

УДК 81'37

THE LEXEME “FIRE” AS A COMPONENT OF SET EXPRESSIONS IN DIFFERENT EUROPEAN LANGUAGES

I.V. Chekulai, O.N. Prokhorova (Belgorod, Russia)

The article deals with the semantic and pragmatic characteristic features of functioning of the phraseological units containing the lexical units that represent the structure of knowledge FIRE in different European languages. The research was performed according to the principles of the comparative approach. It was cleared out in the result of the investigation that the set expressions under analysis possess rather homogeneous structural, functional, semantic and pragmatic characteristic features in the languages under research.

Key words: comparative approach, evaluation, lexeme, set expression, value.

Чекулай І.В., Прохорова О.М. Лексема “вогнь” як компонент фразеологічних одиниць у різних європейських мовах. У статті розглянуто семантичні та прагматичні аспекти функціонування фразеологічних одиниць, до складу яких в якості компонента входять лексеми, що передають структуру знання ВОГОНЬ, у різних європейських мовах. Дослідження виконано з позицій порівняльно-зіставлювального підходу. Внаслідок дослідження було з'ясовано, що досліджені фразеологічні мають достатньо гомогенні структурні, функціонально-семантичні та прагматичні характеристики у досліджених мовах.

Ключові слова: лексема, порівняльно-зіставлювальний підхід, оцінка, фразеологічна одиниця, цінність.

Чекулай И.В., Прохорова О.Н. Лексема “огонь” как компонент фразеологических единиц в различных европейских языках. В статье рассматриваются семантические и прагматические аспекты функционирования фразеологических единиц, в состав которых в качестве компонента входят лексемы, передающие структуру знания ОГОНЬ, в различных европейских языках. Исследование выполнено в сравнительно-сопоставительном ракурсе. В результате исследования было выяснено, что исследуемые фразеологические единицы обладают достаточно гомогенными структурными, функционально-семантическими и прагматическими характеристиками в исследуемых языках.

Ключевые слова: лексема, оценка, сравнительно-сопоставительный подход, фразеологическая единица, ценность.

Introduction.

We live in a material world and are highly dependent on the natural surrounding conditions. We have so much got used to things which our life depends on that we rarely pay attention to them in our everyday activity. But their objective nature demands us from time to time to pay attention to them if not with definite actions but at least in everyday speech structures as a result of transforming our comprehension of these phenomena in our mind. In particular, one of the most convenient forms of such comprehension is represented by the existence of phraseological system in any language which stores the most necessary notions to be used in everyday situations of communication. The actual

character of studying such phenomena on the material of different languages is important to find out whether the basic knowledge and language means to storage such knowledge in the form of language structures is evident.

The main goal of such an investigation is to trace down the main mechanisms and factors determining the congruence of forming such set expressions within different languages in order to see whether they differ much in different systems of representation the actual knowledge of surrounding material, rational and emotional world and thus to define both integral and differential characteristics of such systems.

One of such necessary and important things is fire. According to this, the object of the present investigations

is the set expressions of different European languages which have the nomination of fire as their constitutive parts. The subject matter is predetermined by its object and consists in a comparative semantic study of the structural and functional characteristics of such set expressions.

The material for the investigation was taken from the phraseological dictionaries of different European languages and was verified with the examples of different well-known writers writing in these languages.

The Extra-Linguistic Grounds for the Investigation.

“Women, Fire and Dangerous Things” is one of the most prominent books in the sphere of the cognitive approach to the study of linguistic phenomena in general, and in the domain of philosophical and linguistic concept study, in particular. One of these words, and namely, fire, has caught our attention. And if one undertakes its semantic study on some unbiased basis, it will be rather easy to clear out that this particular quantum of content, this special knowledge structure which semiotically can be expressed as “fire” is no less interesting than the gender structure of knowledge mentioned in the above-said book by George Lakoff [3].

So, fire is one of the dangerous things, no less dangerous than sharks and women. At least, that’s how E.Rosh represents a certain meaningful category of thinking in one of the minor languages of Oceania. Together with the rest of the representatives of that particular category it represents some dangerous quality. But everybody also knows that no human being can exist without fire.

Generally speaking, there are a lot of things which are both dangerous and necessary. One can bring a doctor to a dying person in the car and thus save this person from the inevitable (in the case of the lack of qualified medical help) death, and one can run somebody into death with that very car. One may use a computer to publish a scientific work, and that very computer may be used to print an anonymous letter blemishing an innocent person. We cannot do without a knife to prepare food and one can apply it to kill a person. Moreover, there are things which are both

dangerous and necessary to our life. For instance, everybody knows about the dangerous radiation emitted by mobile phones, but knowing that no person refuses a mobile phone as a necessary means of remote communication in the modern condition. It means that many objects which are our everyday helpers and necessary attributes are at the same time considered as unconditionally dangerous.

FIRE occupies a special place among these “useful and dangerous” notions. First of all, it is one of the four main elements that constitute our world according to the world-outlook of the ancient people. Even the ancient philosophers shared this point of view. The first scientist to develop the theory of the four elements was the ancient Greek philosopher Empedocles who considered the viewed elements of material nature and moving the material because of the interaction of the two antagonistic qualities of Love and Hatred. Later on the idea was developed by such well-known philosophers as Aristotle and Plato. Plato in particular considered these initial elements the basis of the existence and to be apt to change into each other. Aristotle shared this point of view in general and considered each element the combination of certain basis qualities. In particular, warmth and dryness constitute fire, warmth and humidity – air, coldness and humidity – water, coldness and dryness – earth.

Modern science transformed these pseudo-materialistic views into the doctrine of the four main states of the aggregation of matter. Earth corresponds to solid matter, water – to liquid, air – to gaseous and fire is the specimen of plasma. Besides, the four main states of aggregation of matter correspond to such notions of the natural science as the lithosphere, hydrosphere, atmosphere and magnetosphere [ru.wikipedia.org/wiki/Стихия].

Besides, from the objective point of view FIRE is the main source of any energy without which a human being cannot exist. We warm our houses by combustion of certain kinds of fuels and cook food likewise, and fire is the main representation and result of such combustion. The fire produced by the Sun is the main source of energy used naturally and artificially on the Earth, and thus fire becomes the main universal

condition providing the existence of the planet Earth itself, its nature and living matter. And, respectively, the structure of knowledge representing this particular state of aggregation of matter is reflected in the linguistic signs in every language of the world.

The Theoretical Foundations of the Investigation.

We use the term “the structure of knowledge” instead of the usual in such occasions term “concept” deliberately. The associations of different representatives of the European languages connected with the linguistic sign of “fire” are too ambiguous to denote the certain state of matter. It means that, on the one hand, the problem of the concept as a universal term denoting an important domain of human knowledge has been lately given different interpretations, and, instead of clearing up the actual truth concerning this term, in many cases it has been even more obscured by some brisk and in many cases shallow interpretations of its essence. On the other hand, the empirical domain FIRE is somewhat larger than merely a language substitute of one of the states of aggregation of matter. Such associations can be divided into two main groups: “fire as a certain kind of the matter” and “fire as an associative and psychological phenomenon”. It goes without saying that the basis for such a differentiation is of metaphorical nature, where the first represents the source-domain, and the second – the target-domain. Both associative complexes are far from being clearly outlined, and, while making this as a starting point of the following analysis, one may conditionally view them as two different concepts. But to what extent are they different? Should they be treated as the different conceptual entities or the further analysis of these associative complexes may reveal some other particular structures of knowledge which may be defined as “concepts”?

All this requires a thorough complex analysis of speech usage of the lexemes *огонь, вогонь, агонь, oheň, fire, Feyer, feu, fuego, fuoco, tuli, 火* reflecting certain structures of knowledge connected with the main source of world energy within the associative and imaginative sphere of thinking.

The Definition Analysis of the Componential Lexeme.

The analysis of different dictionaries' entries shows that they differ in the respect of their initial interpretations of that structure of knowledge. For instance, the initial meaning of these and semantically correlated words in the Wikipedia online Dictionary of the Russian Language gives us the following: “совокупность раскалённых газов и плазмы, выделяющихся в результате: произвольного/непроизвольного нагревания горючего материала до определённой точки; химической реакции; соприкосновения тока высокого напряжения с горючим материалом. Огонь является основной фазой процесса горения и имеет свойство к самораспространению по затронутым им другим горючим материалам” [ru.wikipedia.org/wiki/Огонь]. The MacMillan Online Dictionary suggests the following: “1. [COUNTABLE/UNCOUNTABLE] flames and heat from something that is burning in an uncontrolled way, e.g. *The school was badly damaged by fire. Three children died in a fire at their home last night; be destroyed by fire: The theatre was completely destroyed by fire; start a fire: It is thought that local youths may have started the fire* [www.macmillandictionary.com/british/fire].

It can be clearly seen that the main discrepancy of these two semantic descriptions consists not only in the more comprehensive Russian definition. The English dictionary lays an emphasis on the general uncontrolled action of fire whereas the Russian explanation tends to be more objective and academic.

Let us consider the other meanings of the word “fire” in the English dictionary:

- “... 2. [COUNTABLE] a small pile of burning wood, coal etc that you make in order to produce heat, e.g. *a coal fire; make/build a fire: We went off to collect wood to build a fire; light a fire: Once the fire was lit, the room seemed more inviting; a blazing/roaring fire: We sat in front of a blazing log fire.* 3. [COUNTABLE] BRITISH a piece of equipment that uses electricity or gas to heat a room: an electric/gas fire: There was an old gas fire in the bedroom. 4. [UNCOUNTABLE] shots from a gun: *We heard a*

sudden loud burst of machine gun fire...
5. [UNCOUNTABLE] FORMAL strong feelings such as anger or enthusiasm: *His words were full of fire and passion*"[www.macmillandictionary.com/british/fire].

This description shows us that the prototypical apprehension of the fire for the majority of people is connected with the plasma tongues of bright orange-yellow colour winding upstairs and disappearing immediately, as in a stove or a burned heap of wood or dry grass in the open air. At the same time, for many average city inhabitants fire is associated primarily with the proportioned small tongues of intense blue colour of a standard kitchen natural-gas burner or a cigarette lighter. For those involved in the sphere of metallurgy these are long tongues of bright straw-yellow colour. All these states of fire which otherwise can also be called *flame/пламя* are characterized with a high (no less than 300° Centigrade) temperature, a definite product of combustion (visible or invisible smoke), a certain burned material and so on.

The indirect meaning of the lexemes representing fire and flame in different languages is primarily associated with actions done in accordance with a person's will or involuntarily but in a certain way reflecting his or her world outlook, devotions, beliefs, convictions, presumptions. All this is produced not by some outer impact but in accordance with the soul's inclination at the moment.

It is this particular meaning that produces different peculiar senses often expressed in the form of set expressions, sayings, proverbs, – in a word, by idiomatic means of a language, by its phraseological resources.

The Comparative Analysis of Functioning the Object of Investigation.

Let us view some actual specimen of using this structure of knowledge within the set-expressions of some European languages. But first we would rather make some general considerations that empirically unite the total number of the idioms investigated. First of all, it is a high degree of variability of the set-expressions where the structure of knowledge denoting FIRE is a source-domain of a general meaning of an idiom, as well as of the other set-expressions which

have such lexical meaningful components of different languages that correspond to such English words as *fire, flame, burn, scorch* and the like.

We would like to begin with the material of the Russian language as the native language of the authors of the present article. Such words as *огонь* or *огонёк/огоньки* as denoting the state of outer manifestation or inner experience of different feelings or emotions often testify to their strong degree or a strong emotion by itself. Their language variability in such cases is primarily predetermined by their outer manifestations. And in the absolute majority of these cases such manifestations are those of a facial expressions, the eyes being the most expressive facial organ of these expressions. This particular extra-linguistic phenomenon explains the fact that the most recurrent model of the idiomatic use of the lexeme ОГОНЬ are the lexemes expressing the notions connected with eyes proper, their pupils, peculiarities of a glance and the like, as well as the emotional semantic features, the phenomenon being intrinsic to all the languages investigated. Here are the particular examples:

– *Пики к бою, шапки вон, баклановцы!.. – Тут голос его внезапно крепчает, мерклые зрачки блестят и загораются белым, загашенным старостью огнем*

(М.А. Шолохов. Тихий Дон).

Проход задышался от слов, от мыслей, от бурных ударов сердца, его глаза горели страшным огнем внутренней силы и раскрывавшегося в душе ужаса

(В. Шишков. Угрюм-река).

При цих словах Дарини Найда поблід і замовк, неспроможний погамувати шалене биття серця: груди його високо підіймалися, очі загорілись вогнем

(М. Старицький. Останні орли).

The yawning, shaking, peevish figure of the mother, with her eyes raised to confront the proud erect form of the daughter, whose glance of fire was bent downward upon her, had a conscious air upon it, that no levity or temper could conceal

(Ch. Dickens. Dombey and Son).

It should be admitted that the scope of feelings and emotions expressed with eyes cannot be reduced to any particular axiological preferences. They may be both of emphatic character and of a mere expression of hatred, anger etc., for instance:

Победа была, должно быть, действительно очень крупная, потому что Ревизанов был заметно возбужден, и в синих глазах его еще не угасли огоньки, зажженные удовольствием борьбы и злорадством успеха

(А.В. Амфитеатров. Отравленная совесть).
Григорий в упор поглядел Аксинье в глаза, увидел, как вспыхнули они балованным отчаянным огоньком

(М.А. Шолохов. Тихий Дон).

– Ти можеш катувать мене, бо я тепер у твоїй владі, а ганьбити не смій, – відповів Гонта похмуро, і в очах його блиснув недобрый вогник

(М. Старицький. Останні орли).

Голос Залізняка зазвучав глухо й грізно, а очі його, в червоному відблиску, що наповнив хату, спалахнули лиховісним вогнем (Ibid.).
The only sign of Sollozzo's disappointment was a quick flickering of his eyes around the room, as if he hoped Hagen or Sonny would speak in his support

(M. Puzo. The Godfather).

It is rather easy to notice that the presented above examples describe emotions associated as antagonistic, and it is expressed with such words as *борьба*, *злорадство успеха*, *балованный*, *отчаянный*, *недобрый*, *лиховісний*, *disappointment*. Besides, there exist cases when the definite peculiarities of any look contain some vague emotion, for example:

Иван Алексеевич, покуривая, глядел на Митьку, а у того в кошачьих зрачках толпились огоньки, и нельзя было понять – смеются зеленые его глаза или дымятся несытой злобой

(М.А. Шолохов. Тихий Дон).

These examples show that structurally isomorphic set-expressions may denote quite polar emotional or evaluative attitude. This does not seem surprising because we usually allot idioms with some shade of

evaluative meaning. But actually it is not evaluative but value meaning. This statement needs some additional explanation. According to the basic theses of the axiological theory, that is, the theory of value, values are basic notions, and evaluation, linguistic evaluation in particular, is merely the means of expressing value [1, с. 66]. This value receives a certain evaluative (positive or negative) sign in a certain communicative situation, and thus we speak about either a positive or a negative evaluative attitude. Still, the cases when a clear-cut evaluative sign is hard to be defined due to a special pragmatic pattern of the utterance is impossible, are rather numerous. Moreover, the written practice when an author of a piece of fiction or newspaper article restrains from a definite evaluative accents within his creation intending to arouse a problem situation within a reading society is widespread in modern literature. That is why FIRE should also be treated not as an evaluative but as a value structure of knowledge [4].

Some other components of the set-expressions with FIRE, the actions described in particular, are of interest, too. Let us view some examples of them and compare these examples with those given above:

Управившись, Григорий приходил в людскую. Сотник гасил в глазах недавние огни, угощал его папиросой, уходил

(М.А.Шолохов. Тихий Дон).

Крикливые голоса притихли, огонь в глазах угас, народу вновь предстояло покориться своей прежней доле, изменить которую не в силах оказалась и пролитая кровь

(В.М. Шишков. Угрюм-река).

Инполит Матвеевич преобразился. Грудь его выгнулась, как Дворцовый мост в Ленинграде, глаза метнули огонь, и из ноздрей, как показалось Остапу, повалил густой дым. Усы медленно стали приподниматься

(И. Ильф, Е. Петров. Двенадцать стульев).

She was small and slight in person; pale, sandy-haired, and with eyes habitually cast down: when they looked up they were very large, odd, and attractive; so attractive that the Reverend Mr. Crisp, fresh from Oxford, and curate to the

Vicar of Chiswick, the Reverend Mr. Flowerdew, fell in love with Miss Sharp; being shot dead by a glance of her eyes which was fired all the way across Chiswick Church from the school-pew to the reading-desk

(W.M. Thackeray. Vanity Fair).

As one can notice, the eyes can “hide”, simply “burn”, “dim”, “die out”, the fire of eyes may “pursuit”, “scorch”, “tease”, the eyes may “throw fire”, “glitter”, “sparkle with” fire and so on. Despite such an ample list of such actions we are apt to consider them the variants of the same phraseological model, as the varied forms of idioms actually express the same structure of knowledge which may in a compressed way be expressed with the word-combination “expression of strong feelings and emotions with eye movements”, and while applied to description of certain emotions, the number of such variations is multiplied manifold. It is due to this particular reason that to “catch”¹ their multitude within a limited space of an entry in a phraseological dictionary.

According to the well-known Russian proverb, “глаза – это зеркало души”. In the case of the phraseological modeling of the concept FIRE this maxim works, so to say, to the full extent. The fire of eyes entails the fire of heart, the fire of soul, the fire of those strong feelings and emotions that overflow a person. That is why the list of the variants representing the general metaphoric model “strong feelings and emotions → fire” may be doubtless be enriched with the set expressions the components of which are not directly connected with the semantic characteristic features of a glance, eye expression etc and describe such feelings and emotions on the basis of subjective state of a certain person. It goes without saying that “eyes” and “soul, thought, inner state” constitute the metonymical relations, or, to be more exact, the relations of synecdoche. Such cases of reinterpretation of the object of description can be found in all the languages investigated. For example:

Наталья, услышав от Дуняшки о смерти Григория, выбежала на баз. “Руки наложу!

¹ Here we mean the allusion on the well-known maxim expressed by E.S.Kubrjakova in the following way: “Значение – это концепт, схваченный знаком” [2, с. 92].

Все теперь мне! Скорей!” – знала ее, огнем хлестала мысль (М.А. Шолохов. Тихий Дон). Хотя он, и не знал, что не за горами время, когда весь мир встряхнется от грома пушек и это великое побоище родит его родине свободу, но в глубине его сердца горел неугасимый огонь ожидания этой свободы, этого преобразования всей жизни русской, когда не будет ни Прохоров Громовых, ни жандармских ротмистров, ни удалых шаек, поднимающих бунт против не правды, ни этих трогательно жалких старцев-пустынников, бежавших к лесным зверям от людей-рабов, людей-гонителей

(В.М. Шишков. Угрюм-река).

*Не хоче батько твого пташиного молока. Не приймає душа. Тільки **вогнем образи** вибурухує вона*

(О. Гончар. Собор).

*Що примусило його відмовитися від славно-го подвигу? Хто вирвав з його серця любов до батьківщини? Хто **погасив полум’я**, яке палахкотіло в ньому?” – ці питання давно мучили дівчину, а тепер з новою непереборною впевненістю точили їй душу*

(М. Старицький. Останні орли).

*Tief verneigte sich Govinda, Tränen liefen, von welchen er nichts wusste, über sein altes Gesicht, **wie ein Feuer brannte das Gefühl der innigsten Liebe, der demütigsten Verehrung in seinem Herzen***

(Hermann Hesse. Siddhartha).

It should be also admitted that there is the English set expression *fire and brimstone* which is polysemic in its content. In its primary meaning it represents an equivalent of the hell-fire but rather often are the cases of its positive usage where a living and brisk character of a person is expressed. These are the particular examples of both cases:

*The minister gave out his text and droned along monotonously through an argument that was so prosy that many a head by and by began to nod and yet it was an argument that dealt in limitless **fire and brimstone** and thinned the predestined*

elect down to a company so small as to be hardly worth the saving

(M. Twain. The Adventures of Tom Sawyer),

НО:

*But Papa was a man of **brimstone and hot fire**, in his mind and in his fists, and was known all over that section of the state as the champion of all the fist fighters*

(Guthrie, Woody. Bound for glory).

Now, it seems quite logical to turn attention to the semantic correspondence of the phraseological units with the lexical component “fire”, “flame”, “Burn” and the like in different European languages. The analysis of such units in these languages shows the general homogeneous character of their formal semantic traces while preserving the high degree of variability mentioned above. But here one must admit that such a phenomenon is a characteristic feature of the languages belonging to a peculiar language group. For instance, the equivalents of the Russian set expression *огнём и мечом* is practically met in all the languages belonging to the Slavonic group, and we have met no corresponding cases in the Germanic languages. Here are the examples of this set expression:

*Тут бы, казалось, самое время вскричать: “**Огнем и мечом!**” – однако же нет. Оказывается, нам всем надлежит всего-навсего использовать все меры воспитательного, идеологического и политического воздействия, основанные на рекомендациях наших педагогов и социологов*

(А. и Б. Стругацкие. Отягощённые злом, или сорок лет спустя).

*... ці дарунки примножувалися власними надбаннями, і монастирі могли б користуватися великими прибутками, коли б неспокійний час, нестримна сваволя шляхти й цілковите беззаконня не позбавляли їх прав і не розоряли раз у раз **вогнем і мечем***

(М. Старицький. Останні орли).

*Nežli podřízli staří Féničané krk nějakému zajatci, sloužili stejně slavné bohoslužby jako o několik tisíc let později nové generace, než táhly na vojnu a hubily své nepřátele **ohném i***

mečem

(J. Hašek. Osudy dobrého vojáka Švejka za světové války).

Another recurrent idiom of the Slavonic languages is the one expressing readiness to venture some dangerous undertaking due to some convictions, love, ideas and the like. Its metaphorical target domain while creating the phraseological model is also represented with the lexical units denoting fire, in particular:

*Ротмистр посмотрит, щелкнет хлыстиком по голенищу, скажет: “Сла-авно!” Вася даже грудь выпячивает от горделивой радости. С ротмистром Соломиным **хоть в огонь**. Вся молодежь от него без ума. Храбрый офицер* (Б. Ясенский. Я гжу Париж).
*“Přeji si, abyste mluvil vždy pravdu a vykonával bez reptání všechny mé rozkazy. Jestli řeknu: **,Skočte do ohně, tak do toho ohně musíte skočit, i kdyby se vám nechtělo**”*

(J. Hašek. Osudy dobrého vojáka Švejka za světové války”).

To admit the actual state of things, one should mention the similar case in French:

*“... et Dieu sait si je suis prêt a me **jeter dans le feu pour vous**”*

(A. Dumas. Les trois mousquetaires).

There are also peculiar set expressions (at least, those with the “fiery” components) which are met in a particular language only, or, at least, within a certain language sub-group. Here we would like to point to the idioms of the east-Slavonic languages denoting different value ideas.

The Russian idiom *из огня да в полымя* meaning getting from a bad situation into an even worse one has no corresponding English variant and perhaps is influenced by the peculiarity of the East-Slavonic peculiarity of the world perception, e.g.

После этого разговоры приутихли. Долго баюкалась в красных вагонах дремотная тишина.

*– **Из огня да в полымя!** – высказал долговазый Борщев общую для большинства мысль* (М.А. Шолохов. Тихий Дон).

We must admit that actually there exists the full equivalent of this particular set-expression in the

Ukrainian language (*з вогню та в полум'я*) but we failed to find such equivalents in the rest of the languages investigated. The same should be said about the following idioms as well:

– *Умеете ли вы стрелять из ружья?*

– *Оборони бог-с... Как огня боюсь... Когда Прохор Петрович производит выстрелы на охоте, я затыкаю уши. Например, вчера...*

(В.М. Шишков. Угрюм-река):

– *Плевал я на толпу, – запальчиво сказал Прохор, и мутные от бессонницы глаза его засверкали.*

– *Нет-с, Прохор Петрович, с огнем шутить опасно* (Ibid.).

– *Челобитчики Иван, сын Кадлин, да Михале, сын Оленов, оставьте присутствие, а так как не проходит недели, дабы на заводчика Никиту Демидова не приносили жалоб, то мыслю я: нет дыма без огня*

(Е. Федоров. Каменный Пояс.

Кн. 1. Наследники).

Special attention should be paid to those set expressions with the lexical components representing FIRE as a structure of knowledge which are of allusive character. This is, so to say, some kind of all-human vertical context based on certain facts, legends, fairy-tales, well-known citations from the Bible and other books and the maxims pronounced by some prominent people. As an example, the following international idiom based on the well-known fact of the famous Greek philosopher Diogenes looking for a man with a lantern in a day-light may be brought forth in fiction contexts:

– *Их, шелужинов-то, на базу днём с огнём не сыщешь, – со вздохом сказала Ильинична*

(М.А. Шолохов. Тихий Дон);

– *Галоўнае, яны імчалі амаль бязгучна. Коні, ведаеце, такой старажытнай пароды, якую зараз з агнем не знойдзеш: сапраўдныя палескія дрыганты з падрэзанымі жыламі ля хвастоў*

(У. Караткевіч.

Дзікае палявання караля Стаха).

Conclusion.

Thus, the structure of knowledge which in English is usually represented with the lexeme *fire* as a component

of different set-expressions is widely represented within the phraseological systems of different European languages. This should be attributed to the high value potential of fire as the main means of providing nature and human beings in particular with energy so necessary for life and at the same time highly dangerous while being used recklessly phenomenon of the material world. The investigation shows that the set expressions with the components with the lexemes corresponding to the English word *fire* in most cases appear in the units having not only identical or similar from a semantic point of view structural and componential but functional characteristic features. Surely, there exist peculiar separate phraseological cases of such set expressions inherent to only one or few languages among the enlisted, but they are rare. This standpoint is confirmed with the results of the present investigation in which the corresponding or semantically analogous lexical units of such European languages as Russian, Ukrainian, Byelorussian, Czech, German, English and French were viewed within the set expressions. This fact gives grounds to consider that this phenomenon may be inherent to other languages, that is, such a phenomenon is of international character. Surely, such a conclusion needs confirmation with similar investigations based on the material of other languages belonging to other language groups or families.

LITERATURE

1. Анисимов С.Ф. Введение в аксиологию : учеб. пособие для изучающих философию / С.Ф. Анисимов. – М. : Современные тетради, 2001. – 128 с.
2. Кубрякова Е.С. Концепт / Е.С. Кубрякова, В.З. Демьянков, Ю.Г. Панкрац, Л.Г. Лузина. Краткий словарь когнитивных терминов. – М. : Филологический факультет МГУ им. М.В. Ломоносова, 1997. – 245 с.
3. Лакофф Дж. Женщины, огонь и опасные вещи : что категории языка говорят о мышлении / Дж. Лакофф; пер. с англ. И.Б. Шатуновского. – М. : Языки славян. культуры, 2004. – 792 с. – (Язык. Семиотика. Культура).
4. Чекулай И.В. Функционально-деятельностный подход к изучению принципов оценочной категоризации в современном английском языке : монография / И.В. Чекулай. Федеральное агентство по образованию; Белгородский государственный университет. – Белгород : Изд-во БелГУ, 2006. – 236 с.