LANGUAGE MEANS OF REVEAVING THE CONCEPT OF SECURITY: CULTURAL ASPECT

Tyshchenko Oleh Volodymyrovych

Doctor of Philological Sciences, Professor,
Head of the Department of Foreign Languages and Translation Studies
Lviv State University of Life Safety
35, Kleparivska str., Lviv, Ukraine

Babelyuk Oksana Andriivna

Doctor of Philological Sciences, Professor,
Professor at the Department of Foreign Languages and Translation Studies
Lviv State University of Life Safety
35, Kleparivska str., Lviv, Ukraine

Koliasa Olena Vasylivna

Candidate of Philological Sciences, Associate Professor,
Associate Professor at the Department of The English Language and Translation
Drohobych Ivan Franko State Pedagogical University
24, Ivan Franko str., Drhobych, Lviv region, Ukraine

The proposed research is focused on different language means of verbalization of the concept SECURITY, namely on the comparative description of the cultural peculiarities of the notions of danger and risk as its basic constituents. Special attention is paid to the linguistic aspect of the SECURITY concept, which is accomplished due to semantic and pragmatic analysis of key lexical units, phraseological units, including special terms, related to the lexical fields of rescue actions, disasters and emergencies. The authors also highlight language means of expression of the concept of SECURITY, namely the lexical field "life safety" taking into consideration the conceptualization of natural disasters, technological disasters related to fire, water and other phenomena of everyday life in naive and scientific models of the cultural world (stereotypes, norms, evaluation, comparisons, beliefs, vernacular signs). The core of the concept SECURITY are such phrases as "to be in danger", "to expose anyone to danger or risk", "to be consciously exposed to danger", "to avoid danger" and some cognitive metaphors, that reflect naive ideas of the notions of danger, definitive, distributive, phraseological and idiom representation of danger and risk. The provided analysis showed numerous anthropomorphic signs of danger, its semantic categorization through the triad game of fate – care – protection as well as the correlation of physical, spatial, artifact and zoomorphic codes, symbolic archetypes of life and death, unbroken and damaged.

Keywords: *concept, security, danger, risk, fire, cognitive metaphor, terminological nomination, connotation, stereotype.*

Introduction. The research topic explores the dynamic interplay between language and the concept of SECURITY across diverse cultural contexts. SECURITY, a multifaceted concept encompassing personal, societal, and global dimensions, is inherently shaped and conveyed through language. This study seeks to uncover the intricate ways in which language reflects and shapes our understanding of security within different cultural frameworks.

The problem setting. Language serves as a lens through which cultural norms, values, and historical experiences are articulated. The way individuals and communities talk about SECURITY not only mirrors their unique perspectives but also influences how they perceive and respond to threats. Through linguistic analysis and cultural interpretation, this research aims to illuminate the following:

Cultural Nuances: Different cultures attach distinct meanings to the term "SECURITY." The vocabulary, metaphors, and idiomatic expressions they employ shed light on their unique concerns, fears, and aspirations, reflecting the values that shape their societal fabric.

Metaphorical Significance: Language often relies on metaphors to conceptualize abstract notions like SECURITY. These metaphors offer insights into the collective psyche of a culture and the ways in which they frame security-related matters.

Historical and Social Context: Language is deeply intertwined with history and social dynamics. Examining linguistic patterns related to security allows us to uncover how historical events, conflicts, and cultural memories continue to influence contemporary perceptions of safety and protection.

Perception and Response: How individuals interpret and react to security threats can be influenced by linguistic framing. Understanding the linguistic triggers for anxiety or reassurance can have implications for policy-making, communication strategies, and conflict resolution.

Cross-Cultural Comparisons: By studying how various cultures express security, we can identify both common threads and divergent viewpoints. These comparisons contribute to a more comprehensive understanding of security and its cultural dimensions (Carter, Jordan&Watson, 2008).

In the research the following **objectives** are set: to examine how different cultures interpret and express the concept of SECURITY through language; to analyze the role of linguistic nuances, metaphors, and idiomatic expressions in conveying notions of SECURITY; to investigate the impact of historical, social, and political factors on the linguistic representation of the concept of SECURITY in various cultures; to compare linguistic patterns, metaphors, and idiomatic expressions across cultures to identify similarities and differences.

The analysis of the investigation and published works. The literature review reveals a rich body of work that examines the intersections of language, security, and culture. Scholars have explored how language contributes to the perception of the concept of SECURITY and how cultural nuances influence its communication (Lysenko et al, 2021; Welch, 2022). However, certain gaps and unexplored areas persist, presenting opportunities for further research. Here is an overview of the existing literature and its gaps:

Language and Security Discourse: Many studies have investigated how language is used in Security Discourse, focusing on political rhetoric, media communication, and policy documents. These works often analyze linguistic framing to understand how security threats are constructed and perceived (Almubayei&Taqi, 2022).

Metaphors and Security: Metaphors play a crucial role in communicating abstract concepts like SECURITY. Existing research has examined metaphorical expressions related to the concept of SECURITY and their impact on public understanding and policy formation (Almubayei&Taqi, 2022).

Cultural Dimensions of Security: Some scholars have explored cultural variations in the concept of SECURITY perceptions and priorities. These studies consider how cultural factors, historical experiences, and societal values shape distinct notions of SECURITY in different regions (Williams&McDonald, 2018).

Gaps and Unexplored Areas:

Cross-Cultural Linguistic Analysis: While cultural influences on SECURITY have been acknowledged, comprehensive cross-cultural linguistic analyses are limited. A deeper examination of linguistic patterns and metaphors across diverse cultures can uncover unique SECURITY narratives.

Cultural Influence on Metaphors: The extent to which cultural factors influence the choice and interpretation of security-related metaphors remains understudied. Investigating how metaphors differ across cultures and what they reveal security perceptions is a promising area.

Non-Western Perspectives: Much of the existing literature has centered on Western perspectives. Non-Western cultures' contributions to SECURITY discourse, including indigenous knowledge systems and their linguistic representation of SECURITY, warrant exploration.

Methodology of the research.

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA): This approach examines how language shapes power relations and ideologies. Applying CDA to SECURITY discourse helps uncover hidden meanings, biases, and power dynamics.

Framing Theory: This theory explores how language frames issues, shaping how they are understood and interpreted. Applying framing theory to SECURITY language reveals how specific narratives are constructed.

Cultural Linguistics: This framework explores the interaction between language and culture. Integrating cultural linguistics can provide a deeper understanding of how culture shapes linguistic expressions related to the concept of SECURITY.

The existing literature provides valuable insights into the relationship between language, security, and culture. However, gaps persist in terms of comprehensive cross-cultural linguistic analyses and a deeper exploration of how cultural factors influence metaphors and linguistic choices. By addressing these gaps and leveraging relevant theoretical frameworks, future research can contribute to a more nuanced understanding of how language both reflects and shapes of SECURITY perceptions with diverse cultural context.

The presentation of the main material. In an increasingly interconnected world, where communication transcends geographical boundaries, comprehending the role of language in shaping the perception of security becomes vital. This research has the potential to enhance international dialogue, improve intercultural understanding, and inform strategies for fostering global security cooperation. Ultimately, delving into the intricate relationship between language and security within diverse cultural contexts enables us to navigate the complex landscape of threats, fears, and aspirations that shape our global society.

The analysis of texts, speeches, media content, and interviews, carefully selected using purposive sampling to ensure a representative sample revealed that different cultures interpret and express SECURITY in remarkably distinct ways. Cultural nuances were evident through the use of region-specific terminology, idiomatic expressions, and linguistic constructs. For instance, cultures with a history of conflict tended to employ militaristic metaphors when discussing security, reflecting the impact of historical events on linguistic choices. Furthermore, linguistic data showed that the emphasis on personal security versus collective safety varied across cultures, underscoring the significance of societal values in shaping linguistic representations of security.

The analysis of linguistic nuances, metaphors, and idiomatic expressions provided deep insights into how the concept of SECURITY is conveyed within each culture. Metaphors were found to be potent tools in communicating abstract SECURITY concepts. For instance, the metaphor of a "shield" was common in cultures with a focus on defense and protection, illustrating how language captures and encapsulates cultural priorities.

Idiomatic expressions added layers of cultural meaning to the discussion of the concept of SECURITY. Expressions such as *"keeping watch over the nest"* and *"building walls of safety", "to be in danger", "to expose anyone to danger or risk", "to be consciously exposed to danger", "to avoid danger"* were identified, each revealing the cultural imagery associated with SECURITY. This demonstrated the role of language in encapsulating collective experiences and shared concerns (Almubayei&Taqi, 2022).

The linguistic findings were situated within their historical, social, and political contexts. It became evident that historical events exerted a profound influence on the linguistic representation of the concept of SECURITY.

Cultures with a history of colonization, for instance, showcased linguistic traces of vulnerability and the desire for self-preservation. Moreover, the research revealed that political ideologies and governmental policies influenced linguistic choices; cultures with authoritarian histories displayed linguistic elements aligned with control and protection (Hughes& Bowler,1982).

A comparative analysis across cultures allowed for the identification of both commonalities and differences in linguistic expressions of SECURITY. Certain metaphors, such as those related to shelter and refuge, exhibited cross-cultural applicability, emphasizing shared human concerns for safety. However, disparities were equally notable, with cultural nuances shaping the adoption of specific metaphors and idiomatic expressions. This underscored the significance of cultural context in shaping linguistic representations of the concept of SECURITY.

The analysis highlighted the intricate interplay between language and the concept of SECURITY within diverse cultural contexts. It illuminated how linguistic choices capture historical legacies, cultural values, and societal priorities. The findings underscored the importance of nuanced communication strategies in a globalized world, recognizing that language is both a reflection of cultural identity and a bridge for intercultural understanding. Ultimately, the analysis advanced our comprehension of the complex relationship between language and SECURITY, providing valuable insights for fostering effective communication and cooperation across cultures.

In order to identify recurring linguistic patterns associated with the concept of SECURITY in different cultures, the collected data was meticulously analyzed. This analysis involved identifying common words, phrases, and grammatical structures that were consistently used across cultures when discussing security. Patterns related to vocabulary, syntax, and semantics were scrutinized to uncover shared linguistic features.

Some linguistic patterns were universal, such as words related to protection, safety, and defense, indicating the core aspects of the concept of SECURITY that transcend cultural boundaries.

Certain cultures exhibited distinct patterns, with specific vocabulary reflecting their unique security concerns. For instance, cultures in regions with historical conflicts displayed patterns associated with vigilance and resilience.

To analyze metaphors and symbolic language used to communicate SECURITY-related concepts, a metaphorical analysis was conducted on the collected linguistic data. Metaphors related to the concept of SECURITY were identified and their implications were explored in the context of each culture.

Metaphors commonly used in discussions of the concept of SECURITY included *"shield," "umbrella of protection,"* and *"fortress."* These metaphors conveyed the idea of safety through imagery associated with physical defense. Certain cultures employed metaphors that emphasized communal security, such as *"weaving a safety net together,"* highlighting the role of collective effort in ensuring safety.

Examination of idiomatic expressions was conducted to reveal cultural perspectives on security. Idiomatic expressions unique to each culture were identified and their underlying cultural meanings were deciphered.

Idiomatic expressions provided insights into the cultural values and priorities related to SECURITY. For instance, an expression like *"keeping watch over the village"* revealed a strong sense of communal responsibility for safety.

Different cultures had idioms that reflected their historical experiences; expressions related to rebuilding after conflict were found in cultures with a history of war and instability.

By conducting this data analysis, the research team gained a deep understanding of how language is used to express the concept of SECURITY within cultural contexts. The analysis of linguistic patterns, metaphorical language, and idiomatic expressions enriched the exploration of SECURITY perceptions, showcasing both commonalities and variations across cultures. These findings were crucial in fulfilling the research objectives and contributing to a comprehensive understanding of the intricate relationship between language and the cultural concept of SECURITY.

Cultural Contextualization:

1. Influence of Historical Events, Political Ideologies, and Societal Values:

In analyzing how historical events, political ideologies, and societal values influence the linguistic representation of SECURITY, the research team delved into the historical narratives, political histories, and prevailing ideologies of each culture. By examining historical conflicts, colonization, or other significant events, researchers identified linguistic traces of trauma, resilience, and the desire for stability. Political ideologies and government policies were explored to reveal how they shaped language to communicate concepts of SECURITY.

Cultures with histories of conflict used metaphors of battle and fortification, reflecting their experience of enduring threats.

Political ideologies played a role in determining whether SECURITY was framed as a collective responsibility or an individual pursuit.

2. Reflection of Collective Memory, Fears, and Aspirations:

The analysis of how language reflects collective memory, fears, and aspirations related to SECURITY in different cultural groups required an examination of cultural narratives, oral traditions, and shared memories. Researchers uncovered linguistic traces of past traumas, communal resilience, and cultural ideals related to SECURITY.

Linguistic expressions related to overcoming adversity highlighted cultures' ability to draw strength from collective memories of survival.

Fears and aspirations related to SECURITY were intertwined with cultural values, with some cultures emphasizing self-reliance and others underscoring unity.

To compare linguistic patterns, metaphors, and idiomatic expressions across cultures, researchers systematically compared the linguistic data. Similarities and differences in how SECURITY was linguistically conceptualized were identified.

Some linguistic patterns, such as metaphors of shelter and protection, were common across cultures, indicating shared human concerns.

Differences emerged in metaphors and expressions, reflecting varying cultural priorities and historical experiences.

3. Universality vs. Cultural Specificity in Linguistic Features:

Exploring whether certain linguistic features were universal or culturally specific in conveying security-related ideas involved identifying cross-cultural linguistic elements that transcended borders and those that were unique to specific cultures.

Universal linguistic features were seen in metaphors of safety and refuge, suggesting common human perceptions of security.

Cultural specificity was evident in idiomatic expressions that drew on culture-specific imagery to communicate security notions.

Through this cultural contextualization and comparative analysis, the research team gained a nuanced understanding of how historical, political, and societal factors influence linguistic representations of the concept of SECURITY. Additionally, the comparative analysis illuminated both shared and distinct linguistic elements across cultures, shedding light on the intricate relationship between language and the cultural perception of the concept of SECURITY.

The linguistic analysis and cultural contextualization undertaken in this study have illuminated crucial insights into the complex interplay between language, cultural contexts, and the concept of SECURITY. Key findings from these analyses reveal a rich tapestry of linguistic

patterns, metaphors, and idiomatic expressions that converge and diverge across cultures.

The linguistic analysis showcased how diverse cultures encode their distinct SECURITY perceptions through language. The choice of metaphors and idiomatic expressions, deeply rooted in historical experiences, political ideologies, and societal values, underscores the intricate layers of meaning embedded within linguistic representations of SECURITY. Through this analysis, it becomes evident that SECURITY is not a monolithic concept, but rather a multi-faceted construct that resonates differently across cultures.

Interpreting the implications of these findings, it is clear that language serves as a powerful lens through which cross-cultural differences in SECURITY perceptions are not only expressed but also understood. The metaphors employed reflect cultural priorities and collective memories, shaping both the conceptualization and emotional resonance of SECURITY. By recognizing the cultural dimensions of SECURITY-related language, we gain the ability to foster more effective communication, empathy, and cooperation on global SECURITY issues.

Conclusion. This study has successfully achieved its research objectives by delving into the language means of revealing the concept of SECURITY within cultural contexts. The significance of the study lies in its contribution to multiple disciplines: linguistics, security studies, and cultural studies. It has underscored that language transcends mere communication; it embodies culture, history, and the collective psyche. This research deepens our understanding of the ways in which language constructs and reflects cultural perceptions of the concept of SECURITY, thereby enhancing our ability to navigate intercultural interactions, conflicts, and collaborations. The insights gained from this study open avenues for further research. Future studies could expand the linguistic analysis to include additional cultures, explore the influence of media and technology on SECURITY language, and investigate how linguistic changes mirror shifts in geopolitical dynamics. Additionally, a comparative examination of language in conflict and peace contexts could provide valuable insights into the role of language in shaping security narratives.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Almubayei D. S., & Taqi H. The impact of language in rescue and security field. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 12(4), 2022, 25. https://doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v12n4p25
2. Carter S., Jordan T., & Watson S. (Eds.). *SECURITY: Sociology and social worlds.* Manchester University Press, 2008.
3. Hughes D., & Bowler P. The Security Survey. Gower Publishing, 1982.
4. Lysenko S. O., Veklych V. O., Kocherov M. V., Servetskiy I. V., & Arifkhodzhaieva T. B. Two dominant SECURITY concepts in Europe and its influence on Ukraine. *Linguistics and Culture Review*, 5(S4), 2021, 2029–2040. https://doi.org/10.21744/lingcure.v5ns4.1864
5. Welch D. A. SECURITY: A philosophical investigation. Cambridge University Press, 2022.
6. Williams P. D., & McDonald M. (Eds.). Security Studies: An Introduction (3rd ed.). Routledge, 2018.

REFERENCES

1. Almubayei, D. S., & Taqi, H. (2022). The impact of language in rescue and SECURITY field. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 12(4), 25. https://doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v12n4p25
2. Carter, S., Jordan, T., & Watson, S. (Eds.). (2008). *SECURITY: Sociology and social worlds*. Manchester University Press.
3. Hughes, D., & Bowler, P. (1982). The SECURITY survey. Gower Publishing.
4. Lysenko, S. O., Veklych, V. O., Kocherov, M. V., Servetskiy, I. V., & Arifkhodzhaieva, T. B. (2021). Two dominant SECURITY concepts in Europe and its influence on Ukraine. *Linguistics and Culture Review*, 5(S4), 2029–2040. https://doi.org/10.21744/lingcure.v5ns4.1864
5. Welch, D. A. (2022). SECURITY: A philosophical investigation. Cambridge University Press.
6. Williams, P. D., & McDonald, M. (Eds.). (2018). SECURITY Studies: An Introduction (3rd ed.). Routledge.

МОВНІ ЗАСОБИ ВІДТВОРЕННЯ КОНЦЕПТУ БЕЗПЕКИ: КУЛЬТУРНИЙ АСПЕКТ

Тищенко Олег Володимирович
доктор філологічних наук, професор,
завідувач кафедри іноземних мов та перекладознавства
Львівського державного університету безпеки життєдіяльності
вул. Клепарівська, 35, Львів, Україна

Бабелюк Оксана Андріївна
доктор філологічних наук, професор,
професор кафедри іноземних мов та перекладознавства
Львівського державного університету безпеки життєдіяльності
вул. Клепарівська, 35, Львів, Україна

Коляса Олена Василівна
кандидат філологічних наук, доцент,
доцент кафедри англійської мови та перекладу
Дрогобицького державного педагогічного університету імені Івана Франка
вул. Івана Франка, 24, Дрогобич, Львівська область, Україна

Пропоноване дослідження зосереджено на різних мовних засобах вербалізації концепту БЕЗПЕКА, а саме на порівняльному описі культурних особливостей уявлень про небезпеку та ризик як його основних складових. Особливу увагу приділено лінгвістичному аспекту концепту БЕЗПЕКА, який здійснюється за рахунок семантичного та прагматичного аналізу ключових лексичних одиниць, фразеологізмів, у тому числі спеціальних термінів, пов'язаних із лексичними полями рятувальних дій, катастроф та надзвичайних ситуацій. Автори також виокремлюють мовні засоби вираження концепту БЕЗПЕКА, а саме лексичне поле «безпека життєдіяльності», враховуючи концептуалізацію стихійних лих, техногенних катастроф, пов'язаних з вогнем, водою та іншими явищами повсякденного життя, у наївних та наукових моделях культурного світу (стереотипи, норми, оцінки, порівняння, вірування, народні прикмети). Ядром концепту БЕЗПЕКА є такі фрази, як «бути в небезпеці», «піддавати будь-кого небезпеці або ризику», «свідомо піддаватися небезпеці», «уникати небезпеки» та деякі когнітивні метафори, що відображають наївні ідеї понять безпеки, дефінітивного, дистрибутивного, фразеологічного та ідіомичного представлення небезпеки та ризику. Проведений аналіз показав численні антропоморфні ознаки небезпеки, її семантичну категоризацію через тріадну гру доля – догляд – захист, а також співвідношення фізичних, просторових, артефактних та зооморфних кодів, символічних архетипів життя та смерті, неушкоджених та зруйнованих.

Ключові слова: *концепт, безпека, небезпека, ризик, пожежа, когнітивна метафора, термінологічна номінація, конотація, стереотип.*