

BLENDS IN ENGLISH AND THEIR STRUCTURE

Dona Usmonova Sotvoldiyevna

Head of the English language department, Fergana State University

Shukurillo Akhmadjonov Egamberdi o'g'li

Master student, Fergana State University

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.6815091>

Abstract. The purpose of this article is to look into the blending process in English. The research investigates the orthographic and phonemic structure of blends on the basis of a quick overview of many prior classificatory studies a quantitative foundation. And also this work is about a morphological process in English known as (lexical) blending. Blending is a common and productive method of word construction that can be defined as follows: Blending is the process of creating a new lexeme by combining elements of at least two existing source words, one of which is shortened in the fusion and/or the source words have some type of phonemic or graphemic overlap.

Key words: blends, lexeme, combination, shortening words, mixing, creating phrases.

СМЕСИ В АНГЛИЙСКОМ ЯЗЫКЕ И ИХ СТРУКТУРА

Аннотация. Цель этой статьи — изучить процесс смешивания на английском языке. Исследование исследует орфографическую и фонематическую структуру смесей на основе краткого обзора многих предшествующих классификационных исследований и количественной основы. А также эта работа посвящена морфологическому процессу в английском языке, известному как (лексическое) смешивание. Смешение — это распространенный и продуктивный метод словообразования, который можно определить следующим образом: Слияние — это процесс создания новой лексемы путем объединения элементов как минимум двух существующих исходных слов, одно из которых укорачивается при слиянии и/или исходном слове. слова имеют некоторый тип фонематического или графического перекрытия.

Ключевые слова: бленды, лексема, сочетание, сокращение слов, смешение, образование словосочетаний.

INTRODUCTION

Blending is simply creating new phrases by combination of two words. Some typical and well-known examples are: [1]

- | | | | | |
|----------------|---|---------------|---|--------------|
| a) br(eakfast) | + | (l)unch | = | brunch. |
| b) mot(or) | + | (h)otel | = | motel. |
| c) fanta(stic) | + | (f)abulous | = | fantabulous. |
| d. fool | + | (phi)losopher | = | foolosopher. |

Blending has previously been studied primarily in terms of the following questions:

- 1) What distinguishes blending from other word-formation processes?
- 2) What distinguishes different types of blends from one another?
- 3) Why are mixes structured the way they are? Why are blends made the way they are, to put it another way?

The existing study is basically concerned with the third question, but in order to fully understand the study's make-up and database, it is necessary to quickly discuss the previous two questions' conclusions. Blending has been explored in a number of research, the majority of which are categorical in character and focus on the above-mentioned questions 2 and 3. Unfortunately, the factors used as a basis for comparison were frequently varied, difficult to operationalise objectively, and not always followed consistently.

Pound (1914: 1) analyzes 314 blends in one of the earliest studies, providing the following definition:

Blend-words are two or more words that are often of the same connotation.

as if merged into one; as factitious conflation that retain, for a time at least the evocative force of their diverse elements, at the very least.

She argues that blends must be distinguished from (among other things) – analogical extensions or enlargements (such as judgmental [judgment dogmatical]) because judgmental does not imply the meaning of dogmatical, and thus no semantic fusion has occurred, and such forms are "generally unintentional," whereas blends are "often conscious or intentional"; however, she notes on same page that neither criterion is safe.

RESEARCH METHOD AND METHODOLOGY

The definition of blends provided by Algeo (1977: 48) is similar to the one proposed above: "A mixture of two or more forms, at least one of which has been abbreviated in the method of combination". This model relies on fundamental qualities, which means that circumstances where whole forms merge without overlap, for example, cases where full forms combine without overlap do not count as blends but rather as compounds (cf. 1977: 54); examples of non-blends mentioned include squandermania, daisy (historically a compound, namely day's eye) and meritocracy ("a derivative with the combining form -ocracy" [1977: 54]).

Table 1 illustrates the many types of blends that come from this classification; the most classic examples of blends entail linear blending with a shortening of both source words at some point during the process overlap (graphemic or phonemic) (cf. Kubozono 1990: 4).

Table 1. Classification and exemplification of blends (phonemic overlap is italicized)

	Both source words are shortened	Only the first source word is shortened	Only the second source word is shortened	No source word is shortened
+Overlap	<i>krətɪkjələ</i>	<i>fjɔnlətəriən</i>	<i>bouldətʃəs</i>	<i>pæləmənɪ</i>
+Linear blending	(critical × particular)	(futile × utilitarian)	(bold × audacious)	(pal × alimony)
+Overlap	<i>kɑːnbələs</i>	<i>æmbɪseksʃəs</i>	<i>slækədəm</i>	— ^s
–Linear blending	(carnivorous × nibble)	(ambidextrous × sex)	(slacker × academy)	
–Overlap	<i>brʌnʃ</i>	<i>krænæpəl</i>	<i>smʊðəkət</i>	—
+Linear blending	(breakfast × lunch)	(cranberry × apple)	(smother × suffocate)	(compounds)
–Overlap	<i>ædʒɪtrɒp</i>	—	<i>smʊkəlʊtɪv</i>	—
–Linear blending	(agitation × propaganda)		(smoke × locomotive)	

646
S. T. Gries

It's worth noting that this classification doesn't just apply to blends; other word-formation processes like compounds and complicated clippings also fit into this category.

While several simply classification approaches exist, far less is known about why blends have the structure they have or, to put it another way, why they are assembled the way they are.

For each blend in the data, it is determined the graphemic/phonemic contributions of each source word (henceforth SW) to the blend according to both analyses introduced above (cf. Figure 4 and Figure 5) as well as their graphemic and the phonemic lengths. The resulting data set was then analyzed in two steps. First, A loglinear analysis was done with the variables and variable levels listed below:

Length: $SW_1 = SW_2$ (both source words are equally long);

$SW_1 > SW_2$; $SW_1 < SW_2$

Contribution: $SW_1 = SW_2$ (both source words contribute equally much); $SW_1 > SW_2$; $SW_1 < SW_2$

Medium: spoken vs. written

Analysis: analysis 1 vs. analysis 2

On the basis of Kaunisto's earlier work, we would expect a significant interaction between Length and Contribution such that high frequencies are expected for Length: $SW_1 >$

SW_2 | Contribution: $SW_1 < SW_2$ as well as Length: $SW_1 < SW_2$ | Contribution: $SW_1 > SW_2$. Also, we would expect a main effect of Contribution: $SW_1 < SW_2$ such that these cases should be more frequent than expected.

RESEARCH RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Second, the frequencies for which specific predictions were derived above were tested with a configural frequency analysis (CFA; cf. von Eye 1990) with Holm's correction for multiple post hoc (binomial) tests.

According to the loglinear analysis, all interactions of more than two variables failed to reach significance; the best model (in terms of parsimony and goodness-of-fit; $\chi_{ML2} = 16.63$; $df = 21$; $p = 0.733$) involved the significant effects represented in Table 2.

We find strong general preferences such that (i) SW_2 tends to be longer, and (ii) SW_2 contributes more of itself to the blend. However, the interpretation of these main effects must be qualified with a view to the two-way effects, for some of which Kaunisto's predictions are relevant.

The results for Contribution | Length demonstrate that Kaunisto's hypothesis is indeed strongly supported: the two combinations with the highest absolute parameter estimates show that, when SW_1 is longer, then SW_2 contributes more, and when SW_2 is longer, then SW_1 contributes more. What is more, we even find a strongly negative parameter estimate for cases where SW_2 is longer and contributes more to the blend, which is also in accordance with the prediction. All these results are even strongly supported by those of the CFA for these cell frequencies: all sixteen possible

combinations of (Length and Contribution) | (Medium and Analysis) for which Kaunisto's predictions hold are among the strongest significant types and antitypes (as ranked by the Q coefficient of pronouncedness).

In addition to the predicted effects, we also find that when both source words are equally long, they strongly tend to contribute to the blend equally. While this result was not anticipated, it is, I believe, not difficult to explain a posteriori: we have seen above that blends play with word similarity. That is, in cases where both source words are equally long such as snark (snake _ shark) or meld (melt _ weld), the fact that the blend is as long as each source word and that each source word contributes an equal number of graphemes (around some shared amount of overlap) further increases the similarity and, thus, the playful character blends tend to exhibit.

Table 2. Significant effects identified in the hierarchical loglinear analysis

Effect	df	partial ass. χ^2	p	Levels and combinations of levels with highest $ \lambda $
LENGTH	2	572.26	0	$SW_1 = SW_2$ (-0.579) $SW_1 < SW_2$ (0.624)
CONTRIBUTION	2	436.18	0	$SW_1 = SW_2$ (-0.532) $SW_1 < SW_2$ (0.506)
CONTRIBUTION \times LENGTH	4	621.41	0	CONTRIBUTION: $SW_1 > SW_2 \times$ LENGTH: $SW_1 < SW_2$ 0.772 CONTRIBUTION: $SW_1 < SW_2 \times$ LENGTH: $SW_1 > SW_2$ 0.737 CONTRIBUTION: $SW_1 < SW_2 \times$ LENGTH: $SW_1 < SW_2$ -0.561 CONTRIBUTION: $SW_1 = SW_2 \times$ LENGTH: $SW_1 = SW_2$ 0.556
CONTRIBUTION \times MEDIUM	2	11.51	0.0032	CONTRIBUTION: $SW_1 = SW_2 \times$ MEDIUM: written -0.112 CONTRIBUTION: $SW_1 = SW_2 \times$ MEDIUM: spoken 0.112
CONTRIBUTION \times ANALYSIS	2	11.53	0.0031	CONTRIBUTION: $SW_1 < SW_2 \times$ ANALYSIS: 1 0.114 CONTRIBUTION: $SW_1 < SW_2 \times$ ANALYSIS: 2 -0.114

CONCLUSION

In short, we haven't fully tapped into the wealth of information that blends can reveal about the linguistic system. Given the plethora of variables that influence blends, as well as the fact that blends are a crossroads of conscious and unconscious processes, as well as spoken and written language, their study should shed insight on a variety of (psycho)linguistic processes.

REFERENCES

1. <https://www.researchgate.net/figure/Classification-and-exemplification-of-blends>
2. Algeo, John (1977). Blends, a structural and systemic view. *American Speech* 52, 47–64.
3. Kubozono, Haruo (1990). Phonological constraints on blending in English as a case for phonology–morphology interface. *Yearbook of Morphology* 3, 1–20.
4. Pound, Louise (1914). *Blends: Their Relation to English Word Formation*. Heidelberg: Winter.
5. Усмонова, Д. С. (2019). Роль и особенность соматических фразеологизмов различных языков. *Мировая наука*, (9), 250-252.
6. Usmonova, D. S., & Yusupova, M. I. Q. (2021). COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE SOMATIC PHRASEOLOGICAL UNITS OF THE ENGLISH AND RUSSIAN LANGUAGES WITH THE COMPONENT “HEART”. *CURRENT RESEARCH JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGICAL SCIENCES (2767-3758)*, 2(11), 94-99.
7. Usmonova, D., & Jurayev, I. (2021). SEMANTIC CHANGE OF VERB MEANING. *CURRENT RESEARCH JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGICAL SCIENCES (2767-3758)*, 2(11), 150-152.
8. Usmonova, D.S. (2021). Axiological Characteristics Of English, Uzbek And Russian Phraseological Units. *The American Journal of Social Science and Education Innovations*. -IMPACT FACTOR 2021: 5. 857. Published: June 18, 2021 | Pages: 40-45, 2021-yil. Doi : <https://doi.org/10.37547/tajssei/Volume03Issue06-06>