University of Pardubice

Faculty of Arts and Philosophy

Contrastive view of abbreviations and their development

Roman Nedomlel

Bachelor's thesis

2011

ZADÁNÍ BAKALÁŘSKÉ PRÁCE

(PROJEKTU, UMĚLECKÉHO DÍLA, UMĚLECKÉHO VÝKONU)

Jméno a příjmení: **Roman NEDOMLEL**

Osobní číslo: **H08272**

Studijní program: **B7310 Filologie**

Studijní obor: **Anglický jazyk pro hospodářskou praxi**

Název tématu: **Kontrastivní pohled na zkratky a zkratková slova a jejich vývoj**

Zadávající katedra: **Katedra anglistiky a amerikanistiky**

Zásady pro vypracování:

Student zpracuje problematiku zkracování a vytváření zkratek a zkratkových slov a to z pohledu kontrastivního. V teoretické části se zaměří především na popis a porovnání zkratkového systému v anglickém a českém jazyce. V praktické části student analyzuje a porovná výskyt zkratek v česky a anglicky psaných textech stejného zaměření a identifikuje tendence v používání zkratek a zkratkových slov ve formálním i neformálním stylu.

Rozsah grafických prací:

Rozsah pracovní zprávy:

Forma zpracování bakalářské práce: **tištěná/elektronická**

Seznam odborné literatury:

Slovník anglických zkratek, Ostrava : Montanex, 2000 Dictionary of foreign phrases and abbreviations, New York : H.W. Wilson , 1972 Zkratky, značky, akronymy, Praha : Horizont, 1983 Slovník zkratek, Praha : Encyklopedický dům, 1994

Vedoucí bakalářské práce: **Mgr. Marek Vít**
Katedra anglistiky a amerikanistiky

Datum zadání bakalářské práce: **30. dubna 2010**
Termín odevzdání bakalářské práce: **31. března 2011**

L.S.

prof. PhDr. Petr Vorel, CSc.

děkan

Mgr. Šárka Bubíková, Ph.D.

vedoucí katedry

V Pardubicích dne 30. listopadu 2010

Prohlašuji:

Tuto práci jsem vypracoval samostatně. Veškeré literární p*RAM*eny a informace, které jsem v práci využil, jsou uvedeny v seznamu použité literatury. Byl jsem seznámen s tím, že se na moji práci vztahují práva a povinnosti vyplývající ze zákona č. 121/2000 Sb., autorský zákon, zejména se skutečností, že Univerzita Pardubice má právo na uzavření licenční smlouvy o užití této práce jako školního díla podle § 60 odst. 1 autorského zákona, a s tím, že pokud dojde k užití této práce mnou nebo bude poskytnuta licence o užití jinému subjektu, je Univerzita Pardubice oprávněna ode mne požadovat přiměřený příspěvek na úhradu nákladů, které na vytvoření díla vynaložila, a to podle okolností až do jejich skutečné výše. Souhlasím s prezenčním zpřístupněním své práce v Univerzitní knihovně.

V Pardubicích dne 25.6. 2011

Roman Nedomlel

Abstract

This bachelor's paper deals with word formations which result in the shorter form of the original, source word(s). Namely, there processes are acronyming, abbreviating, blending, clipping and back-forming. In the theoretical part of this bachelor's paper all the necessary terms will be explained via the theories of certain linguists, like Crystal, Brown, Yule, Akmajian, Štekauer, etc. The theoretical part will provide enough information for the research itself. The goal of the research is to prove or disprove theories whether there is a rising tendency in usage of the abbreviations, blends, clippings, acronyms and back-formations. The research will be done via the archives of well-known periodicals, namely The New York Times from the USA, The Sunday Times from England and Mladá Fronta Dnes from the Czech Republic. The results of this analysis should determine whether the certain theories are correct and which language uses these shorter forms of the words more frequently.

Keywords: word-formations, abbreviations, acronyms, blends, clippings, back-formation

Anotace

Tato bakalářská práce se zabývá tvorbou slov resp. tvorbou zkratek, zkratkových slov a jiných zkrácenin. V teoretické části této bakalářské práce budou vysvětleny všechny termíny za pomoci teorií lingvistů jako David Crystal, Keith Brown, George Yule, Adrian Akmajian, Pavol Štekauer a další. Teoretická část poskytne dostatek informací pro samotný výzkum. Cílem výzkumu je potvrdit nebo vyvrátit teorie týkající se tendence užívání zkratek, zkratkových slov a zkrácenin. Výzkum bude proveden za pomocí archívů světově známých periodik, jmenovitě The New York Times ze Spojených států amerických, The Sunday Times z Anglie a Mladé Fronty Dnes z České republiky. Výsledky této analýzy rozhodnou, jestli jsou teorie pravdivé a který jazyk využívá tato zkrácená slova častěji.

.

Klíčová slova: tvoření slov, zkratky, zkratková slova, zkráceniny

Table of contents

The list of tables

Introduction

Acronyms and abbreviations are the elements of languages. There is no clear sign when they were started to use but nowadays they cannot be separated from any of the modern languages. Abbreviations and acronyms help people to shorten often longer word formations into a smaller form often counting few letters. To give example, United States of America can be abbreviated to USA, leaving out the preposition of. There are countless of examples of abbreviations and acronyms and modern languages could not exist without them. Abbreviations share some phonetic and semantic functions with acronyms.

The development of abbreviation and acronyms is unavoidable. With the start of the internet era, new acronyms and abbreviations are appearing every day. Some of them tend to spread even worldwide but the main percentage stays in their sphere of usage. There are many spheres where abbreviations and acronyms exist, such as business sphere, slang sphere, industry sphere and academic sphere. In the end, some of the abbreviations gain permanent position in the dictionaries as words, for example the abbreviation Dj. The full form disc-jockey is only rarely used. This only proves that the modern languages could not exist without abbreviations because the language registers would not be so rich. The goal of this paper is to research and analyze development of certain acronyms and abbreviations from business sphere, how they developed over the years. Research will be done via archives from well known periodicals. The research of development will be traced from 1785 till 2010 and will display the evolution of business abbreviations and acronyms. The year 1785 is the oldest date given by archives all over the world. It is given by the prestigious periodical from the United Kingdom, *The Sunday Times* and is complete free of charge and available to the public. This archive contains all articles from 1785 to 1985 and displays the development of the English language for 200 years in millions of news, articles and texts. The development from 1985 to present will be researched in archives of the world's known periodical, *The New York Times*. *The New York Times* have their archive dated from 1851 till present and are the great resource for the analysis of the modern abbreviations and acronyms.

The same research will be done in one Czech periodical to contrast the development of Czech and English abbreviations and acronyms. The research of Czech abbreviations and acronyms will not be as extensive as the English one because there are not as many periodicals from business sphere with available archive. The only periodical viable for research, *Mladá Fronta Dnes*, is a younger equivalent of *The Sunday Times* and follows and display news and articles not only from business and from economy.

The contrast of the abbreviation development will be done via the comparison of the frequencies of the abbreviations that are used in both the Czech and the English languages. Each year from 1785 the number of abbreviations in *The New York Times* and *The Sunday Times* will be compared to the number of appearances of the full word forms. The equivalent will be done in the Czech newspaper archives and in the end the final comparison will be done between languages and thus determine which language uses the abbreviations more and which less.

The processes that will be researched and analyzed are abbreviating, acronyming, blending, clipping and back-formatting. The reason why are the word-formation processes of blending and back-formation included in the research is that the resulting new words of these processes have also been shortened (in comparison with the original full form) and to compare these two processes with the other word-formations to fully determine the tendencies and the development of these word-formation methods.

Secondly, this research paper will introduce the forming of abbreviations and acronyms themselves. There are many ways how abbreviations and acronyms are formed and used. Many rules are applied on both categories and will be explained via the theories of well-known and less-know linguists.

1 Theoretical analysis of abbreviations and word-formation processes

In this part of the research paper the theory of abbreviations will be explained. The background information will be gathered from both of the well-known and less-known linguists. The goal of this theoretical part is to introduce abbreviations, their types (blends, clippings,..) and to provide enough information about abbreviations for the research part of this paper.

Akmajian describes the processes of creating new words (neologisms) which involve abbreviations, acronyms, blends, etc. He says that users of language often create new words by using these processes and under good conditions these become stable parts of a larger linguistic community. His definition includes the type of a word formation like none of mentioned linguists described. This category is the coined words, which are entirely new words that appeared in a language. This coinage of words happens when the language users create new words via the processes of blending, clipping, acronyming and such. (Akmajian et al.,25,2001)

Crystal says that abbreviations are one of the most noticeable features of present-day English linguistic life that is often thought to be an exclusively modern habit. The beginnings of the abbreviations can be found over 150 years ago. In 1839, a writer in the New York *Evening Tatler* comments on what he calls the initial language. He was referring to OK (‚all correct') and few other abbreviations. (Crystal, 122,1994)

According to Crystal, there are six types of abbreviations, or forming of abbreviations. The first one are initialisms, which are items spoken as individual letters, such as BBC, DJ and USA. Initialisms are the biggest category of the abbreviations. The second one are the acronyms. Acronyms are very similar to initialisms, but are pronounced as single words, such as NATO, UNESCO and others. The contrast between initialisms and acronyms is that during the pronunciation or writing of

acronyms, the punctuation is often presented. Crystal mentions that some linguists do not recognize a distinction between acronyms and initialisms and rather use term for both of these categories. (Crystal,122,1994)

1.1 Acronyms and Initialisms

The basic definition of acronyms is that a sequence of words has been shortened into one word, for example the *North Atlantic Treaty Organization* can be shortened into a different form. This form usually consists of the initial letters except of the conjunctions and articles, so the shorter form of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization is the *NATO*. This process is called acronyming, and the new shorter forms are called acronyms. Initialisms (according to Crystal, Akmajian and Hudson) are similar to acronyms, they are results of a shortening word-formation but the main difference is the pronunciation. Acronyms are pronounced as whole words but initialisms are spelled.

There are thousands of acronyms and initialisms in the modern languages including *CD, EU, VAT, NATO*, *UNESCO* and others. Some of these acronyms or initialisms tend to replace their original form and become separate new words with own entries in dictionaries. To completely indentify the process of acronyming, the theories of certain linguists will be used, namely Akmajian, Yule, Hudson, Bauer and Heynen.

1.1.1 Akmajian's theory

Akmajian differs with his theory a bit, he renamed the initialisms to a more people friendly name, alphabetic abbreviations. He says that for many English speakers one-time abbreviations like *CD,ER* and *PC* have completely replaced their original forms compact disk (or certificate of deposit), emergency room and personal computer (or politically correct) and became a new independent words. However, Akmajian agrees with other linguists mentioned, than a main characteristic of alphabetic abbreviations (or initialisms) is that each of their letters is pronounced individually in contrast with acronyms. Akmajian's theory is that alphabetic abbreviations now number in the thousands thanks to computers and internet and points out the most used and well known of them, such as *www*, world wide web, *IT,* information technology, *HTML*, hypertext markup language, *OOP,* object-oriented prog*RAM*ming, *HDL,* hardware description language, *I/O,* input/output and *FTP,* file transfer protocol. (Akmajian et al. 26,2001)

Akmajian starts his acronym description by giving the examples of acronyms, similar to other linguists, like *radar* and *laser* where each of the letters that spell the words is the first letter or letters of some other complete word. For example *radar* is originally a radio detecting and ranging and *laser* a light amplification by stimulated emission of radiation. Akmajian explains that it is important for language users to remember that words like these are o originally created as acronyms or they will be considered as new independent words. Akmajian further lists some examples from a computer category, like URL, a uniform resource locator, pronounced as [ɜːl], GUI, a graphical user interface, pronounced as [ˈguːɪ], DOS, a disk operating system, pronounced as [dɒs], SCSI, a small computer system interface, pronounced as [skuzzy], LAN, a local area network, pronounced as [lɑn] and finally GIF, a graphics interchange format, pronounced as [jiff]. Akmajian adds that acronym formation is just one of the word formation processes that are increasingly more popular in American society and perhaps internationally. (Akmajian et al.,26,2001)

1.1.2 Hudson's theory

Hudson compares the acronyming to a clipping in which a phrase is replaced by a word based upon the first letters of its words. Hudson divides the acronyms into two categories. The first category is the word acronyms, which are pronounced as ordinary words but not as spellings. Hudson gives typical examples of the of the words acronyms, like *scuba*, a self-contained underwater breathing apparatus. Hudson's theory is that hardly anyone knows the original word of this acronym and that the word scuba became a very useful new word since the original phrase is too long and descriptive just for the name of the simple apparatus. Next to scuba Hudson gives another example of an acronym which has become more used than its original. The acronym *RAM*, *Random Access Memory*, became common in the computer literature and nowadays tends to be even written in the lower case letters according to Hudson. The third Hudson's example of the word acronyms is the *Unicef*, United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund, which is unique because the *i* is preserved even though the word International is now being omitted from the name of this agency. Hudson clearly states that people vary in their knowledge of certain acronyms like *MASH*, a mobile army surgical hospital,

laser, a light amplification by stimulated emission of radiation, and *NASA*, a National Aeronautics and Space Administration, but as long as the spelling is with upper case letters people can guess than they are dealing with acronyms even without the knowledge of their origin. Some of these acronyms which are used more often tend to have their letters written in the lower case font in order to become a new word according to Hudson's theory.

The second category is the spelling acronyms, or so called initialisms. Initialisms are read and pronounced as spellings, so their acronymic origin is more obvious than in the category of the word acronyms. Hudson explains that the spelling acronyms can become more common than the phrase similarly to word acronyms. Hudson provides three examples of spelling acronyms, *PR,* public relations, *TLC,* tender loving care and *ID*, identification. Hudson describes the spelling acronym *ID* as a case where the acronym itself is not based on the phrase but instead on only one word, identification. In Hudson's opinion the original word was too long and felt too formal and in some cases unsuitable because of its frequent occurrences. In the end, Hudson distinguishes these two types of acronyms and ordinary abbreviations. According to him both lack the appearance and the ability to be pronounced but spelling acronyms lack the pause (period) at the end and are quite often read as a sequence of letters, for example *Mr* is not read as [em ɑː]. (Hudson,243,2000)

Hudson also has a unique description of another acronym category. He speaks about two-level word acronyms. His theory is that some of newly formed acronyms, concerning the names of public interest groups and organizations, are nowadays being specially named in order to suggest some of the organization's purpose. The name two-level acronym is given because the acronym itself expressed two meanings on different levels. Hudson supports this theory by few examples like acronym *NOW*, National Organization of Women, displays the impatience of the organization's members. *MADD* is an organization of angry mothers and *SPECTRE*, Special Executive for Counterintelligence, Terrorism, Revenge, and Extortion, are another two-level word acronyms. (Hudson,243,2000)

1.1.3 Yule's theory

Yule's definition of acronyms is very similar to that of Hudson's, which is that the acronyms are new words created from a set of initial letters of other words. Yule says that acronyms have two forms. The first one is where a pronunciation consists only of saying each particular letter, like in *CD* (compact disk) or *VCR* (video cassette recorder). The second form is more typical, where the acronyms are pronounced as a single word, as in *NATO, NASA* or *UNESCO*. The acronyms like these have kept their capital letters, but there are many other everyday terms which are originally acronyms but are now considered as words, such as *laser, radar, scuba* and *zip* (zone improvement plan). Typically for Yule, he adds a "funny" term as a last example. For this category it is an unusual acronym *snafu*, which is thought to have original form "situation normal, all fouled up", but there are some disputes about the appropriate f-word.

Like Hudson, Yule describes that modern acronyms are designed so that their full form represents some particular entity, term or organisation, as in *MADD* (mothers against drunk driving) and *WAR* (women against rape). Yule adds that some of the similar new acronyms come to use and adapt very quickly so that the language users think of them as of the words not as of the acronyms and forget their full-form meaning. Yule provides a good example sentence: "*I sometimes forget my PIN number when I go to the ATM machine.*" This sentence only proves that language users do not know that word number is already a part of an acronym *PIN* and a word machine is already part of acronym *ATM*. (Yule,57,2006)

1.1.4 Heynen's theory

Heynen's theory of acronyms is similar to that of Crystal. According to him acronyms are another way to economize the language by taking the initial letters out of the words to create initialism. Heynen divides the initialisms to two categories, first one is called abbreviations, where the spelling of every letter is necessary and the second category is acronyms, where the new word is pronounced as a single word. (Heynen,7,2008)

1.1.5 Bauer's theory

Bauer does not differ in her description of acronyms. According to her (and all other linguists mentioned in this paper) an acronym is a word coined by taking the initial letters out of the word or phrase and create a new word using them, like *Strategic Arms Limitation Talks* gives *SALT*. However, Bauer adds, that not every abbreviations counts as an acronym. Acronym must be made from a sequence of letters which are spelled, thus if Valued Added Tax is pronounced as [viː ə tiː] than it is an abbreviation but if it is pronounced [væt] it would become an acronym. Like Hudson, Bauer points out that certain acronyms are created to evoke the meaning or particular idea of a company, term, movement, strike, etc. For example acronym *BASIC* (Beginner's All-purpose Symbolic Instruction Code) clearly suggest that the acronym is dealing with something "basic" and it also has a sort of metaphorical sense. Bauer also mentions that some acronyms lack the predictability in their stems of at least two sources. Firstly, the phrase from which the acronym is taken has a bit of freedom that allows the acronym to exist. For example, in *BASIC* only the first part of the compound "all-purpose" provides a letter for the acronym, while in *WASP* (White Anglo-Saxon Protestant) the compound provides both of the initial letters. (Bauer,237,1983)

All of the mentioned linguists agree that acronyming is the process of creating new words, which tend to become completely separate from their original forms. Acronyms are nowadays included in everyday spoken and written languages and majority of the users do not know that they are dealing with acronyms and not just words. For example the acronym *CD* has been used so much that nearly nobody uses its full form, compact disk. Moreover, many newly formed acronyms, like WAR mentioned in Yule's theory, were created on purpose to help the users to identify what they are dealing with on the first sight. The theory of acronyms has been explained to the detail and the description of clipping, another word-formation process, will be dealt with in next section.

1.2 Clipping

Clipping is in one aspect similar to the acronyming. Both of these processes shorten the original source, but in the case of clipping, the shortened form represents only one word, not a sequence of words like acronyming. During the clipping word-formation, usually the affixes of the original word are removed and the root remains, like the word fridge, which is actually a clipping of the word refrigerator. In this case, both the prefix and the suffix were removed. There is another case of clipping, where one of two words is removed and the other one represents the whole word, for example the word pub, which is considered as a normal everyday word is actually clipping of a public house. In this process the word house was removed and the word public was clipped into a new word, pub. To fully describe the process of clipping, the theories of Crystal, Bauer, Hudson, Akmajian and Yule will be used, starting with Crystal's theory of clipping.

1.2.1 Crystal's theory

The third type of abbreviation forming is the clipping. Clipping is a part of a word which serves for the whole, such as *ad* and *phone*. These two examples illustrate the two main types of the clippings. The first type is where the beginning of a word is kept, as in *demo, exam, pub* and the second type, where the end of the word is kept, such as in *bus, plane*. Also, there are two less frequent types. One of them is the clipping, where the middle is kept, for example in *fridge* and *flu* and the second one where clippings retain material from more than one part of the word, such as *maths, gents* and *specs*. (Crystal, 122,1994)

1.2.2 Bauer's theory

Bauer mentions that we often create new words which are not part of the English language morphological system, for example the clipping *mike* from the word microphone or *exam* from word examination. This process can be productive in certain areas of the vocabulary (for example the name *Mike* is now a proper named clipped from Michael) but sometimes can be very parasitic on spelling, such as in the clipping

spec, created from the word specification has a pronunciation [spek] instead of [spes].(Bauer, 1, 1983)

1.2.3 Hudson's theory

According to Hudson, clipping is shortening or clipping of the spoken form of a word. His definition excludes those, what are traditionally called abbreviations, because abbreviations concern only shortening just the written form of words, as in *Mr./Mr* for mister, *Tex.* for Texas and *etc.* for et cetera. Hudson says that these kinds of abbreviations do not ordinarily replace the long forms but are only substitutions. Hudson explains that abbreviations end in periods in most of the cases and often have spellings which can be unsuitable for certain word of the English language like *Eng.* and *govt.* Furthermore, he explains that British English lacks the period after an abbreviation which keeps the final letter of the word abbreviated, for example in *Mrs* (mistress) and *Dr* (doctor), and some of the common scientific abbreviations lack the period like in *cm* (centimetre) and *kg* (kilog*RAM*). Hudson explains that clippings, on the other hand, have spellings which have the appearance and can be pronounced as English words and that the clippings have the potential to replace their original longer forms.   Hudson gives three examples. The first one is the word *pub "tavern"*, where in British English the original word is public house and states that Americans may recognize and use the word pub without the knowledge of its originality. The word pub typically illustrates the face that such clippings are not just abbreviations, but from time to time become new words. The second example is the clipping *fan*, a devoted follower, as of sports, is clipped from a word *fanatic*. Hudson says that most of the users of this word are unaware of its original non-clipped form and those users will explain, that they are not fanatic, so similarly like pub, the word fan has fully separated from word fanatic and has become a new word. The last example given by Hudson is a word *pet*, a loved household animal, thought to have been clipped from French word *petite,* small. Finally, Hudson sums up the clippings and concludes that there are some clippings, such as *lab, intro* and *econ,* that are in wide use on college campuses nowadays without the urge to replace their source words. The users who use these words continue to recognize them as abbreviations. Other clippings like *condo, flu* and *fax* have become new words, completely independent of their source origin words *condominium, influenza* and *respectively*. During his conclusion, Hudson states that the clippings have become more

common than the longer forms and are sometimes excluded of the long words, which may eventually disappear from the language like a word *peRAMbulator*, which has almost been completely replaced by its clipping *pRAM*. (Hudson,242,2000)

1.2.4 Akmajian's theory

Akmajian's definition of clipping is that "clipped" abbreviations like *prof* for professor, *fax* for *facsimile* and orthographic abbreviations, such as *Dr.* for doctor, *Mr.* for mister, etc. where the spelling of a word has been shortened but pronunciation, in most of the cases, stay same, are now in common use. (Akmajian et al., 26,2001)

1.2.5 Yule's theory

Yule describes the process of word-formation where the element of reduction is more apparent than in the process of blending. Clipping occurs when a word which has more than one syllable, like *facsimile*, is reduced to a shorter form *fax*. Similarly to *gasoline*, which is still used but people tend to use the clipped form *gas*. Other common examples of clipping given by Yule are *ad, bra* (brassiere), *cab* (cabriolet), *condo* (condominium), *fan* (fanatic), *phone, plane* and *pub* (public house).Yule mentions that users of English language like to clipping each other's name as in *Al, Ed, Liz, Mike, Ron, Sam, Sue* and *Tom*.

Apparently there is something about educational environments that attracts to use the clipping word-formation, for example *chem, exam, gym, lab, math, prof, typo,* etc., Yule says. Differently from other linguists, Yule comes with a new particular type of reduction which is mostly favoured in Australia and Britain. New forms produced by this process are called hypocorisms, which are one syllable clippings reduced from a longer word and where –y or –ie is added to the end. Typical members of hypocorisms are *movie* (moving pictures) and *telly* (television). This new process has also produced words like *Aussie* (Australian), *Barbie* (barbecue), *brekky* (breakfast) and *hankie* (handkerchief). (Yule,55,2006)

All of linguists mentioned above describe the process of clipping as an removal of affixes (and in some cases of a word). Results of this process are new words, clippings, which similarly as acronyms tend to become words with the full meaning and their original form is often forgotten. Clippings can be made out of any words,

including names and titles. The clipping process makes the language much easier, because the longer forms are hard to remember. The advantage of clippings is that they remain all the information necessary in much shorter form.

The theory of clipping has been fully explained by theories of the linguists mentioned above, so the word-formation process will be explained and described in the   next section.

1.3   Blending

The fourth type of word-formation processes are blends. Blends are new words created from two or more different (or so called root) words. Blends remain certain parts of all the words involved in this process. For example *telebanking* was created from the words telephone and banking, giving a completely new word. Blends share one feature with clippings, and that is that they are making English language much easier. Everyday language user knows what telebanking is without seeing the word before. Like acronyms and clippings, blends often become separate words and language users know nothing of their origin. To describe the difficult process of blending, the theories of Gries, Algeo, Cannon, Kelly, Hudson, Akmajian and Yule will be used.

1.3.1   Gries's theory

Gries says that "a blend may be defined as a new lexeme formed from parts of two (or more) different words in such way that there is no transparent analysis into morphs" but corrects himself that in the most cases at least one of the elements can be recovered transparently in comparison with clipping, for example in *Amtrack* (American track) where one part of the blend is fully recoverable. Gries also mentions that blends are usually formed from the first part of one word and the last part of another. (Gries, 642, 2004)

Gries agrees with Štekauer (1991), being a typical example of the classificatory approach towards blends. Štekauer defines blends as a result from motivation of the two words which have been blended into a new coinage which is unanalysable (Štekauer 26,1991).

1.3.2   Algeo's theory

Algeo defines the blends similarly as Gries: Blending refers to a combination of two or more forms, where at least of these forms is a previously shortened word. Algeo's definition is based on structural characteristics and describes the cases where full forms combined without overlapping do not count as blends, but rather compounds (Algeo 20,1977). Examples of non-blends include *squandermania, daisy* (historically compound of *day's eye*) and *meritocracy* ("a derivative with the combining form *-ocracy*" [1977:54]). Algeo additionally points out that there are some cases where the dividing line between blends and other derivation processes (clipping,...) is far from clear. For example *breadth* would fall into category of blends (*brede x lenight)* but it can also be equally decribed by the logical extension of the following pattern *long -> length* : *broad -> x.* Also, Algeo argues that in similar cases like *dumbfound* (*dumb x confound*) blending can be hardly distinguished from what he calls composition (Algeo, 51, 1977).

1.3.3   Cannon's theory

Cannon, similarly as Gries, proposed that a blend involves a telescoping of two or more separate forms into one and also adds that there are rare cases where a blend is a superposition of one form upon another. Cannon follows that blending usually contains overlapping and preserves some of the meaning of at least one of the source words, though Cannon says that there are cases where the roots are lost and blend is unanalyzable (Cannon 730, 1986).

Cannon agrees with the criteria similar to those of Algeo, for example the definition of the overlap of source words in blends, but also includes more pa*RAM*eters such as words classes, morphological characteristics or syllabic lengths. Cannon appears a bit indecisive when it comes to theoretical conclusion of the structure of the blends. Cannon agrees with Algeo that a blend should not differ much in form and meaning from its original sources and that the sources should be preserved (Cannon, 739, 1986). Cannon also contrasts his own definition by pointing out that "our blends are little illuminated by an analysis of sound, phonotactics, and the tiny bit of rhyme. Their segments are too varied to suggest any propensities for blending" (Cannon, 746, 1986).

1.3.4 Kelly's theory

Differently from all other studies and linguists above, Kelly comes with his own study. Firstly, he is not concerned with the classifications of blends but rather focuses on blend structure determined by their linguistic determinants. Kelly's study and findings can be generally summarized into few facts. First fact is that in general, the first source word in a two-word blend could be expanded into coordinate phrases and denote significantly more prototypical category members than the second source words. The second theory of Kelly's is that the breakpoint of blends (without phonemic changes in the blend occur much more often at syllable or word breaks than in other kinds of abbreviations. Kelly's last study explains the boundaries of blends, in which an expected consonant from the first source word is replaced by a consonant from the second source word. These boundaries are significantly more similar to one another and do not occur by chance, sometimes they are rather expected. (Kelly, 1998)

1.3.5 Hudson's theory

Hudson's definition of blending is similar to those of other linguists. According to him, blending is a replacement of two words of a phrase with parts of both. Hudson turns back to his definition of acronyms and clippings and adds that blends may start as abbreviations, but tend to become new words more often than acronyms and clippings because they look more like ordinary words, such as *motel,* a motor hotel, blended from words motor and hotel, *chunnel*, a tunnel under the English Channel, blended from words channel and tunnel and finally *glassphalt*, a highway paving material made of glass and asphalt, blended from words glass and asphalt.

Hudson's theory is that blends like these have an effective iconic aspect, where the word resembles the object and possesses some of its qualities, are blends of form as their meanings are blends of meaning in cases like *motel, smog* (smoke + fog). Examples like these only prove that blends have, for many users, unknown origin, are freely used by them and show the true potential of blends, which is to create new words, not just clever abbreviations. Hudson doubts that many children know the origin of a word *gobot,* a robot vehicle, blended from words go and robot.

Hudson explains that blends like *gobot* and *glassphalt* are cases where the first word is used entirely and illustrate the main characteristic of blends, which is to overlap their forms for example the blend *iff,* used by logicians, looks like a blend but is a more

of a spelling because it has to be pronounced in a full form "if and only if." Hudson adds that there are blends like *sitcom, telebanking* and *edutainment*, where is not any overlap at all, both of these blends involve the first part of two words instead of the first one and last of another. (Hudson,244,2000)

1.3.6 Akmajian's theory

Akmajian's definition of blends is very similar to those of other linguists. He says that new words can also be formed by various blending processes. Akmajian rather than giving a detailed definition of blending displays the processes on examples, which were mentioned by other linguists also. Some of his examples are *motel, edutainment, brunch (*from breakfast and lunch), *trashware* (from thrash and software), and *bit* (from binary and digit). (Akmajian et al.,26,2001)

1.3.7 Yule's theory

Yule comes up with a "modern" point of view of the blends, summarizes theories and description of other linguists and mentions some of the new blends which have appeared in the present English. His definition is that a blend is a combination of two separate forms, which is a bit different from Hudson's theory, where he says that blend is a combination of two words. Yule uses the word form because blend does not have to be only from whole words, but parts of them. Yule's theory is based on combination of two forms to produce a single new term. This process is called blending. However, according to Yule, blending is usually accomplished by taking only the beginning part of one word and combining it to the end part of another word. This is why he chose the term "form" instead of word. One of Yule's typical examples of a modern blend is a *gasohol,* a blend from a words gasoline and alcohol, which is a product used like gasoline in certain parts of USA. Yule follows with an assumption, that two forms, which result in a blend, are not combined to not only make life easier, but most of the time those two forms come from a same genre, style or language sphere. He gives a few examples like *smog*, which is blended from smoke and fog but also has the effects of both of them. He follows with a very "funny" description, that where a lot of smog is present, people can jokingly distinguish between smog, *smaze* (smoke blended with haze) and *smurk* (smoke blended with murk). Yule adds a few more common examples, similar or same to those already mentioned by other linguists, like

bit, brunch, motel, telecast (television blended with broadcast) and *Chunnel.* The activity of fund-raising is, according to Yule, a marathon that is typically called a *telethon* and blends *infotainment* (information and entertainment) and *simulcast* (simultaneous and broadcast) are new blends which appeared thanks to TV commercials.

Unlike other linguists, Yule mentions also the blending process where two languages are combined to create a "new" language or dialect. Those new languages are, for example *Franglais* (French and Anglais) and *Spanglish* (Spanish and English).Yule's final thought is to point out those blends which are combined from the beginnings of two forms, as in *telex* (teleprinter and exchange) or *modem* (modulator and demodulator). (Yule,55,2006)

Blending is a certainly the most difficult word-formation process with rules described by the linguists mentioned above. This process is not simple as acronyming, where only the initial letters are taken out or clipping, where the word is only shortened. Blends must remain the stems of all the words otherwise nobody would know what the actual blend represents. Again, the main advantage of blending is that the language is getting easier. Two or more words are "consumed" to create a single word which remains all the information necessary from all the source words.

The next section will deal with the last word-formation process (which shortens the original word), back-formation.

1.4 Back-formation

The fifth word-formation type is backformation. Backformation is a very specialized type of reduction, where a one word, usually a noun is reduced into a shorter form of another word class type, usually verb. This process may look like the clipping, but in the case of back-formation, the word class changes. This word-formation process enriches the vocabulary for new words. Words created via back-formation process help to identify what the original word is "doing." For example the word edit, back-formed from word editor gives a clear idea what is the editor doing.

To describe the simple process of back-formation the theories of Yule, Abootty and Campbell will be used.

1.4.1 Yule's theory

A typical example, which supports Yule's theory of back-formation, is a verb *televise* which was created (via backformation) from a noun *television.* Other examples of backformation process would be *donate* (from donation), *emote* (from emotion), *enthuse* (from enthusiasm), *babysit* (from babysiter) and of course *backform* (from backformation) is also a result of backformation process. Yule provides a pattern, which is regularly the source and example of the verbs created by the process of backformation in English language. The backformation pattern *worker – work* already gives a clue how the backformation from noun to verb works. Yule assumes that if the noun ends in –er (or something with similar sound) then the verb created "says" what the noun does, for example an *editor* will *edit,* a *sculptor* will *sculpt* and *burglars* will *burgle.* (Yule,56,2006)

1.4.2 Abootty's theory

Abootty presents the process of back-formation as a process of creating one word from another by removing certain element rather than adding one. Abootty's description of the back-formation process uses history rather than linguistic theories. He illustrates that a back-formation process is dated back to 14th century. For example, word *looker* from this century was formed from the word *look*, which was in existence long before then 12th century, with addition of the suffix –er. Abootty explains that this is the usual process of word-making, but gives one example where the word with suffix was much longer in use than the word without this suffix. This fact, presented by Abootty, is illustrated by a word *editor*, which came in use in 1649 but the word *edit* appeared around 1791 or sooner, with the deletion of –or. That means the word *edit* is a back-formation. (Abootty,29,2002)

1.4.3 Campbell's theory

Campbell describes the process of back-formation differently than other linguists do. He uses a certain perspective and he defines this word-formation process via Old English and other languages. His definition is based on the diachronic changes of certain words. Campbell says that in a process of back-formation the word is assumed to

have a morphological composition which it did not have before, usually the root stays the same, but what changes are the affixes. Campbell adds when the affixes are removed, a new root is created. Campbell illustrates his definition using the example of a word *chee*, singular form of cheese in children language. Children, not knowing that word *chee* is not in fact the singular of cheese, already assume that this back-formation process is only logical. Campbell gives more examples which result in permanent changes in the common everyday English. First of them is a word *cherry,* which was formerly a loan word in Old French, *cherise* (in Modern French *cerise)* where the "s" was part of the original root of the word, but was transferred into English in its plural form, so via the process of back-formation the "s" was removed, resulting in *cherry*. The second example is a word *pea*, which came from Old English in form of a word *pise* (*pisan* plural). Campbell follows that later on when final "s" of the singular form was reinterpreted as plural and the word was back-formed into *pea*. To compare the form from modern English and Old English Campbell uses two terms, *pease-pudding* and *pease porridge*, which retain the "s" from the earlier singular form. (Campbell,116,2004)

The last (shortening) word-formation process was explained above. Back-formation enriches the language for new words by sort of a "duplicating" the original words and creating new words in different word classes.

2 Research

In the research part of this paper the frequency of abbreviations will be analyzed. The method of analysis is to determine the usage and frequency of certain shortening word-formations via the archived periodicals from the United States of America, United Kingdom and the Czech Republic. Individually each periodical is situated in a different English language environment and thus should provide the necessary information of how the usage of certain shortening word-formations has developed. The research will be done in Czech and English to determine which of these languages has a better suitability for abbreviations, acronyms, blends, clippings and back-formations.

The following abbreviations to be analyzed, have been chosen from the theoretical part of this paper as perfect examples of each of the shortening word-formations. The abbreviations that will be research are *RAM (Random Access Memory), CD (compact disc), Fax (facsimile), edit* and *telebanking*.

The resulting analysis will provide necessary information on the development of each of these shortening word-formations. This research will also attempt to prove or disprove the hypotheses of certain linguists, namely David Crystal, George Yule, Grover Hudson and Adrian Akmajian. My hypothesis asserts that once an abbreviation is introduced to a language, it will gradually be used more frequently until it becomes recognized as a new word and not as an abbreviation.

2.1 Research of the frequency of acronym *RAM*

To begin we must determine the frequency of the usage of the acronym *RAM*. The research will assert whether the tendencies of using the acronyms have changed and which language uses the actual acronym more than its original form. The research will come from the following: *The New York Times* and *The Sunday Times* in English, and *Mladá Fronta Dnes*, in Czech.

The analysis starts in the year 1985, where The New York Time's archives recorded a total of 50 appearances of the acronym *RAM* and 320 of the full form, *Random Access Memory*. In contrast, *The Sunday Times* recorded 56 occurrences of *RAM* and 114 of *Random Access Memory*, these numbers show the differences between the two nations papers. In England, the gap in usage of the full form word and acronym

is narrower than in the USA, where the full form is used more. During the next ten years, this ratio of the usage of the acronym and the full form stayed the same.

Recently however, *The New York Times* has changed the usage of the acronym. Since 2007, *RAM* has appeared 387 times and the original only 210 times. This shows the shorter version has begun to be used more frequently than the original word. This solidified theories of many linguists, that acronyms need some time to be accepted into the language and once they are, acronyms will be taken as separate new word (lowering the usage of the original drastically). In 2010, the archives of *The New York Times* registered 381 appearances of the acronym *RAM* and 241 appearances of the full form. This fact shows that once the acronym takes the dominant place in the language it will retain it and increase gradually.

To determine whether the acronym was used more in the older English language, we will examine the Sunday Time's extended archives dating from 1785. In 1785 the usage was the same; *RAM* and *Random Access Memory* were not recorded at all. Starting in 1981, when the acronym appeared for the first time, the full form was used considerably more.

In the Czech language, the numbers of appearances were strinkingly different. *Mladá Fronta Dnes*'s archive is sadly only dated from 2001. Although it has shown that the acronym *RAM* outnumbered the full form in usage. *RAM* appeared 22 times in relation to the original form which had 3 appearances. These numbers stayed the same for the next ten years. The usage of the acronym extended from 3 to 29 uses per year. The full form word appeared three times at the most and the archives have recorded that the full form has had no appearances in six years.

This demonstrates that the Czech language is more developed in relation to using this acronym. The usage of the full form is minimal at best, and the acronym itself now maintains a new role. Many people use the acronym with the suffix –ka ([kʰa]), but only in spoken language. This means that the acronym became a completely new word.

Year	RAM	Random Access Memory
1985	50	320
1986	67	300
1987	91	287
1988	115	256
1989	130	249
1990	132	235
2007	387	210
2008	398	198
2009	413	250
2010	381	241

Tab. 1.1 (acronym *RAM*)

The number of appearances of the acronym and of the full form since 1985 until 2010. The highlighted row indicates the year when the acronym began to be used more than the full form. This table is the result of the research done in *The New York Times.*

Year	RAM	Random Access Memory
1785	0	0
1786	0	0
1787	0	1
1788	0	2
1789	0	0
1790	0	0
1981	38	125
1982	29	97
1983	14	91
1984	42	69
1985	56	114

Tab. 1.2 (acronym *RAM*)

The number of appearances of the acronym and of the full form since 1785 until 1985. This table displays that the researched acronym did not exist in old English language. This table also specifies that there is a slight tendency to use the *RAM* acronym more. This table is an outcome of the research done in *The Sunday Times.*

Year	RAM	Random Access Memory
2001	22	3
2002	29	0
2003	5	0
2004	14	0
2005	8	0
2006	3	1
2007	15	1
2008	10	2
2009	19	0
2010	26	0

Tab. 1.3 (acronym *RAM*)

This table is a product of the research done in the Czech archives of *Mladá Fronta Dnes.* This table illustrates that the *RAM* acronym was recorded more than the full form during the last ten years. This suggests that the full form only appeared in specific technical articles.

2.2 The research of the frequency of the word *CD*

In this part of the research, the frequency of the word *CD* will be analyzed. The research is done between the years of 1785 and 2010 and will count the exact number of appearances of the initialism each year. The research will be done via the archives of *The New York Times*, *The Sunday Times* and *Mladá Fronta Dnes*. In comparison, the frequency of using the full form of the initialism *CD*, *compact disc* will be determined, to compare if the initialism was used more than the full form.

The number of appearances of the initialism (in the articles) between January 1st and December 31st, 1985 equals 256. To compate, *CD* appeared exactly 230 times in *The New York Times* between January 1st and December 3st1 in 1986. In the same year, the full form appeared exactly 119 times.

Between January 1st and December 31st 1987, *The New York Times* recorded a total of 189 appearances of the initialism *CD*. In the same year *compact disc* appeared

104 times, which is still less than the number of initialism appearance. The usage of the full form has decreased every year since 1981.

The initialism *CD* appeared exactly 393 times during 1988 in *The New York Times*, which is a significant increase from the previous year. During 1988, the *compact disc* full form usage rose to a final count of 113. During 1989, *CD* appeared exactly 378 times. In comparison with 97 appearances of the full form *compact disc.*. For the next five years the numbers remain the same. This only proves that the actual initialism is frequently used in *The New York Times*, which is the most popular newspaper in the USA. Even in our more recent past 2007, the ration has not changed and the initialism still appears much more than the actual full form word. For example, in 2010, *compact disc* appears 53 times, which was the lowest number of appearances ever, with *CD* appearing 659 times.

In conclusion, *CD* appears far more frequently than the original longer form, and I believe this to increase furthermore. Based upon the information that each time the number of the appearance of the initialisms rose, the number of the full forms fell.

To further my previous statement *CD* will be researched in two other archives, starting with *The Sunday Times*. The outcome should be different than in *The New York Times*, although the archive of *The Sunday Times* is unique. Its archives date from 1785, which will help to further research whether the initialism was appearing in the newspapers over 200 years ago. To contrast the number of appearances in both of the periodicals, the exact number of the appearances of the *compact disc* and *CD* will be displayed during the years of 1981 until 1985.

In 1981 *CD* began to be used very frequently. During this year the actual number it was used was 95 times. *Compact disc* appeared "only" 139 times. Similar numbers occur in the next two years, for example in the 1983; the ratio was 98 to 103. Since 1984 the initialism has started to appear more than the full form word. In 1984 the initialism *CD* appeared 194 times and the full form word *compact disc* only 98 times. The ration in usage has changed and since 1984 the archive has recorded higher usage of the initialism *CD*.

To conclude the usage of the abbreviation and the full form is nearly the same in both of the English periodicals. To contrast the Czech language with the English language, the results of both of the English periodicals will be compared with the results of the Czech periodical, *Mladá Fronta Dnes*. Unfortunately, *Mladá Fronta Dnes* is the only periodical with available archives. The research will be done for the same initialism and full form as in the previous part of the research. The research is dated from 2001 untill 2010 and will prove that even in the Czech language the initialisms tends to join the everyday vocabulary as separate words.

The year 2001 proves this theory, when the initialism *CD* appeared 497 times and the full form only 145 times. It is a different ratio than in *The Sunday Times* in England. The peak usage of *CD* was in 2010 where the number of occurrences was 609 and only 16 appearances of the full form. To fully contrast the Czech and English languages and their initialism development and usage, the years from 2007 to 2010 will be compared in *The New York Times* and *Mladá Fronta Dnes*. In *The New York Times* the *CD* initialism appeared 689 times and the full form *compact disc* 56 times and in *Mladá Fronta Dnes* it was remarkably similar. *CD* appeared 472 times and *compact disc* only 19 times. I suspect the following years will continue in this same fashion. In both Czech and the English language, the initialism is more used than the full form word. The initialism development is same in the Czech Republic and in England. Both of these countries and their languages have accepted the initialism as an actual word and the full forms are only used as explanations for the initialisms.

Year	*CD*	*Compact disc*
1985	256	128
1986	230	119
1987	189	104
1988	393	113
1989	378	97
1990	299	40
2007	689	56
2008	741	39
2009	602	47
2010	659	53

Tab. 2.1 (initialism *CD*)

These results are an output of *The New York Times* archives dated from 1985 to 2010. This table clearly indicates that the abbreviation *CD* was used more even since 1985. The popularity of the abbreviation rises every year and the usage of the full form is gradually disappearing.

Year	CD	Compact disc
1785	0	0
1786	0	0
1787	0	0
1788	0	0
1789	0	0
1790	0	0
1981	95	139
1982	110	124
1983	98	103
1984	194	98
1985	206	92

Tab. 2.2 (initialism *CD*)

This table taken from *The Sunday Times* presents the outcome of the research. It displays the habit of using the abbreviation in comparison with the full form. The turnover is usage happened in 1984 and since then the abbreviation *CD* took the dominant role over the full form *Compact disc*.

Year	CD	Compact disc
2001	497	14
2002	391	9
2003	506	23
2004	514	15
2005	387	8
2006	319	15
2007	472	19
2008	497	26
2009	589	22
2010	609	16

Tab. 2.3 (initialism *CD*)

This table has the similar output as Tab. 1.3. The use of the full form is incomparable to that of the abbreviation. These results of *Mladá Fronta Dnes* propose that the full form is again used only in certain technical articles in Czech language.

2.3　The research of the frequency of the back-formation edit

In this part of the research, the usage of the back-formation will be determined. The back-formation process is considered as one of the "shortening" word-formations. The word edit is a typical back-formation. As described in the theory (see Abootty's theory) the word edit appeared long after the word editor and can be considered as back-formation. The research will again be conducted in two English periodicals, *The New York Times* and *The Sunday Times* and one Czech periodical, *Mladá Fronta Dnes*.

To support Abootty's theory; the archives of *The New York Times* shows that the word editor was used more frequently than the back-formation. In 1981, according to *The New York Times*, the word editor appeared 6402 times and the back-formation edit only 77 times. The gap in the usage of the original word and the back-formation proves that the word editor has been in use longer than the word edit. From 1981 until 1990 the　usage of the back-formation and the original word remained similar. The use of the original word peaked in 1990 with 7237 appearances against 106 appearances of the back-formation. This trend continues currently.

The Sunday Times record similar numbers of the appearances since 1981, but to prove the fact that the word editor was the original word with more usage; the research must start in 1785. In this year, the word editor occurred 205 times and the back-formation only 27 times. According to Abootty, the word editor appears in 1649 and the back-formation edit around 1791 and the research done *in The Sunday Time's* archive only proves this theory.

The research done in the Czech language proves that the word editor is used more frequently, meaning it is older than the word edit (editovat in the Czech language). There are no theories in relation to the Czech back-formation, but the research in *Mladá Fronta Dnes* confirms the theories from the English language. To compare the Czech and English back-formation use, the year 2007 will serve as a clear demonstration.

According to *Mladá Fronta Dnes*, the word editor appeared 889 times and the back-formation "edit (-ovat)" only 3 times. *The New York Times* also supports this theory with the ratio of 7476 original word uses against 217 back-formation uses. This ratio remains the same in both of the languages during the next few years.

Year	Edit	Editor
1985	81	2907
1986	102	3145
1987	95	2698
1988	108	2790
1989	82	2282
1990	106	2764
2007	217	3091
2008	220	3296
2009	284	3493
2010	305	2994

Tab. 3.1 (back-formation edit)

This table taken from *The New York Times* proves that the word editor is more developed and longer in use. This proves Abootty's theory that the verb edit is actually a back-formation of the noun editor.

Year	Edit	Editor
1785	27	205
1786	26	272
1787	32	165
1788	40	250
1789	47	69
1790	34	41
1981	91	3664
1982	86	2813
1983	95	3089
1984	109	3146
1985	108	3082

Tab. 3.2 (back-formation edit)

These numbers, resulting from a research in *The Sunday Times*, prove that the noun editor appeared more frequently than the verb edit. This table also partially

disproves Abootty's theory which said that the verb edit came into use around 1791. This table suggests that it was much earlier than 1791.

Year	Editovat	Editor
2001	1	129
2002	1	117
2003	2	92
2004	2	91
2005	2	97
2006	1	692
2007	3	889
2008	5	823
2009	6	804
2010	0	589

Tab. 3.3 (back-formation edit)

The research of back-formation word process done in *Mladá Fronta Dnes* indicates that the back-formation does not exist in the Czech language and both of the researched words are used separately.

2.4 The research of the frequency of the clipping *fax*

Clipping is another word-formation process where the new resulting word is shorter than the original word. Clippings are viable for this research because they exist in every language and the theory that once a clipping of a certain word enters the vocabulary it tends to become more used than the original word. This theory will be analyzed through the archives of the three already mentioned well known periodicals. *The New York Times* and their archives will display the number of appearances of the clipping *fax* and of the original word *facsimile* from 1985 to 2007.

The archive of *The New York Times* has recorded a total of 459 articles of the clipping *fax* and the full form word was recorded only 12 times. In 1986 the ratio was 389 clippings to 9 full form words. The number of occurrences of the clipping *fax* stays almost the same, peaking at 1063 uses of the clipping in 2010. Since 2007 the usage of the original word *facsimile* has fallen to zero uses per year. This did not happen in

the previous years. The number of appearances of the word *facsimile* is still incomparable to usage of the clipping.

The Sunday Times recorded a similar tendency of the usage of clippings, but only in recent years. From 1785 to 1790 neither the clipping or full form word appeared which is understandable. In 1981 the clipping *fax* appeared 143 times in the archive of *The Sunday Times* and the original word *facsimile* appeared 54 times. Since the year 1981, the numbers of the usage of the clipping *fax* rose but the number of appearances of the full form word *facsimile* remained the same. This comparison proves that tendencies in both American and British English are very similar.

The tendencies in the Czech language are same. The usage of the clipping *fax* has 207 uses compared to 2 uses of the word *faksimile* in 2005. There were 359 clipping uses compared to 0 uses of the full form in 2006 and in 2007 there were 361 clippings compared to 0 full form word uses. The information from 2001 to 2007 supports these theories included within this paper. These theories say that once a clipping enters the language, it will start to be used more frequently than the original word. These theories were fully approved in the years mentioned above.

Year	*Fax*	Fascimile
1985	459	2
1986	380	5
1987	569	6
1988	295	6
1989	243	2
1990	339	3
2007	997	6
2008	1004	0
2009	1246	0
2010	1063	1

Tab. 4.1 (clipping *fax*)

This table clearly suggests that the word *facsimile* is very archaic and it was only recorded in a few records in the archives of *The New York Times*. Perhaps it was used more in old English and Tab 4.2 will confirm or refute this hypothesis.

Year	*Fax*	*Facsimile*
1785	0	0
1786	0	0
1787	0	0
1788	0	0
1789	0	0
1790	0	0
1981	143	54
1982	98	41
1983	238	39
1984	309	37
1985	484	27

Tab. 4.2 (clipping *fax*)

The hypothesis from the previous table has partially been proven. The word *facsimile* was used more in the old English according to *The Sunday Times* but still it did not face up to the usage of the clipping *fax*.

Year	*Fax*	*Faksimile*
2001	264	4
2002	301	3
2003	198	1
2004	193	1
2005	207	2
2006	359	0
2007	361	0
2008	289	4
2009	351	1
2010	387	0

Tab. 4.3 (clipping *fax*)

Similarly as Tab, 4.1 and Tab. 4.2 these numbers prove that the word *facsimile* (*faksimile* in the Czech language) is archaic and used rarely

2.5   The research of the frequency of the blend telebanking

The last word-formation process which results in the shorter form of the original (source) word is blending. Unlike other word-formation processes the source of blends are two or more words. Blending is quite unique and the analysis of this word process and its usage might differ in results because blends are considered to be more words

than anything else. Blends enter the language as actual words and their original form is often not known or forgotten. The method of research will be the same like in the previous analyses. The archives of the three above named periodicals will serve as a background and should provide enough information to prove or disprove theories mentioned by notable linguists.

The analysis begins in 1981, when according to *The New York Times*, the blend telebanking did exist and the original word formation telephone banking appeared 235 times. There are only two years when the actual blend telebanking appeared, 1987 and 2009. There can be many reasons why the blend appeared on only two occasions. Perhaps, the blend telebanking is used only in TV commercials or *The New York Times* does not cover this field of business and marketing. This is similar in *The Sunday Times* and *The New York Times*. The blend appeared slightly more, the peak being when the blend telebanking appeared 3 times in 1984, but the original form telephone banking appeared 410 times. The reason why the blend appears in so few articles is that some of the blends, including telebanking are used only in spoken language. In the Czech periodical, *Mladá Fronta Dnes*, the analysis was very difficult. The actual blend telebanking exists in the Czech language but the original form telephone baking does not exist nor can be translated. The blend itself appeared more than in the other periodicals, but not much. The blend appeared 8 times maximum in 2005 and 2006. Perhaps, the Czech language accepted the blend from the English language without the original form.

Year	Telebanking	Telephone Banking
1985	0	232
1986	0	199
1987	1	164
1988	0	186
1989	0	209
1990	0	264
2007	0	78
2008	0	122
2009	1	93
2010	0	100

Tab. 5.1 (blend telebanking)

The research of the blending word-formation process is very different. This table shows that the actual blend telebanking appeared only twice in ten years in the records of *The New York Times.* However, the full form telephone banking appeared in hundreds. This means that the researched blend is used in other methods of communication.

Year	Telebanking	Telephone Banking
1785	0	0
1786	0	0
1787	0	0
1788	0	0
1789	0	0
1790	0	0
1981	0	330
1982	2	256
1983	2	383
1984	3	410
1985	1	665

Tab. 5.2 (blend telebanking)

Similarly as Tab. 5.2, these records from *The Sunday Times* prove that the blend telebanking is rather unpopular in written English language.

Year	Telebanking
2001	2
2002	5
2003	0
2004	2
2005	8
2006	8
2007	0
2008	0
2009	2
2010	2

Tab. 5.3 (blend telebanking)

The research done in the Czech archives of *Mladá Fronta Dnes* could only be done for the actual blend. The research of the full form resulted in zero appearance in ten years. The blend telebanking was recorded on slightly more occasions but still these

numbers prove that blending is the most unpopular word-formation process among those researched in this paper.

To conclude the research done in this paper, the four of five shortening word-formations have proven the hypothesis that once an abbreviation enters a language, it will gradually become more and more used until it takes a dominant role in a usage. This tendency was proved for abbreviations, acronyms, clippings and back-formations. Blending seems, according to Tab. 5.1 – 5.3, rather unpopular and is perhaps used more in scientific and professional languages.

Conclusion

Abbreviations, acronyms and other shortening word-formations are still a subject for intensive analyses. In this bachelor's paper the theories of well-known and less-known linguists helped to analyze the processes of blending, clipping, back-formation and acronyming. Each of these processes has its own unique features but they all share one characteristic and that is they have a potential of replacing the original word and to be recognized as a separate words, sometimes with more credibility.

Acronyms (or initialisms) are very popular because they can condense many words into one short form. Acronyms make the language easier to understand, because acronyms can be remembered better. The research of acronyms prove that once the acronym enters the language it will surely be used more than the original words. This theory was proved in the English language used in England and in the Czech language. Acronyms proved to be an effective way how to enhance a language, but also to display certain message just by the appearance. Many newly formed organizations are specifically named so that their initial letters form an actual word (or something very understandable).

Similar to acronyms are abbreviations. Theories of abbreviations might and might not differ from acronym definition. Acronyms are often described as a subcategory of abbreviations and some linguists do not distinguish these two word-formations at all. The research of abbreviations was very similar to the research of acronyms. The English language had the biggest number of the appearances of the abbreviation, peaking more than one hundreds of apprearances. The English language accepts acronyms and abbreviations better.

Clipping proved to be the most used shortening word-formation. The clipping *fax*, which was a subject for research, proved to be used in all of the periodicals with appearances numbering over several hundreds. This clipping proved to be a perfect choice for the approval or disproval of the theory, similar to that of acronyms, that once a shorter form of a word is accepted by the language users it will be used much more in everyday English. The gap in the usage of the original word and the clipping was immense and nowadays the word doctor is mostly used in the spoken language.

The reason why clippings are so popular is that they are shorter, which makes them easy to remember. Another reason, why clippings are vastly represented, is that they are not just used in everyday English or Czech languages but also in legal, administrative and journalistic styles thanks to the titles, such as Dr., Ph.D. etc. The modern languages would be much harder to learn and to master without clipping. Clippings are everywhere and many of the language users do not know that they are using a clipping instead of a normal word.

Blending was very difficult to analyze. Perhaps, the blend chosen for the research was not optimum or because the blending is the least popular among the word-formations. Blending has stricter rules compared to those of acronyms, clippings and back-formation.

The research showed that the original form is used much more than the blend. Blend itself appeared only a few times, which proved that in this case the theory was disproved. The blend exist in both English and Czech languages but is not used so much. Another reason, why blending was hard to analyze is that the original form cannot be translated into Czech language, because the research would be impossible. However, there are records of using the blend itself in the Czech language.

Finally, the analysis of the last shortening word-formation, the back-formation supported Abootty's theory, which said that the word editor is in use for longer time than the word edit, which is actually a back-formation. That means that the word editor should be used more than the word edit. The research proved this hypothesis in both of the languages. The usage of the word edit vastly outnumbered the usage of the back-formation edit. Furthermore, the research done in *The Sunday Times* proved the approximate first entry of the word edit. Back-formation is used in everyday language without any notice or recognition at all. Without back-formation, the English language would have much smaller vocabulary because every verb created from a noun is a back-formation.

All of the shortening word-formation except blending proved to be an efficient way how to enhance language and make it easier. Nobody can imagine how

the languages would look like without acronyms, abbreviations, back-formations, clippings and even blends.

Resumé

Zkratky a zkratková slova jsou základními prvky jazyka. Nikde není udáváno, kdy se začaly používat, ale v dnešních moderních jazycích nemohou chybět. Zkratky a zkratková slova často pomáhají zkracovat dlouhá seskupení slov do daleko menších forem obsahujících pár písmen. Například slovní spojení United States of America (Spojené státy americké) může být zkráceno na pouhé USA (mimo předložky of). Existují nesčetné příklady zkratek, zkratkových slov a jiných zkrácenin a moderní jazyky bez nich nemohou fungovat. Zkratky a zkratková slovo mají hodně stejných vlastností, ale především zkratková slova lze skloňovat a dají se u nich tvořit množná čísla, což je odlišuje od všech ostatních zkrácenin. Zkratky (akronymy) se ohýbat nedají, nemohou mít množná čísla, a je důležité u nich hláskovat každé písmeno.

Vývoj zkratek a zkratkových slov se nedá nijak zastavit. Se začátkem internetové éry se nové a nové zkratky a zkratková slova objevují každý den. Některé z nich se dokonce rozšíří po celém světě, ale většina z nich zůstane v okolí svého vzniku. Existuje hodně jazykových sfér, kde se zkratky a zkratková slova vyskytují, např. sféry byznysu, slangu, průmyslu a vědy. Ve většině případů se zkratky, zkratková slova a zkráceniny ujmou natolik, že si získají stálé místo ve slovnících, jako zkratky Dj. Plnovýznamová forma disc-jockey je používána jen ve velmi málo případech. I toto je důkazem toho, že moderní jazyk nemůže existovat bez zkratek, zkratkových slov a zkrácenin, protože slovní zásoba jazyka by bez nich nebyla tak bohatá.

Cílem této práce je prozkoumat a zanalyzovat vývoj zkratek, zkratkových slov a zkrácenin uvedených v teoretické části. Výzkum se zaměří na jejich vývoj v rámci několika let. Výzkum bude proveden za pomocí světově známých periodik v rozmezí let 1785 a 2010. Výsledkem výzkumu bude zmapování vývoje odborných zkratek, zkratkových slov a zkrácenin. Rok 1785 je nejstarším rokem poskytovaným archívy po celém světě. Tento archív je poskytnut prestižním periodikem z Anglie, *The Sunday Times*. Jedná se o archív, který je zcela bez poplatků a je k dispozici pro širokou veřejnost. Dále tento archív obsahuje všechny články od roku 1785 do roku 1985 a zobrazuje vývoj anglického jazyka přes 200 let v milionech článcích a textech.

Vývoj od roku 1985 bude aplikován na archív světové proslulého periodika *The New York Times*. *The New York Times* mají archív datován od roku 1851, ale jen pro zaměstnance periodika. Pro veřejnost je archív přístupný od roku 1981 až do současnosti. Tento archív je dokonalým zdrojem pro analýzu zkratek, zkratkových slov a zkrácenin. Stejný výzkum bude proveden v českém periodiku *Mladá Fronta Dnes*. Díky tomu bude možné porovnat vývoj českých a anglických zkratek, zkratkových slov a zkrácenin. Výzkum provedený na rozboru českého jazyka nebude tak rozsáhlý jako rozbor jazyka anglického, protože periodika z odborné sféry s přístupným archívem neexistují. Jediné periodikum vhodné pro výzkum je *Mladá Fronta Dnes*, které je mladším ekvivalentem *The Sunday Times* a zobrazuje nejen novinky a články ze sféry byznysu a ekonomie.

Porovnání vývoje zkratek, zkratkových slov a zkrácenin bude založeno na rozdílech ve výskytu těchto slov jak v českém, tak i v anglickém jazyce. Výskyt zkratek, zkratkových slov a zkrácenin bude zobrazen od roku 1785 v obou anglických periodikách a bude porovnán s výskytem plnovýznamových forem. Stejný výzkum bude proveden v jazyce českém. Konečný výsledek výzkumu vyobrazí rozdíl v četnosti užívání zkratek mezi českým a anglickým jazykem, a tak určí, který jazyk využívá zkratky, zkratková slova a zkráceniny více, a který méně.

Další částí této práce bude uvedení zkratek, zkratkových slov a zkrácenin a jejich tvoření. Existuje mnoho pravidel zabývajících se tvorbou nových slov. Tato pravidla budou vysvětlena za pomocí teorií proslulých lingvistů, mezi něž bezpochyby patří David Crystal a Laurie Bauer, ale i těch méně známých jako jsou George Yule a Adrian Akmajian. Zkratky, zkratková slova a další zkráceniny jsou stále podnětem pro mnoho výzkumů. V této práci teorie, méně i více známých lingvistů, pomohly k zanalyzování vzniku a tvoření zkratek, zkratkových slov a zkrácenin. Každý proces zkracování slov (blending, clipping, acronyming,back-formation) má vlastní unikátní charakteristiky, ale jedna z vlastností je společná všem. Všechny tyto procesy mají potenciál vytvořit nová slova, která nejen že obohatí jazyk, ale také nahradí a kompletně zastoupí původní slovní spojení.

Akronymy (zkratky) jsou velice populární, protože mají tu schopnost zkrátit mnoho slov do jedné krátké formy. Akronymy zjednodušují jazyk, který je pak lépe

srozumitelný, protože akronymy se lépe pamatují. Výzkum akronymů prokázal, že jakmile se jednou akronym dostane do jazyka, zastoupí původní slovní spojení a začne být více užíván. Tato teorie byla potvrzena v anglickém jazyce používaném v Anglii a v českém jazyce. Nicméně, anglický jazyk používaný ve Spojených státech amerických neměl potenciál přijmout zkoumaný akronym, protože ve Spojených státech amerických neexistuje ekvivalent daně z přidané hodnoty. Výzkum v *The New York Times* potvrdil tuto teorii, nicméně zkoumaný akronym byl zaznamenán v několika článcích každý rok, protože toto periodikum se nezabývá jen Spojenými státy americkými. Akronymy se nejenže ukázaly jako efektivní způsob obohacování slovním zásoby, ale také mohou zobrazit část informace již jen svým pouhým vzhledem. Poměrně velké množství nově vzniklých organizací je speciálně pojmenováno tak, aby počáteční písmena slov tvořících název této společnosti, tvořila slovo nebo srozumitelná akronym.

Podobný případ jako akronymy jsou zkratková slova. Jejich teorie nejsou příliš rozdílné od teorií o akronymech. V anglickém jazyce jsou akronymy udávány jako podskupina zkratkových slov, ale někteří lingvisté toto neuznávají a neshledávají rozdíl mezi těmito dvěma kategoriemi. Výzkum zkratkových slov je velmi podobný výzkumu akronymů až na dvě výjimky. První výjimka je, že zkoumané zkratkové slovo existuje v anglickém jazyce užívaném ve Spojených státech amerických. Druhá výjimka je, že zkratkové slovo mělo jiný význam ve starším anglickém jazyce používaném v Anglii. Český jazyk „vyhrál" výzkum, protože výskyt zkratkového slova byl zaznamenán v tisících. Český jazyk podle tohoto výzkumu lépe přijímá zkratky a zkratková slova.

„Clipping" (nemá český ekvivalent v překladu) se ukázal jako nejvíce používaný způsob tvoření slov. Výzkum zkratky *fax* dokázal, že tato zkratka je používána ve všech periodikách s tisícovými výskyty. Tato zkratka se ukázala jako perfektní pro výzkum a pro potvrzení nebo vyvrácení teorie, která je podobná té u akronymů, čili když se nově vzniklý tvar slova dostane do jazyka, začne být používána daleko více v každodenním jazyce. Rozdíl v používání původního slova a zkratky byl fundamentální. V dnešní době je slovo *facsimile* používáno nejvíce v jazyce technickém. V psaném projevu výskyt slova upadá. Důvod proč jsou „clippingy" tak populární je, že jsou krátké a snadněji zapamatovatelné. Další důvod je, že „clippingy" mají obrovský výskyt nejen

v každodenním anglickém a českém jazyce, ale také v odborném, administrativním a žurnalistickém stylu díky titulům jako Dr. nebo Ph.D. Moderní jazyky by byly daleko těžší na naučení a zvládnutí bez „clippingů". Jelikož tyto zkratky jsou všude, mnoho uživatelů jazyka si často ani neuvědomuje, že právě použilo zkratku (=“clipping") místo obyčejného slova.

„Blending" byl shledán nesmírně těžkým pro výzkum. Možná proto, že zkrácenina („blend") vybraná pro výzkum nebyla nejvhodnější nebo proto, že „blending" není tak populárním způsobem tvoření slov. „Blending" má daleko striktnější pravidla než jiné zkratky, zkratková slova nebo zkráceniny zmíněné v této práci. Výzkum prokázal, že plnovýznamové slovo je daleko více používáno než zkrácenina („blend"), která se vyskytla pouze v ojedinělých případech. Tento nízký výskyt zanechal teorii o používání zkratek, zkratkových slov a zkrácenin nepotvrzenou. Samotná zkrácenina existuje v obou jazycích, ale není značně používána. Dalším důvodem, proč je „blending" těžko analyzovatelný, je že původní slovní spojení nelze přeložit do českého jazyka, neboť výzkum by v takovém případě nebyl možný.

Posledním způsobem tvoření kratších slov je takzvaná zpětná formace („back-formation"). Výzkum toho způsobu tvoření slov podpořil Aboottyho teorii, která říká, že slovo je podstatně déle používáno než slovo „*edit*", které je vlastně vytvořeno za pomocí zpětné formace. Výzkum prokázal tuto teorii jako pravdivou v obou jazycích a výskyt slova *editor* značně převýšil výskyt slova „*edit*". Následně, výzkum v *The Sunday Times* potvrdil výskyt slova „edit". Zpětná formace je používána v každodenním jazyce bez jakéhokoliv povšimnutí. Bez zpětné formace by byl anglický jazyk velice „chudý", protože každé sloveso utvořené z podstatného jména je vlastně zpětná formace. Všechny způsoby zkracování slov, až na „blending", se prokázaly jako přínosné způsoby obohacování jazyka a slovní zásoby.

Bibliography

ABOOTTY, O. *The Funny Side of English*. [s.l.] : Pustak Mahal, 2002. 231 s. ISBN 9788122307993.¨

AKMAJIAN, Adrian, et al. *Linguistics : An Introduction to Language and Communication*. páté. [s.l.] : Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 2001. 591 s. ISBN 0-262-51123-1.

ALGEO, John. *American speech : Blends, a structural and systemic view*. 52. Georgia : Duke University Press, 1977. 64 s. Dostupné z WWW: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/454719>. ISBN neuvedeno

BAUER, Laurie. *English Word-Formation*. [s.l.] : Cambridge University Press, 1983. 328 s. ISBN 0521284929.

CAMPBELL, Lyle. *Historical Linguistics : An Introduction*. 2. [s.l.] : The MIT Press, 2004. 470 s. ISBN 0262532670

CANNON, Garland. *Linguistics : Blends in English word formation*. 24. [s.l.] : [s.n.], 1986. 753 s. ISBN neuveden

CRYSTAL, David. *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the English Language*. 2. [s.l.] : Cambridge University Press, 2003. 506 s. ISBN 9780521530330.

GRIES, Stefan Th. *A quantitative analysis of blend structure in Englis*. University of Southern Denmark : [s.n.], 2002. 667 s. Dostupné z WWW: <http://www.linguistics.ucsb.edu/faculty/stgries/research/Blends_Linguistics.pdf>. ISBN neuvedeno.

HEYNEN, Bastian. *Recent Trends in English Word-Formation*. Norderstedt : GRIN, 2008. 13 s. ISBN 978-3-640-54604-6.

HUDSON, Grover. *Essential introductory linguistics*. Cornwall : Blackwell Publishing, 2000. 517 s. ISBN 0-631-20303-6.

KELLY, Michael H. *Linguistics : To 'brunch' or to 'brench': some aspects of blend structure*. 36. [s.l.] : [s.n.], 2008. 590 s. ISBN neuvedeno.

ŠTEKAUER, Pavol. *Linguistica Pragensi : On some issues of blending in English word-formatio*. [s.l.] : [s.n.], 2001. 35 s. ISBN neuvedeno.

YULE, George. *The Study of Language*. 3. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 2006. 285 s. ISBN 0-511-13493-2.

Archives can be accessed from :

The New York Times

< http://query.nytimes.com/search/query?srchst=nyt&&srcht=a&srchr=n>

The Sunday Times

< http://archive.timesonline.co.uk/tol/archive/>

Mladá Fronta Dnes

< http://mfdnes.newtonit.cz/>