences, 32(5), 465–466. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X09990957
53. Pikhtovnikova, L. S. (2018). Lingvosynergetika [Linguosynergetics]. Kharkiv: V. N. Karazin Kharkiv National University Press.
54. Pimenov, E. A. (2004). Issledovanie kontsepta Trauer "pechal'" posredstvom sinonimicheskogo ryada [Exploring the concept Trauer "sadness" through synonyms]. In Ethnohermeneutik und Anthropologie (pp. 89–94). Landau: Verlag Empirische Pädagogik.
55. Pinker, S. (1994). The language instinct. New York: William Morrow and Company.
56. Pinker, S., & Jackendoff, R. (2005). The faculty of language: What's special about it? Cognition, 95(2), 201–236. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2004.08.004
57. Polinichenko, D. Yu. (2007). Yazyk [Language]. In Antologiya kontseptov [Anthology of concepts] (pp. 243–253). Moscow: Gnosis.
58. Prykhodko, A. N. (2013). Kontsepty i kontseptosistemy [Concepts and conceptual systems]. Dnipro: Belaya.

59. Prykhodko, H. I. (2016). Kategoryya otsenki v kontekste izmeneniya lingvisticheskikh paradigm [The category of evaluation in the context of changes in linguistic paradigms]. Zaporizhzhia: Krugozir.
60. Radbil, T. B. (2013). Osnovy izucheniya yazykovogo mentaliteta [Foundations for the study of linguistic mentality]. Moscow: FLINTA.
61. Selivanova, O. O. (2010). Lingvistychna entsyklopediya [Linguistic encyclopedia]. Poltava: Dovkillya-K.
62. Slyshkin, G. G. (2004). Lingvokul'turnye kontsepty i metakontsepty [Linguocultural concepts and meta-concepts]. Volgograd: Peremena.
63. Smith, E. E. (1989). Concepts and induction. In M. Posner (Ed.), Foundations of cognitive science (pp. 501–526). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
64. Stepanov, Yu. S. (2001). Konstanty: Slovar' russkoi kul'tury [Constants: Dictionary of Russian culture]. Moscow: Academic Project.
65. Susov, I. P. (2007). Vvedenie v yazykoznanie [Introduction to linguistics]. Moscow: AST; Vostok-Zapad.
66. Tarp, S. (2001). Lexicography and linguistic concepts of homonymy and polysemy. Lexicographica, 22, 22–39.
67. Tomasello, M. (2003). Constructing a language: A usage-based theory of language acquisition. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
68. Tsurikova, L. V. (2009). Kognitivno-diskursivnaya paradigma kak novoe napravlenie opisaniya i analiza rechemyslitel'noi deyatel'nosti [The cognitive-discursive paradigm as a new direction of describing and analyzing speech-thinking activity]. In Gorizonty sovremennoi lingvistiki: Traditsii i innovatsii [Horizons of modern linguistics: Traditions and innovations] (pp. 76–92). Moscow: Languages of Slavic Cultures.
69. Wierzbicka, A. (2010). Experience, evidence, and sense: The hidden cultural legacy of English. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
70. Wierzbicka, A. (1999). Semanticheskie universalii i opisanie yazykov [Semantic universals and language description]. Moscow: Yazyki russkoi kul'tury.
71. Zhabotynska, S. A. (2018). Generativizm, kognitivizm i semantika lingval'nykh setei [Generativism, cognitivism, and semantics of linguistic networks]. In Doctrina multiplex, veritas una: Uchen' bahato, istina odna [Many scholars, one truth: A collection of scientific papers] (pp. 99–141). Kyiv: Borys Grinchenko Kyiv Metropolitan University.
72. Zhinkin, N. I. (1982). Rech' kak provodnik informatsii [Speech as a conductor of information]. Moscow: Nauka.
73. Zwaan, R. (2004). The immersed experiencer: Toward an embodied theory of language comprehension. In B. Ross (Ed.), The psychology of learning and motivation (Vol. 44, pp. 35–62). New York: Academic Press. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0079-7421(03)44002-4

AUTHOR BIODATA

Author 1

Dr. sc., prof.

Faculty of Romance and Germanic Philology, Odesa I.I. Mechnikov National University

Vsevoloda Zmiienka St, 2, 65082, Odesa, Ukraine

Author 2

Dr. sc., prof.

Faculty of Romance and Germanic Philology, Odesa I.I. Mechnikov National University

Vsevoloda Zmiienka St, 2, 65082, Odesa, Ukraine

Author 3

Dr. sc., prof.

Faculty of Romance and Germanic Philology, Odesa I.I. Mechnikov National University

Vsevoloda Zmiienka St, 2, 65082, Odesa, Ukraine

Author 4

Dr. sc., prof. Valeriia Smaglii, Dr. sc., prof.

Educational and scientific maritime department of humanities, Odessa National Maritime University

Mechnikova str, 34, 65029, Odesa, Ukraine