BLENDING IS CRUCIAL FOR COMING UP WITH NEW WORDS

Ro'zimboyeva Sitora Nurmamat qizi
Student of National University of Uzbekistan
Foreign language and literature:
the English language

Abstract: In order to decipher unknown words utilizing letter-sound patterns when reading, pupils must be able to blend, which is a critical reading skill. Blending involves mentally joining speech sounds to form words. A characteristic of the struggling reader is trouble blending.

Key words: blending, word formation, clipping, compounds, semantics, similarity.

One of the numerous processes used to create new words in English is blending. In order to create a new term with a new meaning, it is necessary to link the beginning of one word and the end of another.

Some common synonyms of blend are amalgamate, coalesce, commingle, fuse, merge, mingle, and mix.

In the English language, blending is not a recent development. This is demonstrated by the fact that one of the most well-known words, brunch, was first used in 1896, more than 100 years ago. But blending hasn't really taken off as a common word-formation method until the last few of decades. Since they have been used often for a considerable amount of time, a significant number of blends are now found in the English vocabulary but are no longer recognize. This can be explained by the fact that blends frequently start out as abbreviations before eventually becoming words because of how they seem.

When two or more words are combined into one, the resulting word may be clipped or partially overlapped. This process is known as blending. Brunch is an illustration of a typical blend since it combines the beginning of the word breakfast with the conclusion of the term lunch. In many circumstances, the components of a blend overlap at segments that are phonologically or graphically identical, such as in the words motel (motor + hotel) and blizzaster (blizzard + disaster). In some blends, such as stoption (stop + option), both constituents maintain their form as a result of the overlap. These are only a few instances of the many different shapes that blends can take. Because blends are formed from two (or sometimes more) content words and, like compounds, are either hyponyms of one of their constituents or show some sort of

paradigmatic relationship between the constituents, blends can be thought of as a subtype of compounding. Contrary to compounds, however, given that the final construction is a single word, blends are subject to a number of phonological restrictions. In particular, blends frequently maintain the primary stress of one of their constituent words and are the same length as the longest of their constituent syllables. Additionally, certain patterns can be seen in the arrangement of the words in a blend (e.g., shorter words come first, more frequent words come first), as well as the location of the switch point, which refers to the point at which one blended word is terminated and switched to another (typically at the syllable boundary or at the onset/rime boundary). The capacity of the blended words to be recognized can be related to the regularities of blend production.

Blends and compounds are similar in all respects, except for the phonotactic structure, according to Bauer et al. (2013), and other research have noted additional significant distinctions, particularly in the semantic relationships between the source words. However, due to the structure's peculiarities, processing blends requires greater cognitive work.

Three perspectives—morphotactic, morphonological, and morphosemantic—can be used to categorize blends of two or more words.

Classification of morphemes
The two types of blends—total and partial—can be categorized morphotactically.

Blends in total
Each word contributing to a blend is diminished to a small splinter in a whole blend. Some linguists restrict blends to these (perhaps with further restrictions): For instance, Ingo Plag believes that "proper blends" are total blends that are semantically coordinated, with the remaining blends being "shortened compounds."
The start of one word is frequently followed by the end of another in English blends:
breakfast + lunch = brunch
 boom + hoist = boost
Blends that are only partially
A full word and a piece of another word are concatenated to form a partial mix. Some linguists do not classify these as blends.
A splinter may come after a whole word:
dumbfound fan + magazine = fanzine.
Overlapping blends

Blends with consonants, vowels, or even syllables that partially overlap are known as overlapping blends. Different types of overlap are possible. These also go by the name of haplologic blends.

Attributional blends

Blends with two ingredients—one of which is the head and the other of which is attributive—are referred to as attribute blends, syntactic blends, or telescope blends. A porta-light is a light that can be carried around; it does not emit light or have portability. A snobject is the head; it is not an objective snob or another type of snob; it is an object that satisfies snobbery.

The attributive blends of English are primarily head-final and primarily endocentric, which is also true for (traditional, non-blend) attributive compounds (among which bathroom, for example, is a kind of room, not a kind of bath).

Blends that are coordinated

Coordinate blends, also known as associative or portmanteau blends, combine two words of equal status and have two heads. Brunch is thus a mix of breakfast and lunch rather than a breakfast-like meal or a lunchtime breakfast; Oxbridge comprises both Oxford and Cambridge universities. The actor-director is equally an actor and a director, which is similar to (traditional, non-blend) compounds.

Those that mix (near) synonyms:

gigantic + enormous = ginormous.

Blending Words	Process
Covid	Corona + Virus + Disease'
Covidiot	Covid + Idiot
Covidient	Covid + Obedient
Quarantini	Quarantine + Martini
Infodemic	Information + Epidemic
Quaranteam	Quarantine + Team
Coronials	Corona + Milennials
Covexit	Covid + Exit
Covidivorce	Covid + Divorce
Quaranteen	Quarantee + Teen

Blending may result from a mistake in lexical choice, the process through which a speaker employs his or her understanding of semantics to choose words. Lewis Carroll's explanation, which inspired the term "portmanteau" to be used for these concoctions, was as follows:

Humpty I believe that Dumpty's theory—that two meanings are combined into one term, sort of like a portmanteau—is the most accurate one. As an illustration, consider the words "fuming" and "furious." Decide that you will use both words—"frumious"—in your speech.

The morphemes or phonemes remain in the same position within the syllable, and the errors are based on similarity of meaning rather than phonological similarity.

The semantic content of the derivative typically carries some of the meaning of its elements, which is a trait of contamination and also the feature that allows a speaker to freely invent blends. The process of creating blends is governed by a few rules. Since the speaker is in no way constrained in how much of either of the constituents she can use, it can often be difficult to tell which parts sum up to the derivative. This leads to the conclusion that English blends are created using a variety of patterns.

References:

1. Bauer, L., Lieber, R., & Plag, I. (2013). The Oxford reference guide to English morphology. Oxford, U.K.: Oxford University Press.

2. Bauer, L., & Tarasova, E. (2013). The meaning link in nominal compounds. SKASE Journal of Theoretical Linguistics, 10, 1–18.

3. Beliaeva, N. (2014). A study of English blends: From structure to meaning and back again. Word Structure, 7(1), 29–54.

4. Beliaeva, N. (2015). Blends at the interface between compounding and clipping: Evidence from readers' evaluations. Neologica, 9, 205–219.

5. Beliaeva, N. (2016). Blends at the intersection of addition and subtraction: Evidence from processing. SKASE Journal of Theoretical Linguistics, 13(2), 23–45.

6. Berg, T. (1998). Linguistic structure and change: An explanation from language processing. Oxford, U.K.: Oxford University Press.

7. Borgwaldt, S. R., Kulish, T., & Bose, A. (2012). Ukrainian blends: Elicitation paradigm and structural analysis. In V. Renner, F. Maniez, & P. J. L. Arnaud (Eds.), Cross-disciplinary perspectives on lexical blending (pp. 75–92). Berlin, Germany: De Gruyter Mouton.

8. Brdar-Szabó, R., & Brdar, M. (2008). On the marginality of lexical blending. Jezikoslovlje, 9(1–2), 171–194.

9. Cambridge English Dictionary Online. (n.d.). Cambridge dictionary. Cambridge University Press.