

**A.M. Jafarli***Sumgait State University**Sumgait, Azerbaijan*email: [umudovaasmer@mail.ru](mailto:umudovaasmer@mail.ru)

## CONTEXTUAL COMPATIBILITY AND SEMANTIC SHIFTS IN THE TRANSLATION OF CONCEPTS

**Abstract.** The article examines the influence of contextual factors on the formation and translation of concepts, as well as the mechanisms of semantic shifts that arise when conceptually significant units are transferred between languages. It analyzes the main theoretical approaches to understanding the concept in modern linguistics, where it is interpreted as a multilayered mental structure that integrates universal and ethnocultural components and reflects the values, cognitive models, and emotional representations of speakers. The study identifies factors that cause discrepancies between conceptual meanings in translation, including differences in cultural background, symbolism, pragmatics, and national associations. Using material from Azerbaijani, Russian, and English, the study demonstrates how historical and cultural conditions shape the transformation of conceptual content, which becomes especially evident in the case of the concept of “victory.” In addition, a comparative analysis of the conceptual meanings of the words “head,” “road,” “home,” and “water” within phraseological units of the three languages reveals both shared patterns and language-specific features of national worldviews. The findings confirm the necessity of considering cultural context, cognitive factors, and emotional nuances when translating concepts, as this ensures a more accurate and contextually grounded transfer of meaning in cross-linguistic communication.

**Keywords:** concept, semantics, translation, cultural context, cognitive models, national worldview, phraseology.

**Conflict of interests:**

The author declare no conflict of interest.

**Article history:**

Received: 17.10.2025

Accepted: 03.12.2025

### Introduction

The concept is one of the core categories in contemporary linguistics, forming a bridge between language, cognition, and culture. Research on concepts has evolved within two interrelated frameworks: the cognitive approach, which examines how humans perceive and categorize the world through linguistic structures, and the linguocultural approach, which investigates culturally conditioned meanings and the influence of collective experience on conceptual formation (Maslova, 2001).

The theoretical foundations of concept studies were laid by S. Askoldov (1997), who defined the concept as a culturally enriched “form of thought,” emphasizing its psychological and experiential nature. D. Likhachev (1997) broadened this perspective by characterizing the concept as a multi-layered semantic structure, embodying national worldview, cultural memory, and individual associations. Scholars such as G. Tokarev (2003), S. Shukurlu (2019), and I. Kazimov (2021) further contributed to refining the notion of the concept, viewing it as a dynamic entity shaped by both universal cognitive mechanisms and ethnospecific cultural experience.

G. Tokarev (2003) interprets the concept as a global multidimensional mental unit combining universal human knowledge with national-specific components shaped by history and culture. S. Shukurlu (2019) classifies definitions of the concept into three groups: 1) mental formations consisting of associations, images, and knowledge; 2) global cognitive units; and 3) idealized culturally conditioned objects. I. Kazimov (2021) distinguishes linguocultural concepts as representations that integrate cultural, ethnospecific, and linguistic elements, functioning as markers of national identity.

This body of scholarship demonstrates that conceptual content varies across languages depending on cultural norms, worldview, collective identity, and historical development. These differences become especially salient in translation, where cultural and contextual discrepancies may lead to semantic shifts or loss of conceptual information. Thus, analyzing the culturally embedded nature of concepts is crucial for understanding how conceptual variation influences cross-linguistic equivalence, particularly in Azerbaijani, Russian, and English.

The present study explores how cultural and contextual factors shape conceptual meaning and identifies mechanisms through which conceptual variation leads to semantic shifts in translation.

### **Materials and Methods**

This study employs a qualitative comparative method to examine culturally conditioned conceptual meanings in Azerbaijani, Russian, and English. The analysis focuses on key theoretical definitions of the concept and explores their cultural components using selected linguistic and scholarly sources.

The methodological procedure includes 1) identifying core definitions of the concept within cognitive linguistics; 2) comparing scholarly perspectives to reveal shared and divergent theoretical positions; 3) analyzing cultural factors influencing conceptual meaning in the three languages; 4) distinguishing universal and national-specific elements within conceptual structures as described in the literature.

This methodological framework provides the basis for analyzing how conceptual variation leads to semantic shifts in translation.

### **Results and Discussion**

The interlingual variability of concepts leads to their manifestation in different forms, depending on their place within a given culture and language. In the process of translation, conceptual shifts and losses are inevitable, since language reflects not only lexical units but also the unique structures that convey specific ways of thinking and cultural identity. Considering these differences, applying a context-sensitive approach to conceptual units enables a more accurate and culturally adequate interpretation, ensuring that the conveyed concept is richer in meaning and more faithful to its original cultural significance.

For instance, the concept of victory demonstrates substantial semantic and cultural divergence across languages. A concept encompasses not only its primary lexical meaning but also emotional resonance and national-cultural values. Accordingly, the Azerbaijani *qələbə*, the Russian *победа* (*pobeda*), and the English *victory* share a literal meaning denoting triumph or success; however, their cultural connotations differ considerably.

In Azerbaijani, prior to 2020, *qələbə* was primarily associated with the First Karabakh War and the struggle for territorial integrity. Since 2020, the concept has been strongly linked to the Patriotic War, with the 44-day conflict transforming it into a symbol of national pride and resilience, embodying the nation's indomitable spirit and the restoration of historical justice. As illustrated:

*Halal olsun Ordumuza –  
Qələbəni çaldı Vətən,  
yeni tarix yazı-yaza  
zəbt olunmuş torpaqları  
yaddan geri aldı Vətən.* (Aziz, 2020)

and:

*Your voice, Azerbaijan, resounds loudly,  
The light of Karabakh shines in your eyes.  
Illuminated by the sun of victory,  
The sky and earth meet in the falcons' gaze...* (Mammadov, 2022).

In Russian culture, *победа* (*pobeda*) carries a broad and deeply symbolic meaning, primarily associated with the Soviet victory in the Second World War. Within the Russian linguistic and cultural context, "May 9 – Victory Day" serves as a powerful symbol of this concept, emphasizing collective resistance, sacrifice, and national resilience. The term *победа* (*pobeda*) denotes not merely a military triumph but also embodies notions of familial devotion, ancestral sacrifice, and moral duty toward future generations. It has become an essential element of national identity, foregrounding themes of patriotism, historical memory, and the pursuit of peace:

*Победа у наших стоит дверей...  
Как гостью желанную встретим?  
Пусть женщины выше поднимут детей,  
Спасенных от тысячи тысяч смертей, –  
Так мы долгожданной ответим* (Akhmatova, 1942).

In English, the concept of *victory* is predominantly associated with individual achievements and personal triumphs. It often denotes success attained by an individual or a small group in competitive contexts, including sports, technology, and science. Unlike the collective and historically charged interpretations found in Azerbaijani and Russian cultures, *victory* in English primarily reflects values of personal effort, determination, and excellence.

These differences show that one and the same concept may acquire different nuances across languages due to cultural and social factors. As a result, universal concepts become culturally reframed within each linguistic community. I. Kazimov (2021) notes that concepts shape the ethnolinguistic worldview and therefore develop culturally specific meanings. In such cases, literal translation of formally identical words can produce semantic distortions or a loss of conceptual depth.

Accordingly, the semantic structure of concepts must be analysed not only at the lexical level but also within their broader cultural and cognitive contexts. Preserving

contextual adequacy is crucial in cross-linguistic comparison, as it ensures that the conceptual layers embedded in a word are not lost. This approach enables a more accurate understanding of how concepts function across languages and highlights the need to consider both cognitive and linguocultural dimensions.

The formation of concepts is shaped by national-cultural values, stylistic variation, socio-historical background, and other contextual factors. As G. Tokarev (2003, p. 187) notes, the cultural specificity of conceptualization becomes evident in the semantic dynamics of polysemous words, where antonymy, synonymy, and derivational patterns play a key role. This perspective highlights that semantic variability and structural relations within the lexicon determine the diverse conceptual interpretations found across languages and cultures.

This perspective aligns with I. Kazimov's view (2021, p. 24) that concepts are closely tied to a language's lexical composition and play a central role in shaping the conceptsphere. He argues that the lexical system reflects the ethnolinguistic worldview and encodes information across different conceptual domains. Thus, both approaches demonstrate that concepts develop not only within individual and collective consciousness but also through the structural and semantic characteristics of the language itself.

Context is one of the key factors affecting the comprehension of concepts across languages. Consequently, the cultural specificity of concepts requires their investigation not only from a linguistic standpoint but also through their contextual and cultural nuances. Semantic dynamism, cultural specificity, and contextual variability emerge as primary factors in conceptual formation and cross-linguistic comparison.

To illustrate this, idioms and expressions containing the words *head*, *road*, *house*, and *water* in Azerbaijani, Russian, and English were comparatively analyzed. Based on these examples, it was determined that the same lexical unit can produce different concepts across languages and even within the same language, depending on context. Idiomatic expressions, in particular, often develop distinct conceptual meanings across linguistic and cultural environments.

In Azerbaijani, the word *baş* ('head') carries both its literal meaning and numerous figurative meanings, including leadership, trouble, love, anger, pride, and shame. For example, "*As he pondered, smoke seemed to rise from his head, and his voice reached the heavens. 'May you be shamed before people, may your face darken before your family and children,' she cursed her husband.*" (Shikhli, 2005, p. 36).

In the following examples, similar or corresponding concepts expressed through *baş* are reflected in all three languages (see Table 1).

Table 1. Conceptual representations of the lexeme *baş* ('head') in Azerbaijani, Russian, and English

Concept	Azerbaijani Language	Russian Language	English Language
<b>Leadership</b>	<i>Başçı, Baş nazir, Baş idarə</i>	<i>Глава (leader), Начальник (chief)</i>	<i>Head of state, Head of department</i>
<b>Disappointment</b>	<i>Başını itirmək (to lose control), başı aşağı (to be downcast)</i>	<i>Потерять голову (to lose one's head), Вешать голову (to hang one's head)</i>	<i>Lose one's head (to panic), Hang one's head (to feel ashamed)</i>
<b>Obedience</b>	<i>Baş əymək (to obey), Başı bələdə olmaq (to be in trouble)</i>	<i>Склонить голову (to bow one's head), Сложитъ голову (to die, to sacrifice)</i>	<i>Bow one's head (to be humble)</i>
<b>Decision-making</b>	<i>Baş götürüb getmək (to leave suddenly), Başı dumanlanmaq (to be confused)</i>	<i>Куда глаза глядят (to go wherever the eyes look)</i>	<i>Head towards (to move toward something), Clear one's head (to gather one's thoughts)</i>

As can be seen, these expressions convey the same concept in translation. This is primarily related to the physiological features of the head in all three languages, such as its association with decision-making (linked to the brain) and obedience (expressed through the act of bowing the head), among others. Some expressions, however, undergo a change in their core component when translated into another language. Let us examine the following examples.

The expression *başına oyun açmaq* means to create unexpected difficulties and problems in someone's life, to cause serious harm, or to intentionally inflict damage. When translated literally into English as *to play a game on someone's head* or into Russian as *сыграть игру на голове*, the meaning becomes completely obscure and fails to convey the deep sense inherent in Azerbaijani. In English, *play a game* generally means to joke or have fun, whereas in Azerbaijani, *başına oyun açmaq* implies causing serious trouble. In Russian, the phrase *сыграть игру* is typically understood either in the context of sports or metaphorically as manipulation. Therefore, instead of a literal translation, it is preferable to consider the contextual meaning and replace the expression with an equivalent phrase in the target language. For example, in English: *to ruin someone's life, to make someone's life miserable, to cause trouble for someone*; in Russian: *сломать жизнь, доставить неприятности, создать проблемы*.

The number of such examples can be extended: expressions such as *ağlını başından almaq* and *başından tüstü çıxmaq* also belong to this category. As can be seen, idiomatic units related to the word *baş* in Azerbaijani reflect social and emotional values. When translated literally, key emotional and cultural nuances are lost, and the meaning of the expression changes. These issues can be minimized through the use of cultural adaptation strategies rather than literal substitution.



Thus, in all three languages, the word *baş* ('head'), which in its literal sense denotes a human organ, acquires different conceptual shades depending on cultural context. During translation from one language to another, it tends to lose the cultural codes inherent in its original linguistic and cultural environment.

The same applies to the word *yol* ('road' or 'way'): in Azerbaijani, it is used both in its literal sense and with figurative connotations. For example, *gözü yol çəkmək* ('to long for someone's arrival') conveys the concept of longing or anticipation, while *yola gətirmək* ('to bring someone to agreement') expresses the concept of persuasion or reconciliation. She was glad that she had persuaded the boy and that he would soon return home (Shikhli, 2005, p. 74). The woman seemed as if she had been waiting longingly; her face bore a look of sadness and weariness (Shikhli, 2005, p. 70).

The word *yol* in Azerbaijani, Russian, and English does not merely denote a physical path but also acquires meanings related to life, choice, direction, spiritual growth, and social values. Across all three languages, 'road' functions as a culturally stable metaphor for life trajectory, moral orientation, and personal development. Expressions that convey similar conceptual meanings across Azerbaijani, Russian, and English rely on the symbolic use of *yol* ('road,' 'path,' 'way') to represent method, decision, or life journey (see Table 2).

Table 2. Conceptual representations of the lexeme *yol* ('road') in Azerbaijani, Russian, and English

Concept	Azerbaijani Language	Russian Language	English Language
<b>Path</b>	uzun yol, düz yol	длинный путь, прямая дорога	long road, straight path
<b>Life</b>	həyat yolu, ömür yolu	жизненный путь, путь судьбы	life path, way of life
<b>Righteousness</b>	düz yol, yoldan çıxmaq	прямой путь, сойти с пути	straight way, go astray
<b>Choice</b>	iki yol ayrıcında qalmaq	на распутье	at a crossroads
<b>Development</b>	yeni yol açmaq	прокладывать путь, дорога к успеху	pave the way, road to success

Some expressions, however, lose their figurative and emotional depth when translated from one language to another, as the semantic nuances cannot be fully conveyed.

The expression *gözü yol çəkmək* (the concept of longing) means to constantly wait for someone or something with deep yearning. A literal translation into English as *pulling one's eyes towards the road* or into Russian as *тянуть глаза к дороге* fails to convey the figurative meaning and emotional depth of the original expression. A more appropriate translation would be 'waiting with longing' in English or 'ждать с тоской' in Russian, although in these versions the road component is lost.

A similar situation can be observed in the expression *yola gətirmək* (the concept of persuasion), which means to convince someone or reach a compromise on an issue. While its literal translation does not make sense in either English or Russian, replacing it with contextually suitable alternatives such as 'to persuade someone' or 'to bring someone to an agreement' produces a more accurate equivalent, even though

the road element disappears. As seen, the word *yol* in all three languages carries both literal and figurative meanings, but the manner of expression and cultural connotation differ across languages. To minimize cultural loss during translation, contextual and culturally adaptive strategies should be applied, ensuring that expressions are rendered with their emotional and semantic nuances preserved. This allows for a more accurate understanding in both cross-linguistic and cross-cultural communication.

The word *su* ('water') in Azerbaijani is capable of forming various concepts. For example, *odla su arasında qalmaq* expresses the concept of helplessness, while *ağzına su alıb oturmaq* conveys the concept of silence. Depending on the context, *su* also serves as a key component in emotionally and culturally rich expressions. For instance, the sentence "*Şamxal daş atmaqda bəhsə girən uşaqlara, budaqları lillənib qalan çiləkənə, ağacı yerindən tərpədə bilməyən boz-bulanıq sulara baxdı*" (Shikhli, 2005, p. 17) reflects the concept of helplessness, while "*Məni niyə bədbəxt elədin? Yurduma-yuvama niyə su saldın?*" (Shikhli, 2005, p. 22) expresses the concept of sorrow, where *su salmaq* symbolizes ruin, domestic tragedy, and the destruction of happiness.

In English, the literal translation "*Why did you flood my home?*" or in Russian "*Почему ты затопил мой дом?*" fails to convey the emotional depth and metaphorical meaning, as both versions refer only to the physical act of flooding. A more culturally adequate translation, such as "*Why did you bring ruin to my home and sorrow to my soul?*" in English or "*Почему ты разрушил мой дом и наполнил мою душу горем?*" in Russian, minimizes the cultural loss.

Additionally, *su* may express the concept of time, as seen in "*Təpələrin dalından ay boylandı... Uzaqda şaxələnib axan Kürün suları ağarışdı.*" (Shikhli, 2005, p. 46). Here, *water* becomes a metaphor for the passage of time and the onset of evening. Similarly, in E. Hemingway's description (1952) – "*The water was a dark blue now... he saw the red sifting of the plankton in the dark water and the strange light the sun made now*" – *water* again serves as an indicator of time, depicting the transition into night.

According to the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis (Sapir, 1921; Whorf, 1956), language influences thought, and different peoples perceive and describe the same phenomena in distinct ways. In Azerbaijani culture, the color white symbolizes purity, clarity, transition, and tranquility, which explains why I. Shikhli (2005) repeatedly depicts the coming of night as the whitening of water. In contrast, E. Hemingway's (1952) association of blue and purple tones with darkness and depth reflects English-speaking cultural perceptions of color and emotion. As seen from the examples above, idiomatic expressions generally lose their original meaning when translated literally from one language into another.

A second type of loss occurs when cultural codes embedded in an expression have no equivalent alternatives in the target language. Each expression carries the cultural markers of its linguistic community, and during translation it is often impossible to find equivalents that fully reflect those markers.

In Azerbaijani, the word *ev* ('home') can convey concepts such as comfort, family, unity, safety, and honor. For example, in the sentence "*Əşrəfi keçən il Qori müəllimlər seminariyasına oxumağa göndərmiş, Şamxalı isə yanında saxlamışdı. Evimizdən biri oxusa bəsdir, – demişdi, – sən qal.*" (Shikhli, 2005, p. 30), the word *ev* represents the concept of family. In "*Vay, evim yıxıldı, Əşrəf, qızı apardılar.*" (Shikhli, 2005, p. 284), it expresses the concept of honor or moral integrity, while in "*Neçə gündü evimdə duz-çörək kəsirsən. Ona görə də sənə bir şey eləmirəm.*" (Shikhli, 2005, p. 297), it conveys the concept of safety or protection. In these examples, particularly in the phrase "*Evimizdən biri oxusa bəsdir*", *ev* functions as a symbol of familial unity and collective identity.

However, when translated into English or Russian, this sense of communal belonging and unity is lost, as no direct equivalent fully captures its cultural and emotional depth.

The expression “*Vay, evim yixıldı!*” (concept of honor and dignity) in Azerbaijani denotes a family tragedy or the loss of moral integrity, used in situations such as a daughter leaving home, disgrace brought upon the family name, or a severe personal misfortune. Literal translations such as “*Oh, my home has collapsed!*” fail to convey the intended meaning. More contextually appropriate versions – “*Oh, I have lost my honor!*”, “*My family is ruined!*”, “*O, моя честь погублена!*”, “*Моя семья разрушена!*” – communicate the emotional message, but the cultural image of the “home” as a symbol of dignity disappears.

Within Azerbaijani culture, *evim yixıldı* embodies notions of shattered hopes, deep sorrow, tragedy, and devastation. The most culturally and emotionally accurate English translations would be “*My life is ruined,*” “*I lost everything,*” “*I am devastated,*” or “*Everything fell apart.*” In Russian culture, although family values are significant, the concepts of *home* and *family* are not as closely intertwined as in Azerbaijani. Consequently, the emotional depth of *evim yixıldı* cannot be fully conveyed in Russian, and some meaning is inevitably lost even in adapted translations.

Expressions used in everyday life that carry ethnographic or culturally specific meanings also tend to remain unclear in translation. It is often impossible to find direct equivalents for such expressions in other languages. For example, *duz-çörək kəsmək* (‘to share bread and salt’) in the sentence “*Neçə gündür evimdə duz-çörək kəsirsən. Ona görə də sənə bir şey eləmirəm.*” reflects the concepts of safety and hospitality. Although the meaning can be conveyed through a more contextually appropriate translation, the linguistic and cultural codes specific to Azerbaijani culture are inevitably lost.

Hospitality is a symbol of the respect, affection, and esteem one person shows to another. This concept embodies not only the act of hosting but also a special attitude toward the guest and the broader culture of welcoming visitors. For example, in the sentences “*Heç nədən qorxmayın, siz qonaqsınız. Qonağa zaval olmaz.*” (Shikhli, 2005, p. 124), “*Durun gedək. Bu kəndə gələn qonaq mənim evimdə çörək kəsməmiş gedə bilməz.*” (Shikhli, 2005, p. 149), and “*Heç ikicə dəqiqə keçməmiş boğmalı armudu stəkanda buğlanan pürrengi çay onun qabağında hazır oldu. Qonaq iki stəkan dalbadal boşaltdıqdan sonra iri dəsmalla, puçur-puçur olub alınandan axan təri sildi.*” (Shikhli, 2005, p. 159), hospitality reflects deep-rooted cultural values of warmth, generosity, and protection. Although the term *hospitality* in English and *зоченпримство* (*gostepriimstvo*) in Russian convey a general sense of welcoming guests, they do not fully capture the deeper emotional, moral, and familial dimensions embedded in the Azerbaijani concept.

In Azerbaijani culture, hospitality goes far beyond social courtesy; it encompasses family-centered values and moral obligations, such as preparing the best dishes for guests, setting a special table, offering the finest space in the home, and showing respect even to an enemy who enters as a guest. These culturally embedded nuances make the Azerbaijani concept of *hospitality* far richer and more emotionally resonant than its direct lexical equivalents in English or Russian.

When the expression *armudu stəkanda çay süzmək* (‘to serve tea in a pear-shaped glass’) is translated into English or Russian, a cultural loss inevitably occurs, as the concept of the *armudu stəkan* does not exist in these languages. In such cases, it is advisable to include explanatory notes to convey the cultural meaning of the expression and the significance of the *armudu stəkan* in Azerbaijani culture. For example: “*In Azerbaijan, serving tea in special pear-shaped glasses is a sign of respect toward guests.*”



or in Russian: “В Азербайджане подача чая в особых стаканах – знак уважения к гостям.”

### Conclusion

The analysis presented in this study demonstrates that the variation of concepts during translation is largely determined by contextual, cultural, and linguistic factors. As evidenced by the examples, literal translation of idiomatic expressions frequently results in the loss of their original meaning, since figurative components and emotional shades cannot be preserved through direct lexical substitution. Similarly, when expressions contain domestic, ethnographic, or culturally specific elements for which no equivalents exist in the target language, cultural loss becomes inevitable.

The findings also underscore the necessity of approaching translation not only as a search for lexical equivalents but as a process that involves the transmission of cultural and social meaning. Expressions that reflect a nation’s worldview, cultural practices, and value system require particular attention, since their translation contributes to intercultural understanding. In this regard, several strategies can be applied to minimize conceptual and cultural losses. One such strategy is contextual translation, which replaces literal forms with expressions that preserve the emotional and semantic load of the original, as seen in the translation of “*Evim yıxıldı*” as “*My life is ruined*.” Another effective approach is explanatory translation, used when literal meaning fails to convey cultural codes; this method allows culturally significant expressions to retain their emotional impact, as in the case of *ev*, which encompasses notions of honor and family unity. Cultural adaptation may also be employed to select expressions consistent with the conceptual and communicative norms of the target language, such as rendering “*Ağzına su alıb oturmaq*” as “*Keep silent like a stone*” in English or “*Молчать, как рыба*” in Russian. In literary and academic discourse, explanatory notes or footnotes may be added to clarify cultural context and ensure the reader’s comprehension of culturally specific expressions.

Overall, the study confirms that concepts are not merely linguistic units but culturally and cognitively embedded structures whose meanings shift across languages depending on contextual and cultural frameworks. Accurate translation of such units requires not only linguistic competence but also cultural sensitivity, ensuring that the deeper layers of meaning are preserved. This approach enhances cross-linguistic equivalence, supports intercultural communication, and contributes to a more comprehensive understanding of how concepts function within and across linguistic systems.

### References

- Akhmatova, A.A. (1942). *Pobeda* [Victory]. Retrieved 17 September 2025 from <https://rupoem.ru/poets/axmatova/slavno-nachato-slavnoe> (in Russ.).
- Askoldov, S.A. (1997). Kontsept i slovo [Concept and word]. In: V.P. Neroznak (Ed.), *Russkaya slovesnost': Ot teorii slovesnosti k strukture teksta: Antologiya* (pp. 267–279). Akademiya. (in Russ.).
- Aziz, V. (2020, October). *Qələbəli Azərbaycan...* [Victorious Azerbaijan...]. Retrieved 15 September 2025 from <https://www.anl.az/down/meqale/edebiyat/2020-oktyabr/726818.htm> (in Azerb.).
- Hemingway, E. (1952). *The Old Man and the Sea*. Scribner.
- Kazimov, I. (2021). Müasir Azərbaycan dili leksikasının koqnitiv və linqvokulturoloji əsasları [Cognitive and linguocultural bases of modern Azerbaijani language lexicon]. *Azərbaycan dili və ədəbiyyat tədrisi*, 3(269), 10–29. (in Azerb.).

- Likhachev, D.S. (1997). Konceptosfera russkogo jazyka [The conceptosphere of the Russian language]. In: V.P. Neroznak (Ed.), *Russkaja slovesnost': Ot teorii slovesnosti k strukture teksta: Antologiya* (pp. 280–287). Akademiya. (in Russ.).
- Mammadov, B. (2022, January). *Zəfər günəşilə şəfəqlənir dan...* [The dawn glows with the sun of victory...]. Retrieved 15 September 2025 from <https://www.anl.az/download/meqale/525/2022/yanvar/779164.htm> (in Azerb.).
- Maslova, V. A. (2001). *Lingvokul'turologiia* [Cultural Linguistics]. Akademiya. (in Russ.).
- Sapir, E. (1921). *Language: An introduction to the study of speech*. Harcourt, Brace and Company.
- Shikhli, I. (2005). *Seçilmiş əsərləri: 2 cildə. I cild* [Selected works: In 2 volumes. Vol. 1]. Şərq-Qərb. (in Azerb.).
- Shukurlu, S. (2019). “Konsept” məfhumu və müxtəlif yanaşmalar [The notion of “concept” and different approaches]. *İpək Yolu*, 4, 126–131. (in Azerb.).
- Tokarev, G. V. (2003). *Koncept kak ob'ekt lingvokul'turologii (na materiale reprezentatsiy kontsepta “Trud” v russkom yazyke)* [The concept as an object of linguoculturology (based on representations of the concept “Labor” in the Russian language)]. Peremena. (in Russ.).
- Whorf, B.L. (1956). *Language, thought, and reality: Selected writings of Benjamin Lee Whorf*. The MIT Press.

#### Список использованной литературы

- Аскольдов С.А. Концепт и слово // Русская словесность: от теории словесности к структуре текста: Антология / Под общ. ред. В.П. Нерознака. Москва: Academia, 1997. С. 267–279.
- Ахматова А.А. Победа. 1942. URL: <https://rupoem.ru/poets/axmatova/slavno-nachato-slavnoe> (дата обращения: 17.09.2025).
- Лихачев Д.С. Концептосфера русского языка // Русская словесность: от теории словесности к структуре текста: Антология / Под общ. ред. В.П. Нерознака. Москва: Academia, 1997. С. 280–287.
- Маслова В.А. Лингвокультурология. Москва: Академия, 2001.
- Токарев Г.В. Концепт как объект лингвокультурологии (на материале репрезентаций концепта «Труд» в русском языке). Волгоград: Перемена, 2003.
- Əziz V. Qələbəli Azərbaycan... // Ədəbiyyat qəzeti. 2020, oktyabr. URL: <https://www.anl.az/download/meqale/edebiyat/2020/oktyabr/726818.htm> (дата обращения: 15.09.2025).
- Hemingway, E. (1952). *The Old Man and the Sea*. Scribner.
- Kazimov İ. Müasir Azərbaycan dili leksikasının koqnitiv və lingvokulturoloji əsasları // Azərbaycan dili və ədəbiyyat tədrisi. 2021. № 3 (269). S. 10–29.
- Məmmədov B. Zəfər günəşilə şəfəqlənir dan... // 525-ci qəzet. 2022. 27 yanvar. S. 14. URL: <https://www.anl.az/download/meqale/525/2022/yanvar/779164.htm> (дата обращения: 15.09.2025).
- Sapir, E. (1921). *Language: An introduction to the study of speech*. Harcourt, Brace and Company.
- Şıxlı İ. Seçilmiş əsərləri: 2 cildə. I cild. Bakı: Şərq-Qərb, 2005. 409 s.
- Şükürlü S. “Konsept” məfumu və müxtəlif yanaşmalar. *İpək Yolu*. 2019. № 4. S. 126–131.
- Whorf, B.L. (1956). *Language, thought, and reality: Selected writings of Benjamin Lee Whorf*. The MIT Press.

**А.М. Джафарлы**

*Сумгаит мемлекеттік университеті*

*Сумгаит, Әзербайжан*

## **КОНЦЕПТТЕРДІ АУДАРУДАҒЫ КОНТЕКСТУАЛДЫҚ СӘЙКЕСТІК ПЕН СЕМАНТИКАЛЫҚ ӨЗГЕРІСТЕР**

**Аңдатпа.** Мақалада контекстік факторлардың концепттердің қалыптасуы мен аудармасына ықпалы, сондай-ақ тілдер арасында концептуалды маңызды бірліктерді беру барысында туындайтын семантикалық өзгерістер механизмдері қарастырылады. Қазіргі лингвистикадағы концепт ұғымына қатысты негізгі теориялық тәсілдер талданып, ол әмбебап және этномәдени компоненттерді біріктіретін, тіл тасымалдаушыларының құндылықтарын, когнитивтік модельдерін және эмоциялық түсініктерін бейнелейтін көпқабатты менталдық құрылым ретінде сипатталады. Зерттеуде аударма кезінде концептуалдық мағыналардың алшақтауына себеп болатын факторлар айқындалады, олардың қатарында мәдени негіздегі айырмашылықтар, символика, прагматика және ұлттық ассоциациялар бар. Аталмыш зерттеу әзербайжан, орыс және ағылшын тілдері материалдары негізінде тарихи-мәдени жағдайлардың концептуалдық мазмұнның трансформациясына қалай әсер ететінін көрсетеді, бұл әсіресе «жеңіс» концепті мысалында айқын байқалады. Сонымен қатар, үш тілдегі фразеологиялық бірліктер құрамында «бас», «жол», «үй» және «су» сөздерінің концептуалдық мәндері салыстырылып, ұлттық тілдік дүниетанымдардың ортақ заңдылықтары мен өзіндік ерекшеліктері айқындалады. Алынған нәтижелер концепттерді аудару барысында мәдени контексті, когнитивтік ерекшеліктерді және эмоциялық реңктерді ескерудің маңыздылығын дәлелдейді, бұл тіл аралық коммуникацияда мәндердің неғұрлым дәл және контекстуалды негізделген берілуін қамтамасыз етеді.

**Түйінді сөздер:** концепт, семантика, аударма, мәдени контекст, когнитивтік модельдер, ұлттық тілдік дүниетаным, фразеология.

**А.М. Джафарлы**

*Сумгаитский государственный университет*

*Сумгаит, Азербайджан*

## **КОНТЕКСТУАЛЬНОЕ СООТВЕТСТВИЕ И СЕМАНТИЧЕСКИЕ ИЗМЕНЕНИЯ ПРИ ПЕРЕВОДЕ КОНЦЕПТОВ**

**Аннотация.** В статье рассматривается влияние контекстуальных факторов на формирование и перевод концептов, а также механизмы семантических изменений, возникающих при передаче концептуально значимых единиц между языками. Анализируются основные теоретические подходы к пониманию концепта в современной лингвистике, где он трактуется как многослойная ментальная структура, объединяющая универсальные и этнокультурные компоненты и отражающая ценности, когнитивные модели и эмоциональные представления носителей языка. В исследовании выявляются факторы, вызывающие расхождения между концептуальными значениями при переводе, включая различия в культурном

фоне, символике, прагматике и национальных ассоциациях. На материале азербайджанского, русского и английского языков демонстрируется, как историко-культурные условия влияют на преобразование концептуального содержания, что особенно заметно на примере концепта «победа». Дополнительно проводится сопоставление концептуальных значений слов «голова», «дорога», «дом» и «вода» в составе фразеологических единиц трех языков, что позволяет выявить общие закономерности и специфические черты национальных картин мира. Полученные результаты подтверждают необходимость учета культурного контекста, когнитивных особенностей и эмоциональных оттенков при переводе концептов, что обеспечивает более точную и контекстуально обоснованную передачу значений при межъязыковой коммуникации.

**Ключевые слова:** концепт, семантика, перевод, культурный контекст, когнитивные модели, национальная картина мира, фразеология.