У НАС В ГОСТЯХ

TRANSLANGUAGING IN ACTION: SHAPING BILINGUAL COMMUNICATIVE STRATEGIES

This research was conducted under an intra-university grant provided by Vanadzor State University

Zh. L. ALOYAN
alozhanna@mail.ru,

S. S. BARSEGHYAN
svetlana-barsegyan@yandex.ru,

N. A. HOVHANNISYAN
hovhannisyan-nare92@mail.ru

Vanadzor State University (Vanadzor, Republic of Armenia)

Посвящается светлой памяти доктора филологических наук, профессора Михаила Давидовича Амирханяна

This study examines the discursive manifestations of translingualism and transculturalism, emphasizing the linguistic specificities of contemporary bilingual environments. The research applies and expands upon S. Gural's notions of the interdependence of discourse and socio-cultural practice, as well as the context-discourse relationship in modern bilingualism. The bilingual individual operates within a dynamic interaction of linguistic and cultural frameworks, simultaneously shaping and being shaped by discursive and cognitive-communicative processes of both their native and

acquired sociocultures. This interplay fosters the emergence of novel discourses, conceptual reinterpretations, and innovative linguistic phenomena, which are central to bilingual speech production. The recombination and reinterpretation of semiotic forms within bilingual discourse contribute to the expansion of linguistic creativity, enabling more complex intercultural dialogues. In the context of globalization, interlinguistic communication plays a pivotal role in shaping linguistic consciousness and the conceptual worldview of bilingual individuals. The evolution of bilingual discourse practices reflects a communicative paradigm that transcends singular cultural boundaries, ultimately manifesting a form of discourse that exists "beyond culture." Thus, the bilingual linguistic personality exemplifies the simultaneous integration and negotiation of diverse linguistic and cultural phenomena within their verbal behavior, reinforcing the dynamic interplay of translingualism and transculturalism in contemporary society.

Key words: *Bilingualism; language contact; transculturalism; linguistic creativity; hybridization; dynamic linguistic environments.*

Introduction

In the modern era, the 21st century has ushered in a transformative period marked by intensified globalization affecting all aspects of social life. These global shifts also present fascinating opportunities for modern linguistics, inspiring deeper exploration into the dynamics of language and cultural contact, as well as the processes of convergence, interaction, and coexistence among them.

Globalization diminishes the spatial and cultural divides between nations, fostering heightened intercultural interactions.

Changing the approach to the very tasks of linguistic study, consequently, changing the volume and 'qualities' of the content in question led to the drastic change of scholarly paradigm. Such a shift of

scientific interest was, undoubtedly, bolstered by the afore-noted extralinguistic factors: a social demand for the knowledge of certain foreign languages was brought on in the society.

The study of bilingualism and language contact has a rich historical tradition, underscoring its enduring relevance. The issue of contact linguistics is based on the following main categories – language contact, bilingualism, adoption and interference, substratum and superstratum, convergence and divergence, code-switching, pidgin and creole languages. Obviously, the concept of language contacts occupies a central place in the conceptual construct of contact linguistics [32, p. 189].

In the context of globalization, contemporary linguistic scholarship conceptualizes bilingualism not merely as dual language competence, but as a dynamic phenomenon characterized by cognitive-adaptive strategies and linguistic hybridization. This reconfiguration of bilingual discourse engenders novel semiotic practices, fostering the emergence of resemanticized concepts and culturally inflected modes of expression.

In light of recently transpiring linguistic processes, modern discursive practices can be referred to as the situation of communication 'beyond culture' [21]. The way emerging bilinguals use language goes beyond the externally imposed boundaries constructed and maintained between named languages, such as English, Spanish, or Arabic [12, p. 236]. The singularity of such a linguistic situation, as far as we are concerned, derives from the fact that every linguo-culture obtains more chances to manifest itself via other languages. Relatively recently emerged concepts of translingualism and transculturalism are just one manifestation of such a communication, i.e. communication beyond the bounds of culture. Translanguaging theories, such as transcultural conceptions and translanguaging, illustrate how language in use in socio-culturally shaped spaces goes beyond the externally imposed boundaries and rigid hierarchies, used to elevate some ways of saying, doing, and being over others [13].

In contemporary linguistics, any reference to the terms transculturation and translingualism indicates a novel phase communication in the era of globalization and formation of contemporary bilingualism, which currently underpins tolerance.

This article aims to analyze the phenomena associated with bilingualism and its impact on linguistic and cultural dynamics in modern society. It explores the application of metanarrative and phrasal approaches within translingual and transcultural language theories to understand bilingual discourse. *Key objectives* include examining bilingualism's psychological and cognitive effects, researching transcultural phenomena (adaptation, cultural exchange, and identity formation), investigating linguistic transformations (recoding, hybridization, and creolization), and identifying factors fostering transcultural competencies for enhanced intercultural communication.

The study of contemporary bilingualism and transcultural phenomena in speech embraces a host of tasks, which, as we can see, encompasses psychological, socio-cultural, linguistic and formative facets. These facets have pragmatic and scientific significance, and their resolution fosters better understanding and effective management of multilingual and multicultural environments, where translingual and transcultural phenomena increasingly widespread and significant aspects of modern society.

The current research focuses on the speech of bilinguals, specifically those who speak Armenian and Russian, Russian and English, and Armenian, Russian and English. In this cases, two languages and cultures interact, creating an intergrated system. Analyzing this system can lead to deeper insights into the linguo-cognitive potential and development of transcultural personality.

Methodology of the Research

Methodological foundations of the current research dwell on the hypotheses, proven by S. Gural, in accordance with which linguo-cultural transformations are of contextual-discursive character [16, p. 176], which is downright vividly manifested in the modern bilingualism [34, p. 82-86], where cognitive and communicative practices come to provide for and complement each other in the discursive interaction [17, p. 15-21].

The theoretical paradigm proposed by S. A. Gural attains renewed significance when applied to the investigation of translingual and transcultural practices in bilingual discourse. The present study employs a comprehensive set of linguistic methodologies, including linguistic observation, structural and word-formation analysis, as well as etymological inquiry. Furthermore, general methodological tools of the humanities are engaged—most notably, the descriptive method, aimed at the systematization and interpretation of translingual phenomena through the compilation, classification, and generalization of empirical data. Cognitive strategies, particularly the reconstruction of background knowledge, further enhance the understanding of the mechanisms underpinning the emergence and functioning of translingual constructs. The article gains another application, i.e. the method of discourse and semantic analysis [14, p. 216].

Focus on discourse categories

To study the speech patterns of bilinguals, the research emphasizes the description of special discourse categories: translingual and transcultural practices. We tend to display that the functioning of translanguaging theories in the discursive environment of bilinguals, on the one hand, appear to be the product and effect of social communication: instrumental processes of interaction and exchange, but, on the other hand, are predicated on linguo-cognitive factors and generate new knowledge.

The Methods of Compiling Factual Basis

Survey procedure. The compilation of the bases was direct observation and surfing the Internet. The research is predicated on 200 odd speech patterns.

From Bilingualism to the *Contemporary Dynamic* Bilingualism – Translingualism

Based on the study of the modern world, it can be accurately asserted that the number of bilinguals surmounts that of monolinguals [37]. According to E. Vereshchagin, bilingualism functions as a mechanism of speech production within the domain of psychology. In linguistic research, it is examined through the lens of language contact theory, whereas in sociology, the phenomenon is approached in relation to issues concerning the social behavior, status, and identity of the bilingual individual [38, p.

160]. The notion of language contact in linguistics is defined by U. Weinreich as a situation "… in which two or more languages are used in turns by the individual (i.e. individuals themselves appear to be the location of establishing language contact)" [39, p. 247], or to put it even more broadly, as "functioning of two languages in one and the same communicative field, which centers around the general native speaker or the group of native speakers" [39, p. 211].

L. Bloomfield, for instance, defines bilingualism as "acquisition of both languages as native" [4, p. 56]. Another definition of bilingualism is put forward by U. Weinreich, "practice of using both languages in turns" [39, p. 22]. A broader definition of bilingualism is provided by A. Schweitzer, "Bilingualism is the coexistence of two languages within the framework of one language (speaking) group, using these languages in various communicative fields, depending on the social situation and other parameters of the communicative act; having served one common group, both languages shape one socio-communicative system and functionally complement each other" [33, p. 111].

The above-mentioned definition rather matches diglossia, as perceiving diglossia beyond social context is pointless. Diglossia subsists, first of all, in society, where two or more languages function, which are used in varied situations for various purposes. The most precise one seems to be the plainest definition of it, proposed by L. Bloomfield. Yet, even this definition has a fallacy: given the existence of sundry types of bilingualism, "mastering them as native languages" is not a necessary prerequisite for naming the individual a bilingual. For example, dominant bilingualism wherein one language prevails over the other, is more widespread, than balanced, wherein an individual is equally proficient in both languages [9]. An individual, who knows the second language enough to communicate freely, is also known as bilingual.

According to Z. Proshina, "…no matter how hard the non-native speaker strived to brush up on his/her second or foreign language, acquired in school, having studied it as a foreign language or a second

language in the non-national environment, he/she will never become a native speaker of that language though can achieve a great deal" [31, p. 94]. Such a stance is put forward by Vivian Cook, who put it in a rather rough wording, in our view, "Adults could never become native speakers without being reborn" [7, p. 187].

The metaphorical worldview within the linguo-cognitive system of bilinguals becomes increasingly complex due to their engagement with distinct discursive practices, shaped by a binary perception of reality across different languages. This dual conceptualization of the linguistic picture of the world arises from the divergent codification inherent in two semiotic systems. In these systems, languages often function simultaneously, having preserved their structure and grammar. 'A bilingual who uses two languages in everyday life in various fields of communication, manifests in his/her speech behavior language formulae of two language systems, two linguo-cultures, each of which effects on his/her speaking product. The difficulty of the process is the fact that pursuant to the situation of communication and his/her communicative needs, the bilingual chooses one language over the other, switching from one code to another. In the process of code-switching, a swift shift of language norm happens, which, in turn, entails violations of the required norms by the bilingual. As a consequence, words and expressions get distorted, speaking and grammatical mistakes are made' [3, p. 12]. The individuals can switch languages on account of the context, but the very languages remain disconnected and independent. In the current paradigm, bilingualism implies bilingual proficiency, but it does not necessarily result in the consolidation of language systems.

In the context of "gloanglization" and the widespread adoption of English as a lingua franca, global bilingualism has experienced significant growth. The intermingling of English with other linguistic systems has given rise to hybrid varieties such as Runglish, Chinglish, and Spanglish, which in turn have led to the development of key theoretical concepts, including English as an International Language, 'World Englishes,' and English as a Lingua Franca.

In this respect, Z. Proshina singles out the following social functions of the English language, 'instrumental, English Medium Instruction,

regulatory, as a contributor of management of society and individuals, creative, creation medium, interpersonal, means of interpersonal communication, /…/ decorative, item-adorning, attention-seeking' [31, p. 26]. This final function, according to Proshina, can be implemented only when language mixing is applicable. Given the fact that cross-cultural communication is performed more and more frequently in the modern world, this function of *global bilingualism* gives rise to translingual and transcultural situations. Bilingual systems, where two languages are used simultaneously, grow increasingly flexible and dynamic, which replicates the evolution in the modern language practices. A new phenomenon by the name of *translingualism* comes to replace the traditional bilingualism; the former stipulates not only simultaneous existence of several languages, but also the incorporation of these language systems into one single and more flexible structure. This evolution of language paradigms traces back to various social, cultural and educational factors.

The process of globalization, as a salient feature of contemporary thought, exerts a profound influence not only on economic structures but also on the subjectivity of the modern individual. Furthermore, it plays a pivotal role in the construction of distinct epistemological frameworks, emblematic of the (post)modern condition [36, p. 141]. As a result, language boundaries become increasingly precise, and individuals use elements of different languages and cultures within one expression in their speech.

Yet in 1982, F. Grosjean [15] noted that a bilingual is not only the integrity of two monolinguals in one personality. O. García [10] proposes in her work the following theory of viewing the modern bilingualism, "… bilingualism is dynamic, and not just additive, as two separate systems that are added (or even interdepend), a dynamic conceptualization of bilingualism goes beyond the notion of two autonomous languages, of a first language (L1) and a second language (L2), and of additive or subtractive bilingualism. Instead, dynamic bilingualism suggests that the language practices of bilinguals are complex and interrelated; that do not

emerge in a linear way or function separately since there is only one linguistic system. Dynamic bilingualism goes beyond the idea that there are two languages that are interdependent as in Cummins (1979); instead, it connotes one linguistic system that has features that are most often practiced according to societally constructed and controlled 'languages', but other times producing new practices" [11, p. 13-14].

The classical notion of bilingualism gives in to the novel modern bilingual model, which is named *dynamic* or *flexible*. One can notice in the speech of bilinguals frequent transitions from one language to another in the middle of the phrase, use of vocabulary, phrases and grammar from different languages in one context, linguistic neologisms on the basis of the two languages, creative usage of two language systems and creating new hybrid languages. In contrast to the classical conception of bilingualism, the theory of translanguaging, as articulated by O. García and Li Wei [11, p. 15], is grounded in contemporary understandings of bilingualism. This theory posits the existence of a singular, integrated language system with functions borrowed from distinct languages. These systems are often employed in alignment with social constructs of language; however, they are sometimes utilized in unconventional ways, leading to the emergence of novel linguistic forms. García further draws an analogy between modern dynamic bilingualism and a cross-country vehicle, wherein individuals leverage their linguistic repertoire to navigate the challenging terrain of communication, adapting to the linguistic "treads" and "craters" of an uneven and inequitable interactive landscape [10].

Translingualism, as designated above, is a more flexible and incorporate medium of using possible linguistic resources and leads to the development of a novel type of bilingualism, viz. flexible or dynamic bilingualism. "The theory of translanguaging highlights the agency of individuals in their linguistic choices, emphasizing the hybridized language practices of multilingual speakers. These speakers engage in a dynamic process of meaning construction, interpreting and processing information fluidly by drawing on linguistic resources from multiple languages and dialects, thereby facilitating a flexible, context-dependent interplay among their diverse linguistic repertoires" [24, p. 386-392].

Another viewpoint of O. García and Li Wei, the concepts of *translingual activity* and *translingual practice* more accurately reflect the modern linguo-cultural and socio-linguistic realias, which are directly linked to linguistic creativity, or speech act of bilinguals [24, p. 29]. Bilinguals in their translingual practice not only encode the initial, fixed cultural meanings, but also create and verbalize new, ever-changing dynamic and unique meanings in the process of communication with the help of linguistic units.

Thus, the intertwined issues of bilingualism, transculturalism, translingualism, linguistic variantology, cross-cultural communication appear to be a relevant field for linguo-cultural researches currently. Yet, translanguaging theories cannot be boiled down to local processes of communication; this process is of systematic nature and is directly connected with the globalization of the modern world. "Globalisation does not diminish the relevance of named language categories but rather accentuates their existence as ideological constructs. It is our communicative practices that transgress and potentially transform the perceived boundaries of these constructs transcultural" [1, p. 164].

Transcultural and Translingual Communication: Concept and Significance

As noted earlier, in robust interactions and interdependence of nations, languages and cultures, new states of humanity emerge, which actualize themselves in a new paradigm, called transculturalism and translingualism.

Transculturalism is a concept introduced by F. Ortiz, a Cuban anthropologist, in 1940 [25]. In the Russian linguistics, first researches of the theme are referred to Z. Proshina, a prominent linguist, who introduces the theory and practice of contact variantology, transculturalism and translingulism to the readers [27; 28].

"The conception of transculturalism as a new episteme, aligning with the era of globalization, is linked to its perception as a new type of

linguistic thinking or discourse, as a cultural and political unconscious of our era, which predetermines the entire activity and vision of the post (modern) human" [36, p. 140].

Transculturalism is predicated on dynamic manifoldness and entails new realization of popular phenomena of bi-/ polylingualism. Upon the definition by M. Tlostanova, "transculturalism, as a new episteme, dwells on the cultural polylogue, which does not necessitate any thorough synthesis, merger, full cultural translation, where cultures encounter, interact, but fail to merge, retaining their right to *lack of transparency*" [35, p. 28]. Nonetheless, it is worthwhile to note that "…under the influence of the interacting cultures, a new worldview and new cultural ideologies are formed, which, to a certain extent, can be identified as borderline – neither here nor there, depending on the individual experience of this condition" [32, p. 191].

Transculture is inextricably linked to translingualism, which, in accordance with Z. Proshina, based on the definitions, provided by S. Kanagaraj, M. Tlostanova and Jerry Won Lee, is perceived as a fluid synergetic transition from one linguoculture to another, which results in their merger to some extent. Meanwhile, there is no full assimilation, and the linguo-cultural identity of the language speakers is preserved. Translingualism implies language permeability, their interdependence, in the aftermath, a novel quality of the enriched linguoculture emerges [30, p. 160]. O.García and Li Wei provide the following definition of translingualism, "translanguaging does not refer to two separate languages nor to a synthesis of different language practices or to a hybrid mixture. Rather, translanguaging refers to new language practices that make visible the complexity of language exchange among people with different histories, and releases histories and understanding that had been buried within fixed language identities constrained by nation-states" [2, p. 21]. In addition, from their point of view, translingualism "goes beyond the concept of the two languages of additive bilingualism or interdependence" [11, p. 20].

W. Baker, who was the first to translate the term *translingualism* and introduced it for scholarly use, who detailed the term as follows, "Translanguaging is the process of making meaning, shaping experiences,

gaining understanding and knowledge through the use of two languages" [2, p. 288].

We certainly concur with many of the referred definitions, and we will attempt to recap these conceptions and sort out the common features of translingualism; translingualism is a concept, which is actualized in multifaceted linguo-cultural interactions, whereby individuals interdepend in various language and cultural environments. In the context of available theories, translingualism is a process, wherein bilinguals combine and adapt diverse linguistic elements and cultural codes. This process materializes in the navigation among languages and cultures without their full merger. Suchlike transition is usually accompanied by the conservation of linguo-cultural identity and creation of hybrid linguo-cultural forms, which, in turn, contributes to the formation of novel linguistic discourse and cultural practices. This process encompasses not only superficial changes in the use of the language, but also profound modifications in the cognitive field, perception and social interrelations, which, in the long run, fosters the formation of new unique linguo-cultural space.

The phenomenon of translanguaging, which results from translingualism, can be defined as a linguistic practice of bilinguals, freely communicating in two or even more languages, whereby they prioritize in their speech not the language system, rather, speech act. Clara Molina, in her conceptualization of translingualism, explores the phenomenon of lingua franca, defining translingualism as the process of collecting information in at least two languages and transmitting it through a third. This framework highlights the fluidity and adaptability of linguistic practices within multilingual contexts, where communication transcends individual language boundaries to facilitate the construction and exchange of meaning across diverse linguistic systems [22, p. 1246].

As Z. Proshina argues, bilinguals with different native languages and cultural backgrounds in translingual contexts employ various communicative strategies, including code mixing and switching,

borrowing, language hybridization, pidginization, simplification, and the activation of metalinguistic knowledge. She posits that translingualism challenges traditional prescriptivism by advocating for fluid movement between linguistic norms [6], emphasizing the necessity of studying transference [20, p. 258-264], and aligning harmoniously with the communicative approach to language formation [29, p. 6].

Arianna Dagnino uses the term *fuzziness*, borrowed from Mathematics and IT sphere for characterizing translingualism and transculturalism [8, p. 179]. It is within the very *blurry* and *fuzzy* bounds between two languages that speech acts of bilinguals resurface. The two languages, which a bilingual knows, not only add up, but also shape an integrated system [29, p. 23].

Thus, it is with the introduction of the translanguaging theories – transculturalism and translingualism – that the researches were refocused from traditional bilingualism to a more flexible, dynamic type of bilingualism, i.e. translingualism and transculturalism. The concept of bilingualism has shifted from the rigid binary model, which conceptualizes languages as two distinct, structurally autonomous systems operating independently within bilingual speech, to a more fluid and dynamic paradigm. This contemporary approach emphasizes *the interaction and permeability of linguistic boundaries, extending beyond the confines of individual languages to encompass interlingual processes and hybridized language practices* [23, p. 23].

The ongoing processes of globalization of English in the modern world and formation of English-native bilingualism boosts and expands the bounds of sprawling translingual and transcultural practices. The concept of World Englishes, put forward in the late 20th century by Braj Kachru, served as the stepping-stone of studying novel translanguaging theories [18, p. 29].

Applied Research

The concepts of *translingualism* and *transculturalism* are widely employed in the analysis of various discourses of all industries. The core factor of contributing to the comprehension of translingual speech is not only the awareness of communicants of separate language norms, rather, the knack for applying strategies, which pave the way for grappling with

emerging difficulties, ingenuity and resourcefulness, which they display in the current communicative situations [5, p. 2].

L. Karakuts Borodina proposes the term *translingvema* for characterizing the linguistic phenomena of transcultural and translingual speech; the former can also designate a top incorporated linguistic unit into the translingual speech [19, p. 2].

Based on the formerly conducted selection, we will present the ***Linguistic*** classification of translingvemas. This type of classification is predicated on the parcellation of one grapheme or consonance of a foreign-language part of the word or the whole word, which results in the formation of graphoderivatives.

1. Phonetico-graphic translingvema is the wordplay use of intersecting Cyrillic, Armenian and Latin alphabets. These letters usually locate themselves *a. at the beginning of the word, b. in the middle of the word, c. at the end of the word*: ***S***амый Правильный Бар (***Samyj Pravil'nyj Bar***) – a bar name in Saint Petersburg; 'Диалоги в Русском Доме: ***Z***най и прод***V***игай' (*Dialogi v Russkom Dome: **Z**naj i prod**V**igaj*) – a project name, implemented by the fund NPO *Center of Innovations and Communications*; ***FAR***Ш-бургерная (***FARSh-burgernaja***)– a burger chain name; ***V*** ла***V***аше (***V laVashe***) – a street-food in Saint Petersburg; ***P***ш***TS*** (***PajTS***) – a sharp, funny new show in Armenian; Мама***L***ыга (*Mama**L**iga*) – name of a restaurant in Saint Petersburg; Щепо***tk***а (*Shhepo**tk**a*); Зайди в мой ин***s***таграм (*Zajdi v moj in**s**tagram*), S***zz***ан (*Tzzan*), Բ***zz***ան (*Bzzan*), Zz***ն***գան հեքիաթներ (***Zz***ngan hekjatner) – name of a children's performance; թ***oo***յնը ամենուր է (***tooj**ny amenoor e*) (double *oo* in Armenian replaces the [u] sound) – a T-shirt ad, made in Armenia.

2. Word formation translingvema is when close or consonant parts of the word in a foreign and native languages are used for graphic hybridization. The hybrid form can be created via superimposition at the expense of intraword homonymy of Russian/Armenian and English words: ***Book'***ля (***Book'lja***) – name of a bookstore, Роман***tic*** *(Romantic)* – name

of a football club in an online game; ***RE*-диски** (***RE-diski***) – ad of taking old and damaged aluminum discs in exchange for new ones; ***RE*-актив** (***RE-aktiv***) – a technology of reactive bilingualism, i.e. a new approach to internalizing foreign languages; ***QR*-codes** (quick response code) – a matrix barcode; каб***LOOK*** **(*kabLOOK)*** – a name of female clothes shop in Pyatigorsk, in the meantime, a name of shoe shop in Samara; ***IT*-шник** (***IT-shnik***) – (slang) an IT specialist; Armenian word-hybrids of the same sphere are created by the same analogy via superimposing Latin parts and Russian suffix -щик: ***SMM*շիկ** (***SMMshik***), ***It*շնիկ** (***ITshnik***) – specialists of the sphere (in Armenian slang), as well as a FB page and courses, which prepare such specialists, հայ***rate (hajrate)*** – a program of rate survey of Armenian employers;   ***copyw*ռայթինգ** (***copywriting***) – an Internet ad: 'copyw***ռ***այթինg за 5 дней (***copywriting za 5 dnej)***'; ***cash***վիր (***cashweer***) – a word in the commerical ad of a bank card; люб***офф*** моя (***ljuboff moja***) – from Facebook comments (practice of replacing Russian last names with the **–ов (*ov*)** ending by the English variant **off** or the omophonic Russian variant **–*офф (-off): Чайкоффский (Chajkoffskij)*** – tea and coffee shop, etc.); Երազա***MEET (jerazaMEET)*** – name of a café in Yerevan, where discussion of a book and meeting with the translator of the book, competition, coffee, tea and treat are held, and simply '***love*** ժամանց' (***love zhamants***) – trans.: great pastime; Ապրիր կարդա***love*** (***apreer kardalov***)– name of a book. It should be noted here that the usage of the English word 'love' for forming hybrid words in the Armenian translingualism is quite frequent since it is the phonetic homonym with a verb ending in Armenian: աշխատե***love (ashhatelov)***, խաղա***love (khaghalov)***, սպասե***love (spaselov)***, etc., մար***zoom (marzoom)*** – a new project, which aims to magnify on its own via unearthing the close and far-off places at the same distance, from within. The usage of the part 'zoom', apart from being a graphic means of hybridization and homophonic equivalent, carries semantic load as well: zoom – magnifier; an ad of courses of learning Russian on the Internet: group courses and բա***zoom (bazoom)*** (trans.: many) other awesome stuff. As it could be noted from the examples, graphic manipulations actualize themselves based on phonetic and graphic interlingual homonymy; additional earmarked meaning is created at its expense, which allows for the

translingual pun/wordplay. Yet, these hybrid forms should be read and pronounced in line with Russian/ Armenian phonetic traditions, since they are merely graphic and phonetic homonyms, and replace corresponding parts of the word in the host language.

3. Lexical translingvema results from single-word code switching, which is used for transferring Russian/Armenian words or words not only in Latin transliteration, but also vice versa. 'Бедная *Liz*' (*Bednaja Liz'*)– a film; *Bistro*ешь-ка (*bistroesh-ka*)– name of a café in Gelendzhik; *Valenok international* – name of a restaurant in Moscow; *Telo.Greika* – a sauna in Moscow Oblast; *Yesh* – a supermarket in Israel and fast food-café in Krasnodar Krai; *Probka* на Цветном (*Probka na tsvetnom*)– an Italian restaurant; Борщ без *BREAD*а (*borshch bez BREADа*)– name of a FB page; Մի անգամ *Gym* գնացած ընկերդ *Insta Gevorg* *(mi angam Gym gnatsats ynkerd Insta Gevorg)*; *sazum.e* – name of an Internet shop and sewing factory; *love* ժամանց (*zhamants*)– from the Internet discourse; *Aygi*-մարկետ (*aygi-market*)– a market name. It is worthwhile to mention not only the Latinisation of graphs, but also the wordplay of interlingual homonymic words, i.e. posts on the Internet: Do you speak English? *Yes* ли бы (*Yes lee bee*) (trans.: if only); He instrumented the ***moll'ную (moll'nuju)*** overture, composed in summer. An overture on European themes with ***moll-серенада (moll'serenada)*** for the orchestra S. Prokofiev; *Pun* или пропал – funny English wordplays; *Лось Vegas (Los Vegas)* – a new American bar for the 'native', a night club, name of a hunting complex with a restaurant in Kamchatka. Translingual practice of bilinguals is rife with the reverse phenomenon, i.e. Russian transliteration of foreign words: *кукумбер* (*cucumber*)– name of a literary magazine for kids aged 9-13; БЫТ-*МЭН* (*BIT-MEN*)– name of a service house in Moscow; *клининговые* компании (*kleeningovije kompanii*) (trans.: cleaning companies); Бухен *хауз* (*Buhen haus*)– name of a beerhouse or a mini-bar; Love-*стория* (Love-**storija**)– a piece of literature by G. Shcherbakova; Internet posts: Какой ты ***мичер*** по зодиаку (*Kakoj ti **teacher** po zodiaku*) (trans.: What kind of teacher are you by your zodiac

sign?); Мое каждое утро **би лайк** (*Mojo kazhdoje utro **be like***) (trans.: Every morning of mine **is like**): I will sleep for another hour or so. However, it is noteworthy that the usage of the Cyrillic alphabet has become rather frequent recently for transferring a foreign-language word.

4.   Grammatical translingvema is based on the linguistic transfer of grammatical structures of a foreign language: Мне кажется, что ***каждое время***, когда я включаю телефон, я вижу то, о чем думал (Mne kazhetsja, chto kazhdoje wremja ja wkljuchaju telefon, ja wizhu to, a chjom dumal) (trans.: I guess, each time I turn on the TV, I see whatever I have been thinking of). (Cf. English each time is каждое время (*kazhdoje wremja*) (in the first meaning of the English word *time*), whereas the correct Russian variant should be каждый раз (*kazhdij raz*)).

Translingual creativity in bilingual speech is prominently reflected in conveying national-cultural specifics, particularly through vocabulary. In contemporary discourse, bilingual speech exhibits a heterogeneous structure that not only leverages existing metalinguistic resources but also taps into the creative potential of the linguistic system. This creativity manifests through puns, emotional and expressive nuances, parodic and word-forming strategies, and manipulation of linguistic structures' form and content. The cultural identity of bilinguals emerges through various linguistic mechanisms, including the use of cognates, internationalisms, anglicisms, and insertions from English. Transcultural conceptions reimagine meaning-making by harnessing the transformative potential of semiotic forms, blending, borrowing, and recombining these elements in innovative ways that transcend their original cultural contexts. Such transcultural dialogic exchanges occur, for instance, when individuals or students integrate and repurpose culturally embedded forms to create new, complex expressions of meaning [26, p. 158].

Based on the above-mentioned examples, we can claim to be dealing with intended wordplay usage of 'blurry', 'uncertain', borrowed linguistic resources in translingual and transcultural discourse, i.e. translingual wordplay as a manifestation of translingual creativity, or translingual speech act by bilinguals.

Conclusion

From the above discussion, the following conclusions can be drawn:

✓ **Integration of Paradigms**: While translingual and transcultural paradigms represent distinct scholarly approaches in linguistics and the philosophy of language, their integration reveals potential for modern contactology. Although traditionally perceived as mutually exclusive, these paradigms converge in bilingual discourse, which transcends clear boundaries between linguistic phenomena and metaconcepts. This synthesis fosters the emergence of novel cultural constructs, the generation of new knowledge, and the creation of unique communicative contexts.

✓ **Reconceptualizing Bilingualism**: Transcultural and translingual activity challenges the conventional understanding of bilingualism as mere proficiency in two languages or the ability to construct grammatically correct sentences in a foreign language. Instead, bilingualism is redefined as the capacity for effective communication, often in mixed-speech forms. This redefinition acknowledges the possibility of "truncated bilingualism," characterized by limited linguistic knowledge.

✓ **Focus on Translingual Creativity**: Traditional studies emphasize the analysis of discrete languages and their respective models in bilingual speech. Conversely, research on translingualism examines the innovative, transformative use of all linguistic resources in a bilingual's repertoire, highlighting a dynamic, integrative approach to language use.

✓ **Shift to Contact Zones**: The study transitions from a binary model of bilingualism, which opposes two languages, to a flexible "contact zone" model. This shift captures the fluid interactions and overlaps between languages, emphasizing translingualism as a dynamic framework.

✓ **Global English Influence**: The globalization of English has amplified its role as a lingua franca, with notable impacts on transcultural practices. This phenomenon includes the spread of English-native bilingualism and its integration into translingual activities.

✓ **Emerging Contact-Linguistic Phenomena**: Translingual research identifies various linguistic interactions, such as code-switching, code-mixing, hybridization, and creative manipulation of linguistic

resources. These processes, observed particularly in Russian, Armenian, and English interactions, illustrate the complexity of bilingual and translingual speech.

✓ **Creativity in Translingual Discourse**: Unlike bilingual contexts where linguistic elements often serve comedic purposes, translingualism prioritizes creative expression. Linguistic play becomes a critical tool for actualizing a bilingual's creativity, driven by intentional and systematic selection of linguistic means. The motivations behind these choices offer insights into the ideological foundations of translingual paradigms.

✓ **Expanding Research Horizons**: The translingual paradigm broadens the scope of bilingualism studies, reinterpreting established concepts and uncovering new linguistic contacts that were previously overlooked.

The evolving manifestations of bilingualism and translingualism underscore the necessity for further exploration of these paradigms across diverse sociolinguistic contexts. This continued research will refine our understanding of linguistic interactions and illuminate contrasts between traditional and emerging frameworks.

REFERENCES

1. *Baker, C.* (2011). Foundations of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism (5rd edn). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters. 504 p.
2. *Baker, W. and Ishikawa T.* (2021). Transcultural Communication through Global Englishes. London; New York: Routledge, 390 p.
3. *Barseghyan, S.S.* (2017). Errativnye konstrukty v usloviyah armyansko-russkogo bilingvizma [Errative Constructions in the Context of Armenian-Russian Bilingualism]. Aktual'nye problemy gumanitarnyh i estestvennyh nauk. Zhurnal nauchnyh publikacij. - N3(98 mart), chast' 2. - M. P. 9-15.
4. *Bloomfield, L.* (1933). Language. New York: Henry Holt and Company. 564 p.
5. *Canagarajah, S.* (2011). Translanguaging in the Classroom: Emerging Issues for Research and Pedagogy in Li Wei (ed.) Applied Linguistics Review, Vol. 2 (Berlin, Germany: De Gruyter Mouton). P. 1-27

6. *Canagarajah, S.* (2015). Translingualism: A Four Part Interview, Part III. [Electronic resource]. – URL: https://transnationalwriting. wordpress.com/2015/09/25/suresh-canagarajah-on-translingualism-a-four-part-interview-part-iii/ (accessed: 02 Feb. 2023).

7. *Cook, V.* (1999). Going beyond the native speaker in language teaching. TESOL Quarterly, Vol. 33, No. 2. P. 185-209.

8. *Dagnino, A.* (2015). Transcultural writers and novels in the age of global modernity. West Lafayette, IN: Perdue University Press, 240 p.

9. *Döpke, S.* (1992). One parent one language. An interactional approach // Studies in bilingualism / Ed. by K. de Bot, T. Huebner. – Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 232 p.

10. *García, O.* (2009). Bilingual education in the 21st century: A global perspective. Oxford, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.

11. *García, O., Li Wei.* (2014). Translanguaging: Language, Bilingualism and Education / – Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 164 p.

12. *García, O., & Kleyn, T.* (Eds.) (2016). Translanguaging with multilingual students: Learning from classroom moments. New York, NY: Routledge, 236 p.

13. *Gee, J.P.* (2014). An introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and method (4th ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.

14. *Grobitskaya, A.M.* (2013). Diskursivno-semanticheskij analiz sobytijnogo makrodiskursa (na materiale angloyazychnyh gazetnyh tekstov): avtoreferat diss. kand. filol. nauk: [Discourse-Semantic Analysis of Event Macro-Discourse (Based on English-Language Newspaper Texts). [Unpublished master's thesis]]. SPb, SPbGU, 216 p.

15. *Grosjean, F.* (1982) Life with Two Languages. Cambridge, M.A.: Harvard university press).

16. *Gural, S.K., & Antonova, E.S.* (2009). Diskurs-analiz v svete sinergeticheskogo videniya [Discourse Analysis in the Light of Synergetic Vision]. Tomsk, 176 p.

17. *Gural, S.K., & Kim-Maloney, A.A.* (2019). Diskurs-analiz i obuchenie mezhkul'turnoj kommunikacii [Discourse Analysis and Teaching Intercultural Communication]. (Ed.), Antropocentricheskie nauki v obrazovanii. Kollektivnaya monografiya. Voronezh. Pp. 15-21.

18. *Kachru, B.B.* (1998). English as an Asian language. Links and Letters. No. 5. P. 89-108.

19. *Karakuç-Boradina, L.A.* (2007). Translingvizm i yazykovaya igra (na materiale proizvedenij V.V. Nabokova) [Translingualism and Language Play (Based on the Works of V.V. Nabokov)]. Vestnik Sankt-Peterburgskogo universiteta, ser. 9. - Vyp. 3, ch. 2. Pp. 151-155.

20. *Leonard, R.L. & Nowacek, R.* (2016). Transfer and Translingualism // College English. – Vol. 78. № 3. P. 258–264.

21. *Marshall, T. Poe.* (2011). A History of communications. Media and Society from the Evolution of Speech to the Internet. Cambridge university press, New York, 2011, 240 p.

22. *Molina, C.* (2011). Curricular insights into translingualism as a communicative competence // Journal of Language Teaching and Research. Vol. 2. № 6. P. 1244–1251.

23. *Nordin, I.G.* (2013), Introduction: Conceptualizing transculturality in literature / Irene Gilsenan Nordin, Julie Hansen, Carmen Zamorano Llena // Transcultural identity in contemporary literature. – Amsterdam and New York: Radopi, P. IX–XXII.

24. *Orellana, M.F., & García, O.* (2014). Conversation currents: Language brokering and translanguaging in school. Language Arts, 91(5). P. 386–392.

25. *Ortiz, F.* (1995). Cuban Counterpoint: Tobacco and Sugar. Durham, N.C.

26. *Pennycook, A.* (2007). Global Englishes and transcultural flows. London and New York: Routledge, 189 p.

27. *Proshina, Z.G.* (2011). Legitimnost' variantov «nerodnogo» anglijskogo yazyka [Legitimacy of "Non-Native" English Language Variants]. Lichnost'. Kul'tura. Obshchestvo. Mezhdunarodnyj zhurnal social'nyh i gumanitarnyh nauk. T. XIII., Vyp. 4, No. 67–68. P. 164–165.

28. *Proshina, Z.G.* (2012). Smena paradigmy yazykovogo obrazovaniya? [Paradigm Shift in Language Education?]. Lichnost'. Kul'tura. Obshchestvo. Mezhdunarodnyj zhurnal social'nyh i gumanitarnyh nauk. T. XIV. Vyp. 2. No. 71–72. P. 176–177.

29. *Proshina Z.G.* (2016). Problemy i perspektivy translingval'nyh i transkul'turnyh kontaktov (vvedenie k tematicheskomu vypusku zhurnala) [Problems and Prospects of Translingual and Transcultural Contacts (Introduction to the Thematic Issue of the Journal)]. Social'nye i gumanitarnye nauki na dal'nem vostoke. - № 2 (50). - Habarovsk, P. 6-23

30. *Proshina, Z.G.* (2017). Translingvizm i ego prikladnoe znachenie [Translingualism and Its Practical Significance]. Vestnik Rossijskogo universiteta druzhby narodov. Seriya: Voprosy obrazovaniya: yazyki i special'nost'. Vol. 14, No. 2. P. 155–170.

31. *Proshina, Z.G.* (2020). Kontaktnaya variantologiya anglijskogo yazyka. Problemy teorii. World Englishes Paradigm: uchebn. Posobie [Contact Variantology of the English Language. Theory Problems. World Englishes Paradigm: textbook]. 3-e izdanie, ster. M.: FLINTA. P. 208.

32. *Savchenko, I.A., Barseghyan, S.S.* (2021). Bilingvizm kak fenomen transkul'turnoj kommunikacii v processe prepodavaniya inostrannogo yazyka [Bilingualism as a phenomenon of Transcultural Communication in foreign Language teaching]. Tomskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta. 463. P. 188–195. http:// DOI: 10.17223/15617793/463/24

33. *Shweitzer, A.D.* (1978). Vvedenie v sociolingvistiku [Introduction to Sociolinguistics]. M.: Vyssh. shk. 215 p.

34. *Suleymanova, G.A., & Gural, S.K.* (2016). Formirovanie dvuyazychiya [Formation of Bilingualism]. Yazyk i kul'tura. Sbornik statej XXVI mezhdunarodnoj nauchnoj konferencii. 82-86 p.

35. *Tlostanova, M.V.* (2004). Postsovetskaya literatura i estetika transkul'turacii. Zhit' nikogda, pisat' niotkuda [Post-Soviet Literature

and the Aesthetics of Transculturation. Living Nowhere, Writing from Nowhere]. M.: Editorial URSS. 416 p.

36. *Tlostanova, M.* (2008) Ot filosofii mul'tikul'turalizma k filosofii transkul'turacii [From the Philosophy of Multiculturalism to the Philosophy of transculturation]. M.: Rossijskij un-t druzhby narodov. 251p.

37. *Veretyagin, M.Yu.* (2013). Teoreticheskie aspekty bilingvizma. Estestvennyj i iskusstvennyj bilingvizm. Tipy bilingvizma [Theoretical Aspects of Bilingualism. Natural and Artificial Bilingualism. Types of Bilingualism]. European student scientific journal, 2. Retrieved February 01, 2024, from http://sjes.esrae.ru/ru/3.

38. *Vereshchagin, E.M.* (1969) Psihologicheskaya i metodicheskaya harakteristika dvuyazychiya (bilingvizma). - [Psychological and methodological characteristics of bilingualism]. M.: Izd-vo MGU. 160 p.

39. *Weinreich, U.* (1979). Yazykovye kontakty. Sostoyanie i problemy issledovaniya [Language Contacts. State and Problems of Research]. Per. s angl. i komment. Yu.A. Zhluktenko. - Kiev: Vishcha shk. 247 p.

ԹԱՐԳՄԱՆՈՒԹՅՈՒՆԸ ԳՈՐԾՈՂՈՒԹՅԱՆ ՄԵՋ. ԵՐԿԼԵԶՈՒ ՀԱՂՈՐԴԱԿՑՄԱՆ ԱԶՄԱՎԱՐՈՒԹՅՈՒՆՆԵՐԻ ՄՇԱԿՈՒՄ

Այս ուսումնասիրությունը անցկացվել է Վանաձորի պետական համալսարանի կողմից տրամադրված ներհամալսարանական դրամաշնորհի շրջանակներում

Ժ. Լ. ԱԼՈՅԱՆ,
Ս. Ս. ԲԱՐՍԵՂՅԱՆ,
Ն. Ա. ՕԳԱՆԻՍՅԱՆ

Վանաձորի պետական համալսարան

Այս ուսումնասիրությունը հետազոտում է տրանսլեզվաբանության և տրանսմշակութայնության դիսկուրսիվ դրսևորումները՝ ընդգծելով ժամանակակից երկլեզու միջավայրերի լեզվական առանձնահատկությունները: Այն կիրառում և ընդլայնում է Ս.Գուրալի դիսկուրսի և սոցիալ-մշակութային պրակտիկայի փոխկախվածության, ինչպես նաև համատեքստի և դիսկուրսի միջև փոխհարաբերության վերաբերյալ հասկացությունները ժամանակակից երկլեզվության մեջ: Երկլեզու անհատները գործում են լեզվական և մշակութային շրջանակների դինամիկ փոխազդեցության մեջ՝ միաժամանակ ձևավորելով և ձևավորվելով իրենց բնիկ և ձեռքբերովի սոցիալ-մշակութային դիսկուրսիվ և ճանաչողական-հաղորդակցական գործընթացներով: Այս փոխազդեցությունը խթանում է նոր դիսկուրսների, հայեցակարգային վերամեկնաբանությունների և նորարարական լեզվական երևույթների ի հայտ գալը, որոնք կենտրոնական դեր են խաղում երկլեզու խոսքի արտահայտման մեջ: Երկլեզու դիսկուրսում նշանագիտական ձևերի վերամիավորումը և վերամեկնաբանությունը նպաստում են լեզվական ստեղծագործականության ընդլայնմանը՝ հնարավորություն տալով ավելի բարդ միջմշակութային երկխոսու-

թյանը: Գործալացման համատեքստում միջլեզվական հաղորդակցու-
թյունը կարևոր դեր է խաղում երկլեզու անհատների լեզվական
զիտակցության և հայեցակարգային աշխարհայացքի ձևավորման
գործում: Երկլեզու դիսկուրսային պրակտիկաների էվոլյուցիան ար-
տացոլում է հաղորդակցական մոդել, որը գերազանցում է որոշակի
մշակույթային սահմանները՝ ի վերջո դրսևորելով դիսկուրսի մի ձև,
որը գոյություն ունի «մշակույթից այն կողմ»: Այսպիսով, երկլեզու
լեզվական անհատականությունը մարմնավորում է տարբեր լեզվա-
կան և մշակույթային երևույթների միաժամանակյա ինտեգրումը և
համակարգումը իրենց խոսքային վարքագծում՝ ամրապնդելով
տրանսլեզվաբանության և տրանսմշակութայնության դինամիկ փո-
խազդեցությունը ժամանակակից հասարակություններում:

Բանալի բառեր՝ *երկլեզվություն, լեզվական շփում, տրանսմշակութայ-
նություն, լեզվական ստեղծագործականություն, հիբրիդացում, դինամիկ
լեզվական միջավայրեր:*

ТРАНСЛИНГВИЗМ В ДЕЙСТВИИ: ФОРМИРОВАНИЕ ДВУЯЗЫЧНЫХ КОММУНИКАТИВНЫХ СТРАТЕГИЙ

Ж. Л. АЛОЯН,
С. С. БАРСЕГЯН,
Н. А. ОГАННИСЯН

Ванадзорский государственный университет

В этом исследовании рассматриваются дискурсивные проявления
транслингвизма и транскультурализма, подчеркивая лингвистические
особенности современных двуязычных сред. Исследование приме-
няет и расширяет понятия С.Гураля о взаимозависимости дискурса и

социокультурной практики, а также об отношениях контекста и дискурса в современном двуязычии. Двуязычный индивид действует в динамическом взаимодействии языковых и культурных рамок, одновременно формируя и формируясь дискурсивными и когнитивно-коммуникативными процессами как своей родной, так и приобретенной социокультуры. Это взаимодействие способствует появлению новых дискурсов, концептуальных реинтерпретаций и инновационных языковых явлений, которые являются центральными для производства двуязычной речи. Рекомбинация и реинтерпретация семиотических форм в двуязычном дискурсе способствуют расширению языкового творчества, позволяя вести более сложные межкультурные диалоги. В контексте глобализации межъязыковая коммуникация играет ключевую роль в формировании языкового сознания и концептуального мировоззрения двуязычных индивидов. Эволюция практик двуязычного дискурса отражает коммуникативную парадигму, которая выходит за рамки отдельных культурных границ, в конечном итоге проявляя форму дискурса, которая существует «вне культуры». Таким образом, двуязычная языковая личность является примером одновременной интеграции и согласования различных языковых и культурных явлений в своем вербальном поведении, усиливая динамическое взаимодействие транслингвизма и транскультурализма в современном обществе.