

LINGUACULTURAL FEATURES OF THE CONCEPT OF “GOODNESS”

Xatamova Dildora Azim qizi

2 nd year master's student in the direction of Comparative linguistics, linguistic translation studies (by languages) of Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages.

Abstract:

This article is devoted to the analysis of the concept of Goodness. “Good is all that, and only that, which is “according to nature”, which “pleases”, which “God commands”, which “contributes to the preservation of society”, which “corresponds to historical necessity”, which “is consistent with the requirements of reason ” etc.

Keywords: goodness, concept, corresponds, linguacultural, features.

The purpose of this study is to determine the conceptual base of the concept of GOOD, its properties and features, its place in the English language picture of the world. The relevance of the study is due to the universal value of the concept of for all cultures and its undoubted significance for English-speaking cultures. The relevance is also manifested in the fact that the study is carried out within the framework of cognitive linguistics, which has been rapidly developing in recent decades. Methods - lexicographic and etymological description, analysis of the semantic structure of the concept.

To achieve the tasks set, it is necessary to clarify the theoretical foundations of the study: what is common and different in the concept and concept, and what is the concept for cognitive linguistics and linguoculturology.

Yu.S. Stepanov writes: “A concept is a phenomenon of the same order as a concept. According to their internal form in Russian, the words concept and concept are the same: the concept is a tracing paper of the Latin conceptus "concept". In the scientific language, these two words also sometimes act as synonyms, one instead of the other. At present, they are quite clearly demarcated. E.S. also insists on the distinction between these words. Kubryakova, who proposed to interpret the term concept broadly, “bringing various units of operational consciousness under this designation, such as representations, images, concepts”. V.Z. Demyankov also delimits the concept, i.e. “what people agree on in order to “have a common



language” when discussing a problem, and a concept “which people must reconstruct from a special type of data, primarily linguistic”.

According to cognitologists, “concepts arise in connection with the categorization of the world - they turn out to be the results of mastering one or another fragment or domain of reality, the results of experience and generalization, and the units that objectify them (primarily words and equivalent linguistic expressions) arise in acts of semiosis as finding "sign body" for the emerging (conceptual) content. The concept acts as a connecting unit in the studies of culture and language, because “it belongs to consciousness, is determined by culture and objectified in language” [5;9]. The linguocultural approach to understanding the cultural concept is that the concept is recognized as the basic unit of culture, its concentrate. Yu.S. Stepanov writes that “the structure of the concept includes everything that makes it a fact of culture - the original form (etymology); a history compressed to the main features of the content; contemporary associations; grades, etc.” [4;41].

Linguocognitive and linguocultural approaches to understanding the concept are not mutually exclusive. According to V.I. Karasik "these approaches differ in vectors in relation to the individual: the linguocognitive concept is the direction from individual consciousness to culture, and the linguocultural concept is the direction from culture to individual consciousness" [6;139].

The linguocultural approach is the study of cultural concepts from the point of view of their value component, i.e. comparison of attitudes towards certain objects, phenomena, ideas that are of value to the bearers of culture. It follows from this that "a cultural concept is a multidimensional semantic formation, in which the value, figurative and conceptual aspects stand out" [6;129].

There is no doubt that "good is one of the most general imperative-evaluative concepts of morality and a category of ethics" [5;75]. V. Dahl defines this concept as follows: “Good = good, which is honest and useful, as opposed to bad and bad” and “Good = good, everything good, useful, serving our happiness” [6;90, 443]. The definition of one concept through another allows us to consider them as semantic doublets.

The roots of the identity between good and good can be found in antiquity. Even then, the benefits were divided into external and internal, and the latter, in turn, into bodily and spiritual. Ancient philosophers - Plato, Aristotle - who introduced the concept of good into science, identified it with happiness, the constituent



components of which are the moral perfection of the soul, as well as wealth, luck, health and some phenomena beyond human control, perceived as positive: fertility, fertile climate and etc. The concept acts as a connecting unit in the studies of culture and language, because “it belongs to consciousness, is determined by culture and objectified in language” [6;9]. The linguocultural approach to understanding the cultural concept is that the concept is recognized as the basic unit of culture, its concentrate. Yu.S. Stepanov writes that “the structure of the concept includes everything that makes it a fact of culture - the original form (etymology); a history compressed to the main features of the content; contemporary associations; grades, etc”.

Linguocognitive and linguocultural approaches to understanding the concept are not mutually exclusive. According to V.I. Karasik "these approaches differ in vectors in relation to the individual: the linguocognitive concept is the direction from individual consciousness to culture, and the linguocultural concept is the direction from culture to individual consciousness" [5;139].

There is no doubt that "good is one of the most general imperative-evaluative concepts of morality and a category of ethics" [4;75]. V. Dahl defines this concept as follows:

“Good = good, which is honest and useful, as opposed to bad and bad” and “Good = good, everything good, useful, serving our happiness”

The definition of one concept through another allows us to consider them as semantic doublets.

The roots of the identity between good and good can be found in antiquity. Even then, the benefits were divided into external and internal, and the latter, in turn, into bodily and spiritual. Ancient philosophers - Plato, Aristotle - who introduced the concept of good into science, identified it with happiness, the constituent components of which are the moral perfection of the soul, as well as wealth, luck, health and some phenomena beyond human control, perceived as positive: fertility, fertile climate and etc. Plato for the first time realizes the universal meaning of the good, and the idea of the good occupies a central place in his teaching, it is the basic principle on which the whole ideal world is built. However, in real life, the good loses its exclusivity and can only be comprehended through evil as its opposite. According to Plato, a person does not choose to live or not to live, but he has the freedom to choose whether to live honestly and in goodness, or live in vice and evil.



Thus, good and its opposite, evil, become the fundamental evaluative concepts that determine the axiological aspects of human activity. Good is anthropocentric - acts as a referent of actions that are correlated with the highest values, appealing to the ideal. Thus, good is connected with the spiritual world of a person, with his good.

Without questioning the fundamental nature of the concepts of good and evil, one cannot fail to note the impossibility of their complete definitions. Good and evil were subjected to attempts to interpret them from the point of view of mythology, ethics, religion and philosophy, from the point of view of the commensurability of these concepts, the status of primacy.

Already in the naive picture of the world, good and evil stand out as the main semantic concepts of the so-called dualistic myths. Each character in these myths refers either to the positive beginning as the bearer of good, or to the negative - as the bearer of evil. Often good and evil do not have direct names, but are denoted by the symbols of the sides - "left" (associated with evil) and "right" (associated with good), or the lower (dark) and upper (light) worlds. Later, the same motif of the dark kingdom - the embodiment of evil, will be found in medieval literature - Lucifer (Satan) - the king of darkness.

Now if I do that I would not, it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me.

I find then a law, that, when I would do good, evil is present with me. Rom.

Within the framework of secular philosophy, non-religious and personal knowledge of the good is being restored. Good in the broad sense of the word, as good, means, firstly, the positive value of something in relation to a certain standard (ideal), and secondly, this standard itself. In everyday speech, the word "good" is used to denote a variety of goods, which manifests its connection with the archetype.

Historically, the first notions of goodness included the idea of the valuable and useful in general; the corresponding words in Greek (*agathos*) and Latin (*bonum*) go back to words denoting strength, courage. The Merriam-Webster Dictionary traces the etymology of the word good (O.E. *gād* = D. *goed* = Germ. *gut* = Icel. *godhr* = Goth. *goths*) and defines the meaning as 'fitting, suitable' (= conforming to a standard) and cognate with English *gather*[20], which, among others, has the meaning of accumulating, acquiring, earning a living. In this sense, the concept of good coincided with the concept of goods.

The selected archetype finds confirmation in modern dictionary definitions, which are an integral part of the meaningful minimum of the concept.



In English explanatory dictionaries, goodness is first defined as a characteristic of material wealth, and the adjective "kind" also, first of all, refers to a thing and only then to a person.

1. Something that is **good** is 1.1.pleasant and enjoyable; 1.2. of high quality or standard

2. Someone who is **good** is 2.1. kind to people and always thinks of their feelings and needs;

morally correct in their behaviour and character

Good: 1. of a favourable character or tendency; fertile; suitable, fit; profitable, advantageous...

2. virtuous, right, commendable; kind, benevolent; loyal;

Good:

1. of a high standard;

2. of the right kind;

3. skilful;

4. helpful;

5. morally right;

With the development of moral consciousness and evaluative categories, lexical unity is preserved, but semantic delimitation occurs within the concept of "good". Signs of actually moral good are developed and fixed. Good is perceived as a value that does not depend on natural or elemental phenomena. Actions that can be defined as good are performed freely, of good will. The main criterion for determining a particular phenomenon as good or evil is the assessment given by the personality of the speaker, which manifests the anthropocentric nature of the concept of good.

The generalized image of the carrier of cultural-linguistic and communicative-activity values, knowledge, attitudes and behavioral reactions includes value, cognitive and behavioral plans. According to V.I. Karasik, the value plan of a communicative personality contains ethical and utilitarian norms of behavior characteristic of a certain ethnic group in a certain period. These norms are enshrined in the moral code of the people, reflect the history and worldview of people united by culture and language. So, the value plan characterizes a communicative personality "according to the ratio of dominant values, according to the degree of their differentiation. In this sense, Good is an axiological category.



The value plan of a communicative personality is manifested in the norms of behavior enshrined in the language. "A norm (from the Latin norma - a guiding principle, a rule, a model) is a model, a rule, a principle of activity, recognized by a social organization and in one form or another assigned for execution by its members"[17:428]. The norms of behavior generalize and regulate specific situations of communication and are fixed in the meanings of words and in idiomatic expressions and proverbs:

Good samaritan. Good Samaritan. To be up to no good. Think bad.

In good with somebody. In a good relationship.

To the good. For anyone's benefit.

Behavioral norms are characterized by prototypical properties, tk. our memory stores knowledge of typical situations in which, in order to follow the expected norms of behavior in a given culture, participants must perform certain actions and receive an evaluative reaction in response to their actions.

Normative behavior (socially expected, approved) is reflected in the language in the form of proverbs, which are either a compressive assessment or a didactic statement: He that spares the bad injures the good. He who spares the bad destroys the good. He best knows what good is that has endured evil. If you don't taste the bitter, you won't know the sweet either.

We know not what is good until we have lost it. What we have - we do not store, having lost - we cry.

The norms of behavior are updated most often when there is a choice between behavioral strategies that are based on the opposition of ethical (moral) and utilitarian values.

In the group of ethical values (and, consequently, the norms of behavior), one can single out the basic principles of human behavior, enshrined in the dogmas of faith and legal codes. Such norms are defined as "supermoral norms of behavior" .

However, the norms of behavior can be considered not only in a sacred and profane sense, but also from the point of view of a person's belonging to a particular group of people. So, the behavior of an individual can be approved or condemned (condemned) by close relatives, or colleagues at work, or members of an ethnic group, while comparing his behavior with a certain local standard.

In the process of using language in natural communication, one can speak of "functional categorization", which involves the scaling and evaluation necessary for



the formation of judgments and statements. It is in this case that the need arises to speak of evaluative categorization” .

The dualism of these concepts is confirmed by the presence of universal symbols - God and Satan. The concept of Good is focused on a system of universal and individual values, opinions, standards, ideals, which can serve as a basis for the formation of the axiological category of Good, which can serve as a subject for further study of the categorization of good in the English language picture of the world.

LITERATURE:

1. Berestnev G.I. Iconicity of good and evil // Questions of linguistics. - M.: Nauka, 1999. - p. 99-113.
2. Boldyrev N.N. Language Mechanisms of Evaluative Categorization //Reality, Language and Mind: An International Book of Research Reports. Issue 2. Tambov: Tambov University Press, 2002. - p. 360-369.
3. Vereshchagin E.M. On the relativity of worldly ethical norms. //Logical analysis of language: Languages of ethics. - M.: Languages of Russian culture, 2000. - p. 235-245.
4. Gak V.G. Actant structure of sins and virtues. //Logical analysis of language: Languages of ethics. - M.: Languages of Russian culture, 2000. - p. 90-96.
5. Gerasimova I.A. Deontic logic and cognitive attitudes. //Logical analysis of language: Languages of ethics. - M.: Languages of Russian culture, 2000. - p. 7-16.
6. Dal V. I. Explanatory Dictionary of the Living Great Russian Language. T.1. - M.: State. foreign publishing house and national dictionaries, 1955. - 700 p.
7. Demyankov V.Z. The concept and concept in fiction and scientific language // Questions of Philology. No. 1. 2001. S. 35-47.
8. Karasik V.I. Language circle: personality, concepts, discourse. - Volgograd: Change, 2002. - 477 p.