ойконімів. Мовець, свідомо чи ні, може використовувати формули «покращення значення» в будь-якому контексті для ойконімів, які первинно позначають негативні явища дійсності.

Перспектива дослідження. Вбачається в уточненні явища енантіосемії, що передбачає градуальний аналіз переходу «+» та «-» конотацій у семантичній структурі ойконімів.

Література

Колісниченко Т. В. Інтенсифікатори "Settlement" номінацій у рекламному туристичному дискурсі. *Актуальні проблеми романо-германської філології та прикладної лінгвістики.* 2016. Вип. 11-12. Ч. 1. С. 303-306.
Суперанская А.В. Общая теория имени собственного. М. : Наука, 1973. 366 с.
Топоров В. Н. Исследования по этимологии и семантике. Т. I: Теория и некоторые частные ее приложения. М. : Языки славянской культуры, 2004. 816 с.
Шанский Н. М. Лингвистические детективы. М. : Дрофа, 2014. 133 с.
I live here. URL *:* https://www.ilivehere.co.uk/lesta-leicester.html. (дата звернення: 15.10.2018).
Mailhammer R. The Germanic Strong Verbs: Foundations and Development of a New System. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co., 2007. 262 p.
Mills D. A Dictionary of British Place-Names. NY : OUP, 2011. 576 p.
Urban dictionary. URL *:* https://www.urbandictionary.com/define.php?term=Chav (дата звернення: 15.10.2018).
Urban Rambles. URL *:* http://urbanrambles.org/walks/uk/england/east-midlands/leicester-815. (дата звернення: 15.10.2018).
Visit Leicester. URL *:* https://www.visitleicester.info. (дата звернення: 15.10.2018).
Visit. Explore. Discover. URL *:* http://www.goleicestershire.com/explore-leicestershire. (дата звернення: 15.10.2018).

MYKHAYLENKO V. V.
(Institute of International Relations and Social Studies, MAUP, Kyiv)

MERONYMY IN PROFESSIONAL DISCOURSE TRANSLATION

The present paper is a study of the role of holonyms, in thre professional discourse of architecture in comparison with the discourse of fiction. The professional discourse of architecture which semantics (lexical and functional), structure, as well ascohesion and coherence stem from specific, target language uses based on anidentified set of specialized features: *style, distinctive features, form, space*. LSPs distinguish themselves as far as choice, use and frequency of nparticular linguistic features of morphology,syntax, vocabulary and textual or discursive properties are concerned. The professional discourse of architecture which semantics (lexical and functional), structure, as well as cohesion and coherence stem from specific, target language uses based on an identified set of specialized features: *style, distinctive features, form, space.* The content must be focused on the lexemes (*modernism, shape, openness, function, material*, etc,), phrases (asymmetrical compositions, general cubic r cylindrical shapes, flat roofs**,** gothic style, geometric form, etc.), idioms (*public housing, open plan, reinforced concrete, wrap-around porch, Gothic Revival, housing boom, Norman Architecture, semi-enclosed courtyard,* etc.), and sentences in the specific context (*As part of the Counter-Reformation the architecture was an attempt to celebrate the Catholic state* [Baroque style]).
Meronyms in the architecture discourse are lexical items denoting a part in respectto lexical items denoting a whole. They vary in showing how necessary the part is to the whole, for example, a *floor* as a meronym of *a room and further, a room as a meronym of a house* others are usual but not obligatory, like *belfry* as a meronym of *a house*; still others are optional like *a weathercock* for a *roof*" [Saeed 2003]. Hyponymy, antonymy, and meronymy reflect different aspects of the organization of a lexical glossary and they all differ from synonymy.
Due to the definitional analysis of the dictionary entries it is proved that the referred three doors are differentiated by their location in the wall of the house. And the additional component of the lexical meaning of the phrase *front door* is "facing the road".
The difference lies in the English culture "front for the guests or head of the family," side "for the family on ordinary days" and back for "servants, beggars and tramps'.
The function of architects is much beyond their creating buildings. They must not ignore the community's traditions, beliefs, and culture which are mainly hidden in details [Cromley 2008, p. 391]. And the translator's task is to specify all these details with the help of meronyms which can retain the smallest item of culture.
Key words: meronym, holonym, semantics, professional discourse, translation, concept.

Михайленко В. В. Мероніми у перекладі професійного дискурсу. Дану статтю присвячено деяким аспектам міжкультурної комунікації на прикладі перекладу професійного (архітектурного) дискурсу. Встановлено семантичні розбіжності у професійних номінацій за допомогою меронімів та їхніх протилежностей – холонімів – у мови оригіналу та перекладу
Ключові слова: меронім, холонім,семантика, професійний дискурс, переклад, концепт.

INTRODUCTION. The vocabulary plays a pivotal role in the LSP theory and practice – it is its major distinct feature among some other features of morphology, syntax and discourse/text structure [Malmkjaer 2017; Mykhaylenko 2018, p. 64-68]. And the vocabulary is a driving engine for the LSP learners because they understand the referential and distributional characteristics of the terms much better than their English instructor due to their background knowledge of the area represented by the given LSP or professional discourse. LSPs distinguish themselves as far as choice, use and frequency of particular linguistic features of morphology, syntax, vocabulary and textual or discursive properties are concerned.

The pragmatic definition of domain-specific communication as an inherent feature of discourse and knowledge system forms a bridge that leads to the scrutiny of communication and the limits of the human mind in acquiring and managing knowledge [Pelikan, Roelcke 2017, p. 680; Baker 1996, p. 9]. Steehbergen suggests four principles of the semantic domain formation, he writes that a semantic domain must meet the following principle:

(1) the meaning of the word is to be established on the basis of a pure semantic analsis only;

(2) the lexical meaning of the word is to be explained in the form of a definition covering all relevant semantic features of that word;

(3) the meaning of a word only be understood well if is studied in relationship with other word belonging to the same semantic domain;

(4) only a structural semantic analysis of a language can help us discover which semantic domains are relevant for that language [Steenbergen 2006, p. 175; Allan 2009].

The objective of our research aims at exploring the role of the semantic relation of meronymy (the part-whole relationship) in the discourse of architecture and revealing the ways of rendering its meronyms from English into Russian employing dictionary definitions, componential structure of the meronym lexical meaning, semantic taxonomies and active context of meronyms.

DISCUSSION. The professional discourse of architecture which semantics (lexical and functional), structure, as well as cohesion and coherence stem from specific, target language uses based on an identified set of specialized features: *style, distinctive features, form, space*. The content must be focused on the lexemes, (*modernism, shape, openness, function, material*, etc,), phrases (asymmetrical compositions, general cubic or cylindrical shapes, flat roofs**,** gothic style, geometric form, etc.), idioms (*public housing, open plan, reinforced concrete, wrap-around porch, Gothic Revival, housing boom, Norman Architecture, semi-enclosed courtyard,* etc.), and sentences in the specific context (*As part of the Counter-Reformation the architecture was an attempt to celebrate the Catholic state* [Baroque style]; *In Germany in the early 1900s the movement held the idea that all art and technology would be unified under the idea of simplistic design and mass-production* [Bauhaus]; Inspiration was taken from the classic styles of Ancient Greek and Roman buildings and design [Neo-Classical]; *The cabin features a translucent white mesh facade, while the interior is lined with plywood punctuated with a series of circular cut-outs, which allows light to pass in and out of the structure* [Chinese architecture], etc.).

According to Strevens, the essential characteristics of specific purpose curriculum is: its goal to meet specified needs of a member of the professional community; related in content in our case, to architecture; focused on the language appropriate to those activities, in syntax, lexis, semantic taxonomies, word distribution, idiomaticity, discourse, etc. [Strevens 1988, p. 1-2; see also Mykhaylenko 2018, p. 64-68].

Meronyms in the architecture discourse are lexical items denoting a part in respect to lexical items denoting a whole. They vary in showing how necessary the part is to the whole, for example, a *floor* as a meronym of *a room and further, a room as a meronym of a house* others are usual but not obligatory, like *belfry* as a meronym of *a house*; still others are optional like *a weathercock* for a *roof*" [Saeed 2003]. Hyponymy, antonymy, and meronymy reflect different aspects of the organization of a lexical glossary and they all differ from synonymy.

Van Sterkenburg specifies that meronymy is a hierarchical sense relations between concepts linking a lexical item denoting a whole and a lexical item denoting a part [Sterkenburg 2003, p. 405]. A meronym denotes a word or other element that together with other elements constitutes a whole, like, *a floor, a ceiling, a roof, a wall, a window, a door* can constitute a *house*, compare a hyponym, on the other hand, denotes a word that belongs to a subset whose elements are collectively summarized by a hypernym. In traditional literary studies there are the two commonly acknowledged variants of synecdoche, part for the whole (and vice versa) and genus for species (and vice versa), find their correspondence in the linguistic concepts of meronymy/holonymy and hyponymy/hypernymy. A meronym denotes a word or other element that together with other elements constitutes a whole.

Meronymy is a semantic relation used in linguistics and it is the opposite of holonymy. A closely related concept is that of mereology, which specifically deals with part/whole relations and is used in logic. It is formally expressed in terms of first-order logic. A meronymy can also be considered a partial order. Iris Litowitz and Marta Evens [Litowitz, Evens 1988] explain that meronymy is not a single relation but a collection of four different part-whole relations with different transitivity behaviour.

These four schemata of meronymic relations [Litowitz, Evens 1988, p. 272-275] express the functional component (i.e., the part is a functioning unit of the whole), the segmented whole (i.e., the whole is divided into pieces), the collection member (i.e., a physical collection or aggregate of objects), and the set-subset aspects of part-whole (i.e., a set is a subset of another set).

In our world of specialization and sub-specialization with partly still existing traditional division into arts and sciences with sacrosanct and institutionally defended barriers between them, we desperately need bridges, like architecture, civil engineering, geology, material resistance study, and ethnography. Objective reality is one, and so should be the knowledge of it [Dodigovic 2017, p. 4-5].

Lothar Hoffmann defined special language as language used by specialists in a certain field of knowledge [Hoffmann 1997]. From the semiotic point of view, says Marina Dodigovic, is a special language emerges as a result of interference of another system of signs introduced by the speaker to communicate with his/her fellow experts on the issues of their special field of knowledge. [Dodigovic 2017; Sterkenburg 2003, p. 405]

Meronymy is a hierarchical sense relations between concepts linking a lexical item denoting a whole and a lexical item denoting a part. Along similar lines, Litowitz and Evens explain that meronymy is not a single relation but a collection of four different part-whole relations with different transitivity behavior. These four schemata of meronymic relations [Litowitz, Evens 1988, p. 272-275] express the functional component (i.e., the part is a functioning unit of the whole), the segmented whole (i.e., the whole is divided into pieces), the collection member (i.e., a physical collection or aggregate of objects), and the set-subset aspects of part-whole (i.e., a set is a subset of another set).

CORPORA ANALYSIS. There are two broad ways to think about meaning: (1) as a relation between language and the world, or in terms of truth; (ii) as a relation between the language and its users, or in terms of understanding [Dowty 1979, p. 375-377].

First we suggest an algorithm of translating meronyms of the domain of architecture used in the discourse of fiction in the parallel texts. For the analysis of meronymy I resorted to the descriptions of the houses in the novel of "Of Human Bondage" by W. Somerset Maugham and its Russian translation, and, then I will precede employing the English textbooks in architecture and their Russian translations with the aim to reveal the typology of rendering models with meronyms

Illustration 1.1. *A woman servant came into a room in which a child was sleeping and drew the curtains. She glanced mechanically at the house opposite, a stucco house with a portico, and went to the child's bed. She pulled down the bed-clothes, took him in her arms, and carried him downstairs.*

Room is a **part** of the inside of a ***building*** that is **separated** from other **parts** by the **walls, floor**, and **ceiling**. So the definition points out that the *room* in the given context is a holonym but the lexical meaning of *downstairs* includes it and turns it into a meronym. *House* is "a **building** that **people**, usually one **family**, **live** in. It is supposed to have a floor, a ceiling, walls, roof, a door, a window; it is divided into rooms." In the English tradition the house is a two-storey building, i.e. there is upstairs and downstairs.

Accordingly, these parts are meronyms in respect to house, though again in respect to the room both of they are holonyms: *downstairs* – to or on a **lower floor** of a **building**, **especially** the **ground flo**or; *upstairs* – towards or on the **highest floor** or **floors** of a **building**. *Portico* – c. 1600, borrowed from Italian portico,which came from Latin porticus "colonnade, arcade, covered walk, porch," from porta "gate, and earlier came from PIE root *per- (2) "to lead, pass over," especially of the painted porch in Athens.

In Modern English it is a **covered entrance** to a **building**, usually a **large** and **impressive building**, that is **supported** by **columns** (Cambridge) or a porch or covered walk, consisting of a roof supported by columns, often at the entrance or across the front of a building; colonnade (Collins); a meronym – a part of the whole – of a house on the opposite site [see also Castoriadis 1993; Oliver, 2007; Cromley, 2008].

Illustration 1.2. *В комнату, где спал ребенок, вошла служанка и раздвинула шторы. Она по привычке окинула взглядом фасад дома напротив – оштукатуренный, с портиком – и подошла к детской кроватке. Откинув одеяло, она взяла его на руки и снесла вниз.*

The correlation of a sub-set of English meronyms with a sub-set of holonyms coincides with the Russian translation. The rest parts of the *room – floor, walls, ceiling* are implied as well as the *stairs* from the first floor to the ground floor. The *window* of the *room* was implicitly expressed by the idiom *drew the curtains* [Lyons 1977], otherwise called 'canonical' and 'facilitative' [Cruse, 1986]. Here is an example of a necessary meronym – a *window* is a necessary condition of a *room*, and in case it is not expressed, it is a part of a room. While a *curtain* is an optional meronym, a *room* remains a room without it [Allan 2009].

The translator added one more meronym фасад "façade" of the house as a specification of the part of the house the servant saw. However, it is redundant, because the house cannot exist without it, the Russian reader would rather need a clarification of the room – "nursery," which is usually upstairs according to the English tradition. Such specification is necessary for the EFL or LSP learners to study language as a part of civilization

Illustration 2.1. *They walked through the garden to the front-door. This was only used by visitors and on Sundays, and on special occasions, as when the Vicar went up to London or came back. The traffic of the house took place through a side-door, and there was a back door as well for the gardener and for beggars and tramps. It was a fairly large house of yellow brick, with a red roof, built about five and twenty years before in an ecclesiastical style. The front-door was like a church porch, and the drawing-room windows were gothic.*

Front door – "the **main entrance** to a **building**, **especially** a **house**,usually **facing** the **road**" (Cambridge), or "the **front door** of a house or other **building** is the main door, which is usually in the **wall** that " (Collins).

Side door "an indirect or less conspicuous means of entrance" (Merriam-Webster), or a **door** at the side of a building" (Collins)

Back door "a **door** at the back or **side** of a **building**, or at the back of a **vehicle**" (Cambridge), "a **door** at the **rear** or side of a building" (Collins)

Due to the definitional analysis of the dictionary entries it is proved that the referred three doors are differentiated by their location in the wall of the house. And the additional component of the lexical meaning of the phrase *front door* is "facing the road". The difference lies in the English culture "front for the guests or head of the family," side "for the family on ordinary days" and back for "servants, beggars and tramps'

Illustration 2.2. *Миновав сад, они подошли к парадной двери. Через эту дверь входили гости; обитатели дома пользовались ею только по воскресеньям и в особенных случаях, – когда священник ездил в Лондон или возвращался оттуда. Обычно же в дом входили через боковую дверь. Был тут и черный ход – для садовника, нищих и бродяг. Дом, довольно просторный, из желтого кирпича, с красной крышей, был построен лет двадцать пять назад в церковном стиле. Парадное крыльцо напоминало паперть, а окна в гостиной были узкие, как в готическом храме.*

Парадная дверь "front-door" is used to mean for special occasions. As for парадное крыльцо "front-door" I believe it is an example of domesticizing the English concept. Besides, the comparison of the front door of the house with the *church porch* "паперть" makes the Russian *крыльцо* inappropriate due to the Gothic style, neither fits the meronym *парадный подъезд* because it would imply a rich mansion house. But Mr Carey had a modest income, he was thrifty by inclination and economical by necessity, and he could not afford to build a portico to his house. The translator employing the noun phrase *парадное крыльцо* violates the Gothic architectural style.

The translation of *side-door* by the analogue *боковая дверь* corresponds to the English definition.

The *back door* is synonymous to the *kitchen door*, but its English-Russian dictionary translation does not reflect the English definition: *"вход в кухню с заднего двора только для своих."* So the translation of *back door* by чёрный ход renders the intended meaning of the author [Castoriadis 1993, p. 300; Davaninezhad 2009].

Illustration 3.1. Modernism is a blanket term given to a movement at the turn of the 20th Century and can include styles such as Futurism, Post-modern and New Classical. Forms were intended to be free of unnecessary detail and focus on simplicity and there is an honouring of the materials used rather than concealing them.

In the professional discourse of architecture represented by the given English text most of concepts are expressed by holonyms, for instance, *modernism, blanket, movement, style, futurism, post-modern, new classical*, each of them can be modeled into a semantic taxonomy where meronyms are able to differentiate their own subset, for instance, *decorative-free, low building, modern materials, interaction of spaces, sun and shading, human comfort, natural light*.

Illustration 3.2. Архитектурный стиль модерн в Европе и Америке приходится на 1890– 1914 годы. Новое направление кардинально изменило представление о прекрасном в графике, дизайне, скульптуре, музыке, балете. Изобретательные архитекторы создавали не просто выразительные сооружения с необычным внешним и внутренним обликом, но и освоили новые материалы – бетон, сталь, стекло. Современные проекты домов в технике модерн используют исторические элементы избирательно, отказываясь от пышного декора и чрезмерной асимметрии в пользу более рациональных решений.

The translator uses holonyms as nodes representing subsets of meronyms, for example, "направления": *графика, дизайн, скульптура, музыка, балет*; "материалы": *бетон, сталь, стекло*.

Experimenting with formats of bilingual glossaries [Sin-way 2010] and initiating a new philosophy in applied lexicography we believe that there can be two possible approaches to the entry structure:

(i)   from meronym to holonym for the beginners in professional discourse translation;
(ii)   from holonym to meronyms for the experts.

FINDINGS & PERSPECTIVES. The function of architects is much beyond their creating building. They must not ignore the community's traditions, beliefs, and culture which are mainly hidden in details [Cromley 1976, p. 391]. And the translator's task is to specify all these details with the help of meronyms which retaim the smallest items of culture.

We suggest the pre-translation algorithm which includes:

Step 1. Selecting holonyms (nominations of the "wholes" and their counterparts meronyms (nominations of the parts of the "wholes") from the text marked with intertextuality [Oliver 2007, p.1380fl]

Step 2. Modeling the componential structures. The semantic structure of a lexeme is a system of its components. A lexeme can be analyzed and described in terms of its semantic components to define different lexical relations.

Step 3. Defining overlapping componentsforming a semantic net [Sterkenburg 2003; Steenbergen 2006].

Step 4. Mark optional meronyms. Many parts are optional and the same part names often apply to many different wholes. Meronym relations can be helpful in defining words [Murphy 2010, p.123].

Step 5. Undertake culturalization or localizatiom [Hermans 2003; Calloway 2005; Bassnett 2007; Cromley 2008; Davaninezhad 2009; Concha 2010; Sakellariou 2014].

Note: The addressee's level of acquisition of the target text requires either the use of holonyms to generalize the text, or meronyms to make it more detailed.

Note: The addressee's level of acquisition of the target text requires either the use of holonyms to generalize the text, or meronyms to make it more detailed [Bassnett 2007; Cromley 2008; Davaninezhad 2009; Concha 2010; Sakellariou 2014].

References

Allan K. (ed.). *Concise Encyclopedia of Semantic*. Boston : Elsevier, 2009. xxi, 1080 pp.

Baker M. Linguistics and cultural studies: Complementary or competing paradigms in Translation Studies? / Ed. A. Lauer, H. Gerzymisch-Arbogast, J. Halle, E. Steiner *Übersetzungswissenschaft im Umbruch : Festschrift für Wolfram Wilss*. Tübingen : Gunter Narr, 1996. P. 9–19.

Bassnett S. Culture and Translation. / Ed. P. Kuhiwzcak & K. Littau. *A Companion to Translation Studies*. Clevedon : Multilingual Matters, 2007. P. 13- 23.

Calloway S., Cromley E., Powers A. (eds.). The Elements of style : An Encyclopedia of domestic architectural detail. Firefly Books, 2005. 592 p.

Castoriadis C. Social transformation and cultural creation / Ed. Cornelius Castoriadis. *Political and Social Writings. Vol. 3*. (tr. D. A. Curtis). Minneapolis : University of Minnesota Press, 1993. P. 300-313.

Concha O. M. The parts of the building : Meronymy in the discourse of construction engineering. *Estudios Ingleses de la Universidad Complutense*. 2010, vol. 18 . P. 11-34

Cromley E. Cultural embeddedness in vernacular archirecture. *Building research and information*. 2008. Vol. 36 (3). P. 391-394.

Culler J. Presupposition and intertextuality. *MLN*. 1976. Vol. 91(6). P.1380- 1396.

Davaninezhad F. K. Cross-cultural communication and translation. *Translation Journal*. 2009. Vol. 13. No.4.

Dodigovic M. et al. Trends in Vocabulary Research. TESOL, 2017. Vol.17. Issue 1. P.1-7.

Dowty D. R. Word *meaning and Montague grammar. The semantics of verbs and times in generative semantics and in Montague's PTQ*. Synthese language library, vol. 7. Dordrecht, Boston, and London: D. Reidel Publishing Company 1979, xvii + 415 pp.

Hermans T. Cross-cultural translation studies as thick translation. *Bulletin of SOAS*. 2003. Vol.66 (3). P. 380-389.

Hoffmann L. et al (eds.) Fachsprachen. *Languages for Special Purposes*. 1. Halbband (Mathematical Research,). Amsterdam : de Guyter,1997. 1412 p.

Litowitz I. M., Litowiyz B., Evens M. Problems with part-whole Relation. / Ed. Marta *Evens* .... Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 1988. P. 261—288.

Malmkjaer K., The Routledge Handbook of Translation Studies and Linguistics. Accessed on : 04 Nov 2018. URL : https://www.routledgehandbooks.com/doi/10.4324/9781315692845-27.2010.

Murphy L., Koskela A. Key Terms in Semantics. London/Oxford : Bloomsbury, 2010. 256 p.

Mykhaylenko V. V. Professional Discourse : Societal Functions Of Disintegration & Integration. *Матеріали VI Наукової конференції з міжнародною участю. Когнітивно-прагматичні дослідження професійних дискурсів*. Харків : ХНУ ім. В. Н. Каразіна, 2018. P. 64-68.

Oliver P. Built to meet needs – Cultural issues in vernacular architecture. London/New York : Routledge, 2007. 480 p.

Pelikan K., Roelcke T. Theoretical models and specific communication situations in project. *Open Linguistics*. 2017. Vol. 3. P. 679–698.

Saeed J. I. *Semantics*, 2nd ed. Wiley-Blackwell, 2003. 480 p.

Sakellariou P. and intercultural communication. *Journal of Specialized Translation*. 2014. Issue 15. P. 229-245.

Sin-way C. Translation and bilingual dictionaries. Tubingen : Niemeyer, 2010. 196 p.

Steenbergen G. J. Semantics, World View and Bible Translation : An integrated analysis of a selection of Hebrew lexical items referring to negative moral behaviour in the book of Isaiah. Stellenbosch Sun Press, 2006.

Sterkenburg P. G. J. van. A practical guide to lexicography. Amsterdam/ Philadelpia : John Benjamins Publishing, 2003. 459 p.

Strevens P. ESP after twenty years, a re-appraisal in ESP State of the Art. SEAMEO Regional Language Centre, 1988. P. 1-13.