“WITH A MILLION PRODUCTS OUT THERE, HOW DO YOU ADVERTISE? YOU DON’T. YOU ODDVERTISE.”: A CORPUS-BASED STUDY OF SOME -VERTISE, -VERTISING, AND -VERTISEMENT LEXICAL BLENDS IN ENGLISH

The paper deals with certain formal and semantic aspects of 197 English lexical blends the right-hand elements of which are the splinters -vertise (← advertise), -vertising (← advertising), and -vertisement (← advertisement). It aims to give a detailed analysis of the formal as well as semantic behavior of the three splinters. The formal analysis of the data shows that all three splinters prefer to be combined with full left-hand elements, thus forming relatively transparent structures. The semantics of the analyzed blends indicates that the primary meanings of the source words advertise, advertising and advertisement, respectively, have remained unchanged, i.e. that the splinters -vertise, -vertising, and -vertisement simply represent abbreviated forms of their respective source words. Finally, the results of the analysis of the -vertise, -vertising, and -vertisement blends suggest quite strongly that, in the people’s constant battle for attention and profit, almost everything can be a billboard nowadays, from parts of the human body (e.g. leg-vertising), animals (e.g. sheep-vertising) to roofs (e.g. roof-vertisement), sky (e.g. sky-vertisement) and even egg shells (e.g. egg-vertising).
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1. Introduction

In the world’s relentless pursuit of profit, the industry of advertising, especially “commercial consumer advertising” (LEECH 1966: 25), seems to be under considerable pressure, not only in regard to producing innovative ideas, goods, or services or developing new ways of introducing them into the market (cf. PILLER 2003: 170, 176), but also in regard to the language (esp. vocabulary) used to promote these ideas, goods, or services. To be a success, the language of commercial consumer advertising in general, and names of goods and services in particular, must be attractive and memorable (cf. LEECH 1966: 27; PANIĆ 2004: 285), since “[in] capitalist consumer society, it is not products that are sold but names” (PILLER 2001: 189; cf. BALDI AND DAWAR 2000: 966, who argue that “[commercial] names not only designate, they advertise”). That is, to be able to rise to the challenges of the rather competitive market (and therefore thrive and survive), businesses must produce inventive and vivid names for their companies, goods, services, etc. It is here, in the language of advertising, where lexical creativity is probably most heavily
exploited. One such highly creative word-formation process in (advertising) English is lexical blending (cf. BALDI AND DAWAR 2000).

Lexical blending generally refers to the process of intentionally combining the forms as well as meanings (or some of their elements) of two (occasionally more) words and/or their irregular, non-morphemic parts (or so-called splinters, see, e.g., BAUER 2006; MATTIELLO 2023) into a single word “through simple concatenation or through concatenation coupled with overlap of shared [phonemic and/or graphemic] segments” (KELLY 1998: 579), as in *autobesity* ‘the fact of cars being much bigger and heavier than they were in the past’ ← *auto* × *obesity*, *candyceutical* ‘a small, chewy, coloured sweet that contains vitamins or other ingredients to improve your health’ ← *candy* × *(pharma)ceutical*, or *spathroom* ‘a bathroom that has been designed to be very clean, comfortable and relaxing, like a spa’ ← *spa* × *(b)athroom*. The clipping of at least one of the source words and their subsequent fusion into a single lexical item with(out) overlap is what principally makes blending a rather unconventional way of producing new words (FRADIN 2000: 11), very much unlike any other (regular) word-formation process.

In view of the above, the theoretical framework adopted in this paper for the analysis of lexical blends and consequently splinters is that put forward by Dressler (2000), in which he makes a fundamental distinction between prototypical grammatical morphology (i.e. inflection, derivation, and compounding), marginal morphology (i.e. “phenomena [such as classical and modern combining forms (PRĆIĆ 2008)] that are at the boundaries between morphology and other components […], or within its subcomponents […],” (MATTIELLO 2023: 27)), and extragrammatical morphology. Extra-grammatical morphology refers to “a set of heterogeneous formations (of an analogical or rule-like nature) [such as blends, acronymus, initialisms, clippings, reduplications, back-formations, expletive infixes, hypocoristics] which do not belong to morphological grammar, in that the processes through which they are obtained are not clearly identifiable and their input does not allow a prediction of a regular output” (MATTIELLO 2013: 3). According to Mattiello (2013: 34), “[a]nother reason for excluding blending from morphological grammar is its semantics”. Namely, “although some splinters […] may be used repeatedly in the blending process, they are not reinterpreted, but simply undergo a process of “abbreviation”” (MATTIELLO 2013: 34). Put differently,
they are semantically dependent on their source words for interpretation (MATTIELLO 2013: 35). “Secretion, on the other hand, differentiates secreted combining forms (e.g. -holic in computerholic) as being grammatical, although non-prototypical, and productive in terms of frequency, semantic coherence, and applicability” (MATTIELLO 2013: 34; cf. MATTIELLO 2018: 8). Although splinters themselves “do not involve any semantic change” (BAGAGLINI AND MICHELI 2022: 34) or “secretion process” (MATTIELLO 2018: 13), they may eventually develop into bound morphemes (i.e. secreted combining forms or secreted affixes) such as -holic (from alcoholic) (CALLIES 2016; MATTIELLO 2018; 2023), given the favorable circumstances.

The propagation of such word-forming elements in present-day English word-formation (especially in the second half of the 20th century) has been noted by a number of researchers (see, e.g., FANDRYCH 2008: 103, 108; LALIĆ-KRSTIN, SILAŠKI et al. 2022: 1; MATTIELLO 2019: 525; 2023: 202; ZYMANEK 2005: 429). Studies that have solely or partially focused on more or less frequent and productive splinters in English (e.g. docu- (=documentary), -umentary (=documentary), fem- (=feminist), vege-(=vegetable), -cation (=vacation), -flation (=inflation), -tainment (=entertainment), -zine (=magazine), -gasm (=orgasm), hallo/-(-o)ween (=Halloween), -ware (=software), -cino (=cappuccino), brex- (=Brexit)) are fairly numerous (see, e.g., BARRENA JURADO 2019; CALLIES 2016; DANILOVIĆ JEREMIĆ 2021; LALIĆ-KRSTIN 2010; 2014; 2016; LALIĆ-KRSTIN AND SILAŠKI 2018; LALIĆ-KRSTIN, SILAŠKI et al. 2022; MATTIELLO 2017: passim; 2018; 2021; 2023). As is especially evident from the last example listed above (i.e. brex-), the emergence of splinters in English (and beyond, see, e.g., BAGAGLINI AND MICHELI 2022 for Italian, TOMIĆ 2019 for Serbian) may be triggered by some globally significant social, political and economic events (cf. also MANOJOLOVIĆ 2021; MATTIELLO 2023: 199; ROIG-MARÍN 2021).

Considering the pervasiveness of advertising in contemporary societies (COOK 2001: 1; 2008: abstract), it is not surprising that the words advertise, advertising and advertisement themselves have gained in popularity over the past few decades (see Trends of advertise, advertising, advertisement in the Collins Online Dictionary (see Sources)), also serving as constituents (in their full or clipped forms) of many novel English blends. Despite the fact that some researchers of blending in English have already pointed out the relatively frequent employment of the three words or their fragments in the formation of blends (cf., e.g., LALIĆ-KRSTIN 2010: 153; MATTIELLO 2023: 189, 200), to the best of my knowledge, no study to date has been carried out into the structural or semantic aspects of the English blends whose one of the source words is advertise, advertising, or advertisement. The frequency of these words in English blends, specifically their final splinters (i.e. -vertise, -vertising, and -vertisement), was first observed by Lalić-Krstin (2010: 153) and therein exemplified by the nouns such as blogvertisement, spamvertising,
subvertisement, and voicevertising.\footnote{Even though initial splinters are not the focus of the present study, mention should also be made of the fact that the noun advertisement has produced the initial splinter adver-, as attested in the blends advertorial, advertelligent, Advermind (Mattiello 2023: 189, 200).}

What this paper aims to analyze is certain formal as well as semantic aspects of English lexical blends whose right-hand elements are the splinters -verte (← advertise), -vertising (← advertising), and -vertisement (← advertisement). The main aim of this contribution is to give a detailed analysis of the formal and semantic behavior of the splinters -verte, -vertising, and -vertisement in English lexical blends.

The paper is structured as follows: after the introduction, Section 2 discusses the dataset and methodology used in the analysis of the data. In Section 3, which is divided into three subsections, the results obtained by both qualitative and quantitative analyses of the -verte, -vertising, and -vertisement blends are presented and discussed in the context of the previous relevant research results. Finally, Section 4 provides the conclusions, as well as some implications for future research. All blends used for the purposes of the present paper are alphabetically listed in the Appendix.

2. Dataset and methodology

The data to be examined in this paper include examples of blends collected from the English Web Corpus 2021 (enTenTen21), the Timestamped JSI web corpus 2014–2021, and the Timestamped JSI web corpus 2021–2022 (all available in the Sketch Engine software, see Sources) by querying for the items ending in the .+verte, .+vertising, and .+vertisement strings. Specifically, the query was as follows: the concordance tool, lemma, POS: any, case sensitive A ≠ a; frequency, lemmas; view options: lempos for KWIC only.\footnote{POS is short for part of speech, KWIC is short for key word in context, and lempos is short for lemma and part of speech.} The retrieved frequency lemma lists were then thoroughly searched for the items which fit the criteria described below. The English Web Corpus 2021 (enTenTen21), which is a static corpus, boasts 52 billion words, while the Timestamped JSI web corpus 2014–2021 (over 60 billion words) and the Timestamped JSI web corpus 2021–2022 (over 16 billion words) are dynamic, monitor corpora where new texts (i.e. news articles) from RSS feeds are added regularly (SKETCH ENGINE).

For the .+verte, .+vertising, and .+vertisement strings, the enTenTen21 corpus returned the greatest number of items (namely 1,089 -verte items, 2,136 -vertising items, and 747 -vertisement items), whereas the two Timestamped JSI web corpora returned fewer items. Namely, the Timestamped JSI web corpus 2014–2021 returned 149 -verte, 1,989 -vertising and 710 -vertisement items, and the Timestamped JSI web corpus 2021–2022 returned 60 -verte, 494 -vertising, and 336 -vertisement items. However, some of the items had to be removed from the obtained lists due to multiple reasons. Specifically, besides the words advertise, advertising and advertisement themselves, excluded from the obtained lists were:

(a) all misspelled words or randomly joined words,
(b) items containing (either continuously or discontinuously) the whole words advertise, advertising and advertisement (e.g. deadvertisement, headvertising, animadvertise, BADvertise, deadvertise, dreadvertise, Headvertise, madvertise, Spreadvertise, bad-
vertising, sadvertising, Dadvertising, Deadvertising, Madvertising, Bladvertising, madvertising, Padvertising, fadvertising, sad(-)ertisement, Badvertise, Headvertising, dadvertising, dvertising, -dvertising (e.g. Feedvertise, oddvertise, Aidvertising, Oldvertising, Bandvertising, blandvertising, Bloodvertising, brandvertising, beardvertising, dogvertising, foodvertising, fraudvertising, friendvertising, Gladvertising, Godvertising, Godvertising, Goodvertising, handvertising, kidvertising, Kindvertising, sandvertising, oddvertising, podvertising, beadvertising, slidevertising, Wildvertising, Woodvertising, Cloudvertise), as well as (c) blends in which it was simply impossible to determine the exact form of the first source word from the available concordances (e.g. Mervertise, Bluevertise).

It is also important to note that differently spelled items such as bicapitalized or hyphenated blends (e.g. Buxvertise – BuxVertise or Ass-vertise – Assvertise) were considered variants of one word if they denoted or referred to the same entity, concept, etc. The total dataset included 197 blends, namely 32 examples ending in the splinter -vertise, 123 -vertising examples and 42 examples whose right-hand element is the splinter -vertisement. The 10 most frequent blends with the -vertise, -vertising and -vertisement splinters retrieved from the enTenTen21 are given in Tables 1, 2, and 3 below, respectively.

**Table 1: The 10 most frequent -vertise blends in the enTenTen21 corpus**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Blends</th>
<th>Frequency per million tokens (freq/mill)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Carvertise</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Blogsvertise</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Jobvertise</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Blogvertise</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) AKvertise</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) spamvertise</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Linkvertise</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) Eyevertise</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) subvertise</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10) Crashvertise</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2: The 10 most frequent -vertising blends in the enTenTen21 corpus**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Blends</th>
<th>Frequency per million tokens (freq/mill)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) malvertising</td>
<td>1,968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) subvertising</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) femvertising</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) spamvertising</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) catvertising</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Blends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>malvertisement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>slashvertisement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>subvertisement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>spamvertisement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Artvertisement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Believertisement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>blogvertisement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>wikivertisement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>shockvertisement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>fenvertisement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data were then qualitatively and quantitatively analyzed in terms of:
(a) the (most common) structural patterns used in the blends’ formation,
(b) the presence and nature of overlaps in blends,
(c) the syllabic length of blends in relation to the syllabic length of their source words,
(d) the syntactic categories of blends and their morphosyntactic makeup,
(e) the semantics of the collected blends and the semantics of the three splinters, as they may exhibit specific semantic disassociations from their original forms,
(f) the (most common) functions the -vertise, -vertising, and -vertisement blends serve, since the formation of new words may be interpreted as a response to the (advertising) realities that have emerged over the past few decades. Or, in the words of Roig-Marín (2016: 2), “[a]s our world and ways of life keep on changing, so do words”.

The meanings of the collected blends were established either by using the definitions their creators provided as part of the corresponding concordances or, in those cases where no definition was provided, by resorting to the available linguistic context (i.e. source co-texts) and/or a simple Google search. Based on the semantic criterion, the blends were further classified into several subgroups.
Finally, mention must be made of the fact that all examples of blends which meet the criteria explained above were included in the total dataset, irrespective of their country of origin. For example, the blend AT-Vertise represents the name of an advertising company based in Berlin, Germany, whereas Catvertise serves as the name of a company headquartered in the Netherlands.

3. Results and discussion

Here, the results of the formal as well as semantic analysis of the English blends with the final splinters -vertise, -vertising, and -vertisment are presented and discussed in great detail in the context of other pertinent findings.

3.1. The final splinter -vertise

Within the group of -vertise blends, the predominant structural pattern is that of a full SW₁ and the final splinter -vertise. Namely, 28 out of 32 -vertise blends (87.5%) are formed this way (e.g. Jazzvertise ← jazz × (ad)vertise). The remaining few blends (12.5%) represent the products of blending the initial splinter of SW₁ with the final splinter of SW₂, i.e. -vertyse, as in Magvertise ← mag(net) × (ad)vertis. No example in this group of blends is formed by splicing the final splinter of SW₁ and the final splinter of SW₂ (i.e. -restrial), though this combination is not impossible in English blending (cf. MILLER 2014: 195), as attested by, for example, Cryptstagram ← (en)crypt × (In)stagram (TOMIĆ 2023: 198). Taking into consideration the findings from previous studies into the formal behavior of a number of frequent and productive English splinters (cf., e.g., BARRENA JURADO 2019; DANILOVIĆ JEREMIĆ 2021: 60; LALIĆ-KRSTIN 2014; MATTIELLO 2018: 13; 2023: 192), which find that most of these new word-forming elements take unclipped SW₁s, the preponderance of this structural pattern in my dataset comes as no surprise. For instance, even a cursory look at the blends collected by Mattiello (2023: 192–194, 197) for the purposes of a corpus-based investigation of a number of splinters (e.g. -cation, -flation, -umentary, -zine) shows that they are normally coupled with a full SW₁. Similarly, Danilović Jeremić’s (2021: 62) analysis of blends in animated television series for children led her to conclude that “the most common pattern, in both overlapping and non-overlapping blends, concerns a full word followed by a final splinter”. As a matter of fact, this further confirms the preference for the aforementioned structural pattern in contemporary English blends (cf. LALIĆ-KRSTIN 2010: 96).

Although overlapping is one of the distinctive features of blends, in that it largely contributes to delimiting them from other neighboring categories such as compounds or clipped compounds, there are only three overlapping -vertise blends in my dataset, namely Akvertise ← Ak(ive) × (ad)vertise, Drivertise ← drive × (ad)vertise and subvert × (ad)vertise. In the first example, overlapping is both phonemic and graphemic, whereas in the second and third example, the segments overlap only graphemically.

Based on these results, overlapping appears to be negatively correlated with the blends functioning as proper nouns, as most of the collected -vertise blends are proper names, specifically commercial names (see below).¹¹ That is to say, the majority of the

¹¹ Baldi and Dawar (2000: 966) write that “trade names (names that identify firms and corporations, […]), trademarks (brand names under which a firm advertises and sells its products, […]), or service marks
-vertise blends seem to have arisen with the need to create names of companies, platforms, websites, etc. This further implies that certain structural differences we find among blends (including, but not limited to overlapping) may be attributed to the specific sociolinguistic register they come from, in this particular case – advertising (cf. RONNEBERGER-SIBOLD 2006 for some formal differences between German blends in brand names and German satirical blends).

The syllabic length of all the -vertise blends equals that of the SW₂, i.e. the trisyllabic verb advertise, as the SW₁ or their clipped fragments to which the bisyllabic splinter -vertise is added are normally only one syllable long. In comparison with the available results for the length of those blends whose right-hand elements include other recurring splinters, the results obtained herein reveal the same tendency – that the phonological head of the blend is the right-hand source word. For instance, in his research on the ‘wordgasm’, Barrena Jurado (2019: 16–17) finds that the splinter -gasm (← orgasm) “is combined with bases of one syllable in 54.50% of the cases […], as in artgasm”. Such combinations are, for the most part, as long as their SW₂, accounting for as much as 59,55% of his data. The results of my analysis of the syllabic length of the -vertise blends are also in keeping with the findings of most other authors who dealt with this issue in intentional lexical blends (see, e.g., GRIES 2004; KUBOZONO 1990: 15).

Regarding other formal properties of the -vertise blends, namely the word classes they belong to, it is interesting to note that the verb advertise (from which -vertise has been splintered) mostly forms part of new nouns (81,25%). This stands in sharp contrast to what researchers reported in reference to most blends’ grammar – that most of them are made up of the same word class elements (cf. BELIAEVA 2019: 4 and the references cited therein; CANNON 1986: 740; POUND 1914: 23). There are only 6 -vertise blends (18,75%) (cashvertise, causevertise, femvertise, slashvertise, spamvertise, subvertise) that function as verbs in the available co(n)texts, as evidenced by the following concordances extracted from the corpora (a–f).

(a) 〈s〉Here are some possible designs that would allow companies to “cashvertise”, including the one above for Campbell Soup.〈/s〉〈s〉(enTenTen21),

(b) 〈s〉If one must ‘causevertise’, there are certain caveats to keep in mind. 〈/s〉〈s〉(Timestamped JSI web corpus 2014–2021),

(c) 〈s〉This International Women’s Day, don’t be tempted to “femvertise”. 〈/s〉〈s〉(Timestamped JSI web corpus 2014–2021),

(d) 〈s〉Now that’s an article that doesn’t slashvertise Disney’s new show.〈/s〉〈s〉(enTenTen21),

(e) 〈s〉September signals the onset of holidays and as early as this month, spammers are already gearing up for the said season as they “spamvertise” their products.〈/s〉〈s〉(enTenTen21),

(f) 〈s〉We would like to subvertise and distract official communication.〈/s〉〈/s〉(enTenTen21).

(names under which services are promoted and rendered, […]” are all, as a rule, subsumed under the general term commercial names.

12 Renner (2019: 41) defines the phonological head of a blend in English as “the source word which gives its phonological contour to the blended output”. In English, it “corresponds to the syllabic contour (i.e. the number of syllables) and the stress contour” (RENNER 2019: 41). See also Renner and Lalić-Krstin (2011) for prediction rules for stress assignment in English blends.
What is also striking about these -vertise nouns is the fact that they all belong to the category of proper nouns, namely proper (commercial) names, with only one example – AKVertise – having SW1 which is a proper name itself (AK is a fragment of Akvile (a Lithuanian feminine name)). Taking into consideration the results of a number of previous studies on blends that touch on the issue of their grammatical properties (see, e.g., BAUER, LIEBER et al. 2013: 459; LALIĆ-KRSTIN 2010: 18, 128; MATTIELLO 2019: 7), the high percentage of the blends ending in -vertise which are proper names (81,25%) raises the question of blending being one of the most readily available mechanisms for the creation of proper names in present-day English word-formation. This may, at least in part, be explained by the fact that “companies’ names [as well as those of commercial products, applications, websites, etc.] worldwide are increasingly becoming more creative” (LALIĆ-KRSTIN, SILAŠKI et al. 2022: 6) so as to increase the entity’s visibility and forge its “social identity” (PILLER 2001: 198).

More specifically, the splinter -vertise seems to be particularly productive in the formation of the names of:

(a) companies that have to do with advertising such as the aforementioned AKVertise ← Akv(ile) × (ad)vertise (name of a social media advertising agency founded by Akvile DeFazio), CatVertise ← cat × (ad)vertise (name of an animal casting agency), AirVertise ← air × (ad)vertise (name of the company specializing in 3D outdoor advertising campaigns), Ass-Vertise (also AssVertise) ← ass × (ad)vertise (name of the company specializing in innovative human-ass billboards), AT-Vertise ← AT × (ad)vertise (name of a film production company specializing in TV Commercials, Digital Content and Visual Storytelling), CarVertise ← car × (ad)vertise (name of an advertising company that pays everyday drivers to place removable advertisements on their cars), CrashVertise ← crash × (ad)vertise (name of an advertising services company which offers “an all new guerrilla marketing trend by which ‘the crash is the message’”), EyeVertise ← eye × (ad)vertise (name of a company which specializes in optical websites for the eye care community), LinkVertise (also LinkVertise) ← link × (ad)vertise (name of a company that provides a link monetization tool that serves as both a URL shortener and as a way to earn advertising money with links),

(b) platforms, interfaces or websites that have to do with advertising such as ApVertise ← ap(p) × (ad)vertise (name of an influencer marketing platform connecting brands to influencers), BlogsVertise ← blogs × (ad)vertise (name of a platform for influencer marketing campaigns), CrossVertise ← cross(-media) × (ad)vertise (name of a cross-media booking platform for agencies and advertisers), SportsVertise ← sports × (ad)vertise (interface which enables booking, settlement, the upload of the advertising content and the automatic transmission), BuxVertise ← bux (bux is a graphic alteration of the word bucks ‘dollars’) × (ad)vertise (also BuxVertise) (name of a website which allows you to earn money from clicking advertisements),

(c) other (i.e. names of marketplaces, audit tools, projects, databases that have to do with advertising): CallVertise ← call × (ad)vertise (name of a pay per call marketplace that connects affiliate publishers with caller advertisers), HypeVertise ← hype × (ad)vertise (name of an Instagram audit tool for brands and influencers), JazzVertise ← jazz × (ad)vertise (name of a book project which focuses on the use of jazz in advertising),

13 The issue of proper nouns (names) being assigned a part of speech was extensively discussed by Mignot and Philippe (2022: 8–9).
Jobvertise ← job × (ad)vertise (name of a job and resumé database).

One other aspect worth noting is the orthography of the above blends. Namely, the creators of the -vertise blends functioning as commercial names use a variety of graphic devices such as bicapitalization (cf. CRystal 2011: 65), hyphens, images, different typeface or font colors to make their business stand out even more visually.14

3.2. The final splinter -vertising

In this subsection, the results of the formal and semantic analysis of the blends whose right-hand element is the splinter -vertising are presented and thoroughly discussed. As in the previous subsection, I will first deal with their formal properties and then with their semantic aspects. The analysis performed for the purposes of this subsection is both qualitative and quantitative.

In the overwhelming majority of the -vertising blends (92.68% or 114 out of 123 examples), the splinter is combined with an entire SW. Some of the blends which illustrate this pattern are: artvertising ← art × (ad)vertising, bagvertising ← bag × (ad)vertising, cabvertising ← cab × (ad)vertising, femvertising ← fem × (ad)vertising, shockvertising ← shock × (ad)vertising, smellvertising ← smell × (ad)vertising, thumb-vertising ← thumb × (ad)vertising, trollvertising ← troll × (ad)vertising. Among the remaining blends, there are combinations of the initial and the final splinters (e.g. cal-vertising ← Cal(cutta) × (ad)vertising, chatvertising ← chat(bot) × (ad)vertising, Hopvertising ← Hop(kins) (John Hopkins University) × (ad)vertising) (8 examples or 6.50%) as well as those of two final splinters (e.g. pitvertising ← (arm)pit × (ad)vertising) (1 example or 0.81%).

Only five overlapping blends (4.06%) are attested among the analyzed -vertising blends, namely solvertising ← solve × (ad)vertising, bravvertising ← brave × (ad)vertising, subvertising ← subver(sive) × (ad)vertising, invertvertising ← iny(ited) × (ad)vertising, and innovvertising ← innov(ative) × (ad)vertising. The fact that these blends are not generally intended to amuse, but name specific phenomena or ideas, mostly new types of advertising, may possibly be the reason for a conspicuous absence of overlapping in almost all of them. In other words, due to their primary “naming and an information condensation function” (not a playful one), their creation is not “chiefly motivated by the possibility of maximizing overlapping” (Rennert 2015: 129–130). According to the same author (Rennert 2015: 129–130), “functional ludicity” or “playfulness is foregrounded when the act of word-formation [in this case lexical blending] primarily fulfills a ludic function”, whereas “playfulness is backgrounded when the act of word-formation primarily has a naming function and an information condensation function”, as is true of most of the -vertising (as well as -vertise) blends. It is, therefore, safe to say that there is also a significant correlation between overlapping in blends and their pragmatic function of playfulness. This is further supported by the results of Ronneberger-Sibold’s (2006: 165) analysis of the corpus of German blends “which may qualify as literary in the widest sense, with a satirical tendency”. Namely, by examining the blending techniques the creators of such blends most frequently choose, she (Ronneberger-Sibold 2006: 175) managed to show that the satirical blends were commonly created by combining two full source words which necessarily, phonemically and/or graphemically, overlap (hence the term complete blends), as “their [satirical] effect depends to a large degree on their

14 For the ways some of the names are styled, visit: https://www.akvertise.com/..
intelligibility” (RONNEBERGER-SIBOLD 2006: 155) (e.g. quacknowledgement ← quack × acknowledgement (graphemic overlap) or abducktion ← abduction × duck (phonemic overlap)).

The part-of-speech analysis reveals that all the -vertising blends are nouns, specifically common nouns. These nouns, for the most part (103 examples or 83.73%), represent the result of coalescing the denominal splinter -vertising with another (common) noun, as in: memevertising ← meme × (ad)vertising, tatverting ← tat × (ad)vertising, roofvertising ← roof × (ad)vertising, moonvertising ← Moon × (ad)vertising, or dreamvertising ← dream × (ad)vertising. Despite the prevalence of the noun–noun combination in the analyzed subset of -vertising blends, there are several examples in which the splinter -vertising is amalgamated with an adjective (12 examples or 9.75%) (e.g. bravvertising ← brave × (ad)vertising, Cyber-Vertising ← cyber × (ad)vertising, fauxvertising ← faux × (ad)vertising), a verb (7 examples or 5.69%) (e.g. minevertising ← mine × (ad)vertising, cryvertising ← cry × (ad)vertising, tryvertising ← try × (ad)vertising) and even an exclamation (1 example or 0.78%) (e.g. ugh-vertising ← ugh × (ad)vertising).

Similarly to the splinter -vertise, -vertising is chiefly blended with monosyllabic SWs, as evidenced by 108 examples (87.80% of the total subset) (e.g. skyvertising ← sky × (ad)vertising, Nichevertising ← niche × (ad)vertising, hunkvertising ← hunk × (ad)vertising, egg-vertising ← egg × (ad)vertising, cartvertising ← cart × (ad)vertising, boobvertising ← boob × (ad)vertising). Even in those cases where SW₁ is polysyllabic, it is, for the most part (8 out of 15 examples or 53.33%), a one-syllable splinter that is added to -vertising (e.g. Hopvertising ← Hop(kins) × (ad)vertising, sympvertising ← symp(athy) × (ad)vertising). Consequently, there are very few examples with trisyllabic or tetrasyllabic SW₁s providing (more than) two syllables to the resulting blends (e.g. subvertising ← subver(sive) × (ad)vertising, Innovvertising ← innov(ative) × (ad)vertising). As a result, only a handful of the analyzed -vertising blends have more than four syllables, that is, five or six syllables. All this clearly implies that there is also a strong tendency for -vertising blends to have the same number of syllables as their SW₂, since “the blend as such already provides many clues for the identification of SW₂” (GRIES 2006: 548). This result fully conforms to what many researchers concluded in their papers discussing this specific formal property of English blends (see, e.g., BAUER AND HUDDLESTON 2002; GRIES 2006; HONG 2004).

Somewhat more illuminating insights into the behavior of the -vertising splinter are obtained through the semantic analysis of the -vertising blends. The results of this analysis allowed me to conclude that, unlike the -vertise blends which predominantly function as commercial names (of advertising companies), the -vertising blends are principally used to name various types of advertising (93 examples or 75.60%). As will be illustrated in the following sections, the great majority of the -vertising blends are of subordinate endocentric nature. Further nuancing of what is meant by these (relatively) new forms of advertising is possible based on the semantic relations between their source words. Accordingly, the analyzed -vertising blends may be grouped as follows:

(a) ‘advertising of what is denoted or referred to by SW₁ or advertising of that which is somehow related to SW₁’ (e.g. crashvertising ‘advertising of car crashes’, Flipver-

15 The complete-telescope blend quacknowledgement and the complete-inclusive blend abducktion are taken from Brown (2014) and Brown (2017). For more on these two subtypes of complete blends, see Ronneberger-Sibold (2006).
“advertising of Galaxy Z Flip device’, fruitvertising ‘fruit-related advertising’, gift-
vertising ‘advertising of elaborate free gifts in which marketers surprise their customers
with these free gifts, film their reactions and put the resulting video on YouTube’ (CBC),
shitvertising ‘advertising of shit’, snack-vertising ‘advertising of snacks’),

(b) ‘advertising on, in, through, or with the help of what or who is denoted or
referred to by SW_1’, Some of the illustrative examples include: blogvertising ‘advertising
through blogs’, banvertising ‘advertising by placing a ban on sth’, bumvertising ‘advertising
which exploits bums (vagrants) for its purposes’, capchavertising ‘a form of advertising
which requires a person to watch the advertisement in order to fulfill the CAPTCHA box’
(WORDSTREAM), catvertising ‘advertising that features cats for its purposes’, CyberVer-
tising ‘advertising on the web’, dronevertising ‘advertising through drones’, egg-vertising
‘advertising on eggs’, gamevertising ‘a way of advertising a product by making it appear
in a computer game’, hunkvertising ‘advertising that features impressive male physiques
for its purposes’, labvertising ‘advertising displayed in the computer labs’, legvertising ‘ad-
vertising which uses women’s legs to send a message’, mapvertising ‘advertising on maps’,
memevertising ‘advertising through memes’, moonvertising ‘advertising projected onto the
surface of the moon’, news-vertising ‘advertising which uses events in the news or which
are being talked about to pull along your brand and project it into the public’ (Time-
tamped JSI web corpus 2014–2021), packvertising ‘advertising through the eccentrically
English packaging designs’ (enTenTen21), petvertising ‘radio advertising which incorpo-
rates pets telling their stories about being covered by pet insurance (RAC Insurance)’
(CARNEY), pornvertising ‘advertising which uses pornographic allusions and images to
send a message’, reactvertising ‘advertising which usesa brand to quickly react to the latest
events, usually without having any pre-planned strategy’ (IMPULSE BLOG), roofvertising
‘advertising on rooftops’, sexvertising ‘an advertising method using sex and/or sexuality
to sell products or services’, sheepvertising ‘advertising which uses sheep as an advertis-
ing medium to attract people’s attention and sell products or services’, skinvertising ‘per-
manent advertising of long dead companies on people’s bodies’, skyvertising ‘advertising
which employs tiny lit-up drones flying in sync with one another displaying well-known
logos, characters and so on, i.e. advertising in the sky’ (FITZPATRICK 2022), smutver-
tising ‘the use, falsely or otherwise, of sexually arousing video or imagery to gain interest
from parties who would otherwise ignore one’s offerings’ (enTenTen21), streamvertising
‘advertising in which streaming media giants are expanding to incorporate commercial
breaks into their content by offering cheaper subscription models’ (RAZDAN 2022),
stuntvertising ‘advertising which includes filming real people in an unusual brand experi-
ence’ (enTenTen21), tatvertising ‘advertising which involves being adorned with a Dragon
Tattoo’ (Timestamped JSI web corpus 2014–2021), tech-vertising ‘advertising which uses
the powers of tech’, thigh-vertising ‘temporary tattoo advertising on thighs’, thongvertising
‘the placing of ads on the triangle of fabric often exposed by thong wearers’ (CARTER
2006), thumb-vertising ‘a movement that offers up thumbs as the next great advertising
medium’ (enTenTen21), Toastvertising ‘advertising which includes making a flip book by
burning images into pieces of toast’ (SUPERSIZED MEALS), voicevertising ‘advertising
by using one’s voice to promote a product’ (LALIĆ-KRSTIN 2010: 153), wallvertising ‘ad-
vertising on walls’,

(c) ‘advertising done by what or who is referred to or denoted by SW_1’ (e.g.
bankvertising ‘advertising by banks’, Nanvertising ‘advertising produced by Nan Whaley’,
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scumvertising ‘advertising by scums’),

(d) ‘advertising targeted at who or what is denoted or referred to by SW’, (e.g. Christvertising ‘advertising which focuses on the ultimate end-user; God [...] because if God loves your brand, it will become stronger and more successful’ (enTenTen21), feelvertising ‘advertising that aims to inspire strong public feelings’, femvertising ‘advertising that is targeted at women’, Gabvertising ‘advertising intended for brands or businesses that often share similar values as members of the Gab community’ (Timestamped JSI web corpus 2021–2022), manvertising ‘advertising specifically marketed to men’, momvertising ‘advertising marketed to moms’, normvertising ‘advertising that challenges societal norms’ (Timestamped JSI web corpus 2014–2021), scamvertising ‘advertising meant to scam or trick you into buying or believing something just so whoever is running the ads can profit from it’ (URBAN DICTIONARY), fear-vertising ‘fear-inducing advertising’, shockvertising ‘advertising that aims to shock’, solvertising ‘advertising in which creativity and innovation merge to become a solution to a problem’, spamvertising ‘advertising activities which promote sending of spam’, tagvertising ‘advertising to users who follow specific tags’, thinkvertising ‘advertising related to the particular mood of the person at that time’, tryvertising ‘advertising which is all about consumers becoming familiar with new products by actually trying them out’ (enTenTen21),

(e) ‘advertising characterized or described by SW’, (e.g. fast-vertising ‘advertising that thrives on the principles of speed, creativity and personal branding’ (STORYBOARD18), greenvertising ‘green or environment-friendly advertising’, malvertising ‘malicious advertising or advertising involving malware’, smellvertising ‘scented advertising’, subvertising ‘the process of subverting advertisements to spoof and parody’ (GOOGLE ARTS & CULTURE), sympvertising ‘advertising or marketing campaigns infused with a pinch of sympathy in times of economic uncertainty’ (enTenTen21), wokevertising ‘advertising that is aware of social issues’).

A relatively small number of the -vertising blends (15 examples or 12.19%) are used as alternative names for the existing types of advertising, whereby people more concisely express their attitude towards a specific type, subject or means of advertising. Some of the examples illustrating this use are: bravvertising (<s>Not to be outdone, Burger King is trying to stimulate some desire of its own with a little “bravvertising” campaign designed to make sure consumers know Burger King is the place to go when they want a nice heavy piece of meat. </s> (enTenTen21)), cashvertising ‘advertising which helps you make big money’ (STORYBOARD18), causevertising ‘advertising with a cause’, crapvertising ‘advertising that is of extremely poor quality’, factvertising (<s>The X-Rays weren’t advertising. </s> They were “Factvertising” – comparative Factvertising. </s> (Timestamped JSI web corpus 2014–2021)), fakevertising ‘fake advertising’, Fart-Vertising ‘advertising of a product which stops the noises’, fauxvertising ‘advertising in which an existing message is creatively falsified to reach a higher truth or deeper meaning’, inventing ‘invited advertising’ (<s>He’s coined a phrase called “Invertising”, or Invited Advertising. </s> (enTenTen21)), pause-vertising ‘advertising in which ads are paused’ (<s>There’s this new term bubbling up in the media: “pause-vertising.” </s> (enTenTen21)), shopvertising ‘a concept used to describe how the boundaries between advertising and sales are being blurred’ (<s>Content and commerce will converge as ‘shopvertising’ evolves from shoppable social to shoppable TV and digital out-of-home resulting in a contraction of the closed-loop marketing cycle. </s> (enTenTen21)), ‘spyver-
'advertising strategy which includes faux ads', trollvertising (Some are calling it Burger King trollvertising, but these Burger King advertisement aren’t really “trolling.” It’s more an invasion of personal space. (Timestamped JSI web corpus 2014–2021)), wastertising ‘a not-so-new form of advertising’. As is evident from these examples, the overall meaning of such blends is rarely neutral, that is, they more often than not bear a special, pragmatic meaning (cf. MATTIELLO 2013: passim). Included in this category are also blends describing a hypothetical or fictitious form of advertising such as dreamvertising ‘advertising in dreams’ (… there’s one territory that we haven’t yet explored – our dreams (or ‘dreamvertising’) in theory could be the holy grail in getting a consumer’s undivided personal attention […]. (enTenTen21)).

As few as 10 of the -vertising blends (8,13%) serve the purpose of naming a business entity (e.g. Eyerture ‘name of a promotional product supplier, apparel decorator, and inventor of the custom pinhole sunglasses’, Hopvertising ‘name of the JHU student ad agency’, Innoververtising ‘name of a multimedia advertising company’, Freevertising (It’s totally up to you, and the technology is completely free. Take a look at this quick demo video to see how Freevertising can turn your RSS feed into a great revenue source. (enTenTen21)), Sporterverting ‘name of a company’), a business model (e.g. a cal-vertering ‘name of a platform that provides space for the voices of witty and cerebral advertising made in Calcutta ad agencies’, Nicheververtising ‘name of a web app that helps you become an authority in your niche’), a blog (e.g. ugh-vertering ‘name of a blog’), an event or a competition (e.g. Outververtising ‘name of an event for the advertising and marketing industry championing LGBTQIA+ inclusivity’, Stockvertering ‘name of a competition which will see the internationally distinguished ad college challenge entrants to find creative ways to fuse brands with seemingly irrelevant stock images’).

There are also few blends (5 examples or 4,06%) the meaning of which is rather unclear due to the ambiguity of what is denoted or referred to by SW1 or the semantic relations between the source words. These are: hackvertering, hatevertering, minevertering, punvertering, and snoopvertering.

3.3. The final splinter -vertisement

The final group of 42 -vertisement blends is, similarly to the former two groups, first analyzed as concerns the blends’ structural patterns. This formal analysis of the -vertisement blends indicates that the prevailing pattern is, once again, that of a full SW1 and the final splinter. As many as 35 -vertisement blends (83,33%) are formed this way. Examples include: Madonnavertainment ← Madonna × (ad)vertisement, filmverture ← film × (ad)vertisement, track ← track × (ad)vertisement, Mockverture ← mock × (ad)vertisement, Dualvertisement ← dual × (ad)vertisement, etc. Only 7 examples (16,66%) are produced by blending the initial splinter of SW1 and the final splinter of SW2, i.e. the -vertisement fragment, as in snapverture ← Snap(chat) × (ad)vertisement or annoyverture ← annoy(ing) × (ad)vertisement. No -vertisement blend is produced by fusing two final splinters. Segment overlapping is identified in only two examples, namely subverture ← subver(sive) × (ad)vertisement and believerture ← believe × (ad)vertisement.

Despite the fact that all the -vertisement blends are nouns (belonging to the group of common nouns), a morphosyntactic analysis shows that not all of them represent com-
binations of two nouns (e.g. *wikivertisement, infovertisement*) (35 examples or 83.33%), but that mixtures of an adjective and a noun (e.g. *Dualvertisement* or *Mockvertisement* (6 examples or 14.28%)) as well as those of a verb and a noun (1 example or 2.38%) (e.g. *believertisement*) are also possible. However, when compared to the *-vertising* blends, the number of morphosyntactic combinations in the *-vertisement* blends is rather limited. Notwithstanding this difference, the splinter *-vertisement* also has a preference for monosyllabic SW₁s, as evidenced by 30 out of 42 examples (71.42%), so that the resultant blend is, once again, generally as long as SW₂.

From a semantic point of view, the great majority of the *-vertisement* blends are relatively transparent, in that the first source word more accurately defines the type of advertisement expressed by SW₂ (39 examples or 92.85%). Similarly to the semantics of the *-vertising* blends, here, too, a rich variety of semantic subgroups can be identified, depending on the (literal/figurative) meaning of SW₁, as well as its semantic relation to SW₂, as evidenced by the blends in (a)–(e) below:

(a) ‘advertisement by means of what or with the help of who or what is denoted or referred to by SW₁’: *bikevertisement* ‘an advertisement attached to a bicycle’ (e.g. &lt;s&gt;I recently added a little bikevertisement on my Deep Vs to give cagers something to read when I trackstand at lights […] &lt;/s&gt;&lt;p&gt; (enTenTen21)), *asvertisement* ‘advertisement displayed on a person’s bottom’, *blogvertisement* ‘advertisement on a blog’, *infovertisement* ‘advertisement that uses information instead of emotion to appeal to potential customers’ (e.g. &lt;p&gt;The article is overtly promotional and reads like an infovertisement. &lt;/p&gt;&lt;s&gt; (enTenTen21)), *mapvertisment* ‘advertisement in Google Maps and Bing Maps’, *memevertisment* ‘advertisement that uses memes’, *newsvertisment* ‘advertisement which uses events in the news or which are being talked about to pull along your brand and project it into the public mind’ (Timestamped JSI web corpus 2014–2021), etc. Interestingly enough, the greatest number of the *-vertisement* blends belong to this particular semantic subgroup.

(b) ‘advertisement that is targeted at who or what is denoted or referred to by SW₁’: *catvertisment* ‘advertisement which is aimed at cats and their owners’, *manvertisment* ‘advertisement specifically targeted at men’, *smellvertisment* ‘advertisement that appeals to people’s sense of smell’;

(c) ‘advertisement for what or who is denoted or referred to by SW₁’: *docu-vertisment* ‘advertisement for a new documentary’ (e.g. &lt;/s&gt;&lt;s&gt; ‘This was so evident in a new PBS ‘docu-vertisment, The Human Face of Big Data, airing Feb 24th, […] &lt;/s&gt;&lt;s&gt; (enTenTen21)), *filmvertisment* ‘advertisement for a film’, *Madonnaversitment* ‘advertisement featuring Madonna’;

(d) ‘advertisement produced by who or what is denoted or referred to by SW₁’, as in *fanvertisment* ‘advertisement made by a fan’ or *Ars-vertisment* ‘advertisement made by the ARS advertising agency’;

(e) ‘advertisement characterized or described by SW₁’: *malvertisment* ‘malicious advertisement’ (&lt;/s&gt;&lt;s&gt;Malicious websites and malvertisements (malicious advertisements) are designed to look like a page or ad […]&lt;/s&gt;&lt;s&gt; (Timestamped JSI web corpus 2021–2022)), *Dualvertisment* (e.g. “For whatever reason, you end up with a Dualvertisment: a Crossover in adspace. […]” (DUALVERTISEMENT (n.d.))), *crapvertisment* ‘advertisement of extremely poor quality’, etc.
Besides these, there is one blend – *Artvertisement* – whose function is rather different from those of the other -*vertisment* blends, as it represents ‘the name of a new album by Darrin Bradbury’. Additionally, the semantics of the blends *educationvertisement* and *tweetvertisement* is somewhat obscure due to the lack of (extra)linguistic context in which they appear. That is, based on the available concordances, it is ambiguous whether *educationvertisement* should be interpreted as ‘advertisement for education’ or, say, ‘advertisement produced by educational institutions, staff working in education, etc.’, as well as whether *tweetvertisement* means ‘advertisement through a tweet’ or ‘advertisement of a tweet’.

4. Conclusions

In this paper, I have attempted to provide a granular level of detail about some formal and semantic aspects of 197 English lexical blends having, as their right-hand elements, splinters -*Vertise*, -*Vertising*, and -*vertisment*. First and foremost, the analysis shows that these final splinters are not only frequent and productive in the formation of contemporary English blends, but that they “at the same time serve to attest to new [advertising] realities and societal changes” (ROIG-MARÍN 2016: 2). Put differently, the -*Vertise*, -*Vertising* and -*vertisment* blends are all indicative of some of the most fundamental changes contemporary societies, together with contemporary languages, have seen thus far. Namely, the range of the blends analyzed here indicate that, in the people’s constant battle for attention and profit, advertising is literally everywhere, from various parts of the human body (e.g. ass, boob, leg, skin, thigh, thumb, armpit, etc.), animals (e.g. cat, sheep, dog, etc.) to roofs, air and even egg shells. After all, the most important thing in marketing (especially nowadays) is being seen or heard. The use of these unconditional advertising media, as well as unusual advertising subjects (e.g. car crashes) is, most probably, part of the broader advertising strategy commonly referred to as *guerrilla marketing* “in which a company uses surprise and/or unconventional interactions in order to promote a product or service” (HAYES 2010).

This endless quest for innovative ways of promoting ideas, goods, services, etc. in the advertising industry seems to be well reflected in the lexical devices employed in their naming. Being a manifestation of creative bending of morphological rules or structural transgression (LALIĆ-KRSTIN, SILAŠKI et al. 2022: 7; cf. LÓPEZ RÚA 2012: 33), blends perfectly fit the intentions of advertising and marketing experts. Compactness, both formal and semantic, may be yet another (socio)linguistic factor (cf. LALIĆ-KRSTIN AND SILAŠKI 2019: 225–226) that influenced the multiplication of blends whose right-hand source words are *advertise*, *advertising* and *advertisement*, as it is particularly important to be concise when conveying an advertising message, both in form and content.

As far as the formal aspects of the analyzed blends are concerned, it can be concluded that the splinters -*Vertise*, -*Vertising*, and -*vertisment* tend to be combined with unclipped source words. Since the first source words of the analyzed blends are normally shorter than the second ones (i.e. *advertise*, *advertising*, and *advertisement*), we can also conclude that there is a strong tendency to retain the shorter source word intact. This formal tendency is reinforced by what some researchers (cf. GRIES 2004: 418) reported as regards the contributions of individual source words to blends. Gries (2004: 418–419), for instance, found that “shorter source words indeed contribute more of themselves to
blends”, which suggests that “blend formation is indeed governed by a desire to ensure the recognizability of source words”, though probably not to the exact same degree in all registers.

In view of the fact that a relatively large percentage of English blends, including the -vertise blends in my dataset, are proper names, it is safe to conclude that the process of lexical blending represents a fertile source of proper nouns in the English lexicon. Considering the fact that non-native elements are desirable in the advertising language in general and its naming practices in particular (PILLER 2003: 171–172), it is somewhat surprising that no foreign lexical items were attested among the SW₁’s of, at least, -vertise blends. This may be, at least partly, explained by the obvious intention of the creators to produce more transparent structures and therefore facilitate their understanding, and using words from other languages may prove counterproductive.

Additionally, the analyzed examples indicate one other interesting fact about blends – the existence of blend families, which may play a part in their further establishment in the English lexicon. Examples include: subvertise, subvertising, subvertisement; Ass-vertise, assvertising, assvertisement; Blogvertise, blogvertising, blogvertisement; cat-vertise, catvertising, catvertisement, femvertise, femvertising, femvertisement; shockvertise, shockvertising, shockvertisement; slashvertise, slashvertising, slashvertisement; spamvertise, spamvertising, spamvertisement; webvertise, webvertising, webvertisement.

Finally, as the primary meanings of the source words advertise, advertising and advertisement have remained unchanged in the analyzed blends, it is also safe to conclude that splinters -vertise, -versting, and -vertisement are not going in the direction of becoming morphemes in their own right. That is to say, they simply represent abbreviated forms of their respective source words, thus forming parts of blends which are relatively transparent semantic structures. These results may in addition contribute to drawing up a more comprehensive list of splinters in English. Compiling such lists may be conducive to deciding whether a word belongs to the category of blends or some other category such as compounds or derivatives. The obtained results also beg the question as to why certain blend fragments lend themselves to the semantic processes of generalization or specification (e.g. -zilla, -nomics, -nado) (cf. LALIĆ-KRSTIN 2016; LALIĆ-KRSTIN, SILAŠKI et al. 2022), while others, such as -vertise, -versting, and -vertisement, continue to depend on their source words for semantic interpretation. Is it their status as terms that prevents the meaning of these words from being “stretched” or “compressed” to include more general or specific senses?
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Горица Р. Томић

‘WITH A MILLION PRODUCTS OUT THERE, HOW DO YOU ADVERTISE? YOU DON’T. YOU ODDVERSE.’: КОРПУСНА АНАЛИЗА НЕКИХ ЕНГЛЕСКИХ ЛЕКСИЧКИХ СЛИВЕНИЦА ЧИЈИ СУ КРАЈЊИ ФРАГМЕНТИ -VERTISE, -VERTISING И -VERTEMENT

Резиме

Рад се бави неким формалним и семантичким аспектима 197 примера двочланих енглеских лексичких сливеница чији су десни елементи фрагменти -vertise (← advertise), -vertising (← advertising) и -vertisement (← advertisement) прикупљених из великих електронских корпуса. Циљ рада јесте да изврши детаљну анализу формалног и семантичког понашања ова три крајња фрагмента. Резултати формалне анализе грађе показују да се сва три фрагмента у највећем броју сливеница комбинују са нескраћеним левим елементом, чиме постају релативно морфотактички прозирне структуре. Анализа семантике сливеница показује да су значења речи из којих су ова три фрагмента издвојена остала непромењена, тј. да у анализираним примерима није дошло до проширења или сужења њиховог значења, те да фрагменти -vertise, -vertising и -vertement представљају њихове скраћене форме. Најзад, извршена семантичка анализи прикупљених сливеница указује и на то да се у данашње време, у циљу привлачења што веће пажње и остваривања што веће користи, безмало све користи као рекламни пано, од делова људског тела (нпр. legvertising), животиња (нпр. sheepvertising), кровова (нпр. roofvertisement), неба (нпр. skyvertisement), до љуски јајета (нпр. egg-vertising).

Кључне речи: тврба речи, енглеске лексичке сливенице, фрагменти -vertise, -vertising, -vertement

Appendix

-vertise blends

1) AKvertise
2) Airvertis
e
3) Apvertis
4) Ass-vertise (Assvertis)
5) AT-Vertise
6) Blogvertis
7) Blogsvertis
8) Buxvertis (BuxVertise)
9) Callvertis
10) Carvertis (CarVertise)
11) cashvertis
12) Catvertis
13) causevertis
14) Crashvertis
15) Crossvertis
16) Drivvertis
17) Earnvertis
18) EyeVertise
19) femvertis
20) Hypevertis
21) Invertis
22) Jazzvertis
23) Jobvertis
24) Linkvertis (LinkVertise)
25) Magvertis
26) Netvertis
27) Shockvertis
28) slashvertis
29) spamvertis
30) Sportsvertis
31) subvertis
32) Webvertis

-vertising blends

1) ACTvertising
2) AGvertising
3) appvertising
4) artvertising
5) assvertising
6) bagvertising
7) bankvertising
8) Banvertising
9) beachvertising
10) beervertising
11) benchvertising
12) bikevertising
13) blogvertising
14) boobvertising
15) bravertising
16) bumvertising
17) Cabvertising
18) cal-vertising
19) Captchavertising
20) Cartvertising
21) Cashvertising
22) catvertising
23) Causevertising
24) chatvertising
25) Christvertising
26) contentvertising
27) craftvertising
28) crapvertising
29) crashvertising
30) cryvertising
31) cute-vertising
32) CyberVertising
33) dreamvertising
34) dressvertising
35) drone-vertising
36) egg-vertising
37) Eyevertising
38) factvertising
39) fakevertising
40) FartVertising
41) fast-vertising
42) fauxvertising
43) feelsvertising (feels-vertising)
44) femvertising
45) Flipvertising
46) Freevertising
47) fruitvertising
48) Gabvertising
49) gamevertising
50) giftvertising
51) greenvertising
52) hackvertising
53) Hatevertising
54) Hopvertising
55) hunkvertising
56) Innovertising
57) invertising
58) labvertising
| 59) | legvertising |
| 60) | malvertising |
| 61) | manvertising |
| 62) | mapvertising |
| 63) | memevertising |
| 64) | minevertising |
| 65) | momvertising |
| 66) | moonvertising |
| 67) | Nanvertising |
| 68) | netvertising |
| 69) | news-vertising |
| 70) | Nichevertising |
| 71) | normvertising |
| 72) | outvertising |
| 73) | packvertising |
| 74) | pause-vertising |
| 75) | petvertising |
| 76) | pitvertising |
| 77) | pornvertising |
| 78) | prankvertising |
| 79) | punvertising |
| 80) | reactvertising |
| 81) | roofvertising |
| 82) | scamvertising |
| 83) | scarevertising |
| 84) | scumvertising |
| 85) | sexvertising |
| 86) | sheepvertising |
| 87) | shitvertising |
| 88) | shockvertising |
| 89) | shopvertising |
| 90) | skinvertising |
| 91) | skyvertising |
| 92) | slashvertising |
| 93) | smellvertising |
| 94) | smutvertising |
| 95) | snack-vertising |
| 96) | snoopvertising |
| 97) | solvertising |
| 98) | spamvertising |
| 99) | Sportvertising |
| 100) | spyvertising |
| 101) | Stockvertising |
| 102) | streamverting |
| 103) | stuntvertising |
| 104) | subverting |
105) sympvertising
106) tagvertising
107) tatvertising
108) tech-vertising
109) thigh-vertising
110) thinkvertising
111) thongvertising
112) thumb-vertising
113) Toastvertising
114) trackvertising
115) trollvertising
116) tryvertising
117) ugh-vertising
118) VaginaVertising
119) Voicevertising
120) wallvertising
121) wastvertising
122) webvertising
123) wokevertising

-vertisement blends

1) annoyvertisement
2) appvertisement
3) ars-vertislement
4) Artvertisement
5) assvertisenment
6) believertisement
7) bikevertisement
8) blogvertisenment
9) catvertisenment
10) chatvertisenment
11) crapvertisenment
12) docu-vertisenment
13) Dualvertisement
14) educationvertisenment
15) falsvertisenment
16) fanvertisenment
17) femvertisenment
18) filmvertisenment
19) funvertisenment
20) infovertisenment
21) Madonnavertisement
22) malvertisenment
23) manvertisenment
24) mapvertisenment
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Word</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>memevertisement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Mockvertisement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>newsvertisement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>prankvertisement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Roofvertisement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>scamverisement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>sheepverture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>shockverture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>skyverture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>slashverture (slash-verture)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>smellverture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>snapverture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>spamverture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>subverture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>tweetverture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>trackverture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>webruitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>wikiverisement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>