



James O. Butler

Lancaster University, Lancaster, UK

The Rocket's Red Glaringly Apparent Intent: The Dazzling Effects of Firework Naming

Voprosy onomastiki, 2018, Volume 15, Issue 1, pp. 168–180
DOI: 10.15826/vopr_onom.2018.15.1.008

Language of the article: English

James O. Butler

Lancaster University, Lancaster, UK

The Rocket's Red Glaringly Apparent Intent: The Dazzling Effects of Firework Naming

Вопросы ономастики. 2018. Т. 15. № 1. С. 168–180
DOI: 10.15826/vopr_onom.2018.15.1.008

Язык статьи: английский

DOI: 10.15826/vopr_onom.2018.15.1.008
UDC 81'373.46 + 81'371 + 339.138

James O. Butler
Lancaster University
Lancaster, UK

THE ROCKET'S RED GLARINGLY APPARENT INTENT: THE DAZZLING EFFECTS OF FIREWORK NAMING

This article provides a preliminary investigation into the naming practices of a unique product group: pyrotechnics. It is conducted through a comprehensive survey of units made available in the UK marketplace (of 2015) during peak seasonal availability (end of October through early November), when fireworks can easily be purchased from non-specialist retailers. The semantic content underpinning effective branding is shown as being predominantly focused on the sensory impact of the explosions, which provides the primary naming impetus. The analysis is conducted through a statistical assessment against thematic grouping — this approach is typical for the statistical assessment of brand names linguistic categorisation. The author introduces a range of twelve thematic categories that correspond to the semantic fields used as the associative basis for each name. This analysis features a dedicated assessment of two specific categories: Rockets (which provide a statistically-representative snapshot of the entire range) and Sparklers (which were omitted from the quantitative data). The article shows that most often firework names are retrieved from military and cosmic thematic groups and point mainly to the expected visual effects. Besides providing relevant quantitative data, the paper demonstrates the qualitative linguistic versatility of firework names, arguing that they hold significant analytic opportunities for examining the role of associative semantics in the commercial naming of entertainment products.

Key words: commercial names, fireworks, rockets, marketing, branding, metaphor, onomastic database, semantics.

© Butler J. O., 2018

1. Introduction

Little outshines the wondrous spectacle of a fireworks display; the sensational riotous explosions that light the sky, the thick swirling fog of gunpowder residue, the crackling barrage of color that transfixes and seems as though it will never end — before abruptly doing so, leaving a lingering sense of awe in the now-particularly empty night sky. A thrilling means of celebration, fireworks typically mark the significant events, such as holidays, and conclude all manner of ceremonies. The development and use of fireworks as an entertainment device has a long history that spans across the globe, yet very little research has been conducted on the artistry behind their commercial design — of which the name is a significant factor. The dominant focus of academic work has hitherto been on injuries and other negative factors related to the misuse of fireworks — essential areas of study given the dangerous nature (and appeal to younger audiences) of the products, but the glamorising role of commercial branding provides a unique source for investigating the extent to which semantic allusions in product marketing may overtly correspond with name.

The intrinsic role of naming in commercial branding has been explored across a variety of onomastic surveys [e.g. Lee, 2009; Nuessel, 2010; Hernández, 2013]. Across these studies, one point is consistently made: that archetypal expectations of the target consumer are promoted, through snappy characterizations of highly associative value. Branding is an active component of advertising, intended to make a product appealing through emphasizing specific traits and qualities deemed desirable by its intended audience. The importance of representative semantics contained in product names appears to be a consistent element across diverse range of product types that have undergone onomastic assessment; this study will assess these thrilling single-use and seasonally-restricted devices using a methodological model that thematises associative hermeneutics.

The introduction of pyrotechnics to European nations from Eastern cultures is a lengthy and complex history, but their gradual adaptation from weapons to entertainment products is evident from a very early stage. An inventory of the library contents of Mary Queen of Scots contains a reference to a volume entitled *The Art of Fyir*, which, although primarily devoted to military purposes, is described as containing two chapters on “utilizing these effects upon the occasion of public feasts and triumphs” [Sharman, 1889, 143–144]. The entry expresses surprise at encountering a volume covering this application at such an early date, but also notes contemporaneous volumes (the *Libro della pirotechnica* by Vannucio Biringuccio, printed in Venice in 1540, and *La Pyrotechnie ou Art de Feu*), which illustrates the aesthetic interest in the devices. Salatino’s work on collecting early depictions of fireworks within European manuscripts further illustrates their rapid move into social entertainment, throughout the continent [Salatino, 1998].

As with many niche interests, there exists a hobbyist fan base interested in all things related to fireworks, from reviewing currently available pieces, through collecting and

cataloguing historical shells, both unused and spent. Yet despite this passion underlying the subject, there has been no published academic study on the semantic and metaphoric basis of onomastic development for pyrotechnics. The name is but one aspect of commercial branding, and the vivid art that adorns individual shells is a striking visual determiner used to draw customer attention (as shown by the extent to which they are covered through the aforementioned resources), but the allusions crafted through felicitous naming is an integral component in forming desirable commercial identities.

Due to their entirely commercial nature, it is vital to always consider this factor in the assessment of any quality relating to branding. Every component is carefully tailored as a form of advertisement, and so will likely bear a high-relation with any properties associated with audience expectation. In his opening comments, Fleming [2005, 3] notes the pleasure of browsing, choosing, and anticipation of fireworks from in-store displays, “each selling itself with a lively name and bold design” as being frequently (albeit, informally) cited as the most vivid memories relating to the festivities. Such is the impact of carefully crafted branding. This survey will examine the onomastic patterns of both collected packs and standalone shells, with the dataset further annotated into functional subcategories, to assess the linguistic connections between firework form and associative semantic cues.

To that end, a degree of clarification regarding broad firework types available to the UK market is provided below. Each of these classes contains a number of specialist sub-categories, but for the purpose of this investigation a generalized level is sufficient. These definitions are the authors’ own amalgamations from a variety of sources, and has been purposefully generalized to broad categories which encompass several specialist types in order to maintain classificatory simplicity.

R o c k e t: single-shot aerial units that self-propel (with a solid fuel motor) and are attached to guiding sticks, so that a variety of effects may erupt from a separate charge at distance.

F o u n t a i n: freestanding units which erupt in a shower of sparks (and other effects) of varying height and intensity.

W h e e l s: a fountain designed to be affixed to a surface, where the kinetic force spins the unit at varying speeds.

R o m a n C a n d l e: tubes that expel a series of airborne charges at great speed, which may culminate in a variety of effects during flight or at their apex.

C a k e s: shells that launch a variety of effects sequentially from a single fuse, typically sold as independent units; numbers of charges ranges from five to over three hundred, with the lower end usually serving as largest pieces in selection packs.

S p a r k l e r: slow-burning handheld units that consist of a composition-coated wire, typically waved to form patterns of light (excluded from the cultivated dataset due to the substantial difference in use).

There exists a diverse range of specialist terminology for the range of specific effects that may be found across various fireworks. There are dozens of possible visual effects which may form compositions, all of which are descriptions based on the shape and lighting particulars of the visual effect, and include the likes of: *Brocade*, *Crosette*, *Palm*, and *Willow*. These terms are used to differentiate minor details, such as *Chrysanthemum* and *Peony* — both represent perfectly spherical bursts, but the latter typically features a higher number of stars that will likely change color as the burst outwards. These classifications can be extensively detailed, e.g. *Flower of Winter* — ‘petals of amber to flash, inner petals of blue and a pistil of twinkling green,’ and are subject to regional psychosemantic influence, as seen in the glossaries of Japanese fireworks provided by Shimizu [1981]. Similarly, the various audio effects that may be employed are classified through intensity, from *hum*, *crackle*, and *croaker*, through *whistle* and various types of *scream*. The combination of these elements to varying intensities, along with the shell type and flame coloring agent, comes together in a unique alchemical formula for each firework.

2. Methods and database design

The highly sensory nature of fireworks displayed through their detailed visual and audio design nomenclature presents a solid basis for investigating the semantic tactics employed in their naming patterns. This study will follow the categorical model employed by Raento and Douglass [2001] in their semantic breakdown of Las Vegas casino names, which provides a structural principle ideally suited for combining onomastic assessment with wider branding theory (wherein referencing specific allusions are key associative components). The explosive element provides the primary allure of the displays, and so it is predicted that cues associated with this aspect will predominantly feature in the onymic branding, both overtly and through metaphorical inference.

The data for this survey was collected from the advertisement material of major chains, independent retailers (typically newsagents), and online stores that could deliver the units through courier service, representing the variety of “garden fireworks” — Category 2, as defined by the British Standards BS 7114 — openly available to the general UK population in 2015. These devices are safe for viewing at either 5 or 8 meters distance (with a 3 and 5 meter debris scattering range), with more detailed guidelines noted on the device. Each entry was classified in the database by pack (selection box), individual shell name, category type, manufacturer, primary semantic theme(s), and primary sensory association. Twenty-five brand names provided the inventory for all UK retailers — often with store-exclusive package bundles — but two primary distributors owned eleven of these. As a consequence, a number of units were found in packs across different retailers and brands, but as the packaging and form did not differ for any of these pieces, only the first instance encountered was included on the database.

It was also observed that the selection of individual units included in named selection packs was not consistent from year to year, for example, the contents of TNT's Merlin box differed greatly in its 2012, 2014, and 2015 iterations, with only 4 of the 19 fireworks consistently included.

Actual effects were not observed, nor were the descriptive details (when available) retained. Suppliers for public events (Category 4) were not included, as their products are restricted (so are not readily attainable) — nor were temporary vendors of suspect legality. None of the retailers sold Category 3 products (“display fireworks” — requiring a minimum 25 meter viewing distance, allowing for a 20 meter fallout radius) over the counter, so for the remit of this study they are not considered commonly available and are therefore not included.

Given the mass-market appeal of fireworks, it is not uncommon for temporary businesses or market stalls (commonly referred to as ‘pop-ups’) to open for an extremely short period of time, with the sole intent of selling pyrotechnics, which often presents major legal issues, as many of the products available through these vendors are often illicit goods. As they do not meet the stringent safety requirements imposed on UK manufacturers, they would therefore not be generally available for purchase by the population, and should therefore be left out from the survey. Unlike the professional suppliers, information on these products is also difficult to validate from these temporary sources — of the six of which were approached (and informed of the intent of this study) and requested for data pertaining to the research alone, none were willing to allow records — of any kind — to be made.

Units included in multiple packs were given only a single record in the database, and those with identical names were given one entry per manufacturer. There were thirty-nine instances of a name shared by multiple units in the same pack. Although marginally distinct (typically in terms of coloration), the effects of these twinned units were otherwise identical and so were likewise granted only a single entry for this onomastic survey. Likewise, many variations of rocket units bore the same name but also some marker of color identification on their external shell, and therefore received a single record. An example of this onymic overlap may be observed in the *Wicked Demons* selection pack (from Golden Dragon), which contained three distinctly named units, across six different effects: *Angry Demon* (green and blue), *Dancing Demons*, *Hunting Demons* (red, yellow, and purple). This set was given three entries in the database, based solely on the naming division.

A miniscule number of units (totaling 4) did not possess a name on their shell, just a stylized pattern, and five premium selection packs were comprised of numerically labeled units (totaling 35) — all of these were excluded from the statistical analysis. The names of six further units across the selection packs of different manufacturers could not be determined, and a further two could only be partially identified. The former were excluded, but the latter provided sufficient information to establish a thematic label, and were retained. As noted above, the Sparklers group was also removed from the analysis.

The cultivated dataset used for this analysis ultimately comprised of 1 638 items (from the base total of 1 735 entries). This amount was substantially higher than anticipated, and precludes the addition of a complete index to this study.

Smaller firework units included within selection boxes provided 840 entries, with the larger standalone units numbering 798. This provided a roughly even split between the two groupings.

3. Semantic features of fireworks names

Each entry was assigned a semantic tag from a range of twelve categories, with the codification scheme described below. The two values following each title show the total number of entries listed under each category, and the resulting percentage of the total dataset. This task was undertaken by the sole researcher in order to ensure consistency between entries.

Military (266, 16.3%): volatile combat situations filled with explosions and a barrage of threats makes for strong metaphoric ties with firework effects, providing names that evoke scenes of destruction (*Minefield*, *Battlefield*), illusions of carnage (*Napalm*, *Missile Berserker*), and simulations of gunfire (*Ammo Box*, *Pump Action*).

Cosmic (250, 15.25%): the aerial nature of most firework effects, requiring spectators to watch them unfold skies, lends itself directly to metaphoric association with extraterrestrial objects (*Meteor Blitz*, *Starstreak*, *Exploding Comets*), occurrences (*Champagne Supernova*, *Solar Flare*, *Mission to Mars*), and star-filled galaxies forming anew (*Red Cosmos*, *Orion's Belt*).

Specification (239, 14.6%): what you see is what you get, these names span the technical (*3" Blue to Silver Glitter*, *2-Minute Spectacular*, *Blue Crackling Willow*, and *Screeching Skyriider*) through slightly more descriptive (*Sky Glitter*, *Flaming Pearls*, *Satellite Killer*), but otherwise directly inform of the expectant effects.

Fantastic (172, 10.5%): magic, monsters, and mythical entities, these names draw on highly active elements of folklore to evoke scenes of grand chaos (*Shrieking Demons*, *Dragon King*, *Fairies from Hell*), through approximation of unworldly spectacle (*Flying Phoenix*, *Valhalla*).

Marketing (167, 10.2%): this class is similar to **Specification**, but rather than featuring literal, description, instead emphasize the size of the effects — employing metaphoric allusion alongside a simple descriptive elements as a means of both exaggerating the latter and providing a semblance of credibility to the former. All fine examples of marketing semantics (*Ultimate Battle of Colours*, *Titan*, *Best of British*, *Thunder King*, *Supercharged*).

Miscellaneous (118, 11.5%): semantic outliers that do not adequately fall within any other defined category, or span multiple of the preceding categories, these names ranged from the bizarre (*Satan's Polar Battle*, *Funky Frog Fountain*, *Thundering*

Space Spiders), fun descriptive (*Popcorn Fountain, High Voltage*), nuanced associations to spectacle (*Harlequin, Royal Fanfare*), locations particularly associated with fireworks (*Shanghai Cyclone, China Star*), through entries peerless within the data (*Krazy Klock, More Tea Vicar?*).¹

Precious (92, 5.6%): gemstones and metals provide strong color-based descriptive names, crafted to dazzle the spectator with opulent association, be it generic reference (*Gemstone Bombard, Jewelled Cyclone*), or specific coloration and effects (*Lake of Sapphires, Dancing Diamonds, Shower of Rubies, Silver Crown*).

Pop-Culture Reference (85, 5.2%): by associating external cultural items, these names not only receive the excitement yielded by the reference, typically rock songs that also give some indication as to anticipated effects (*Stairway to Heaven, Jumping Jack Flash, Purple Rain, Bats Out of Hell*), or other iconic action-based franchises with which the company wishes to hold themselves in comparison (*Harry Popper, Masters of the Universe, Scorpio Rising*).

Nature (84, 5.1%): these names draw on the raw power elemental manifestations that shake the world (*Seismic Shockwave, Krazy Krakatoa, Earth Quake, Old Faithful*), occurrences of devastation (*Wild Fire, Acid Rain, Lava Flow*), visual wonders (*Rainbow Rise, Paradise Beach*), and floral form (*Flower Pot, Glistening Fruits*).

Emotion (51, 3.1%): these units are named in an attempt to positively guide the experience of the user (*Joyous Cone, Happiness, Love Heart*), through a range of negative experiences that reflect the tempestuous nature of the medium (*Vengeance, Green Envy, The Tantrum*).

Animal (31, 1.9%): exotic fauna that actively hunt, scatter, or preen in a flurry of bright color and seemingly erratic movement provides direct comparison for many of the incendiary effects (*Siamese Fighting Fish, Leaping Lions, Midnight Peacock, 1000 Bees*).

Seasonal (13, 0.75%): given the seasonal nature of firework availability and use, discussed above, a portion of names associate with these specific periods as a means of emphasizing their celebratory suitability. Within the UK market, this spans the 5th November (*Guy's Gunpowder and Tri Fawkes*), Halloween a week earlier prior to this date (*Frankenstein Fountain, Witches Cauldron*), and New Years Eve (*Big Ben Countdown*).

The secondary impressionistic metadata record was taken from the dominant sensory-based implications of each firework name. Each unit was ranked as belonging primarily to one of five groups relevant to the potential effect output: audio, visual,

¹ Note should be made of a small subset comprised of extreme poetic forms (*Lightning over the Citrus Grove, Ducks Playing in the Autumn Leaves, Flying Fish Feast in the Emerald Seas*). These entries were not distinct enough to merit their own classification, but their onymic value is worthy of recognition in this study.

kinetic, combined (two or three of the former equally), or nil. Table 1 shows the resulting data.

Table 1

Sensory-based cues

Sense	Number	Percentage
Visual	645	39.4
Nil	444	27.1
Combined	242	14.8
Audio	187	11.4
Kinetic	120	7.3
TOTAL	1 638	100

A high level of difficulty was encountered in the classification of several entries when the name was ambiguous in its reference, for example: *Siren* (which could reference either a mythical creature or a warning signal) which required either scrutiny of the item's packaging, or assessment against its immediate peers from the same manufacturer when this was not available. *Bangers and Flash* likewise was included as a *Specification* entry, but is equally a pun on the popular British meal, bangers (sausages) and mash, so could theoretically have been classified as a *Miscellaneous* entry on this UK-specific analysis. Where more than one thematic label could be equally applied. For example, with *Opal Orchid*, *Nitro Nova*, and *Dragon Chrysanthemum*, *Crackle Dragon*, *Hawaiian Palms*, only a single thematic category was desired for each entry, so the dominant element was adopted. The use of floral terms to describe many of the effects posed particular issue in categorical determination, belonging mostly (but not always) to the *Specification* group — as may be seen in the last example provided just above. Similar issues were encountered with a small number of names that held symbolic seasons associations, such as *Pumpkin* (*Nature* when stripped of context, but here referencing the keen association of the squash cultivar with seasonal Halloween festivities) and *Blasting Barrel* (*Military*, but in the UK symbolically representative of the Guy Fawkes Night). Given the restricted seasonal nature of firework availability, references to these events were given semantic priority.

The *Rocket* category was chosen for a dedicated analysis, due to their iconic association with the firework medium, and its comparable division measured against the complete dataset, both semantically and sensory-based premise. Table 2 provides an abridged comparison of the classificatory categories and semantic cues that demonstrates the classificatory alignment that justified a focal analysis of the representative group.

Table 2

Semantic ratio of names in rocket group measured against complete data set

	Total, %	Rocket, %
Specification	14.2	14.4
Cosmic	15.25	19.75
Military	16.2	17.4
Precious	5.6	3.0
Fantastic	10.5	6.8
Pop-Culture Ref.	5.2	7.6
Nature	5.1	5.3
Sense: Visual	39.4	37.9
Sense: Nil	27.1	32.6

The two thematic categories that saw an increased ratio (but not to a degree that was statistically significant) were *Military* and *Cosmic*. This might be expected to be a result of the physical form of the units closely resembling the exploratory vessels (*Apollo*, *Soyuz*, *Space Shuttle*) and ordnance delivery systems (*Tomahawk*, *Apache Warhead*, *Stinger*, *Heat Seeker*, *Saber Rocket*, *Vega Rocket*) of the two fields respectively, but these inclusions are the only names that match this suggestion. It is the implications of impressive effects that provide the impetus for metaphorically descriptive unit naming, with no notable distinction from the wider data set. *Mercury Rising*, *Moon Burst*, *High Impact*, *Atomic Meltdown* are more emblematic of these two categories, whilst *Sky Thriller*, *Sky Storm*, and *Brimstone* provide corresponding examples from other themes. *Specification*-based names (*Flash Bolt*, *Ding Dong Rockets*) provide intentionally generic semantic labels, the *Marketing* style maintains allusion to scale and value (*Mega 2000*, *King Rockets*), and the *Pop-Culture Reference* category similarly perpetuates a connection to action-based explosions, both in number (*Space Invaders*) and size (*Death Star*). As with the *Miscellaneous* definition, special mention should be made to the single highly poetic thematic-spanning: *Love is in the Air as Many Winged Hearts*.

One of the defined categories was excluded from the main analysis — *Sparklers* (with 32 entries) — due to their disparate function and form of display, but the onomastic patterns observed during their collection allows them to serve as an interesting side-study. Whereas all other types are designed for enjoyment at a distance, sparklers present more active and personal interaction for younger audiences (under supervision). The branding of these packages was notably less aggressive in their semantic tone (with examples of this being: *Giant Moonlight Sparklers*, *Starlight Sparklers*,

Platinum Sparklers, and *Novelty Star Sparklers*), and possessed a significantly higher proportion of generic descriptors, specifically in reference to size. The use of *giant*, *mega*, *monster* and other synonyms in 15 of the packs serve as a means of suggesting value — with the implication that a larger size will result in a longer burn time (and more enjoyment); only a single pack featured the reverse, *small*. Just under half (14) of the units contained reference to the color of the effects, but only two featured audio-based characteristics (*Monster Crackling Sparklers* and *Crackling Sparklers*).

Only 2 units bore metaphoric names that did not include a generic (both named *Aces*, a term which holds transferable semantic significance as being the highest valued cards in a deck). This lack of variety and imagination in reference is perhaps related to the different role of these products in events. Given the afore-noted intended audience, names which incorporate less threatening semantic elements are likely being used to imply the safety of the sparklers, rendering the need to impress and lure potential customers is minimal — thereby allowing the branding to appeal to a very different emotional association. As they are supplemental pieces, the suggestion of value, and of their more functional purpose is very much reflected in their branding.

4. Conclusions and perspectives

Although this pilot study has been necessarily limited to an extremely small segment of the product group (restricted to units available for purchase by the general public across the UK in the 2015 fall season), the fascinating hermeneutics that guide their commercial naming presents a number of potential directions to take further work. As there is a significant hobbyist community conducting an inventory of fireworks as they appeared on the market across time would present a fascinating opportunity to assess the potential chronological progression of semantic characteristics; for example, whether a shift to various thematic fields, such as space- or war-based names, coincided with contemporaneous trends, interests, and sensibilities. The addition of a pricing field to the data could be used to examine potential thematic shifts across various tiers of perceived value. Another field that could provide an additional line of semantic query could be the intensity of the overall pack experiences — although a fuzzy characteristic, and tracked inconsistently between manufacturers, several items did provide some measure of indicating overall noise and impact factor (to allow consideration for families with smaller children, pets, those with PTSD combat veterans, and other social aspects). This shift in marketing appeal could hold correspondingly softer onymic semantics for the individual firework shells contained.

A feasible comparative angle could be taken initially through conducting similar surveys across the analogous products available in various countries, to determine whether onymic and semantic patterns are consistent across cultures. This could be of particular interest in the examination of Chinese fireworks intended for the domestic audience. One category of fireworks in particular, firecrackers, were excluded from

this analysis, as they have been illegal in the UK since 1997 — alongside all fireworks “of erratic flight.” It would be of interest to assess the extent to which this descriptive characteristic features in the branding of these products outside of this market, given its primary characteristic is specifically identified as part of the legislative restriction.

The database could see further development so as to allow for a more detailed inventory of every selection pack available on the market, such as tracking the contents of each in order to identify individual units included more frequently. This could serve to measure effectively the semantic presences of the units more likely to be interacted with — as those named units potentially hold a weighted perceptual influence. As an active market (in terms of both competitive one-upmanship and regulation), the range made available to the public is constantly shifting and being updated, providing ample opportunity for continued assessment of this dedicated field.

Yet this preliminary investigation demonstrates the pivotal semantic premise of providing a sizable spectacle is a consistent factor in firework naming. This marketing strategy employs powerful metaphoric associations typically employing aspects that emphasize the scale of the effects — with this specific product, the bigger, louder, and flashier the suggestion of effects in the name, the more likely it is to attract consumer interest. Additional psychosocial assessment could be conducted in populational recognition, expectation, and representativeness of these linguistically-formed associations. There is little subtlety in the allusionary effects conveyed by many of the names, as they establish a semantic premise of what the audience might expect from each unit, in terms of color, effect, and scale. Whether or not the effects of each product meet these expectations is another matter entirely, but for the purposes of hyping consumer expectation, the name is arguably the most important part of commercial branding. The difficulties in assigning a singular classificatory tag to a high number of entries — as may be seen in the examples provided in the definition of each semantic class — is demonstrative of the highly evocative symbolism formed by any lexis that serves as a name, no matter how semantically removed from the named item it may superficially appear.

There is incredible potential for the further exploration of the linguistic properties underpinning firework names, and the author hopes that this preliminary inquiry will encourage work in this semantically explosive field. Commercial names provide a particularly transitory onomastic dataset, prone to short, seasonal, or restricted shelf-lives and availability. The influential role of powerful and imaginative reference in commercial naming conventions renders product groups such as these equally worthy of dedicated linguistic analysis as more traditional historic-led areas of onomastic study. The creativity on display for each unit is purposefully filled with unabashed wordplay and colorful metaphor, carefully crafted to impress from every angle, beginning — as the perception of any commercial product does — with the name.

- Fleming, M. (2005). *Firework Art*. Liverpool, UK: Rumble.
- Hernández, L. P. (2013). A Pragmatic-Cognitive Approach to Brand Names: Case Study of Rioja Wine Brands. *Names* 61, 33–46. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1179/0027773812Z.00000000038>
- Lee, M. G. (2009). Selling Decency and Innocence: Names of Singing Groups in the *Malt Shop Memories* Collection. *Names*, 57, 162–174. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1179/175622709X462469>
- Nuessel, F. (2010). A Note on Names for Energy Drink Brands and Products. *Names*, 58, 102–110. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1179/002777310X12682237915188>
- Raento, P., & Douglass, W. A. (2001) The Naming of Gaming. *Names*, 49, 1–35. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1179/nam.2001.49.1.1>
- Salatino, K. (1998). *Incendiary Art: Representations of Fireworks in Early Modern Europe*. Los Angeles, CA: Getty Research Institute.
- Sharman, J. (1889). *The Library of Mary Queen of Scots*. London: Elliot Stock.
- Shimizu, T. (1981). *Fireworks: The Art, Science, and Technique*. Austin, TX: Pyrotechnica Publications.

Received 14 February 2017

Butler, James

PhD, Research Associate
Department of English Literature & Creative
Writing
County College, Lancaster University
Bailrigg, Lancaster, LA1 4YD
United Kingdom
E-mail: j.o.butler@lancaster.ac.uk

Батлер, Джеймс

PhD, научный сотрудник
кафедра английской литературы
и писательского мастерства
Колледж Каунти, Ланкастерский
университет,
Bailrigg, Lancaster, LA1 4YD
United Kingdom
E-mail: j.o.butler@lancaster.ac.uk

Джеймс Батлер

Ланкастерский университет
Ланкастер, Великобритания

**О ЧЕМ СИГНАЛЯТ НАМ ОГНИ:
«ВЗРЫВНОЙ» ЭФФЕКТ НАЗВАНИЙ ФЕЙЕРВЕРКОВ**

Статья содержит предварительные результаты исследования названий уникального продукта — пиротехники. Базу для анализа составили названия фейерверков, доступных на рынке Великобритании (по состоянию на 2015 год) во время сезонного пика (конец октября — начало ноября), когда пиротехнические изделия широко представлены в неспециализированных магазинах. Показано, что названия фейерверков направлены главным образом на ассоциативное воссоздание эффекта взрыва. Количественный анализ материала основан на предварительном распределении названий по тематическим

группам — такой подход, несмотря на известные трудности, является традиционным при анализе коммерческих названий: как лингвистическом, так и статистическом. Автор выделяет двенадцать тематических групп, которые соответствуют семантическим зонам, послужившим источниками для названий, и одновременно определяют ассоциативный фон последних. В статье осуществляется анализ названий двух групп продуктов: собственно ракет-фейерверков (они составляют репрезентативную в количественном отношении часть всего корпуса имен) и бенгальских огней (которые в ходе количественного анализа не учитываются). В статье показано, что наиболее востребованными оказываются военная и космическая тематические группы, при этом чаще всего название апеллирует к ожидаемому визуальному воздействию на зрителя. Помимо описания результатов количественного анализа, автор демонстрирует разнообразие названий фейерверков, которые дают возможность расширить наши представления о роли ассоциативной семантики в коммерческих названиях товаров для развлечения.

Ключевые слова: коммерческие названия, фейерверки, маркетинг, брендинг, метафора, ономастическая база данных, ракеты, семантика.

Рукопись поступила в редакцию 14.02.2017