Gorica R. Tomić[1]
University of Kragujevac
Faculty of Education in Užice
Department of Languages and Literatures
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8546-4781

"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* (← *vertisement*). 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. *legvertising*), animals (e.g. *sheepvertising*) to roofs (e.g. *roofvertisement*), sky (e.g. *skyvertisement*) and even egg shells (e.g. *egg-vertising*).

Keywords: word-formation, English lexical blends, splinters *-vertise, -vertising, -vertisement*

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

---

1tomic@pfu.kg.ac.rs; dragulj988goricicak@gmail.com

exploited.[2] One such highly creative word-formation process in (advertising) English is lexical blending (cf. BALDI AND DAWAR 2000).[3]

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' ← aut<u>o</u> × <u>o</u>besity, *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' ← sp<u>a</u> × (b)<u>a</u>throom.[4] 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.[5]

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, acronyms, 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: 1; cf. also DRESSLER 2000: 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).[6] Put differently,

---

2 Lexical creativity is understood here "as the [native] speaker's ability to create new complex words in an unpredictable (i.e. non-rule-governed) way" (MATTIELLO 2017: 49).

3 The products of lexical blending – lexical blends, which "at times border[ing] on a marketing strategy" (MUNAT 2007: xv), have long been recognized as exceptionally frequent and productive in the context of commercial sectors such as advertising or marketing (ADAMS 2001: 141; CRYSTAL 1995: 130; FANDRYCH 2008: 115; KREIDLER 1994: 5029f as cited to in FANDRYCH 2008: 111; LEHRER 2007: 128; MATTIELLO 2013: 2; RONNEBERGER-SIBOLD 2010: 206–207).

4 All three examples are taken from the Cambridge Dictionary Blog (see Sources). Phonemic and/or graphemic overlap is indicated by underlining the shared segments of two source words (SW). The fragments of the source words which do not participate in the formation of the blend are given in brackets. The × symbol represents the process of blending.

5 "[B]ecause of their striking structural make-up, [lexical blends and other similar formations] are expressive and eye- [and ear-]catching from a pragmatic point of view" (BALDI AND DAWAR 2000: 963).

6 Despite also being clipped from longer existing words, splinters significantly differ from *clippings* (e.g. *info* (from *information*), *bot* (from *robot*), *uni* (from *university*), etc.), in that they cannot be used on their own. This is why some authors (e.g. FANDRYCH 2008: 114) refer to them as *bound splinters* (as opposed to *free splinters* or *clippings*).

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.[7]

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, SILAŠ-KI et al. 2022: 1; MATTIELLO 2019: 525; 2023: 202; SZYMANEK 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*), *-cci-no* (←*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; MATTIEL-LO 2017: passim; 2018; 2021; 2023).[8] As is especially evident from the last example listed above (i.e. *brex-*), the emergence of splinters in English (and beyond, see, e.g., BAGAGLI-NI AND MICHELI 2022 for Italian, TOMIĆ 2019 for Serbian) may be triggered by some globally significant social, political and economic events (cf. also MANOJLOVIĆ 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*,

---

7 What other criteria, besides time, frequency and productivity (LEHRER 2007; MATTIELLO 2018; 2023: 202), influence the transition from a bound splinter to a bound morpheme is not known. Here, mention must also be made of the paper by Correia Saavedra (2014) where an automated method of identifying splinters which are likely to become morphemes in their own right (e.g. *-sumer* ← *consumer*, *-verse* ← *universe*) was presented. In her study on transitional morphology, Mattiello (2023: 4, 187–189) refers to such splinters as "potential combining forms" or "combining forms in the making".

8 Some of these studies will be dealt with more comprehensively later in the paper, specifically in the discussion of the research results.

subvertisement, and *voicevertising*.[9]

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 *-vertise* (← *advertise*), *-vertising* (← *advertising*), and *-vertisement* (← *vertisement*). The main aim of this contribution is to give a detailed analysis of the formal and semantic behavior of the splinters *-vertise*, *-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 *-vertise*, *-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 .+*vertise*, .+*vertising*, and .+*vertisement* strings. Specifically, the query was as follows: the concordance tool, lemma, POS: any, case sensitive A≠a; frequency, lemmas; view options: lemposes for KWIC only.[10] 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 .+vertise, .+vertising, and .+vertisement strings, the *enTenTen21* corpus returned the greatest number of items (namely 1,089 *-vertise* 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 *-vertise*, 1,989 *-vertising* and 710 *-vertisement* items, and the *Timestamped JSI web corpus 2021–2022* returned 60 *-vertise*, 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-*

---

9 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).

10 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*.

vertising, sadvertising, Dadvertising, Deadvertising, Madvertising, Bladvertising, madver-tisement, Padvertisement, fadvertisement, sad(-)vertisement, Badvertisement, Headver-tisement, dadvertisement) or the fragments *-dvertise, -dvertising* and *-dvertisement* (e.g. *Feedvertise, oddvertise, Aidvertising, Oldvertising, Bandvertising, blandvertising, Blood-vertising, brandvertising, beardvertising, dogvertising, foodvertisement, fraudvertising, friendvertising, Gladvertising, Godvertisement, Godvertising, Goodvertising, handvertising, kidvertising, Kindvertising, sandvertising, oddvertising, podvertising, beadvertising, slide-vertisement, 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 consid-ered 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 *-vertise-ment*. 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*

Blends	Frequency per million tokens (freq/mill)
1) *Carvertise*	55
2) *Blogsvertise*	39
3) *Jobvertise*	24
4) *Blogvertise*	18
5) *AKvertise*	16
6) *spamvertise*	10
7) *Linkvertise*	9
8) *Eyevertise*	9
9) *subvertise*	8
10) *Crashvertise*	7

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

Blends	Frequency per million tokens (freq/mill)
1) *malvertising*	1,968
2) *subvertising*	300
3) *femvertising*	95
4) *spamvertising*	91
5) *catvertising*	48

6) *outvertising*	46
7) *prankvertising*	35
8) *Nichevertising*	31
9) *shockvertising*	30
10) *artvertising*	29

Table 3: *The 10 most frequent -vertisement blends in the enTenTen21 corpus*

Blends	Frequency per million tokens (freq/mill)
1) *malvertisement*	275
2) *slashvertisement*	217
3) *subvertisement*	110
4) *spamvertisement*	35
5) *Artvertisement*	16
6) *Believertisement*	10
7) *blogvertisement*	6
8) *wikivertisement*	5
9) *shockvertisement*	5
10) *femvertisement*	5

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 *-vertisement* 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 SW_1 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 SW_1 with the final splinter of SW_2, i.e. *-vertise*, as in *Magvertise* ← mag(net) × (ad)vertise. No example in this group of blends is formed by splicing the final splinter of SW_1 and the final splinter of SW_2 (i.e. *-vertise*), 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 SW_1s, 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 SW_1. 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<u>v</u>(ile) × (ad)<u>v</u>ertise, *Drivertise* ← dri<u>ve</u> × (ad)<u>ve</u>rtise and *subvertise* ← sub<u>vert</u> × (ad)<u>vert</u>ise. 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. RONNE-BERGER-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 SW$_2$, i.e. the trisyllabic verb *advertise*, as the SW$_1$s 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.[12] 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 SW$_2$, 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><s> *Here are some possible designs that would allow companies to "cashvertise", including the one above for Campbell Soup.*</s><s> (enTenTen21),

(b)　　</s><s> *If one must 'causevertise', there are certain caveats to keep in mind.* </s><s> (Timestamped JSI web corpus 2014–2021),

(c)　　</s><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> (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> (enTenTen21),

(f)　　<s>*We would like to subvertise and distract official communication.*</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 SW$_1$ which is a proper name itself (*AK* is a fragment of *Akvile* (a Lithuanian feminine name)).[13] 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* ← Ak<u>v</u>(ile) × (ad)<u>v</u>ertise (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)<u>v</u>ertise (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_1. 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* ← sol<u>ve</u> × (ad)<u>ve</u>rtising, *bravertising* ← bra<u>ve</u> × (ad)<u>ve</u>rtising, *subvertising* ← sub<u>ver</u>(sive) × (ad)<u>ver</u>tising, *invertising* ← in<u>v</u>(ited) × (ad)<u>v</u>ertising, and *Innovertising* ← inno<u>v</u>(ative) × (ad)<u>v</u>ertising. 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" (RENNER 2015: 129–130). According to the same author (RENNER 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* ← qu<u>ack</u> × <u>ack</u>nowledgement (graphemic overlap) or *abducktion* ← ab<u>duc</u>tion × <u>duck</u> (phonemic overlap)).[15]

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, *tatvertising* ← 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. *bravertising* ← bra<u>ve</u> × (ad)<u>ver</u>tising, *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_1, 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 SW_1 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 SW_1s providing (more than) two syllables to the resulting blends (e.g. *subvertising* ← sub-<u>ver</u>(sive) × (ad)<u>ver</u>tising, *Innovertising* ← inno<u>v</u>(ative) × (ad)<u>ver</u>tising). 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 SW_2 since "the blend as such already provides many clues for the identification of SW_2" (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 SW_1 or advertising of that which is somehow related to SW_1' (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).

tising '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 SW₁'. 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', *captchavertising* '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', *CyberVertising* '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* 'advertising 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' (Timestamped JSI web corpus 2014–2021), *packvertising* 'advertising through the eccentrically English packaging designs' (enTenTen21), *petvertising* 'radio advertising which incorporates 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 advertising medium to attract people's attention and sell products or services', *skinvertising* 'permanent 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), *smutvertising* '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 experience' (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* 'advertising on walls',

(c) 'advertising done by what or who is referred to or denoted by SW₁' (e.g. *bankvertising* 'advertising by banks', *Nanvertising* 'advertising produced by Nan Whaley',

scumvertising 'advertising by scums'),

(d) 'advertising targeted at who or what is denoted or referred to by SW$_1$' (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), *feelsvertising* '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$_1$' (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: *bravertising* (<s>Not to be outdone, Burger King is trying to stimulate some desire of its own with a little "bravertising" 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><s> The X-Rays weren't advertising. </s><s> They were "Factvertising"' – comparative Factvertising. </s><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', *invertising* 'invited advertising' (</s><s>He's coined a phrase called "Invertising", or Invited Advertising.</s><s> (enTenTen21)), *pause-vertising* 'advertising in which ads are paused' (</s><s>There's this new term bubbling up in the media: "pause-vertising."</s><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-*

tising' 'advertising strategy which includes faux ads', *trollvertising* (<s>Some are calling it Burger King trollvertising, but these Burger King advertisement aren\'t really \"trolling.\" It\'s more an invasion of personal space.</s>(Timestamped JSI web corpus 2014–2021)), *wastevertising* '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' (<s>[…] 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 […].</s> (enTenTen21)).

As few as 10 of the *-vertising* blends (8,13%) serve the purpose of naming a business entity (e.g. *Eyevertising* 'name of a promotional product supplier, apparel decorator, and inventor of the custom pinhole sunglasses', *Hopvertising* 'name of the JHU student ad agency', *Innovertising* 'name of a multimedia advertising company', *Freevertising* (</s><s> It's totally up to you, and the technology is completely free. </s></p><p><s> Take a look at this quick demo video to see how Freevertising can turn your RSS feed into a great revenue source. </s><s> (enTenTen21)), *Sportvertising* 'name of a company'), a business model (e.g. a *cal-vertising* 'name of a platform that provides space for the voices of witty and cerebral advertising made in Calcutta ad agencies', *Nichevertising* 'name of a web app that helps you become an authority in your niche'), a blog (e.g. *ugh-vertising* 'name of a blog'), an event or a competition (e.g. *Outvertising* 'name of an event for the advertising and marketing industry championing LGBTQIA+ inclusivity', *Stockvertising* '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 SW_1 or the semantic relations between the source words. These are: *hackvertising*, *hatevertising*, *minevertising*, *punvertising*, and *snoopvertising*.

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 SW_1 and the final splinter. As many as 35 *-vertisement* blends (83,33%) are formed this way. Examples include: *Madonnavertisement* ← Madonna × (ad)vertisement, *filmvertisement* ← film × (ad)vertisement, *track* ← track × (ad)vertisement, *Mockvertisement* ← mock × (ad)vertisement, *Dualvertisement* ← dual × (ad)vertisement, etc. Only 7 examples (16,66%) are produced by blending the initial splinter of SW_1 and the final splinter of SW_2, i.e. the *-vertisement* fragment, as in *snapvertisement* ← Snap(chat) × (ad)vertisement or *annoyvertisement* ← annoy(ing) × (ad)vertisement. No *-vertisement* blend is produced by fusing two final splinters. Segment overlapping is identified in only two examples, namely *subvertisement* ← sub<u>ver</u>(sive) × (ad)<u>ver</u>tisement and *believertisement* ← belie<u>ve</u> × (ad)<u>ve</u>rtisement.

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 SW_1s, as evidenced by 30 out of 42 examples (71,42%), so that the resultant blend is, once again, generally as long as SW_2.

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 SW_2 (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 SW_1, as well as its semantic relation to SW_2, 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 SW_1': *bikevertisement* 'an advertisement attached to a bicycle' (e.g. </s><s> I recently added a little bikevertisement on my Deep Vs to give cagers something to read when I trackstand at lights […] </s></p> (enTenTen21)), *assvertisement* '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. <p><s> The article is overtly promotional and reads like an infovertisement. </s><s> (enTenTen21)), *mapvertisement* 'advertisement in Google Maps and Bing Maps', *memevertisement* 'advertisement that uses memes', *newsvertisement* '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 SW_1': *catvertisement* 'advertisement which is aimed at cats and their owners', *manvertisement* 'advertisement specifically targeted at men', *smellvertisement* 'advertisement that appeals to people's sense of smell',

(c)   'advertisement for what or who is denoted or referred to by SW_1': *docu-vertisement* 'advertisement for a new documentary' (e.g. </s><s> This was so evident in a new PBS 'docu-vertisement', The Human Face of Big Data, airing Feb 24th, […] </s><s> (enTenTen21)), *filmvertisement* 'advertisement for a film', *Madonnavertisement* 'advertisement featuring Madonna',

(d)   'advertisement produced by who or what is denoted or referred to by SW_1', as in *fanvertisement* 'advertisement made by a fan' or *Ars-vertisement* 'advertisement made by the ARS advertising agency',

(e)   'advertisement characterized or described by SW_1': *malvertisement* 'malicious advertisement' (</s><s>Malicious websites and malvertisements (malicious advertisements) are designed to look like a page or ad […]</s><s> (Timestamped JSI web corpus 2021–2022)), *Dualvertisement* (e.g. "For whatever reason, you end up with a Dualvertisement: a Crossover in adspace. […]" (DUALVERTISEMENT (n.d.))), *crapvertisement* 'advertisement of extremely poor quality', etc.

Besides these, there is one blend – *Artvertisement* – whose function is rather different from those of the other *-vertisement* 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 *-vertisement*. 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 *-vertisement* 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 *-vertisement* 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 SW$_1$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*; *catvertise, 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*, *-vertising*, 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*, *-vertising*, 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?

Works Cited

ADAMS 2013: ADAMS, Valerie. *Complex Words in English*. London: Routledge, 2013.

BAGAGLINI AND MICHELI 2022: BAGAGLINI, Veronica, and Silvia M. MICHELI. "The emerging Italian affix -iota between blending and derivation: A corpus-based analysis". *Italian Journal of Linguistics*, 34(1) (2022): 31–58. DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.26346/1120-2726-183

BALDI AND DAWAR 2000: BALDI, Philip, and Chantal DAWAR. "Creative processes". In: Booij, Geert, Christian Lehmann and Joachim Mugdan (eds.), *Morphologie: Ein internationales Handbuch zur Flexion und Wortbildung = Morphology: An International Handbo-*

ok on Inflection and Word-formation. Vol. 1. Berlin/NewYork: Walter de Gruyter, 2000, 963–972.

BAUER 2006: BAUER, Laurie. "Splinters". In: Brown, Keith (ed.), The Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics. Amsterdam: Elsevier, 2006, 77–78.

BAUER AND HUDDLESTON 2002: BAUER, Laurie, and Rodney HUDDLESTON. "Lexical word-formation". In: Huddleston, Rodney, and Geoffrey K. Pullum (eds.), The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002, 1621–1722.

BAUER, LIEBER et al. 2013: BAUER, Laurie, Rochelle LIEBER and Ingo PLAG (eds.). The Oxford Reference Guide to English Morphology. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.

BELIAEVA 2019: BELIAEVA, Natalia. "Blending in Morphology". In: Aronoff, Mark (ed.), Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Linguistics. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019, n.p.

CALLIES 2016. CALLIES, Marcus. "Of soundscapes, talkathons and shopaholics: On the status of a new type of formative in English (and beyond)". STUF - Language Typology and Universals, 69(4) (2016): 495–516. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1515/stuf-2016-0021

CANNON 1986: CANNON, Garland. "Blends in English word formation". Linguistics, 24(4) (1986): 725–753.

COLLINS ONLINE DICTIONARY: Collins Online Dictionary | Definitions, Thesaurus and Translations. <www.collinsdictionary.com/dictionary/english>.

COOK 2001: COOK, Guy. The Discourse of Advertising. London: Routledge, 2001.

COOK 2008: COOK, Guy (ed.). The Language of Advertising. London: Routledge, 2008.

CORREIA SAAVEDRA 2014: CORREIA SAAVEDRA, David. "Automatically identifying blend splinters that are morpheme candidates". Digital Scholarship in the Humanities, 31(1) (2014): 55–71. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1093/llc/fqu059

CRYSTAL 1995: CRYSTAL, David. The Cambridge encyclopedia of the English language. Cambridge [England]: Cambridge University Press, 1995.

CRYSTAL 2011: CRYSTAL, David. Internet Linguistics. New York: Routledge, 2011.

DANILOVIĆ JEREMIĆ 2021: DANILOVIĆ JEREMIĆ, Jelena. "Blend-o-Rama: Blending in the Titles of Episodes of Animated Television Series for Children". Nasleđe Kragujevac, 18(48) (2021): 53-69. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1515/ling.1986.24.4.725

FANDRYCH 2008: FANDRYCH, Ingrid. "Submorphemic elements in the formation of acronyms, blends and clippings". Lexis, 2 (2008): 105–122. DOI: https://doi.org/10.4000/lexis.713

FRADIN 2000: FRADIN, Bernard. "Combining forms, blends and related phenomena". In: Doleschal, Ursula, and Anna Thornton (eds.), Extragrammatical and marginal morphology. München: Lincom Europa, 2000, 11–59.

GRIES 2004: GRIES, Stefan Th. "Isn't that fantabulous? How similarity motivates intentional morphological blends in English". In: Achard, Michel, and Suzzane Kemmer (eds.), Language, Culture, and Mind. Stanford: CSLI Publications, 2004, 415–428.

GRIES 2006: GRIES, Stefan Th. "Cognitive determinants of subtractive word formation: A corpus-based perspective". Cognitive Linguistics, 17(4) (2006): 535–558. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1515/COG.2006.017

HAYES 2010: HAYES, Adam. "What Is Guerrilla Marketing? Definition, Examples, and History". Investopedia, 14 Nov. 2010, www.investopedia.com/terms/g/guerrilla-marketing.asp. Accessed Oct. 2023

HONG 2004: HONG, Sung-Hoon. "Properties of English Word-Blends: Structural Description and Statistical Distribution". *English Language and Linguistics*, 18 (2004): 117–140.

KELLY 1998: KELLY, Michael H. "To 'Brunch' or to 'Brench': Some Aspects of Blend Structure". *Linguistics*, 36(3) (1998): 579–590.

KUBOZONO 1990: KUBOZONO, Haruo. "Phonological Constraints on Blending in English as a Case for Phonology-Morphology Interface". In: Booij, Geert, and Jaap Marle (eds.), *Yearbook of Morphology* 3. Dordrecht: Kluwer, 1990, 1–20.

LALIĆ-KRSTIN 2010: LALIĆ-KRSTIN, Gordana. *Strukturni i sadržinski aspekti novih slivenica u engleskom jeziku: kognitivnolingvistički pristup* [neobjavljena magistarska teza]. Filozofski fakultet, Novi Sad, 2010.

LALIĆ-KRSTIN 2014: LALIĆ-KRSTIN, Gordana. "Forms and meanings of the source word armageddon in English lexical blends". In: Prćić, Tvrtko et al. (eds.), *Engleski jezik i anglofone književnosti u teoriji i praksi: Zbornik u čast Draginji Pervaz*. Novi Sad: Filozofski fakultet, 2014, 257–274.

LALIĆ-KRSTIN 2016: LALIĆ-KRSTIN, Gordana. *Morfemizacija krnjih leksičkih osnova u savremenom engleskom jeziku: leksikološki i leksikografski aspekti*. [neobjavljena doktorska disertacija]. Filozofski fakultet, Novi Sad, 2016.

LALIĆ-KRSTIN AND SILAŠKI 2018: LALIĆ-KRSTIN, Gordana, and Nadežda SILAŠKI. "From Brexit to Bregret: an account of some Brexit-induced neologisms in English". *English Today*, 34(2) (2018): 3–8. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1017/S0266078417000530

LALIĆ-KRSTIN, SILAŠKI et al. 2022. LALIĆ-KRSTIN, Gordana, Nadežda SILAŠKI and Tatjana ĐUROVIĆ. "Meanings of -*nomics* in English: From *Nixonomics* to *coronanomics:* How -nomics has extended its original meaning to additional senses". *English Today*, 39(2) (2022): 1–8. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1017/S0266078422000013

LEECH 1966: LEECH, Geoffrey. *English in Advertising: A Linguistic Study of Advertising in Great Britain*. London: Longmans, 1966.

LEHRER 2007: LEHRER, Adrienne. "Blendalicious". In: Munat, Judith (ed.), *Lexical Creativity, Texts and Contexts*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2007, 115–133. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1075/sfsl.58.16leh

LÓPEZ RÚA 2012: LÓPEZ RÚA, Paula. "Beyond All Reasonable Transgression: Lexical Blending in Alternative Music". In: Renner, Vincent, François Maniez and Pierre J.L. Arnaud (eds.), *Cross-Disciplinary Perspectives on Lexical Blending*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 2012, 23–34.

MANOJLOVIĆ 2021: MANOJLOVIĆ, Nina. "Newly created blends and compounds in the English language related to the Covid-19 Pandemic". *Philologia Mediana*, 13(1) (2021): 843–861. DOI: https://doi.org/10.46630/phm.13.2021.51

MATTIELLO 2013: MATTIELLO, Elisa. *Extra-Grammatical Morphology in English: Abbreviations, Blends, Reduplicatives, and Related Phenomena*. Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter Mouton, 2013.

MATTIELLO 2017: MATTIELLO, Elisa. *Analogy in Word-formation: A Study of English Neologisms and Occasionalisms*. Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter Mouton, 2017.

MATTIELLO 2018: MATTIELLO, Elisa. "Paradigmatic Morphology: Splinters, Combining Forms, and Secreted Affixes". *SKASE Journal of Theoretical Linguistics*, 15(1) (2018): 2–22.

MATTIELLO 2019: MATTIELLO, Elisa. "'Brexit, Grexit, with the possibility of Spexit': Blend splinters and secreted affixes as creative word-formation mechanisms". In: Bonsignori, Veronica, Gloria Cappelli and Elisa Mattiello (eds.), *Worlds of Words: Complexity, Creativity, and Conventionality in English Language, Literature and Culture*, vol. 1. Pisa: Pisa University Press, 2019, 525–538.

MATTIELLO 2021: MATTIELLO, Elisa. "Blends vis-à-vis compounds in English". *Italian Journal of Linguistics*, 33(1) (2021): 3–34. DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.26346/1120-2726-165

MATTIELLO 2023: MATTIELLO, Elisa. *Transitional morphology: Combining forms in Modern English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2023. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009168274

MIGNOT AND PHILIPPE 2022: MIGNOT, Élise, and Manon PHILIPPE. "Introduction: Proper names and the lexicon – an exposition". *Lexis*, 20 (2022): 1–17. DOI: https://doi.org/10.4000/lexis.6906

MILLER 2014: MILLER, Gary D. *English Lexicogenesis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.

MUNAT 2007: MUNAT, Judith (ed.). *Lexical Creativity, Texts and Contexts*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2007.

PANIĆ 2004: PANIĆ, Olga. "Brand Names: How They Are Made and What They Are Made For. *B.A.S.*": *British and American Studies*, 10 (2004): 285–291.

PILLER 2001: PILLER, Ingrid. "Brand Name Formation". *Nomina Africana*, 15(1&2): 189–202.

PILLER 2003: PILLER, Ingrid 2003. "Advertising as a site of language contact". *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 23 (2003): 170–183.

POUND 1914: POUND, Louise. *Blends: Their Relation to English Word Formation*. Heidelberg: C. Winter, 1914.

PRĆIĆ 2008: PRĆIĆ, Tvrtko. "Suffixes vs final combining forms in English: A lexicographic perspective". *International Journal of Lexicography*, 21(1) (2008): 1–22. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1093/ijl/ecm038

RENNER 2015: RENNER, Vincent. "Lexical Blending as Wordplay". In: Zirker, Angelika, and Esme Winter-Froemel (eds.), *Wordplay and Metalinguistic/Metadiscursive Reflection: Authors, Contexts, Techniques, and Meta-Reflection*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton, 2015, 119–134.

RENNER 2019: RENNER, Vincent. "French and English lexical blends in contrast". *Languages in Contrast. International Journal for Contrastive Linguistics*, 19(1) (2019): 27–47. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1075/lic.16020.ren

RENNER AND LALIĆ-KRSTIN 2011: RENNER, Vincent, and Gordana LALIĆ-KRSTIN. "Predicting stress assignment in lexical blends: the case of English and Serbian". In: Tomović, Nenad, and Jelena Vujić (eds.), *International Conference to Mark the 80th Anniversary of the English Department, Faculty of Philology, University of Belgrade: English Language and Literature Studies: Image, Identity, Reality: Proceedings. Vol. 1*. Belgrade: Faculty of Philology, 2011, 265–273.

ROIG-MARÍN 2016: ROIG-MARÍN, Amanda. "'Blended' Cyber-Neologisms: New words show how our world is changing". *English Today*, 32(4) (2016): 2–5. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1017/S0266078416000274

ROIG-MARÍN 2021: ROIG-MARÍN, Amanda. "Blending and Compounding in English Coroneologisms". *Brnos Studies in English*, 47(1) (2021): 31–45. DOI: https://doi.org/10.5817/

BSE2021-1-3

RONNEBERGER-SIBOLD 2006: RONNEBERGER-SIBOLD, Elke. "Lexical Blends: Functionally Tuning the Transparency of Complex Words". *Folia Linguistica*, 40(1–2) (2006): 155–181.

RONNEBERGER-SIBOLD 2010: RONNEBERGER-SIBOLD, Elke. "Word-Creation: Definition – Function – Typology". In: Rainer, Franz, Wolfgang U. Dressler, Dieter Kastovsky and Hans Christian Luschützky (eds.), *Variation and Change in Morphology*: *Selected Papers from the 13th International Morphology Meeting, Vienna, February*. Philadelphia: Benjamins, 2010, 201–2016.

SZYMANEK 2005: SZYMANEK, Bogdan. "The latest trends in English word-formation". In: Štekauer, Pavol, and Lieber Rochelle (eds.), *Handbook of Word-formation: Studies in Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*. Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands, 2005, 429–448.

TOMIĆ 2019: TOMIĆ, Gorica. "On a New Type of Word-Forming Element in Serbian". *Филолог – часопис за језик књижевност и културу*, 20(20) (2019): 248–266. DOI: https://doi.org/10.21618/fil1920248t

TOMIĆ 2023: TOMIĆ, Gorica. "Combinatorial Possibilities and Meanings of the Splinter *-stagram* (← *Instagram*) in New English Lexical Blends". *Komunikacija i kultura online*, 14(14) (2023): 190–210. DOI: https://doi.org/10.18485/kkonline.2023.14.14.10

Sources

AKVERTISE. Social Media Advertising Agency - AKvertise. *AKvertise*. <www.akvertise.com>.

BROWN 2014: BROWN, Craig. "CRAIG BROWN: Call the police! There's been an abducktion". *Mail Online*, 12 June 2014, www.dailymail.co.uk/debate/article-2655774/CRAIG-BROWN-Call-police-Theres-abducktion.html.

BROWN 2017: BROWN, Craig. CRAIG BROWN'S Dictionary of New Words: "Q, Quacknowledgement to Qwrty". *Mail Online*, 3 Aug. 2017, www.dailymail.co.uk/debate/article-4755682/CRAIG-BROWN-S-Dictionary-New-Words.html.

CAMBRIDGE DICTIONARY BLOG. About Words - Cambridge Dictionary blog. *About Words - Cambridge Dictionary blog*. www.dictionaryblog.cambridge.org.

CARNEY. "Petvertising – Carney". *Carney*, www.carney.co/daily-carnage-feature/petvertising.

CARTER 2006: CARTER, Meg. "StrawberryFrog uses human thumbs as ad sites". *the Guardian*, 8 Dec. 2006, www.theguardian.com/media/2006/dec/08/advertising.

CARVERTISE. "Carvertise - Advertise On Uber, Lyft, and Grubhub Cars". *Carvertise*, www.carvertise.com.

CATVERTISE. "Catvertise". *Catvertise*, www.catvertise.nl.

CBC. "Giftvertising | CBC Radio". *CBC*, 14 Mar. 2015, www.cbc.ca/radio/undertheinfluence/giftvertising-1.2993142.

DUALVERTISEMENT(n.d.). https://tvtropes.org/pmwiki/pmwiki.php/Main/Dualvertisement.

EYEVERTISE. "Optometry Website Design | Eyevertise". *Optometry Website Design | Eyevertise*, www.eyevertise.com.

FITZPATRICK 2022: FITZPATRICK, Alex (2022, December 13). *The rise of "skyvertising"*. https://www.axios.com/2022/12/13/skyvertising-drone-ads.

GOOGLE ARTS & CULTURE. "Subvertising - Google Arts & Culture". *Google Arts & Culture*, artsandculture.google.com/story/8AVhlhWUhMQgJw.

IMPULSE BLOG. "Reactvertising - Advertising and quick reactions! | impulse-blog". *impulse-blog*, www.theimpulsedigital.com/blog/reactvertising.

LINKVERTISE. *Linkvertise*, linkvertise.com.

RAZDAN, Harsha (2022, August 14). *Is streamvertising the future of advertising*. https://www.financialexpress.com/business/brandwagon-is-streamvertising-the-future-of-advertising-2629163/.

SKETCH ENGINE. "Create and search a text corpus | Sketch Engine". *Sketch Engine*, www.sketch-engine.eu.

STORYBOARD18. (2023, July 12). *Explained: What is fastvertising?* https://www.storyboard18.com/how-it-works/explained-what-is-fastvertising-10144.htm.

SUPERSIZED MEALS. *Supersized Meals*. www.supersizedmeals.com/food/index.php?topic=-Funny&page=6.

URBAN DICTIONARY. www.urbandictionary.com.

WORDSTREAM. CAPTCH-AD: A New CAPTCHA Form of Advertising? [Blog post]. *WordStream*. www.wordstream.com/blog/ws/2012/03/29/captcha-advertisement.

Горица Р. Томић

'WITH A MILLION PRODUCTS OUT THERE, HOW DO YOU ADVERTISE? YOU DON'T. YOU *ODDVERTISE.*': КОРПУСНА АНАЛИЗА НЕКИХ ЕНГЛЕСКИХ ЛЕКСИЧКИХ СЛИВЕНИЦА ЧИЈИ СУ КРАЈЊИ ФРАГМЕНТИ *-VERTISE, -VERTISING* И *-VERTISEMENT*

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* (← *vertisement*) 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 *-vertisement* представљају њихове скраћене форме. Најзад, извршена семантичка анализа 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: творба речи, енглеске лексичке сливенице, фрагменти *-vertise, -vertising, -vertisement*

Appendix

-vertise blends

1)   *AKvertise*

_____

2)   *Airvertise*
3)   *Apvertise*
4)   *Ass-vertise (Assvertise)*
5)   *AT-Vertise*
6)   *Blogvertise*
7)   *Blogsvertise*
8)   *Buxvertise (BuxVertise)*
9)   *Callvertise*
10)   *Carvertise (CarVertise)*
11)   *cashvertise*
12)   *Catvertise*
13)   *causevertise*
14)   *Crashvertise*
15)   *Crossvertise*
16)   *Drivertise*
17)   *Earnvertise*
18)   *EyeVertise*
19)   *femvertise*
20)   *Hypevertise*
21)   *Invertise*
22)   *Jazzvertise*
23)   *Jobvertise*
24)   *Linkvertise (LinkVertise)*
25)   *Magvertise*
26)   *Netvertise*
27)   *Shockvertise*
28)   *slashvertise*
29)   *spamvertise*
30)   *Sportsvertise*
31)   *subvertise*
32)   *Webvertise*

-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) *streamvertising*
103) *stuntvertising*
104) *subvertising*

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)   *wastevertising*
122)   *webvertising*
123)   *wokevertising*

-vertisement blends

 1)   *annoyvertisement*
2)   *appvertisement*
3)   *ars-vertisement*
4)   *Artvertisement*
5)   *assvertisement*
6)   *believertisement*
7)   *bikevertisement*
8)   *blogvertisement*
9)   *catvertisement*
10)   *chatvertisement*
11)   *crapvertisement*
12)   *docu-vertisement*
13)   *Dualvertisement*
14)   *educationvertisement*
15)   *falsvertisement*
16)   *fanvertisement*
17)   *femvertisement*
18)   *filmvertisement*
19)   *funvertisement*
20)   *infovertisement*
21)   *Madonnavertisement*
22)   *malvertisement*
23)   *manvertisement*
24)   *mapvertisement*

25)   *memevertisement*
26)   *Mockvertisement*
27)   *newsvertisement*
28)   *prankvertisement*
29)   *Roofvertisement*
30)   *scamverisement*
31)   *sheepvertisement*
32)   *shockvertisement*
33)   *skyvertisement*
34)   *slashvertisement (slash-vertisement)*
35)   *smellvertisement*
36)   *snapvertisement*
37)   *spamvertisement*
38)   *subvertisement*
39)   *tweetvertisement*
40)   *trackvertisement*
41)   *webvertisement*
42)   *wikivertisement*