Interpritation of the Catigories "Good" and "Evil" in the Sociocultural Community

Tatyana V. Samosenkova, Ludmila F. Svoykina, Ksenia S. Vorobieva,
Anna A. Merezhko and Olga V. Lutova
Belgorod State University Pobeda Street 85, 308015 Belgorod, Russia

Abstract: In this study, the researchers deal with different ethical approaches to the problem study of the "good" and "evil", the definition of these terms which varied depending on the specific historical conditions of the social development . The interpretation of the concepts "good" and "evil", their evaluative characteristics and language representation were also studied.

Key words: Society, ethics, concept, good, evil, cognitive characteristic features, language representation, representative, morals

INTRODUCTION

The objective world is divided by a man in terms from the point of view of a value character. "In essence, the diversity of human activity objects, social relations and natural phenomena which are also included in this range can act as a "subject of values" as objects of value attitude, i.e. assessed in terms of good and evil, truth and untruth, beauty or ugliness, permitted or forbidden, fair or unfair, etc. Valuable aspects of a person's life are closely related to the human cognitive activity, "extreme orientation knowledge is expressed in the very categories of value, interests and preferences of different social groups and personalities".

An important component of the value relations in society is the individual value orientation. One of the most important components of the individual value orientation content is his moral beliefs and principles of behavior. The valuable orientations of a person are the basis for solving complex issues including the issue of choosing between good and evil.

Good is the most common evaluative concept that refers to the positive aspect of human activity. It is the opposite of evil (Summers, 2009). The idea of good fixes a substantive definition of man's free will. This is what a man would have done, if it did not dependent on his will. Along with the concepts of freedom and goodness of God it is the most important life-purpose concept. Being a part of the development of the world moral goodness it plays the same role as the beauty plays its role in the framework of art. According to the Longman dictionary the term "good" means: The objective of the subject characteristics, fixing its excellence combined with emotional appreciation (when something is called good, in this case it is understood that it is fit for purpose, for example good cloth, a good horse); The value, the usefulness of items for the man, as well as valuable, useful for human subjects (the good news, to amass good); The moral quality of a person and his actions, a division of good (to do a good deed, a good woman). The concept of "good" is a part of specific category of philosophy and ethics.

Evil is also defined as the total estimated concept that refers to the negative aspect of human activity that is subject to control and overcome; it is the opposite of good. Evil is called everything that has a devastating impact on a person in his natural and social manifestations; in a broader sense, it is identified with the life-negation. In this study we consider the features of concept representation of "good" and "evil" in human society.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Methods of the analysis are defined by objectives, a theoretical and practical orientation of the research and character of an analyzed material. We have implied the following types of the analysis: The conceptual analysis (structuring and the analysis of the semantic content of concepts for the purpose of their reconstruction on the basis of studying the representative specifics of the corresponding language units); the contextual analysis (studying features of the context which causes the process of semantic formation of values, representing concepts of good and evil).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The main part: Language is the social phenomenon. It is the characteristics of the community of people who speak

---

Corresponding Author: Tatyana V. Samosenkova, Belgorod State University Pobeda Street 85, 308015 Belgorod, Russia

it. The distinction of a language as a social phenomenon consists in its two peculiarities: language omnitude as a communication vehicle and the fact that language is a communication vehicle but not a content sor aim of communication. It is a semantic cover but not a mental content. It bears a social character. It acts as an information keeper about the world. Social character of a language is manifested in dialectical unity of social and individual personality's consciousness. The development of the society at any moment reflects in the development of the language as well.

"National topography contradicts evolution principle by no means. Cultural evolution (and the evolution of society as well) is not only an inevitable but beneficial action, because culture cannot stay in statuesque, hardened condition but evolution carries within "everlasting wall" of the culture. Therefore, "old everlasting values, earned by several-hundred-old people experience" whih will be discussed in our study is invariable topography whih determines "key-note of communication" that is preserved in the people's memory due to discourse entity. Statement about the repeatability of key values of people's experience took acknowledgement in the researches of everlasting categories "good" and "evil".

"Good" and "evil" is inseparable connected with each other. It is impossible to give the full definition to good without the definition of evil. During the whole life a human being understands what is good and what is bad. Good and evil as central notions of ethics are revealed as a general form of morality expression that separates ethical and immoral. The human actions and all human activity are assessed through the prism of these notions. According to the history of ethics, conceptualization of good and evil changed due to the definite historical conditions of society development and due to the fact whose interests were presented by the ethic history. Good is everything that gets on well with nature, brings pleasure, God's will, everything that contributes to the social entity that corresponds to the historical necessity, all these and other definitions differ so much that it may be doubtful whether all mentioned master units correspond to a certain word. Surely, it is difficult to presuppose that philosophers quite spontaneous impose that or those meaning to this word. Probably, these forms posses some semantic entity providing their contrast. What is good itself? Is it possible to avoid "naturalistic mistake" in this definition? According to John Moor, any actual verbalized definition of good inevitably contains such mistake, that is good is principally indeterminable. This statement that was formulated in the "The principles of ethics", John Moor tended to prove strictly analytically, though the following metaethical critics discovered some of metaphysical postulates in the foundation of his statements. The main otologic promise of John Moor is the idea of objective existence of good ("inner good") as some unique quality. The conclusion of the indefinability of good arises out of this statement: in view of "simplicity" of this quality it cannot be described via compound parts and due to its unique character it cannot be identified with any other simply trait. Another epistemological idea of John Moor consists in postulating intuition as the human ability to directly apprehend good in its unique character and "simplicity".

According to John Moor, we can define good, however, if we are suggested the definition like "Good is pleasure", we are enable to refuse it as we instinctively know that in fact Good is not equal to pleasure. The research of John Moor is still being quite an expert evidence in favor of the issue about indefinability of good. Research community comes back to the problem of definition of good and evil (and other general concepts of ethics) again and again (Hurford *et al.*, 2007).

Whereas evil is also determined as general estimative notion that means negative aspect of human activity that is liable for limitation and overcoming; is the opposite to good. Evil is everything that influence the person in their natural and social manifestations destructively; in broad sense it is identified with life-negation. There is physical (diseases, natural disasters and so on), social (wars, economic crises, other social cataclysms) evil and moral evil (cruelty, callidity and other sins). Problems of evil are traditional for philosophy and central for ethics.

Evil and good are correlative notions, nevertheless they are unsymmetrical, they are unequal. Preferential starting point of human activity is its positive orientation good. In individual and social conscience evil seldom acts openly as malevolence.

One thinkers considered evil as substantial beginning (for example, in Manichaeanism it took shape of oldest son Sataniel or Lucifer; in philosophical naturalism it was identified with suffering as anthropological property of living world; in Neoplatonism it was viewed as physicality withstanding the spirit), other thinkers interpreted it as defect, deviation from good as human situation, determined by the intelligence and will imperfection. Thus, according to Stoics, Evil is the consequence of warped judgments; augustin restricted evil to the sin, understanding it as false pride, disobedience. The problem of explanation of evil within optimistically oriented monistic paradigm tends to be the most difficult. It was most vividly and purposefully discussed within philosophical and religious systems

where it assumed a shape theodicy, adjustment of evil existence with the idea of one absolute and fair God. In the history of public thought there were prevailing concepts that interpreted evil as the shade of benefit, its individual case or deviation from it. Within the framework of such representation evil is the result of human freedom, expression and evidence of its completeness. Evil is evil only from individual point of view but in a broader context from the point of view of airy plan, it is the requirement of harmony of the whole multi-layered perfections; hence, evil is as a sin is counterbalanced by punishment, then it may be viewed as necessary display of God's justice. Thus, in this case the question is not only about the explanation of Evil but principally about its justification. Thereby, the fact that evil goes hand-in-hand with good in unnatural way is being simplified. Though, we should not wash out the bounders between evil and good.

Are all definitions of good and evil in dictionaries, text books and special ethic papers true? It is evident that definitions may be interpreted differently taking into account the context: it may be the explication of the word "good" in the current usage or establish some new meaning of this word or describe some "thing", that is called good or point out the traits of in fact "approved" by everybody things or recommend these things to approve or express their approval by the speaker and etc. In each case the given definition carries the message, accomplishes a special function and the usage of it in the peculiar context is quite appropriate.

We have analyzed the data which are presented in the language dictionaries that help to get the most specific semantic features distinguishing shades of the investigated concepts. According to the linguistic dictionary the following semantic plans and a set of semantic features to the concept "good" are: The good as something that brings all the positive, good, useful. To clarify the meaning of this plan we took a number of synonyms: benefit, wealth, advantage, profit, boon, gain; The good as something that has positive moral quality of high moral standing. Synonyms: virtue, morality, honour; When combined with the definite study it acquires a value that determines the overall quality of people who lead a righteous life. With respect to the concept "evil" keywords 3 semantic features are distinguished:

- Evil as something bad, harmful, the opposite of good. Synonyms: ill, harm, wickedness, badness, hurt
- Evil as calamity, misfortune, trouble. Synonyms: mischief, misfortune, calamitys

Evil as a sin, a heavy reprehensible disadvantage, dishonouring quality. Synonyms: sinfulness, vice, immorality, depravity, corruption, lewdness. Actually John Moore considered metaphysical postulate of the existence of good and evil in itself (an objective, "non-human" goodness) as self-evident and universally recognized and he interpreted all criticized epic doctrines as if they, too, take this premise and built their evidence in accordance with it all criticized epic doctrines. One can only speak about the definition of good and evil in that context, where good and evil are treated as concepts and their referents are some objective reality or objective feature. Strictly speaking in the context of the moral consciousness, morality, normative ethics of good and evil are not differentiated so criticism of normative and ethical "definitions" of good and evil both contain "naturalistic mistake" does not make sense: value position is expressed in these quasi definitions and the question that some of them are "right" cannot be solved by applying the logical-epistemological criteria.

However, the normative ethics of these two contexts does not distinguish between them: value position is interpreted as the knowledge of right and duty and "good" and "duty" is considered as concepts which are defined according to the rules of logic. To a large extent this methodological confusion which received the name "cognitivism" in meta-ethics determines the nature of theorizing in the traditional ethics. Normative ethics is not interested in what people think to be "good or bad" it tends to find out what is good and evil in fact. But the application of this methodology does not lead to the wanted result because any attempt to determine the "objective good" and "objective evil" creates a "naturalistic mistake" from the point of view of cognitivism. The cognitivist position of the objectivity of good and evil has deep roots, it is not a purely speculative postulate but also is based on intuition of a real moral consciousness.

The peculiarity of moral values is in the fact that they are directly perceived and experienced by evaluating the subject as either above or non-subjective on their criteria and in this sense it is objective. Calling things utilitarianly "kind" (good) the individual does not mean that it has the meaning of "kindness" (though grammatical and logical structure of its evaluation suggests the interpretation). The true meaning of such evaluations, easily recognized by ordinary consciousness is the observation that evaluated thing, thanks to its objective properties, corresponds to the subjective expectations and preferences of the individual (or other people with whom he identifies himself). In addition, such estimates are usually performed also an expressive function, that is, they express a positive attitude to the subject of this thing (an emotion or a feeling of "approval"). As for the moral

evaluation, everyday intuition does not catch the need for the presence of subjective intentional component case seems as if the qualification of a thing as a morally good or bad points to the presence of this thing objective properties-"goodness" or "wickedness" and does not state to match some of its other characteristics. General human moral position is identified with the concept of good content and the presence of different positions for different people due to the difficulties of knowledge of good, mistakes and errors along the way. Of course, in this case no one does not deny that the moral evaluation is associated with certain feelings but these subjective emotive sides of moral consciousness appears as a kind of supplement and support the search and make good evaluation. According to this model, the theoretical concept of good is an independent scientific problem solution of which does not depend on the subjective intentions and attitudes. However, all attempts to consistently implement cognitivist methodology and to create on this basis consistent "theory of good" have failed: the definition of good, moral philosophers proposed, either it is not a definition but as noted above, expresses a particular value positions. The same thing happens with regard to the concept of evil.

The advantage of cognitivist methodology is that it allows reach for an organic moral consciousness specific to it (in contrast to the utilitarian consciousness) a subjective belief of good and evil objectivity. However, cognitivism does not give a clear answer to the question of how the value of good and evil is transformed into a positive attitude to "good or evil object" and becomes a motivating force of human behavior. Thus, according to Socrates, a man who knows good cannot act against it; digression from the good is caused by ignorance of it or a subjective misconception. In another embodiment of cognitivism, the knowledge of the objective good does not predetermine human behavior: in the case non-suppositional "free will" comes that decides to follow what is good or not; that is theoretical knowledge about good influence on the behavior only in combination with another metaphysical entity, "free will"(Witt, 2001).

Noncognitive interpretation of "good" as a word expressing a certain subjective disposition is definitely confirmed in the cases where the base of an "approving" evaluation directly serve the interests, desires, the subject of addiction: "Good is what I like" and the evil is harmful, respectively. Noncognitivism does not agree with the fact that though the lack of interest in the subjective evaluation based on turns it into knowledge of the objective good and evil. The fact that we often appreciate or give a negative assessment of some of the things that do not bring us any benefit, pleasure and other still does not mean that these things are

"objectively good", that has a value in and out itself and if an approving of their assessment is carried out without subjective pre-installation on this action but only from the knowledge of their "objectively good or evil" properties (Fairbanks, 2007).

The subjective intention is not confined to "interest", "need" and the like, it can be specifically moral both in its modality (which is a special kind of "approval" or "sense of duty") and the content aimed at a particular class "of approved" or "obligatory" items or actions. The individual makes a moral evaluation based on a common, specifically moral stance which he or she has and not on the subjective interests and not on the notion of good or evil as the objects. Good is one of the most common concepts of moral consciousness and one of the most important categories of ethics. Along with its opposite good is the most generalized form of differentiation and opposition of moral and immoral whih has positive and negative moral value that meets the requirements of morality and that contradicts them. With the help of the good ideas people evaluate social practices and actions of individuals. Depending on what is being evaluated (action, the moral quality of the person, human relations or social work classes, the state of society as a whole) the concept of good takes the form of more specific concepts. Religious ethic interprets it as an expression of good will and mind of God and evil as something opposed to it (Neoprotestantism, Neothomism). Essentially, different objective-idealistic theory of "good" and "evil" has the same meaning or deducing it out of a kind of knowledge not available to the "essence" of a cosmic law or world ideas (Conway, 1988).

Attempts of materialist explanation of good and evil in the Marxist ethics usually led to ethical naturalism; the origin of good is more often seen in the abstract ahistorical "human nature", its tendency for pleasure, happiness, psychologically understood interests (hedonism, eudemonism). But the theory of the "original" human nature in general actually gave out a certain type of person living in a particular society. In a number of contemporary ethical theories definition of good and evil it is generally considered impossible (intuitionism). Good and evil are announced expression of emotions of a human (neopositivism) or entirely independent of the personal conception of the individual (existentialism) (Aiken, 1958).

CONCLUSION

Summing up the analysis of the concepts "good"and "evil" it should be mentioned that different ethical approaches to the study of the problem of "good" and

"evil", the definition of these terms varied depending on the specific historical conditions of the development of society. Thus, ethics is currently considering the studied concepts as objective moral quality: good is the most general concept of morality that unites their totality positive norms and moral requirements and serves as an ideal; evil acts as a set of negative, immoral law. Good can be seen as moral purpose of behavior and in this case it acts as a motive of action and finally, the good and can act as a virtue, as a moral quality of the person. And evil is called everything that has a devastating impact on a person in his natural and social manifestations; in a broader sense, it is identified with the life-negation. This multivalent valued definition of good and evil acts of the nature of morality whih permeates all aspects of human activity (Adams, 1999).

Thus, evil appears in different hypostases such as social evils. And the life morals illustrate the results and consequences of commitment to a vicious, evil and immoral and it is a spiritual destruction. Good appears as a set of moral social values, the moral qualities of the person as the highest value, as helping and caring for others, as well as a norm of behavior, a requirement of obligation with respect to the individual activities.

REFERENCES

Adams, M.M., 1999. Horrendous Evils and the Goodness of God. Cornell University Press, Ithaca.

Aiken, H.D., 1958. God and evil: A study of some relations between faith and morals. Ethics, 68: 77-97.

Conway, D.A., 1988. The philosophical problem of evil. Int. J. Philosophy Religion, 24: 35-66.

Fairbanks, D.J., 2007. Relics of Eden: The Powerful Evidence of Evolution in Human DNA. Prometheus Books, Amherst.

Hurford, J.R., B. Heasley and M. Smith, 2007. Semantics: A Course Book. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, New York.

Summers, D., 2009. Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English. 3rd Edn., Burnt Mill, Harlow.