



UDC 811. 111:81'35

[https://doi.org/10.52058/2786-6165-2024-10\(28\)-26-43](https://doi.org/10.52058/2786-6165-2024-10(28)-26-43)

Borolis Inna Ivanivna senior lecturer at the Department of Philology and Translation Kyiv National University of Technologies and Design, 2, Mala Shyianovska St., Kyiv, 01011, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5480-4798>

Denysenko Vitalina Mykolaivna senior lecturer at the Department of Philology and Translation, Kyiv National University of Technologies and Design, 2, Mala Shyianovska St., Kyiv, 01011, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4918-5830>

BLENDING AS A MANIFESTATION OF THE FLEXIBILITY AND MOBILITY OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE

Abstract. The article deepens into the intricate process of word formation in modern English. The article defines blending as one of the leading ways of word formation in the English language today. It highlights how the English language, shaped by its historical development, incorporates words of foreign origin that undergo assimilation and evolution to create new words, concepts, and meanings. The article provides a detailed discussion on the ambiguous definitions and terminologies associated with blending, such as telescoping, word fusion, hybridization, and contamination, among others. Blending has emerged as a predominant method of word formation in modern English, driven by linguistic economy and creativity. The article underscores the need for further research to understand its mechanisms, predictability, and usage across different contexts.

The article delves into the complex process of word formation in modern English, particularly analyzing blending as one of the leading ways of creating new words. The authors note that the English language, with its centuries-old history of development, has been significantly influenced by other languages, which have left their mark on its vocabulary. Foreign words are not only accepted into the English lexicon but also assimilated and evolved, becoming the basis for new words, concepts, and meanings.

One of the key processes highlighted in the article is blending. Blending is a method of word formation that involves combining parts of two or more words to create a new one. As noted, such a process of combining can include elements of varying lengths, where sometimes the main part of one word is preserved, while other parts are shortened or modified. The article thoroughly analyzes various terms and definitions used to describe this phenomenon, such as telescoping, word fusion, hybridization, and contamination, each representing a distinct aspect or variation of blending.



Additionally, the authors mention that while the term "blending" has been known for a long time, its specific application in modern English is still a subject of active study. This is due to the fact that, through its flexibility and creativity, blending has become one of the main mechanisms of linguistic economy—a phenomenon characterized by reducing the number of elements used to express the same or even a greater amount of information.

The article carefully examines examples of how new words are formed through blending. The examples include neologisms such as "brunch" (a combination of "breakfast" and "lunch") and "smog" (a combination of "smoke" and "fog"), which have become everyday words in modern English. The authors also note that blending is not limited to everyday vocabulary—this process is actively used in the fields of science, technology, and media, where there is a need to quickly create terminology for new phenomena and concepts.

The article emphasizes that blending is not only a mechanism for conserving linguistic resources but also a way to creatively approach word formation. By combining parts of words, people can play with sound, meaning, and style, creating terms that more accurately convey new or complex concepts. This makes the English language richer and more adaptable to the rapidly changing conditions of the modern world.

One important aspect highlighted in the article is that the blending process is not always clearly defined or predictable. There is often difficulty in determining where one word ends and another begins, which creates ambiguity in the meaning and pronunciation of the newly formed word. This, in turn, calls for further research into the mechanisms of this phenomenon.

The article also touches on the historical aspects of word formation in the English language, emphasizing how the language has changed under the influence of other cultures and linguistic systems. Specifically, the process of blending is considered one of the evolutionary stages of language development, arising in response to new social, cultural, and technological challenges. Blending enables speakers to adapt their language to new conditions without losing its core properties and characteristics.

Moreover, the article discusses some controversial issues regarding the classification of blending. Scholars often debate how this process should be classified and what criteria are definitive for its identification. Some linguists consider blending a distinct type of word formation, while others view it as part of a broader category of word shortening or even as a form of contamination. In this regard, the authors emphasize the need for further theoretical and empirical research to better define this phenomenon.

One of the key recommendations of the authors is the need to study the predictability of blending in different contexts. The article provides examples



from various spheres of life where blending plays a particularly important role, such as media, pop culture, advertising, as well as scientific and technical terms. In each of these fields, the creation of new words through blending helps express complex ideas succinctly and effectively, while retaining a certain ironic or playful tone, which is often important in popular culture and advertising.

Overall, the article offers a comprehensive approach to understanding blending as an important element of modern word formation, considering it from various perspectives: from phonetic and morphological to semantic and cultural. The authors stress that blending is one of those mechanisms that demonstrate the language's constant desire to economize its resources while simultaneously developing and adapting.

The article also emphasizes the need to study how newly formed words through blending are perceived by speakers and how they become embedded in the general vocabulary of the language. This question is important for understanding how new words make their way into dictionaries and how they are used in different social and cultural contexts. Linguistic economy and the desire for brevity are the main drivers of this process, which also increases interest in studying such new formations in a diachronic aspect.

Thus, the article not only underscores the significance of blending in modern English but also offers a deeper analysis of its role in the linguistic system. It opens up broad possibilities for further research and examination of this process in the context of global linguistic changes. Recommendations for further research include the study of the mechanisms of new word creation, the analysis of their predictability, and the role of blending in the formation of terminology in various fields of knowledge.

Keywords: word formation, blending, splinter, telescoping, word fusion

Бороліс Інна Іванівна ст. викладач, Київський національний університет технологій та дизайну, вул. Мала Шияновська, 2, Київ, 01011, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5480-4798>

Денисенко Віталіна Миколаївна ст. викладач, Київський національний університет технологій та дизайну, вул. Мала Шияновська, 2, Київ, 01011, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4918-5830>

БЛЕНДІНГ ЯК ПРОЯВ ГНУЧКОСТІ ТА МОБІЛЬНОСТІ АНГЛІЙСЬКОЇ МОВИ

Анотація. Стаття заглиблюється в складний процес словотворення у сучасній англійській мові, зокрема аналізує блендінг як один із провідних



способів створення нових слів. Автори відзначають, що англійська мова, маючи багатовікову історію розвитку, зазнала значного впливу інших мов, які залишили свої сліди у її словниковому складі. Слова іноземного походження не лише приймаються до складу англійської, але й асимілюються та еволюціонують, стаючи основою для нових слів, концептів та значень.

Один із ключових процесів, на який звертається увага у статті, — це блендінг. Блендінг — це метод словотворення, який полягає в об'єднанні частин двох або більше слів для створення нового. Як зазначається, такий процес об'єднання може охоплювати елементи різної довжини, де інколи зберігається основна частина одного слова, а інші частини скорочуються чи видозмінюються. Стаття докладно аналізує різноманітні терміни та визначення, що використовуються для опису цього явища, такі як телескопія, словове злиття, гібридизація та контамінація, кожен із яких представляє окремий аспект або варіацію блендінгу.

Додатково, автори зазначають, що хоча сам термін "блендінг" вже давно відомий, його конкретне застосування в сучасній англійській мові все ще залишається об'єктом активного вивчення. Це пояснюється тим, що через свою гнучкість та креативність блендінг стає одним із основних механізмів мовної економії — явища, що характеризується скороченням кількості елементів для вираження тієї ж або навіть більшої кількості інформації.

Стаття детально розглядає приклади, як нові слова формуються шляхом блендінгу. Наведені приклади включають такі неологізми як "brunch" (поєднання слів "breakfast" і "lunch"), "smog" (поєднання "smoke" і "fog"), що стали повсякденними словами сучасної англійської мови. Автори також зазначають, що блендінг не обмежується лише повсякденною лексикою — цей процес активно використовується у галузях науки, технологій та медіа, де виникає потреба в швидкому створенні термінології для нових явищ та концепцій.

Стаття наголошує на тому, що блендінг — це не лише механізм економії мовних ресурсів, але й спосіб прояву творчого підходу до словотворення. Поєднуючи частини слів, люди можуть грати зі звучанням, значенням та стилем, створюючи терміни, які більш точно передають нові або складні концепції. Завдяки цьому англійська мова стає багатшою і більш адаптивною до швидко змінюваних умов сучасного світу.

Одним із важливих аспектів, який підкреслюється у статті, є те, що процес блендінгу не завжди є чітко визначеним або передбачуваним. Часто виникає складність у визначенні, де закінчується одне слово і починається інше, що створює неоднозначність у значенні та вимові новоутвореного слова. Це, в свою чергу, викликає потребу у подальших дослідженнях для вивчення механізмів цього явища.



Стаття також звертається до історичних аспектів словотворення в англійській мові, підкреслюючи, як мова змінювалася під впливом інших культур та мовних систем. Зокрема, процес блендінгу розглядається як одна з еволюційних стадій розвитку мови, яка виникає у відповідь на нові соціальні, культурні та технологічні виклики. Блендінг дає можливість мовцям пристосовувати свою мову до нових умов, не втрачаючи при цьому її основних властивостей та особливостей.

Крім того, у статті аналізуються деякі дискусійні питання щодо класифікації блендінгу. Вчені часто сперечаються про те, як саме слід класифікувати цей процес та які критерії є визначальними для його ідентифікації. Деякі лінгвісти вважають блендінг окремим типом словотворення, тоді як інші розглядають його як частину ширшої категорії словових скорочень або навіть як форму контамінації. У зв'язку з цим автори підкреслюють необхідність подальших теоретичних та емпіричних досліджень для точнішого визначення цього феномену.

Однією з ключових рекомендацій авторів є необхідність дослідження передбачуваності блендінгу у різних контекстах. У статті наводяться приклади з різних сфер життя, де блендінг грає особливо важливу роль, такі як медіа, поп-культура, реклама, а також наукові та технічні терміни. У кожній з цих сфер створення нових слів шляхом блендінгу допомагає виразити складні ідеї коротко та ефективно, при цьому зберігаючи певну іронічну або грайливу нотку, що часто є важливим у популярній культурі та рекламі.

Загалом, стаття пропонує комплексний підхід до розуміння блендінгу як важливого елементу сучасного словотворення, розглядаючи його з різних точок зору: від фонетичних та морфологічних до семантичних та культурних. Автори наголошують на тому, що блендінг є одним із тих механізмів, який демонструє постійне прагнення мови до економії ресурсів і водночас до розвитку та адаптації.

Окремо підкреслюється необхідність дослідження того, як саме новоутворені слова через блендінг сприймаються мовцями та як вони вбудовуються в загальний лексичний склад мови. Це питання важливе для розуміння того, як нові слова потрапляють до словників та як вони використовуються у різних соціальних і культурних контекстах. Мовна економія та прагнення до скорочення є основними рушіями цього процесу, що також підвищує інтерес до вивчення таких новоутворень у діяхронічному аспекті.

Таким чином, стаття не лише підкреслює значення блендінгу в сучасній англійській мові, але й пропонує глибший аналіз його ролі у мовній системі. Вона відкриває широкі можливості для подальших



досліджень і вивчення цього процесу в контексті глобальних мовних змін. Рекомендації для подальших досліджень включають вивчення механізмів створення нових слів, аналіз їх передбачуваності та ролі блендінгу у формуванні термінології у різних галузях знань.

Ключові слова: словотворення, блендінг, сплінттер, телескопія, словове злиття.

Formulation of a problem. The word-formation system of modern English has been actively and fruitfully studied by both domestic and foreign linguists. A significant number of works have been written that consider certain aspects of word formation. However, recently the language has been changing very quickly, its structure is partially changing, but mainly the lexical composition of the language and the productivity of word-formation models are changing. Existing theoretical knowledge becomes insufficient. Therefore, it is necessary to identify new, modern trends that have been traced in recent decades. Formation of words with the help of blending is a common way of word formation, which has its own characteristics.

Analysis of the current research.

There are several prominent researchers and scholars who have conducted comprehensive analyses of current research on various aspects of modern English. **Joan L. Bybee** focused on the morphology, phonology, usage-based models. Bybee's work on usage-based phonology and morphology has been influential in understanding how frequency and usage impact language structure and change. Her book "Phonology and Language Use" integrates insights from cognitive linguistics and corpus linguistics. The researcher concludes that with the respect to the frequency of occurrence of the inflectional morpheme, as well as their order with respect with the respect to the verb stem, is that the relevance principle governs the formation of inflection at every stage. It sets up the syntactic conditions necessary and, in the addition governs the likelihood that an actual fusion will eventually take place. To a large extent the degree of fusion is determined rather mechanically by how long and in what order inflectional morphemes have been attached to the stem. But this is not entirely the case with stem changes that co-occur with inflectional categories, because these can be affected by morpho-phonemic changes. These changes are also governed by the relevance principle, and will be treated along with other matters relating to the organization of verbal paradigms.

Ray Jackendoff studied syntax, semantics, cognitive linguistics. His works are devoted to mental structure, an integrated approach to generative grammar, conscious and unconscious aspects of language structure, the structure of complex actions, and cognition of society and culture.



Jackendoff's research bridges the gap between syntax, semantics, and cognition. His book "Foundations of Language: Brain, Meaning, Grammar, Evolution" [] offers a comprehensive overview of his theoretical approach to language structure and its cognitive underpinnings. The author also returns to an important aspect of the hypothesis that the ability to acquire a language is a human cognitive specialization. Such cognitive specialization must be coded somehow in the genes, which determine how the brain is built. His works are devoted to mental structure, an integrated approach to generative grammar, conscious and unconscious aspects of language structure, the structure of complex actions, and cognition of society and culture. In his studies are discussed issues relating to various aspects of the structure of social cognition and theory of mind. He investigates the formal properties of mental structure and the relations between mental structure and brain structure, and opens with the following statement: "This book is concerned with exploring human nature in terms of the mental structures that play a role in constituting human experience and human behavior". Jackendoff provides his understanding of the terms brain, understood, rather conventionally, as the physical body part which accomplishes cognition (p. 3) and mind, understood, far less conventionally, as "the brain seen from the point of view of its functional or computational aspect" (p. 3). He also lists different ways, or 'dimensions', of studying the notions of mind/brain. In the conclusion to this chapter he stresses the fact that the discussion at this point is strictly programmatic, and later chapters return to these issues in the broad context of other cognitive phenomena.

Further Developments in Cognitive Linguistics

In subsequent works, Ray Jackendoff expanded his research into the interaction between language, thought, and perception, further bridging the gap between cognitive science and linguistics. One of his significant contributions is the «Parallel Architecture» model, which challenges the traditional generative grammar model by proposing that linguistic structures (syntax, semantics, and phonology) are processed in parallel rather than sequentially. This model suggests that each of these components operates independently, but they are interconnected through interfaces that allow for the integration of meaning, sound, and structure.

Jackendoff also contributed significantly to the understanding of «Conceptual Semantics», a theory that places meaning at the forefront of linguistic analysis. He argued that our understanding of meaning is rooted in human cognition, and linguistic structures reflect this cognitive organization. In his works, Jackendoff emphasized the importance of grounding linguistic meaning in human experience and argued that many aspects of language, particularly syntax, are shaped by the way we perceive and categorize the world around us.



Jackendoff's Influence on Modern Linguistics

Jackendoff's influence extends beyond theoretical linguistics, impacting fields such as psycholinguistics, neuroscience, and even artificial intelligence. His insights into the relationship between language and cognition have informed studies on language acquisition, helping researchers understand how children develop the ability to form complex grammatical structures based on limited input. Moreover, his work on the mental structures that support linguistic competence has inspired computational models in AI aimed at mimicking human language processing capabilities.

By integrating cognitive science into the study of language, Jackendoff opened new avenues for interdisciplinary research, allowing linguists, psychologists, and computer scientists to collaborate in exploring the deeper mechanisms of language and thought. His contributions remain a cornerstone in the ongoing exploration of how language functions within the broader framework of human cognition.

David Crystal dealt with Sociolinguistics, language change, internet linguistics. Crystal has written extensively on the evolution of English, including its sociolinguistic aspects and the impact of digital communication. His book "The Stories of English" provides a historical perspective on English and its global spread.

The first chapter "Modelling English" consists of a short introductory diagram showing the relationships between the different aspects of the study of language that are exposed in the body of the work, following the classical dichotomy: structure vs. use. The following chapters are grouped in the aforementioned six thematic parts, each part containing a variable number of chapters between two and six, all dealing with the main areas of study of a particular subfield. These six chapters also differ in length: 120 pages are devoted to Part 1 (*The History of English*), and 178 to Part 5 (*Using English*), with the remaining parts ranging from 30 to 75 pages.

The first part, "The history of English", presents the first seven chapters in chronological order: "The origins of English", "Old English", "Middle English", "Early Modern English", "Modern English" and, lastly, "World English", which enlarges this traditional classification. For each chapter, the author offers an account of basic axes of synchronic description: spelling, sounds, grammar and vocabulary, as well as other aspects like existing corpora and major milestones in the history of the language for each period, like *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, Chaucer, Shakespeare, etc. The author gives a short introduction presenting the mythical and historical origin of English that precedes Chapter 3 about Old English. Together with the basic account of the language, this chapter addresses a number of questions: runes, early literature and its devices, phonetic changes,



different sources of vocabulary like Latin and Old Norse, Scandinavian influence and the emergence of dialects. Another valuable asset of the chapter is the number of illustrated examples of early writing samples, often accompanied by their transcription and translation, which can be particularly useful for both students and dilettantes. Likewise, the presence of maps is essential for understanding the birth of Old English dialects.

His views on Middle English, presents the continuity of the English language through the historical events and their effect on the transformation of the language, and discusses topics such as the change and continuity of literary tradition, the Chaucerian work, the Norman and French influence and changes in the different aspects of the language: sound system, spelling, grammar, morphology and vocabulary. Special attention is also drawn to the development of Middle English dialects and the origins of the standard variety. All these contents are presented in a clear and summarised fashion. As in the preceding chapter, the panels' contents are of great value: pictures of various literary works are accompanied by their transcription, and the use of maps and diagrams constitute an essential contribution for understanding Crystal's account

He presents a synchronic description of Early Modern English, roughly between 1400 and 1800 AD, and focuses on a number of subjects: the emergence of printing in England, main texts such as the various versions of the Bible, authors like Shakespeare, changes in grammar and sound, the stabilisation of the language (influenced by the regularisation of spelling or punctuation), and the publication of Johnson's dictionary. Again, illustrations allow to have a visual image of the protagonists and reference works, and panels offer several examples of each point.

His works provide an outline of some interesting topics on Modern English, like the grammatical changes at the beginning of the period, the influence of prescriptive grammar, modern varieties of English, the American linguistic identity and current trends in lexical creation. Some tables offer specific data on these matters, like the evolution in the creation of scientific vocabulary and the preferred pronunciation of some terms.

The purpose of the article is to provide an in-depth analysis of the phenomenon of blending in the English language. It aims to explore the historical development and evolution of English, emphasizing how words of foreign origin have been assimilated and how new words, concepts, and meanings, including blends, have emerged.

Presentation of the main material.

The modern English language appears as a product of a long historical development, in the process of which it has undergone multifaceted changes due to various reasons. Words of foreign origin have gone through a long path of



assimilation and continue their development, forming new words, concepts, and meanings, including blends. In the linguistic literature, the phenomenon ‘blending’ has a rather ambiguous definition. Linguists give different interpretations of blending. In addition, there is no single term for this process. There are the following options: telescoping, word fusion, hybridization, insertive word formation, insertive word fusion, telescoping, contamination, or overlapping. The question of the status of blending is still open. The mechanisms of blend formation are studied mainly by Western scientists, among which are I. Plag and P. Bertinetto.

Among foreign researchers, we also do not find a single definition. For example, A. Enarson presents “blending” as a combination of two or more forms in which at least one word has been abbreviated. The abbreviation may be due to the simple omission of part of the word or maybe the result of overlapping sounds or letters [...]. S. Gries sees “blending” as the creation of new lexemes by combining parts of at least two other words, and one of them has been shortened [...]. In turn, A. Lehrer defines blends as “underlying compounds which are composed of one word and part of another, or parts of two other words. The word part is called a splinter”. [...]. A splinter usually cannot occur as a word, but there is a possibility for the splinter to become a combining form. Linguistically a splinter is a clipping. A classic definition was given by a British linguist Laurie Bauer: “A blend may be defined as a new lexeme formed from parts of two (or possibly more) other words in such a way that there is no transparent analysis into morphs” [...].

The term ‘telescoping’ describes the combination of words in such a way that the new formations turn out to be common to both sources as if merged into one, whole sounds, morphemes, and syllables. A typical example of such lexical units is the word *netholic* – network + alcoholic (addicted to the Internet).

Other authors, for example, G. Marchand, prefer the term “contamination”. G. Marchand, on the basis of the English language, defines contamination as a method of merging parts of words into one new word [...]. Contamination is also observed in colloquial speech and is often a deviation from the literary norm.

Blending, which is extremely popular today, is not a new process in language. Blends have been recorded in Latin and Greek, as well as in Sanskrit, but this phenomenon is most common in Germanic languages [1, p.54].

The first ‘fusions’ were random in nature and often represented occasionalisms. Lewis Carroll is a well-known creator of contaminations, who turned their creation and use into a literary device and called these fusions “portmanteau words” (Previously, this word meant “suitcase for transporting clothes”. Its peculiarity was that it was hinged and could open in both directions. It is because of this property that it was associated with blends). L. Carroll wrote, “Well, ‘slithy’ means ‘lithe and slimy’. You see it’s like a portmanteau – there



are two words packed up into one word.... ‘Mimsy’ is ‘flimsy and miserable’”. Other well-known examples of L. Carroll are *chortle* (chuckle and snort), *galumph* (gallop and triumph).

The word blend was not used as a linguistic term before the late 19th century, and even then, it did not mean what it means today. In the academic works of the late 19th century, the term was used mainly in the context of speech errors, e.g. Sweet (1892: § 48) mentioned that blending of different constructions may cause certain grammatical and logical anomalies. The same use of the term can be seen in Jespersen (1918: 52): “Contaminations or blendings of two constructions between which the speaker is wavering occur in all languages”. The study of blending, as an independent way of word formation, begins to appear in the 20th century, but this method reaches its peak in the late 20th and early 21st centuries. This interest is not accidental, since it was during this period that this method of word formation passes from the category of secondary to the category of main ones, as evidenced by a large number of regularly appearing blends.

Scholars arguing for the predictability of blends focus on the regularities that may help develop a systematized account of this category, despite its fuzzy boundaries. Such systematizations have been developed in many studies including Kubozono [1990], Gries [2006, 2012], and Arndt-Lappe & Plag [2013]. Thus, in Gries [2006, 2012] inferences about the systematic nature of blends are made based on corpus data on the frequency of occurrence of certain types of formations. Some insights into the mechanism of blending are drawn from considering cognitive factors involved in the formation (Arndt-Lappe & Plag [2013], Gries [2006, 2012]) and processing of blends.

A huge number of contaminations appear at the turn of the 20th-21st centuries, which is explained by a number of factors: the desire to save language resources and efforts, the spread of the Internet, and the popularity of using the language game on the Internet and in the media. The ability of contaminants to draw attention to an unusual language form (ironic Lollywood (Lahore (Pakistani city)) + Hollywood), their catchiness is widely used in ergonyms – the names of brands and advertising products (Amway – American Way, Camcorder – camera + recorder).

In British English, such formations are used mainly in journalism, for example: *edvertorial* (an advertisement and an editorial). Thanks to politicians, the word *Brexit* (Britain and exit) appeared. This word is understood as the process of the UK leaving the European Union. Another large area that has given a large number of blends is the field of science and technology. For example, *chunnel* (channel and tunnel).

It is a well-known fact that a language reflects the realities of modern life. The coronavirus has led to the emergence of a number of new blends in the



English language, which were instantly picked up by many Internet users. For example:

covidpreneur – COVID + entrepreneur (a person or organization that uses the general panic amid the Covid-19 pandemic, buying and reselling consumer goods);

homecation – home + vacation (holiday spent at home);

homeference – home + conference (conference held at home);

zoombie – ZOOM + zombie (a person feeling overwhelmed by endless zoom conferences);

covidiot – COVID + idiot (a person who deliberately does not comply with safety measures during a pandemic COVID-19);

maskne – mask + acne (acne or skin irritation caused by prolonged exposure to the mask);

lockstalgia – lockdown + nostalgia (feeling when a person misses the time spent in quarantine);

spendemic – spending + pandemic (excessive spending of money during quarantine);

coronely – corona + lonely (the loneliness that people experienced during quarantine);

coronapocalypse – corona + apocalypse (seemingly the end of the world as we know it because everyone is either infected with coronavirus in the lungs);

coronageddon – corona + armageddon (the near-certain, end-of-times condition created either by the actual COVID-19 virus or the massive social, financial, and political devastation generated on the back of global hysteria);

quarantini – quarantine + martini (a cocktail you make at home and drink alone or with members of your household during a period of imposed isolation);

zumping – Zoom + dumping (the act of dumping someone over Zoom);

coronials – corona + millennials (babies conceived or born during the COVID-19 pandemic, especially one apparently conceived during a lockdown);

coronasomnia – corona + insomnia (sleep problems related to stress caused by the COVID-19 pandemic).

The universal structural features of the blends involve the formation of derivatives of units, as a rule, on the basis of two correlates, although several samples of three-element blends are also present in the English language:

Intelevsionary – Intel + Television + Visionary.

Taking as a basis the classification proposed by Yu. A. Zhluktenko, according to which they stand out full (connection of the initial fragment of one the original word with the final fragment of the second), partial (the combination of a truncated fragment of the foundation of the first original word with the full basis of the second) and haplological blends (the combination of components



with their application at the junction), it was estimated that complete and haplological units are most spread; in English, their number is 34.9 % and 39.5 %.

Blends, like full-fledged lexical units, have a certain set of morphological signs, the composition of which varies depending on the frequency of a part of speech affiliation of the derivative. The prevalence of nouns should be emphasized, although such parts of speech as a verb, an adjective, and an adverb are also represented. The initial components of blend words should match each other in several ways – phonological, semantic, grammatical – and at the same time have a high lingua-creative potential.

Thus, in recent decades, blending has become one of the leading ways of word formation, producing a large number of words that have entered the vocabulary. The main productive models of creating blends in modern English are: 1) $ab + cd \rightarrow ad$; 2) $ab + cd \rightarrow abd$; 3) $ab + cd \rightarrow acd$; 4) $ab + cd \rightarrow ac$. During the formation of blends, not only the univerbation of the values of the original lexemes can occur, but also certain semantic modifications: addition, transfer, and reinterpretation of meanings. They simplify the recipient's understanding and perception (even at the associative level). Blends were formed based on complete letter and sound compatibility to create a word that makes sense and is easy to pronounce. Morphological motivation helps us easily understand the meaning of even an unknown word if we know what the components of this word mean.

Unlike other ways of word formation, the word-forming unit here is not the stem, but its arbitrary fragment. Such a fragment does not exist in the language, but appears only at the time of word creation, which explains the absence of a single word-forming model. The main methods are reduced to two – the connection (amalgamation) of the fragments of the bases and the actual fusion of the fragments. In the first place is always part of the dominant word, which contains the main information or feature of the newly created word. In most cases, the second part of the word is shortened, and when transforming words, they rely on a more appropriate sound and meaning, a combination of letter-sounds and sense.

Blends serve the needs of the scientific community to denote new concepts and entities, they are one of the ways of manifesting the author's word-making in fiction and gain more and more distribution in journalistic works due to their expressiveness, novelty of form, and content.

The **spread of the internet** has been a major catalyst for this linguistic change. Online spaces provide rapid, global, and informal communication environments where users are constantly looking for ways to express themselves creatively while economizing on time and effort. The internet's vast reach and speed facilitate the adoption and dissemination of contaminations.



Memes, hashtags, and viral phrases often thrive because of their blend of humor, irony, and creativity. These linguistic innovations quickly capture the attention of users, and once they go viral, they spread to a broader audience. For example, "**smog**" (smoke + fog) might have started in scientific discourse, but similar contaminations like "**Brangelina**" (Brad + Angelina) became widespread because of the internet and social media.

Moreover, platforms like Twitter, with its original 140-character limit, promoted the use of shorter, hybridized forms of words to maximize space while maintaining clarity and punch. The internet, therefore, serves as both a **stage and laboratory** for language experimentation, where new forms are born and either fade out or become part of everyday speech.

3. The Popularity of Language Games

The **language game** in media and online spaces highlights how playfulness with language has become both a creative and persuasive tool. The example of "**Lollywood**" (Lahore + Hollywood) mirrors a broader global trend where people adapt the "Hollywood" suffix to various localities (e.g., "**Bollywood**" for Bombay/Mumbai). This wordplay adds an element of irony, satire, or commentary, often poking fun at the cultural dominance of Western media while reappropriating its forms for local use.

In advertising, this linguistic creativity is harnessed to make brands more **memorable**. Take "**Amway**" (American Way), where blending serves to evoke associations with American ideals of success, independence, and innovation while remaining catchy and easy to pronounce. This makes brands more relatable and attractive to global markets.

Advertisers and marketers understand that blending words creates **novelty**, and novelty captures attention. The **familiar + unfamiliar** dynamic (where one part of the word is recognizable, and the other part adds an element of surprise) draws consumers in. These contaminations tend to be **sticky**, staying in people's minds for longer periods because of their clever construction.

4. Ergonyms and Contaminations in Branding

In the commercial world, **ergonyms**—names of businesses, brands, or products—often rely on these creative blends to stand out in competitive markets. Examples like "**Amway**" and "**camcorder**" demonstrate how language blending can convey multiple layers of meaning, helping consumers quickly understand a product's functionality or the brand's identity.

- **Camcorder**: A blend of "camera" and "recorder," instantly communicates that this device serves both functions.

- **Amway**: By blending "American" and "way," the brand conveys its origins and the promise of success through the American model of entrepreneurship.

This technique makes brands **easy to remember** and often gives them an edge in cross-cultural marketing. In an age where branding has to transcend



national borders, such blending plays a crucial role in making names accessible and resonant with diverse audiences.

5. Cultural Implications

These contaminations not only serve linguistic or commercial purposes but also reflect deeper **cultural shifts**. The blending of terms can signify **globalization**, where cultures and languages mix more freely, creating hybrid identities and forms of expression. The use of **portmanteaus** or hybrid words often signifies how modern societies are increasingly complex and interconnected.

For instance, the proliferation of words like **"frenemy"** (friend + enemy) or **"glocal"** (global + local) reflects a nuanced understanding of relationships and environments in the 21st century. These words capture contradictions or dualities that didn't necessarily exist in such prominent ways in previous generations.

1. Linguistic Economy and Resource Conservation

The idea of **saving language resources and efforts** reflects a tendency toward simplifying communication. People naturally gravitate toward shorter, punchier, and more memorable language forms to convey complex ideas quickly. This desire for efficiency aligns with the rise of global digital communication, where brevity is crucial (e.g., in social media, texting, and advertising).

Contaminations, like **"camcorder"** (camera + recorder), are perfect examples. Instead of referring to two separate devices, a single term conveys both, saving time, space, and cognitive effort. This practice mirrors a broader trend where languages evolve to adapt to new technologies and social contexts. **Abbreviations, acronyms, and portmanteaus** (blends) have become increasingly popular, especially in digital communication (e.g., "blog" from "web log" or "brunch" from "breakfast + lunch").

Conclusions and prospects for further research. Thus, the following conclusions were drawn during the study. Despite different approaches to the definition of the concept of "blending" in linguistic literature, many authors agree on one thing: blending is the combination of parts of two or more words. With the development of society and language, new lexical units will appear. Blends make up a considerable part of the corpus of new English words. Blending, being one of the ways of word formation, has universal general language characteristics that manifest themselves at various language levels, as well as national features that reflect the consciousness and perception of reality by the speakers of a particular linguistic culture. Based on the tendency to save language resources, it can be argued that most new nominations will be created with the help of blending. It should be also noted that at the moment blending is widely used in fiction for the so-called "term creation", and as a means of wordplay and information coding in mass media and advertising, therefore, needs further research.



Their widespread adoption in ergonyms and brand names speaks to their **efficiency, creativity, and cultural relevance** in modern communication. Whether in marketing, media, or everyday conversation, these hybrid words are shaping how we express ourselves in a fast-paced, interconnected world.

Cognitive and Social Impacts of Linguistic Economy

The rise of linguistic economy goes beyond mere simplification and extends into the cognitive and social realms. By creating blends and shortening terms, speakers not only conserve time but also reduce the mental load required for processing complex information. Blended words, such as "smog" (smoke + fog) or "spork" (spoon + fork), offer concise and immediately recognizable concepts, enhancing cognitive efficiency by limiting the need for additional explanation or context. This streamlining process allows speakers and listeners to communicate more effectively in high-speed environments, such as digital platforms, where rapid comprehension is often required.

From a social perspective, the widespread adoption of blended words and other forms of linguistic economy signals inclusivity within a specific cultural or digital community. These new terms often originate in niche internet subcultures or youth-dominated environments, and their adoption by the broader public reflects changing communication norms. For instance, terms like "stan" (from "stalker" and "fan") emerged in online fan communities and have since entered mainstream lexicons, bridging the gap between subcultural identity and general communication. Thus, linguistic economy functions not only to simplify but also to establish shared understandings within and across communities.

Technological Drivers of Linguistic Change

Advances in technology have further driven the evolution of linguistic economy. With the proliferation of voice-activated assistants (e.g., Siri, Alexa) and predictive text software, language has adapted to meet the needs of both human and machine interaction. In these contexts, brevity and clarity are paramount. Shortened or hybridized terms often improve interaction efficiency between users and devices, as machines can process concise inputs more easily. The creation of terms like "vlog" (video + blog) reflects the necessity for new linguistic forms that can accommodate emerging technologies while retaining human readability and interpretability.

Moreover, the influence of artificial intelligence (AI) in generating new linguistic forms is becoming more pronounced. Algorithms designed to optimize communication frequently resort to abbreviations and acronyms, further contributing to the spread of linguistic economy. As AI technologies continue to evolve, their role in shaping human language will likely expand, creating new linguistic patterns that align with digital efficiency and human cognitive limits.



Impact on Language Evolution and Globalization

Linguistic economy, particularly through the use of blends and abbreviations, has also become a hallmark of globalization. As English solidifies its position as a global lingua franca, non-native speakers are increasingly adopting simplified and hybridized forms to facilitate cross-cultural communication. This trend not only reflects the influence of English as a dominant language but also highlights how global interactions are encouraging the blending of linguistic traditions. For instance, words like "Spanglish" (a blend of Spanish and English) demonstrate how linguistic economy allows for fluid transitions between languages, reflecting the multicultural and multilingual realities of today's world.

In professional and academic settings, the trend toward linguistic economy is also evident. Shortened forms and acronyms, such as "MOOC" (Massive Open Online Course) or "Wi-Fi" (Wireless Fidelity), have become standard terminology in global discourse. These terms exemplify how linguistic economy fosters more efficient communication in fields that require precision and clarity, especially when interacting across linguistic and cultural barriers.

By blending ideas, languages, and concepts, contaminations not only streamline communication but also enhance its richness, reflecting the dynamic and evolving nature of human interaction in the digital age. This idea revolves around the increasing prevalence of **linguistic contaminations** - words or phrases.

References:

1. Bertinetto P. M. Blends and syllable structure: a four-fold comparison // La gramatica i la semantica en l'estudi de la variacio / ed. by Lorente, Merce, Nma Alturo, E. Boix, M.-R. Lloret, L. Payrato. Barcelona: Promociones y Publicaciones Universitarias, 2001. P. 59-112.
2. Zatsnyi Yu. A. (2009) Shljahy i sposoby zbagachennja suchasnoi' rozmovnoi' leksyky anglijs'koi' movy [Ways and methods of enriching the modern colloquial vocabulary of the English language]. Nova Philolohiya. Issue 34. Zaporizhzhia. (In Ukrainian)
3. Zatsnyi A. P. (1997) Neolohizmy anhliiskoi movy 80-90 rokiv XX stolittia. [Neologisms of the English language in the 80s and 90s of the 20th century]. Zaporizhzhia. (In Ukrainian)
4. Zhlutenko Yu. A. (1983) Angliiskiye neologizmy [English neologisms]. Kyiv. Nauk. dumka. (In Russian)
5. Bauer L. English word-formation. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983. 312 p.
6. Enarson A. New blends in the English Language. Karlstad: Hostterminen, 2006. 120 p.
7. Gries St. Th. Cognitive Determinants of Subtractive Word-formation: a Corpus-based Perspective // Cognitive Linguistics. 2006. № 17. P. 535-588.
8. Lehrer A. Lexical Creativity, Texts and Contexts [Електронний ресурс]. University of Pisa, 2007. URL: <https://benjamins.com/catalog/sfsl.58> (дата обращения: 12.02.2023)
9. Plag I. Word Formation in English. Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics. Cambridge University Press, 2002. 266 p.
10. Sweet, H. (1892). A new English grammar, logical and historical (Vol. 1). Retrieved from <http://www.archive.org/details/newenglishgramma100sweeuoft>



Література:

1. Bertinetto P. M. Blends and syllable structure: a four-fold comparison // La gramatica i la semantica en l'estudi de la variacio / ed. by Lorente, Merce, Nma Alturo, E. Boix, M.-R. Lloret, L. Payrato. Barcelona: Promociones y Publicaciones Universitarias, 2001. P. 59-112.
2. Zatsnyi Yu. A. (2009) Shljahy i sposoby zbagachennja suchasnoi' rozmovnoi' leksyky anglijs'koi' movy [Ways and methods of enriching the modern colloquial vocabulary of the English language]. Nova Philolohiya. Issue 34. Zaporizhzhia. (In Ukrainian)
3. Zatsnyi A. P. (1997) Neolohizmy anhliiskoi movy 80-90 rokiv XX stolittia. [Neologisms of the English language in the 80s and 90s of the 20th century]. Zaporizhzhia. (In Ukrainian)
4. Zhlutenko Yu. A. (1983) Angliiskiye neologizmy [English neologisms]. Kyiv. Nauk. dumka. (In Russian)
5. Bauer L. English word-formation. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983. 312 p.
6. Enarson A. New blends in the English Language. Karlstad: Hostterminen, 2006. 120 p.
7. Gries St. Th. Cognitive Determinants of Subtractive Word-formation: a Corpus-based Perspective // Cognitive Linguistics. 2006. № 17. P. 535-588.
8. Lehrer A. Lexical Creativity, Texts and Contexts [Електронний ресурс]. University of Pisa, 2007. URL: <https://benjamins.com/catalog/sfsl.58> (дата обращения: 12.02.2023)
9. Plag I. Word Formation in English. Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics. Cambridge University Press, 2002. 266 p.
10. Sweet, H. (1892). A new English grammar, logical and historical (Vol. 1). Retrieved from <http://www.archive.org/details/newenglishgramma100sweeuoft>