

UDC 811.111-81'25

DOI: 10.32342/2523-4463-2023-2-26/2-10

OLENA MEDVID

*PhD in Philology, Associate Professor,
Germanic Philology Department
Sumy State University*

KATERYNA VASHYST

*MA in Philology, Lecturer,
Foreign Languages Department,
Sumy State University*

PRAGMATIC DEVIATIONS IN TRANSLATION OF LEXICAL BLENDS WITHIN SOCIO-POLITICAL DISCOURSE

У статті аналізуються нові тенденції та процеси у словотворенні, роль аналогії та внутрішньомовних запозичень як значущих джерел і шляхів поповнення словникового складу англійської мови, що впроваджуються наразі майже в усі мови світу та суттєво впливають на їх розвиток. Серед найпродуктивніших засобів словотворення останнім часом все більшого поширення набуває блендинг. Бленди як номінативні одиниці, що складаються з двох або більше слів, із скороченням принаймні одного з них у місці з'єднання, є невід'ємною рисою англійської мови загалом і сучасного англійського політичного дискурсу, зокрема. Лексичні бленди потрібні для позначення нових понять та явищ і часто є одним із виявів словотворчої майстерності автора; вони стають популярними завдяки своїй виразності та новизні форми і змісту. *Метою* статті є дослідження функціональних особливостей блендингу як засобу посилення прагматичної складової політичного дискурсу, а також стратегій та прийомів їх перекладу. Використання прагмалінгвістичних елементів (англ.: blends у нашому випадку) передбачає дослідження зв'язків між мовними одиницями та умовами комунікативно-прагматичного простору, відстеження зв'язку між інтенційним компонентом адресата та вибором мовних засобів при перекладі досліджуваних одиниць в межах політичного дискурсу іншою мовою, українською зокрема. *Методологія* дослідження поєднує традиційні наукові методи з новими лінгвістичними системно-функціональними прийомами. Значення роботи полягає в тому, що систематизовано теоретичний матеріал з проблеми дослідження, проаналізовано функціональні та перекладацькі труднощі блендів, зокрема запропоновано аналогічні моделі передачі українською мовою англійських політичних блендів. *Результати* доводять актуальність дослідження, яке дозволило отримати нові дані щодо технік, ефективних для іншомовної передачі смислів блендингових одиниць, що виникли останнім часом у соціо-політичному дискурсі. Принципи цих прийомів можуть бути універсальними і використовуватись для подальших досліджень, зокрема перекладу англійських лексичних блендів, спонукаючи до інноваційних засобів вербокреації, наприклад, у флективних мовах, де зазначене явище є нетиповим. Цей процес гіпотетично свідчить, що наразі відбувається перерозподіл складових у межах структур та систем різних мов і активується здатність їх до реорганізації.

Ключові слова: політичний дискурс, блендинг, бленд, словотвірний елемент, перекладацькі техніки, прагматичні девіації.

For citation: Medvid, O., Vashyst, K. (2023). Pragmatic Deviations in Translation of Lexical Blends Within Socio-Political Discourse. *Alfred Nobel University Journal of Philology*, vol. 2, issue 26/2, pp. 151-172, DOI: 10.32342/2523-4463-2023-2-26/2-10

Introduction

The lexical level of language is the most flexible among other levels and responds instantly to changes in people's lives. Moreover, the renewal of the lexical structure has become rapid in the modern era of information technology when language is the primary tool for manipulating mass consciousness. A clear example of such manipulation is the contemporary socio-political discourse in which politicians' speeches are the leading source of their influence on voters. Many expressions and lexemes used lately in the socio-political discourse have become popular and serve as a basis for deriving new words.

Blending has been growing recently among the most productive ways of word formation. Blends, as nominative units consisting of two or more words with a contraction of at least one of them at the place of the junction, are an integral feature of the English language in general and modern English socio-political discourse in particular. Such lexemes are stylistically marked, have an interesting structure, and attract society's attention. At the same time, blends effectively convey the meanings of modern phenomena that arise in society. They extend their structure, combining not only two but three and even more words at a time, thus, having a more extensive range of expression possibilities than words formed using other traditional word-formation techniques.

The issue of word formation and blending as a type of word formation in English was studied by G. Wentworth [1934], N. Chomsky [1970], J. Algeo [1977, 1978], R. Quirk [1985], G. Cannon [1986], L. Bauer [2001], D. Crystal [2003], O. Bat-El [2005], S.Th. Gries [2006], A. Enarson [2007], G. Fauconnier and M. Turner [2008] and other foreign scientists. Ukrainian linguists T.R. Tymoshenko [1975], L.F. Omelchenko [1980], Yu.A. Zhluktenko, V.P. Berezinsky, I.I. Borisenko [1983], A.P. Prokopets [2005], O.O. Selivanova [2008], I.M. Savchyn [2012], O.V. Tkachyk [2013], Yu.A. Zatsny [2013], S.O. Shvachko [2017], S.M. Yenikeieva [2007, 2011], O.L. Harmash [2017], L.M. Chumak [2018], and others are also interested in this phenomenon.

In particular, the peculiarities of the creation and functioning of blending units in Ukrainian, as a language of the Slavic branch, which has become a dynamic pragma-stylistic phenomenon of the Ukrainian language discourse in recent decades, were studied by linguists O.A. Styshov [2005], N.F. Klymenko [2000, 2008], S.S. Lukyanenko [2009], N.V. Stratulat [2011], O.M. Turchak [2013], A.M. Nelyuba [2014], Zh.V. Kolois [2015], I.O. Korobova [2016], O.O. Taranenko [2015], V.P. Oleksenko [2021], Ye.A. Karpilovska [2022], and others. A lot of our research is devoted to the peculiarities of the linguopragmatic organization of socio-political discourse, including its translation aspect, which is studied by I.S. Shevchenko [2008], O.M. Medvid [2012], S.M. Yenikeieva [2017], O.V. Popova [2017], A.P. Martynyuk [2022], etc. Still, the issue of blending as a linguistic means of strengthening the socio-political discourse pragmatic component needs to be investigated more, especially from the point of view of lexical blend interpretation while being translated into other languages considering their specifics both at the structural level and semantic one, which determines the relevance of the study of the 21-st century socio-political discourse innovative vocabulary.

The **article's relevance** is determined firstly by the need to study blends, the specific layer of vocabulary, as the number of new lexical units is constantly increasing, particularly within the socio-political discourse. It is due to some reasons, including, on the one hand, the growing public interest in the latest socio-political phenomena and their nominations; on the other hand, the appeal of politicians to the new forms of communication with voters, in particular, which makes them popular among various categories of society. Consequently, new concepts and realities emerge that require language units to nominate them. Despite the considerable scholarly interest, these lexical items have yet to be the subject of a comprehensive systematic linguistic and translation analysis within socio-political discourse.

The *goal* of the study is to analyze the functional features of blends as a means of strengthening the pragmatic component of the socio-political discourse, as well as the strategy and techniques of their translation.

The **study's empirical material** is blended lexical units from Op-Ed texts of articles on socio-political problems in English and Ukrainian language Internet publications selected by graduate students of the Germanic Languages Department while working in the LinguaStar translation center of the Sumy State University.

Methodology

The use of pragmalinguistic elements (English/Ukrainian blends, in our case) involves the investigation of relationships between language units and the conditions of the communicative-pragmatic space, tracing the relationship between the addressee's intentional component and the choice of language means when translating the studied units within the socio-political discourse in another language.

The general and special *methods* to achieve the goal and objectives of the study were used: information retrieval method – to select research material and process basic theoretical knowledge; generalization method – to highlight the most critical academic positions; deduction and induction – to clarify the theoretical foundations, generalize data and formulate conclusions; discourse analysis – to identify specific communicative and pragmatic features of political communication; contextual and functional methods – to actualize the linguopragmatic meaning of the lexical units under the study, i.e., blends; the vocabulary definitions analysis – to examine their linguopragmatic peculiarities; structural-semantic and component analysis – to determine the ways of blend formation and their main structural elements – all this is necessary for the implementation of translation analysis, which needs in addition the aspects of conceptual analysis, while rendering blending lexical units from one language to another, taking into account social, cultural, historical, communicative, and other extra-linguistic factors of the discourse.

Theoretical issues: Linguistic essence of blending

Along with traditional types of word formation, such as affixation, compounding, clipping, conversion, or abbreviation, etc., words formed by merging morphemes and their parts due to the process called *blending* increasingly appear (not only in English as a source of this phenomenon). Thus, the significance of different word-forming types in the system is redistributed due to language evolution. If, in the first half of the 20th century, lexical blends were few in English, and therefore this method of word formation was exotic, by the end of the century, the number of words formed by merging increased so much that they became common in English, and appeared in other linguistic structures, different from English [Green, 1991; Thurner, 1993; Зацний, 2008; Algeo, J., 2010; Нелюба, 2014; Тараненко, 2015; Гармаш, 2017; Єнікеева, 2017, etc.].

The development of *blending* as a type of word formation occurred under intensive use within such language styles as scientific, advertising, and journalistic, actively observed in the 20th – 21st centuries. This evolution also postulated specific requirements for the language units, such as brevity in the transfer of information, ease of pronunciation, the ability to participate in word-changing processes, etc.

Linguists interpret the analyzed word-forming process and the units of this word-forming type, called blends, differently. As indicated yet by G. Wentworth [1933], none of the classes of words, processes, and phenomena in the language has as many designations as blends (English variants: *contamination*, *portmanteau-word*, *portmanteau*, *blend*, *blend-word*, *amalgam*, *amalgam-word*, *amalgam-form*, *fusion*, *fusion-word*, *composite*, *composite-word*, *overlapping-word*, *conflation*, *coalesced-word*, *coalescence-form*, *telescope-word*, *telescoped-word*, *hybrid*, *analogical-neologism*, *brunch-word*, *counter-word*, *cross-form*, *word-blending* [Algeo, 1977], as well as humorous nominations: *suitcase-word*, *timanteau word* (blending of two stems – *time* + *portmanteau*), *blund* (*blunder* + *blend*) [Onions, 1966]). As we can see, even some of the terms used to denote blends are blends themselves. The reason for the appearance of numerous terms is the lack of clear criteria for the definitions of extraordinary, structurally, and semantically telescoping units and the lack of research on the mentioned phenomenon.

Despite the voluminous history of the research done by scientists *blending* is still an ambiguous notion starting with its nomination. Our analysis of allonym definitions of the recently popular terms for blending lexical units of the English language proves that “contamination” and “telescope” are very generalized and do not have evident linguistic characteristics; instead, the terms “blend” and “hybrid” (in addition, the English term “hybrid” itself is the result of two words fusion “half” and “bred” (past participle from the verb “breed” – “to give birth”, “generate”) have relevant linguistic meanings and can be considered as metasigns of the phenomenon under study. The calculation of the semantic distance coefficient of the metasigns definitions of the specified phenomenon under study (according to S. G. Berezhan's formula) shows that

the most appropriate terminological nominations are “blend” and “hybrid” [Швачко, Медвідь, 2013]. In foreign linguistics, scientists prefer the term nomination “blend words” for lexical units of such telescopic word-formation type [Hockett, 1968; Dufva, 1992; Enarson, 2006; Gries, 2006; Lehrer, 2007; etc.]

Ukrainian linguists do not stay away from studying this extraordinary phenomenon in the lexicology of the English language, which, under the influence of many socio-political factors, began to spread very quickly throughout the world in the second half of the 20th century. There is still a debate about the place of blending non-standard lexical units that do not obey any rules of grammar in the derivational system of the modern English language: *blending* needs to be clearly distinguished from other paradigms within word formation processes. There are as many points of view as there are authors in the field. Yu.A. Zhluktenko (back in the 80s of the 20th cent.) notes that blending nominations, like compound words, reflect the tendency to *univerbalize* and rationalize the language and demonstrate a different degree of dissection and motivation. Due to the hidden clipped components, the degree of their dissection and motivation is lower than in compound words. The linguist concludes that blending is an independent word-formation type found between compounding and abbreviation [Жлуктенко, Березинский, Борисенко, 1983]. We assume (following Zhluktenko) that it is impossible to attribute the specified type of word formation to any of the traditional means because such lexical units do not have a prototype in the language; they are initially generated in the minds of native speakers, and then enter the language as full-fledged units. Although they often have an occasional character, their life is limited not only by the pragmatics of discourse but also by a specific speech situation, which does not limit their right to exist in another context and discourse under other socio-pragmatic conditions, depending on formal syntagmatic (morphological, grammatical, syntactic) requirements of a particular language. L. Chumak [2018] notes that two processes occur during the formation of blends: the truncation of the derivative words or at least one of them and the merging of these “splinters” or the truncated word with the complete one. Blending words differ from compound words because their structural components (“splinters”) are dependent forms and cannot function freely in the language [Чумак, 2018].

The Ukrainian school of researchers of this non-traditional type of word formation in the system of English lexical units, which flooded the vocabulary of various languages of the world, including Ukrainian, was initially based on the well-known foreign linguists’ works (see above), which mainly considered the mechanisms of innovative word formation under analysis from the structural-semantic point of view, taking into account the internal potential of the English language analytical structure [Prokopets, 2005; Selivanova, 2008; Tkachyk, 2013; etc.]. The impulse for studying the process of extrapolation of pro-English methods of word formation in the Ukrainian language, considering the “bifunctionality” of linguistic signs (their representation in the language both in the form of lexemes and in the form of word-formation elements), was made by Yu.A. Zatsny (since the 70s of the 20th century). He highlighted the potential possibilities of generating new methods of word formation, in particular blending, in other languages of the world (Ukrainian including), carefully analyzing its translation capabilities from the English language. Furthermore, the scientist showed the lacunae for new research paradigms of studying the essence of blending functioning and creation [Зацный, Янков, 2013]. Recently, much attention has been given to the cognitive and synergetic nature of linguistic *blending*.

In this study, following Yu. Zatsny, we also support S. Yenikeieva’s approach, which singles out *blending* as an independent way of word formation regarding the fact that the formation of blends involves both “mechanisms of contraction of derivative stems (which are leading in word formation) and mechanisms of shortening and fragmentation of words (which is typical for form formation)” [Єнікеєва, 2007, p. 268]. Moreover, our interest is caused by the wide use of synergetic ideas in S. Yenikeieva’s research, from the linguosynergetics point of view, which is defined as “an applied field of synergetic description of linguistic phenomena” [Селіванова, 2008]. She investigates the phenomenon of *blending* through *synergoderivatology* [Єнікеєва, 2011], the extrapolation of ideas and principles of synergy to a word formation, in particular blending, which contributes to the identification of self-regulation and self-organization mechanisms of the mentioned process. The reasons for this are the diversity of constituents of word formation, cross-level relations with other language endosystems, and the dynamism of functioning and evolu-

tion. Many aspects related to the word-formation structural organization, the dynamics of verb-creative processes, and the ways and means of its development have not been adequately covered due to the limitations of traditional approaches. Synergetics, with its principles of disequilibrium, emergence, non-linearity, and autopoetics, as noted by S. Yenikeieva, opens up new opportunities for establishing the principles of this transsystem structure, identifying the principles of its development through self-organization and determining the scenarios of its evolution [Єнікеєва, 2011].

J. Algeo, in his research, mentions Lewis Carroll, a prominent writer who created many occasional blends in his books and considered blends to be the words contained two meanings in one word [Algeo, 2010], regarding the fact that the form of a word follows its meaning, that is concept goes first. This idea attracts the attention of scientists studying the cognitive paradigm in linguistics. The results of comprehending the world are fixed not only at the cognitive level through the lexicalization of concepts but also, as O.L. Garmash [2017] claims, at the metacognitive level through morpholized metaconcepts. The phenomena of lexicalization of morpholized metaconcepts, morpholization of lexicalized concepts, paraphraseologizing, and telescoping can be illustrative examples of the transition of randomness into regularity. It should be noted that the lexicalization of morpholized metaconcepts is a mental mechanism for the formation of lexicalized concepts based on morpholized metaconcepts. Because of this process, we can get a bifunctional concept, based on the original mental unit, with a new function realized [Гармаш, 2018 p. 105], which is typical for lexical blends in particular. The constant movement of the components within the system leads to the changeability of specific components within the concept itself. The changes concern not only and not so much the fact of producing a new word as a completely new sign (semantically and structurally) [Gries, 2006]. Hence, we can observe a change in the verbal explication of the concept, changes in the semantic spectrum of the concept, the visual image of the concept, and the establishment of new correlations in the concept system as a whole.

Thus, several questions relating to the nature of *blending* are still to be discussed: whether it is more cognitive or more affective, congruent or incongruent, automatic or controlled, spontaneous or systemic. We assume that studying within cognitive and synergetic linguistics should be used in the new interdisciplinary path of blending research, which describes how language interacts with cognition, its dynamics, and self-organizing properties, to fill the lacunae in different branches of linguistic and extra-linguistic studies.

Furthermore, the analysis of the corpora under our research proves that the use of blends is widespread now in not only languages with analytical structure, but this trend towards language economy and increasing the semantic capacity of lexical units is becoming popular also in Slavic languages (whose grammatical structure is synthetic, that is not so flexible for blending). Though there are fewer examples of blends in the dictionaries of these languages, the search for empirical material for analysis led us to different Internet websites, which are full of innovation samples, including Ukrainian lexical blends.

Ukrainian linguists face the issue of studying lexical blending on Ukrainian-speaking soil, the first attempts to analyze the word-forming models of Ukrainian blending appear, and the dynamics of its development create new lacunae for study [Styshov, 2005]; Klymenko, 2000; Nelyuba, 2014; Kolois, 2015; Taranenko, 2015; Korobova, 2016; and others]. The author of lexical and word-forming innovations dictionaries, A.M. Nelyuba [2014], states the fact that at the beginning of the 21st century, “regarding the rapid development of Internet media, in which word-forming possibilities are becoming extremely dynamic, causing the diversity of the innovative structure, the number of derivatives of blended origin has increased significantly” [Нелюба, 2014, p.113], which requires their careful analysis. As part of the study of internal borrowings, the word-forming potential of the language is studied by O.O. Taranenko. From our point of view, the research by O.O. Taranenko, which considers prognostic problems in linguistics to be a priority, is worthy of attention. His attempts to build a research concept for the analysis of changes in the derivational system of the Ukrainian language, turning to both typical forms and atypical structural-semantic models of word formation (yet in 2015), as we can see, find actualization today. The author does not simply present a picture of the relevant dynamic fragments of modern Ukrainian word formation but brings the scientific search into the existence of the lan-

guage — the social context that motivates and implements the intentions of the language society [Тараненко, 2015]. Our research encompasses a comprehensive consideration of this thesis.

Recently, the socio-political content of the Ukrainian Internet discourse has been filled with new vocabulary, increasing the lexicon of the modern Ukrainian language at the expense of structurally and semantically innovative lexical units, emotionally charged, often having pejorative pragmatics. The socio-political processes taking place in Ukraine, starting from November 2013, have undergone a broad linguistic expression caused by the psychophysiological reactions of people to the observed events. The number of occasional word formations that instantly gain popularity as independent lexemes and corresponding hashtags indicate that these linguistic units should become the object of basic research. Such lexemes and lexicalized compounds represent innovative processes in the Ukrainian language's lexical-semantic system and demonstrate various word formation methods.

Special attention is paid in our study to translating texts of socio-political discourse, particularly to nominative units in the texts that perform a socio-pragmatic function of communicative influence on the audience; such linguistic units often may be of blended forms and blended concepts [Медвідь, 2012] (both in English and Ukrainian). The principles of the blend unit creation proposed by the representatives of cognitive linguistics, in our opinion, should be taken into account when translating lexical blends into foreign language discourse, which may cause their structural and semantic deviations. Synchronization of the metacognitive level of the linguistic-mental environment is determined by changes occurring at the cognitive level [Гармаш, 2018]. In particular, it is activated through the effect of analogy: lexical blends formed by analogy cause mental processing and generalization of the subsequent model. Naturally, linguistic innovations are based mainly on our previous linguistic experience.

Discussion and results

Blends as pragmatic components in the socio-political discourse

From the viewpoint of pragmalinguistics, discourse is an activity of the participants of communication aimed at establishing and maintaining contact, emotional and information exchange, creating communication strategies, and influencing each other. Speech influence is one of the types of socio-psychological influence and, in a broad sense, means speech communication in terms of its purposefulness [Медвідь, 2012]. Speech influence, according to I. Shevchenko, is a way to change the intentional sphere of a person's inner world by modifying individual fragments of his/her knowledge structure (IKS – individual cognitive space). She defines speech influence as the influence on a person by means of speech, which aims to persuade him/her to take a particular point of view or decide to take some action consciously, transfer information through CCS – collective cognitive space [Шевченко, Морозова, 2003]. O.V. Popova notes that the communicative influence is a speech act of an addresser, which is guided by the communication intention and the discourse practice of a particular communication sphere, aimed at changing thinking, mental state of the addressee, and his/her assessment of any phenomenon regardless of the communicative interaction type [Попова, 2017].

The political discourse texts aim to implement speech influence on the audience (voters) and have a solid pragmatic orientation. Political discourse reflects the political situation, and its nature depends on the existing state and social system. K. Reiß [1976] calls texts that can influence the recipient's behavior and contain explicit or implicit impulses of such behavior operative. Regarding this definition of the operative type of texts, we consider the texts of political discourse operative because one of their primary functions is influence.

Various language and speech means are used to implement this function, that is, the communicative influence of the political text on the message recipient. Having analyzed different aspects of the communicative influence, the scientists consider the following speech influence levels: phonological, prosodic, somatic, morpho-syntactic, lexico-semantic, and pragmalinguistic.

In this study, we are interested in the lexico-semantic and pragmalinguistic levels, where lexical units are the primary means. Due to the variety of linguistic semantics, the choice of words is a universal tool through which various influences are implemented. Although any lexical unit, depending on the context and intentions of the author, can have the potential for in-

fluence, stylistic means and figures are of particular importance in terms of influence power: idioms, phraseological units, metaphors, comparisons, irony, hyperbole, lexical repetitions, and other tropes.

S. Yenikeieva considers blends as lexical, stylistic, and pragmalinguistic means of speech influence and refers blending to the ways of realizing the play of words in a political text. The researcher believes that the game revolves around the struggle of ideologies in political discourse. It has such properties of communication as theatricality and drama, used by an individual to exploit the inherent language opportunities to present human needs [Єникеева, Єнікеев, 2017]. According to I. Shevchenko [2017], since the masses perceive politics through the mass media, theatricality is one of the constitutive characteristics of political discourse. Politicians always seek to impress the public by developing language strategies and tactics to create an attractive image for the people. The presentation function of the blending type of words used in speeches is manifested in its ability to the vivid emotional reflection of reality and the development of a dramatic (or theatrical) component of political discourse.

The ability to produce the most expressive lexical units is implemented by blending derivation at the cognitive level. As O. Harmash notes, this happens due to the development of the cognitive ability of native speakers to create new cognitive models through the linguistic arrangement of knowledge [Гармаш, 2018], and therefore, the new conceptual material encourages people to reproduce non-standard linguistic mechanisms for the formation or transformation of linguistic units to achieve the effect of expressiveness in communication due to the structural and semantic possibilities of a language.

Consider in more detail the role of blends in strengthening the pragmatic value of socio-political discourse. Thus, blending is often used to convey new realia that has caused a resonance in society, which arises at the intersection of political, economic, and social spheres of life. Such lexemes include the following blends, which are found in the texts of English-language publications: *meritocracy* < *merit* + *aristocracy* = knowledgeable people, *chavalanche* < *chav* + *avalanche* = gang of teenagers, *stagflation* < *stagnation* + *inflation* = period of economic stagnation with simultaneous inflation, *corporatocracy* < *corporate* + *democracy* = power of corporations, etc.

For example, the blend word *meritocracy* is commonly used in socio-political discourse as part of the theory that power should belong to people distinguished by their achievements, abilities, and professional competence rather than by social background or status. Accordingly, such a blend is used to nominate talented politicians. It can be used in political discourse texts to implement a politician's self-presentation strategy, creating a positive image of a politician or political party as a whole.

The blend *chavalanche* is a realia of the UK social life. It refers to white teenagers or young people from the working class characterized by antisocial and aggressive behavior. Usually, this social group has a stable image of uneducated people who have unskilled jobs or live on social payments, wear clothes with bright logos (traditionally with the symbols of the British company "Burberry"), and massive jewelry. An abbreviated version of the blend *chavalanche* is *chav*, often used in the texts of periodicals on political and social issues.

Another political blend realia is the name of a political phenomenon when a politician seeks complete information on some subject. Such behavior of a politician is nominated as *fact-trip* = *fact* + *trip*.

Corporatocracy is used in the media to denote the trend of power concentration over society's political and economic life in the hands of large corporations, which determine the further vector of social development guided by corporate interests and the principles of enrichment. This concept is used concerning the most economically and politically developed countries, especially the United States.

Other uses of blends in socio-political texts may include the names of various political organizations, such as the *Daughters of American Revolution*, which operates in the United States and is abbreviated *DAR*, combined with the word *darling* forms the blend *DARling*. In addition to the names of organizations, other proper names may be involved in the blend formation in political discourse, such as the names of politicians, as in the case of *Billary* = *Bill* + *Hillary* – a married couple of Bill and Hillary Clinton.

The highly active blending word-formation process in the US socio-political discourse can be considered the election campaign of 2015–2016 when a fierce political struggle was waged between D. Trump and H. Clinton. The US election campaign generated many neologisms, created by politicians and voters, thus representing a means of moral influence and a response to it, to some extent. It was the period when the English vocabulary was replenished with such blend words associated with the name of presidential candidate Donald Trump as “*trumponomics*” – Trump’s economic policy, “*trumpflation*”, etc. It is characteristic that the use of these blends in the candidates’ speech is most ironic and generally serves as one of the stylistic means of implementing the strategy of discrediting the opponent. For example, in criticizing Clinton’s political campaign, Trump uses occasionalism *Hillarycare* by analogy with the previously formed neologism *Obamacare*, associated with a critical US health care reform bill that President Obama sought to implement. The use of the occasional blend *Hillarycare* thus criticizes Clinton’s actions. This criticism directly indicates that Hillary Clinton is a successor in her political views to the previous president.

One of the most exciting examples of occasional blends related to the US election campaign in 2015–2016 was the appearance of the negative nomination *Killary*, a blend of the verb *kill* and the name of the presidential candidate Hillary Clinton. In this case, the negative connotation of the new way of nominating a politician is obvious; the contexts in which the word *Killary* appears tend to reinforce the authors’ negative attitudes toward Clinton.

Blending acquires the status of a productive word-formation type in English socio-political discourse because some components of blend units are becoming popular and are serial by their nature. In such cases, the clipped “splinter” is no longer correlated only with the source lexical unit but is perceived as a structural element with a specific function and semantics. It becomes a real lexeme, such as *-verse* (world, union), *-rati* (noble society). In socio-political media discourse, there are examples of the use of such elements: the word *Googleverse* < *Google* + *universe* = products, services, and technologies owned by Google, as well as any web pages, groups, images, etc., i.e., everything that is possible to find through Google search engine; the blend with the use of the element *-rati*, such as *Twitterati* < *Twitter* + *literati*, which means representatives of the elite, celebrities, politicians who actively use the social network Twitter and attract the attention of many fans, is also gaining popularity.

Therefore, the concept of “blending” is relevant to the sphere of English-language socio-political discourse. It vividly reflects changes in society’s political life, revealing the need to denote new realities and concepts. Often, new phenomena are complex concepts for the representation of which blending is best suited. Due to their expressiveness and informative capacity, blends exert the most significant influence on the message recipients.

Challenges in translating English blends within the socio-political discourse

Structural and semantic features of English blends and their role in socio-political discourse (blends are used to nominate complex concepts and socio-cultural realities) cause difficulties in their translation into Ukrainian as an inflectional language (opposed to analytical English); blending is structurally alien to the Ukrainian language.

When translating socio-political discourse, a translator often comes across unusual lexemes to which blends also belong, and therefore he/she should know how to interpret these units. But although blending as a way of generating structurally and semantically extraordinary lexemes is recognized as a peripheral way of word formation in English, it is gaining popularity in many world languages, creating some difficulties for a translator. In the pair “English – Ukrainian”, the number of units of this type prevails in the English language, and the search for translation matches of English blends in the Ukrainian language is significantly complicated and limited.

When we consider the peculiarities of translating blends as an element of the pragmatic component, it should be noted that in socio-political discourse, the concept of value is predominant, and the translator must reproduce it in the target text regarding the value hierarchy of different cultures. Moral and ethnic values, closely related to the peculiarities of the national mentality and temperament, play a unique role in political argumentation [Белова, 2003, p. 37]. When the conceptual pictures of the world do not match, such features as national mentality, consciousness, character, and the degree and adequacy of the reality reflected in the language can become a significant obstacle to communication [Reiß, 1976].

A difference in the conceptual and linguistic pictures of the world of communicators makes a translator's task extremely difficult. The purpose of translating socio-political discourse is to achieve the reaction from a foreign-language addressee that is similar to the response of a source text addressee (sometimes the translator has to look for some other values using which the pragmatics of the source discourse unit preserved). In general, values do not exist in culture isolated but form a value picture of the world. Linguistically, they can be described as cultural concepts that are multidimensional and culturally significant socio-psychological formations in the collective consciousness [Мартинюк, Ахмедова 2022]. This kind of ethnic concept provokes the most considerable translation challenges, requiring deep background knowledge of the translator. At the same time, there is rarely a situation of the complete absence of a concept in a particular linguistic culture; this phenomenon occurs less often than the absence of a one-word nomination for a specific concept. It means that any concept can be translated from one language into another, possibly reducing/expanding the text or another verbal form representation. Differences between cultures, in general, can be manifested in the quantitative and combinatorial variability of the choice of features in the world conceptualization. To explain the peculiarities of such a choice of features, the translator must refer to the language and other people's extralingual aspects like history, psychology, philosophy, and culture. Difficulties in translating socio-political discourse are often caused by the use of specific terms depending on the relevant ideological concepts [Шевченко, 2008]. For instance, the widespread use of names and titles in political speeches presupposes considerable prior (background) knowledge of the translator, which allows him/her to correlate the name with the named object. A political text, especially if it is a prepared politician's speech, involves the clever use of specific expressive lexical units (including blends), the goal of which is to enhance the text's emotional perception, win the addressee's sympathy, and force him/her to empathize, perceive, adopt and share the desired for the addresser emotional state [Таценко, 2017, p. 259]. Emotional information is more accessible, perceived, and better remembered by the audience; it is a more natural and effective way to influence the recipient.

Therefore, the political blend *prebituary* (*preliminary + obituary*) is a big challenge for translation due to its structural, semantic, pragmatic, and lingua-cultural aspects that the translator should consider to translate this unit adequately while maintaining its functions in the political text. The linguistic component of this blend does not contain international words, which are often part of political terms and make translation easier. The literal translation of the blend *prebituary* is "попередній некролог" (*poperedniy nekroloh* – "previous obituary"). This lexeme reflects the worldview peculiarities of the English culture because such a phenomenon is absent in the Ukrainian one. In addition, this blend has a vivid pragmatic component. It enhances the pragmatic influence of the political text, giving a sharply pessimistic forecast for a politician, sometimes with an element of irony and traditional English "black humor".

To convey the pragmatic potential of a blend in a translation of a socio-political text, a translator can resort to various translation methods and techniques. We analyze them and their potential in translating socio-political blends under consideration.

Translation techniques of blends within English socio-political discourse

When conveying socio-political blends, a translator must use a number of his/her professional competencies, skills, and abilities to identify the given in the text units, perform their structural and semantic analysis, identify their pragmatic and stylistic features, interpret the underlying national realities and creatively reproduce the identified characteristics in the relevant units of the translation language, preserving the communicative intentions of the author. The combination of these factors gives grounds to assert that the activity of a translator's linguistic personality, his/her thinking, mind, and creative potential are fully involved in the translation of non-standard lexical units, which are blends. The translator perhaps has the most significant influence on how the recipient will perceive the information presented in the text.

In our research, we analyzed the possible variants of blend translation within political discourse to identify fundamental translation techniques used for blending words. Regarding the study results, the main methods of blend conveying are transcription, transliteration, tracing, descriptive translation, selection of correspondence, and translation using an analogical model. We consider each of them in more detail, involving examples in the research's corpus.

Due to the complexity of blend translation, translators rarely resort to creative translation methods and forming analogical blend models; translation requires much effort and is challenging. Therefore, transliteration (or transcription) is often used, and sometimes even borrowing, when the blend word is taken from the original English text without changes and transferred to the translated text, maintaining its graphic characteristics. We see examples of such translations when sharing the blend *Obamacare* in the Ukrainian media. Thus, there is a translation variant of this lexeme through transcription, where an attempt is made to convey the pronunciation of the English word using the Ukrainian language:

(1) *Трамп закликав республіканців не припиняти спроби скасувати **Обамакер** ([Obamaker] – Ukrainian transcription of *Obamacare*) [Час-Тайм, 2017].*
'Trump urged Republicans not to stop trying to repeal **Obamacare**'.

It preserves the blending structure of the source word (proper name *Obama* and noun *care*) and the national, cultural, and pragmatic components of the lexeme.

The term *Obamacare* is used as a short name for the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, and lately, its use has been so widespread that it has become almost official and known quite by everybody. It includes the reform author's name and the keyword of the common name, thus providing the most concise information about the project, performing an expressive function through its non-standard structure, and simultaneously revealing the tendency of the English language to brevity and blending. The proposed translation options reproduce these functions but may be incomprehensible to the recipient without background knowledge about the bill. Even more difficult to understand may be the translated version in the form of a graphic borrowing:

(2) *Президент США Дональд Трамп у четвер підписав указ про зменшення впливу програми **Обамакаре** [Трамп наказав послабити дію Obamacare, 2017].*
'On Thursday US President Donald Trump signed a decree to reduce the impact of the **Obamacare program**'.

In addition to the socio-cultural barrier, there may also be a language barrier: such a translation unit is not adapted for perception by a Ukrainian-speaking reader. However, compared to the previous versions, in the context of this sentence, the lexeme "програма" (prohrama – "program") is provided, which carries some background information about the realia referred to in the text. We consider it more rational to combine the above methods of translation with descriptive translation, e.g.:

(3) *The US House of Representatives voted to close **Obamacare, the state compulsory health insurance program**' [Obamacare: Has Trump managed, 2019].*
'Американська Палата представників проголосувала за згортання **Обамакаре – державної програми обов'язкового медичного страхування (state program of compulsory health insurance)**' (authors' translation).

This version of the translation provides additional information that explains the essence of the realia, and at the same time, the blend itself is preserved.

The translator's neologism is an exciting technique for translating non-standard formations, including blends. This translation technique is rightly considered the most difficult. We suggest our translation of *Obamacare* within the political discourse by creating neologism *Обамастрахування* [Obamastrakhuvannia] (*ObamaInsurance* – the element *Insurance* clears up the essence of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act promoted by Obama), for example, in the following discourse fragment:

(4) *However, since the implementation of **Obamacare**, jobs in the health care sector rose by 9% [Clinton: ObamaCare was originally 'HillaryCare', 2016].*
'Проте з часу реалізації **Обамастрахування** [Obamastrakhuvannia] кількість робочих місць у сфері охорони здоров'я збільшилась на 9%' (authors' translation).

Transcription or borrowing can also be applied to *Hillarycare* that was derived from *Obamacare* – *Гіларікер* ([Hilariker] – Ukrainian transcription of *Hillarycare*), for example:

(5) “It was called **Hillarycare** before it was called **Obamacare**”, Clinton told a crowd of supporters at a country club in Vinton, Iowa [Clinton: ObamaCare was originally ‘HillaryCare’, 2016].

“Її було названо **Гіларікер** [Hilariker] ще до того, як її почали називати **Обамакер** [Obamaker]”, Клінтон сказала натовпу своїх прихильників у заміському клубі у Вінтоні, штат Айова’ (authors’ translation).

It should be noted that if *Obamacare* is a neologism relatively standard in US politics, *Hillarycare* is occasional, and therefore often in the context of a journalistic or political text, the meaning and essence of this phenomenon is revealed to the recipient by the author himself/herself. This lexeme is most often used in the text next to *Obamacare*. The translator should consider this when translating and deciding whether providing a translational explanatory comment or any additional descriptive element is appropriate.

We use transcoding techniques (transcription/transliteration) also for the translation of the following political blends:

- *Euroshima* = *Europe* + *Hiroshima* – Євросима ([Yevrosyma] Ukr.) – this blend is a political term that emerged during the demonstrations against the deployment of a nuclear weapon in European countries and elimination of the threat of a new war that could turn Europe into a giant Hiroshima;

- *Fritalux* = *France* + *Italy* + *Benelux* – Фріталюкс ([Fritaluks] Ukr.) is a blend that combines in its structure the names of European countries to denote their union.

In general, the method of transcription/transliteration is not often used in the translation of blends. That may be due to the structural characteristics of the analyzed lexical units, which are often misunderstandable when translated by transcription or transliteration.

One of the ways to translate blends is tracing: translation by parts with their subsequent assembly into a single whole. This technique is sometimes used due to linguistic purism to avoid borrowing a foreign lexeme or its element. Blend tracing is an equal translation of the correlates of each blend component, then combining them into a semantically integral unit. The use of this translation technique is illustrated by the example of the following blends that occur in socio-political discourse: *femalleader* = *female* + *leader* – жінка-лідер [zhinka-lider] (leader woman); *headadministrator* = *head* + *administrator* – головний адміністратор [holovnyi administrator] (chief administrator); *polifluential* = *politically* + *influential* – політично впливовий [politychno vplyvovyi] (politically influential), etc. The resulting translation version, however, does not give a complete and objective idea of the structure of an original lexeme, and therefore such a translation can not be considered a maximum equivalent.

In some cases, blends may be accompanied by a double version of the translation, which indicates the lack of strict rules for the use of techniques and the possibility of their choice by the translator to achieve specific goals. Thus, blends can be translated not only by tracing but also by descriptive translation: *genopolitics* – *генополітика* [genopolityka] / *вивчення генетичної основи політичних поглядів* [vivchennia genetychnoi osnovy politychnykh pohladiv] (a study of the genetic basis of political views), *Palintologist* – *Пейлінтолог* [Peilintolog] / *зацікавлений у особистості колишнього губернатора Аляски Сари Пейлін* [zatsikavlenyi v osobystosti kolyshn'ogo gubernatora Alasky Sary Peilin] (the one who is interested in the personality of the former governor of Alaska Sarah Palin), etc.

The descriptive, or explicative, translation technique is the most universal and can help the translator in the most challenging situations. It is vital if, in the translation language, there is no corresponding concept for various social, geographical, or national reasons [Зацний, 2008, p. 12]. If the above examples of socio-political blends can be translated both by tracing and descriptively, some lexemes can be translated only descriptively. For instance, *prebituary* = *preliminary* + *obituary* can only be translated in descriptive translation, considering the pragmatic, linguistic, cultural, structural, and semantic difficulties analyzed above. Using the descriptive translation, we have the variant *прогнозований провал кандидата на виборах* [prohnozovanyi proval kandydata na vyborakh] (a predicted election failure of the candidate). Some other examples of the descriptive translation of blends are: *politickle* = *policy* + *tickle*,

which due to structural and semantic peculiarities can be translated only as *політична дискусія / політичні дебати, спрямовані на критику і підпорядкування політичних позицій опонента власній позиції, шляхом спекуляції на його непрактичності та виставленні його ідей в гумористичному світлі* [politychni debaty, spriamovani na krytyku i pidporiadkuvannia politychnykh pozytsiy oponenta vlasniy pozytsii shlahkom spekulatsii na yogo nepraktychnosti ta vystavlenni yogo idei v humorystychnomu svitli] (a political discussion / political debate aimed at criticizing and subordinating the opponent's political positions to one's own, by speculating on his/her impracticality and presenting his/her ideas in a humorous light); *guesstimate = guess + estimate – надання політичної оцінки, не спираючись на повну чи чітко висвітлену інформацію, таким чином переносячи її результат на рівень інтуїції та суб'єктивного досвіду; інтуїтивний розрахунок, політична здогадка* [nadannia politychnoi otsinky, ne spyraiuchys' na povnu informatsiiu, perenosiachy ii rezultat na riven' intuitsii ta subiektyvnogo dosvidu; politychna zdogadka] (providing a political assessment not based on complete or clearly covered information, thus transferring its result to the level of intuition and subjective experience; intuitive surmise; political conjecture), *adhocrasny = ad hoc + bureausrasny – гнучка організаційна система* [hnuchka orhanizatsiyna systema] (a flexible organizational system).

However, despite the widespread use of descriptive translation to convey blends of English socio-political discourse in the Ukrainian text, this translation method should not be used often. We explain our point of view by the verbiage of the definitions obtained due to this technique. The positive moment of this method is its potential to provide an accurate idea of the translated blend meaning, giving a detailed interpretation of its content. It contributes to a better understanding of the innovation by recipients of the translated text. Still, it reduces or even nullifies the pragmatic communicative value of such a blend in the political text. In our opinion, descriptive translation should be used if translation by other techniques that could preserve the pragmatic, linguistic, and cultural characteristics of a blend is not possible.

A very popular blend translation technique is the translation using an analogical model, which tends to preserve the original structure of the blend. The analogical model means reproducing the language unit's original structure in translation. The analogy is a similarity caused by the influence of some language elements, which form a more productive and widespread model, on other correlated elements, which occurs rarer [Зацний, 2008, p. 19]. A typical example of blend translation using an analogical model is *Françlais*, based on correlates *French* and *Anglais*. In Ukrainian, such a lexeme is translated by the form of an analogical word-forming type unit – *франгліїський* ([frangliis'kyi] – Ukrainian transcoding, taking into account inflections in the Ukrainian language).

We consider the translation of political blends by an analogical model the most appropriate, as it provides an opportunity to preserve both the structural properties of these lexical items and more accurately convey their pragmatic political component. We suggest our analogical model versions of some political blends:

1) *Manufactroversy = manufactured + controversy* (used to denote an unnatural, non-existent conflict fabricated by politicians who deceive and use false arguments to achieve their goals) – *полемікація (polemikatsia) = полеміка (polemika – “polemic”) + фальсифікація (falsyfikatsia – “falsification”)*;

2) *politainer = politician + entertainer* (a politician who was or is a show business person, former athlete, etc., or participates in entertainment programs, especially during the election campaign) – *шоулітик (shoulityk) = шоу (shou – “show”) + політик (polityk – “politician”)*;

3) *Chindia = China + India* (China and India united by economic or market relations) – *Киндія (Kynthia) = Кунтай (Kytai – “China”) + Індія (Indiia – “India”)*;

4) *politainment = politician + entertainment* (a concept that means the tendency to broadcast political news and events in the media by using elements of show business and pop culture to simplify political information and reduce tensions when broadcasting unpleasant political topics) – *шоулітика = шоу (shou – “show”) + політика (polityka – “politics”)*;

5) *politiciinaire = politician + millionaire* (a politician who enters politics for enrichment, as well as a politician who has entered politics due to wealth and the status of an influential businessman) – *полігарх = політик (polityk – “politician”) + олигарх (oliharh – “oligarch”)*;

6) *regonomics* = *region* + *economics* (the concept to denote focus on a particular economic region development) – *регіономіка* (*regionomika*) = *регіон* (*region*) + *економіка* (*ekonomika* – “economics”);

7) *slowflation* = *slow* + *inflation* (a concept that means slow growth or even stagnation in the country’s economy together with high inflation rates) – *інфлесія* (*inflesia*) = *інфляція* (*inflatsia* – “inflation”) + *економічна регресія* (*ekonomichna regressia* – “economic regression”); *інфлиза* (*inflyza*) = *інфляція* (*inflatsia* – “inflation”) + *криза* (*kryza* – “crisis”).

It is known that translators of socio-political journalistic texts rarely use such a method of conveying blends. It is due to the need to involve considerable effort from the translator, who, in this case, should use creative and analytical skills to decode the original structure, analyze its components, and reproduce the appropriate word-formation model in the translation language. However, in many cases (as mentioned above), translators manage to generate translation language units that produce the original model of the source language.

The influence of blending on the derivational possibilities of the Ukrainian language

The metacognitive needs of society contribute to the dynamic development of the language system, affecting changes in linguistic means of explication and the creation of new forms within the structural and semantic capabilities of the language. Blending, as a way of forming new lexical units to denote the latest artifacts and phenomena by means of the English language as an analytical system, which overflowed the Internet, where socio-political discourse occupies one of the primary places thanks to the media, could not but affect other language structures of the world, Slavic including, despite the synthetic, flexible nature of their structure. The Ukrainian language has also undergone such changes, both as a need to translate English-language blends (which we encountered when analyzing the empirical research material in the previous section) and as a reaction to the needs of 21st-century new nominations, particularly socio-political concepts.

The process of updating the Ukrainian language vocabulary at the expense of non-standard lexical units, not typical for the system of Ukrainian word formation, has become the subject of research by domestic linguists. Conceptually and structurally, the features of derivational neologisms are discussed in the works by N.V. Stratulat [2011], word-forming innovations in Ukrainian socio-political naming are analysed in the works by S.S. Lukyanenko [2009], innovations in the language of the press are studied by O.M. Turchak (2013), etc.

The Internet texts most actively respond to social changes with new words and concepts appearing. The blogosphere systematically gives rise to new occasional entities, which over time, acquire mass use. The political confrontation of the last decade has its linguistic explanation. In the socio-political discourse of modern Ukrainian-language media, we observed innovations recently introduced into the vocabulary of Ukrainians (*кримнашівці* – [krymnashivtsi], *Путлер* – [Putler], *Лугандон* – [Lugandon], *Домбавве* – [Dombabve], *алкомайдан* – [alkomaidan], etc.). Such derivational innovations should be considered according to their structural and semantical features, especially under the translation process into an English-speaking environment (without such concepts).

The lexicalization process of a single concept through combining several meanings is structurally diverse. For example, due to agglutination:

within the limits of lexical-syntactic derivation, names are formed by combining the components of word phrases into a complete lexical unit. For example, “noun + pronoun”: *Krymnash* – formed from the phrase “our Crimea” – means a sarcastic name for financial reforms in Russia after the annexation of Crimea (the new tax introduced by Russia was called “Krymnash” by Internet users). In this case, the appellation is also characteristic, since the onym *Крым* loses the features of its name and is used as a structural component of a neologism-appellation, which further leads to the creation of blending units by analogy. For example: *Namkrysh* (formed from the expression “nam kryshka” – “it’s our end”) is used to explain the situation of the “Crimeans” after the introduction of sanctions and the beginning of the anti-terrorist operation.

Nowadays, in Ukrainian socio-political discourse, we can find many conceptual derivations formed through the structural blending of different union types with varying segments of words:

Лугандон – [*Lugandon*] – the name is formed by a combination of the initial segments of the toponyms *Luhan-sk* + *Don-etsk* (used ironically to refer the so-called “Donetsk and Luhansk People’s Republics”; *Укроп* – [*Ukrop*] (homophone to “dill” in Ukr., but means *Ukr-ainskyi Op-ir* – “Ukrainian national defense organization”), *кацапульта* – [*katsapulta*] – *kats-ap* (pejorative nomination of Russians) + *cat-ap-ult-a*); *олімпіард* – [*olympiard*] (*olympia-da* + *milia-rd*) dollars, *Гейропа* – [*Geyropa*] (*gay-s* + *Eu-ropa*), *окупендум* – [*occupendum*] (*occup-ation* + *refer-endum*), *Домбabwe* – [*Dombabwe*] (*Do-netsk* + *Zi-mbabwe*) composition of the truncated initial segment of one word with the final segment of another.

In some cases, there is an overlap between words, which consists in the fact that a part of the stem of another word is superimposed on the end of the stem of one word. A vivid example is:

Путлер – [*Putler*] (*Pu-t-in* + *Gi-t-ler*) (It is noteworthy that such a nickname for the Russian president first appeared in Russia itself, where a poster with the inscription “Putler kaput!” was unfurled during a rally in Vladivostok in 2009. As a result of a linguistic examination conducted by the Ministry of Justice of the Russian Federation, the word was recognized as having a “clearly expressed emotional assessment of the personality or activities of V.V. Putin as a representative of state power and has an offensive character”) [Кирилюк, 2020];

as well as: *майдауни* – [*maidaun*] (*mai-da-n* (square) + *da-un* (patient with Down’s disease), *КРИМіналітет* – [*KRYMinalitet*] (*Crim-ean* + *Crim-(ean)-inalit-y*), *Кримль* – [*Kryml*] (*Crim-ean* + *Kr-(e)-ml*) – used in the sense of “Crimea occupied by Russia”; *Дондурас* – [*Donduras*] (*D-on-etsk* + *G-on-duras*), *Луганда* – [*Luganda*] (*Lu-han-sk* + *U-gan-da*).

The explosive wave of linguistic creativity observed in today’s Ukrainian media discourse, especially in social networks, should be considered a reaction to the full-scale military invasion of the Russian Federation into Ukraine on February 24, 2022. In this regard, the desire to resist Russia’s information war gives rise to pejorative pragmatics in the verbalization of the emotional and psychological state of the society:

могілізація – [*mogilizatsia*] (*mo(g)il-a* (grave) + *mo(b)ilizat-ion*);

Госдура – [*Gosdura*] (*Gos-du-ma* (Parliament of the Russian Federation) + *du-ra* (stupid));

путриот – [*putriot*] (*Put-in* + *pat-riot*);

Бомбас – [*Bombas*] (to *b-omb* + *D-ombas-s*);

дегенерал(ы) – [*degeneral*] (*de-gener-ate* (someone who deviates in his behavior and mental qualities) + *general*);

бомжахед – [*bomjahed*] (*bom-zh* (homeless person) + *mu-jahed-din*);

зомбиленд – [*zombilend*] (*zombi-e* + *Disney-land*)

A large number of innovations with a negative evaluation, which nominates events, phenomena, and individuals, anyway connected with military events in Ukraine, indicates the axiological orientation of the creative efforts of speakers and requires a separate analysis of the Ukrainian language word-forming potential, which determines the relevance of further research.

As the structural-semantic variety of examples of Ukrainian-language socio-political discourse shows, in addition to typical cases of telescopic derivation/blending (a careful study of which structure is presented by J. Algeo (English blends), Ye.O. Redko (Ukrainian blends), etc.), there are atypical (deviant) cases of innovative word-creation. For example, word combinations sometimes become the basis for the formation of lexical blends, in particular in the Ukrainian language, considering its inflectional system. In such cases, the process of blending metacognitive models is correlated with the operations of conceptual fragmentation (according to Garmash [2018]), being especially important in translation, in our opinion. Hence, conceptual fragmentation – the mental operation of extracting fragments from the verbal content of concepts, which are further included in the processes of conceptual derivation – becomes the basis of the translation from Ukrainian to English, particularly as the language of international media. The difference in the structural system of these two languages causes the most incredible difficulty in translation and the impossibility of finding an equivalent in the target language, particularly in English. Therefore, the method of transcoding, which is often used when translating blends from English to Ukrainian, taking into account the worldwide popularity of English, does not work in this case and mostly requires additional explanations.

Moreover, one of the main advantages of lexical blending in the original language, the economy of form and sense, not speaking of stylistic and expressive loads, turns, on the contrary, into burdensome redundancy. In this case, translation requires an in-depth linguistic-mental process of the perception adequacy and decoding the implication of different blending lexical components regarding its semantic, contextual, stylistic, pragma-discursive, and extralingual aspects¹.

Conclusions

The socio-political discourse is an integral part of contemporary society, the development of which constantly continues, particularly the sphere of politics always retains its relevance. Thus, it is a phenomenon functionally aimed at forming in recipients (voters, as a fact) a specific fragment of their worldview or even the whole picture of the world. Accordingly, a new linguistic and mental environment is created, conditioned by qualitative changes at the cognitive level, which requires the latest nominations, but considering the structural and semantic capabilities of the language for the representation of innovative metacognitive models. Therefore, we can observe a change in the verbal explication of new concepts, changes in the semantic spectrum of the concept, the visual image of the concept, and the establishment of new correlations in the concept system as a whole.

Hence, a significant part of non-standard cases of the lexical unit formation in a language, represented by innovative metacognitive models, in mainly, conceptual telescopic / blending derivation, considering the structural and semantic capabilities of the language, are the result of qualitative changes at the cognitive level of the corresponding linguistic environment.

Thus, semantic derivatives are formed under regular word-forming mechanisms of verb creation at the synchronic level of the language, which contributes to generating units of secondary nomination. At the same time, extralinguistic and linguistic factors are mutually determined by the immanent structure. The essence of lexical blending lies not only in word-forming but in pragmatic functions. The analysis of the socio-political English-language discourse, regarding the pragmatically colored blending units, shows, that the language system's organization principles are closely correlated with the dynamics of the development of the society itself.

As pragmatylistic means, lexical blends are typical for English socio-political discourse, and their use, especially in recent years, has been growing. It is explained by the fact that such lexical units vividly reflect changes in the political sphere of society and reveal the lack of equivalent means to denote new realities and concepts. An important factor is the adaptation of blends to modern socio-political discourse: complex concepts that exist in contemporary politics can be conveniently expressed through blends, which combine several words and have the potential to enhance the pragmatic significance of the text. Due to their expressiveness and informative capacity, blends exert the most significant influence on the message's recipient.

Taking into account the focus of socio-political discourse on speech influence, the conveying of blend stylistics and the transfer of linguistic and cultural realia that form the basis of the blend implication and strengthen the socio-pragmatics of the given text cause difficulties both in the comprehension of the English original and translation variants. The study of the translation aspect of blends within socio-political discourse revealed a lot of challenges, such as the need for a definite means for conveying blend semantics in the translation language, the complex nature of blend explication, and the problem of their interpretation.

Among the translation techniques that are most effective in overcoming the outlined translation difficulties of socio-political blends, such ones should be mentioned first: transcription, transliteration, tracing, and creating an analogical model. We consider the descriptive translation method inappropriate when translating socio-political blends because such a technique does not allow conveying pragmatics of blends and implement them in the translation language as expressive lexical and stylistic units

¹ This, for example, is currently being tested by student translators at the LinguaStar Translation Center of Sumy State University through work with Op-Ed articles of Internet publications.

that are components of speech influence on the addressee, that is, society as a whole. *The principles of the techniques studied in the article can be used for further research as being universal for translating English blends in inflectional languages, where such a phenomenon is non-typical; hence, promoting the creation of lexical blended innovations in such languages for nominations of everyday-born concepts within socio-political discourse.*

The translation of blending vocabulary (in our case, from English into Ukrainian and vice versa) in many cases is a process of lexicalization of the newest units in the absence of equivalents within the translation language, which involves a mandatory method of step-by-step decoding of the constituent blends at both the structural and semantic levels, up to the lexicalization of the whole of the concept through the deverbalization of the combination of meanings within the original unit (source language), thereby filling the linguistic-mental gaps through the creation of lexical blending innovations (translation language), through “conceptual derivations”. This process is currently being actualized in the socio-political discourse within the Internet mass media, which requires significant interpretive knowledge and skills on the part of translators (both in translation from English to Ukrainian and vice versa, which is currently urgent due to geopolitical aspects).

The conducted research provides grounds for further studies: modern media texts demonstrate the extraordinary activity of innovative blends as an informational weapon during the Russian-Ukrainian war. The variety of structural and semantic models of the analyzed blending derivatives testifies to the high creative potential of speakers and the productivity of word-forming methods, particularly in the Ukrainian language. As evidenced by the results of our previous observation studies, the dynamic nature of the system of the Ukrainian-speaking linguistic and mental environment is based on the principal general provisions of synergy since the potential of the self-organization of the language system (Ukrainian including) is at the center of its attention. It should be emphasized that intrasystem deviant phenomena do not reduce the internal balance of the language system but only indicate flexibility and ability to self-organize.

Bibliography

- Белова, А.Д. (2003). *Лингвистические аспекты аргументации*. Київ: Логос.
- Гармаш, О.Л. (2017). *Англомовні морфологізовані метаконцепти в процесах концептуальної деривації (на матеріалі мовних інновацій кінця ХХ – початку ХХІ ст.)*. (Дис. док. філол. наук). Запорізький національний університет, Запоріжжя.
- Гармаш, О.Л. (2018). Семантична складова мережи англомовних концептуальних структур. *Наукові записки Національного університету «Острозька академія»: серія «Філологія»*, 1 (69/1), 104-106. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.25264/2519-2558-2018-1\(69\)/1-104-106](https://doi.org/10.25264/2519-2558-2018-1(69)/1-104-106)
- Єнікеєва, С.М., Єнікеєв, Д.С. (2017). Антропонім DONALD TRUMP як основа для створення лексичних інновацій в сучасній англійській мові. *Нова філологія*, 70, 66-70.
- Єнікеєва, С.М. (2007). Роль телескопії у збагаченні арсеналу словотвірних засобів сучасної англійської мови. *Науковий вісник Волинського державного університету ім. Л. Українки. Філологічні науки*, 5, 264-270.
- Єнікеєва, С.М. (2011). Синергодериватологія: синергетичний аспект дослідження вербокреативних процесів. *Мова і культура*, 14 (7), 442-448.
- Жлуктенко, Ю.А. (Ред.). (1983). *Английские неологизмы*. Київ: Наукова думка.
- Зацний, Ю.А., Янков А.В. (2008). *Інновації у словниковому складі англійської мови початку ХХІ століття. Англо-український словник*. Вінниця: Нова Книга.
- Зацний, Ю.А. (2013). О некоторых инновационных процессах и механизмах в лексико-семантической системе английского языка. *Новая филология*, 58, 63-74.
- Карпіловська, Є.А. (2022) *Актуальні аспекти вивчення українського словотворення*. Відновлено з: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=V6VvZnBnsCs>
- Кирилюк, О.Л. (2020). Структура асоціативно-семантичного поля «ворог» у дискурсі. *Актуальні питання гуманітарних наук*, 29 (2), 53-58. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24919/2308-4863.2/29.209437>

- Клименко, Н.Ф., Карпіловська, Є.А., Кислюк, Л.П. (2008). *Динамічні процеси в сучасному українському лексиконі*. Київ: Видавничий дім Дмитра Бурого
- Клименко, Н.Ф. (2000). Телескопія. В.М. Русанівський (Ред.), *Українська мова. Енциклопедія* (с. 680). Київ: Видавництво «Українська енциклопедія» ім. М.П. Бажана.
- Колоїз, Ж.В. (2015). *Неузуальне словотворення*. Кривий Ріг: Астерікс.
- Коробова, І.О. (2016). Новітні телескопізми сучасної української мови. *Вісник Київського національного лінгвістичного університету: Філологія*, 19 (2), 101-106.
- Лук'яненко, С.С. (2009). *Лексико-словотвірні інновації в українському соціально-політичному назовництві*. (Дис. канд. філол. наук). Харківський національний університет ім. В.Н. Каразіна, Харків.
- Мартинюк, А., Ахмедова, Е. (2022). (Sub)cultural specificity of fiction simile and the choice of translation strategy. *Topics in Linguistics*, 23 (2), 50-62. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.2478/topling-2022-0011>
- Медвідь, К.М., Швачко, С.О. (2013). *Лексична контамінація в сучасній англійській мові*. Відновлено з: <http://essuir.sumdu.edu.ua/handle/123456789/30536>
- Медвідь О.М. (2012). Мовні засоби впливу на реципієнта (на матеріалі політичного дискурсу). *Науковий вісник Волинського національного університету імені Лесі Українки*, 6 (231), 116-121.
- Нелюба, А.М. (2014). *Явища економії в словотвірній номінації української мови (системний вимір)*. Харків: Харківське історико-філологічне товариство.
- Олексенко, В.П. (2021). Структурно-семантичні особливості неолексем на позначення культурно-мистецької сфери. *Записки з українського мовознавства*, 28, 149-168. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.18524/2414-0627.2021.28.235532>
- Омельченко, Л.Ф. (1980). Телескопія – один из малоизученных способов глаголообразования современного английского языка. *Филологические науки*, 5, 66-71.
- Попова, О.В. (2017). Впливова функція дискурсу ЗМІ Великобританії в процесі BREXIT. *Наукові записки національного університету "Острозька академія". Серія "Філологічна"*, 64 (2), 91-94.
- Прокопец, А.П. (2005). Типология словообразовательных контаминантов. *Ученые Записки Таврического Университета им. В.И. Вернадского. Филология*, 18 (57), 107-111.
- Савчин, І.М. (2012). Телескопія як один із словотворчих засобів мовної економії англійської мови. *Наукові записки. Серія "Філологічна"*, 26, 293-296.
- Селіванова, О.О. (2008). *Сучасна лінгвістика: напрями та проблеми*. Полтава: Довкілля-К.
- СТИШОВ, О.А. (2005). *Українська лексика кінця ХХ століття (на матеріалі мови засобів масової інформації)*. Київ: Пугач.
- Стратулат, Н.В. (2011). Нові запозичення у словнику української мови як результат семантичного процесу метафоризації. *Філологічні студії: Науковий вісник Криворізького державного педагогічного університету*, 6, 448-455.
- Тараненко, О.О. (2015). *Актуалізовані моделі в системі словотворення сучасної української мови (кінець ХХ–ХХІ ст.)*. Київ: Видавничий дім Дмитра Бурого.
- Таценко, Н.В. (2017). *Реалізація емпатії в сучасному англійському дискурсі: когнітивно-сенергетичний аспект*. Суми: СумДУ.
- Тимошенко, Т.Р. (1975). *Телескопія в словообразовательной системе современного английского языка*. (Дис. канд. філол. наук). Педагогічний інститут іноземних мов, Київ.
- Ткачик, О.В. (2013). Номінативні процеси в англійському політичному дискурсі. *Мова і культура*, 16 (4), 224-230.
- Трамп наказав послабити дію Обамасаре. (2017). *Українська правда*, 13 жовтня. Відновлено з: <https://www.pravda.com.ua/news/2017/10/13/7158192/>
- Турчак, О.М. (2013). Поняття «оказіоналізм» у мовознавчій літературі та його мовленева реалізація в українських періодичних виданнях кінця ХХ століття. *Вісник Дніпропетровського університету імені Альфреда Нобеля. Філологічні науки*, 2 (6), 299-305.
- Час-Тіме: Трамп закликав республіканців не припиняти спроби скасувати "Обамакер". (2017). *Голос Америки (VOA: Ukrainian Service)*, 30 липня. Відновлено з: <https://ukrainian.voanews.com/a/3965169.html>

Чумак Л.М. (2018). *Лексичні інновації в англomовному медійному дискурсі початку XXI століття: структурний і лінгвопрагматичний аспекти*. (Дис. канд. філол. наук). Київський університет імені Бориса Грінченка Київ.

Шевченко, І.С. (2008). *Основи теорії мовної комунікації*. Харків: Народна українська академія.

Шевченко, І.С., Морозова, Е.И. (2003). Дискурс как мислекоммуникативное образование. *Вісник Харківського національного університету імені В.Н. Каразіна. Філологія*, 587, 33-3

Шевченко І.С. (2017). Концептуалізація комунікативної поведінки в дискурсі. І.С. Шевченко (Ред.), *Як намалювати портрет птаха: методологія когнітивно-комунікативно-го дослідження мови* (с. 106-147). Харків: ХНУ імені В.Н. Каразіна.

Algeo, J. (1977). Blends, a structural and systemic view. *American Speech*, 52 (1/2), 47-64. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.2307/454719>

Algeo, J. (1978). The Taxonomy of Word Making. *Word*, 29 (2), 122-131. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/00437956.1978.11435654>

Algeo, J., Pyles, Th. (2010). *The Origins and Development of the English Language*. Boston: Wadsworth Cengage Learning.

Bat-El, O. (2005). Blends. K. Brown (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics* (pp. 66-70). Oxford: Elsevier.

Bauer, L. (2001). *Morphological Productivity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511486210>

Cannon, G. (1986). Blends in English Word Formation. *Linguistics*, 24 (4), 725-753. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1515/ling.1986.24.4.725>

Chomsky, N. (1970). Remarks on nominalization. R.A. Jacobs, P.S. Rosenbaum (Eds.), *Readings in English Transformational Grammar* (pp. 184-221). Toronto & London: Ginn and Company.

Clinton: ObamaCare was originally "HillaryCare". (2016). *The Hill*, 21 January. Retrieved from: <http://thehill.com/policy/healthcare/266660-clinton-obamacare-was-hillarycare-first>

Crystal, D. (2003). *English as a Global Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dufva, H. (1992). *Slipshod Utterances: A Study of Mislanguge*. Jyväskylä: University of Jyväskylä.

Enarson, A. (2007). *New Blends in the English Language*. Karlstad: Hostterminen.

Fauconnier, G., Turner, M. (2008). *The Way We Think: Conceptual Blending and the Mind's Hidden Complexities*. Retrieved from: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/244515975>

Green, J. (1991). *New Words. A Dictionary of Neologisms since 1960*. London: Paragon.

Gries, S.Th. (2006). Cognitive Determinants of Subtractive Word-Formation Processes: A Corpus-Based Perspective. *Linguistics*, 17 (4), 535-558. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1515/COG.2006.017>

Hockett, Ch.F. (1968). *A Course in Modern English. Language Learning*. New York: Macmillan Company.

Lehrer, A. (2007). Blendalicious. J. Munat (Ed.), *Lexical Creativity, Texts and Contexts* (pp. 115-136). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Onions, C.T. (Ed.). (1966). *Oxford Dictionary of English Etymology*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G., Svartvik, J. (1985). *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London & New York: Longman, 1779 p.

Reiß, K. (1976). *Textyp und Übersetzungsmethode. Der operative Text*. Kronberg: Scriptor.

Thurner, D. (1993). *Portmanteau Dictionary: Blend Words in the English Language, Including Trademarks and Brand Names*. Jefferson (NC) & London: McFarland.

Wentworth, H. (1934). *Blend-words in English*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University.

Why is Obamacare so controversial? (2019). *BBC News*, 29 March. Retrieved from: <http://www.bbc.com/news/world-us-canada-24370967>

PRAGMATIC DEVIATIONS IN TRANSLATION OF LEXICAL BLENDS WITHIN POLITICAL DISCOURSE

Olena M. Medvid, Sumy State University (Ukraine).

e-mail: o.medvid@gf.sumdu.edu.ua

Kateryna M. Vashyst, Sumy State University (Ukraine).

e-mail: k.vashyst@gf.sumdu.edu.ua

DOI: 10.32342/2523-4463-2023-2-26/2-10

Key words: *political discourse, blending, blend innovation, word-forming element, translation technique, pragmatic deviations.*

The research touches upon the innovations in the English word formation processes, i.e., the role of analogy and intralingual borrowings as significant sources and ways of replenishing English vocabulary, interfering entirely with all the languages in the world and greatly influencing their development. Nominative units consisting of two or more words with a contraction of at least one of them at the place of a junction, i.e., blends, are an integral feature of the English language in general and modern English socio-political discourse in particular. *Blending* has been growing recently among the most productive means of word formation. Blends are needed to denote new concepts and phenomena and are often used to manifest the author's word-formation skills; they become popular due to their expressiveness and novelty of form and content. The *goal* of the article is to study the functional features of blends as a means of strengthening the pragmatic component of the socio-political discourse, as well as the strategy and techniques of their translation.

The general and special *methods* were used to achieve the goal and objectives of the study: information retrieval method – to select research material and process basic theoretical knowledge; generalization method – to highlight the most critical academic positions; deduction and induction – to clarify the theoretical foundations, generalize data and formulate conclusions; discourse analysis – to identify specific communicative and pragmatic features of socio-political communication; contextual and functional methods – to actualize the linguopragmatic meaning of the lexical units under the study, i.e., blends; the vocabulary definitions analysis – to examine their linguopragmatic peculiarities; structural-semantic and component analysis – to determine the ways of blend formation and their main structural elements – all this is necessary for the implementation of translation analysis.

The use of pragmalinguistic elements (blends, in our case) involves investigating relationships between language units and the conditions of the communicative-pragmatic space, tracing the relationship between the addressee's intentional component and the choice of language means when translating the studied units within the socio-political discourse into another language.

Conclusions. Regarding the focus of socio-political discourse on speech influence, the conveying of blend stylistics and the transfer of speech realia that form the basis of the blend implication and strengthen the socio-pragmatics of the given text cause difficulties in comprehending the English original and translation variants. The study of the translation aspect of blends within socio-political discourse revealed a lot of challenges, such as the need for a unique means for conveying blend semantics in the translation language, the complex nature of blend explication, and the problem of their interpretation.

Among the translation techniques that are most effective in overcoming the outlined translation difficulties of socio-political blends, such ones should be mentioned first: transcription, transliteration, tracing, and creating an analogical model. The descriptive translation method is considered inappropriate when translating political blends (under research) because such a technique does not allow conveying pragmatics of blends and implement them in the translation language as expressive lexical and stylistic units that are components of speech influence on the addressee, and the society as a whole. The principles of the techniques studied in the article can be used for further research as being universal for translating English blends in inflectional languages (Ukrainian including), where such a phenomenon is non-typical. *The process of blending hypothetically proves the activation of the redistribution of components within the different language structures and systems and their ability to self-reorganize.*

References

- Algeo, J. (1977). Blends, a structural and systemic view. *American Speech*, vol. 52, issue 1/2, pp. 47-64. DOI: <http://doi.org/10.2307/454719>
- Algeo, J. (1978). The Taxonomy of Word Making. *Word*, vol. 29, issue 2, pp. 122-131. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/00437956.1978.11435654>
- Algeo, J., Pyles, Th. (2010). *The Origins and Development of the English Language*. Boston, Wadsworth Cengage Learning Publ., 364 p.

- Bat-El, O. (2005). Blends. In K. Brown (ed.). *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*. Oxford, Elsevier, pp. 66-70.
- Bauer, L. (2001). *Morphological Productivity*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 245 p. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511486210>
- Belova, A.D. (2003). *Lingvisticheskie aspekty argumentatsii* [Linguistic Aspects of Argumentation]. Kyiv, Logos Publ., 300 p.
- Cannon, G. (1986). Blends in English Word Formation. *Linguistics*, vol. 24, issue 4, pp. 725-753.
- Chas-Time: Tramp zaklykav respublikantsiv ne pryypyniaty sproby skasuvaty Obamaker*. (2017). [Time-Time: Trump has urged Republicans not to stop trying to repeal "Obamacare"]. *Voice of America*, 30 July. Available at: <https://ukrainian.voanews.com/a/3965169.html> (Accessed 03 November 2023).
- Chomsky, N. (1970). Remarks on nominalization. In R.A. Jacobs, P.S. Rosenbaum (eds.). *Readings in English Transformational Grammar*. Toronto & London, Ginn and Company, pp. 184-221.
- Chumak, L.M. (2018). *Leksychni innovatsii v angломovnomu mediinomu dyskursi pochatku XXI stolittia: strukturnyi i lingvopragmatychnyi aspekty*. Diss. kand. filol. nauk [Lexical Innovations in the English-Language Media Discourse of the Beginning of the 21st Century: Structural and Linguopragmatic Aspects. PhD philol. sci. diss.]. Kyiv, 269 p.
- Clinton: ObamaCare was originally "HillaryCare". (2016). *The Hill*, 21 January. Available at: <http://thehill.com/policy/healthcare/266660-clinton-obamacare-was-hillarycare-first> (Accessed 03 November 2023).
- Crystal, D. (2003). *English as a Global Language*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 229 p.
- Dufva, H. (1992). *Slipshod Utterances: A Study of Mislanguange*. Jyväskylä, University of Jyväskylä Publ., 246 p.
- Enarson, A. (2007). *New Blends in the English Language*. Karlstad, Hostterminen Publ., 120 p.
- Fauconnier, G., Turner, M. (2008). *The Way We Think: Conceptual Blending and the Mind's Hidden Complexities*. Available at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/244515975> (Accessed 03 November 2023).
- Green, J. (1991). *New Words. A Dictionary of Neologisms since 1960*. London, Paragon, 356 p.
- Gries, S.Th. (2006). Cognitive Determinants of Subtractive Word-Formation Processes: A Corpus-Based Perspective. *Linguistics*, vol. 17, issue 4, pp. 535-558.
- Harmash, O.L. (2017). *Angломovni morfologizovani metakontsepty v protsesakh kontseptualnoi deryvatsii (na materiali movnykh innovatsii kintsia XX – pochatku XXI stolittia)*. Diss. dokt. filol. nauk [English-Language Morpholized Metaconcepts in the Processes of Conceptual Derivation (on the Material of Linguistic Innovations of the Late 20th – Early 21st Centuries). Dr. philol. sci. diss.]. Zaporizhzhia, 525 p.
- Harmash, O.L. (2018). *Semantychna skladova merezhy angломovnykh kontseptualnykh struktur* [Semantic component of the network of English-language conceptual structures]. *Naukovi zapysky Natsionalnoho universytetu "Ostroz'ka akademiia" Filologiya* [Scientific notes of the National University "Ostroh Academy" Philology], vol. 1, issue 69/1, pp. 104-106. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.25264/2519-2558-2018-1\(69\)/1-104-106](https://doi.org/10.25264/2519-2558-2018-1(69)/1-104-106)
- Hockett, Ch.F. (1968). *A Course in Modern English*. Language Learning. New York, Macmillan Company, 648 p.
- Karpilovska, Ye.A. (2022). *Aktualni aspekty vyvchennia ukrainskoho slovotvorennia* [Actual Aspects of the Study of Ukrainian Word Formation]. Available at: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=V6VvZnBnsCs> (Accessed 03 November 2023).
- Klymenko, N.F., Karpilovska, Ye.A., Kyslyuk, L.P. (2008). *Dynamichni protsesy v suchasnomu ukrains'komu leksykoni* [Dynamic Processes in the Modern Ukrainian Lexicon]. Kyiv, Dmytro Burago Publishing House, 336 p.
- Klymenko, N.F. (2000). *Teleskopiia* [Telescope]. In V.M. Rusanivsky (ed.). *Ukrains'ka mova. Entsyklopediia* [Ukrainian Language. Encyclopedia]. Kyiv, Ukrainian Encyclopedia Publ., p. 680.
- Kolois, Zh.V. (2015). *Neuzualne slovotvorennia* [Unusual word Formation]. Kryvyi Rih, Asterix Publ., 454 p.
- Korobova, I.O. (2016). *Novitni teleskopizmy suchasnoi ukrains'koi movy* [The Latest Telescopisms of the Modern Ukrainian Language]. *Kyiv National Linguistic University Bulletin: Philology Series*, vol. 19, issue 2, pp. 101-106.
- Kyrylyuk, O.L. (2020). *Struktura asotsiatyvno-semantychnoho polia "Voroh" u dyskursi* [The structure of the associative-semantic field "Enemy" in the discourse]. *Aktualni pytannia humanitarnykh nauk* [Actual Issues of Humanitarian Sciences], vol. 29, issue 2, pp. 53-58. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24919/2308-4863.2/29.209437>
- Lukyanenko, S.S. (2009). *Leksyko-slovotvirni innovatsii v ukrains'komu sotsialno-politychnomu nazyvnytvii*. Diss. kand. filol. nauk [Lexical and word-forming innovations in Ukrainian socio-political nomenclature. PhD philol. sci. diss.]. Kharkiv, 208 p.

- Lehrer, A. (2007). Blendalicious. In J. Munat (ed.). *Lexical Creativity, Texts and Contexts*. Amsterdam. John Benjamins Publishing Company, pp. 115-136.
- Martyniuk, A., Akhmedova, E. (2022). (Sub)cultural specificity of fiction simile and the choice of translation strategy. *Topics in Linguistics*, vol. 23, issue 2, pp. 50-62. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.2478/topling-2022-0011>
- Medvid, K.M., Shvachko, S.O. (2013). *Leksychna kontaminatsiia v suchasni anglis'kii movi* [Lexical contamination in modern English]. Available at: <http://essuir.sumdu.edu.ua/handle/123456789/30536> (Accessed 03 November 2023).
- Medvid, O.M. (2012). *Movni zasoby vplyvu na retsypienta (na materialy politychnoho dyskursu)* [Linguistic means of influencing the recipient (on the material of political discourse)]. *Naukovyi visnyk Volyn's'koho natsionalnogo universytetu imeni Lesi Ukrainky* [Scientific Bulletin of Volyn National University named after Lesya Ukrainka], vol. 6, issue 231, pp. 116-121.
- Nelyuba, A.M. (2014). *Yavyshe ekonomii v slovtovirni nominatsii ukrains'koi movy (systemnyi vymir)* [Phenomena of Economy in the Word-Forming Nomination of the Ukrainian Language (System Dimension)]. Kharkiv, Kharkiv Historical and Philological Society., 184 p.
- Onions, C.T. (ed.). (1966). *Oxford Dictionary of English Etymology*. New York, Oxford University Press, 1041 p.
- Oleksenko, V.P. (2021). *Strukturno-semantichni osoblyvosti neoleksem na poznachennia kulturno-mystets'koi sfery* [Structural-semantic features of neolexems for the designation of the cultural and artistic sphere]. *Zapysky z ukrains'koho movoznavstva* [Notes on Ukrainian Linguistics], vol. 28, pp. 149-168. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.18524/2414-0627.2021.28.235532>
- Omelchenko, L.F. (1980). *Teleskopiia – odin iz maloizuchenykh sposobov glagolobrazovaniia s'ovremennogo angliyskogo yazyka* [Telescopy – One of the Little-studied Ways of Verb Formation of the Modern English Language]. *Filologicheskie nauki* [Philological Sciences], vol. 5, pp. 66-71.
- Popova, O.V. (2017). *Vplyvova funktsiia dyskursu ZMI Velykobrytanii v protsesi BREXIT* [Influential Function of British Media Discourse in BREXIT process]. *Naukovi zapysky natsionalnogo universytetu "Ostroz'ka Academia". Seria "Filologichna"* [Scientific Notes of the National University "Ostroh Academy". Philological Series], vol. 64, issue 2, pp. 91-94.
- Prokopets, A.P. (2005). *Tipologii slovoobrazovatelnykh kontaminantov* [Typology of word-forming contaminants]. *Uchonyie Zapiski Tavricheskogo Universiteta im. V. I. Vernadskogo. Filologiya* [Bulletin of Tauride National University named after V.I. Vernadsky. Philology], vol. 18, issue 57, pp. 107-111.
- Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G., Svartvik, J. (1985). *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London & New York, Longman, 1779 p.
- Reiß, K. (1976). *Textyp und Übersetzungsmethode. Der operative Text [Text Type and Translation Method. The Operative Text]*. Kronberg, Scriptor Publ., 212 p.
- Savchyn, I.M. (2012). *Teleskopiia yak odyin iz slovtovorchykh zasobiv movnoi ekonomii anglis'koi movy* [Telescopy as one of the word-forming means of the linguistic economy of the English language]. *Naukovi zapysky. Seria "Filologichna"*. [Scientific notes. Philological series], vol. 26, pp. 293-296.
- Selivanova, O.O. (2008). *Suchasna lingvistyka: napriamy ta problemy* [Modern Linguistics: Directions and Problems]. Poltava, Dovkillya-K. Publ., 712 p.
- Shevchenko, I.S. (2008). *Osnovy teorii yazykovoy komunikatsii* [Fundamentals of the Theory of Language Communication]. Kharkiv, Narodna ukrainska akademiya Publ., 168 p.
- Shevchenko, I.S. (2017). *Kontseptualizatsiia komunikatyvnoi povedinky v dyskursi* [Conceptualization of Communicative Behavior in Discourse]. In I.S. Shevchenko (ed.). *Yak namaluvaty portret ptakha metodolohiia kognityvno-komunikatyvnoho doslidzhennia movy* [How to draw a portrait of a bird: methodology of cognitive-communicative language research]. Kharkiv, Kharkiv National University named after V.N. Karazin Publ., pp. 106-147.
- Shevchenko, I.S., Morozova, Ye.I. (2003). *Diskurs kak myslekomunikativnoie obrazovaniie* [Discourse as thought-communicative system]. *Visnyk Kharkivs'koho natsionalnogo universytetu imeni V.N. Karazina. Filologiya* [Bulletin of Kharkiv National University named after V. N. Karazin. Philology], vol. 587, pp. 33-38.
- Stratulat, N.V. (2011). *Novi zapozychennia u slovnyku ukrains'koi movy yak rezultat semantynoho protsesu metaforyzatsii* [New borrowings in the dictionary of the Ukrainian language as a result of the semantic process of metaphorization]. *Filologichni studii: Naukovyi visnyk Kryvoriz'koho derzhavnoho pedagogichnoho universytetu*. [Philological Studies: Scientific Bulletin of Kryvyi Rih State Pedagogical University], vol. 6, pp. 448-455.
- Styshov, O.A. (2005). *Ukrains'ka leksyka kintsia XX stolittia (na materialy movy zasobiv masovoi informatsii)* [Ukrainian Vocabulary of the End of the 20th Century (Based on the Language of Mass Media)]. Kyiv, Pugach Publ., 387 p.
- Taranenko, O.O. (2015). *Aktualizovani modeli v systemi slovtovorenna suchasnoi ukrains'koi movy (kinets XX–XXI stolit')* [Updated Models in the Word-Formation System of the Modern Ukrainian Language (End of the 20th – 21st Centuries)]. Kyiv, Dmytro Burago Publishing House., 248 p.

Tymoshenko, T.R. (1975). *Teleskopiia v slovoobrazovatelnoi sisteme sovremennogo angliiskogo yazyka*. Diss. kand. filol. nauk [Telescopy in the Word-Formation System of the Modern English Language. PhD philol. sci. diss.]. Kyiv, 176 p.

Turchak, O.M. (2013). *Poniattia "okkazionalizm" u movoznavchii literaturi ta yoho movlennieva realizatsiia v ukrains'kykh periodychnykh vydanniakh kintsia XX stolittia* [The concept of "occasionalism" in linguistic literature and its speech implementation in Ukrainian periodicals of the late 20th century]. *Visnyk Universitetu imeni Alfreda Nobelya. Seriya: Filologichni Nauki* [Alfred Nobel University Journal of Philology], vol. 2, issue 6, pp. 299-305.

Tatsenko, N.V. (2017). *Realizatsiia empatii v suchasnomu anglomovnomu dyskursi: kognityvno-senergetychnyi aspekt* [Realization of Empathy in the Current English Discourse: Cognitive-Synergetic Aspect]. Sumy, Sumy State University Publ., 357 p.

Thurner, D. (1993). *Portmanteau Dictionary: Blend Words in the English Language, Including Trademarks and Brand Names*. Jefferson (NC) & London, McFarland, 200 p.

Tkachyk, O.V. (2013). *Nominatyvni protsesy v anglomovnomu politychnomu dyskursi* [Nominative Processes in English Political Discourse]. *Mova i Kultura* [Language and Culture], vol. 16, issue 4, pp. 224-230.

Trump nakazav poslabyty diiu Obamacare. (2017). [Trump ordered to weaken the action of Obamacare]. *Ukrains'ka Pravda* [Ukrainian Truth]. Available at: <https://www.pravda.com.ua/news/2017/10/13/7158192/> (Accessed 03 November 2023).

Wentworth, H. (1933). *Blend-Words in English*. Ithaca, NY, Cornell University, 5 p.

Why is Obamacare so controversial? (2019). *BBC News*, 29 March. Available at: <http://www.bbc.com/news/world-us-canada-24370967> (Accessed 03 November 2023).

Yenikeieva, S.M. (2007). *Rol' teleskopii u zbahachenni arsenalu slovotvirnykh zasobiv suchasnoi angliis'koi movy* [The role of telescoping in enriching the arsenal of word-forming means of the modern English language]. *Naukovyi Visnyk Volyn'skoho derzhavnoho universytetu imeni L. Ukrainky. Filolohichni nauky* [Scientific Bulletin of the Volyn State University named after L. Ukrainka. Philological Sciences], vol. 5, pp. 264-270.

Yenikeieva, S.M. (2011). *Synergoderivatologija: synergetychnyi aspekt doslidzhennia verbokreatyvnykh protsesiv* [Synergoderivatology: the synergistic aspect of verb creative processes research]. *Mova i kultura* [Language and Culture], vol. 14, issue 7, pp. 442-448.

Yenikeieva, S.M., Yenikeiev, D.S. (2017). *Antroponim DONALD TRUMP yak osnova dlia stvorennia leksychnykh innovatsiy v suchasniy angliiskiy movi* [Anthroponyme DONALD TRUMP as Basis for Creation of lexical Innovations in Modern English]. *Nova filologija* [New Philology], vol. 70, pp. 66-70.

Zatsny, Yu.A., Yankov, A.V. (2008). *Innovatsii u slovnykovomu skladi angliis'koi movy pochatku XXI stolittia. Anglo-ukrains'kyi slovnyk* [Innovations in the Vocabulary of the English Language at the Beginning of the 21st Century: English-Ukrainian Dictionary]. Vinnytsia, Nova Kniga Publ., 360 p.

Zatsny, Yu.A. (2013). *O nekotorykh innovatsyonykh protsessakh i mekhanizmach v leksiko-semanticheskoi sisteme angliiskogo yazyka* [On Some Innovative Processes and Mechanisms in the Lexico-semantic System of the English Language]. *Nova filologija* [New Philology], vol. 58, pp. 63.

Zhluhtenko, Yu.A. (ed.). (1983). *Angliiskiie neologizmy* [English Neologisms]. Kyiv, Naukova Dumka Publ., 172 p.

Одержано 20.11.2022.