

UDC 81'42:811.111

DOI <https://doi.org/10.32782/2522-4077-2026-217-4>

FRAME MODEL OF THE CONCEPT HARMONY

ФРЕЙМОВА МОДЕЛЬ КОНЦЕПТУ HARMONY

Skarlupina Yu. A.,

orcid.org/0000-0002-9710-3844

*Teaching Assistant at the Department of Foreign Languages and Linguodidactics,
Sumy State University*

The article looks into the analysis of the concept HARMONY in the English discourse from the linguosynergetic perspective, according to which a concept is regarded as an open self-developing system. As far as a concept is considered to be a basic component of interpreting the world around, there exists a necessity of determining the mutual impact of language units and cognitive processes. The main focus of the research is on reconstructing the frame model of the concept HARMONY in line with the belonging of its verbalised forms to basic frames, in accordance with the theory of semantic fields. This aim was achieved by analysing the nominative units of the concept, i.e. dictionary definitions of the lexeme “harmony”, collocations extracted from the Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA), as well as idioms and paremias representing this concept. The use of COCA materials was determined by the vast amount of contexts, provided by this Corpus, which provided the ground for classifying the extracted units. At the same time the definitions extracted from 12 monolingual dictionaries gave the opportunity to look into the interconnections between the nominative units belonging to different schemas within the basic frames. Therefore, the above-mentioned nominative units were categorised and affiliated to basic frames, allowing to visualise the systematic and dynamic nature of this concept. The frame model of concept HARMONY built as a result of the present research, contributes to the study of the dynamic character of this concept and its fractal nature, i.e. its openness to change and development while preserving its most essential features in each element of the whole system.

Key words: concept, harmony, frame model, linguo-cognitive processes, corpus linguistics.

У статті проаналізовано концепт HARMONY в англomовному дискурсі з лінгвосинергетичної точки зору, згідно з якою концепт розглядається як відкрита саморозвиваюча система. Оскільки концепт вважається основним компонентом інтерпретації навколишнього світу, існує необхідність визначення взаємного впливу мовних одиниць та когнітивних процесів. Основна увага дослідження зосереджена на реконструкції фреймової моделі концепту «HARMONY» відповідно до належності його вербалізованих форм до базових фреймів, згідно з теорією семантичних полів. Ця мета була досягнута шляхом аналізу номінативних одиниць концепту, тобто словникових визначень лексеми «harmony», словосполучень, отриманих з корпусу сучасної американської англійської мови (COCA), а також ідіом та паремій, що представляють цей концепт. Використання матеріалів COCA було обумовлено великим обсягом контекстів, наданих цим корпусом, що стало основою для класифікації виокремлених одиниць. Водночас визначення, видобуті з 12 одномовних словників, дали змогу дослідити взаємозв'язки між номінативними одиницями, що належать до різних схем у межах базових фреймів. Отже, згадані номінативні одиниці були категоризовані та віднесені до базових фреймів, що дозволило візуалізувати систематичний та динамічний характер цього концепту. Фреймова модель концепту HARMONY, побудована в результаті даного дослідження, сприяє вивченню динамічного характеру цього концепту та його фрактальної природи, тобто його відкритості до змін та розвитку, зберігаючи при цьому найістотніші риси в кожному елементі всієї системи.

Ключові слова: концепт, гармонія, фреймова модель, лінгво-когнітивні процеси, корпусна лінгвістика.

Problem Statement. The idea of seeking and understanding harmony has been relevant throughout the history of human society. It has remained so today, as evidenced by numerous references to it in both linguistic and philosophical studies. The realities of life, both in the past and in the

© Skarlupina Yu. A., 2026



Стаття поширюється на умовах ліцензії відкритого доступу (CC BY 4.0)

present, urge people to focus their self-development on harmonising relationships in all aspects of life, on “restoring harmony in the human-human-nature-society system” [1, p. 26]. Regarding the linguistic perspective, there is a need to identify the mutual influence of language and cognitive structures.

Analysis of recent research and publications. Linguists have been focusing their attention on the frame approach to the conceptual analysis of a language and on reconstructing frame networks as a means of language units research since the middle of the twentieth century, when the term “frame” was used in analysing cognitive structures [2, p. 80]. Back in 1982, Charles J. Fillmore defined a “frame” as “any system of concepts related in such a way that to understand any one of them you have to understand the whole structure in which it fits”, stressing the fact that it plays a role in the description of linguistic meaning [3, p. 111, 119]. This idea is echoed by modern linguists, who highlight the importance of the notion of “frames” for the study of concepts. For instance, M. Poluizhyn sees the main task of a lexicographer in investigating the role and typical circumstances of using frames commonly used for a certain word which verbalises a concept [4, p. 215]. N. Tatsenko stresses the idea that while being considered a type of concept, a frame can also be regarded as a representation of a certain concept [5, p. 107].

One of the most elaborate classifications of frames was introduced by S. Zhabotynska, who points out, in her analysis of conceptual networks, that they are formed by basic propositional schemas, the type of which is determined by their affiliation to one of the five basic (thing, action, possessive, identification and comparative) frames [6, p. 80; 7, p. 19]. As emphasised by A. Uberman, semantic frames form the basis for understanding concepts, since combinations of background data determine both the awareness and subsequent use of the concept [8, p. 186].

As pointed out by researchers, studying lexemes alongside the contexts in which they are used broadens the scope of possibilities for a holistic study of a given phenomenon [9, p. 50]. Therefore, it seems appropriate to use collocations of the lexeme “harmony,” based on the Corpus of Contemporary American English, dictionary definitions, as well as corresponding idioms and paremias to explore the concept of HARMONY from the perspective of basic frame models.

Research aim. This study aims to reconstruct the frame model of the concept HARMONY based on its nominative units in the English discourse. This aim can be achieved by the frame analysis, which enables the reconstruction of the hierarchical structure of a conceptual sphere. The object of the research is the concept of HARMONY in English discourse, viewed from the linguosynergetic perspective. The subject of the research, the peculiarities of this concept’s verbalisation in the English language, is analysed according to the verbalised forms’ affiliation to basic frames and to the principles of frame modelling of the concept’s semantic structure.

The main material of the research. In order to affiliate the concept HARMONY to the basic frames, the following materials of investigation were used:

- the definitions of “harmony” in 12 monolingual dictionaries: Cambridge Dictionary, Dictionary.com, Merriam-Webster Dictionary, Collins Concise English Dictionary, Vocabulary.com, The Free Dictionary, Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English Online, Oxford Learner's Dictionary, The Britannica Dictionary, WordReference Random House Learner's Dictionary of American English, APA Dictionary of Psychology and Oxford Academic;

- idioms and paremias representing this concept;
- 100 collocations (the total number available in the corpus) extracted from the corpus materials, to which certain restrictions were applied, namely: two words before and two words after the lexeme “harmony.” In addition, results demonstrating the repetition of the lexeme “harmony” and its usage in the meaning of a proper noun were removed from the sample, as they do not affect the study’s results.

The identification and analysis of the meanings and forms of linguistic units functioning within discourse, in accordance with basic frames, provide an opportunity to describe both the background, i.e. culturally determined, information and the linguo-cognitive processes involved in the understand-

ing of the concept of HARMONY, and, in this way, to describe the essence of this concept within the English-speaking worldview.

While the definitions of the lexeme ‘harmony’ drawn from various types of English dictionaries make it possible to identify the logical predicates of the lexeme’s denotative meaning, dictionary definitions, together with an analysis of collocations extracted from COCA, synonyms, idioms, proverbs and contexts of use of the lexeme ‘harmony’, provide grounds for asserting that the concept of HARMONY belongs to the following basic frames (Table 1):

Table 1

Basic frames (according to S. Zhabotynska)

		Basic frames (according to S. Zhabotynska)				
Concept HARMONY	The Thing Frame	The Action Frame	The Possession Frame	The Identification Frame	The Comparative Frame)	
	The Quantitative Schema	State/Process Schema	The Part-whole Schema	The Personification Schema	The Identity/Metamorphosis Schema	
	+	-	+	+	-	
	The Qualitative Schema					
	+					
	The Locative Schema	The Contact Schema	The Inclusion Schema	The Classification Schema	The Similarity/Analogy Schema	
	+	+	-	+	+	
	Temporative Schema					
	+					
	The Mode of Existence Schema	The Causative Schema	The Ownership Schema	The characterisation schema	The likeness/ metaphor schema	
+	-	-	-	+		

Since the basic frames (thing, action, possession, identification and comparison) can be combined, forming conceptual networks, the verbalised forms of the HARMONY concept can be grouped according to their affiliation with the basic frames as follows:

The Thing frame:

– quantitative schema (HARMONY is SUCH), the collocations listed demonstrate that the concept of HARMONY can be perceived as a phenomenon or state that has a greater or lesser degree and consists of a greater or lesser number of elements. It seems appropriate to note that these collocations can also be categorised as a partitive scheme of the possessive frame (*four-part harmony, greater harmony, three-part harmony, two-part harmony*);

– qualitative schema (HARMONY IS SUCH), i.e. the concept of HARMONY is perceived as a phenomenon having certain features, in particular:

– in terms of types of human relationships, which brings the qualitative schema closer to the locative one (*ethnic harmony, inner harmony, internal harmony, interpersonal harmony, harmony in interpersonal relationships, interracial harmony, marital harmony, racial harmony, social harmony*);

– or types of activity (*ecological harmony, musical harmony*);

- and can also be characterised in terms of level or quality (*crystal clear harmony, in perfect harmony, peaceful harmony, relative harmony*), which can also be characterised as a quantitative feature;
- locative schema (HARMONY is/exists THERE), i.e. this phenomenon can be characterised as
 - inherent to a certain space (*communal harmony, cosmic harmony, domestic harmony, regional harmony, universal harmony*);
 - or existing between a certain group of people or objects, which can also be viewed as a contact schema (*harmony among, harmony between*);
 - temporal schema (HARMONY exists THEN), i.e. the concept is perceived as a phenomenon with temporal limitations, i.e. it can be achieved, sustained, preserved or discontinued, or be characteristic of a certain period of time (*achieve harmony, achieving harmony, autumn harmony, create harmony, creates harmony, disrupt the harmony, emphasises the harmony, foster harmony, harmony disrupted, maintain harmony, maintaining harmony, preserve harmony, promote harmony, promotes harmony, promoting harmony, restoration of harmony, restore harmony, restoring harmony, seek harmony, sung harmony*);
 - a mode of existence schema (HARMONY exists THAT WAY), i.e. the concept of HARMONY is perceived as a mode or state of existence (*coexist in harmony, harmony singers, live in harmony, lived in harmony, living in harmony, sang harmony, sang in harmony, sing harmony, sing in harmony, singing harmony, singing in harmony, sings harmony, sings in harmony*), that is, as a feature of a particular environment that can be characterised as a qualitative schema;

Action Frame:

- a schema of contact action, i.e. it is evident from the context that the concept HARMONY is an agent which:
 - is in a state of interaction/conflict with other objects or phenomena (*harmony and conflict, harmony and dissonance, harmony or counterpoint, harmony or discord*);
 - or exerts an influence on an object or environment, which, as noted above, brings this schema closer to the locative one (*harmony together, harmony with nature, mutual harmony, together in harmony*);

Possessive Frame:

- partitive schema, i.e. HARMONY-whole:
 - consists of certain elements (*Elements of Harmony, harmony in elements, harmony of elements, principles of harmony, a pleasant musical sound made by different notes being played or sung at the same time, notes that are played or sung with the main tune and that make the piece more complicated and interesting, any simultaneous combination of tones chordal structure, as distinguished from melody and rhythm, the science of the structure, relations, and practical combination of chords, a pleasing combination of different parts, a collation of parallel passages, especially from the Gospels, with a commentary demonstrating their consonance and explaining their discrepancies*);
 - or is a part of a certain whole (*there is harmony in autumn*);

Identification Frame:

- schema of personification: the individual serves as the personifier of the concept; i.e., the lexeme ‘harmony’ is used as a proper name or title, indicating the speakers’ intention to transfer the perception of the concept onto an object or a person (*Barbershop Harmony Society* (name of a musical group), *Fifth Harmony* (name of a band), *Harmony Ceremony* (name of an event), *Harmony Farms* (name of a farm), *Harmony Grove Soccer Complex* (name of a sports complex), *Harmony Hall* (name of a song, name of an arts centre), *Harmony Korine* (proper name), *Harmony Science Academy* (name of an educational institution), *Logitech Harmony* (company name), *The Bone Thugs & Harmony* (name of a music group));
- a classification schema where the concept is categorised according to a way of perceiving the world or sensations (*colour harmony, harmony vocals, aesthetic harmony, spiritual harmony, tonal harmony, visual harmony, harmony and rhythm, harmony and texture*), which can also be characterised as a qualitative schema, it also seems logical to draw a parallel with the partitive schema, since different ways of perceiving the world are parts of a comprehensive worldview; furthermore, the way

As can be seen in Figure 1 above, all the components of the frame model of the concept HARMONY are interconnected (with the only exception of “having time limits, which, on the other hand, can be considered an all-encompassing feature, inherent to all the others) and constitute a well-balanced system.

Conclusions. The research into the verbalised forms of the concept HARMONY in the English discourse allows us to observe both linguistic and cognitive aspects of this concept as an open system. The distribution of the nominative units of the concept of HARMONY demonstrates that the multifaceted character of its perception by English speakers preserves, nevertheless, the integrity of all components of this concept as a dynamic, self-developing system.

At the same time, the correlation between the verbalised representations of the concept HARMONY, as well as their being affiliated with different schemas provide evidence for the fractal nature of this concept HARMONY, as being characterised by self-similarity of its elements.

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

1. Борзик О. Б. Аспектний аналіз генези категорії «гармонія». *Духовність особистості: методологія, теорія і практика*. 2020. Т. 97, № 4. С. 25–36. URL: <https://doi.org/10.33216/2220-6310-2020-97-4-25-36>
2. Medvedovska D. Frame model of the volunteer concept. *Filologični traktati*. 2024. Vol. 16, no. 2. P. 78–85. URL: [https://doi.org/10.21272/ftk.2024.16\(2\)-8](https://doi.org/10.21272/ftk.2024.16(2)-8)
3. Fillmore C. J. Frame semantics. *Linguistics in the morning calm: Selected papers from SICOL-1981*. Seoul, Korea, 1982. P. 112–137.
4. Полюжин М. Поняття, концепт та його структура. *Науковий вісник Східноєвропейського національного університету імені Лесі Українки. Філологічні науки. Мовознавство*. 2015. № 4. С. 212–222. URL: http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/Nvvnufm_2015_4_43
5. Таценко Н. "Концепт" як ключове поняття когнітивної лінгвістики. *Вісник Сумського державного університету. Серія: Філологія*. 2008. № 1. С. 105–110. URL: <https://essuir.sumdu.edu.ua/handle/123456789/1580>
6. Zhabotyńska S. A. Principles of building conceptual models for thesaurus dictionaries. *Cognition, communication, discourse*. 2010. No. 1. URL: <https://doi.org/10.26565/2218-2926-2010-01-05>
7. Zhabotyńska S. Semantics of lingual networks in an educational combinatory thesaurus. *Studia philologica*. 2019. No. 2. P. 17–27. URL: <https://doi.org/10.28925/2311-2425.2019.13.3>
8. Uberman A. On the cognitive frame of freedom. *Lege artis. Language yesterday, today, tomorrow*. 2025. P. 180–197. URL: <https://doi.org/10.34135/lartis.25.10.1.10>
9. Baranovska O. D. Prospects for corpus study of emotive verbs in the English language. *Nova filologija*. 2020. Vol. 1, no. 80. URL: <https://doi.org/10.26661/2414-1135-2020-80-1-8>
10. Harmony. APA dictionary of psychology. URL: <https://dictionary.apa.org/harmony>
11. Definition of HARMONY. Merriam-Webster: America's most trusted dictionary. URL: <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/harmony>
12. Definition of 'harmony'. Collins Concise English Dictionary. URL: <https://www.collinsdictionary.com/dictionary/english/harmony>
13. Dictionary.com | Meanings & Definitions of English Words. Dictionary.com. URL: <https://www.dictionary.com/browse/harmony>
14. Harmony – Definition, Meaning & Synonyms. Vocabulary.com. URL: <https://www.vocabulary.com/dictionary/harmony>
15. harmony – WordReference.com Dictionary of English. English to French, Italian, German & Spanish Dictionary – WordReference.com. URL: <https://www.wordreference.com/definition/harmony>
16. Harmony | Encyclopedia.com. Encyclopedia.com | Free Online Encyclopedia. URL: <https://www.encyclopedia.com/literature-and-arts/performing-arts/musictheory-forms-and-instruments/harmony>
17. harmony | meaning of harmony in Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English | LDOCE. Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English | LDOCE. URL: <https://www.ldoceonline.com/dictionary/harmony>
18. Harmony Definition & Meaning | Britannica Dictionary. Encyclopedia Britannica | Britannica. URL: <https://www.britannica.com/dictionary/harmony>
19. harmony noun – Definition, pictures, pronunciation and usage notes | Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary at OxfordLearnersDictionaries.com. Oxford Learner's
20. Dictionaries | Find definitions, translations, and grammar explanations at Oxford Learner's Dictionaries. URL: <https://www.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com/definition/english/harmony>

21. harmony, n. meanings, etymology and more | Oxford English Dictionary. Oxford English Dictionary. URL: https://www.oed.com/dictionary/harmony_n
22. harmony. Cambridge Dictionary | English Dictionary, Translations & Thesaurus. URL: <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/harmony>
23. harmony. TheFreeDictionary.com. URL: <https://www.thefreedictionary.com/harmony>
24. Speake, J. (Ed.). (2015). Oxford Dictionary of Proverbs. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acref/9780198734901.001.0001>

Дата першого надходження статті до видання: 26.03.2026
Дата прийняття статті до друку після рецензування: 22.04.2026
Дата публікації (оприлюднення) статті: 30.05.2026