

Yana Tikan

PhD, Associate Professor
National Technical University of Ukraine
"Igor Sikorsky Kyiv Polytechnic Institute"
Kyiv, Ukraine
ORCID 0000-0002-4142-1704
Y.Tikan@kpi.ua

Oleksandr Babych

Master's student
National Technical University of Ukraine
"Igor Sikorsky Kyiv Polytechnic Institute"
Kyiv, Ukraine
sashababich1997@gmail.com

PRAGMALINGUISTIC FEATURES OF TELESCOPIC UNITS' REPRODUCTION IN MEDIATEXTS WHEN TRANSLATED FROM ENGLISH INTO UKRAINIAN

Abstract. A new area of research in modern linguistics is a variety of media resources, including the global Internet, which is not only the information accumulation environment, but also the source of new language units' emergence from various fields of science and technology, human life and work. The peculiarity of vocabulary development and enrichment is the developed ability of national languages to express the unknown through the known, to denote the new with the help of existing signs. One of such ways of word "creative" formation is the telescopic, or contamination. This article focuses on the study of such linguistic phenomenon as a "telescopic unit" in the media discourse. The authors begin the study with the general overview of the main features, typology and characteristics of telescopic units, or blends. In addition, they describe blends' main formation models. At the same time, special attention is paid to the main translation methods of telescopic units, their peculiarities and differences. The research paper also presents the various blends' translation techniques and strategies, key tips essential to ensure the most exact and adequate transition of English telescopic units into Ukrainian. Given the variety of ways to form blends, the diversity of their meanings and expressive connotation, it is often difficult to find an appropriate translation method for further adequate decoding. And the actual lack of telescopic units' dictionaries increases the need for further study of the sources and formation mechanisms of these neologisms for their more accurate translation. The study encourages the idea of further research in the sphere of a contamination phenomenon. The results of this study can assist any interpreter in adequate telescopic units' translation.

Keywords: telescopic; word formation; formation models; blends; mediatext; contamination; translation methods and strategies.

1. INTRODUCTION

One of the ways to form new vocabulary, which has recently demonstrated its increasing productivity, is telescopic – a method of word formation that is a merger of two (or more) abbreviated word bases or a merger of a complete base with a shortened base, resulting in a new word that fully or partially combines the meaning of its all-structural elements. This method of token formation is also called fusion, narrowing, contamination, hybridization. In English literature, the phenomenon of a telescopic unit is called blend, blending, fusion, portmanteau word. The relative novelty, growing productivity and "popularity" of this word formation method determine the relevance of the study of various telescopic units' formation mechanisms, their semantic features, and the establishment of their usage areas.

In recent years, linguistic research has paid considerable attention to telescopic as one of the most effective ways of word formation. Today, there are different views on this phenomenon as a way of word formation in English. Some scholars attribute telescopic units to abbreviations (Kubriakova, 1977; Mogilevsky, 2002), as well as to abbreviated words and word

formations (Shansky, 2003). However, most scientists single out telescoping as a separate method of word formation (Astafurova, 2001; Omelchenko, 2009; Zatsny, 1998; Yenikeeva, 2012). Among the other scholars who have devoted their research to the issues of telescoping, it is worth noting the following linguists: Mattiello (2008), Partridge (2002), Soudek (1978), Widdowson (2002). The independence of this phenomenon is confirmed by the structural-semantic and functional features of telescopic units, which unite two or more lexical units and are characterized by a certain functional relationship.

The main purpose of the study was to substantiate the formation and functioning peculiarities of telescopic units used in English-language media, as well as to determine the methods, strategies and difficulties of their translation from English into Ukrainian.

2. METHODS

To achieve the goal of the research, we used a set of methods. They are based on a communicative-functional approach and include theoretical analysis of special literature on the research topic, selection of texts for analysis using selective-analytical and contextual methods of English-language media research and identification of appropriate translator strategies, as well as linguistic and translation interpretation.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1. Overview of the notion “telescopic unit”, its typology, key features and characteristics

A telescopic unit is the formation of a nominative modelled unit of two words with “cutting” at least one of them at the junction, with the possible overlap and insertion of morphemes, as well as preserving the accent-component structure of one of the original words, taken as morphological sample. In modern English, this method of word formation is mainly used to create:

- 1) scientific and technical terminology (*infostructure* < *information* + *infrastructure*; *robodoc* < *robot* + *doctor*; *teleputer* < *television* + *computer*)
- 2) colloquial and slang lexical units (*kidlab* < *kid* + *laboratory*; *netois* < *net* + *patois*; *netizen* < *net* + *citizen*).

Considering the nature of contamination, it is necessary to emphasize its complex nature, because it involves mechanisms of word-bases contraction (which are leading in word formation), and mechanisms of abridgement, fragmentation of words (which is typical for form-creation) in the process of telescopes’ formation. It should be noted that the telescopes formation mechanisms have much in common with word formation. First, the formation of both telescopes and complex words are based on free lexical units. Secondly, in semantic terms, both ways of word formation are univerbation, i.e., condensation of the semantics of words combination within one lexical unit. Third, the relationship between the components of both composites and telescopes is based on their basis’s alignment (Karaban, 2001).

On the other hand, the main difference between telescoping and word formation is that it is based on the recovery of foundations that have partially or completely lost their integrity. “Fragments” of tokens used to create telescopes, usually “absorb” the semantics of their free prototypes. The semantics of blending is formed by universalization, i.e., “imposition of values” of its components and can thus be equal to the sum of the components’ meaning, for example, *framily* < *friends* + *family*.

Thus, telescoping allows to express concepts, no matter how complex, within a single word. However, the pragmatic significance of this word formation method is determined not only by the formal convenience, but also by the expressiveness of derived telescopes. The phonological unusualness as well as richness of the telescopic forms’ content make them expressive and emotional. And this, in turn, gives originality and brightness to the statements of the speaker. The communicative convenience of telescopic units contributes to their consolidation in the main dictionary of literary English and the popularization of this word formation method (Soudek, 1978).

3.2. Models of telescopic units' formation

In modern English there are different types of telescopic tokens. As a result of research of derivative telescopic units' formation mechanisms, we were able to distinguish a number of models:

1) $ab + cd = ac$ (*hi-fi* < *high fidelity*, *hi-tech* < *high technology*, *sci-fi* < *science fiction*, *mopol* < *mobile police*)

2) $ab+cd = ad$ (*agflation* < *agriculture + inflation*, *chugger* < *charity + mugger*, *Denglish* < *Deutch + English*);

3) $ab+cd = abd$ (*blogebrity* < *blog + celebrity*, *carbage* < *car + garbage*, *deskfast* < *desk + breakfast*)

4) $ab + cd = acd$ (*camouflanguage* < *camouflage + language*, *Afrocaribbean* < *African + Caribbean*, *collaboratory* < *collaborative + laboratory*) (Holets, 2015).

Among the neologisms recorded by lexicographical sources, there are several lexical innovations created by combining the apheresis of two words, according to the model $ab + cd = bd$, which was considered unproductive in previous years: *netiquette* < *Internet + etiquette*, *netizen* (*Internet user*) < *Internet + citizen*, *netpreneur* < *Internet + entrepreneur*.

The models we have mentioned above are used to form the largest number of telescopic lexical innovations, but other less productive models can be distinguished. For example, the telescopes *adorkable* < *adorable + cute (dork)* and *autopathography* < *autobiography + pathology* were created by "dissecting" the first basic word and including in its composition the full form (usually monosyllabic) or a "fragment" of the second basic token. Schematically, this can be represented as follows: $ab + cd = acb$.

The basis for the formation of telescopes, as a rule, are two words, but there are cases when telescopic units are formed by combining parts of three or more words. Quite original in the mechanism of formation is, for example, a blend *Minnewisowa*, which was created by combining the apocopies of the first two words *Minnesota* and *Wisconsin* with the apheresis of the third word *Iowa*. The model of formation of such blend can be given as follows: $ab + cd + eg = acg$ (Turchak, 2005).

3.3. Pragmatic features of telescopic units

According to scholars (Halyshyn, 2011; Holets, 2015; Klymenko, 1999), blends play an important role in modern conversational and newspaper-journalistic speech, i.e., in those elements of communication, where the desire for prompt material presentation is particularly noticeable. Formal convenience, compactness of meaning and expressiveness of telescopes contribute to their popularization. Characterizing telescopic units' functionality, most telescopes are used in the media and in advertising. Due to the freshness and unexpectedness of the form, they attract attention and have a certain pragmatic influence on the reader. (Klymenko, 1999) Words created by telescoping often have a bright, expressive connotation, making their use more ironic and satirical in literary works and media products (for example, *paytriot* < *pay + patriot* - "a hypocrite who shows himself a patriot when it is beneficial to him", *breastern* < *breast + western* - "a movie with a busty beauty in the lead role"). At the end of the 20th and the beginning of the 21st century, there was not only a quantitative increase of telescopes in the vocabulary of the English language, but also their thematic belonging and sphere of functioning expanded. New telescopes can be divided into a number of thematic groups (Halyshyn, 2011):

- IT (information technology) (*blogebrity* < *blog + celebrity*, *hackint* < *hacking + intelligence*, *Mactel* < *Macintosh + Intel*);

- economics (*agflation* < *agriculture + inflation*, *stagflation* < *stagnation + inflation*, *flexecutive* < *flexible + executive*);

- terminology (*biotecture* < *biological (біологічний) + architecture*, *diffability* < *different + disability*);

- toponyms (*Chindia* < *China + India*; *Bolliwood* < *Bombay + Holliwood*; *Eurabia* < *Europe + Arabia*; *Mexifornia* < *Mexico + California*);

- language hybrids (*Denglish* < *Deutsch* + *English*, *Spanglish* < *Spanish* + *English*, *Chinglish* < *Chinese* + *English*, *Hindlish* < *Hindi* + *English*, *Konglish* < *Korean* + *English*, *Singlish* < *Singapore* + *English*);
- language styles and sub-languages (*publilect* < *puberty* + *dialect*; *camouflanguage* < *camouflage* + *language*; *Ebonics* < *Ebony* + *phonics*; *cryptolect* < *cryptography* + *dialect*);
- holidays (*Chrismukkah* < *Christmas* + *Hanukkah*; *Falloween* < *fall* + *Halloween*);
- new literature genres and art (*fictomercial* < *fiction* + *commercial*, *docusoap* < *documentary* + *soap-opera*, *dramedy* < *drama* + *comedy*, *fratire* < *fraternity* + *satire*, *giraffiti* < *giant* + *graffiti*);
- commerce and show business (*Adidas* < *Adi Dassler*; *Popsicle Industries* < *pop* + *icicle*, *chocice* < *chocolate* + *ice*, *triscuit* < *tri* + *biscuit*, *Bradgelina* < *Brad* + *Angelina*, *MaxFactor* < *maximal* + *factor*);
- science and technology (*Oxbridge* < *Oxford* + *Cambridge*, *pixel* < *picture* + *element*, *arcology* < *architectural* + *ecology*, *camcorder* < *camera* + *recorder*);
- Internet-sphere (*blogosphere* < *blog* + *biosphere*, *netizen* < *internet* + *citizen*, *inetiquette* < *Internet* + *etiquette*).

3.4. Methods of telescopic units' translation

When working with telescopic units or apertures, the translator plays an important role. They should involve a set of professional competencies, skills and abilities to identify these units in the translated text, perform their structural and semantic analysis, identify pragmatic and stylistic features, interpret national realities in the underlying blends and use creative reproduction of identified characteristics in the relevant units during the translation. So, according to the research, the main methods of telescopic units' translation include the following:

1) Explicit translation.

Explicit translation (descriptive) is a way of transmitting non-equivalent vocabulary, which consists in revealing the meaning of the original unit with the help of phrases. This technique is the most universal, able to help the translator in the most difficult conditions: it is especially necessary if the language of translation does not have a corresponding concept for one reason or another of a social, geographical or national nature.

Consider a number of examples that demonstrate the use of this translation technique: “*AAAsking* = *AAA (highest ratings) + asking*” – a request to the company to assign it a higher degree of reliability, the so-called rating of “three A” (*AAA-заним, прохання компанії присвоїти їй вищий ступінь надійності, так званий рейтинг «трьох А»*). “*Alcoholiday* = *alcohol + holiday*” – a day off that involves the consumption of alcoholic beverages (*алкогольний вихідний, вихідний день, який передбачає споживання алкогольних напоїв*). “*Definictionary* = *definite + dictionary*” – a dictionary that contains accurate, adequate definitions of words and concepts (*тлумачний словник із точним і відповідним поясненням слів та понять*). “*Googlennium* = *Google + millennium*” – a generation that uses the search engine Google (*Google-покоління, покоління, яке користується пошуковою системою Google*). “*ICANNOT* = *Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers + I cannot*” – one of the Internet corporations which does not cope with its responsibilities (*Інтернет-корпорація «ЯНЕМОЖУ», Інтернет-, яка не справляється зі своїми обов'язками*). The most probable reason for the widespread use of explication in the transmission of blends is that this technique gives an objective idea of the unit value being translated by providing a detailed interpretation of its content. Due to the fact that blends often serve as a method of naming new concepts and phenomena of the surrounding reality, science and technology, this feature of descriptive translation contributes to a better understanding of innovation by recipients (Mattiello, 2008).

2) Selection of correspondences.

Correspondence – is expressed in the coincidence of formal, semantic and informative components of the source and translated texts in interpretation, when one or more units of the translated language is regularly used to convey the content of a unit in the original language. The

method of correspondence is clearly seen in the following examples, formed from fragments of two bases: “*Autocade = automobile + cavalcade*” – a motorcade (автокада, автоколона). “*Colaholic = cola + alcoholic*” – a fan of Coca-Cola (колаголік, любитель Кока-коли). “*Eurepair = Europe + repair*” – renovation (євроремонт). “*Homicideath = homicide + death*” – murder (вбивство).

3) *Literal translation of correlates.*

Literal translation of correlates is a translation performed at a lower level than one required to convey a constant plan of content in compliance with the norms of the language of translation. Examples that illustrate the use of this method of translation include the following units: “*Addictionary = addiction + dictionary*” – an interesting, exciting dictionary (словник, від якого не відірватись). “*Femaleader = female + leader*” – a woman leader (жінка-лідер). “*Headministrator = head + administrator*” – the main administrator (головний адміністратор).

4) *Transcription / transliteration.*

Transcription is a translation technique based on the phonetic principle, i.e., for example, the transmission of sounds of a foreign name by Ukrainian letters. While transliteration is a translation technique based on the transfer of a graphic image of a foreign word, i.e., on the transfer of letters; it is the transmission of text written using one alphabetical system of the source language by means of another alphabetical system of the target language.

These methods are usually applied to borrowed blends. Borrowing tokens of this type occurs as a result of the emergence and spread of a suitable name for an object or phenomenon of the surrounding reality, which has gained global popularity. It is obvious that in this case the translator is required to apply an extensive general scientific knowledge and knowledge of the linguistics basics. Examples of such blends are the following units: “*Euroshima = Europe + Hiroshima*” (Євросіма), “*Fritalux = France + Italy + Benelux*” (Фріталюкс) (Cannon, 1989).

5) *Translation from a similar model.*

Translation from a similar model is to reproduce the original structure of the language unit. Analogy – a similarity caused by the influence of some language elements which form a more productive and more common model, than the other associated elements, rarer and more numerous. An example of the translation by analogy is the unit “*Franglais*”, created on the basis of the correlates French and English, in the Ukrainian language received the form of a unit of a similar word-forming type – “*franglish*” (франгліський).

6) *Loan translation.*

Loan translation – translation by parts with their subsequent assembly into a single unit. In some cases, this technique is used due to language purism, i.e., in order to avoid borrowing a foreign token or its element, which corresponds to one of the basic principles of a professional translator.

Among other examples of blends interpreted by loan translation, are the following units: “*adhocracy = ad hoc + bureaucracy*” (адхократія), “*animatronics = animated + electronics*” (аніматроніка), “*cattalo = cattle + buffalo*” – cow buffalo (коровобізон), “*decathlete = decade + athlete*” (десятиборець) (Kruts, 2003).

3.5. *Blends' translation strategy*

The first stage of work with blends is “decoding”; this term is usually understood as:

- 1) the process of establishing the correlate (unabridged form);
- 2) correlates themselves of a particular blend.

But the meaning of the blend does not always coincide with the meaning of the correlate. Therefore, by “deciphering” we mean not only the establishment of the equivalent, but also the definition of this blend’s meaning in a particular context.

The following basic methods are exploited to decipher the blends:

– context analysis. If the nature of the work requires acquaintance not with the first but with the following sections of the text and they reveal an unfamiliar blend, it is necessary to review the previous sections of the text, and it is especially important to read the entire text if the blend is not given;

– use of blend dictionaries and other reference materials. Although establishing the meaning of blends using dictionaries seems at first glance the most reliable and effective way, in fact it has its serious limitations. Since these units are among the “moving” elements of vocabulary, it is not possible to find dictionaries of telescopes at hand, as they exist in limited quantities (Zatsnyj, 2010).

When working with the dictionary, the translator must keep in mind the following:

- before referring to the dictionary, they should first identify according to the context, to which area of knowledge this blend belongs;
- it is necessary to have bilingual general and terminological dictionaries for correct translation;
- monolingual dictionaries contain only transcripts and interpretations, which can lead to inaccuracies in translation;
- use of analogies is relevant.

The use of analogies is used as an auxiliary method, as it can provide only a rough understanding of blends’ meaning. The given classification of decoding methods is rather relative. In fact, context analysis is a necessary condition for understanding any given text; the use of the method of analogy requires the proposal structure analysis, etc., so in practice a combination of these methods is used inevitably. With some experience, the translator himself finds specific to certain texts models of blends, which allows him to easily navigate further the general values of the new units built on such models (Halyshyn, 2011).

When transmitting telescopic units to the Ukrainian language, first of all, it is necessary to remember that this word-forming type is originally English and is associated with key trends that characterize the language system in both synchrony and diachrony. In the Ukrainian language, the popularity of blends is not so high, although this method of word formation comes from the category of peripheral. In this regard, it should be noted that during blends’ translation, the reproduction of a model that is identical to the original is not always possible and justified.

The next step after their decoding is telescopic units’ direct translation. To carry out this process successfully, a translator needs to know the basic methods of transmitting English-language telescopic units into Ukrainian, which were mentioned above.

4. CONCLUSIONS AND SCOPE FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

The research shows that telescoping is one of the newest word formation methods in the modern media discourse. We have described the notion of telescoping, its formation models, stylistic peculiarities and functioning in the modern media discourse. Thus, contamination plays an important role in new word formation due to its ability to describe complex notions within a single word. In this regard, a telescopic unit is complex in its nature and creates new linguistic phenomena which have never existed before. This research paper proposes essential tips for a proper understanding of blends meaning, their formation and decoding to ensure the most adequate translation. Therefore, telescoping is an interesting object for linguistic research and an important component in modern media that deserves special attention. In the modern linguistic literature, there is an ambiguous approach to determining the status, structure and semantics of telescopic units, given the large number of studies on the conversational aspects of this phenomenon: from structural and semantic characteristics, cognitive indicators to determining linguistic and cultural features.

The translation aspect of the study deserves further special attention. Given the variety of ways to form blends, the diversity of their meanings and expressive connotation, it is often difficult to find an appropriate translation method for further adequate decoding. And the actual lack of telescopic units’ dictionaries increases the need for further study of the sources and formation mechanisms of these neologisms for their more accurate translation.

REFERENCES

- Cannon, G. (1989). *Abbreviations and Acronyms in English Word-Formation*. New York. [in English]
- Halyshyn, I. M. (2011). *Teleskopiya yak odyin iz novitnih sposobiv slovotvoru v anhliyskiy movi [Telescopy as one of modern methods of word formation in the English language]*. Lutsk. [in Ukrainian]

- Holets, V. A. (2015). *Neologismy v suchasnyy angломovniy molodizniy presi [Neologisms in modern English youth media]*. Pyatyhorsk. [in Ukrainian]
- Karaban, V. (2001). *Pereklad anhliyskoyi naukovoї tehnichnoyi literatury [Translation of English scientific technical literature]*. Vinnytsia. [in Ukrainian]
- Kemmer, S. (2000). *Schemas and lexical blends*. Essen. [in English]
- Klymenko, O. L. (1999). *Popovnennia slovnykovoho skladu suchasnoyi anhliyskoyi movy z neliteraturnykh pidsystem [Increasing of word composition of the modern English language]*. Zaporizhzhia. [in Ukrainian]
- Kruts, L. B., & Omeltchenko L. F. (2003). *Teleskopiyni slova suchasnoyi anhliyskoyi movy ta jich strukturno-semantychna harakterystyka [Telescopic units of the modern English language and their structural-semantic characteristics]*. Lviv. [in Ukrainian]
- Mattiello, E. (2008). *An Introduction to English Slang: A description of its Morphology, Semantics and Sociology*. Monza. [in English]
- Soudek, L. (1978). *The Relation of Blending to English Word Formation: Theory, Structure and Typological Attempts*. Innsbruck. [in English]
- Tomaszewicz, E. (2008). *Novel words with final combining forms in English. A case for blends in word formation*. Poznan.
- Turchak, O. M. (2005). *Okazionalizmy v movi ukrayinskoyi presy 90-h rokiv XX stolittia [Occasionalisms in the language of Ukrainian media in the 90's of the 20th century]*. Dnipro. [in Ukrainian]
- Yenikieyeva, S. M. (1999). *Formuvannia ta funkcionuvannia novykh slovotvorchychykh elementiv anhliyskoyi movy [Formation and functioning of the new word-formation elements of the English language]*. Zaporizhzhia. [in Ukrainian]
- Zatsnyi, Yu. A. (1997). *Neolohizmy anhliyskoyi movy 80-90 rokiv XX stolittia [Neologisms of the English language in the 80-90's of 20th century]*. Zaporizhzhia. [in Ukrainian]
- Zatsnyi, Yu. A., & Pachomova, T. O. (2001). *Mova i suspilstvo: zbahachennia slovnykovoho skladu suchasnoyi anhliyskoyi movy [Language and community: enrichment of the vocabulary of the modern English language]*. Zaporizhzhia. [in Ukrainian]
- Zatsnyi, Yu. A., & Yankov, A. V. (2010). *Nova rozmova leksyka i fraseolohiya [New colloquial vocabulary and phraseology]*. Vinnytsia. [in Ukrainian]

Яна Тікан, Олександр Бабич. Прагмалінгвістичні особливості відтворення телескопічних одиниць у медіатекстах при перекладі з англійської мови на українську. Новим напрямом досліджень сучасної лінгвістики є різноманітні медіатексти (з-поміж яких: публіцистичний текст, газетний текст, радіо-, телетекст, мережевий текст, гіпертекст, рекламний текст тощо), включаючи глобальну мережу Інтернет, що є не лише об'єктом накопичення інформації, а й джерелом появи нових мовних одиниць із різних галузей науки і техніки, життя людини і повсякдення. Медіатексти характеризуються чітко вираженою прагматичною та соціокультурною спрямованістю. Зазначено, що собливістю розвитку та збагачення словникового запасу є розвинена здатність національних мов виражати невідоме через відоме, позначати нове за допомогою існуючих знаків. Одним із таких способів словоутворення є телескопія або контамінація. Статтю присвячено дослідженню такого мовного явища, як «телескопічне слово» в медіатексті. Дослідження присвячено огляду основних особливостей, типології та характеристик телескопічних одиниць, або блендів. Також подано опис основних моделей формування блендів. При цьому особлива увага приділяється основним методам перекладу телескопічних слів, їх особливостям та відмінностям. Дослідницька робота також представляє різні технології та стратегії перекладу телескопізмів, ключові поради, необхідні для забезпечення найбільш точного та адекватного перекладу англійських телескопічних слів на українську. Це дослідження дає поштовх до подальшого дослідження явища телескопії у перекладцькому аспекті для забезпечення адекватної передачі телескопічних одиниць українською мовою.

Ключові слова: бленди; телескопія; словотворення; моделі формування; медіатекст; контамінація; методи та стратегії перекладу.

Received: October 16, 2020
Accepted: November 05, 2020