

4. Geeraerts, D., Grondelaers, S., Bakema, P. 1994. *The Structure of Lexical Variation: Meaning, Naming and Context*. Berlin, New York : Mouton de Gruyter.
5. Ipsen, G. 1924. *Der Alte Orient und Indogermanen. Stand und Aufgaben der Sprachwissenschaft*. 89–167. Heidelberg.
6. Karaulov, Y. N. 1981. *Linhvisticheskoe Konstruirovaniye i Tezaurus Literaturnogo Jazyka*. Moskva: Nauka.
7. Katz, J.J. 1997. Recent Issues in The Semantic Theory. *Foundations of Language* 3: 124-194.
8. Lehrer, A. 1974. *Semantic Fields and Lexical Structure*. Elsevier: Holland.
9. Merriam -Webster's Collegiate Dictionary. 2001. NY : Pearson Education, Limited.
10. Random House Kernerman Webster's College Dictionary. 2009. NY : Random House Inc.
11. Smith, R. H., Kim, S. H. 2007. Comprehending Envy. *Psychological Bulletin* 113: 46-64.
12. *The American Heritage Dictionary of Idioms*. 2013. Boston : Houghton Mifflin Company.
13. *The American Heritage Roget's Thesaurus*. 2013. Boston : Houghton Mifflin Company.
14. *The New Lexicon Webster's Dictionary of the English Language*. 1987. NY.: Lexicon Publications, Inc.
15. Trier, J. 1931. *Der Deutsche Wortschatz im Sinnbezirk des Verstandes*. Heidelberg: Winter 1.
16. Tsoller, V. N. 1996. *Ekspressivnaja Leksika : Semantika i Prahmatika*. *Filologicheskie nauky* 6: 62–71.
17. Ufimtseva, A. A. 1961. «Teorii Semanticheskogo Polia I Vozmozhnosti Ikh Primenenia pri Izuchenii Slovarnogo Sostava Yazyka». *Voprosy Teorii Yazykov v Sovremennoi Zarubezhnoi Lingvistike*. 48-64. Moskva: Nauka.
18. Ufimtseva, A. A. 1962. *Opyt Izucheniia Leksiki Kak Sistemy*. Moskva : Izd-vo AN SSSR.
19. Vasiljev, L. M. 1971. «Teoriia Semanticheskikh Polei». *Voprosy Yazykoznaniiia* 5: 105-113.
20. Vasiljev, L. M. 1997. *Metodi Sovremennoj Linhvistiki*. Ufa: Izd-vo Bashkirskoho un-ta.
21. Verdieva, Z. N. 1986. *Semanticheskie Polya v Sovremennom Anhliiskom Jazyke*. Moskva: Vysshaia Shkola.

УДК 811. 11'373

V. V. Mykhaylenko,

Ivano-Frankivsk King Danylo Galytsky University of Law, Ivano-Frankivsk

### POLITICAL DISCOURSE ACTUALISING A WORD PRAGMATIC COMPONENT

*The actualization/activation of a pragmatic component in the lexical meaning of the word 'consultation' under its discourse influence is in the focus of the present investigation. There are two main modes for exploring word meaning: in relation to other words and in relation to the world. First, traditional method used in dictionaries is to define a word in terms of other words, second, a foundational theory, which is interested in how lexical expressions acquire properties necessary for the user in discourse. The semantic correlation of the lexeme and the discourse stimulates some shifts in the word meaning. We focus our investigation on of the lexeme consultation functioning in political discourse. The professional (political) discourse is usually represented by a semantic net [11, p.3-18] which makes it cohesive and determines the topic. The lexemes in the net share a common component that links them into a semantic domain, for instance, party, negotiation, information, agreement, decision, etc. encode the political discourse. The notion of «Semantic domain» is inspired by «The Theory of Semantic Fields,» a structural model for lexical semantics introduced by Jost Trier at the beginning of the last century. The basic assumption is that lexicon is structured into Semantic Domains: semantic relations among concepts belonging to the same domain are very dense. To reveal a pragmatic component in the semantic domain of 'consultation' linking other registers of discourse, for instance, legal, academic, banking, medical, and family is another step forward in semantic pragmatics.*

**Key words:** lexeme, meaning, pragmatic component, political discourse, actualization, semantic domain, concept.

#### АКТУАЛІЗАЦІЯ ПРАГМАТИЧНОГО КОМПОНЕНТА СЛОВА У ПОЛІТИЧНОМУ ДИСКУРСІ

*У центрі даного дослідження - причини актуалізації/активації прагматичного компонента значення слова 'consultation' у структурі політичного дискурсу. Семантична взаємодія лексеми та дискурсу обумовлює деякі зміни у лексичному значенні слова.*

**Ключові слова:** лексема, значення, прагматичний компонент, політичний дискурс, актуалізація/ активація, семантичне поле, концепт.

#### АКТУАЛИЗАЦИЯ ПРАГМАТИЧЕСКОГО КОМПОНЕНТА СЛОВА В ПОЛИТИЧЕСКОЙ ДИСКУРСЕ

*Актуализация/активация прагматического компонента значения слова 'consultation' в структуре политического дискурса и их причины – в фокусе настоящего исследования. Семантическое взаимодействие лексеми и дискурса обуславливает некоторые сдвиги в лексическом значении слова.*

**Ключевые слова:** лексема, значение, прагматический компонент, политический дискурс, актуализация/активация, семантическое поле, концепт.

**INTRODUCTION.** At present two kinds of word meaning theory can be distinguished. First, a semantic theory of word meaning, which is interested in clarifying what meaning is encoded by the lexical items of a natural language. A framework establishing that the word 'consultation' [2, p. 142–149] encodes the lexical concept *assistance* would be an example of a semantic theory of word meaning, second, a foundational theory, which is interested in how lexical expressions acquire properties necessary for the user in discourse. We focus our investigation on of the lexeme *consultation* functioning in political discourse.

A broad definition of Political Language is suggested by Ursula Okulska and Piotr Cap: an area of studies of language in mainly (but not exclusively) political setting [see: 17] (viz. 'language and [in/of] politics [1, p. 32–43]) complemented by research on power positions and social perceptions of languages as means of struggle for cultural/command superiority and dominance (viz. 'language politics' -see: Blommaert, 1997) [5, p.1–10]. In their definition they underline the political content of the professional discourse with its dominant concept of 'power' which reveals the ideological character of political discourse, as Teun A. van Dijk stresses [19, p. 15-34; cf.: 3, p. 139–158]. And Ursula Okulska and Piotr Cap compare their definition with that given by Jan Blommaert and Chris Bulcaert, where there is a concern with particular linguistic aspects such as non-modal meaning, persuasive tactics or there is metalinguistic negation, and with recent trends of political discourse such as conversationalisation [see also: 5, p. 1–10].

The professional (political) discourse [4, p. 193-198] is usually represented by a semantic net [11, p.3-18] which makes it cohesive and determines the topic. The lexemes in the net share a common component [16, p. 32-68] that links them into a semantic domain [see: 15], for instance, the political discourse may be based on *party, negotiation, information, agreement, decision* forming a political domain. The notion of «Semantic domain» is inspired by «The Theory of Semantic Fields» a structural model for lexical semantics introduced by Jost Trier at the beginning of the last century. The basic assumption is that lexicon is structured

into Semantic Fields: semantic relations among concepts belonging to the same field are very dense [see: 7, 8, 14], for instance, while concepts referring to different fields are typically unrelated. The main limitation of this theory is that it does not provide an objective criterion to distinguish among Semantic Fields.

In computational linguistics for Semantic Fields have been proposed quite recently the concept of *Semantic Domain* [14] which is a cluster of terms and texts that exhibit a high level of lexical coherence, i.e. the property of domain-specific words to co-occur together in texts [see: 8; 12]. In the present work, we will refer to these kinds of relations among terms, concepts and texts by means of the term *Domain Relations*, adopting the terminology introduced by. Relations between concepts, components, senses or meanings should not be confused with relations between the terms, words, expressions or signs used to express the concepts [see: 20; 16]. It is, however, common to mix both of these kinds of relations under the heading «semantic relations» (Cruse, Lyons, 1977; Malmkjær, 1995, Murphy, 2003). A contextual semantic domain corresponds to what cognitive linguistics describes as a cognitive frame or cognitive context [6, p. 5–16]. Whereas lexical semantic domains deal with the paradigmatic relations between a lexical item and other members of the same category, contextual semantic domains focus on the syntagmatic relationships between a lexical item and other lexical items that are used in the same context or cognitive frame.

**DISCUSSION.** Word meaning played a somewhat marginal role in early contemporary philosophy of language, which was primarily concerned with the structural features of sentences and showed less interest in the format of lexical representations and in the nature of the word-level input to compositional processes. Nowadays, it is well-established that the current approach to word meaning is bound to have a major impact in tipping the balance in favor or against a given picture of the fundamental properties of human language (Standford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, 2015).

Word meaning relates to the semantic value that is conventionally associated with individual lexical items, which is to say WORDS (see also LEXICAL SEMANTICS). The conventional meaning associated with a word is often referred to more technically as a semantic representation, semantic unit or lexical CONCEPT [12, p. 91–110]. In modern linguistics, word meanings are held to be conceptual entities, which is to say, they are held to constitute mental units, paired with phonetically-realizable forms, and stored in long-term MEMORY (see also SEMANTIC MEMORY). The repository of such form-meaning pairings forms a structured inventory which is commonly referred to as the MENTAL LEXICON. [see: 8, 9]. One way in which this has been expressed is in terms of the distinction between denotation—what a word refers to or designates—and connotation—what a word evokes. For instance, the denotation of *consultation* is ‘advice’ while the connotation is ‘bargain’ (Standford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, 2015). The concept of Semantic Domain extends the concept of Semantic Field from a lexical level, in which it identifies a set of domain related lexical concepts, to a textual level, in which it identifies a class of similar documents. The founding idea is the lexical coherence assumption, that has to be presupposed to guarantee the existence of Semantic Domains in corpora [10, p.6-9]. We shall analyze the relations between Semantic Domains at the lexical and at the textual levels, describing the property of *Lexical Coherence* in texts. We will try to provide empirical evidence for that most of the lexicon in text fragments belongs to the principal legal domain of the text, giving support to the *One Domain per Discourse* hypothesis.

**INVESTIGATION.** The objective of the research is to reveal a semantic correlation of the lexeme *consultation* and its discourse, primarily, a political one. The data consists of a small corpus of real-life of text fragments of political discourse. The corpus consists of British and American political discourse represented by text fragments of various registers (laws, speeches, reports, addresses, etc.). We shall start with the lexical meaning of the noun *consultation* to reveal its basic meaning and the ways of its enrichment.

In lexical semantics the word meaning is represented as a set of components arranged in a fixed order. We consider that in functional or compositional semantics the meaning is represented as a set of components with a self-regulated hierarchy due to the the word combinability in the text. [cf.:13, p. 1–24]. One of the issues is that research on word meaning has attempted to address is how much of the meaning associated with a given instance of use is due to the word itself, and how much is due to the context (linguistic or extra-linguistic) in which each token is embedded. Another issue that has exercised researchers on word meaning has been how best to model the semantic representations associated with words. Traditionally, linguists have distinguished that part of a word’s meaning which is core (semantic knowledge) and that which is non-core (pragmatic or encyclopaedic knowledge) [3, p. 1–22].

First we shall employ the traditional method to define a word in terms of other words. Definitions and terms are essential for any systematic knowledge. Their rigorousness and other properties vary a lot, from vague terms and implicit definitions to specialized terms with formalized definitions. According to Merriam-Webster, the lexeme *consultation* definition has the following constituents: (examples omitted from this quotation), for instance:

1. A meeting in which someone (such as a doctor or lawyer) talks to a person about a problem, question, etc.
2. A discussion about something that is being decided.
3. The act of looking for information in a book, on a map, etc.
4. A council, conference; specifically: a deliberation between physicians on a case or its treatment.
5. The act of consulting or conferring.

Every natural language has a lexicon organized into lexical entries, which contain information about lexemes. These are the smallest linguistic expressions that are conventionally associated with a non-compositional meaning and can be uttered in isolation to convey semantic content [Standford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, 2015]. Definitions are a list of necessary and sufficient conditions for particular meanings. [17, p.225]. This is a typical «dictionary definition»: it defines a word using a compact prose description. Note that in terminology, we might prefer restricting the meaning to just ‘a word or expression that has a precise meaning in a specific context’. Here we are interested in the meaning of the noun lexeme *consultation*. It is evident that the lexical meaning of *consultation* can be modeled as a semantic structure with an ordered hierarchy [16, p. 32-68]: *meeting, discussion, information supply, council, conference, deliberation*. In their turn they have their own potential basic meaning: *meeting* – a gathering of people for a particular purpose (such as to talk about business); *discussion* – the act of talking about something with another person or a group of people; a *conversation* about something; *information* (search/supply): knowledge that you get about someone or something; facts or details about a subject; *council*- a group of people who are chosen to make rules, laws, or decisions about something; *decision*- a formal meeting in which many people gather in order to talk about ideas or problems related to a particular topic (such as medicine or business) usually for several days; *deliberation* – careful thought or discussion done in order to make a decision.

Consequently, in English lexicon the lexeme *consultation* is polysemantic taking into consideration its definition. In the English world view they reflect the following frame:

Addressor Meets Addressee / Addressee Meets Addressor (Both are Participants).  
Addressor Gives Information to Addressee

Addressee Receives Information

Addressee Makes a Decision.

Let's recall semantic roles or cases to reveal all the possible semantic components in the meaning of *consultation*. We shall make up a list of semantic roles constituting one of the most common and simplest forms of lexical semantic representation adopted. Semantic roles are also referred to as «case frames» (Fillmore 1968) or «theta-grids» (Stowell 1981). They acquired a prominent role in linguistic theory thanks to the works in the 70-ies and 80-ies of Gruber (1965), Fillmore's (1968, 1977) seminal papers, and Jackendoff's early work (1972, 1976). Nevertheless, they go back to Panini's *karakas* (cf. Cardona 1974). In terms of Semantic roles or cases, first, both participants are Agents, then the Addressor becomes the Doer of an action and the Addressee becomes the Benefactive, the place of meeting is Locative and Discussion is Instrument. Semantic roles attempt to capture similarities and differences in word meaning that are activated in various situations or frames that will contribute to the mapping from semantics to syntax. They belong, then, to the semantics/syntax interface generating a discourse, in our case – a political discourse, for instance:

1.1. In the course of consultations in accordance with the provisions of a covered agreement, before resorting to further action under this Understanding, Members should attempt to obtain satisfactory adjustment of the matter.

1.2. During consultations Members should give special attention to the particular problems and interests of developing country Members.

1.3. Additionally, the revised draft DCC Licence was published in November 2012 and continues to be developed in light of other smart metering consultations and the DCC licensing competition.

1.4. If a request for consultations is made pursuant to a covered agreement, the Member to which the request is made shall, unless otherwise mutually agreed, reply to the request within 10 days after the date of its receipt and shall enter into consultations in good faith within a period of no more than 30 days after the date of receipt of the request, with a view to reaching a mutually satisfactory solution.

The nucleus meaning *consultation* activates the component *negotiation*.

2.1. All solutions to matters formally raised under the consultation and dispute settlement provisions of the covered agreements, including arbitration awards, shall be consistent with those agreements and shall not nullify or impair benefits accruing to any Member under those agreements, nor impede the attainment of any objective of those agreements.

2.2. This Understanding shall be applied only with respect to new requests for consultations under the consultation provisions of the covered agreements made on or after the date of entry into force of the Agreement.

2.3. This consultation has been carried out in accordance with the Government's consultation principles

2.4. Members affirm their resolve to strengthen and improve the effectiveness of the consultation procedures employed by Members.

The nucleus meaning *consultation* activates the component *hearing*.

3.1. Information and Consultation Directives (national level)

3.2. Responses to this consultation should be sent to...

3.3. The consultation can be found on DECC's website.

3.4. Responses to this consultation should be sent to...

The nucleus meaning *consultation* activates the component *conferencing*.

4.1. [Draft-Laws] submitted for public consultation.

4.2. The Dispute Settlement Body is hereby established to administer these rules and procedures and, except as otherwise provided in a covered agreement, the consultation and dispute settlement provisions of the covered agreements.

4.3. If the consultations fail to settle a dispute within 60 days after the date of receipt of the request for consultations, the complaining party may request the establishment of a panel.

The nucleus meaning *consultation* activates the component *discussion*.

5.1. The Government will undertake this formal consultation exercise before the DCC Licence comes into force with the intention that the SEC will be designated to have effect at that point.

5.2. Consultations shall be confidential, and without prejudice to the rights of any Member in any further proceedings.

5.3. Supplementary consultation on updated draft legal text.

The nucleus meaning *consultation* activates the component *dispute/ mooting*.

6.1. The detail of the SEC legal text may evolve as a result of the DCC competitive process, the consultation on transition and further policy development.

The nucleus meaning *consultation* activates the component *agreement*.

7.1. The rules and procedures of this Understanding shall also apply to consultations and the settlement of disputes between Members concerning their rights and obligations under the provisions of the Agreement Establishing the World Trade Organization (referred to in this Understanding as the «WTO Agreement») and of this Understanding taken in isolation or in combination with any other covered agreement.

The nucleus meaning *consultation* activates the component *examination*.

8.1. The Chairman of the Dispute Settlement Body provided for in paragraph 1 of Article 2 (referred to in this Understanding as the «DSB»), in consultation with the parties to the dispute, shall determine the rules and procedures to be followed within 10 days after a request by either Member.

The nucleus meaning *consultation* activates the component *settlement*.

Relational theories of lexical semantics hold that any word can be defined in terms of the other words to which it is related [see: G.A. Miller et al.]: Consultation → Negotiation; Consultation → Hearing; Consultation → Conferencing; Consultation → Discussion; Consultation → Dispute/ Mooting; Consultation → Agreement; Consultation → Examination; Consultation → Settlement. An algorithm for components identification must distinguish sets of linguistic contexts, raising the question of how much context is required. The limits of a linguistic context can be defined arbitrarily, but we prefer to define it in terms of sentences or text fragments, that is to say, two words co-occur in the same context if they occur in the same sentence [see: G.A. Miller et al.]. Words whose meanings are sufficiently similar in some respect are often said to constitute a SEMANTIC DOMAIN, though this term is rarely if ever given a precise definition. G.A. Miller and associates have developed a lexical database called WordNet which contains more than 118,000 different word forms and more than 90,000 different word senses, or more than 166,000 pairs. Approximately 17% of the words in WordNet are polysemous; approximately 40% have one or more synonyms. It is a kind of multidimensional thesaurus, in which these types of lexical relations are explicitly encoded [15, p. 235–312]. Thus WordNet is an attempt to model the way in which a speaker conceptualizes one component of word meaning.

Any political *consultation* is undertaken to reach an agreement, settlement through conceding, then it includes the pragmatic component *bargain*: (1) an agreement between parties settling what each gives or receives in a transaction between them or what course of action or policy each pursues in respect to the other; (2) something acquired by or as if by bargaining; (3) a transaction, situation, or event regarded in the light of its results (Merriam-Webster Dictionary). Therefore a new pragmatic component is activated in the basic potential meaning of the lexeme *consultation* under the influence of the current political discourse.

#### CONCLUSIONS AND PERSPECTIVES OF THE RESEARCH REFERENCES.

The relational theories of lexical semantics point out that any word can be defined in terms of the other words to which it is related, the lexeme *consultation* in the context can be defined in the following way:

Consultation → Negotiation; Consultation → Hearing; Consultation → Conferencing; Consultation → Discussion; Consultation → Dispute/ Mooting; Consultation → Agreement; Consultation → Examination; Consultation → Settlement. All the given lexemes are sufficiently similar in some respect to constitute a SEMANTIC DOMAIN, wherein the component *bargain* means «an agreement between parties settling what each gives or receives in a transaction between them or what course of action or policy each pursues in respect to the other». The concept of *Semantic Domain* [14] which is a cluster of terms and texts that exhibit a high level of lexical cohesion, i.e. the property of domain-specific words to co-occur together in texts. The notion of «Semantic domain» is inspired by «The Theory of Semantic Fields» a structural model for lexical semantics introduced by Jost Trier at the beginning of the last century. The basic assumption is that lexicon is structured into Semantic Domains: semantic relations among concepts belonging to the same domain are very dense. Any political *consultation* is undertaken to reach an agreement, settlement through conceding, then it includes the pragmatic component *bargain*: (1) an agreement between parties settling what each gives or receives in a transaction between them or what course of action or policy each pursues in respect to the other; (2) something acquired by or as if by bargaining; (3) a transaction, situation, or event regarded in the light of its results. The development of the semantic domain «consolidation» as a 'representant' of the conceptual system is marked by the pragmatic component *bargain*.

To reveal a pragmatic component in the semantic domain of consultation linking other registers of discourse, for instance, academic, legal, banking, medical, and family is another step forward in semantic pragmatics.

#### References:

1. Демьянков В. З. Политический дискурс как предмет политической филологии / В. З. Демьянков // Политическая наука. Политический дискурс: история и современные исследования. – Москва: ИНИОН РАН, 2002. – № 3. – С. 32–43.
2. Baizerman, Michael, Hall, William T. Consultation as a Political Process / Michael Baizerman, William T. Hall // Community Mental Health Journal. – 1977. – Volume 13. – Issue 2. – Pp. 142–149.
3. Bean, C. A., Green, R. Relationships in the Organization of Knowledge / C. A. Bean, R. Green (eds.). – Dordrecht : Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2001. – 225 p.
4. Bell, D.V.J. Political Linguistics and Event Research / D.V.J. Bell // International Interactions: Empirical and Theoretical Research in International Relations. – 1979. – Volume 6. – Issue 3. – Pp. 193–198.
5. Blommaert Jan, Bulcaen Chris. Political Linguistics / Jan Blommaert, Chris Bulcaen (eds.). Vol.9. University of Gent / University of Antwerp, 1994–1995. – Pp. 1–10.
6. Croft, William and Cruse, D. Alan. Cognitive Linguistics / William Croft, D. Alan Cruse. – Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 2004. – 356 p.
7. Crystal, D. The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Language. 2nd ed. / D. Crystal. – Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1997. – 488 p.
8. Evans, Vyvyan. Word Meaning / Vyvyan Evans // Patrick Hogan (ed.) The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the Language Sciences. – Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 2014. – 1054 p.
9. Evans, Vyvyan and Green, Melanie. Cognitive Linguistics: An Introduction / Vyvyan Evans, Melanie Green. – Edinburgh : Edinburgh University Press, 2006. – 848 p.
10. Gliozzo, Alfio, Strapparava, Carlo. Semantic Domains in Computational Linguistics / Alfio Gliozzo, Carlo Strapparava. – Berlin, Heidelberg : Springer, 2009. – 131 p.
11. Green, R. Relationships in the Organization of Knowledge: An Overview / R. Green // C. A. Bean, R. Green (eds.). Relationships in the Organization of Knowledge. – Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2001. – Pp. 3–18.
12. Green, R., Bean, C. A., Myaeng, S. H. The Semantics of Relationships. An Interdisciplinary Perspective / R. Green, C. A. Bean, S. H. Myaeng. (eds.). – Dordrecht : Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2002. – Pp. 91–110.
13. Klapuri, Anssi. Semantic Analysis of Text and Speech / Anssi Klapuri. – Tampere : Tampere University of Technology, 2007. – Pp. 1–24.
14. Malmkjaer, Kristen. Linguistics Encyclopedia / Kristen Malmkjaer (ed.). – London and New York : Routledge, 2004. – 688 p.
15. Miller, George A. Introduction to WordNet: An On-line Lexical Database / George A. Miller, Richard Beckwith, Christiane Fellbaum, Derek Gross, and Katherine Miller // International Journal of Lexicography. 1990. – Vol. 3, 4. – Pp. 235–312.
16. Nida Eugene A. A Componential Analysis of Meaning: An Introduction to Semantic Structures / Eugene A. Nida. – Amsterdam : Walter de Gruyter, 1979. – 272 p.
17. Okulska, Urszula, Cap, Piotr. Analysis of Political Discourse: Landmarks, Challenges and Prospects / Urszula Okulska, Piotr Cap // Urszula Okulska, Piotr Cap (eds.) Perspectives in Politics and Discourse. – Amsterdam. Philadelphia : John Benjamins Publishing, 2010. – 416 p.
18. Riemer, Nick. Introducing Semantics / Nick Riemer. – Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 2010. – 460 p.
19. van Dijk Teun A. Political Discourse and Ideology / Teun A van Dijk // van Dijk Teun A. // Clara Ubaldina Lorda, Montserrat Ribas (Eds.), Anàlisi del discurs polític. – Barcelona: Universitat Pompeu Fabra, IULA, 2003. – Pp. 15–34.
20. Wierzbicka, Anna. Semantics: Primes and Universals / Anna Wierzbicka. – Oxford : Oxford University Press, 1996. – 516 p.

УДК 81'255.4:801.82.2–3

**M. Yu. Rebenko,**

*Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv*

#### TRANSFORMATIONS OF J. D. SALINGER'S VOCABULARY OF *HAPAX LEGOMENA* WITHIN LITERARY TRANSLATION

*The article focuses on many-facet and systemic studies of the two-aspect translation deformation (objective and subjective translation deformations), features and characteristics of this complex interlingual and intercultural phenomenon in English-Russian and English-Ukrainian texts of translation of J. D. Salinger's «Nine Stories». The comparative quantitative translation analysis at the macro-stylistic text level through the textual indices of J. D. Salinger's vocabulary exclusiveness*