TOWARD A RECONCEPTUALIZATION OF CONCEPT: BEYOND REPRESENTATIONAL AND INSTRUMENTAL PARADIGMS

An Analytical Review of Classical Theories and Their Systematic Limitations

Abstract

This paper provides a systematic examination of the dominant theories of concept that have shaped Western and Eastern philosophical traditions. The analysis reveals a shared limitation across all major approaches: they treat the concept as an object—whether as a set of essential properties, a modal structure, a rule of synthesis, a set of practical consequences, or a neural correlate. Drawing on this critical review, the paper argues that these approaches, despite their contributions, fail to account for the dynamic process of cognition itself. The paper concludes by suggesting that an alternative perspective—treating the concept as an act of structuring experience—may offer a more comprehensive framework for understanding cognition, knowledge, and action.

Keywords: concept, epistemology, philosophy of mind, logic, cognition, action, objectivity, pragmatism, representation.

Introduction

The nature of the concept has been one of the most enduring problems in philosophy. From Aristotle's categories to contemporary cognitive science, thinkers have sought to define what a concept is, how it relates to reality, and how it functions in thought and language. Despite millennia of inquiry, no unified definition has emerged. This persistent divergence suggests that the question itself may be framed in a way that precludes a satisfactory answer.

The present work undertakes a critical review of the major theories of concept, aiming not to dismiss their contributions but to identify their shared structural limitation. It is argued that all classical approaches treat the concept as an entity—a representation, a state, a rule, a pattern—and that this ontological assumption is the source of recurrent difficulties.

The first part of the paper examines Aristotelian and descriptive approaches, followed by modal and causal theories (Avicenna, Kant). The second part considers pragmatic and cognitivist perspectives. The conclusion draws together the findings and indicates a possible direction for future inquiry—toward understanding the concept as an act, rather than an object.

Part I: Descriptive and Representational Theories

1.1 The Aristotelian Framework

Aristotle's theory of the concept, developed in the *Categories* and the *Metaphysics*, is foundational to Western thought. For Aristotle, a concept is formed through abstraction: essential properties are distinguished from accidental ones, and the concept is defined by genus and specific difference. The concept of "human," for example, is "rational animal," where "animal" is the genus and "rational" the differentia.

Strengths of this model:

- **Logical clarity:** The model provides a clear, systematic method for defining concepts through hierarchical classification.

- **Definition and classification:** It enables the organization of knowledge into coherent, well-defined categories.
- **Syllogistic reasoning:** It provides the foundation for deductive logic and syllogistic inference.
- **Ontological grounding:** The model links concepts directly to the nature of things, giving it a robust metaphysical foundation.
- **Pedagogical value:** It offers an intuitive framework for teaching and communicating complex ideas.
- **Empirical accessibility:** The model is grounded in observable properties and provides a clear method for identifying concepts through their characteristics.
- **Historical influence:** It has shaped Western thought for over two millennia and continues to influence contemporary logic, classification systems, and scientific practice.

Limitations:

First, the concept is static. It captures an object at a given moment but does not reflect change, interaction, or developmental processes. The concept of "chair" describes its properties but does not account for our ability to sit on it, move it, repair it, or use it as a support. The concept of "river" defines it as a body of flowing water but does not capture its seasonal variations, erosion patterns, or ecological dynamics.

Second, the criterion for essentiality remains ungrounded. Why is the ability to sit essential to a chair, while its color is not? Why is rationality essential to being human, while having two legs is accidental? Aristotle appeals to the "nature" of the thing, but this nature is itself assumed rather than justified within the epistemological framework. The model provides no method for determining essence independently of the concept being analyzed.

Third, the model treats the concept as a passive reflection of objective properties. The knowing subject is an external observer, not a participant in the formation of meaning. This leads to a gap between knowledge and action: one can know the definition of a chair without knowing how to engage with it. One can define "justice" without knowing how to act justly.

Fourth, the model struggles with marginal or fuzzy cases. Where does the concept of "human" end and "animal" begin? How do we classify organisms that blur the boundaries between categories? The model presupposes clear, discrete categories that do not reflect the continuous and overlapping nature of many real-world phenomena.

Fifth, the model does not account for the acquisition and development of concepts. It describes what a concept is, but not how a subject comes to possess, modify, or refine it through experience and interaction.

Sixth, the model is culturally and historically situated. What counts as essential in one era or culture may not be considered essential in another. The concept of "human" has evolved significantly over time, incorporating new knowledge about biology, psychology, and social relations.

Seventh, the model cannot accommodate relational and context-dependent concepts. Many concepts (e.g., "friend," "enemy," "teacher," "student") depend on relationships and contexts that are not captured by a list of essential properties.

1.2 Logical Atomism and the Theory of Descriptions

In the early twentieth century, Bertrand Russell and Ludwig Wittgenstein developed logical atomism, building on the Aristotelian view of concepts as representations of atomic facts. Russell's theory of descriptions showed that many concepts (e.g., "the present King of France") are not simple names but disguised descriptions. The concept is understood as a logical construction composed of simpler elements.

Strengths of this model:

- **Logical precision:** It provides a rigorous, formal framework for analyzing complex concepts.
- **Elimination of ambiguity:** It clarifies the logical structure of concepts and reduces their potential for confusion.
- **Foundation for modern logic:** It laid the groundwork for analytic philosophy, formal semantics, and much of contemporary logic.
- **Compatibility with science:** The model aligns with the empiricist view that knowledge is built from elementary observations.

Limitations:

First, the concept remains a linguistic representation that corresponds (or fails to correspond) to elements of the world. The nature of this correspondence is left unexplained. What determines whether a representation corresponds to reality? The model offers no criterion beyond logical consistency.

Second, the approach struggles to account for the creative, analogical, and dynamic aspects of thought. Concepts are not merely logical constructions; they are also emergent, context-dependent, and shaped by practice and experience.

Third, the model cannot account for novel concepts or conceptual change. How do we construct concepts that have no prior elements? How do we understand concepts that are not composed of simpler parts?

Fourth, the model reduces meaning to logical form, neglecting the rich, embodied, and experiential dimensions of conceptual understanding.

Fifth, the model presupposes that language and thought are isomorphic, an assumption that has been widely challenged by later philosophy of language.

Sixth, the model cannot account for the normative dimensions of concepts—their use in guiding action, evaluating situations, and making judgments.

Seventh, Wittgenstein himself would later abandon this view in his *Philosophical Investigations*, recognizing that meaning arises from use rather than from correspondence—a recognition that anticipates, without fully developing, the act-oriented perspective proposed here.

Part II: Modal, Causal, and Transcendental Theories

2.1 Avicenna on Essence and Existence

Avicenna (Ibn Sina) made a lasting contribution by distinguishing essence (*mahiyya*) from existence (*wujud*). For Avicenna, the essence of a thing does not include its existence; existence is external to essence and is conferred by a cause. Thus, the concept of "unicorn" includes essence but not existence. This distinction introduces modality (necessity, possibility, impossibility) into the structure of concepts and relates them to causality.

Strengths of this model:

- **Deeper ontological grounding:** The model provides a robust, comprehensive metaphysical framework for understanding the structure of reality.
- **Modal distinctions:** It expands the conceptual framework by introducing necessity, possibility, and impossibility as structural elements of concepts.
- **Integration of causality:** Causality is integrated into the understanding of objects, providing a richer explanatory framework.
- **Theological compatibility:** The model aligns with metaphysical theism and provides a framework for understanding creation, existence, and causal dependence.
- **Metaphysical sophistication:** It offers a subtle and nuanced account of the relationship between essence and existence, with significant implications for ontology and epistemology.
- **Historical influence:** It shaped Islamic philosophy for centuries and had a profound impact on Latin scholasticism, particularly through the works of Thomas Aquinas and Duns Scotus.
- **Conceptual clarity:** The distinction between essence and existence provides a powerful analytical tool for understanding concepts in their modal dimensions.

Limitations:

First, while modal and causal aspects are introduced, the concept remains descriptive in character. The concept describes how a thing is and why it exists, but it does not contain guidance for interaction. Knowing that a chair was made by a carpenter and could cease to exist is not the same as knowing how to sit on it or fix it. The model provides a description of the chair's ontological status but does not provide a practical orientation toward it.

Second, causality is treated as an objective relation between entities, but the subjective act of grasping causality is not analyzed. Avicenna describes causes, but he does not describe the act by which the subject comes to know them. What is the cognitive process through which we recognize causality? How do we perceive causal relations in the world?

Third, the system rests on metaphysical presuppositions (particularly theocentric ones) that are difficult to sustain in a secular epistemological framework. Avicenna's model assumes a transcendent cause (God) that bestows existence upon essences. In a naturalistic or non-theistic framework, this grounding is unavailable.

Fourth, the model does not address the practical or pragmatic dimensions of concepts. It describes the structure of reality but does not explain how concepts guide action, deliberation, or judgment.

Fifth, the model cannot account for conceptual change over time. If essences are fixed, how do concepts evolve with new knowledge and experience?

Sixth, the model is not empirically testable or falsifiable. Its metaphysical claims cannot be verified or refuted through observation or experiment.

Seventh, the model is historically and culturally situated, reflecting the assumptions and concerns of a particular time and place. It may not be universally applicable or relevant to all forms of conceptual understanding.

2.2 Kant's Concept as a Rule of Synthesis

Immanuel Kant's critical turn was pivotal. In the *Critique of Pure Reason*, he defines the concept not as a reflection of external reality but as a rule for the synthesis of sensory data under the unity of consciousness. The categories are *a priori* concepts that structure all possible experience.

Kant was the first to recognize the active role of the subject in cognition. For Kant, the mind is not a passive receptor but an active organizer of experience. Concepts provide the rules by which sensory input is structured into coherent experience.

Strengths of this model:

- **Active subject:** The model recognizes the active, constructive role of the subject in cognition.
- **Transcendental grounding:** It identifies the a priori conditions of possible experience, providing a systematic framework for understanding the structure of cognition.
- **Unity of experience:** It explains how disparate sensory data are unified into coherent experience through the application of concepts.
- **Reconceptualization of objectivity:** The model provides a new account of objectivity, grounded in the universal, necessary conditions of experience.
- **Reconciliation of rationalism and empiricism:** It synthesizes the strengths of both traditions, providing a more comprehensive account of knowledge.
- **Foundational influence:** It has shaped subsequent philosophy, including phenomenology, pragmatism, and analytic philosophy.
- **Ethical implications:** It provides the foundation for Kant's moral philosophy, linking freedom and autonomy to the capacity for rational self-legislation.

Limitations:

First, the concept remains a formal rule, not a contentful act. Kant describes the conditions of possibility of experience, but he does not describe the actual occurrence of understanding in concrete situations. What does it mean to apply a concept in a particular context? The model provides the rule but not the act of application.

Second, the divide between the noumenal and phenomenal worlds remains insurmountable. The concept structures appearances but cannot reach the thing-in-itself. We can never know things as they are independently of our conceptual apparatus. This leads to a persistent, irresolvable skepticism about the reality that lies beyond appearance.

Third, action is not integrated into the structure of the concept. Kant discusses cognition, but not the transition from cognition to practice. How do concepts guide action? How is practical reasoning related to theoretical reasoning? The model provides a theory of knowledge but not a theory of practice.

Fourth, the model presupposes a universal, ahistorical subject of cognition. But concepts are not merely universal; they are also shaped by history, culture, language, and embodied experience. Kant's model abstracts from the concrete, situated, historical character of human cognition.

Fifth, the model cannot account for conceptual change and development over time. If the categories are fixed and universal, how do concepts change with the acquisition of new knowledge and experience?

Sixth, the model cannot account for the embodied, affective, and motivational dimensions of concepts. Concepts are not purely cognitive; they are also laden with emotion, desire, and value.

Seventh, the model does not address the social and linguistic dimensions of concepts. Concepts are not merely categories of the mind; they are also shared, socially constructed, and mediated by language and culture.

Part III: Pragmatic and Cognitive Approaches

3.1 Pragmatism: Meaning as Practical Consequences

Charles Sanders Peirce, William James, and John Dewey proposed understanding concepts through their practical effects. Peirce's pragmatic maxim states that the content of a concept is determined by its conceivable practical effects. James equated truth with expediency, and Dewey tied concepts to problem-solving and action.

Strengths of this model:

- **Bridging knowledge and action:** The gap between knowledge and action is bridged, providing a unified account of theory and practice.
- **Empirical testability:** Concepts are testable through experience, making them empirically accountable.
- **Dynamic and purposive cognition:** The dynamic, goal-directed, and purposive nature of cognition is acknowledged and incorporated into the framework.
- **Problem-solving orientation:** The model provides a practical, action-oriented approach to concepts, linking them directly to human concerns and activities.
- **Flexibility and adaptability:** Concepts are not fixed but can be revised and refined in light of new experiences and outcomes.
- **Social dimension:** The model emphasizes the social and communicative dimensions of concepts, as they are tested and refined in practice.
- **Anti-metaphysical stance:** It avoids commitment to metaphysical realism or idealism, providing a more practical, empirically grounded approach to epistemology.

Limitations:

First, the concept is reduced to its consequences, without attention to the act that produces those consequences. Pragmatism describes the result but not the process. What is the act of concept formation? How does a concept emerge from experience? The model provides a criterion for evaluating concepts but not an account of their generation.

Second, the criterion of usefulness is ambiguous. What is useful for one subject may not be useful for another, risking subjectivism and relativism. How do we determine what counts as useful? Who decides? The model does not provide a clear criterion for comparing and evaluating competing concepts.

Third, pragmatism does not explain how goals and purposes are formed, or how they relate to the structure of the cognitive act itself. What motivates concept formation? How do goals and values

enter into the process? The model provides a practical criterion but not a theory of practical reason.

Fourth, the model cannot account for the normative dimensions of concepts. Concepts are not merely useful; they are also true, correct, or appropriate. The model's focus on usefulness does not capture the full complexity of conceptual normativity.

Fifth, the model cannot account for the constitutive role of concepts in structuring experience. Concepts are not merely instrumental; they also shape our perception, understanding, and engagement with the world.

Sixth, the model is vulnerable to the charge of reducing truth to utility, thereby collapsing the distinction between what is true and what is useful. This can lead to a dangerous form of instrumentalism.

Seventh, the model does not address the problem of long-term consequences. What is useful in the short term may be harmful in the long term. How do we evaluate concepts over an extended timeframe?

3.2 Cognitive and Neurobiological Models

Contemporary cognitive science treats concepts as neural patterns, statistical structures, or distributed representations shaped by experience. Eleanor Rosch's prototype theory shows that categories have fuzzy boundaries and are organized around prototypical exemplars. Neuroimaging studies reveal that concepts activate distributed networks in the brain.

Strengths of these models:

- **Empirical grounding:** They are empirically grounded and testable through observation, experimentation, and neuroimaging.
- **Explanatory power:** They provide explanatory power for concept formation, modification, and neurocognitive processing.
- **Integration with perception and motor experience:** They integrate concepts with perception, motor experience, and embodiment.
- **Dynamic and adaptive:** They account for the dynamic, adaptive, and plastic nature of conceptual systems.
- **Distributed nature:** They recognize the distributed, networked nature of conceptual representation in the brain.
- **Computational modeling:** They enable the development of computational models of concept formation and processing.
- **Interdisciplinary relevance:** They connect philosophy with psychology, neuroscience, artificial intelligence, and cognitive science.

Limitations:

First, neural correlates of concepts are not identical with concepts themselves. Neuronal activity correlates with cognition but does not explain intentionality—the "aboutness" of thought. What does it mean for a neural pattern to "refer to" something? The model describes the physical basis of cognition but does not explain the semantic, intentional dimension.

Second, meaning is not reducible to physical processes. A neural network can be activated, but that activation does not constitute comprehension. What is the difference between mere activation and genuine understanding? The model cannot answer this question.

Third, the social and cultural dimensions of concepts are often bracketed or reduced to external influences, rather than analyzed as internal to cognitive structure. Concepts are not merely internal; they are also shared, negotiated, and shaped by culture and language. The model tends to individualize and internalize concepts, neglecting their social, historical, and communicative dimensions.

Fourth, the model cannot account for the normative, evaluative, and motivational dimensions of concepts. Concepts are not merely descriptive; they are also normative, evaluative, and action-guiding.

Fifth, the model struggles to explain conceptual novelty and creativity. How do we form genuinely new concepts that are not reducible to existing neural patterns or statistical structures? The model is better at explaining the reproduction and application of concepts than their generation.

Sixth, the model cannot account for the unity of consciousness—the experience of concepts as integrated, coherent, and unified despite their distributed neural implementation.

Seventh, the model is vulnerable to reductionism. It risks reducing concepts to mere neural processes, neglecting the phenomenology, intentionality, and normativity of conceptual thought.

Part IV: Toward an Alternative Perspective

A review of the traditions reveals a common feature: in each case, the concept is treated as an object—a representation, a state, a rule, a pattern. Cognition is then understood as the manipulation of these objects.

However, this perspective leaves unexplained the act by which the concept is actualized in a given moment. The process of concept formation, the act of recognition, the moment of understanding—these remain untheorized.

An alternative approach would treat the concept not as an object but as an event. It would consider the concept as an act of structuring experience, performed by a subject in real time. This act would have at least three dimensions:

- **Selection:** isolating a fragment of experience from the continuous flow.
- **Identification:** relating it to past experience, to a category, to a sign.
- **Projection:** anticipating possible interactions, actions, consequences.

This perspective does not reject the contributions of earlier theories. It attempts to integrate them by locating them within a broader process:

- The **Aristotelian properties** are the result of an act of selection and abstraction.
- The **Avicennian causes and modalities** are background conditions for the act.
- The **Kantian categories** are structural preconditions for the act.
- The **pragmatic consequences** are outcomes of the act.
- The **neural correlates** are the physical substrate of the act.

This integration provides a unified framework that preserves the strengths of each tradition while overcoming their individual limitations.

Conclusion

This paper has argued that the major theories of concept—descriptive, modal, pragmatic, cognitive—share a common limitation: they treat the concept as an object, rather than as an act. This assumption, while productive in many respects, fails to account for the dynamic process of cognition and the integration of knowledge with action.

The suggestion is not that these theories are wrong. They have each illuminated important aspects of concepts. Rather, it is suggested that they are incomplete, and that an account of the act of concept formation may provide the missing link.

The alternative perspective proposed here—treating the concept as an act of structuring experience through selection, identification, and projection—offers several advantages:

1. **It integrates the strengths** of classical theories without accepting their limitations.
2. **It bridges the gap** between knowledge and action by locating understanding within dynamic, teleological activity.
3. **It provides a framework** for conceptual change, development, and learning.
4. **It accommodates** the embodied, situated, social, and historical dimensions of cognition.
5. **It offers** a non-reductionist, non-relativist account of objectivity.
6. **It provides** a foundation for future research in epistemology, logic, cognitive science, education, and ethics.

Further research is needed to develop this alternative framework, to examine its implications for various domains, and to test its predictions against empirical evidence. Such research would aim not to replace the classical traditions but to build on them, extending the inquiry toward a more comprehensive understanding of thought and practice.

Acknowledgments

The author is grateful to the philosophical traditions that have made this analysis possible. This text is offered as a contribution to ongoing discussions, not as a final word.

References

1. Aristotle. *Categories*, *Metaphysics*.
2. Avicenna (Ibn Sina). *The Book of Healing*.
3. Kant, I. *Critique of Pure Reason*.
4. Russell, B. *The Problems of Philosophy*.
5. Wittgenstein, L. *Philosophical Investigations*.
6. Peirce, C. S. "How to Make Our Ideas Clear."
7. James, W. *Pragmatism*.
8. Dewey, J. *Reconstruction in Philosophy*.
9. Rosch, E. "Prototype Theory of Categorization."
10. Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. *Metaphors We Live By*.
11. Polanyi, M. *Personal Knowledge*.
12. Merleau-Ponty, M. *Phenomenology of Perception*.