

РОЗДІЛ 4 ЗАГАЛЬНЕ МОВОЗНАВСТВО

UDC 81'373.72

DOI <https://doi.org/10.32782/tps2663-4880/2023.29.1.36>

SEMANTIC DEVELOPMENT OF THE POLYSEMOUS LEXEME ENG. FIRE IN THE INTEGRAL STRUCTURE OF PHRASEOLOGICAL UNITS

НАПРЯМИ СМИСЛОВОГО РОЗВИТКУ БАГАТОЗНАЧНОЇ ЛЕКСЕМИ АНГЛ. FIRE В ЦІЛІСНІЙ СТРУКТУРІ ФРАЗЕОЛОГІЧНИХ ОДИНИЦЬ

Bechko Ya.V.,

orcid.org/0000-0001-6845-2546

*Candidate of Philological Sciences, Associate Professor,
Associate Professor at the Department of Ukrainian and Foreign Languages
Uman National University of Horticulture*

In our article, we focused on the peculiarities of the semantic display of the polysemantic lexeme English. fire in phraseological context and on the reflection of this development in the integral semantic structure of the group of phraseological units with the corresponding key component in the form of a frame, determining for the interpretation of the FIRE concept at the phraseological level. By phraseological context we understand both the internal structure of phraseological units and the integral structure of the corresponding phraseological groups. Having studied idiomatic phrasemes, we found out whether the set of phraseological units with the mentioned lexeme as their key unit constitutes a system-organizing whole and the role of the lexeme Eng. fire in structuring of the corresponding phraseological group. We also tried to determine whether the lexeme we are studying can acquire a phraseologically related meaning, or, when used as part of phraseological units, it simply implements its system of meanings, inherent to it as a unit of the lexical-semantic system and presented in explanatory dictionaries. Our analysis was aimed at more fully elucidating the content of the FIRE concept and its semiotic-model potential.

In our article, we find out in what way the specific meaning of the word Eng. fire affect the general meaning of the phraseological unit that includes this word. In this regard, the degree of motivational transparency of the internal form of phraseological units is important, because it is this transparency that allows to correlate certain components of the integral meaning of the phraseme with the corresponding lexemes in its composition. However, idioms differ in this sense, having more or less motivational transparency or being opaque because their motivation is either purely conventional or historically obscured.

The analysis of the semantic display of the lexeme Eng. fire at the phraseological level testified that this display is uneven and even selective. Phrase-making activity in the phraseological context of the English language is revealed only by the semantemes “fire, flame” and “making fire”, partially coinciding in terms of their expression of secondary phraseologically related meanings.

Regarding the division of the analyzed phraseological units into nominative and predicative, it should be noted that predicative compounds constitute the main array of the grouping. A common feature for the integral semantics of most of them is the designation of a certain situation, which is distinguished by the feature “nature of effective influence”. As we have seen from the examples, this influence can be constructive and destructive, and this contrast is decisive for the semantic structure of the analyzed group. From a quantitative point of view, phrasemes with the meaning of destructive influence predominate, which gives reason to consider this contrast as a privative one, and phrasemes with the meaning of constructive influence as a marked (by virtue of a smaller number) member of this privative correlation.

It is worth to mention that in many phrasemes, fire is depicted as a source and even a subject of destructive actions aimed at a person and his environment; but such a source may often not be specified precisely as fire, but instead appears precisely as “something unspecified (generalized) and dangerous”. Much less often, fire appears as a source or tool of constructive influence.

The situations described in idioms almost always relate to a person in one way or another, to his relationships with the environment in which he exists.

Key words: semanteme, polysemy, set phrase, structure, frame, inner form, key lexical component, sense development.

У нашій статті ми зосередили увагу на особливостях смислового відображення полісемантичної лексеми англ. *fire* у фразеологічному контексті і на відображенні цього розвитку в цілісній семантичній структурі фразеологічного угруповання з відповідним ключовим компонентом у вигляді фрейму, визначального для інтерпретації концепту FIRE на фразеологічному рівні. Під фразеологічним контекстом ми розуміємо як внутрішню структуру окремо взятих фразеологізмів, так і цілісну структуру відповідних фразеологічних угруповань. Дослідивши фраземи ідіоматичного характеру, ми з'ясували, чи становить сукупність фразеологічних одиниць зі згаданою лексемою як їхньою ключовою одиницею системно організованим цілим і роль лексеми англ. *fire* у структуруванні відповідного фразеологічного

угруповання. Ми також спробували визначити, чи може досліджувана нами лексема набувати фразеологічно пов'язаного значення, чи, вживаючись у складі фразеологізмів, вона просто реалізує свою систему значень, властиву їй як одиниці лексико-семантичної системи і подану в тлумачних словниках. Наш аналіз був спрямований на повніше висвітлення змісту концепту FIRE і його семіотико-модельний потенціал.

У нашій статті ми з'ясуємо як конкретно значення слова англ. *fire* впливають на загальний зміст фразем, до складу яких входить це слово. У цьому плані важить ступінь мотиваційної прозорості внутрішньої форми фразеологічних сполук, адже саме ця прозорість дозволяє співвіднести ті чи інші компоненти цілісного значення фраземи з відповідними лексемами в її складі. Проте ідіоматичні фраземи відрізняються у цьому сенсі, маючи більшу чи меншу мотиваційну прозорість або ж і будучи непрозорими тому, що їх мотивація є або суто умовною, або історично затемненою.

Аналіз смислового відображення лексеми англ. *fire* на фразеологічному рівні засвідчив, що це відображення є нерівномірним і навіть вибіркоким. Фразеотворчу активність у фразеологічному контексті англійської мови виявляють лише семантими «вогнь, полум'я» і «ведення вогню», частково збігаючись і в плані вираження ними вторинних фразеологічно пов'язаних значень.

Щодо поділу аналізованих нами фразем на номінативні і предикативні, слід зауважити, що предикативні сполуки становлять основний масив угруповання. Спільною рисою для цілісної семантики більшості з них є позначення певної ситуації, що розрізняється за допомогою ознаки «характер результативного впливу». Як ми бачили з прикладів, цей вплив може бути конструктивним і деструктивним, і саме це протиставлення є визначальним для семантичної структури аналізованого угруповання. У кількісному плані переважають фраземи, у яких ідеться про деструктивний вплив, що дає підставу розглядати це протиставлення як привативне, а фраземи із значенням конструктивного впливу – як маркований (за ознакою меншої чисельності) член цієї привативної кореляції.

Варто зазначити, що в багатьох фраземах вогнь зображується як джерело й навіть суб'єкт деструктивних дій, спрямованих на людину та середовище її існування; але таке джерело часто може й не конкретизуватись саме як вогнь, натомість виступаючи саме як «щось неконкретизоване (узагальнене) й небезпечне». Значно рідше вогнь фігурує як джерело чи інструмент конструктивного впливу.

Ситуації, описані у фраземах, практично завжди в той чи інший спосіб стосуються людини, її зв'язків з оточенням, у якому вона існує.

Ключові слова: семантика, багатозначність, фразема, структура, фрейм, внутрішня форма, ключове слово, смисловий розвиток.

Problem and task setting. In our article we focused on the research of the peculiarities of the semantic display of the polysemantic lexeme Eng. *fire* in the phraseological context, by which we understand both the internal structure of individual phraseological units and the integral structure of the corresponding phraseological groups. Accordingly, we set ourselves the following tasks: 1) to establish the peculiarities of the display of lexical polysemy of the key lexeme Eng. *fire* in phraseological context; 2) to find out whether the set of phraseological units with the mentioned lexeme as their key unit constitutes a systematically organized whole; 3) in case of a positive answer to the second question, to determine the role of the lexeme of Eng. *fire* in the structuring of the corresponding phraseological group. We will also try to determine whether the lexeme we are studying can acquire a phraseologically related meaning, or, when used as part of phraseological units, it simply implements its system of meanings, inherent to it as a unit of the lexical-semantic system and presented in explanatory dictionaries.

The aim of the paper. The research of functioning of the lexeme Eng. *fire* from this point of view is relevant, as our analysis will help to more fully illuminate the meaning of the FIRE concept and its semiotic-model potential. In general linguistics this analysis is of interest for the development of the problem of the nature of the semantic representation of polysemous lexical units at the phraseological level.

Thus, we have to find out how specifically the meaning of the lexeme Eng. *fire* affect the general meaning of the phraseological unit that includes it. In this regard, the degree of motivational transparency of the internal form of phraseological compounds is important, because this transparency allows to correlate certain components of the integral meaning of the phraseological unit with the corresponding lexemes in its composition. However, idiomatic phrases can differ in this sense, having more or less motivational transparency, or being opaque because their motivation is either purely conventional or historically obscured.

Analysis of recent scientific papers. Lexemes for designation of high-temperature processes and phenomena in various aspects of their manifestation and taking into account the peculiarities of different languages are studied by such linguists as T.O. Chernysh, I.V. Besedovska, N.V. Batryn, Y.V. Bechko, [1; 2; 3; 4; 5; 6]. The object of our research is idiomatic phrases, as well as comparative phrases and proverbs (due to their inherent figurative and expressive nature).

Main material presenting. We start with the examples in which the lexeme Eng. *fire* is used in its original, literal meaning, it denotes *fire*, taken in terms of its various properties (sometimes these phrases can be interpreted in another, in particular generalized sense), e.g.: *fire and water are good servants, but bad masters* [7, p. 78]; *the fire which lights (warms) us*

at a distance will burn us when near [7, p. 78] (in a broader sense, this proverb can mean “everything is good in moderation”); also see comparative phrases: *get on like a house on fire (afire)* [7, p. 77]; *as red as fire* [7, p. 84]; *burn like fire* [7, p. 77]; *like a forest fire (like wild fire)* [7, p. 78].

We established that the lexeme Eng. *fire* occurs in both nominative and predicative compounds. The analysis of the previous phraseological units showed that the lexeme Eng. *fire* here does not mean fire itself, but fire-like phenomena and material objects related to it in a certain way, compare with: *Hermes' (St. Elmo's) fire* [7, p. 78], *fires of heaven (heavenly fires)* poetic “stars” [7, p. 78], *fire and brimstone* [7, p. 78] and *the fires of hell* – metonymic designations of “fiery Gehenna” [7, p. 78] (the first expression is also used as a swear word – as noted by L.O. Pavlovska, for the lexemes denoting fire, their use in formulas expressing a bad attitude towards the addressee is typical, but they are absent in formulas with a benevolent meaning [8, p. 8]). Here we will include St. Anthony's fire “*beshykh*” [7, p. 78], as well as the names of strong alcoholic beverages: *liquid fire* [7, p. 78] and *fire water* [7, p. 77]. It is interesting to note that in the last two examples, “fire” as a motivational feature emphasizes the burning tactile sensation of the drink, unlike such names as Eng. *brandy* or Ukr. *horilka* the internal shape of which is related to the thermal processes of making the corresponding drinks [1, p. 80].

We also identified such nominative compounds in which the lexeme Eng. *fire* is used in a figurative sense associated with positive phenomena of the spiritual sphere (enthusiasm, unquenchable desire to achieve a high and noble goal, inspiration), for example: *sacred fire* [9, p. 652], *Promethean fire* [9, p. 279]. Instead, the phraseological unit to indicate excitement and enthusiasm, Eng. *fire and fury* is quite ambiguous regarding the semantics of the internal form, since the name of fire can independently indicate elevated emotional and affective states, and such use is usual for it [9, p. 652].

In the composition of predicative idiomatic compounds, the lexeme Eng. *fire* in its basic, literal semantic version expresses a fairly wide range of derived meanings. The most common of them is “a source of intense destructive, mainly negative, but not always physical influence”: *a burnt child dreads the fire* [9, p. 277]; *a small fire is quickly trodden out* [9, p. 516]; *pull smb's chestnuts out of the fire* [7, p. 145]; *put the fat to the fire* [9, p. 264]; *play with fire* [7, p. 114]; *between two fires* [9, p. 277]; *put one's finger in the fire* [9, p. 276]; *heap coals of fire on smb's head* [7, p. 157]; *fire and sword*

[9, p. 321]; *go through fire and water* [9, p. 432]; *a brand from (out of) the fire* [9, p. 279]; *drive out fire with fire* [9, p. 277]; *out of the frying pan into the fire* [9, p. 301]; *pull (snatch) smb (smth.) out of the fire* [9, p. 279]; *strike fire* [9, p. 279]; *breathe fire* [9, p. 278]. Among the specified phraseological units there are examples used to express interpersonal relations of a negative nature (*breathe fire* [7, p. 78]). In such cases, the semantics of fire serves to express a destructive influence, which has two aspects: external, which refers to the expression of a negative attitude, and, of course, emotional, which is the motivator of the external manifestation of this or that negative attitude.

It is interesting to note the examples where the lexeme Eng. *fire* expresses a destructive influence, the result of which, however, gives positive consequences, as, for example, in biblicalism *heap coals of fire on smb's head* “to embarrass someone”, which appears in the Old (Parables, 25: 21–22) and New (Essay of St. Paul to the Romans, 12: 20) Testaments (pop.: *If thine enemy be hungry, give him bread to eat; and if he be thirsty, give him water to drink: For thou shalt heap coals of fire upon his head, and the LORD shall reward thee* [10, p. 675–676]); compare also *drive out (fight) fire with fire*. The fact is that a destructive force can be directed to fight something negative (also destructive in nature), then it acts as something positive; it can be said that the “minus for minus gives plus” scheme works here.

In addition to the destructive meaning, in predicative compounds the studied lexeme Eng. *fire* is also used, although less often, in the meaning “purposeful effective constructive activity”. Such activity is mostly evaluated positively, e.g.: *on the fire* [7, p. 79] (in contrast to the compound *on fire* “very attractive, erotic”, this phrase means “in work, in the process of becoming”); *(not) set the Thames / the world on fire* [7, p. 79]; *have many irons in the fire* [9, p. 411]; *keep the home fires burning* [9, p. 278].

This enantiosemy of the word Eng. *fire* in the phraseological context can be compared with the already mentioned proverbs, which represent fire as a source of ambivalent influence, that is, as an element whose action can produce both positive and negative results (Eng. *the fire which lights (warms) us at a distance will burn us when near; fire and water are good servants, but bad masters* [9, p. 411]).

The opposition of destructive and constructive influence is neutralized in the context of the proverb Eng. *there is no smoke without fire* [11, p. 939], where *fire* functions as a figurative symbol of effective action as such, regardless of the nature of its consequences.

Another meaning of the studied lexeme Eng. *fire* in predicative idiomatic phrases is “intensifying positive influence on a person, on his actions and psyche”: Eng. *build (light) a fire under smb* [9, p. 277]; *where is the fire?* [9, p. 279]. It should be noted that the source of such influence can be either another person (in the first example) or a certain material reason (in the second).

In a separate group, we put phraseological units in which lexeme Eng. *fire* is used to indicate such an internal factor influencing human behavior, which is the internal emotional and affective states of this person. Therefore, fire is interpreted here as passion, inspiration, excitement, energy, initiative: Eng. *a fire in the blood* [7, p. 78]; *full of bush fire* [7, p. 278]; *a ball of fire* [7, p. 62]; *fire in one's belly* [9, p. 597]; *on fire* [12, p. 264]. Thus, the semanteme “fire” in its secondary idiomatic application shows a connection both with the realm of emotional-affective semantics and, in general, with the semantic sphere associated with the internal, mental characteristics of a person.

In the idiomatic set phrase Eng. *be on fire* [9, p. 597], the lexeme Eng. *fire* acquires the meaning “painful, unpleasant sensations associated with a pathological, painful condition, in particular with high temperature, fever”: (compare also the already mentioned English names of absinthe and alcohol drinks, similarly motivated by the semantics of unpleasant somatic sensations).

Having established the given meanings, we can state that the feature common to all of them is the expression of a certain influence (destructive or constructive, negative or positive), as a result of which its object leaves its usual state.

As for other, secondary semantic varieties of the noun Eng. *fire* (as already mentioned, they have meanings that express emotional experiences, namely inspiration, passion, ardor, e.g.: Eng. *a fire in the blood*; *full of bush fire*; *a ball of fire*; *on fire*, painful bodily sensations and conditions, including pain, increased body temperature, heat, fever: *be on fire*; *St. Anthony's fire*, and also the lexeme Eng. *fire* is actively used in the military sphere to denote shooting (fire)), our analysis showed that the phraseological activity, although much less and semantically limited, is revealed only by the semanteme “firing, firing a firearm”. This meaning is reproduced in the internal form of phraseological units in an indirect way, as a result of which its reflection at the level of a complete, “superficial” phraseological meaning is reduced, as far as can be judged, to two types already established in relation to the semanteme “fire”: 1) “a source of intense destructive (and mainly negative) influence” (and this source acts in the field

of interpersonal relations): Eng. *come under fire* [9, p. 597]; *unde running fire* [9, p. 279]; *direct one's fire against* [9, p. 277]; *r fire* [9, p. 279]; *open fire* [9, p. 279]; *stand fire* [9, p. 279]; *draw fire from smb (upon oneself)* [7, p. 77]; *baptism of fire* [7, p. 64]; *in the line of fire* [7, p. 199]; 2) “purposeful, effective (and positively evaluated) activity” (and in general it refers to certain negative points in the implementation of such activity): Eng. *hang fire* [9, p. 78]; *hold (one's) fire* [9, p. 78]; *miss fire* [9, p. 79].

Conclusions. Thus, the analysis of the semantic representation of the lexeme Eng. *fire* at the phraseological level testified that this display is uneven and even selective. Phrase-making activity in the phraseological context of the English language is revealed only by the semantemes “fire, flame” and “making fire”, partially coinciding in terms of their expression of secondary phraseologically related meanings.

Returning to the division of the analyzed phraseological units into nominative and predicative, it should be noted that predicative compounds constitute the main array of the phraseological group. A common feature for the integral semantics of most of them is the designation of a certain situation, distinguished by a feature “the nature of effective influence”. As we have seen from the examples, this influence can be constructive and destructive, and this contrast is decisive for the semantic structure of the analyzed phraseological group. From a quantitative point of view, phrasemes with the meaning of destructive influence predominate, which gives reason to consider this contrast as a private one, and phrasemes with the meaning of constructive influence as a marked (on the basis of smaller number) member of this private correlation.

Summarizing all of the above, it is worth noting that in many phraseological units, fire is depicted as a source and even a subject of destructive actions aimed at a person and his environment; but such source often may not be specified precisely as fire, but instead appears precisely as “something unspecified (generalized) and dangerous”. Much less often, fire appears as a source or tool of constructive influence.

The situations described in idioms almost always relate to a person in one way or another, to his relationships with the environment in which this person exists, including with other people. Accordingly, the subject and/or object of said generalized or specifically “fiery” destructive influence is often the person himself. Much less often interpersonal relations have a constructive character.

Therefore, fire is understood in phraseological units as a natural phenomenon, closely and

ambivalently connected with human existence. This understanding is reflected in the fact that for phraseological units with the corresponding key lexeme Eng. *fire* there is the defining frame, which includes, as its main component, an intensive productive action differentiated by the characteristic of “constructiveness/destructiveness”, with which such semantic components of the frame as “person”, “fire” and “source of dangerous influence” are correlated.

The prospects for further research. Continuation of studies in this direction includes the involvement in

the analysis of other words, semantically more or less closely related to the noun Eng. *fire*, in particular we must involve lexemes for the designation of various thermal objects, processes, and features, as well as the use of lexical and phraseological material of other languages. As a result, all these studies should deepen our ideas about the role and place of concepts related to the designation of fire and other high-temperature phenomena in the linguistic picture of the world, taken in its universal and concrete, ethno-cultural and cultural-historical features.

REFERENCES:

1. Черниш Т. О. Морфологічні та семантичні особливості відображення іє. **gı̄her-* / *gı̄hor-* «горіти» у дієслівних континуантах псл. **gorēti* / **goriti* / **garati*. *Мовознавство*. 2015. № 3. С. 77–87.
2. Черниш Т. О. Слова на позначення високої температури (на матеріалі української та польської мов). *Польсько-український бюлетень : Київські полоністичні студії*. К., 2010. Т. 16. С. 482–495.
3. Беседовська І. В. Семантична природа сенсорних прикметників на позначення температури в сучасній українській літературній мові (на матеріалі поетичних творів Лесі Українки). *Вісн. Житомир. держ. ун-ту ім. І. Франка*. 2009. № 46. С. 162–165.
4. Батрин Н. В. Інваріантні значення і типові смисли англійських прикметників семантичного поля температурної ознаки : автореф. дис ... канд. філол. наук : 10.02.04. Львівський нац. ун-т ім. І. Франка. Львів, 2003. 19 с.
5. Бечко Я. В. Смысловый розвиток ад'єктива термічної семантики нім. *heiß* у контексті внутрішньої форми фразем. *Науковий журнал. Закарпатські філологічні студії*. Випуск 21. Ужгородський національний університет, 2022. С. 187–190.
6. Бечко Я. В. Роль конотативно-асоціативних рис найменувань вогню фразеологічному контексті. *Науковий журнал. Закарпатські філологічні студії*. Випуск 27. Том 1. Ужгородський національний університет, 2023. С. 130–135.
7. Longman Dictionary of English Idioms / edited by Thomas Hill Long. Harlow: Longman, 1979. 387 p.
8. Павловська Л. О. Вербальні формули побажань у різноструктурних мовах: прагмасемантичний і лінгвокультурний аспекти: автореф. дис ... канд. філол. наук : 10.02.17. Рівненський інститут слов'янознавства Київського славістичного. Рівне, 2009. 18 с.
9. Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English. Harlow: Pearson, 2003. – 1949 p.
10. The Holy Bible containing Old and New Testament translated out of the original tongues and with the former translations diligently compared and revised by His Majesty's special command. Authorized King James version. – London: Trinitarian Bible Society; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, s.a. 1235 p.
11. Баранцев К. Т. Англо-український фразеологічний словник. К.: Рад. школа, 1969. 1052 с.
12. Spears R. A. Dictionary of American Slang. Lincolnwood, Ill.: NTC, 1991. 528 p.