LEXICAL BLENDS IN THE LITHUANIAN LANGUAGE: THE CASE OF *THE DATABASE OF LITHUANIAN NEOLOGISMS*

Agnė ALEKSAITĖ*

Abstract: Lithuanian linguistics tracts have long approached lexical blends exclusively as *speech-error blends*. Latest research based on the continuously updated Database of Lithuanian Neologisms (DLN) shows that, when it comes to the Lithuanian language, there are the distinct *speech-error blends* and *intentional blends*, accounting for 2.4% of all new lexis in the DLN. The aim of this paper is to look into the recorded blends from the following perspectives: (a) origin; (b) structure; (c) type of blending, and so on. The article also contains a brief introduction of the DLN that has been in the works at the Institute of the Lithuanian Language since 2011, it being the source of the material covered in the study, as well as a concise overview of the scarce studies of blends in Lithuania.

In Lithuanian linguistics tracts, lexical blends, or blends (for more on the definition of this term, see Cannon 1989: 107–108; Skardžius 1996: 21; Bat-El 1996: 283; Plag 2003: 17; Katamba 2005: 128; Arndt-Lappe, Plag 2013: 537) of two words (or several words on very few occasions (Plag 2003: 155; Bauer 2006: 501; Cook, Stevenson 2010: 130; Renner 2019: 30), have long been 'fringe phenomena that do not merit any closer scrutiny' (Miliūnaitė 2014: 246), isolated breaks in speech ('some kind of slip of a tongue'; for more, see Urbutis 2009: 354–355) that occur for psychological reasons, such as the 'speaker's inability to choose a particular competing unit' (LKE 2008: 282), e.g., *dvėlė* from **dv**asia 6. 'spirit, soul' (CLLD 2017) and **v**ėlė 1. 'in Christian religion, the soul of the dead'[1] (CLLD 2017), and their method of formation – blending – is not to be considered a 'part of the process of word formation in its traditional sense' (Miliūnaitė 2014: 249). The material available in the Database of Lithuanian Neologisms (DLN) shows that this

---

* PhD student, Junior Researcher at the Research Center of the Standard Language, Institute of the Lithuanian Language, P. Vileišio g. 5, LT-10308 Vilnius, LITHUANIA (ag.aleksaite@gmail.com).
[1] In the article, parts of the source words that made their way into the lexical blend are highlighted, elements of overlapping segments underlined.

type of formations are 'not some isolated breaks in speech but rather neologisms as the product of conscious linguistic activity' (Miliūnaitė 2014: 261); therefore, one must 'differentiate between the blending in speech and language' (Murmulaitytė 2018: 65).

Foreign linguistics papers delineate this distinction between blends using terms such as *speech-error blends* and *intentional blends* (Gries 2004: 201; 2012: 146; cf. this distinction is referenced in Urbutis 2009: 354–355). Even though foreign (just like Lithuanian) linguistics tracts would not pay a lot of attention to blends (Bat-El 1996: 283; Lehrer 2003: 369, 379; Renner 2019: 27; for shortage of this kind of research in the Croatian language see Mikić Čolić 2015: 25), however, recently there have been quite a few papers approaching blends as the product of conscious linguistic activity, linguistic game (Gries 2012: 145; Villoing 2012: 40; Ahn 2014: 26; Renner 2015: 121, 130 et al.). Besides, they offer a much more graphic, expressive (Lehrer 2003: 370), as well as efficient medium to denominate a thing, phenomenon, and whatnot (Miliūnaitė 2014: 256; Mikić Čolić 2015: 26, 32); in other words, blends have 'two meanings rolled into one word' (Miliūnaitė 2014: 250).

The aim of the study

The aim of this paper is to analyse the blends recorded in the DLN from the following aspects: (a) origin; (b) structure; (c) type of blending, and so on.

This article relies on the DLN, which is subject to ongoing development. As of 16 November 2020, the DLN contained 6,103 lexicographically defined language units, of which 274 were blends, including loanwords where the blending took place in a language other than Lithuanian, and 12 potential blends where the formation in the Lithuanian language is unclear.

The structure of the article is as follows: (1) introduction; (2) a review of the DLN, constituting the source of the subject material; (3) a review of blend studies in Lithuania; (4) analysis of borrowed blends that made their way into the Lithuanian language; (5) analysis of Lithuanian indigenous lexical blends from different angles; and (6) conclusions.

The Database of Lithuanian Neologisms, a structured source of new lexis

Launched by the Institute of the Lithuanian Language in the fall of 2011, the Database of Lithuanian Neologisms (DLN, http://naujazodziai.lki.lt) is so far the only effective Lithuanian database that compiles new language units in a structured fashion and contains records of new language units (words, collocations, and abbreviations) that originated in the Lithuanian

language at the turn of the 21st century and are in use by the general public[2] (for more about the utility of the database for language users, see Vaskelaitė 2017: 7). Data for the database are collected manually[3] from a lot of extremely variegated texts of public usage, such as online news portals, fiction, advertising, blogs, social media, and so on (Miliūnaitė 2015: 170). Around 500 new words are published every year. This may not seem like much, but collecting data is manual labour, the top priority being quality rather than quantity. Approximately 20% of the data are sent in by users (also see Miliūnaitė 2018: 6), which 'debunks the two tenacious myths that the Lithuanian language is dying and that new words are being created exclusively by linguists' (Vaskelaitė 2017: 7). Of course, the DLN does not include socially unacceptable curse words, vulgarisms, limited social slang, specific rare professionalisms, and specialist terminology from narrow fields (Miliūnaitė 2012: 10). The selection of data for the DLN is grounded on one criterion that is recognised in theory and practice of new coinages, which is the recording of words and their meanings in dictionaries. New coinages are words and meanings thereof that are not featured in main sources of lexicography. The dictionaries containing lexis originating in the early 21st century that are important for the purposes of establishing the database are *The Contemporary Lithuanian Language Dictionary* (CLLD 2017), *The Dictionary of the Lithuanian Language* (DLL 2017) and *The Dictionary of International Words* (DIW 2001).

The database is provided to language users 'as a non-finite and ever-evolving, growing collection of data' (Miliūnaitė 2012: 10); it stores and structures lexical innovations that are recorded by hand and describes on the basis of various lexical, grammatical, stylistic, and normative attributes (for more on the nature and sources of the DLN data and screening and presentation of neologisms, see Miliūnaitė 2015). Automated search in the DLN facilitates retrieval of neologisms containing certain attributes, affixes, and stems (based on sequences of letters); made with entries from various texts, the database is a 'source for new linguistic phenomena just as it is an instrument of investigating the current state and evolution of words, one that, in addition to neologisms, allows obtaining information about them

---

[2] *The New Borrowings Database* (NBDB, http://nsdb.sociolingvistika.lt/?lid=1) administered by the Sociolinguistics Department at the Institute of the Lithuanian Language deserves a separate mention. As of 4 November 2020, the database contained 2,295 language units that only give the 'view of one facet of the neologisms of the period, which is the new borrowings' (Miliūnaitė 2012: 6). What was left out of the NBDB completely, was 'another large portion of neologisms: new coinages that bear no connection with loanwords, as well as indigenous words that have attained new meanings' (Miliūnaitė 2012: 6); by contrast, the DLN is 'only concerned with new lexis: indigenous, as well as foreign' (Miliūnaitė 2012: 7).
[3] Tools of automatic extraction of neologisms from online news portals are currently at the stage of development.

that is relevant from the standpoint of studies of word formation' (Murmulaitytė 2016: 1; also see Miliūnaitė 2018: 16); in other words, it 'is one of the most critical and exciting ongoing resources of the modern Lithuanian language that can be dissected in terms of origin, norm, semantics, and other aspects' (Rimkutė-Ganusauskienė 2019: 185). Of course, compiled manually, the DLN material does not offer an objective and comprehensive view of the quantity, spread, formation, and other aspects of neologisms (Miliūnaitė 2012: 10), even though 'continued monitoring of usage makes it possible to detect new phenomena /…/ much sooner before they could be entered into one corpus or the other' (Miliūnaitė 2009: 98).

The article relies on the material available in the DLN that, albeit less voluminous compared to corpuses, allow pinpointing the underlying methods of origination of neologisms in the modern Lithuanian language, and the emerging tendencies in formation. What makes the database unique is that, in addition to professional linguists, it is being developed by the general public, which follows its sense of language and knowledge of the mother tongue to recognise new language phenomena and deliver it to the DLN's developers.

Review of blends in Lithuanian linguistics tracts

This chapter contains a concise, chronological overview of Lithuanian linguistics tracts referring to blends (see Table 1).

Table 1. *Assessment of blends in Lithuanian linguistics tracts*

Lithuanian linguistics tract (see References for full title)	Original quote regarding blends	Translation of the quote regarding blends	Assessment grade[4]
KTŽ 1990	*Naujo žodžio ar posakio atsiradimas, sumyštant dviejų žodžių arba posakio dalims* (p. 108).	The emergence of a new word or phrase through amalgamation of parts of two words or a phrase (p. 108).	0
Skardžius 1996	*Kontaminaciniai dariniai yra tokie, kurie sąmyšio keliu yra sudaryti iš*	Blends are formations made, by way of mixing, of two synonyms or	0

---

[4] A negative grade of assessment is market with a [-], meaning that blending is not considered a method of word formation – these are *speech-error blends*; a positive grade of assessment is market with a [+], meaning that blending is perceived as a regular thing – here we have *intentional blends*. Definitions of blending with no grade attached are marked with a [0]; any shortage of data to be able to determine whether blending can be considered a method of word formation is marked with a [?].

	dviejų sinoniminių arba kokių nors giminingų žodžių (p. 21).	some other related words (p. 21).	
Kabašinskaitė 1998	*Liaudies etimologija, kontaminacija, taip pat ir (leksinė) analogija lemia jokiais griežtais dėsniais nenumatomus, nenuspėjamus žodžių kitimus ir turėtų priklausyti žaismingajai kalbotyros, tiriančios žodžių istoriją, kertelei. Šie reiškiniai atspindi kalbos ryšį su asociacinėmis žmogaus mąstymo savybėmis, bet pats jų vyksmas nėra chaotiškas; egzistuoja tam tikri dėsningumai, pagal kuriuos galima klasifikuoti, grupuoti įvairius jų atvejus* (p. 5).	Folk etymology, blending, as well as (lexical) analogy results in unpredictable word transformations that cannot be explained with any strict rules, and should be put into the playful corner of linguistics dealing with the history of words. These phenomena reflect the connection between language and the associational qualities of human thinking, although the process as such is not chaotic; there are some laws that allow us to classify, categorise different cases (p. 5).	+[5]
INTe 2008	3. *kalbot. naujo tarpinio kalbos vieneto susidarymas kryžiuojantis dviem artimiems kalbos vienetams.*	3. *Ling.* the formation of a new interim language unit through the crossing of two similar language units.	0
LKE 2008	*Kontaminacijos padariniai paprastai suvokiami kaip vienkartinės kalbėjimo klaidos ir tik retai kada įsigali kalboje* (p. 282)[6].	The consequences of blending are usually perceived as one-time speech errors and rarely find a foothold in language (p. 282).	-
Urbutis 2009	*Žodžių darybai terūpi dariniai, o ne fonetiniai ar kitokie perdirbiniai, vienų teksto žodžių keitimas kitais, kontaminacijos padariniai ir panašūs dalykai* (p. 324).	Word formation is only concerned with derivatives rather than phonetic or some other adaptations, substitution of some words in a text with others, the consequences of blending, and whatnot (p. 324).	-
Miliūnaitė 2014	*Dabartinėje lietuvių kalbos vartosenoje*	Blends account for a noticeably increasing	+

---

[5] In this paper, blending (along with other specific phenomena of analogy, such as folk etymology, lexical analogy) is addressed as a regular phenomenon.
[6] The article is signed V. U., which stands for Vincas Urbutis.

	pastebimai gausėjančią naujažodžių dalį sudaro kontaminaciniai dariniai (maišiniai), kurių padažnėjo skolinantis ar verčiant iš kitų kalbų, taip pat šiek tiek pasidaroma pačioje lietuvių kalboje. Taigi vyraujantis šių darinių tipas – ne pavieniai kalbėjimo riktai, o naujažodžiai kaip sąmoningos kalbinės veiklos rezultatas (p. 261).	portion of neologisms in the modern usage of the Lithuanian language, their number growing through borrowing or translation from other languages; some of them originate from Lithuanian as well. Therefore, the prevalent type of these formations are not isolated speech breaks, but rather new coinages as a result of conscious language activity (p. 261).	
Murmulaitytė 2018	*Reikėtų į kontaminantus rimčiau pažvelgti ne vien kaip į atsitiktinius, kalbėjimo reiškinius ir pripažinti, kad jie kuriami ne tik netyčia 'suklupus liežuviui' ar kitaip pačiam kūrėjui netikėtai, bet (turbūt net dažniau) sąmoningai. [...] Tam būtina sukaupti gerokai daugiau indigenios maišybos pavyzdžių, nei tiriamuoju laikotarpiu buvo užfiksuota [...] (p. 68).*	Blends should be given more serious attention not just as some incidental occurrences of speech, recognising that they do not occur merely as a 'slip of the tongue' or in some other way, surprising to the author, but consciously (which probably happens even more often). /…/ This requires gathering a much larger base of cases of indigenous blending than that, which was recorded during the period covered by the study /…/ (p. 68).	+, ?

As the above table shows, Lithuanian linguistics tracts have barely touched upon blends so far. The scientific papers that have been published earlier offer a brief definition of blending without any grade (KTŽ 1990, Skardžius 1996, INTe 2008), or a definition of blending with a negative grade, where this phenomenon is perceived purely as *speech-error blends* (LKE 2008, Urbutis 2009), with one exception of a scientific study that approached blending as a conscious, regular occurrence (Kabašinskaitė 1998). Latest research (by the way, conducted on the basis of the DLN) shows that one must draw a line between *speech-error blends* and *intentional blends* in the Lithuanian language, because conscious blending two words occurs quite frequently (Miliūnaitė 2014, Murmulaitytė 2018).

Analysis of borrowed blends in the Lithuanian language

As it was already mentioned, as for 16 November 2020, there were 274 blends and 12 potential blends recorded in the DLN[7], of which 130 were loanwords (47.4%) and 144, indigenous blends (52.6%). The breakdown of borrowed blends by origin is displayed in Table 2.

Table 2. *The origins of borrowed blends*

Donor language	Examples	Count	Percentage
English	*banksteris* 'a dishonest banker engaging in criminal banking activity' < *bankster* < ***bank**er* + *gang**ster*** etc[8]	108	83.1%
Russian	*okupendumas* 'the referendum on the separation of Crimea from Ukraine that took place on terms of occupation (unconventional warfare) on 16/3/2014' < *окупендум* < ***оккуп**ировать* + *рефе**рендум***	15	11.5%
French	*bistronomija* 'a trend to go to a small inexpensive restaurant that looks like a diner' < *bistronomique* < ***bistro**t* + *gastro**nomique***	2	1.5%
Spanish	*pokeritas* 'a Mexican burrito with poke' < *pokerrito* < ***poke*** + *bu**rrito***	2	1.5%
Greek	*glotozauras* 'a language that has kept its archaic qualities' < ***glōtt**a* + *dino**zauras***	1?[9]	0.8%
Italian	*frapučinas* 'a cold coffee drink that comes in a bottle' < *frappuccino* < ***frapp**e* + *ca**ppuccino***	1	0.8%
Swedish	*frigebudas* 'the name of a Swedish garden house' < *friggebod* < ***Friggebo*** + ***bod***	1	0.8%
Total		130	100%

[7] Blends of unknown formation are excluded for the purposes of general statistics and will be covered at the end of the article.

[8] *infokalipsė* 'a global disastrous internet connectivity failure' < *infocalypse* < ***info**rmation* + *apo**calypse***; *labraliūtas* 'a Labrador groomed to resemble a lion' < *labra-lion* < ***labra**dor* + ***lion***; *masknė* 'a skin disease caused by prolonged mask-wearing' < *mascne* < ***mask*** + *a**cne***; *sekstingas* 'swapping erotic images in the electronic media (usually by text messages or e-mail)' < *sexting* < ***sex*** + *tex**ting***; *skortai* 'a short garment: a pair of shorts and a skirt all in one' < *skort* < ***skirt*** + *s**horts***.

[9] This is most probably an indigenous blend deriving from foreign (Greek) words.

The DLN data presented above show that most of the blends come to the Lithuanian language from today's *lingua franca* – the English language[10], which leads 'both as a source language and as an agent language' (Rutkienė 2019: 148; for more on this instrument of international communication, see Crystal 2003; 2005: 36–37; Girčienė 2006: 2–3). Other donor languages (for more on this term, see Wohlgemuth 2009: 51), such as Russian, French, Spanish, Greek, Italian, and Swedish, have loaned by a word or two to the Lithuanian language, with Russian standing out with a slightly higher prolificacy rate, it being the language of a neighbouring state. A massive 98.5% borrowed blends in the Lithuanian language are nouns.

Analysis of Lithuanian indigenous lexical blends: their composition, patterns of lexical blending, and so on

At this time, there are 144 indigenous blends recorded in the DNL, including 138 nouns (95.8%), 2 verbs (1.4%), 1 adjective (0.7%), 1 onomatopoeic word (0.7%), 1 conjunction (0.7%), and 1 collocation (0.7%)[11]. The donor language of these blends are shown in Table 3.

Table 3. *Lithuanian indigenous lexical blends by lexical category*

Lexical categories of source words	Lexical categories of lexical blends	Examples	Count	Percentage
noun + noun	noun and *collocation[12]	*akvarezija* 'poetry illustrated with water colours' < *akvarelė* + *poezija* etc[13]	112	77.8%
adjective + noun		*elektrukas* 'an e-card (bought and	12	8.3%

---

[10] Notably, the English language is considered prestigious in Lithuania (Grumadienė 2004: 214; also see Vaicekauskienė 2007: 34).

[11] The DLN has been found to contain one collocation based on blending: *europanglų kalba* 'the English language affected by European languages that is used in the communication of different European nations' < *Europa* (noun) + *anglų* (noun) (*languages*).

[12] Blending (noun + noun combination) was the method used in deriving the above collocation *europanglų kalba*, which does not have a lexical category.

[13] *biurozauras* '*iron*. a person who has held the managing position in an institution (usually, a governmental body)' < *biuras* + *dinozauras*; *Dovanorama* 'the name of a mall in Vilnius, temporarily doctored to attract shoppers during the rush to buy Christmas presents' < *dovanos* + *Panorama*; *kalėdonomika* 'calculating the spending on Christmas' < *Kalėdos* + *ekonomika*; *katuiruotė* '*jest*. a cat scratch mark on a person' < *katė* + *tatuiruotė*; *kiaulega* '*jest*. a colleague who is not averse to swinery' < *kiaulė* + *kolega*; *kurortinas* 'mass self-isolation at a resort (on a beach) during the lockdown' < *kurortas* + *karantinas*; *Vilnecija* '*jest*. Vilnius that resembles Venice after a flood caused by a summer shower' < *Vilnius* + *Venecija*.

		sent online)' < ***elektr****oninis, -ė* + *atvi****rukas*** etc[14]		
verb + noun		*čiulbingala* '*jest.* a singing nightingale (the name of a woodcarving)' < ***čiulb****ėti* + *lakš****tingala*** etc[15]	10	6.9%
onomatopoeic interjection + noun		*miaujiena* 'news relating to cats and cat care' < ***miau*** + *nau****jiena***	2	1.4%
*abbreviation + noun[16]		*es'faltas* '*iron.* asphalt installed with European Union (EU) fund moneys' < ***ES*** + *as****faltas***	2	1.4%
noun + adjective		*baslikas, -a* '*jest.* prostrate like a post' < ***basl****ys* + *p****aslikas***	1	0.7%
noun + verb	verb	*klaipėdinti* '*jest.* (to) move around Klaipėda' < ***Klaipėd****a* + ***pėdinti***	1	0.7%
verb + verb		*padainaklamuoti* 'to recite by singing' < ***padain****uoti* + conjunctive vowel *-a-* + *de****klamuoti***	1	0.7%
noun + adjective	adjective	*kaunastiškas, -a* '*hypoc.* typical of Kaunas as a	1	0.7%

---

[14] *geronomika* 'good, positive economic news' < ***ger****as, -a* + *ek****onomika***; *Klaikėdos* '*iron.* a commercialised Christmas that has lost its true meaning' < ***klaik****us, -i* + *Ka****lėdos***; *klaikraštis* '*jest.* a newspaper that spreads horrific information' < ***klaik****us, -i* + *lai****kraštis***; *vulgaretė* '*iron.* an operetta made vulgar' < ***vulgar****us, -i* + *ope****retė***; *žeuras* '*jest.* a neologism based on the consonance with the adjective *žiaurus* (brutal), a name for the euro that everyone in Lithuania is looking forward to, yet could devastate Lithuania's economy' < *žiaurus, -i* + ***euras***.

[15] *išsigimenceris, -ė* '*contempt.* a degenerate (antisocial) influencer' < ***išsigim****ti* + *influen****ceris***; *perkatonas* 'a marathon of online shopping' < ***perk****a* + *mar****atonas***; *vėminutyvas* '*contempt.* a puke-inducing diminutive' < ***vėm****ė* + *de****minutyvas***; *verktinis, -ė* '*iron.* a crying conscript; someone who is crying over the conscript military and wants to dodge the service or someone who is mocking it; someone who cries over something for no reason' < ***verk****ti* + *šauk****tinis***.

[16] The first source word is an abbreviation without a lexical category.

		wonderful, fantastic city' < ***Kaun**as* + *fant**astiškas***		
noun + onomatopoeic interjection	onomatopoeic interjection	*bumbuliokšt* '*hypoc.* a word to describe a fall of a child who is just learning to walk' < ***bumbul**is* 'kūdikis' + *keber**iokšt***	1	0.7%
conjunction + conjunction	conjunction	*irba* 'conjunction and/or' < ***ir** + a**rba***	1	0.7%
		Total	144	100%

The DLN's data show that the most prolific lexical blending combinations are noun + noun (77.8%), followed by adjective + noun (8.3%), and verb + noun (6.9%); the productivity of other combinations is negligent. Notably, according to the DLN, right now Lithuanian word combinations only involve 2 source words. Moreover, studies of other languages have shown that 'blends are often composed of two semantically similar words' (Cook, Stevenson 2010: 135).

In the Lithuanian language, blends are usually made with 6 main types of blending (see Table 4).

Table 4. *Types of lexical blending*

Type of blending	Examples	Count	Percentage
Both source words are abridged	*grizotas* 'buckwheat risotto (with buckwheat instead of rice)' < ***gri**kiai* + *ri**zotas* etc[17]	102	70.8%
Only the first source word is abridged	*fotelova* 'a multifunctional piece of furniture: an easy chair that doubles as a bed' < ***fotel**is* + ***lova*** etc[18]	16	11.1%
Only the second source word is abridged	*meškafonas* 'a cell phone for kids aged 3–8 that only has several functions' < ***meška*** + *tele**fonas*** etc[19]	18	12.5%

[17] *koronorama* 'the name of a news show at the time of the coronavirus pandemic' < ***koron**a* + *Pa**norama*; *okupantsaka* '*jest.* people's talks, stories of soviet ideology' < ***okupant**ai* + *pa**saka*; *oropokalipsė* 'a threatening apocalyptic vision potentially brought on by air pollution' < ***or**as* + *ap**okalipsė*; *poilsenybė* 'His Highness on a royal vacation' < ***poils**is* + *did**enybė*; *stiliabaisa* '*jest.* someone's horrendous dress style' < ***stili**us* + *pa**baisa*; *tortilainis* 'a snack, a mix between a tortilla and a hotdog' < ***tortil**ija* + *dešr**ainis*; *vasovas* '*jest.* wintry March' < ***vas**aris* + *k**ovas*.
[18] *meškelionė* 'a trip of a bear family' < ***mešk**a* + *k**elionė*; *panikorona* 'panic due to the coronavirus' < ***panik**a* + *k**orona*; *pasakelionė* 'an educational genre – a role-playing journey through fairy tales' < ***pasak**a* + *k**elionė*; *sūrprizas* '*jest.* a prize with a lot of cheese (a Dutch hotdog)' < ***sūr**is* + ***prizas***.

Neither of the source words is abridged	The above *europanglų kalba* < **Europa** + **anglų** (*kalba*) etc[20]	4	2.8%
Sandwich blending[21]	*ekskremlentai* '*contempt.* Kremlin's propaganda filth that TV channels are spreading' < **ekskrem** + **kreml** + *entai* < *ekskrementai* + *Kremlius* etc[22]	2	1.4%
Other	*seimokratūra* '*iron.* the parliament turned prosecutor's department' < **Seim**as + *prok*u*ratūra* etc[23]	2	1.4%
Total		144	100 %

The DLN shows that most of the blends in the Lithuanian language were made by shortening both source words (70.8%); coining blends by shortening the first (11.1%) or only the second (12.5%) source word is not a very strong trend. Considering all types of blending, one can see that the ratio between lexical shortening and other methods (where source words are not shortened or the shortening is not the underlying and only type of blending) is about 94:6. The blends *seimokratūra* and *verygmarinas* merit a separate mention: Table 4 shows that they were made not only by shortening both source words, and by dropping certain parts of the word (-*u*-, -*ga*-) to make pronunciation easier.

Most (64.6%) indigenous blends do not have any overlapping segment; the DLN has been found to contain around 35.4% indigenous blends with overlapping segments (see Table 5; cf. Ahn 2014: 23).

Table 5. *Lithuanian indigenous lexical blends overlapping segment*[24]

---

[19] *panikademija* 'panic over an epidemic' < **panika** + *epi***demija**; *šlamštastika* 'a loan translation to denominate a show about the effects of garbage on our planet' < **šlamštas** + *fant***astika**; *šlamštastika* '*pejor.* crummy journalism' < **šlamštas** + *žurnali***stika**; *veryganas*, -*ė* '*jest.* a non-drinker who actively support Health Minister Aurelijus Veryga's policy on tightening alcohol control' < **Veryga** + *ve***ganas**, -*ė*; *žirnelistika* '*jest.* the part of the media that supports the ideas of Ingrida Šimonytė, the politician who made polka-dot textile popular' < **žirnelis** + *žurna***listika**.

[20] *kekskavatorius* '*iron.* a digger in Kaunas, the future 2022 European capital of culture (KEKS), demolishing the architectural heritage of the inter-war era' < **KEKS** + **ekskavatorius**; *trumpasakaitė* 'a short tale' < **trumpas**, -*a* + *pas***akaitė**; *zebrasilas* 'a mixture between a zebra and a donkey' < **zebras** + **asilas**.

[21] '[...] a sandwich blend is a blend in which (part of) one of the source words is sandwiched between two splinters of the other source word (e.g. *pyrimidine* < *pyri* + *imid* + *idine* < *pyridine* + *imide*)' (Renner 2019: 32).

[22] *postkapitalipsė* 'a threatening post-apocalyptic vision of the end of the capitalist society' < **post** + **kapitali** + **lipsė** < *postapokalipsė* + *kapitalizmas*.

[23] *verygmarinas* '*iron.* a neologism for margarine in reference to Health Minister Aurelijus Veryga's decree' < **Veryga** + **mar**g*arinas*.

Type of overlapping segment	Example	Count	Percentage
Consonant	*kalafobija* '*jest.* the fear of buying cauliflowers because of how expensive they have become' < **kala*f*ioras** + **f*obija*** etc[25]	23	45.1%
Vowel	the above *akvarezija* < **akvar*e*lė** + po**e*zija*** etc[26]	12	23.5%
Grapheme	*kaunastika* 'the entirety of the untold experiences of visiting Kaunas' < **Kaun*as*** + *fant*as*tika* etc[27]	16	31.4%
	Total	51	100%

Most of the blends found in the DLN had a consonant as their overlapping element (45.1%). The most frequently-occurring blending consonants are as follows: *-l-* (4 neologisms), such as the above *fotelova* < **fote*l*is** + **l*ova***; *-t-* (4 neologisms), such as the above *katuiruotė* < **ka*t*ė** + ta**t*uiruotė***; *-d-* (3 neologisms), such as the above *pindemija* < **pin*d*ėti** + pan**d*emija***, and *-m-* (3 neologisms), such as the above *šeimūnas* < **šei*m*a** + sei**m*ūnas***. Blends with the vowel as an overlapping element were half as many (23.5%). The most frequently occurring blending vowels are as follows: *-a-* (5 neologisms), such as the above *barbaliausė* < **barb*a*ras** + **k*a*liausė**. Nearly 31.4% Lithuanian blends have blending graphemes; as often as not, these are two overlapping letters (10 neologisms), such as the above *kaunastika* < **Kaun*as*** + *fant*as*tika*; less frequently, three overlapping letters (5 neologisms), such as the above *baslikas, -a* < **bas*lys*** + p**a*slikas***; in some isolated cases, there are four overlapping letters (1 neologism), such as the above *ekskremlentai* < **eks*krem*** + **k*reml*** + **entai** < *ekskrementai* + *Kremlius*.

Studies of other languages have showed that it is usually the second source word that constitutes the larger part of a blend (Arndt-Lappe, Plag 2013: 542). The DLN has been found to contain 64.6% Lithuanian blends, which stands to prove this argument: such as *bumsiklopedija* 'an educational playbook with a toy (*bumsius*) that a retail chain is distributing for marketing purposes' < **bums*i*s** (5 letters) + *enc*i*klopedija* (10 letters),

---

[24] 'An overlapping segment is a segment in a blend shared by the two source words' (Ahn 2014: 23).

[25] *pindemija* '*pejor.* a pandemic that is making the public mad; going mad by talking about the pandemic non-stop' < **pin*d*ėti** + pan**d*emija***; *šeimūnas* 'an MP who is taking care of family affairs' < **šei*m*a** + sei**m*ūnas***.

[26] *barbaliausė* 'a scarecrow made to scare barbarians away' < **barb*a*ras** + **k*a*liausė**; *pliažašius* '*iron.* the beach at the Lukiškės Square (a historic landmark) in Vilnius installed there at the initiative of Vilnius Mayor Remigijus Šimašius)' < **plia*ž*as** + **Šim*a*šius**.

[27] *navakaras* 'a night of the poet Kęstutis Navakas' < **Nava*ka*s** + **va*ka*ras**; *pusbrolakis* 'a character in a book: a werewolf's cousin' < **pusbro*l*is** + *vilk*o*lakis*.

darbostogos 'a time when a person is juggling between work and vacation, trips outside of the office' < ***darb****as* (4 letters) + *a****tostogos*** (7 letters) (cf. Eng. *workation*), *pupulis* 'a ball of beans and vegetables' < ***pup****a* (3 letters) + *kuk****ulis*** (4 letters). Even 'if both source words are equally long, the second word contributes more because this would enhance its recognisability by compensating for the fact that it is not processed in the normal way' (Gries 2004: 204), such as the above *barbaliausė* < ***barba****ras* (5 letters) + *kali****ausė*** (7 letters) and *grizotas* < ***gri****kiai* (3 letters) + *r****izotas*** (6 letters), and so on. With 23.6% Lithuanian blends, the largest part of the blend is made up by the first source word, such as the above *akvarezija* < ***akvar****elė* (7 letters) + *po****ezija*** (5 letters), *pliurpalyvas* '*pejor.* a narrative on the level of gibberish' < ***pliurpal****as* (8 letters) + *nar****atyvas*** (4 letters), *šaukštutė* 'a hybrid of spoon and fork' < ***šaukšt****as* (6 letters) + *šak****utė*** (3 letters) (cf. Eng. *spork*). The length of 11.8% of indigenous blends is defined by the first and the second source word in equal measure, such as the above *Dovanorama* < ***dova****nos* (6 letters) + *Pa****norama*** (6 letters), *eurosaka* '*jest.* people's talks, tales of the European Union and its ideology' < ***Euro****pa* (4 letters) + *pa****saka*** (4 letters), *žmoganzė* 'a hypothetical hybrid of man and chimpanzee' < ***žmog****us* (4 letters) + *šimp****anzė*** (4 letters) (cf. Eng. *humanzee*).

Notably, 44.4% Lithuanian blends (64 neologisms) carry out an emotional-expressive function, meaning that these neologisms are typically used in jest (51.6%, or 33 neologisms), such as *relaksencija* 1. '*jest.* the relaxation of His Excellency the President during the coronavirus pandemic'; 2. '*jest.* a relaxed His Excellency the President' < ***relaks****acija* + *eksc****elencija***; less often, used to demonstrate irony towards an object, phenomenon, and so on (31.3%, or 20 neologisms), such as *eurasamtis* '*iron.* the colander that the Ministry of Defence purchased for euros at an overly-inflated price for the army's kitchen' < ***eur****as* + *kiau****rasamtis***. In isolated cases, they stand to express a strong negative opinion: pejorative (7.8%, or 5 neologisms), such as *klerkvabalis* '*perj.* a name for a clerk' < ***klerk****as* + *ka****rkvabalis***, and contemptuous (6.3%, or 4 neologisms), such as the above *išsigimenceris, -ė* < ***išsigim****ti* + *influ****enceris***; the DLN has been found to contain 2 blends with a strong positive (hypocoristic) shade (3%, or 2 neologisms), such as the above *bumbuliokšt* < ***bumbuli****s* 'kūdikis' + *keber****iokšt***.

A separate group in the DLN consists of 12 lexical blends labelled as *(possible) blend*. These neologisms were not included in the article for the purposes of general statistics. The DLN usually reserves this label to blends with a meaning that can be explained in different ways, such as *melagiena* '*perj.* fake, misleading news' (cf. Eng. *fake news*) could be either a lexical blend (< ***melagi****ngas, -a* + *nauj****iena***), or a derivative with the suffix *-iena* (: *melag-is̶, -ė* + *-iena* = *melagiena*; cf. Lith. *naujiena*); *spintologija* 'the ability to manage the contents of your wardrobe and dress yourself properly'

could be either a lexical blend (< ***spint**a* + *psich**ologija*** (?)), or a compound (: *spint~~a~~* + connective vowel *-o-* + *-logija* according to INTe 2008 'the second part of a compound that points to its connection with a certain science'; also see OED), or a derivative with the suffix *-ija* (: *spintolog-~~as~~*, *-ė* + *-ija* = *spintologija*).

Conclusions

1. The database contains 274 lexical blends, consisting of loanwords (47.4%) and indigenous blends (52.6%) in roughly equal amounts. Most blends have made their way into the Lithuanian language from English, the modern-day *lingua franca* (83.1%). Other donor languages – Russian (11.5%), French (1.5%), Spanish (1.5%), Greek (0.8%?), Italian (0.8%), and Swedish (0.8%) – have loaned but a word or two to the Lithuanian language; Russian, the language of Lithuania's next-door neighbour, however, stands out amidst this group of languages with a slightly higher degree of productivity.

2. Borrowed and indigenous blends in the Lithuanian language are dominated by nouns (98.5% and 95.8%); in other words, the DLN contains a predominant amount of nominative neologisms that denominate new realities (by performing a referential and emotional-expressive function).

3. DLN data show that the most productive lexical blending combinations are noun + noun (77.8%), followed by adjective + noun (8.3%), and verb + noun (6.9%); the productivity ratio of other combinations is miniscule. Notably, the blending of Lithuanian words currently involves just 2 source words.

4. The database contains lexical blends made under 6 patterns of lexical blending. Most blends in the Lithuanian language are made by shortening both source words (70.8%); somewhat fewer lexical blends are made by only shortening the first (11.1%) or the second (12.5%) source word; the productivity of other types of lexical blending is negligible.

5. Most (64.6%) of the Lithuanian blends present in the DLN do not have an overlapping segment. 35.4% of indigenous lexical blends have an overlapping segment: an overlapping consonant (45.1%), overlapping graphemes (more than two letters) (31.4%), or an overlapping vowel (23.5%).

6. 44.4% Lithuanian blends in the database have a stylistic connotation: many of these neologisms carry either a facetious (51.6%), or an ironic (31.3%) emotional-expressive shade.

7. Based on the DLN, it can be seen that, despite the established tradition, a distinction must be made between *speech-error blends* and *intentional blends* in the Lithuanian language, which account for 2.4% of the whole of the new lexis in the DLN.

References

Ahn 2014	= Suzy Ahn, Faithfulness conflict in Korean blends, in *University of Pennsylvania Working Papers in Linguistics* 20 (1), 21–30. https://repository.upenn.edu/pwpl/vol20/iss1/4/.
Arndt-Lappe, Plag 2013	= Sabine Arndt-Lappe, Ingo Plag, The role of prosodic structure in the formation of English blends, in *English Language and Linguistics* 17 (3), 537–563. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1360674313000154.
Bat-El 1996	= Outi Bat-El, Selecting the best of the worst: the grammar of Hebrew blends, in *Phonology* 13, 283–328.
Bauer 2006	= Laurie Bauer, Compounds and minor word-formation types, in *The Handbook of English Linguistics*, Edited by Bas Aarts, April McMahon, 483–506, Malden: Blackwell.
Cannon 1989	= Garland Cannon, Abbreviations and acronyms in English word-formation, in *American Speech* 64 (2), 99–127.
CLLD 2017	= Editor-in-chief Stasys Keinys, *The Contemporary Lithuanian Language Dictionary*, Vilnius: The Institute of the Lithuanian Language. http://lkiis.lki.lt/dabartinis (only available in Lithuanian).
Cook, Stevenson 2010	= Paul Cook, Suzanne Stevenson, Automatically identifying the source words of lexical blend in English, in *Computational Linguistics* 36 (1), 129–149.
Crystal 2003	= David Crystal, *English as a Global Language*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Crystal 2005	= David Crystal, *Kalbos mirtis*, Vilnius: Tyto alba.
DIW 2001	= Valerija Vaitkevičiūtė, *The Dictionary of International Words*, Vilnius: Alma littera.
DLL 2017	= Editor-in-chief Gertrūda Naktinienė, *The Dictionary of the Lithuanian Language* I–XX (1941–2002), Vilnius: The Institute of the Lithuanian Language, www.lkz.lt (only available in Lithuanian).
DLN	= Rita Miliūnaitė, Agnė Aleksaitė, *The Database of Lithuanian Neologisms*. Ongoing online database since 2011. By Rita Miliūnaitė,

	Vilnius: The Institute of the Lithuanian Language. http://naujazodziai.lki.lt, https://doi.org/10.35321/neol (only available in Lithuanian).
Girčienė 2006	= Jurgita Girčienė, Naujieji skoliniai ir jų atitikmenys, in *Gimtasis žodis* 6, 2–7. http://etalpykla.lituanistikadb.lt/fedora/get/LT-LDB-0001:J.04~2006~1367154452710/DS.002.0.01.ARTIC.
Gries 2004	= Stefan Th. Gries, Some characteristics of English morphological blends, in *Papers from the 38th Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistics Society* II, Edited by Mary A. Andronis, Erin Debenport, Anne Pycha and Keiko Yoshimura, 201–216, Chicago: Chicago Linguistics Society.
Gries 2012	= Stefan Th. Gries, Quantitative corpus data on blend formation: psycho- and cognitive-linguistic perspectives, in *Cross-disciplinary perspectives on lexical blending*, Edited by Vincent Renner, François Maniez & Pierre J. L. Arnaud, 145–167, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. http://www.stgries.info/research/2012_STG_QuantDataBlendFormation_CrossDiscPerspLexBlend.pdf.
Grumadienė 2004	= Laima Grumadienė, Skolinimosi pobūdis pasaulio kalbose, in *Skoliniai ir bendrinė lietuvių kalba*, Vilnius: Lietuvių kalbos instituto leidykla, 210–217.
INTe 2008	= Editor-in-chief Algimantas Kinderys, Kompiuterinis tarptautinių žodžių žodynas *Interleksis*, Vilnius: Alma littera, Fotonija.
Kabašinskaitė 1998	= Birutė Kabašinskaitė, *Lietuvių kalbos liaudies etimologija ir artimi reiškiniai*, Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidybos institutas.
Katamba 2005	= Francis Katamba, *English Words: Structure, History, Usage*, New York: Routledge.
KTŽ 1990	= Kazimieras Gaivenis ir Stasys Keinys, *Kalbotyros terminų žodynas*, Kaunas: Šviesa.
Lehrer 2003	= Adrienne Lehrer, Understanding trendy neologisms, in *Italian Journal of Linguistics* 15 (2), 369–382. http://linguistica.sns.it/RdL/15.2/07.Lehrer.pdf.
LKE 2008	= Edited by Vytautas Ambrazas, *Lietuvių kalbos enciklopedija*, Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidybos institutas.

Mikić Čolić 2015	= Ana Mikić Čolić, Word formation of blends, in *Mostariensia* 19 (2), 21–36. https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/33292387.pdf.
Miliūnaitė 2009	= Rita Miliūnaitė, *Dabartinės lietuvių kalbos vartosenos variantai*, Vilnius: Lietuvių kalbos institutas.
Miliūnaitė 2012	= Rita Miliūnaitė, Lietuvių kalbos naujažodžių duomenynas, in *Gimtoji kalba* 6, 3–11.
Miliūnaitė 2014	= Rita Miliūnaitė, Naujieji kontaminaciniai dariniai lietuvių kalboje, in *Acta Linguistica Lithuanica* 71, 246–264.
Miliūnaitė 2015	= Rita Miliūnaitė, Naujažodžių atranka ir pateikimas *Lietuvių kalbos naujažodžių duomenyne*, in *Leksikografija ir leksikologija* 5, 161–184.
Miliūnaitė 2018	= Rita Miliūnaitė, Naujažodžių pateikimas ir paieškos galimybės Lietuvių kalbos naujažodžių duomenyne, in *Bendrinė kalba* 91, 1–21. http://www.bendrinekalba.lt/Straipsniai/91/Miliunaite_BK_91_straipsnis.pdf.
Murmulaitytė 2016	= Daiva Murmulaitytė, *Lietuvių kalbos naujažodžių duomenynas ir naujadarų tyrimų perspektyvos*, in *Bendrinė kalba* 89, 1–27. http://www.bendrinekalba.lt/Straipsniai/89/Murmulaityte_BK_89_straipsnis.pdf.
Murmulaitytė 2018	= Daiva Murmulaitytė, Kontaminacija ir lietuvių kalbos naujadara, in *Kalba ir kontekstai* VIII (1), 60–70. http://talpykla.elaba.lt/elaba-fedora/objects/elaba:31651794/datastreams/MAIN/content.
NBDB	= Edited by Loreta Vaicekauskienė, *The New Borrowings Database*. http://nsdb.sociolingvistika.lt/?lid=1.
OED	= *Online Etymology Dictionary*. http://www.etymonline.com/.
Plag 2003	= Ingo Plag, *Word-Formation in English*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Renner 2015	= Vincent Renner, Lexical blending as wordplay, in *Wordplay and Metalinguistic/Metadiscursive Reflection*, Edited by Angelika Zirker, Esme Winter-Froemel, 119–133. Berlin: De Gruyter. https://www.degruyter.com/downloadpdf/books/9783110406719/9783110406719-006/9783110406719-006.pdf.

Renner 2019	= Vincent Renner, French and English lexical blends in contrast, in *Languages in Contrast* 19 (1), 27–47.
Rimkutė-Ganusauskienė 2019	= Aušra Rimkutė-Ganusauskienė, Naujieji avalynės pavadinimai, in *Terminologija* 26, 184–208. http://journals.lki.lt/terminologija/article/view/383/462.
Rutkienė 2019	= Lina Rutkienė, Hibridiniai statybos terminijos dūriniai su klasikiniais prepoziciniais sietiniais kamienais, in *Terminologija* 26, 140–161. http://journals.lki.lt/terminologija/article/view/381/460.
Skardžius 1996	= Pranas Skardžius, *Rinktiniai raštai 1: Lietuvių kalbos žodžių daryba*, Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidykla.
Urbutis 2009	= Vincas Urbutis, *Žodžių darybos teorija*. 2-asis leidimas, Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidybos institutas.
Vaicekauskienė 2007	= Loreta Vaicekauskienė, *Naujieji lietuvių kalbos svetimžodžiai: kalbos politika ir vartosena*, Vilnius: Lietuvių kalbos instituto leidykla.
Vaskelaitė 2017	= Ramunė Vaskelaitė, Skaitmeninių technologijų keliami iššūkiai ir siūlomi būdai juos įveikti. 24-oji Jono Jablonskio konferencija, in *Bendrinė kalba* 90, 1–12. http://www.bendrinekalba.lt/Straipsniai/90/Vaskelaite_BK_90_straipsnis.pdf.
Villoing 2012	= Florence Villoing, French compounds, in *Probus. International Journal of Romance Linguistics* 24 (1), 29–60.
Wohlgemuth 2009	= Jan Wohlgemuth, *A Typology of Verbal Borrowings*, Berlin / New York: Mouton de Gruyter.