1.3. THE LANGUAGE PERSONALITY IN THE CONCEPT *GOOD* CONTEXTS TO THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE PICTURE OF THE WORLD

Horiainova V. V.
Teacher of the foreign languages department,
Cherkasy Bohdan Khmelnytsky National University,
Cherkasy, Ukraine
vitacherkasy@vu.cdu.edu.ua
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7021-8337

Introduction

Throughout history, humankind has successfully practiced determining the meaning of words and expressions. This is based on intuitive notions of meaning relevant to learning language and its use as a syncretic substance.

Linguistic, logical and philosophical thematic temptations relevant to the strategy of automatic translation, representing thinking as computation, and constructing artificial languages have intensified interest in analyzing the essence of meaning in recent decades. As often happens in scientific cognition, the analysis of a given intuitive notion may split it into various theoretical concepts focused upon particular characteristics and aspects of the intuitive notion in question, and explicating these features with increasing accuracy. Each of them gets included in a respective system of objects, principles, methods and criteria and usually becomes an alternative of the other ones as a theoretical interpretation of the initial idea.

Speaking of language personality, it should be noted that it can be considered only within a certain cultural environment. It is a unique phenomenon and has several components – social and mental, reflecting them in communication and, thus, reflecting their belonging to a particular cultural society. In general, axiological status of concept *good* has metaphorical meaning and express emotions and feelings. Concept *good* is multiplex phenomenon of mental, emotional and social life. Nevertheless, it must be understood the obligatory function of the context to appellation to the concept *good*.

Context issues were investigated in different characteristics: Questions of rethinking context (G. Goodwin, A. Duranti)[1], definition of context, linguistic approaches (R. Finkbeiner, J. Meibauer, B. Pertra)[2], the indeterminacy of contextualization (M. Silverstein), modeling and using context (A. Dey, B. Kokinov, D. Leake, R. Turner)[3], compositionally, especially, in historic context (T. Janssen)[4], methods of context processing in intelligent systems, context understanding (I. Zavushchak, E. Burov)[5], philosophical meaning of the context (V. Lisovuy)[6]. It has become clear the need for perception of the context in different variations that improves awareness the concept *good* in the linguistic structure previous researches. All these points were described in the previous article *"The concept "good" in the English–language picture of the world"*[7]. Both linguistic and non- linguistic researches have been used and processed.

It is better to note the concept *good* analysis describes of conceptual metaphors that show typical metaphorical expressions, prototype modeling concept, associations of the concept *good*, applicable semantics of verbs that connect to the concept *good*. In addition, it is the oneness of structural-linguistic connections; distinction in the use of direct and indirect speech in different ways of communication, characterized features addressed nomination in the discourse of *good*.

---

[1] Goodwin Charles, Duranti Alessandro, eds. "Rethinking context: an introduction". Rethinking context: *Language as an interactive phenomenon.* Cambridge : Cambridge University Press. P: 1–42. Retrieved February 19, 2017.

[2] Finkbeiner R., Meibauer J, Petra B. What is a Context?: *Linguistic Approaches and Challenges*. John Benjamins Publishing. 2012. 253 с.

[3] Dey Anand, Kokinov Boicho; Leake David; Turner Roy. Modeling and Using Context : 5th International and Interdisciplinary Conference, (24 June 2005). Paris, France, 2005. *Proceedings. Springer Science & Business Media.*

[4] Janssen T. M. (2012) Compositionality: Its historic context / in M. Werning, W. Hinzen, & E. Machery (Eds.). The Oxford handbook of compositionality. P. 19–46, Oxford University Press.

[5] Завущак І. І., Буров Є. В. Методи опрацювання контексту в інтелектуальних системах. *Вісник Національного університету "Львівська політехніка". Серія : Інформаційні системи та мережі. Львів : Видавництво Львівської політехніки.* 2017. № 872, С. 121–130.

[6] Лісовий В. Контекст. *Філософський енциклопедичний словник* / В. І. Шинкарук (гол. редкол.) та ін. Київ : Інститут філософії імені Григорія Сковороди НАН України : Абрис, 2002. 742 с.

[7] Vasylenko O. M, Horiainova V. V. The concept good in the English–language picture of the world. *Гілея : науковий вісник.* 2018. № 130(3). 260–264.

The **aim** of the article is to describe the dominant parts of context that discover the units structure of the lexical and semantic field of *good* in English and specify characteristic and convey the meanings of the concept of *good* in language.

To achieve this aim it is necessary to accomplish the following tasks:

– to reveal the key features of verbal and non-verbal, grammatical, lexical context;

– to analyze the points of divergence of the context and ambiguity;

– to define the lexical meaning and the main task of the concept *good* in English;

– to compare the systemic organization of the lexical and semantic field of *good*.

The research used the following methods and techniques: descriptive, providing analysis, classification and interpretation of the results; comparative with which to work the common and unique in the comparable languages; etymological analysis, which establishes change the semantics of language units in the course of its historical development; statistics, which determine various constituent elements of the written language.

§ 1. The definition of context

Context in its primary meaning is a category of linguistics, but we are all witnesses to the intense growth of its use in non-linguistic sense – not only as a banal metaphor in everyday speech, but as a specialized term in a growing number of areas that are far from linguistics. The scope and dynamics of this phenomenon is a serious enough reason to study it, and makes topical the questions as to what sort of needs are met by the nonlinguistic use of «context» and what characteristics of context as a linguistic category adequately spread into other areas; in other words, what is it about the notion of context that makes such use legitimate, and what makes it necessary, why this notion is so convenient and preferred[8].

This sort of questions sound even more intriguing. If we pay attention to the obviously paradoxical situation: possibilities and facilities (including instrumental) provided by the non-linguistic use of context are recognized and used extremely broadly, studies directly connected with non-linguistic contexts are ever more numerous. But the question as to what context is (as a general category, not as concrete sorts of contexts), and from which

---

[8] Tasseva E. Determinants of Meaning: Invisible, though Ubiquitous Context. *Fslozofia*. 68. 2013. № 10. P. 884.

of its characteristics these possibilities and convenience stem, remains in fact unasked in literature. The primary conceptual source of all contextual considerations and instrumentalizations remains little noticed[9].

Tasseva E. convinced that this phenomenon is not just a curiosity, that it is not accidental either. It is a logical effect resulting from certain contemporary attitudes to the doing of science (methodologism, functionalism, instrumentalism, formalism, etc.), so I shall try to point out some characteristic features of context which give me reasons to raise the above questions and to attempt to show why this ubiquitous, but invisible, concept deserves notice[10].

There are three natural starting points for studying the essence of context and its category potential:

1) linguistics (where "context" really functions as a general theoretical category);

2) the practice of non-linguistic use of contextual concepts and ideas;

3) the theoretical non-linguistic consideration of context as a determinant of meaning in juxtaposition to other determinants[11].

What is happening as regards the third point has been already outlined above. For contextualism and other schools context, taken as a general category, still remains uninteresting and hence almost invisible.

The analysis of its nature has followed the model of the "chaos" example – the syncretic intuitive notion of context has broken down into a chaotic and inconsistent "cloud" of theoretic concepts and corresponding conceptions, where can be found some "condensation nuclei" of basic opinions. The developments are important and very interesting, but I do not have enough space here to consider them in more detail.

The other starting point reveals a boundless variety of forms and modes of practical use of context ideas (and concepts) borrowed from linguistics into many fields, some of which being quite distant from it. The range spans from the use of the word "context" in everyday speech to the introduction of strictly defined contextual concepts in formal logic[12].

---

[9] Tasseva E. Determinants of Meaning: Invisible, though Ubiquitous Context. *Fslozofia*. 68. 2013. № 10. P. 884.

[10] Ibid.

[11] Ibid.

[12] Ibid. P. 885.

In this empirical diversity there is a full spectrum of degrees of conceptual processing of (non-linguistic) context ideas – from metaphorical to strict categorial use within scientific theories. From all this empirical material I shall focus briefly on two important cases of non-linguistic use of contextual notions:

1) in studying the effects of contextual dependence and determinacy as a factor of scientific knowledge development;

2) in logic and metalogic (logical semantics) where contextual concepts are in use as categories within formal logical systems.

Interest in the contextual considerations and representations in the philosophy of science arose and grew in the last century. In a very short period of history there appeared at least a dozen significant contextual conceptions considering different aspects of the essence, structure, and dynamics of science and scientific practice. They are based on notions of context situated at different levels of conceptualization. Some of these conceptions have underlying them the intuitive potential of some metaphor, some image focused on universality and continuity[13].

From the discussion of the paradigmatic and syntagmatic relations it follows that a full understanding of the semantic structure of any lexical item can be gained only from the study of a variety of contexts in which the word is used, i.e. from the study of the intralinguistic relations of words in the flow of speech. This is of greatest importance in connection with the problem of the synchronic approach to polysemy.

Language is a social phenomenon, and it is closely tied up with the social structure and value system of society. Therefore, language can not avoid being influenced by all these factors like social role, social status, sex and age, etc. Social roles of language personalities are culture-specific functions, institutionalized in a society and recognized by its members. By social status, we mean the relative social standing of the participants[14].

Each participant in the language event must know, or make assumptions about his or her status in relation to the other, and in many situations, status will also be an important factor in the determination of who should initiate the conversation. Sex and age are often determinants of, or interact with, social status. The terms of address employed by a person of one sex speaking to an older person, may differ

---

[13] Tasseva E. Determinants of Meaning: Invisible, though Ubiquitous Context. *Fslozofia*. 68. 2013. № 10. P. 885.

[14] Гумбольдт В. О различии строения человеческих языков и его влиянии на духовное развитие человечества (1830–1835) / по В. Фон Гумбольдт "Избранные труды по языкознанию". М., 1984. С. 38.

from those which would be employed in otherwise similar situations by people of the same sex or of the same age[15].

The analysis, however, is focused on explicating various aspects and properties, and as a rule the instrumental side predominates in it. Thus, it shows a tendency of turning in the direction of attributive and operational answers. Moreover, it cannot be said in advance whether the tools preferred as promising will be sufficient to interpret all important properties of the initial notion. Therefore, it is normal a need of revising the very means of conceptualization to be felt; usually, Church regarding logicism in philosophy of mathematics like that outlines this situation: "If we are to take the logicists seriously, we must concede them a broad sense of the term, logic"[16].

Following the chosen strategy of expanding the range of chosen tools, the situation develops with accumulation of concrete theoretical and metatheoretical results but also with accumulation of relativism, when extending the potential of tools and shifting the emphasis from substratum questions to attributive and operational answers. The model of ontological relativism becomes increasingly pertinent updating the situation "replacing ontology with ontologies" depicted by Qiune: "A curious thing about the ontological problem is its simplicity. It can be put in three Anglo-Saxon monosyllables: "What is there?" It can be answered, moreover, in a word – "Everything"[17].

The result is diversity of theoretical hypotheses and conceptions interpreting the initial intuitive notion; there forms a constantly expanding field of competitive alternatives where divergence strongly prevails over convergence.

§ 2. Verbal and non-verbal context

Logical conceptualizations of non-linguistic contextual notions are of particular interest, because in contemporary logic the wave of studies related to interpretations of contextual determinacy and their importance is growing. And this is the scientific area where the non-linguistic category use of contextual ideas has reached the highest instrumental level. The most famous example of such a concep-tualization is the semantics of possible worlds. It was first introduced

---

[15] Lichao Song. The Role of Context in Discourse Analysis. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research.* November 2010. Vol. 1. No. 6. P. 877.

[16] Tasseva E. Determinants of Meaning: Invisible, though Ubiquitous Context. *Fslozofia*. 68. 2013. № 10. P. 878.

[17] Ibid.

in relation to modal connectives, quickly developed, and soon became commonly accepted in logic and philosophy. By its application a large amount of scientific product has been obtained in logic, metalogic, and philosophy of logic. But at the same time certain limitations began to show under the impetuously growing diversity of logical systems[18].

Against that background, the semantics of possible worlds (which are, so to say, conceptually closed, maximal systems) has gradually turned from a universal into an insufficient (as regards giving an adequate interpretation of part of the new content accumulated in logic) semantic conceptual context in cases where the object of study are logical types of determinacies that do not meet certain requirements of "size" and consistency. This has led to attempts at essential and instrumental working out of new more flexible interpretative context: D. Lewis and Stalnaker's "nearby possible worlds", "impossible worlds", Barwise and Perry's situational semantics, Scott-Montague's "neighborhood" semantics, Hintikka's "states of affairs", Austin's "events", Seligman's "infons", Fillmore's frames, etc. Different versions of contextual calculi (some defining context as "a term with a hole") have been launched in programming as well[19].

All these semants, upon which corresponding conceptions are built, actually change the principle of global integrity ("worlds") into various principles of regional continuity as factors of contextual determinacy. Again, it would be reasonable to ask why the fuzzier notions are preferred as determinants[20].

Finally, having made this overview of the diversity of aspects, functions and conceptualizations of various types of contextual ideas working in linguistics and mainly outside it, which shows their semantic richness, I should like to point out some specific features of the notion of context. These issues determine its potential to function as a logical philosophical category and that usually do not fall into the focus of attention[21].

Ideas how to categorize types of context differ everywhere. Some linguists divide context into two groups, while some insist on discussing

---

[18] Tasseva E. Determinants of Meaning: Invisible, though Ubiquitous Context. *Fslozofia*. 68. 2013. № 10. P. 886.
[19] Ibid.
[20] Левицький А. Е. Порівняльна граматика англійської та української мов. К. : Освіта України, 2007. С. 7.
[21] Tasseva E. Determinants of Meaning: Invisible, though Ubiquitous Context. *Fslozofia*. 68. 2013. № 10. P. 886.

context from three, four, or even six dimensions. According to different circumstances mentioned in the above definitions, it is accepted to divide context into linguistic context, situational context and cultural context. In this way, it is better to understand expressions of the concept, especially *good* in the language.

§ 2.1. Linguistic Context

Linguistic context is a reflection of the experience of existential contexts (the contexts of reality) in the structures of language. Such discourse show the connection between the words, phrases, sentences and even paragraphs. Take the word "bachelor" as an example. We can't understand the exact meaning of the sentence "He is a bachelor." without the linguistic context to make clear the exact meaning of this word. Linguistic context can be explored from three aspects: deictic, co-text, and collocation[22].

In the flow of speech and every certain episode, the recipients have to recognize their location in space and time. It's important to notice, that these peculiarities narrate directly to the deictic context.

Deictic expressions help to establish deictic roles, which derive from the fact that in normal language behavior the speaker addresses his utterance to another language personality, and may refer to himself, to a certain place, or to a time. In recent years, some linguists began to pay attention to the previous discourse co-ordinate. Levis introduces this co-ordinate to take account of the aforementioned sentences. We refer to the deictic expressions like the time expressions now, then, etc., the spatial expressions here, there, etc., and the linguistic personality expressions *I, you*, etc... In 1934, Porzig argued for the recognition of the importance of syntagmatic relations, between, e.g., bite and teeth, bark and dog, blond and hair, which Firth called collocation. Collocation is not simply a matter of association of ideas. Although milk is white, we should not often say white milk, while the expression white paint is common enough[23].

In this instance, linguistic context is the language that surrounds or go with the creator or model interaction of discourse. This kind of context is the whole range of communicative topics, elements of active and passive stock, sociolinguistic characteristics of the environnment, lexico-grammatical paradigms and the set of connections

---

[22] Lichao Song. The Role of Context in Discourse Analysis. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research.* November 2010. Vol. 1. No. 6. P. 876.
[23] Ibid. P. 877.

between lexical meanings and grammatical forms that correspond to a certain type of discourse. Such specific textual environment of each phrase, group of phrases or individual word the interpretations of the words occur in discourse, are constrained by, following Halliday, their co-text[24].

§ 2.2. Situational Context

Situational context, or context of situation, refers to the environment, time and place, etc. in which the discourse occurs, and also the relationship between the participants. This theory is traditionally approached through the concept of register, which helps to clarify the interrelationship of language with context by handling it under three basic headings: field, tenor, and mode[25].

It is a set of material and abstract circumstances created or generated according to a fact or situation. The environment of the situation determines whether the foundations are material or symbolic. This is directly related to the information that each participant has and can provide, for example, by asking questions or intuitively, to understand the event and to be able to interpret it. Verbal behavior always occurs in certain scenarios, the real situation (characters, events, time, place, etc.). The nascence of linguistic acts can also help determine the significance of a situational context[26].

§ 2.3. Cultural context

Cultural context is understood worldview that unites representatives of social groups and distinguishes them from each other one. The content of the information depends on the situation as well this explains the importance of situation theory in the semantic and logical analysis of information[27].

---

[24] Halliday M. Systemic Background. *In Systemic Perspectives on Discourse*. Vol. 1 : Selected Theoretical Papers from the Ninth International Systemic Workshop, Benson and Greaves (eds). Vol. 3 in The Collected Works. 1985 p. P. 188.

[25] Lichao Song. The Role of Context in Discourse Analysis. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research.* November 2010. Vol. 1. No. 6. P. 877.

[26] Dey A. K. Understanding and Using Context. *Personal and Ubiquitous Computing.* 2001. Vol. 5. № 1. P. 6.

[27] Devlin K. Logic and information. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 1991. P. 219.

The ontological components of situation theory are individuals' relations, place, type and parameters[28]. The parameters are not individual. They are determined by the cognitive behavior of the protagonist and indicate important information links[29]. Mechkor S. determines the relationship between the situation in everyday life and the situation in the theory of situations. He notes that people often use the word situation to denote context and vice versa. However, situation and context have different meanings in definitions in dictionaries. So, a situation is a series of events that occur and conditions that exist at a particular time and place. Context is a situation in which something exists or happens and helps to explain it[30].

Cultural context, which we interpret as social conventions on speech behavior in the context of a specific situation. Thus the process in question gives rise to a very rich variety of different conceptions of meaning. This includes, for instance:

– a group of verification theories of meaning stemming from Frege (based on various correspondence concepts) and the Vienna Circle;

– a broad type of use theories of meaning (deflationist, inflationist, other versions of pragmatism, etc.), including the trend of inferentialist theories of meaning;

– Putnam's causal theory of meaning;

– relational theories of meaning based on Peirce's semiotics;

– Fodor's asymmetrical causal dependency theory of meaning;

– picture theories of meaning stemming from Wittgenstein's "picture theory of language";

– a great diversity of contextualist theories of meaning;

– many stand-alone conceptions looking somewhat exotic against the general background, e. g., Mihailo Marković's dialectical theory of meaning, etc[31].

---

[28] Devlin K. Situation theory and situation semantics. P. 3. URL: https://web.stanford.edu/~kdevlin/Papers/HHL_SituationTheory.pdf

[29] Devlin K. Situation theory and situation semantics. P. 4. URL: https://web.stanford.edu/~kdevlin/Papers/HHL_SituationTheory.pdf

[30] Lindström S. Situations and Attitudes: critical study Jon Barwise and John Perry. Cambridge, MA and London : MIT Press. 1983. 352 p. URL: http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.99.5867&rep=rep1&type=pdf

[31] Tasseva E. Determinants of Meaning: Invisible, though Ubiquitous Context. *Fslozofia*. 68. 2013. № 10. P. 879.

The noun *ring* in such context may possess the meaning "a circlet of precious metal" or "a call on the telephone"; the meaning of the verb to get in this linguistic context may be interpreted as "possess" or "understand" depending on the actual situation in which these words are used. It should be pointed out however that such cases, though possible, are not actually very numerous. The linguistic context is by far a more potent factor in determining word meaning[32].

It is of interest to note that not only the denotational but also the con- notational component of meaning may be affected by the context. Any word which as a language unit is emotively neutral may in certain contexts acquire emotive implications. Compare, e.g., fire in to insure one's property against fire and fire as a call for help. A stylistically and emotively neutral noun, e.g. *wall*, acquires tangible[33].

The key gain from this framework is that it provides an account of incremental learning of word meaning from discourse. In particular, this framework allows both abstract and context-specific word knowledge to increment through a single learning mechanism. Encounters with words provide specific word memories that include the contexts of these encounters. Abstraction over these instances occurs as memories of prior instances affect the processing of a new instance.

Thus, abstract meanings arise from the summation of unique contexts and their effects on new encounters with the word. This framework also allows the emergence of an aspect of meaning that is often neglected in modern treatments, namely connotative meaning[34].

Associations between a word and the non-linguistic contexts of its occurrences are part of what gets encoded in the instance-based memory model. Finally, and perhaps most important, it provides a theoretical basis for understanding the role of definitions. Definitions are encoded as specific contexts for a word, as are sentences that contain the word.

---

[32] Deignan A. Metaphor and Corpus Linguistics. Amsterdam. Philadelphia : John Behjamins, 2005. P. 48.

[33] Ibid. P. 49.

[34] Воркачёв С. Г. Лингвокультурология, языковая личность, концепт: станов-ление антропоцентрической парадигмы в языкознании. *Науч. докл. высш. шк. Филол. науки.* 2001. № 1. С. 64–72.

Whether a definition is just another context or a privileged context depends on the overlap of its features with those of other contextual memory traces. The definition has the potential of resonating with sentence episodes (and vice versa) so as to aid in the emergence of core meaning features.

Words in thematic groups are joined together by common contextual associations within the framework of the sentence and reflect the interlinking of things or events[35]. Common contextual association of the words is due to the regular cooccurrence of these words in a number of sentences.

Words making up a thematic group belong to different parts of speech and do not possess any common denominator of meaning:

tree – grow – green;
journey – train – taxi – bags – ticket or;
sunshine – brightly – blue – sky.

Here we clearly perceive the combined effect of both the linguistic arid the extra-linguistic context. The word wall does not ordinarily occur in combination with the adjectives sweet and *good*ly. So the peculiar lexical context accounts for the possibility of emotive overtones which are made explicit by the context of situation. The verb accept occurs in numerous contexts together with the nouns proposal, invitation, plan and others. As a rule, thematic groups deal with contexts on the level of the sentence[36].

Such meanings are sometimes described as grammatically (or structurally) bound meanings. Cases of the type she will make a good teacher may be referred to as syntactically bound meanings, because the syntactic function of the verb make in this particular context (a link verb, part of the predicate) is indicative of its meaning "to become, to turn out to be". A different syntactic function of the verb, e.g. that of the predicate (to make machines, tables, etc.) excludes the possibility of the meaning "to become, turn out to be".

In lexical contexts of primary importance are the groups of lexical items combined with the polysemantic word under consideration. This can be illustrated by analysing different lexical contexts with using

---

[35] Vasylenko O. M, Horiainova V. V. The concept good in the English–language picture of the world. *Гілея : науковий вісник.* 2018. № 130 (3). С. 261.

[36] Meyer Ch. F. English Corpus Linguistics: An Introduction. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 2004. P. 9.

polysemantic words. The adjective heavy, e.g., in isolation is understood as meaning "of great weight, weighty" (*heavy load, heavy table,* etc.).

When combined with the lexical group of words denoting natural phenomena such as wind, storm, snow, etc., it means "striking, falling with force, abundant" as can be seen from the contexts, e.g. heavy rain, wind, snow, storm, etc. In combination with the words industry, arms, artillery and the like, heavy has the meaning "the larger kind of something" as in *heavy industry, heavy artillery*, etc[37].

Features of the context in which a word occurs are important. The constraint provided by the context was the primary predictor of vocabulary growth, particularly for producing trained words. More generally, contexts range from being supportive (to varying degrees) to being misleading.

In this study, the critical text factor was context variability, and we assessed the supportiveness of context by using a cloze task procedure, which, similar to that of Daneman and Green, asked a separate set of participants to produce words for the context sentences with the target word removed. Because our target words are too rare to be produced in this cloze procedure, the cloze responses were evaluated by independent scorers for their relatedness to the target word and used in subsequent analyses as the predictors of context support from the context sentences[38].

It can be easily observed that the main factor in bringing out this or that individual meaning of the words is the lexical meaning of the words with which heavy and take are combined. This can be also proved by the fact that when we want to describe the individual meaning of a polysemantic word, we find it sufficient to use this word in combination with some members of a certain lexical group. To describe the meanings of the word handsome, for example, it is sufficient to combine it with the following words – *a) man, person, b) size, reward, sum*. The meanings *"good-looking"* and *"considerable, ample"* are adequately illustrated by the contexts[39].

The verb take in isolation has primarily the meaning *"lay hold of with the hands, grasp, seize"*, etc. When combined with the lexical group

[37] Гумбольдт В. О различии строения человеческих языков и его влиянии на духовное развитие человечества (1830–1835) / по В. Фон Гумбольдт «Избранные труды по языкознанию». М., 1984. С. 55.

[38] Раєвська Н. М. Теоретична граматика сучасної англійської мови. К. : Вища школа, 1979. С. 36.

[39] Vasylenko O. M, Horiainova V. V. The concept good in the English–language picture of the world. *Гілея : науковий вісник*, 2018. № 130 (3). С. 261.

of words denoting some means of transportation (e.g. to take the tram, the bus, the train, etc.) it acquires the meaning synonymous with the meaning of the verb go.

As inherently social animals, humans live in a succession of multiple, different, situational contexts. Consistent with my definition of culture above, one of the functions of human cultures is to ascribe meaning to these situational contexts. Of course, there are many different aspects of situational context, including time, place, interactants, the content of activities or conversations, the reasons why the interactions are occurring in the first place, and the possibility of any future interactions between the same interactants. All of these factors, and others, combine to produce the unique situational contexts in which we live our lives[40].

Ambiguity refers to a word, phrase, sentence or group of sentences with more than one possible interpretation or meaning. There are two kinds of ambiguities: lexical ambiguity and structural ambiguity. Lexical ambiguity is mostly caused by homonymy and polysemy. For example, these four words, right, rite, write and wright, are all pronounced as [rait], but they are quite different from each other. Let's also have a look at the following sentence: They passed the port at midnight. This sentence is lexically ambiguous. However, it would normally be clear in a given context which can indicate the meaning of the word "port", meaning either harbor or a kind of fortified wine. Structural ambiguity arises from the grammatical analysis of a sentence or a phrase. For example, the phrase young men and women can be analyzed as either "young /men and women/" (i.e. both are young) or "/young men/ and women" (i.e. only the men are young). Let us also examine the following sentence: *I like Bill more than Mary.*

This sentence can mean "I *like Bill more than Mary does." or "I like Bill more than I like Mary.*" In such examples, a given context can indicate what the sentence exactly means[41].

Among the attempts to determine the meaning of "meaning", some cases analogues to the "football" example can be found. In a considerable part of the conceptions of meaning monism is recognized as a desirable principle. But it is typical for the determining basis to be chosen from among determinants of meaning (i. e. *representation, inference, and context*) without taking into account that they may have the same level

---

[40] Clark B. Stylistic analysis and relevance theory*. Language and Literature.* 2006. Vol. 5. № 3. P. 15.

[41] Lichao Song. The Role of Context in Discourse Analysis. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research.* November 2010. Vol. 1. No. 6. P. 877.

of generality (a*s "goalkeeper" and "forward").* A theory corresponding to the chosen determinant is then developed and a program of reinterpreting alternative conceptions in terms of the chosen basis is set forth. The program gradually "grows over" with philosophical and methodological arguments justifying it as necessary and with techniques showing that it is possible (at least partially and relatively). It is also usual in this process for a significant amount of scientific results to be produced some of which might prove to be really important. But usually these advances are also interpreted automatically as a confirmation of the basic thesis, though the latter may not be correct[42].

Actually, in the present case the most natural candidate for general basic concept is the notion "determinant of meaning". Moreover, this concept is meaningful even for those who believe the very term "meaning" is more or less devoid of sense (at least in a substantial aspect). Such choice of a monistic basic concept for the field of views on the essence of meaning may seem as trivial as the "football player" example. But it gives a new perspective, in which there is a general framework, the irritating polyparadigmality becomes a normal diversity of conceptions (of determinants of meaning), and the field as a whole can start its transformation from a chaotic "cloud" containing accumulated tensions and in commensurabilities into a more systematically organized knowledge module[43].

§ 3. The lexical meaning of the concept good in English

Dualistic myths were a reflection of the attempts of our distant ancestors to comprehend and understand the world around them. The social and cultural background for the emergence of dualistic myths was, first of all, the dualistic organization of society, dividing each tribe into two parts. The overwhelming number of tribes described the device of the world with the help of paired symbols – *the sun-moon, the male-female, the right-left, the upper-lower, the north-south.*

For the English language picture of the world, the pair "north-south" has a specific meaning. The spatial position of the north and south for modern man is associated with the top and bottom, which is associated with cartographic traditions. In turn, the top and bottom, the upper and lower worlds, are the containers of good and evil, light and dark forces.

---

[42] Tasseva E. Determinants of Meaning: Invisible, though Ubiquitous Context. *Fslozofia*. 68. 2013. № 10. P. 880.
[43] Ibid. P. 881.

Concepts are usually revealed on the basis of compatibility, mostly predicative, less often – attributive, complementary, and sometimes take into explanation a variety of broad linguistic contexts (folklore, art, journalism and other manifestations).

However, in German-Scandinavian mythology, where English history and culture originates, the spatial model of the world includes horizontal and vertical projections. In the horizontal model of the world, the center is inhabited by people, and on the outskirts, particularly in the north, is the realm of the dead. The vertical model divides the world into a land where people live, the sky where the gods dwell, and the underworld where the realm of the dead is. Thus, the "bottom" and "north" become identical to each other in the Old English period[44].

According to Plato, a person does not choose to live or not to live, but he has the freedom of choice in living honestly and in good, or living in vice and evil[45]. Due to the analysis of the subject of language personality as a form of representation of knowledge in language, as a conceptual model reflection of reality, as a modification of the recipient's consciousness (artistic, aesthetic, ethical, scientific, axiological, pragmatic) and as a model of influence on consciousness, intelligence, memory, behavior, attitudes can be characterized context[46].

According to the cognitive paradigm, language space (word, text, situation, context, etc.) is understood as complex sign that expresses the knowledge of the language personality about reality. It is exemplified in the concepts as the form of individual-subjective picture of the world by language personality[47].

Thus, the problems of interaction of the language picture of the world and the language personality should be considered as a speech product of the functioning of the language system. It is characterized by double system, the basis of which is not only the focus on usage, but also the subject's reflection of the linguistic picture of the world of a language personality. An integrating factor

---

[44] Гумбольдт В. О различии строения человеческих языков и его влиянии на духовное развитие человечества (1830–1835) / по В. Фон Гумбольдт «Избранные труды по языкознанию». М., 1984. С. 48.

[45] Левицький А. Э. Функціональні зміни в системі номінативних одиниць сучасної англійської мови : автореф. дис. ... док. філол. наук : 10.02.04. КДЛУ. Київ, 2009. С. 11.

[46] Селіванова О. О. Актуальні напрями сучасної лінгвістики (аналітичний огляд). К. : Фітосоціоцентр, 1999. С. 107.

[47] Бабенко Л. Г. Лингвистический анализ художественного текста. Теория и практика : учебник ; практикум. М. : Флинта : Наука, 2003. С. 24.

of the two mentioned categories – the language picture of the world and language personality – there is a concept. After all, the concept, as we know, on the one hand, is the basic unit of the conceptual picture of the world, and on the other – the cognitive level of the language personality.

Without questioning the fundamental nature of the concepts of good and evil, it is impossible not to note the impossibility of their complete definitions. Good and evil have been tried to interpret them from the point of view of mythology, ethics, religion and philosophy, from the point of view of commensurability of these concepts, the status of primacy[48].

Communicative relevance and opportunity of domination of irrelevant concepts may indicate about the lack of a concept and as a single integrated unit in foreign mind of the recipient. However, it is also has the ability to construct the translator concept in a particular act of communication with a number of similar value concepts which are relevant to the recipient of media culture[49].

Internal form etymological sign is revealed only to researchers and scholars. To use this language of the content of this layer concept exists indirectly, as the foundation on which any and keep the other "layers" values.

We considered lexemes as they have a common feature, which is the one responsible for the unification of all lexemes in one paradigm. However, within the paradigm of each unit in a particular context is neutralized by the existence of other immunologically distinct sems which are specific to each lexeme[50].

Considered semantic field is based on privative oppositions, ie the opposition of the "presence of X / absence of X". *Good* is bipolar field, based on two constituent units, which have antonymic relation to each other. In such a bipolar structure, there is no arhisem or arhilexeme because the two sectors, which divides the lexical and semantic field, cannot be neutralized.

---

[48] Воркачёв С. Г. Лингвокультурология, языковая личность, концепт: становление антропоцентрической парадигмы в языкознании. *Науч. докл. высш. шк. Филол. науки.* 2001. № 1. С. 47.

[49] Бархударов Л. С. Мова і переклад. М. : Міжнародні відносини, 2001. С. 62.

[50] Бархударов Л. С. Структура простого предложения современного английского языка. Фенікс, 2008. С. 28.

In addition to the difficulty of finding arhilexeme for both poles the characteristics of the considered field is the fact that sem are marked positive in all lexeme that contain these things (+ *good*)[51].

Within each category, the lexical unit contains a special type of opposition and is neutralized according to the semantic component in a certain context. Scientific studies have examined the semantic sphere reflects the evolution of the language of science.

Good in the English language picture of the world is a linguocultural concept, whose components are inseparable because of their axiological nature. The subject-shaped component of the concept represents the situation of evaluation and the interaction of the subject and the object with respect to the standard / norm mediated by the context and the field of experience. The conceptual component of *good* can be as a universal value, consciously correlated with higher values / ideal and acting simultaneously as a standard and an evaluation tool. Two material and spiritual segments structure it; its value component is graded with respect to the parameters of values and evaluation[52].

A cluster of four cognitive models forms the superordinate category of *good*; its members possess a full set of criterial properties of the category, reflected in the meanings of its prototypical name adjective *good*. Extensions of subordinate categories are motivated by one of the cognitive models corresponding to a particular hyperseme of the word good; extensions are distinguished by the semantic links of the verbalizing lexemes and are also structured according to the periphery center scheme[53].

As indicated above, vocabulary, despite being an open category, might be organized into fields.

Human, through his intellect, formalizes verbal substance and arranges it into a paradigm. In our case, we are dealing with a very particular paradigm, that of a religious scenario.

On the one hand, it is identified the traditional, common language and semantic connotations communication, on the other – the author's vision. If the description of God, the day of goodness, justice it is used vocabulary containing these things (+ *good*). The concept of Satan, night,

---

[51] Корунець І. В. Порівняльна типологія англійської та української мов : навч. посібник. Вінниця : Нова Книга, 2004. С. 366.

[52] Osborn M. Archetypal Metaphor in Rhetoric: The GOOD-Dark Family. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*. 1967. Vol. 53. P. 25.

[53] Левицкий Ю. А. Теоретическая грамматика современного английского языка. Издательство Пермского университета, 2004. С. 25.

evil are associated with the presence of seme (+ dark or – *good*), then antonymic opposition fire (as a weapon in the battle against Satan God) and the sun – individual way of structuring the lexical-semantic field of fiction[54].

In addition, metaphorical meanings are unevenly distributed on the parts of speech: metaphor *good* is commonly used as a noun. The only exceptions are non-conventional metaphors. Fresh metaphors of *good* are used only for those target areas that are already involved in the conceptual metaphors that reinforces the idea that the paradigmatic relations are available for use in the development of new meanings of words. On the other hand, the amount of fresh metaphors in the body is very small, the vast number of metaphors with the semantics of *good* are stable expression.

The concept *good* is both a benchmark and an assessment tool; it is gradual and varies in height and strength of value; *good* consists of two conceptual segments of moral and utilitarian. The stereotyped view of *good* as an element of the English world reflects the moral imperative and determines the dominants of morality, pleasantness, high quality and sufficiency in the English national culture, correlated with Christian ethics[55].

The proposed integrative linguocultural and linguistic-cognitive approach to the *good* concept allows us to interpret it as a cultural universal as an idioconcept, whose content is conditioned by the picture of the world of which it is a part. The specific character of the axiological concept of *good* is the unity and interrelation of its conceptual, value and figurative components. As a cultural universal, the concept of *good* reflects the basic moral and utilitarian values, that have evolved in the course of the development of civilization, which determine the presence in it of two PCMs "Spiritual" and "Material".

The concept of *good* is represented on the lexical level by direct (primary) and portable (secondary) names. The basic, the most frequent lexeme, is good, whose seminal composition demonstrates the greatest number of criterial properties of the *good* concept, as well as its *synonyms*

---

[54] Charteris-Black J. *The Blackbird on the Shoulder. Gender & Metaphors of "Depression".* Paper presented at the "7th International Conference on Researching and Applying Metaphor (RaAM 7)" on "Metaphor in Cross Cultural Communication," held at the University of Extremadura, Spain, 2008. P. 26.

[55] Іваненко Н. В. Концепт добра у контексті філософії мови. *Наукові записки. Серія : Філологічні науки (мовознавство). Кіровоград :* РВЦ КДПУ ім. В. В. Винниченка, 2002. Вип. 44. С. 136.

pleasing, kind, well behaved, virtuous, capable, healthy, useful, fine, suitable, valid, significant, whole, possessing an incomplete set of values inherent in the word good. In the English world, the concept of *good* is constructed metaphorically and metonymically, using the language tools of the secondary nomination. Metaphorical and metonymic mapping represent different approaches to constructing a concept that complement each other and form a holistic of *good*[56].

The core includes up to 30 lexical units (microfield benefit), expressing the concept of *good* things or actions, good morals. They are united in microfield, nuclear unit which is to benefit lexical unit *good* (n), so between them there are direct semantic links. The mentioned microfield has the greatest number of sems – 252 semantic components and the most common sem nuclear unit *good* – 60%).

Semantic components "*good*" (adj.), "*good*" (n), benefit are active (available in 20% or more units), they combine linguistic units of specified microfield by different types of paradigmatic relations, privative and identity.

Number of lexems of microfield *happiness* is 22 lexical units, 119 sem (68 of them with common kernel). The most active sems of this microfield is semantic components *"success", "fortune", "luck"*. Opposition to equipollent is observed between units of *happiness – felicity, fortunate – lucky, fortune – luck – chance – hap*, that the system is ideographic English synonyms.

Lexemes of these microfields reflect the most essential features of the concept of *good* in the English language and contain the largest number of key common sem of *good*. Zone which is around nuclear has microfields as *happiness, good, good*, as their nuclear units are part of semes of nuclear microfield, and therefore the associated direct links are as follows:

Good → benefit of happiness;

Good charity → kindness good;

Good → good→ good → friendly→ good.

Units of the English language to describe concepts *good* exist in lexical-semantic field as elements of the system that are in opposition and differ due to differential sems. Basing on the principle of direct / indirect ties and quantitative criteria we refer units of microfields which are related to key lexemes of semantic field of direct links and contain the largest number of joint sem of nuclear of lexeme good.

---

[56] Зеленецкий А. Л. Сравнительная типология основных европейских языков: учеб. пособие. М. : Академия, 2004. С. 28.

Between units of field it is installed paradigmatic semantic relation, which appear in the privative relations and oppositions of identity. This provided an opportunity to examine all sems set as a whole, which has a certain structure[57].

Conclusions

In general, the corpus approach is attractive for any theoretical framework in lexical semantics, for the basic reason that it provides an unparalleled empirical basis for lexical research. The wealth of data contained in the corpora – regardless from what perspective they are analysed – will simply benefit any research endeavour in lexical semantics, no less so in cognitive semantics than in other approaches. But more specifically and more importantly, there is a certain theoretical affinity between cognitive semantics and the distributional analysis of corpus data, an affinity that rests on at least the following three features. First, both approaches are explicitly usage-based. In fact, it is difficult to see how cognitive semantics can live up to its self-declared nature as a usage-based model if it does not start from actual usage data and a methodology that is suited to deal with such data.

Despite the similarities in the comparable lexical and semantic fields in both languages there are found differences in the semantics of individual lexemes, the number of units entering into certain relations and system of relations. This is due to a number of linguistic and extra-linguistic facts. The environment of the language personality functioning is determined by the organization and working in different types of contexts, especially because of the concept good.

The analysis showed that all the examples described by bipolar structure: + good / – good. In other words, decomposition of each unit to sems revealed that the plan of the contents of each lexeme, on the one hand, contain a common symptom of "the presence of good" or "no good" on the other – are unique to this unit features distinguishing lexeme from the other units of lexical and sematic field.

Among the distinctive features of lexical-semantic field of *good* in two languages there is not the same amount of semantic components in microfield. Differences are indicated as unequal types of paradigmatic of semantic relations and different number of common semes between peripheral units and nuclear fields.

---

[57] Vasylenko O. M, Horiainova V. V. The concept good in the English–language picture of the world. *Гілея : науковий вісник.* 2018. № 130(3). C. 263.

Summary

The article deals with research of the structure of the context components and ways of manner to ascertain the notion of the concept good in the language. The lexical components have the occasional character. It must be noticed, the context is determined as obligatory function to divide meanings of concept good in the English language picture of the world. Different lexical and grammatical classes show lexical–semantic field of concept good. It is merged on the general base good, resulting in them explicitly or implicitly. This approach allowed disclosing the structure connections between units in the lexical-semantic field good and the features of the language personality in various types of context.

References:

1. Бабенко Л. Г. Лингвистический анализ художественного текста. *Теория и практика* : учебник ; практикум. М. : Флинта : Наука, 2003. 406 с.

2. Бархударов Л. С. Мова і переклад. Москва : Міжнародні відносини, 2001. 235 с.

3. Бархударов Л. С. Структура простого предложения современного английского языка. Феникс, 2008. 200 с.

4. Воркачёв С. Г. Лингвокультурология, языковая личность, концепт: становление антропоцентрической парадигмы в языкознании. *Науч. докл. высш. шк. Филол. науки.* 2001. № 1. С. 64–72.

5. Гумбольдт В. О различии строения человеческих языков и его влиянии на духовное развитие человечества (1830–1835) / по В. Фон Гумбольдт «Избранные труды по языкознанию». М., 1984. С. 37–297.

6. Завущак І. І., Буров Є. В. Методи опрацювання контексту в інтелектуальних системах. *Вісник Національного університету «Львівська політехніка». Серія : Інформаційні системи та мережі.* Львів : Видавництво Львівської політехніки. 2017. № 872. С. 121–130.

7. Зеленецкий А. Л. Сравнительная типология основных европейских языков : учеб. пособие. М. : Академия, 2004. 252 с.

8. Іваненко Н. В. Концепт добра у контексті філософії мови. *Наукові записки. Серія : Філологічні науки (мовознавство). Кіровоград :* РВЦ КДПУ ім. В. В. Винниченка, 2002. Вип. 44. С. 136–140.

9. Корунець І. В. Порівняльна типологія англійської та української мов : навч. посібник. Вінниця : Нова Книга, 2004. 464 с.

10. Левицкий Ю. А. Теоретическая грамматика современного английского языка. Издательство Пермского университета, 2004. 156 с.

11. Левицький А. Е. Порівняльна граматика англійської та української мов. К. : Освіта України, 2007. 136 с.

12. Левицький А. Э. Функціональні зміни в системі номінативних одиниць сучасної англійської мови : автореф. дис. ... докт. філол. наук : 10.02.04. КДЛУ. Київ, 2009. 37 с.

13. Лісовий В. Контекст. *Філософський енциклопедичний словник /* В. І. Шинкарук (гол. редкол.) та ін. Київ : Інститут філософії імені Григорія Сковороди НАН України : Абрис, 2002. 742 с.

14. Раєвська Н. М. Теоретична граматика сучасної англійської мови. К. : Вища школа, 1979. 301 с.

15. Селіванова О. О. Актуальні напрями сучасної лінгвістики (аналітичний огляд). К. : Фітосоціоцентр, 1999. 148 с.

16. Charteris-Black J. The Blackbird on the Shoulder*. Gender & Metaphors of "Depression".* Paper presented at the "7th International Conference on Researching and Applying Metaphor (RaAM 7)" on "Metaphor in Cross Cultural Communication," held at the University of Extremadura, Spain, 2008. 145 p.

17. Clark B. Stylistic analysis and relevance theory. *Language and Literature.* 2006. Vol. 5. № 3. P.10–15.

18. Deignan A. Metaphor and Corpus Linguistics. Amsterdam. Philadelphia : John Behjamins, 2005. 174 p.

19. Devlin K. Logic and information. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 1991. 308 p.

20. Devlin K. Situation theory and situation semantics. URL: https://web.stanford.edu/~kdevlin/Papers/HHL_SituationTheory.pdf

21. Dey A. K. Understanding and Using Context. *Personal and Ubiquitous Computing.* 2001. Vol. 5. № 1. P. 4–7.

22. Dey Anand, Kokinov Boicho; Leake David; Turner Roy. *Modeling and Using Context* : 5th International and Interdisciplinary Conference, (24 June 2005). Paris, France, 2005. *Proceedings. Springer Science & Business Media.*

23. Finkbeiner R., Meibauer J, Petra B. What is a Context? : *Linguistic Approaches and Challenges*. John Benjamins Publishing. 2012. 253 с.

24. Goodwin Charles, Duranti Alessandro, eds. "Rethinking context: an introduction". Rethinking context: *Language as an interactive phenomenon.* Cambridge : Cambridge University Press. P: 1–42. Retrieved February 19, 2017.

25. Halliday M. Systemic Background. *In Systemic Perspectives on Discourse.* Vol. 1 : Selected Theoretical Papers from the Ninth International Systemic Workshop, Benson and Greaves (eds). Vol. 3 in The Collected Works. 1985 p. P. 188.

26. Janssen T. M. (2012) Compositionality: Its historic context / in M. Werning, W. Hinzen, & E. Machery (Eds.). The Oxford handbook of compositionality. P. 19–46, Oxford University Press.

27. Lindström S. Situations and Attitudes: critical study Jon Barwise and John Perry. Cambridge, MA and London. MIT Press. 1983. 352 p. URL: http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.99.5867 &rep=rep1&type=pdf

28. Lichao Song. The Role of Context in Discourse Analysis. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research.* November 2010. Vol. 1. No. 6. P. 876–879.

29. Meyer Ch. F. English Corpus Linguistics: An Introduction. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004. 185 p.

30. Osborn M. Archetypal Metaphor in Rhetoric: The GOOD-Dark Family. Quarterly Journal of Speech. 1967. Vol. 53. 241 p.

31. Tasseva E. Determinants of Meaning: Invisible, though Ubiquitous Context. *Fslozofia*. 68. 2013. № 10. P. 877–889.

32. Vasylenko O. M, Horiainova V. V. The concept good in the English–language picture of the world. *Гілея : науковий вісник.* 2018. № 130(3). С. 260–264.