




# Concepts from the Point of Culture and Historical Development View

Ayna Turaeva<sup>1</sup><sup>a</sup>, Tamerlan Usmanov<sup>2</sup><sup>b</sup> and Eliza Arsalieva<sup>2</sup><sup>c</sup>  
<sup>1</sup>*Chechen State University Named After A.A. Kadyrova, Grozny, Russian Federation*  
<sup>2</sup>*Chechen State Pedagogical University, Grozny, Russian Federation*

**Keywords:** Concept, Homeland, Culture, History, Russia, UK.

**Abstract:** The model of the world for any culture is usually built of the number of universal concepts and cultural constants. This article uses the approach to the concepts as some phenomena that reflect the national linguistic picture of the world. The concept “homeland” in Russian and in English is used as an object of analyses. It is assumed that due to the difference in cultural values and historical development the emotional coloring of this concept (despite its universality) will be different for different countries. The Hofstede scale of cultural dimensions was used as an analysis tool. The research materials were the publications on conceptology are used as the research material.

## 1 INTRODUCTION

The conceptual field of culture studies is formed in a specific way: the term in cultural discourse in most cases is not “pure”. Culturological research is forced to deal with the problematization of the usual conceptual apparatus, an appeal to the “scientific archive”, that is, to the history of the formation of concepts, to the boundaries of conventions within which terminology is formed.

A modern researcher must imagine the history of the formation of concepts and ideas, the context of the formation of their “dictionary” meanings, the modern functioning in various discourses. The language of the cultural sciences closely interacts with ordinary language (and the scientist himself is included in the living tradition of the language), with public discourses - political, economic, administrative. The scientific space, which is a space of power, is structured not only by scientific problems, but also by authorities, institutions that legitimize their presence, including through terminological innovations or, on the contrary, conceptual conservatism. This is how the concepts of the humanities (not only cultural studies) are formed - concepts “burdened” with a complex interweaving of meanings and internal relationships.


The study of the concept sphere of cultural studies, therefore, is an attempt to find out the features of the formation of problem fields, where different methodologies collide, theories are built, phenomena are studied.


It is a fact that people think in a way of concepts. Concepts participate in different relationships and form a system of interdependent mental images.


The most important component of the national linguistic picture of the world in any culture is the concept of “homeland”. Through this concept it is possible to trace the one’s attitude towards society and the place of residence as well as historical and cultural development in certain country (Svorobovich, 2019).

As the concept “homeland” has a high universality and is familiar for representatives of any culture, it is one of the most interesting key concepts of culture (Esmurzaeva, 2008).

The hypothesis of this study is the assumption that the concepts “homeland” would have different emotional colouring in different countries.

<sup>a</sup> <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9017-5143>

<sup>b</sup> <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0181-5300>

<sup>c</sup> <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7832-699X>

## 2 RESEARCH METHODS

The Hofstede scale of cultural dimensions was used as an analysis tool. The research materials were The publications on conceptology are used as the research material.

Concept analysis is an apology for cultural studies, both theoretical and practical, which we have tried to show in this monograph. The book opens with articles that set the tone for the process of conceptualization itself. After all, if there is a concept, there must be a procedure, moreover, inscribed in the methodological field of cultural science. This procedure is based on the analysis of multiplicity, to which the works of J. Deleuze and F. Guattari refer. The modern paradigm of culture is a paradigm of difference, it is built on the basis of the postulate not of identity, but of difference and multiplicity, individuality of cultural phenomena. And the concept turns out to be the tool that is adequately able to capture the essence of individuality as such. The concept is arranged as a cipher, a code, which means that the conceptualization procedure is a guessing-guessing of this code, for-or de-encryption. Each concept refers to different scientific problems, appeals to a variety of ideas and images, it turns out to be in the center of possible fields of conceptualization. Moreover, these fields, once encrypted, become a polygon of an infinite number of decryptions, allowing, moreover, provoking, a plurality of interpretations, each of which is true. This is how – provocatively, problematically – the concept sphere is arranged. Having carried out the demarcation, we are faced with the need to comprehend the concepts, in their conjugation with each other. The concept has a formation, and given the infinity of interpretations, this formation has no end. Concepts make complex art objects of the intellectual space out of problems and possible solutions, breaking the established discourse, eluding propositions, arising from concepts, and revealing the insufficiency of things and phenomena in themselves.

## 3 RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Exploring the concepts implemented in texts in a particular language, we can hypothetically identify the concepts that exist in a given usage, combine them into groups, which are hypothetically assigned the status of the most direct and adequate implementation of concepts. The history of the use of the term concept in different linguistic areas demonstrates the

preservation of the original motivation, the metaphor that originally lay in the image - the idea of "rudimentary truth". This metaphor, as N. Yu. Shvedova (Uzunalova, 2020) rightly points out, is preserved in the interpretation in which concepts are considered as "embryos" of mental operations, "buds of the most complex inflorescences of mental concreteness" (Andreeva, 2017). Unlike the words of ordinary language, this term carries with it the initial motivation as an indispensable attribute of the terminological culture. The professional community is guided by this motivation when it decides which term and in what context is better, and which is worse. Concepts are realized in concepts. Continuing the image proposed by Askoldov, we can say: if the concepts are carefully watered, abundant concepts will grow out of them. And in other cultures, some concepts can wither, giving place to others, more tenacious or more carefully watered. In some soils, certain concepts may never come up. When the concept "accepted" and "ascended", we observe the concepts implemented in speech. But on what material of texts do we have the right to rely, revealing the "germination" of concepts? The purely quantitative side does not help: texts about justice, about beauty, etc. can all turn out to be too "adult" ("non-naive") and / or hypocritical. So, the proverb of Belobrysa is a rat, and the black one is beautiful does not mean at all that Russians love exclusively dark-skinned girls: blondes also enjoy well-deserved popular love among us. And this second opinion is confirmed by the stable phrases clear-faced, clear-faced beauty. Orientation to "setting" texts, such as commandments, from which consequences are sometimes drawn about the concept of justice and equality of people, does not help either. So, for a member of a criminal gang, the concept of "justice", if it exists, is unlikely to be in the same implementation (in the same concept - and the underworld, as you know, "lives by concepts"), as for Robin Hood (Bolotskaya). The practical answer to the last question is given by lexicographic practice. The concept underlying the concept has its own potential, it is able to differentiate: dictionaries show an elementary reflection of this ability as a tendency to form various verbal shades and transfers.

In order to confirm or refute the proposed assumption, let us compare, for example, the cultural values of the representatives of Great Britain and Russia using such a universal tool as the Hofstede scale of cultural dimensions (Hofstede Insights, <https://www.hofstede-insights.com>). As we can see, the "Power Distance" indicator in the UK is much lower (35%) than in Russia (93%), which means that

representatives of Russia would show more ceremonial attitude towards the “homeland”, while for the UK representatives it will be more “familiar” attitude.

The “Individualism” score for the UK (89%) is more than double higher than in case of Russia and that means that Russian representatives consider “motherland” as “our motherland” and Great Britain representatives - as “my motherland”.

The Masculinity indicator, which is about twice as high for the UK (66%) vs Russia (36%), indicates a greater restraint in the manifestation of feelings by the British people compared to Russians. It can be applied also to the “homeland” concept.

The uncertainty avoidance indicator for Russians (95%) is three times higher than for representatives of the UK (35%), which indicates that representatives of Russia try to follow generally accepted rules, which makes love for the motherland in a certain sense pragmatic than in the case of representatives of the UK, who treat their homeland less pragmatically (Hofstede Insights, <https://www.hofstede-insights.com>).

The Long-Term Orientation indicator for Russia (81%) is also higher than for the UK (51%), which is consonant with the previously considered indicator and, in our opinion, has the same explanation.

The indicator of indulgence for Russian culture (20%), in contrast to British culture (69%), is very low, which indicates the readiness of representatives of our country to make self-sacrifices, including for the Motherland.

Thus, it becomes clear that the emotional colouring of the “homeland” concept for the world’s linguistic picture of British people and Russian people, are different.

Indeed, the English word “homeland” is completely neutral in emotional colouring, while the Russian word “Родина” (homeland) is associated with patriotism and respect and starts with capital letter to underline this respect (Dzhabrailova, 2018).

It is important also to mention that the Russian-language “Родина” (motherland) corresponds to several English versions of this word: “mother land”, “native land”, “home”, “homeland”. There are such popular in UK sayings as “return home” and “homesickness” (Uzunalova, 2020).

In addition, it is more typical for English-speakers to use the concept “one’s country”, which, on the one hand, is broader than the Russian-language “Родина” (homeland), and on the other hand, it is devoid of additional, peripheral meanings.

Due to the specific (as was also shown by means of Hofstede cultural dimensions scale), restraint in the

manifestation of feelings and emotions, the most often used by UK authors concept to describe their native land is “one’s country” (Andreeva, 2017).

According to the research made by V.N. Telia, S.G. Vorkacheva, I. Sandomirskaya, the Russian concept of “Родина”(homeland) is a relational concept: it must contain the relation parameter. The relational concept “homeland” is covered by the subject-object relation, because representing an object - the homeland is always someone’s (Dzhabrailova, 2018).

Also, relationality is indicated by the results of research made by another author, who indicates that the most common bigram, including the word “Родина” (homeland) in Russian, is “наша Родина”(our homeland), which to a certain extent indicates the collectivist type of culture of Russian society, which is also confirmed by the Hofstede scale. The expression “our homeland” is found in Russian literature more often than “his/her homeland” or “my homeland” (Uzunalova, 2020).

At the same time, Russian people in comparing to UK representatives used to separate the “homeland” meaning in a way of homeland as a “state” and homeland in a way of “motherland”. For UK representatives such separation would sound, probably as a nonsense as according to the Power Distance Hofstede dimension, the approach of UK people to the homeland is “warmer” and much more familiar (home -sweet - home) (Andreeva, 2017).

Similar conclusions were made in other investigated research works. It is shown that in Russian language there are two concepts used to designate the topic of this question. The first is “Отчизна” (Fatherland), derived from the Russian “отец” (father) and thus the direct equivalent of the Latin “*partia*” (a noun referring to something cognate with father(s), although this noun has a neutral gender). The second one is “motherland”, a feminine noun derived from “to give birth” (to be born), making it closer to the English word “Родина” (Motherland) (Bolotskaya).

Another important finding is made in the study of T. I. Kolabinova. The researcher analyzes the concept of “Motherland” and “Fatherland” based on famous Russian writer M. A. Sholokhov’s novel “Quiet Flows the Don” (Kolabinova, 2011). It is proved that at the time when the action of the novel takes place (the period of revolution dramatical changes in 1920-1940) the concept “Fatherland” separated from the concept “Motherland” as the first was meant “faith and the tsar” (“For Faith, the Tsar and the Fatherland”) but the second one started to associate

with the USSR and Stalin ("For motherland for Stalin").

## 4 CONCLUSIONS

"A frontal study of modern common Russian vocabulary and its presentation in the Russian Semantic Dictionary as a natural multi-level system showed that the central place in this system is occupied by lexical classes that combine units (words and phraseological units) that name a person, himself, his life, his body, physical condition, mind, feeling, will, his abilities and capabilities, behavior and actions, labor and products of labor, occupations, pastime, contacts and relationships with each other. In their composition, quantitatively, these classes are many times superior to the classes of words that name the realities of living and inanimate nature, objects that are not related to labor and products of human activity. But it's not just about quantity. Classes of words relating to the person himself, to his life in all its diverse manifestations, demonstrate their constant openness, firstly, for the most diverse replenishment (and, accordingly, losses) and, secondly, for no less diverse assessments and qualifications. In addition (and this is very important), the relations and connections between these classes are completely different than the relations and connections between classes of words that name realities that are not directly related to human life and people's attitudes to these realities. In the first case, such connections sometimes turn out to be so close and complex that determining the place of a word in a particular class turns out to be difficult, conditional; compare, for example, vocabulary related to the spheres of thought and emotions, will and feelings, behaviors and contacts (Kolabinova, 2011). Those "worlds" (spheres), in the bosom of which a person's life takes place, are presented by the language itself as the environment of a person, as that organic and natural environment in which he exists and acts.

## REFERENCES

- Svorobovich, R. V., 2019. Interpretation of the concept "Motherland" in Russian and English in the aspect of translation. *Linguistic personality and translation: Proceedings of the IV International Scientific and Educational Forum for Young Translators*. p. 208-212.
- Esmurzaeva, Zh. B., 2008. The concept "Native land" (in Russian and English languages) in the system of valuable concepts of the language picture of the world. *Almanac of Modern Science and Education*. 8 (15). p. 53-55.
- Hofstede Insights. <https://www.hofstede-insights.com/>
- Dzhabrailova, M. M., Ovkhadov, M. R., 2018. The concept "Motherland" in the Russian, English, and French paremics. pp. 515-518.
- Uzunalova, A. E., Borlakova, Z. E., 2020. *Linguocultural analysis of the concepts of "patriotism" and "homeland" in the Russian, English and Nenets languages*. pp. 415-419.
- Andreeva, A., 2017. *The concepts "freedom", "justice", "law", "homeland" in the worldview of Russians and Americans*. pp. 11-14.
- Bolotskaya, E. A., *Concepts "Motherland" and "Fatherland" in the Russian, English and German language picture of the world: a comparative analysis*. pp. 212-216.
- Kolabinova, T. I., 2011. *The representation of the concept "Motherland" in the novel of M.A. Sholokhov "The Quiet Don" and in Russian conceptsphere*. 2 (24). pp. 180-183.