University of Pardubice

Faculty of Arts and Philosophy

English Verbification in a Cross-Discourse Analysis

Master Thesis

2022 Barbora Hladíková

Univerzita Pardubice
Fakulta filozofická
Akademický rok: 2019/2020

ZADÁNÍ DIPLOMOVÉ PRÁCE

(projektu, uměleckého díla, uměleckého výkonu)

Jméno a příjmení:	**Barbora Hladíková**
Osobní číslo:	**H19340**
Studijní program:	**N0231A090011 Anglická filologie**
Téma práce:	**English Verbification in a Cross-Discourse Analysis**
Zadávající katedra:	**Katedra anglistiky a amerikanistiky**

Zásady pro vypracování

Cílem diplomové práce je charakterizovat anglickou verbifikaci jakožto specifický druh konverze v oblasti frekvence užití, morfologie a sémantického výkladu a podrobně prostudovat projevy verbifikace napříč různými typy diskurzu. Studentka nejprve představí fenomén konverze se zaměřením na její výskyt v anglickém jazyce a s využitím relevantní literatury popíše jak veskrze uznávané, tak i sporné a dosud projednávané vlastnosti tohoto způsobu tvorby slov. Důraz bude kladen především na vymezení morfologického mechanismu konverze, zhodnocení možností její sémantické interpretace a posouzení její lexikalizační produktivity. V návaznosti na specifika konverze studentka definuje verbifikaci a vytyčí její podstatné znaky, zejména hlavní výchozí slovní druhy a nejčastější významové kategorie konvertovaných sloves. Následná analytická část práce bude zaměřena na diskurzivní zmapování frekvenčních, morfologických a sémantických aspektů verbifikace prostřednictvím analýzy korpusu verbifikátů z několika odlišných typů psaného diskurzu. Na základě výsledků analýzy studentka posoudí, zdali se zjištěné vlastnosti verbifikace shodují s vybranými teoretickými tvrzeními o konverzi, a s přihlédnutím k příznačným stylistickým rysům jednotlivých diskurzů zhodnotí míru možného vlivu diskurzu na zkoumané sféry anglické verbifikace.

Rozsah pracovní zprávy:
Rozsah grafických prací:
Forma zpracování diplomové práce: **tištěná/elektronická**
Jazyk zpracování: **Angličtina**

Seznam doporučené literatury:

Bauer, Laurie. 2004. *Morphological Productivity*. Vol. 95 of *Cambridge Studies in Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. PDF.

Biber, Douglas, and Susan Conrad. 2019. *Register, Genre, and Style*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108686136.

Brinton, Laurel J., and Donna M. Brinton. 2010. *The Linguistic Structure of Modern English.* Rev. ed. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company. https://doi.org/10.1075/z.156.

Clark, Eve V., and Herbert H. Clark. 1979. „When Nouns Surface as Verbs." *Language* 55, no. 4 (December): 767-811. https://doi.org/10.2307/412745.

Don, Jan. 2005. „On Conversion, Relisting and Zero-Derivation: A Comment on Rochelle Lieber: English Word-Formation Processes." *SKASE Journal of Theoretical Linguistics* 2 (2): 2-16. http://www.skase.sk/Volumes/JTL03/02.pdf.

Hernández Bartolomé, Ana I., and Gustavo Mendiluce Cabrera. 2005. „Grammatical Conversion in English: Some New Trends in Lexical Evolution." *Translation Journal* 9, no. 1 (January). http://www.translationjournal.net/journal/31conversion.htm.

Lieber, Rochelle. 2004. *Morphology and Lexical Semantics*. Vol. 104 of *Cambridge Studies in Linguistics*. New York: Cambridge University Press. PDF.

Lieber, Rochelle. 2017. „Derivational Morphology." *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Linguistics*, March 2017. https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780199384655.013.248.

Martsa, Sándor. 2013. *Conversion in English: A Cognitive Semantic Approach*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing. PDF.

Plag, Ingo. 2003. *Word-Formation in English*. New York: Cambridge University Press. PDF.

Štekauer, Pavol, Ana Díaz-Negrillo, and Salvador Valera Hernández. 2011. „Meaning Predictability and Conversion." *Folia Linguistica* 45 (1): 165-197. https://doi.org/10.1515/flin.2011.006.

Štekauer, Pavol, and Rochelle Lieber, eds. 2005. *Handbook of Word Formation*. Vol. 64 of *Studies in Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*. Dordrecht, Netherlands: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/1-4020-3596-9.

Valera Hernández, Salvador. 1999. „Many Questions and Few Answers: On Conversion in English." *Revista Alicantina de Estudios Ingleses* 12: 181-198. https://doi.org/10.14198/raei.1999.12.14.

Valera Hernández, Salvador. 2017. „Conversion and Figurative Extension of Meaning." *SKASE Journal of Theoretical Linguistics* 14 (2): 2-17. http://www.skase.sk/Volumes/JTL35/pdf_doc/01.pdf.

Vedoucí diplomové práce: **PhDr. Petra Huschová, Ph.D.**
Katedra anglistiky a amerikanistiky

Datum zadání diplomové práce: **30. dubna 2020**
Termín odevzdání diplomové práce: **31. března 2021**

doc. Mgr. Jiří Kubeš, Ph.D.
děkan

Mgr. Olga Roebuck, Ph.D.
vedoucí katedry

V Pardubicích dne 30. listopadu 2020

Prohlašuji:

Práci s názvem English Verbification in a Cross-Discourse Analysis jsem vypracovala samostatně. Veškeré literární prameny a informace, které jsem v práci využila, jsou uvedeny v seznamu použité literatury.

Byla jsem seznámena s tím, že se na moji práci vztahují práva a povinnosti vyplývající ze zákona č. 121/2000 Sb., o právu autorském, o právech souvisejících s právem autorským a o změně některých zákonů (autorský zákon), ve znění pozdějších předpisů, zejména se skutečností, že Univerzita Pardubice má právo na uzavření licenční smlouvy o užití této práce jako školního díla podle § 60 odst. 1 autorského zákona, a s tím, že pokud dojde k užití této práce mnou nebo bude poskytnuta licence o užití jinému subjektu, je Univerzita Pardubice oprávněna ode mne požadovat přiměřený příspěvek na úhradu nákladů, které na vytvoření díla vynaložila, a to podle okolností až do jejich skutečné výše.

Beru na vědomí, že v souladu s § 47b zákona č. 111/1998 Sb., o vysokých školách a o změně a doplnění dalších zákonů (zákon o vysokých školách), ve znění pozdějších předpisů, a směrnicí Univerzity Pardubice č. 7/2019 Pravidla pro odevzdávání, zveřejňování a formální úpravu závěrečných prací, ve znění pozdějších dodatků, bude práce zveřejněna prostřednictvím Digitální knihovny Univerzity Pardubice.

V Pardubicích dne 13. 6. 2022

Barbora Hladíková v. r.

Na tomto místě bych ráda vyjádřila své upřímné poděkování v první řadě PhDr. Petře Huschové, Ph.D. za vedení mé práce a všechny cenné rady, podrobnou zpětnou vazbu a především celkový vlídný a otevřený přístup, který vedení po celou dobu provázel. Zároveň bych chtěla velice poděkovat své rodině a přátelům, jmenovitě Michalovi, Marvinovi, Aivarovi, Madeline, Jessice a A. G., kteří mi v průběhu psaní této práce byli neocenitelnou oporou a pomáhali mi tak úspěšně překonat náročné životní období.

ANNOTATION

This paper examines the nature of English verbification, or conversion to verb, by means of a partly comparative corpus-based analysis across 4 distinct types of written discourse. The main features investigated are the frequency of verbification, its morphological and semantic properties, and the possible influence of discourse type on these parameters. In this way, the thesis aims to put to test selected academic assumptions about conversion and the hypothesis that conversion, and hence verbification as well, may be controlled by discourse-specific factors.

KEYWORDS

verbification, conversion, discourse analysis, frequency, morphology, semantics

NÁZEV

Anglická verbifikace v mezidiskurzivní analýze

ANOTACE

Tato práce zkoumá povahu anglické verbifikace neboli konverze do slovesa prostřednictvím korpusové analýzy částečně komparativního charakteru napříč 4 různými druhy psaného diskurzu. Hlavními sledovanými rysy jsou zde frekvenční, morfologické a sémantické vlastnosti verbifikace a dále možný vliv typu diskurzu na tyto parametry. Na základě této metody si práce klade za cíl ověřit vybraná akademická tvrzení o konverzi a rovněž hypotézu, že konverze, a tudíž i verbifikace může být ovlivněna diskurzivními faktory.

KLÍČOVÁ SLOVA

verbifikace, konverze, analýza diskurzu, frekvence, morfologie, sémantika

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF SYMBOLS AND ABBREVIATIONS

N = noun

ADJ = adjective

V = verb

ADV = adverb

PREP = preposition

CONJ = conjunction

INTERJ = interjection

X→Y = conversion from word-class X to word-class Y

OE = Old English

MnE = Modern English

CED = Cambridge English Dictionary

MW = Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary

OALD = Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary

INTRODUCTION

The focal point of this thesis is a distinct subtype of the so-called conversion, namely, conversion to verb, hereinafter to be referred to as *verbification*. By means of a corpus analysis drawing on data from 4 different text types, this paper aims to investigate in a closer detail the nature of verbification in the English language with 2 primary objectives: firstly, in response to the extensive controversy accompanying most theoretical accounts on the matter, to test via verbification the validity of some of the most frequently propounded academic assumptions about conversion as a whole, and secondly, to evaluate verbification against the broader hypothesis that the actual realisation of conversion in a given discourse may be influenced by stylistic properties of that discourse.

The paper is divided into a theoretical and practical part. The theoretical part comprises the first 2 main chapters and establishes the essential framework for the subsequent analysis. The first chapter defines conversion for the purposes of the thesis, addressing its occurrence and productivity across languages with a focus on English, discussing a variety of theoretical approaches to conversion to demarcate its overall scope, describing its morphological and semantic mechanisms, and providing a word-class based typology of conversion, in which different kinds of conversion are outlined. Particularly verbification is characterised in detail in the second main chapter, which comments both on generic properties of verbification as a whole and on the more specific features of its individual subtypes.

The practical part, representing the third main chapter of this paper, begins with an introduction of 2 sets of assumptions underlying the analysis, both of which fundamentally relate to conversion in general and are subsequently tested specifically on verbification. On the basis of these assumptions, verbification is examined in respect of its 1) relative frequency, 2) morphological properties, and 3) semantic properties within a corpus containing data from 4 written discourses—research articles, advertising texts, literary fiction, and Internet forum posts—to discern any potential discursive influence on the above 3 sides of verbification. After delineation of the methodology, the outcomes of the analysis are discussed in 3 successive sections, each of which deals with one of the abovementioned 3 parameters and clarifies whether, and to what extent, any of the relevant assumptions have been confirmed or disproved. The concluding, fourth main chapter then presents a comprehensive summary of both the theoretical part and the analysis performed.

The corpus data as well as their feature analyses are provided in the appendices of this paper.

1 CONVERSION

The term "**conversion**," as understood in this thesis, refers to a linguistic phenomenon relating lexeme pairs such as *a walk—to walk*, *dry—to dry*, *warm—to warm*, or *a fence—to fence* (examples taken from Don 1993, 1). Perhaps the earliest explicit description of this relation, at least for the English language, dates back to Henry Sweet's *A New English Grammar* (1891–1898, 1:38–40), which, according to Marchand (1969; quoted in Don, Trommelen and Zonneveld 2000, 944), simultaneously represents the first known publication to apply the label "conversion" to the underlying process linking up the members of the pairs of the above kind. Since Sweet's concise characterisation, however, the notion of conversion has been addressed in a wide variety of different frameworks with the result that the precise nature of the phenomenon is becoming increasingly challenging to delimit even in a theory-independent account. The primary aim of this chapter, therefore, is to provide a careful demarcation of conversion as to be conceived of in this paper, which will then serve as a theoretical ground for a description of English verbification, dealt with in Chapter 2.

1.1 BASIC DESCRIPTION OF CONVERSION

Despite the heterogeneity of theoretical approaches to conversion, a number of its distinguishing features occur in the literature regularly in similar formulations, regardless of the framework adopted. These generally accepted basic characteristics of conversion are summarised in Valera (2015, sec. 1, par. 1), where conversion is described as a process marked by 2 fundamental properties:

- **Change of word-class.** Conversion, as defined by Valera, concerns the use of a particular word as if it were a member of a different word-class, with all of its corresponding morphological, syntactic, and semantic characteristics (as noted in the following point). Thus, for instance, a noun may be used as a verb or vice versa (Valera 2015, sec. 3, par. 3). An example of such usage is the word *start*, prototypically a verb with the basic meaning "to begin doing or using something" (OALD 2020), when occurring in a sentence such as (1) below, where it can be considered "converted" into a noun:

  (1) *He was put up for sale before the <u>start</u> of this season.*
  (Valera 2015, sec. 1, ex. 1)

- **No change in the [basic] form of the word in question.** The absence of formal change, however, is paralleled by a notable change in:
    - **inflection**.

      The converted word assumes the inflectional paradigm of the new word-class. Even though this potential is not demonstrated in Valera's above example with *start*, it is implied that *start* in its nominal use should be, accordingly, capable of taking the plural *-s*.
    - **syntax**.

      The word is put in a syntagmatic context characteristic of the new word-class. Correspondingly with this condition, the nominalised verb *start* in (1) above is preceded by the definite article *the* and postmodified by an *of*-prepositional phrase (although the latter property is not inherent only to nouns in English).
    - **semantics**.

      The word undergoes a meaning shift towards the semantic profile of the new word-class. In the case of the converted *start* in (1), the word denotes no longer an action but rather an event or an abstract result of an action, although it retains a semantic connection with the original verb. Furthermore, as Valera (2015, sec. 3, par. 4) specifies, converted items tend to have a considerably wide semantic range thanks to their adaptability to the particular context of utterance; semantic shifts of varying kinds and profundity can therefore be proclaimed commonplace among converted words. Thus, the entry "start (n.)" in OALD (2020) lists not only the meaning "the point at which something begins" as in (1) above, but also, *inter alia*, "the act or process of beginning something" as in (2), "the opportunity that you are given to begin something in a successful way" as in (3), "the place where race begins" as in (4), or "a race or competition that somebody has taken part in" as in (5) below:

      (2) *We need to get an early <u>start</u> in the morning.*

      (3) *The job gave him his <u>start</u> in journalism.*

      (4) *The runners lined up at the <u>start</u>.*

      (5) *She has been beaten only once in six <u>starts</u>.*

      (all examples taken from OALD 2020)

      In relation to the above, Valera (2015, sec. 3, par. 4) also draws attention to the important fact that conversion is compatible with the processes of metaphor and metonymy. This idea is elaborated in Valera (2017), where several examples are

provided of converted words maintaining or undergoing a figurative extension, including *hamstring*$_{V}$ "to disable as if by hamstringing; to cripple, destroy the activity or efficiency of," converted from *hamstring*$_{N}$, i. e. a tendon on the back side of the knee (Valera 2017, 6).

The notion of conversion as a word-class change without any visible formal marking in the basic form occurs in a large number of other accounts, often in a nearly identical wording; these include Aronoff (1976, 71), Balteiro (2007a, 66), Bauer (1983, 32, 227), Don (1993, 2), Jespersen ([1909–1949] 1949, 6:84–85), Kruisinga (1932, 96), Lieber (2004, 89; 2017, sec. 1.3), Martsa (2013, 61), McArthur (1992, 263), Plag (1999, 222), and, importantly, even Henry Sweet himself (1891–1898, 1:38). Other sources, especially those that compare conversion with affixation, interpret the phenomenon in a similar fashion, except that they prefer to describe the formal identity between the lexemes in terms of an absence of any extra affix (e. g. Bauer 2003, 327; Booij 2016, 107; Brinton and Brinton 2010, 101; Quirk et al. 1985, 1558) or at least any *overt* extra affix (e. g. Marchand 1969, 359[1], quoted in Lieber 2005, 419; Schmid 2015, sec. 3, par. 5). Provided that the above characterisation of conversion by Valera (2015) is slightly modified so as to not necessarily involve a "change" or "shift," but simply to concern pairs of semantically related words that are distinguished in word-class but not in the basic form, it can further accommodate descriptions such as those put forward by Don, Trommelen and Zonneveld (2000, 943), Farrell (2001, 109–110)[2], Lieber (1980, 188), Lyons (1977, 2:522), or Nida (1949, 56–57), in addition to those mentioned earlier.

Aside from the above-outlined basic properties, however, there is little academic consensus on the nature of conversion, whose more specific features or principles are mostly dependent on the particular theoretical standpoint adopted. Below follows a list of some of the most contested and/or unresolved issues on the matter:

- in which languages conversion can be said to occur, and how productively;
- where the appropriate place of conversion lies within the language system, and—in relation to that—by what kind of principle or mechanism conversion is driven;
- how wide its morphological scope is, and whether there are any morphological constraints on conversion;
- what the precise semantic character and potential is of converted items;

[1] The phenomenon labelled "conversion" in this thesis is by Marchand interpreted as "zero-derivation" and its products as "zero-(marked) derivatives."

[2] Farrell (2001) uses the term "functional shift" for conversion. The same term is used by Cannon (1985).

- which cases should be included in conversion and which should not, or should only be regarded as unprototypical or marginal. This issue bears on the previous points, but is above all closely related to the kind of typology of conversion proposed.

In the remainder of this chapter, the above-described questionable points are addressed in their respective order on the basis of an assessment of the relevant theoretical approaches provided in the literature, with the aim to arrive at a fairly objective delineation of conversion in all of the above respects.

1.2 Cross-Linguistic Occurrence and Productivity of Conversion

The description of both the occurrence and productivity of conversion across languages of the world relies crucially on the strictness assumed of the criterion regarding (absolute) formal identity of the basic forms of the lexemes in a conversion pair. A convenient compromise on this state of affairs is proposed by Manova and Dressler (2005, 72, 76), who present a fairly liberal definition of conversion, whereby any kind of manipulation is allowed with inflectional or inflection-signalling material on either (or both) of the lexemes involved even in the basic forms; the only conditions for a process to be acknowledged as conversion are word-class change and no addition or deletion of derivational affixes. Along these lines, the authors distinguish 3 types of conversion with an increasing formal difference in the basic forms of the "input" and "output" lexemes, according to which part of the input is taken as the base:

1) **word-based conversion**, where the base for conversion "exists autonomously in a given language" (Manova and Dressler 2005, 71), as in German *weit*$_{\text{ADJ}}$ "wide" → *weit-en*$_{\text{V}}$ "to widen" (Neef 1999, 199) or Dutch *kist*$_{\text{N}}$ "coffin" → *kist-en*$_{\text{V}}$ "to coffin, to lay in a coffin" (Don 2005, 8);
2) **stem-based conversion**, where the base consists of a root and at least 2 suffixes, the last of which is removed or replaced during conversion (Manova and Dressler 2005, 70), as in Russian *igr-á-t′*$_{\text{V}}$ "to play, act, perform" → *igr-á*$_{\text{N}}$ "play, acting, game, sport" (89);
3) **root-based conversion**, where the base is stripped of all suffixes during conversion (Manova and Dressler 2005, 69), as in the case of Latin *don-um*$_{\text{N}}$ "gift" → *don-a-re*$_{\text{V}}$ "to donate" (88).

As implied by Valera (2015, sec. 6, par. 1–2), some form of conversion as defined in the above broad sense has been found in Indo-European as well as Uralic, Semitic, Turkic, Mongolic, and North Caucasian language families, and also in Basque; however, the productivity of the process varies quite significantly across the individual languages. Also

cross-linguistically variable is the predominant type of conversion on the basis of the above typology: while strongly inflecting languages, such as Latin, Serbo-Croatian, or Polish, are likely to manifest especially root-based and stem-based conversions, weakly inflecting languages that approach the ideal isolating type ordinarily feature only the word-based kind (Manova and Dressler 2005, 86–91). An important representative of the latter class of languages is Modern English, a very weakly inflecting and predominantly analytic language, which, in addition, exhibits no morphological word-class distinction in the basic forms of lexemes. The latter property has enabled English to develop the generally rare subtype of word-based conversion, currently the only productive conversion pattern in English, that involves absolute formal identity on the input's and output's basic forms, which are therefore (normatively) indistinguishable from each other in isolation, as with the pair *start*$_{V}$–*start*$_{N}$ (contrastively to a word-based conversion pair such as Dutch *kist*$_{N}$–*kist-en*$_{V}$, where the potential identity in the basic form is disturbed by the presence of the output's inflectional suffix). It is this specific type of word-based conversion in English that represents the focus of this thesis and will be further commented on in the subsequent chapters.

The productivity of conversion in the English language has been almost unequivocally claimed to be high (e. g. Farrell 2001, 117; Lyons 1977, 2:523; Naumann and Vogel 2000, 935–936; Quirk et al. 1985, 1558) or even "extremely" high (e. g. Bauer 1983, 226; Hernández Bartolomé and Cabrera 2005, sec. 2, par. 6; Lipka 1992, 85); authors such as Brinton and Brinton (2010, 79) or Cannon (1985, 429–430), who classify conversion in English among less productive processes, appear to be rather exceptions in this respect. The reasons suggested of the alleged high productivity of the phenomenon include the substantial economy of expression that conversion enables (Mel'čuk 2000, 530), ease of creation on the formal side (Valera 2015, sec. 6, part. 3), and the overall ready understandability of the converted items (Balteiro 2007a, 65) with a very small chance of ambiguity (Jespersen [1909–1949] 1949, 6:85).

In the rest of this paper, then, English conversion is to be approached as a special type of word-based conversion that apparently manifests high productivity and is characterised by absence of change in inflectional material in the basic forms of the lexemes involved, resulting in their formal identity.

1.3 The Status of Conversion in the Language System

Perhaps the most fundamental point of scholarly dispute over the precise nature of conversion relates to the level (or domain) of language system on which conversion supposedly lies and, therefore, should be primarily approached from. To establish a comprehensive perspective on

conversion (and thereby verbification) in this regard, the most influential theoretical accounts addressing this issue are outlined and evaluated in this section. Apart from discussing the linguistic domains where conversion might or might not be located, two additional, related matters of controversy are to be examined in the following subsections: firstly, whether or not conversion is a "directional" process (i. e. whether one of the lexemes can be considered basic and the other derived from it, in the broadest sense; Don 1993, 12, 21–22), and secondly, whether or not conversion can be regarded as a word-formation process.

1.3.1 LEXICAL APPROACHES

Quite uniquely among other scholars, Rochelle Lieber proposes two distinct theories of conversion, one relying on the so-called "redundancy rules" (Lieber 1980, 1981) and the other known as the "relisting analysis" (Lieber 1992, 2004), according to both of which conversion in English is an essentially non-directional phenomenon realised on the level of the lexicon. In her first account, Lieber (1980, 198–203) suggests to treat the members of a conversion pair as two separate lexical entries listed in the permanent lexicon, each specified on its own for lexical class and category membership, that are related by means of a "redundancy" relation (Lieber 1980, 199), relating phonologically identical and semantically connected lexical terminals differring only in category. The "relisting" analysis (Lieber 1992, 157–164; 2004, 89–95), then, conceives of conversion as a special type of coinage beginning with the use of a certain word as a member of a different word-class: given a conversion pair such as *hammer*$_{N}$–*hammer*$_{V}$ (example taken from Plag 1999, 220), the relisting analysis asserts that the form *hammer* has been listed in the mental lexicon twice, first entered as a noun and later "relisted" (i. e. re-entered) as a verb, with the latter instance resulting from the coinage and subsequent entrenchment of *hammer*$_{V}$ in the given speech community in the specific sense "hit with a hammer." As seen, while the "redundancy" theory places conversion outside word-formation, the "relisting" analysis perceives conversion as a word-formation technique.

Both of Lieber's accounts have been criticised especially for their non-directional orientation (Don 1993, 36–43; Don 2005), which has been deemed untenable; most importantly, Don (2005) argues that conversion in English, as well as in German and Dutch, is subject to a number of semantic, morphological and/or phonological constraints and therefore cannot be considered an extra-grammatical process. In view of Don's cogent criticism, neither the theory of redundancy rules nor the relisting analysis of conversion can be accepted in this paper.

1.3.2 SEMANTIC APPROACHES

The essence of semantic approaches to conversion can be outlined in three broad generalisations: firstly, rather than considering conversion an exclusively semantic matter, most authors from this strand of literature highlight the interplay of semantics, syntactics, and morphology in the phenomenon's mechanism, although the latter two provinces are usually described as driven by some fundamental semantic and/or conceptual impetus. Secondly, the definition of conversion in these accounts tends to be based on some kind of semantic change, not infrequently metaphor and/or metonymy. Thirdly, conversion in semantically oriented frameworks is usually interpreted as a directional process and a kind of word-formation in its own right, independent of affixation or other derivational techniques.

All of the above features are explicitly reflected, for instance, in Martsa (2013), whose cognitive semantic framework draws on a number of other important contributions to the study of conversion with a semantic or cognitive orientation (including Štekauer 1996, Twardzisz 1997, and especially Kövecses and Radden 1998, Dirven 1999, and Radden and Kövecses 1999). Applying the methodological tools from these works, Martsa understands conversion as an intrinsically semantic process motivated by **conceptual mappings**, i. e. "projection[s] of one set of conceptual entities into another set of conceptual entities" (Radden and Dirven 2007, 12), which are, in response to the speaker's communicative need to express a rather specific meaning, performed on the input lexeme, giving rise to either **conceptual metonymy**—formulable as "X (STANDS) FOR Y"—or **conceptual metaphor**, formulable as "X IS (PERCEIVED AS BEING SIMILAR TO) Y" (Martsa 2013, 280–281). This conceptual re-evaluation of the entity denoted by the input lexeme then triggers and at the same time controls the subsequent inflectional and syntactic changes taking place during conversion (Martsa 2013, 129–130). In effect, every type of conversion that Martsa acknowledges may be said to be underlain by one or more generic conceptual metonymies and/or—less often—conceptual metaphors, from which one or more specific submetonymies or submetaphors may sometimes be derived. Thus, for example, the verbified noun *shell*$_{V}$ "remove the shell from sth" is in Martsa's model interpreted as relying on the generic conceptual metonymy "OBJECT OF MOTION FOR THE MOTION," specifically on one of its submetonymies, "A THING REMOVED FOR THE ACTION OF REMOVING THAT THING" (Martsa 2013, 138–140).

Although the notion of conversion as a kind of semantic derivation, particularly as one governed by metonymy and/or metaphor, is not accepted universally and has been explicitly argued against, for instance, in Lipka (1992, 138n4, 139–140), semantic approaches to conversion point out the importance of taking the complex semantic side of the phenomenon

into account and simultaneously demonstrate that conversion may be efficiently accounted for as operating not on a single, but on multiple layers of the language system concurrently, even if one of these layers is foregrounded.

1.3.3 SYNTACTIC APPROACHES

Syntactic accounts on conversion can be divided into two branches, directional and non-directional. Since each of these branches is characterised by different trends, they are discussed in separate sections.

1.3.3.1 NON-DIRECTIONAL SYNTACTIC APPROACHES

Non-directional explanations of conversion generally identify the phenomenon with what is variously labelled as **multifunctionality**, **multiple class membership**, **multiple category specification**, **category indeterminacy**, or **category underspecification**, where all the labels listed are more or less synonymous with one another (Martsa 2013, 70). These approaches tend to account for conversion as concerning a single morpheme or lexical item that can possibly assume several different syntactic roles, depending on the syntagmatic context into which it is inserted; in isolation, it is conceived of as either unspecified for word-class membership altogether (as argued in Farrell 2001), or, by contrast, as pertaining to multiple word-classes at once (as asserted in Hockett 1958, 225–227, or Nida 1948, 434–436; 1949, 56–57). Following this perspective, no new word can be said to be created because the operation involves merely a relation between two different uses of the same word, rather than a derivational process.

The above understanding of conversion, whether in terms of word-class underspecification or overspecification, has been extensively criticised in the literature on the grounds that conversion must be strictly distinguished from multifunctionality (Balteiro 2007a, 68, 133; Don, Trommelen and Zonneveld 2000, 950–951; Manova and Dressler 2005, 71; Martsa 2013, 69–70; Naumann and Vogel 2000, 935–936) and that a multifunctionality analysis can be for the English cause possibly assumed only for cases where a change merely in function, but not really in word-class as such can be claimed, e. g. for words alternating between adverbs, prepositions, and/or conjunctions (Martsa 2013, 70) or nouns serving as nominal premodifiers (Balteiro 2007a, 68).

1.3.3.2 DIRECTIONAL SYNTACTIC APPROACHES

Syntactically oriented approaches positing directionality in conversion are in fact better perceived as oscillating between the domains of syntax and morphology, inclining in a varying intensity towards the earlier rather than the latter and sometimes also including semantic considerations. A notable representative of such accounts is Mel'čuk (2000, 526–527, 530), who lists conversion among morphological processes, but proceeds to define the phenomenon

as an operation in which the desirable target meaning is expressed by a type of substitution of one or more features (such as "part of speech") performed on a given stem's syntactics[3]. A similar analysis is presented in Iacobini (2000, 867), where conversion is taken to pertain to derivational morphology, but is interpreted as a "change of syntactic category [and semantics] of the base without an overt marker." In a broader view, then, accounts such as Mel'čuk (2000) and Iacobini (2000) again suggest the inability to efficiently describe conversion with a sole focus on only one domain of the language system.

1.3.4 MORPHOLOGICAL APPROACHES

Morphological approaches represent by far the most common type of analysis applied to conversion phenomena. Most of them situate conversion within derivational, rather than inflectional morphology, perceive it as a productive directional word-formation process, and often comment on the interconnectedness of the morphological dimension of conversion with its syntactic and semantic levels. In the sections below, two subclasses of derivational morphological analyses of conversion are discussed: the so-called **zero-affixation** or **zero derivation** theory and approaches that define conversion as a distinct (primarily) morphological process independent of any derivational method.

1.3.4.1 CONVERSION AS ZERO-AFFIXATION

In a number of works, including Adams (1973, 37), Jespersen ([1909–1949] 1949, 6:85), Kastovsky (1968), Kiparsky (1982, 135), or Lipka (1992, 84–86), conversion is analysed as an affixational operation that concerns attachment of a phonologically null class-changing derivational affix (usually a suffix) to the base. The most influential proponent of this theory, whose account has inspired most of the works following the said approach to conversion, is Marchand (1969; quoted in Don 1993, 26), in whose framework conversion is accordingly called "**zero-derivation**." Crucially, a zero-derivation analysis can only be deemed plausible where the so-called **Overt Analogue Criterion** (Sanders 1988; quoted in Martsa 2013, 12) is fulfilled, according to which it must be possible to find at least one semantically analogous case of overt derivational affixation involving the same input and output word-classes. Following this condition, zero-derivation can be claimed, for instance, for *clean*$_{\text{ADJ}}$ → *clean*$_{\text{V}}$ "make, render clean", based on the parallel with overt affixations such as *legal*$_{\text{ADJ}}$ → *legal-ize*$_{\text{V}}$ "make, render legal" or *sterile*$_{\text{ADJ}}$ → *steril-ize*$_{\text{V}}$ "make, render sterile" (Marchand 1969, 359; quoted in Martsa 2013, 11–12).

[3] In Mel'čuk's framework, the term "syntactics" refers to the third part of a linguistic sign, along with "signifier" and "signified."

Despite its undeniable influence, the zero-affixation theory is well-known in conversion studies for its multitude of serious flaws, summarised in detail e. g. in Balteiro (2007a, 38–40, 49–53) or Martsa (2013, 23–32). Perhaps most importantly, the Overt Analogue Criterion is generally unreliable, since for many obvious cases of conversion, there are either no overt analogues available at all, or there are multiple possible analogues available, but each indicating a different direction of the derivation (Sanders 1988; quoted in Balteiro 2007a, 49–51). Hence, the stance is adopted in this paper that however widespread the zero-affixation analysis may be, it cannot efficiently account for conversion phenomena.

1.3.4.2 Conversion as an Independent Derivational Process

With a frequency similar (and perhaps even superior) to that of zero-affixation analyses, conversion tends to be classified as a discrete, essentially morphological non-concatenative word-formation process on a par with derivational affixation, compounding, and related techniques. Albeit mostly implicit, the line of reasoning for such a treatment of conversion—reflected in works such as Bauer (2003, 124–125, 327; 2005, 316), Brinton and Brinton (2010, 101), Don (1993, 1–2; 2005), Katamba (1993, 54), Lieber (2017, sec. 1.3, par. 1), Manova and Dressler (2005, 71–72), Plag (1999, 93; 2003, 17, 107), or Quirk et al. (1985, 1520, 1558), all of which are situated in different theoretical backgrounds—seems to be based on the following observations:

- certain parallels between conversion and affixation (e. g. Bauer 2003, 123; Don 2005, 7; Manova and Dressler 2005, 71) and also between conversion and backformation (Bauer 2003, 124);
- the fact that conversion concerns the relationship between word-classes, a domain that has been traditionally studied predominantly within the field of morphology;
- the potential of conversion to form new lexical items and, hence, its validity to be acknowledged as a process of word-formation, a part of the language system that has also been perceived and researched mostly as a branch of morphology.

1.3.5 Conclusion and Definition of Conversion

In line with the main tenets of the above-outlined approaches that have not been dismissed as wholly unjustified, **conversion** in this thesis is to be understood as a directional word-formation technique whose mechanism always performs a combination of morphological as well as syntactic, semantic, and/or conceptual operations on the way from the input to the output. Nevertheless, it is the morphological dimension upon which conversion will be recognised primarily in this paper, since, as demonstrated, it is for the reasoning presented in Section

1.3.4.2 that the most substantial support can be found in the literature. With that said, conversion will be treated as a process parallel to affixation and other derivational techniques, since the zero-affixation analysis, as shown, cannot be held; therefore, no overt derivational analogues will need to be specified for individual conversion types.

As a corollary of the above definition, the following phenomena are ruled out of the scope of conversion within this thesis:

- **homonymy**—since true homonyms are not semantically related and therefore fail to meet the condition of a semantic relation between the two lexemes;
- **multifunctionality** and other chiefly syntactic shifts;
- clearly **metalinguistic** uses of lexemes, which do not represent instances of word-formation and do not include semantic change, such as the nominal uses of the underlined words in (6) and (7) below:

  (6) *There are too many <u>althoughs</u> in this paragraph.*

  (7) *He has missed an '<u>m</u>' out of 'accommodate.'*

  (Quirk et al. 1985, 1563n[b]; quotation marks in (7) added)

Metalinguistic uses, however, must be distinguished from any innovative conversions (including nonce-formations), which will be included in the scope of conversion in this thesis as long as they fulfil all morphological, syntactic, and semantic criteria of the phenomenon. This decision is in line with Bauer's (2004, 38–39) argumentation that it is not possible to predict with certainty for any new coinage, however conspicuous, whether it will remain a nonce-word or will gradually integrate in the language through frequent and widespread use; in addition, as aptly noted by Clark and Clark (1979, 769), who focus on innovative verbifications in particular, every established verbified item—and, by extension, every established lexeme created by conversion—was once itself an innovation.

With conversion thus defined, a description follows of its morphological capacity (Section 1.4), semantic properties (Section 1.5), and individual types (Section 1.6).

1.4 Morphological Capacity of Conversion

1.4.1 Inflection

As mentioned in Section 1.1, one of the fundamental morphological properties of conversion is full acceptance of the target word-class' inflectional profile. In English, the inflection of converted items is, characteristically, always regular, i. e. never affected by the historical ablaut, umlaut, or any other synchronically irregular inflectional feature (Brinton and Brinton 2010, 102). Hence, if one of the members of a conversion pair manifests an irregular inflection, it

represents the base, rather than the output, as in the pair *drink*$_{N}$–*drink*$_{V}$, where the verb is the input and the noun the output; in contrast, in pairs such as *ring*$_{N}$–*ring*$_{V}$[4] or *grandstand*$_{N}$–*grandstand*$_{V}$, where neither member is irregularly inflected, the verbs must be considered the outputs, since otherwise they should manifest the irregular inflections of the forms *ring*$_{V}$ and *stand*$_{V}$ and therefore be inflected as **rang*$_{V}$ and **grandstood*$_{V}$ respectively (Plag 2003, 109–110).

1.4.2 INPUT VS. OUTPUT: WORD-CLASSES

Likely due to the widely shared assumption of inflectional adjustment as a necessary prerequisite for acknowledging conversion, which echoes for instance in Balteiro (2007a, 76, 114), Manova and Dressler (2005, 71–72), or Quirk et al. (1985, 1558), the vast majority of academic accounts on conversion in English traditionally centre on the three most inflectionally developed word-classes, i. e. nouns, verbs, and—with a somewhat lesser frequency—adjectives, thanks to the accessibility of morphological evidence; other word-classes, as demonstrated by Martsa (2013, 77–81), are generally approached with more scepticism as either potential inputs or outputs of conversion.

Related to this issue is the question whether there are any actual restrictions on the word-class of the input and of the output. With regard to the input, there seems to be unanimous agreement, regardless of the theoretical stance assumed, that there are no limitations in this respect; thus, at least in theory, any word-class can enter the conversion process (Bauer 1983, 226), including closed word-classes (Valera 2015, sec. 3, par. 1). However, works that also comment on the frequency of certain conversion types (e. g. Adams 1973, Balteiro 2007a, Martsa 2013) suggest that different word-classes have quite radically different potentials to become the input to conversion. Allegedly, the most frequently observed input word-classes are, again, nouns, verbs, and adjectives (Bauer 1983, 229)—especially the first two of these (Adams 1973, 38; Valera 2015, sec. 3, par. 1); in contrast, closed-class items are often characterised as a quite rare kind of input (Balteiro 2007a, 107–109; Hernández Bartolomé and Cabrera 2005, sec. 3.4, par. 1; Martsa 2013, 99; Quirk et al. 1985, 1562–1563). These assumptions have been corroborated by two important corpus-based studies on conversion by Balteiro (2001) and Cannon (1985), whose data on the different kinds of input word-class are provided in Table 6 in Appendix F. Balteiro (2001, 14, 17) suggests that the low productivity of conversion from closed-class items may be due to their semantic restrictedness to

[4] Here in the sense *ring*$_{N}$ "a piece of jewellery" and *ring*$_{V}$ "to provide with a ring; to surround sb/sth; to draw a circle."

grammatical meanings only; open-class items, in contrast, carry the more easily transferrable lexical meaning and therefore constitute a more efficient basis for the correct interpretation of the resulting converted word.

At the same time, however, it is possible for a single word to become input to multiple kinds of conversion (Hernández Bartolomé and Cabrera 2005, sec. 3, par. 3). Bauer (1983, 230) believes that especially closed-class inputs often manifest this flexibility; a word such as *down*$_{\text{ADV/PREP}}$, for example, can undergo conversion to verb (*he <u>downed</u> his beer*) as well as to noun (*he has a <u>down</u> on me*).

On the side of the output, the particular definition of conversion becomes relevant. Provided that conversion is defined as in this thesis, i. e. on the basis of not only syntactic, but also semantic and morphological criteria, the output can only be an open-class item, i. e. a noun, adjective, verb, or—albeit highly arguably—an adverb (Bauer 1983, 226; Valera 2015, sec. 3, par. 1). This, as Martsa (2013, 68–69) points out, sets conversion apart from **grammaticalisation**, a process whereby an open-class item—often inflected—gradually acquires the status of a closed-class item and/or a functional word, which is frequently accompanied by a certain amount of semantic bleaching (as with *regarding*$_{\text{V}}$ → *regarding*$_{\text{PREP}}$, *according*$_{\text{V}}$ → *according to*$_{\text{PREP}}$, or *except*$_{\text{V}}$ → *except (that)*$_{\text{CONJ}}$). Further, the open-class condition on the output eliminates alleged instances of conversion among closed word-classes only, which, as already argued in Section 1.3.3.1, can be analysed instead as instances of multifunctionality.

1.4.3 Input vs. Output: Morphological Structure

In this section, two issues are addressed: firstly, how the conversion mechanism can(not) process units below or above the word level, and secondly, in what ways conversion can interact with other word-formation processes such as affixation or compounding.

1.4.3.1 Units Higher/Lower Than a Word

So far, only instances of conversion derived on the level of the word have been discussed. Certain sources, however, also maintain the possibility of units either lower or higher than a word to be involved in conversion as the input (the output, in contrast, seems to always act as a single word). Examples of such situations include the alleged conversions from an affix (*an ism*, Quirk et al. 1985, 1563), a combining form (*a maxi*, Bauer 1983, 230), a phrase (*a has-been*, *a forget-me-not*, Adams 1973, 55), or even a whole sentence (*you went <u>“What’s your job?”-ing</u> down our way*; *His <u>‘I don’t know’s’</u> are a perfect nuisance*; Kruisinga 1932, 131). Nevertheless, such conversions, if admitted at all, are usually considered marginal and/or controversial, since at least some of them can be alternatively analysed as metalinguistic

uses (Martsa 2013, 81–82) or compounds (Balteiro 2007a, 108; Szymanek 2005, 433). In view of their questionable status, these structures will be considered as going beyond the essential field of focus of this thesis and are to be disregarded in the rest of this paper.

However, there is one unit that might be said to transcend the level of the (prototypical) word and that is to be acknowledged here as a potential conversion input, namely, **compounds** (including phrasal verbs). Despite their borderline status between a word and a phrase and, therefore, between word-formation and syntax, compounds seem to be universally accepted as a kind of complex word with the potential to enter at least certain kinds of conversion (e. g. Balteiro 2007a, 103, 105; Don, Trommelen and Zonneveld 2000, 949; Katamba 1993, 317–318; Martsa 2013, 133–134, 275; Olsen 2000, 905; and, importantly, even Sweet 1891–1898, 1:293) and they are treated so in both of the corpus-based studies by Balteiro (2001) and Cannon (1985), in the latter of which, furthermore, they constitute a substantial part (35.1%) of all conversion inputs. Moreover, the meaning of compounds is often non-compositional, particularly in the case of phrasal verbs, which provides additional support to the preference to recognise compounds as words, rather than phrases, for the purposes of this thesis. Hence, cases such as *wallpaper*$_{N\rightarrow V}$ (Martsa 2013, 275), *call down*$_{V}$ → *a call-down*$_{N}$ (Kennedy 1920, 47; quoted in Balteiro 2007a, 105), *clean up*$_{V}$ → *a clean-up*$_{N}$ (Jespersen [1909–1949] 1949, 6:122), or the already mentioned *grandstand*$_{N\rightarrow V}$ are to be treated in this paper as word-level conversions.

1.4.3.2 Compatibility with Other Word-Formation Processes

The second issue to be discussed with regard to the morphological make-up of items involved in conversion is the well observable compatibility of conversion with other word-formation techniques, which applies both on the side of the input and on that of the output. Nevertheless, this compatibility seems to be subject to several important restrictions, especially as far as the input item is concerned.

1.4.3.2.1 Restrictions on the Input

Apart from compounds, the input may also be a word bearing a derivational affix, an acronym, a blend, or even a clipping (Bauer 1983, 226). In this regard, particularly the processes of derivational affixation and compounding tend to obstruct a lexeme's entering conversion in certain cases.

Starting with **derivational affixation**, it has often been pointed out that conversion from affixed bases is generally rare (e. g. Farrell 2001, 118); in Balteiro's (2001) corpus-based study, affixation was present only on 6.47% of all inputs. Martsa (2013, 273–276) proposes a detailed set of alleged constraints on affixed inputs, according to which verbs, adjectives, and nouns

bearing derivational affixes (e. g. *enlarge*$_{V}$, *baptize*$_{V}$, *beautiful*$_{ADJ}$, *happiness*$_{N}$) resist conversion; however, for most of these constraints, counterexamples can be found (e. g. *embrace*$_{V\rightarrow N}$, Balteiro 2001, 16; *unfit*$_{ADJ\rightarrow V}$, Don, Trommelen and Zonneveld 2000, 948), and particularly derived nouns bearing either a non-native affix (e. g. *engineer*$_{N}$, *pressure*$_{N}$) or a native affix different from *-ness* and *-ity* (e. g. *glider*$_{N}$, *hostess*$_{N}$) seem fairly open to conversion.

Concerning **compound inputs**, only 2 alleged restrictions are found in the literature: firstly, of compound adjectives, only those can be verbified whose latter element is *proof*, e. g. *waterproof*$_{ADJ\rightarrow V}$ (Marchand 1969, 371; quoted in Adams 1973, 50), and secondly, compound verbs, including those created by backformation (but, in this case, not including phrasal verbs), resist conversion to noun, so that forms like **air-condition*$_{N}$ or **baby-sit*$_{N}$ are improbable to occur (Martsa 2013, 275). The latter restriction, however, can apparently be circumvented in some cases, as illustrated by *house-hunter*$_{N}$ / *house-hunting*$_{N}$ → *house-hunt*$_{V}$ → *house-hunt*$_{N}$ "a (single) instance of house-hunting" (Adams 1973, 107).

Other word-formation methods than affixation, compounding, and backformation performed on a lexeme do not seem to restrict its potential to become converted in any way. Thus, conversion has been observed among **abbreviations** (e. g. *404*$_{N\rightarrow V}$, *SUV*$_{N\rightarrow V}$; Martsa 2013, 133), **acronyms** (*MIRV*$_{N\rightarrow V}$, Cannon 1985, 420), **blends** (*smog*$_{N\rightarrow V}$, Cannon 1985, 420), and even **clippings** (*divvy*$_{N\rightarrow V}$, Kreidler 2000, 962).

1.4.3.2.2 RESTRICTIONS ON THE OUTPUT

Products of conversion can lend themselves as inputs to other word-formation methods. In this regard, a single restriction seems to be in effect, whereby converted items are resistant to attachment of derivational affixes (Myers 1984, 65–66; quoted in Balteiro 2007a, 25–26); however, at least some affixes are exempt from this alleged constraint, namely *-er* and *-able* (as in *document*$_{N\rightarrow V}$ + *-er/-able* → *documenter*$_{N}$, *documentable*$_{ADJ}$; Pesetsky 1990, quoted in Don 1993, 52) and, apparently, also *-ee* (as in *experiment*$_{N\rightarrow V}$ + *-ee* → *experimentee*$_{N}$; Lieber 2005, 404). All other word-formation processes seem compatible with products of conversion without any obvious limitation, including compounding (*shake*$_{V\rightarrow N}$ + *hand-* → *handshake*$_{N}$, Adams 1973, 67), combination with a particle yielding a phrasal verb (*smooth*$_{N\rightarrow V}$ + *out*, Quirk et al. 1985, 1562), abbreviation (*GPS = Global Positioning*$_{V\rightarrow N}$ *System*, Szymanek 2005, 435), acronymy (*AWACS = Airborne Warning and Control*$_{V\rightarrow N}$ *System*, Szymanek 2005, 435), blending (*broadcast*$_{V\rightarrow N}$ + *news*$_{N}$ → *newscast*$_{N}$, Quirk et al. 1985, 1583), and clipping (*submarine*$_{ADJ\rightarrow N}$ → *sub*, Kreidler 2000, 960).

Curiously, it is also possible for an output of conversion to become input to another conversion. This phenomenon, labelled "**oscillation**" by Jespersen ([1909–1949] 1949, 6:124) and, more recently, "**reconversion**" by Martsa (2013, 21), seems rather limited in scope: firstly, so far, no sequences involving more than 2 consecutive conversions have been described, and secondly, the product of the latter conversion must be semantically differentiated from the input of the earlier conversion so as to prevent blocking between the first and third item of the resulting triplets, as in *protest*$_{V1}$ "to show disapproval" → *protest*$_{N}$ "an expression of disapproval; *(later)* a gathering organised to show disapproval" → *protest*$_{V2}$ "to stage a [public] protest" (Kiparsky 1982, 142). Jespersen ([1909–1949] 1949, 6:124–127) lists 3 existing reconversion patterns:

1) **N→V→N**, allegedly the most common type (e. g. *jaw*$_{N1}$ "bones at the bottom of the face" → *jaw*$_{V}$ "use the jaw in talking; *(later)* scold" → *jaw*$_{N2}$ "a talk, a scolding");
2) **ADJ→V→N**, e. g. *faint*$_{ADJ}$ "sluggish, timid, weak" → *faint*$_{V}$ "become weak, swoon" → *faint*$_{N}$ "a fainting fit [or, falling unconscious]";
3) **V→N→V**, e. g. *wake*$_{V1}$ "be(come) awake" → *wake*$_{N}$ "vigil beside a corpse" → *wake*$_{V2}$ "hold a wake over (a corpse)."

The overall manipulation of meaning both during and after conversion, which, as seen above with *protest* or *jaw*, enables to circumvent item blocking in reconversions by means of drawing on the input's polysemy, is discussed in detail in the following section.

1.5 Semantics of Conversion

As already indicated in Section 1.1, despite the necessary semantic adaptation of the output to the target word-class, there remains—at least initially—a certain semantic link between the input and output items in a conversion pair (Martsa 2013, 67, 71). Such meaning relatedness exists due to the semantic mechanism of conversion, which, as explicated by Štekauer (1996; quoted in Balteiro 2007a, 26–28), involves selection—or "topicalisation," in Štekauer's terms—of a particular salient meaning facet (a semantic role, property, or feature) of the input that is subsequently projected to the output to become the essence of its lexical meaning.

More often than not, the "topicalisation" concerns the primary, basic semantic properties or associations related to the entity denoted by the input (often in terms of the entity's ordinary purpose(s) in everyday life). This is the principle underlying one of the frequently highlighted characteristics of conversion, namely, that the meaning of the output is usually perfectly understandable and highly predictable from the meaning of the input (e. g. Crocco-Gàleas 1990, 27; Jespersen [1909–1949] 1949, 6:85; Martsa 2013, 194), even if the converted

word is encountered for the first time and/or in isolation: given a verb such as *salt*$_{V}$ (Štekauer 1996; quoted in Balteiro 2007a, 28), the most likely interpretations will naturally revolve around either adding salt to food or spreading it onto a road or pavement, both of which are purposes for which *salt*$_{N}$ is ordinarily used. Nevertheless, on other occasions, the topicalisation concerns secondary, rather than primary meaning facets, in which case the intended meaning of the output becomes comparatively more sensitive to the situational context of the utterance and other extralinguistic factors and its predictability decreases (Štekauer 1996; quoted in Balteiro 2007a, 28–29). This situation is especially often observed among N→V conversions, where such contextually determined denominal verbifications have been classified by Clark and Clark (1979) under the more general category of so-called **contextuals**, i. e. items that have "an indefinitely large amount of [possible] senses" and their correct interpretation relies heavily on an effective pragmatic cooperation between the speaker and the listener and their shared extralinguistic knowledge (Clark and Clark 1979, 782–783). Many contextual conversions come from proper nouns, such as *Houdini*$_{V}$ as in the sentence *My sister Houdini'd her way out of the locked closet*, where it assumes the meaning "escape by trickery," based on the activity that the referent of the input noun was famous for (Clark and Clark 1979, 784); other contextuals originate from common nouns, such as *stone*$_{V}$ or *bottle*$_{V}$ in the sense "throw stones/bottles at somebody" (Clark and Clark 1979, 785), which obviously draws on a non-prototypical usage of the items in question and, analogously to *Houdini*$_{V}$, can only be correctly inferred in an appropriate context.

It may have been precisely the existence of contextual conversions that has led some scholars, including Bauer (1983, 226) or Plag (1999, 220), to speculate that from the semantic point of view, conversion is an essentially unrestricted process, governed in fact exclusively by the context of utterance, so that the output can theoretically have any meaning imaginable. In general, converted items indeed do share a greater or lesser amount of semantic flexibility regulated by both the linguistic and extralinguistic context (Balteiro 2001, 19; Valera 2015, sec. 3, par. 4); however, as pointed out by Štekauer (1996, 102, 106; quoted in Balteiro 2007a, 28), any product of conversion, including a contextual one, is necessarily limited in its possible number of meanings, firstly, by the total number of meaning facets of the input (out of which, furthermore, only a single one can be selected for conversion, as explained above), and secondly, if the input item is polysemous, then the overall potential semantic scope of the output cannot generally exceed the totality of the meanings of the input (out of which, again, only a single one is operated upon during the particular instance of conversion). Due to this important semantic constraint, any output of conversion (at least initially) not only naturally possesses

a considerably narrower semantic range than the input, but it is, moreover, semantically reliant on the input item, since its meaning is built upon one of the input's senses, because of which the output's meaning is also necessarily more specific than that of the input's. This relationship between the output and input items has been described as "**semantic inclusion**" or "**semantic dependence**" (Brinton and Brinton 2010, 102; Marchand 1969, quoted in Katamba 1993, 120; Quirk et al. 1985, 1558–1559) and will be further illustrated in Section 1.6.3.

The topicalisation and transfer of meaning during conversion need not concern only literal meanings. As demonstrated in Valera (2017), both literal and figurative meanings are open to the conversion process: apart from the more prototypical cases such as *holster*$_{N}$ → *holster*$_{V}$ "to put a gun into a holster" (Valera 2017, 3–4), where only literal meanings are manipulated, there are instances where the meaning topicalised is figurative, as in (8) below, or where a literal meaning is selected as the point of departure, upon which it undergoes figurative extension in parallel with the conversion, so that the output possesses a meaning that is not present in the input, as in (9):

(8) *lobby*$_{N}$:

i. (*literal*) "a large entrance-hall in the House of Commons, chiefly serving for interviews between members and persons not belonging to the House"

ii. (*figurative*) "the persons who frequent the lobby of the house of legislature for the purpose of influencing its members in their official action"

→ *lobby*$_{V}$ "to influence (members of a house of legislature) in the exercise of their legislative functions by frequenting the lobby"

(Valera 2017, 5)

(9) *coffee-house*$_{N}$ "a house of entertainment where coffee and other refreshments are supplied; much frequented in the 17th and 18th centuries for the purpose of political and literary conversation" → *coffee-house*$_{V}$ "to indulge in gossip"

(Valera 2017, 7)

In cases like (9) above, it may be said that the conversion is directly motivated by figurative extension performed on the base (Valera 2017, 7).

In addition, if the input item has both literal and figurative senses, conversion may occasionally transfer all of these into the output, as in (10) below:

(10) *oyster*$_{N}$:

i. (*literal*) "any of the various bivalve molluscs of the family Ostreidae"

ii. (*figurative*) "a reserved or uncommunicative person"

oyster$_{V}$:

i. (*literal*) “to fish for or gather oysters”

ii. (*figurative*) “to become silent; to shut up”

(Valera 2017, 5–6)

Once the output is created and becomes a lexeme in its own right, it can then undergo further meaning changes (including all kinds of figurative extension), often independently on the semantic development of the input; hence, it is not exceptional that the output’s original meaning transforms with time (Kruisinga 1932, 96–97) and/or the output becomes polysemous (Twardzisz 1997; quoted in Balteiro 2007a, 33). Such was the case of *hamstring*$_{V}$, already described in Section 1.1, which, in addition to its literal (anatomical) sense “to cut the hamstring of a human/animal,” developed over time the nowadays prevalent figurative sense “to disable, cripple, destroy the activity or efficiency of—as if by cutting one’s hamstring” (Valera 2017, 6). Contrastively to the verb, the original noun has not undergone any similar figurative shift so far.

Naturally, any meaning shift and/or development of a new meaning within the output following the conversion somewhat weakens the semantic connection with the input. Sometimes, the meaning (or one of the meanings) of the output recedes so far from the topicalised input meaning that the semantic link between the input and output senses is completely broken: Balteiro (2007a, 29) cites the example of *milk*$_{V}$, which, after the derivation of its original sense “to obtain milk from a cow or any other dairy animal” (*milk*$_{V1}$), came to be used with an increasing metaphoricity, leading to the development of the additional senses “to exploit; obtain as much money, advantage, etc. as possible from sth, esp. in a dishonest way” (*milk*$_{V2}$) and “to obtain information by secretly listening to sb’s phone calls” (*milk*$_{V3}$), where the last mentioned sense already bears little to no semantic trace of the original noun *milk*$_{N}$. In line with Balteiro’s opinion (2007a, 29), cases like *milk*$_{V3}$ will not be acknowledged as conversions in this paper and will instead be relegated to the domain of pure semantic derivation; in contrast, cases like *milk*$_{V2}$ will continue to be admitted as conversions, since their semantic connection with the input is still retrievable and their inclusion in the scope of conversion is not incompatible with theories that interpret conversion as a kind of semantic extension (such as Martsa 2013).

Returning to the matter of context-sensitivity and semantic (un)limitedness of converted items, the issue is often considered whether conversion is completely random and unpredictable in the meanings expressed, or whether some regularity can be found in them and conversion therefore subsumes a set of fairly stable meaning categories, at least some of which are realised

more frequently than all the other possible ones. While accounts such as Adams (1973, 27), Bauer (1983, 226), or Plag (1999, 220) incline more to the former viewpoint, others, such as Balteiro (2007a), Bauer (2004, 63–64), Don (2005, 7–9), or Martsa (2013), assert that conversion is clearly "pattern-forming" on its semantic side (Balteiro 2007a, 40). Accordingly, the literature on conversion offers a number of lists and taxonomies of frequently encountered meanings of converted words, many of which seem to be recurrent items in nearly all the meaning lists available. Because the specific proposed meaning categories of products of conversion are fundamentally dependent on the word-classes of the input and output, they will be described in Chapter 2 for the individual subtypes of conversion to verb, after the classification principles of typology of conversion according to input and output word-classes are delineated.

1.6 TYPOLOGY OF CONVERSION

This section is meant to put forward a comprehensive taxonomy of individual types of conversion as defined in this paper, together with their distinct characteristics. Although conversion can also be classified in different ways, probably the most commonly used parameter for this purpose—and, simultaneously, the most convenient one for the aims of this thesis—is the direction of conversion, more specifically, the word-class of the output, according to which conversion is to be categorised here. Before the actual typology can be introduced, however, there are 4 important issues related to classifying conversion that need to be addressed first.

1.6.1 A WORD-CLASS BASED TYPOLOGY

Assuming the concept of word-class as the base for a typology of conversion is not unproblematic, due to the well-known issue of diffuse and partly overlapping boundaries between individual word-classes (Balteiro 2007a, 70–74). Since, however, the very notion of conversion is dependent on the idea of word-class (Bauer 2005; quoted in Valera 2015, sec. 2, par. 3) and, in particular, on the standard division into classes such as noun, adjective, or verb, the following typology of conversion will draw on the traditionally recognised word-class system for English with awareness of its limitations. To tackle these limitations as effectively as possible, the output word-class will be determined on the basis of a combination of morphological, syntactic, and semantic distinguishing criteria applicable to at least the most prototypical members of the given class, which will be provided at the beginning of every section characterising a given conversion type. Because conversion as defined in this thesis is perceived as a primarily morphological phenomenon, the morphological criteria for delineating

word-classes will be given priority; hence, any conversions that do not assume the full morphological potential of the given word-class will not be acknowledged, even if they do comply with the corresponding syntactic and semantic word-class profile.

1.6.2 CONVERSION: PRIMARY VS. SECONDARY, TOTAL VS. PARTIAL

Precisely the requirement of adoption of the target word-class' morphology in its entirety, together with the definition of conversion as a type of word-class change, rules out two phenomena that are sometimes, rather controversially, incorporated into conversion classifications as broader subcategories of conversion: the so-called "**change of secondary word-class**," whereby the shift affects only "secondary" word-class features like transitivity of verbs, gradability of adjectives, or countability of nouns, and "**partial conversion**," which does involve "primary" word-classes such as nouns, adjectives, or verbs, but only some of the new word-class' characteristics are adopted by the output—usually only the syntactic and/or semantic ones, but not the morphological ones (Balteiro 2007a, 78–79). Thus, besides structures that have already been relegated to the domains of multifunctionality or grammaticalisation, forms such as "*the wealthy*" or the countable use of *coffee*$_{N}$, as in "*two coffees*" (examples taken from Quirk et al. 1985, 1559, 1564), also fall out of the scope of conversion in this paper, where only what may be labelled "primary" and "total" conversion, as opposed to "secondary" and "partial" conversion, is to be acknowledged.

1.6.3 DIRECTIONALITY CRITERIA AND SYNCHRONY VS. DIACHRONY

Once conversion is classified according to the output word-class, the much discussed difficulty often arises of determining which of the two lexemes of a given pair actually represents the output (Brinton and Brinton 2010, 102; Iacobini 2000, 867). A variety of directionality criteria are provided in the literature to resolve such problematic cases; the choice and use of these criteria, however, depend to a large degree on the related issue of whether conversion should be approached and analysed from a **synchronic** or **diachronic** perspective. Certain authors, most notably Balteiro (2001, 2007a, 2007b), argue for adopting a dia-synchronic approach where diachronic criteria, for instance etymology, take precedence, with the result that many forms traditionally analysed as conversions—such as pairs of loanwords whose forms fell together over time (e. g. *account*$_{N/V}$, *quarrel*$_{N/V}$, *study*$_{N/V}$, *travel*$_{N/V}$; Balteiro 2001, 12) or related English words pertaining to different word-classes whose originally distinct forms were levelled throughout the history of the English language (e. g. OE *smoca*$_{N}$–*smocian*$_{V}$ → MnE *smoke*$_{N}$–*smoke*$_{V}$; Balteiro 2001, 11)—are excluded from the scope of conversion on the grounds of not being "true" conversions historically. However, as pointed out by Martsa (2013, 89, 237),

the predominant contemporary approach to conversion is either primarily or purely synchronic, deliberately disregarding the fact that in some cases, the formal identity of two lexemes otherwise manifesting all typical characteristics of conversion may have a different diachronic explanation. This stance seems indeed to be underlying most currently available works on conversion and in a number of them it is advocated explicitly, as in Martsa (2013, 89–90, 236), but also Iacobini (2000, 870), Naumann and Vogel (2000, 932), Quirk et al. (1985, 1558), Twardzisz (1997, 167), or Valera (2015, sec. 2, par. 5). Following these approaches, conversion in this thesis will be understood as an essentially synchronic process; it will, therefore, also cover cases such as *travel*$_{N/V}$ or *smoke*$_{N/V}$ and its directionality will be evaluated principally via synchronic criteria.

In particular, the basis for determining the direction of conversion in this paper will be represented by the set of synchronic criteria proposed by Marchand (1964; quoted in Martsa 2013, 237–239), one of the most elaborated and most frequently utilised systems of criteria developed for this purpose. The individual criteria are listed below; the first two of them have already been addressed in Section 1.5.

1) **Semantic dependence.** That word of a conversion pair is the output whose interpretation is dependent on the content features of the other word. Hence, in the pair *whistle*$_N$–*whistle*$_V$, the noun is the output, since its interpretation can be paraphrased in terms of "a musical instrument producing a whistling sound," while *whistle*$_V$ can be interpreted in terms of making "a high or musical sound by blowing air out through one's lips," that is, without making any reference whatsoever to a *whistle*$_N$.
2) **Semantic range.** That word of a conversion pair is the output which has a smaller, i. e. narrower field of reference and is therefore more specific. Thus, in *whistle*$_N$–*whistle*$_V$, the noun is the output because it refers to a fairly limited set of entities that must conform to quite specific chararacteristics to qualify as whistles; in contrast, *whistle*$_V$ has a much broader semantic range, since whistling can be realised not only with all kinds of *whistles*$_N$, but also with blades of grass, with the help of one's fingers, etc.
3) **Restriction of usage (and frequency of occurrence).** That word of a conversion pair is the output which has a smaller range of usage and, consequently, occurs with a lower frequency than the other word. Thus, in *author*$_N$–*author*$_V$, the verb is the output because its range of usage is much smaller than that of *author*$_N$ and also because the verb occurs considerably less frequently than the noun.

4) **Semantic pattern.** This criterion applies to conversion pairs in which one of the members has a specific kind of meaning that marks it as the output. Such is the case of pairs like *cheat*$_{N}$–*cheat*$_{V}$ or *flirt*$_{N}$–*flirt*$_{V}$, where, in both cases, the noun is the output, manifesting the characteristic derivational pattern "V → N 'one who V-es.'"
5) **Phonetic shape.** This criterion applies to conversion pairs with affixed members, where certain types of affixes, characteristic of a particular word-class, mark the direction of conversion. For instance, in N–V pairs where the members bear typically nominal derivational suffixes such as *-(a/o)tion*, *-ition*, *-ment*, *-(t)ure*, or *-ade*, the noun must be seen as the input and the verb as derived from it, as in *commission*$_{N}$–*commission*$_{V}$ or *fracture*$_{N}$–*fracture*$_{V}$.
6) **Morphological type.** This criterion applies specifically to compounds with a certain structure that characteristically follow a conversion pattern with a particular given direction. Notably, in conversion pairs whose members are compounds with the "ADJ+N" or "N+N" structure, the direction is strictly N→V; hence, in both *blacklist*$_{N}$–*blacklist*$_{V}$ and *snowball*$_{N}$–*snowball*$_{V}$, the verb is the output.
7) **Stress.** As will be discussed in Section 1.6.4, the members of conversion pairs sometimes differ in their stress patterns, especially where the members are complex words and/or words of a Romance origin. According to Marchand (1964), the position of primary stress may be indicative of the direction of conversion: for instance, in pairs such as *óuthouse*$_{N}$–*óuthouse*$_{V}$ or *úndercurrent*$_{N}$–*úndercurrent*$_{V}$, the verb is the output because it still bears the primary stress on the first syllable, which is a typical nominal feature. With respect to Latinate word pairs, whose members are particularly often differentiated in stress, Kiparsky (1982, 140) specifies that where the stress pattern differs on the input and on the output (as in *tórment*$_{N}$–*tòrmént*$_{V}$), the direction is V→N[5], and where the stress pattern is identical with both members (as in *páttern*$_{N}$–*páttern*$_{V}$), the direction is N→V.

It is taken into account that Marchand's set of criteria is not without limitations; for instance, the restriction of usage criterion is problematic in cases where both members of the conversion pair have a low type frequency in general (Iacobini 2000, 871). Hence, two more, additional criteria will be applied for determining the direction of conversion:

[5] Adams (1973, 39) argues that this is not always the case, providing the counterexample *ségment*$_{N}$–*segmént*$_{V}$, where the direction is N→V. However, it is here presumed that even with possible exceptions to Kiparsky's postulate, the correct direction of the conversion would eventually be established on the basis of evaluation of the other criteria (especially the semantic ones), which would in cases like *segment* indicate a denominal, rather than deverbal origin.

8) **Regularity of inflection.** This formal criterion was already described in Section 1.4.1: crucially, if one of the members of a conversion pair is irregularly inflected, it is the input (as in *drink*$_{V}$ → *drink*$_{N}$).
9) **Precedence of occurrence.** That word of a conversion pair is the input which is historically first attested earlier than the other word. This is a diachronic criterion and, in line with the primarily synchronic view on conversion adopted here, it will be used only as the last resort if all other criteria fail to determine the direction of conversion convincingly. The same strategy is applied by Adams (1973, 39) and Marchand (1963; quoted in Martsa 2013, 239–240), who also approve of evaluating the date of first record in otherwise doubtful cases.

1.6.4 CONVERSION WITH SLIGHT FORMAL MODIFICATIONS

Adoption of a primarily synchronic view on conversion has consequences in relation to certain contentious forms that may be potentially acknowledged as conversions as well. These forms represent pairs of semantically related lexemes pertaining to different word-classes that, synchronically, show all typical characteristics of conversion, but their basic forms are not completely identical; instead, they manifest some sort of minor phonological and/or orthographic difference. Balteiro (2007a, 110–114) presents 3 types of these slight formal modifications:

1) **Difference in stress.** This is mostly the case of many N/ADJ–V pairs consisting of disyllabic Latinate words that are in their original language analysable as prefixed; some typical examples include *ábstract*$_{ADJ}$–*abstráct*$_{V}$, *dígest*$_{N}$–*digést*$_{V}$, *ínsert*$_{N}$–*insért*$_{V}$, *súrvey*$_{N}$–*survéy*$_{V}$, or *fréquent*$_{ADJ}$–*frequént*$_{V}$. Brinton and Brinton (2010, 102) add that stress shift is also present in conversions from phrasal verbs, during which primary stress moves from the particle to the first element, as in *còme báck*$_{V}$ → *cómeback*$_{N}$ or *tàke óver*$_{V}$ → *tákeover*$_{N}$.
2) **Difference in vowel quality (alone).** This difference may occur in N/ADJ–V pairs of polysyllabic words and concerns a full vowel or diphthong on the verb contrasting with /ə/ on the related noun or adjective, as in *implement*$_{N}$ /ˈɪmplɪm**ə**nt/ vs. *implement*$_{V}$ /ˈɪmplɪm**e**nt/ or *deliberate*$_{ADJ}$ /dɪˈlɪbər**ə**t/ vs. *deliberate*$_{V}$ /dɪˈlɪbər**eɪ**t/.
3) **Difference in consonant quality.** This is a less frequent variance than the previous two types and it is the only type of formal difference in this list that can be reflected in orthography. It affects N–V pairs, whereby the noun ends in a voiceless consonant, whereas the verb ends in a voiced consonant. There are two subtypes of this difference:

a) Cases where the final, voiced consonant on the verb contrasts with its corresponding voiceless equivalent on the noun (usually as the result of root allomorphy). The difference is sometimes, but not always, reflected in spelling. Examples include *abuse*$_{N}$–*abuse*$_{V}$, *belief*$_{N}$–*believe*$_{V}$, *intent*$_{N}$–*intend*$_{V}$, or *mouth*$_{N}$–*mouth*$_{V}$. Additionally, Quirk et al. (1985, 1566) note examples specific to British English that involve a difference exclusively in orthography, such as *practice*$_{N}$–*practise*$_{V}$ or *licence*$_{N}$–*license*$_{V}$.

b) Cases where the voiced and voiceless final consonants on the verb and on the noun are not (phonological) alternatives of each other, as in *constrain**t***$_{N}$ vs. *constrai**n***$_{V}$, *expense*$_{N}$ /ɪkˈspen**s**/ vs. *expend*$_{V}$ /ɪkˈspen**d**/, or *excess*$_{N}$ vs. *exceed*$_{V}$.

In a strictly diachronic approach to conversion, all of the above forms would naturally fall out of the scope of English conversion because they may be analysed as results of either borrowing or diachronic levelling of form; a synchronic view, however, enables their potential inclusion into conversion processes. Despite the lack of complete concord among synchronic approaches as regards their treatment, the prevalent attitude in the literature, as pointed out by Valera (2015, sec. 4.1, par. 1–2), is to acknowledge such structures as conversion pairs as well—with the notable exception of type 3b, which seems to be mentioned in relation to conversion solely in Balteiro (2007a). Accordingly, all above types of pairs of related lexemes marked by slight formal modifications will be considered as underlain by conversion in this paper, except for type 3b, for whose recognition there is not enough support in the literature and whose admittance would likely render conversion as understood in this thesis too unrestrained.

With conversion as demarcated throughout sections 1.6.1–1.6.4, its individual types can now be introduced.

1.6.5 CONVERSION TO NOUN

In order to qualify as a noun, the output of conversion must meet the following criteria:

- **Morphologically**, it is capable of taking the *-s* plural and *-s'* genitive inflection and it can potentially accept a derivational affix characteristically attaching to nouns, such as *-er*, *-ism*, or *-ness* (Adams 1973, 17).
- **Syntactically**, it has the potential to be premodified by adjectives (Balteiro 2007a, 74), follow determiners such as *a*, *the*, *my*, or *this*, and be preceded by prepositions (Adams 1973, 17). In a clause, it can act as the subject, the object, or a premodifier of another noun (Balteiro 2007a, 74).

- **Semantically**, it expresses a substance (in the widest sense possible, including specific things and living entities), attribute, or phenomenon (Sweet 1891–1898, 1:54, 61).

Conversion to noun is believed to have solid productivity, despite its competition with the numerous affixational nominalising techniques in English including *-ation*, *-er*, or *-ment* (Adams 1973, 37). As seen in Table 7 in Appendix F, in Balteiro's (2001) and Cannon's (1985) corpus-based studies, nominalising conversion accounted for 42.77% and 42.68% respectively of all conversions.

As for the input word-classes, by far the most frequently exploited one seems to be verb (Adams 1973, 38; Balteiro 2001; Quirk et al. 1985, 1560), although in Cannon's (1985) study, as shown in Table 8 in Appendix F, the prevalent nominalising pattern was ADJ→N. Apart from nominalised verbs (e. g. *bore*$_N$, *cut*$_N$, *finish*$_N$, *kick*$_N$, *lock*$_N$, *sink*$_N$, *surprise*$_N$, *turn*$_N$; Martsa 2013, 183–184) and adjectives (*capital*$_N$, *musical*$_N$, *private*$_N$, *stimulant*$_N$, *variable*$_N$; Balteiro 2007a, 81–82), nominalising conversion—provided that there is enough semantic differentation between the input and the output—can also yield lexemes based on gerunds (*building*$_N$, *covering*$_N$, *drawing*$_N$; Adams 1973, 25), participles (*sighing(s)*$_N$, Balteiro 2007a, 82; *coloured(s)*, Adams 1973, 22), adverbs (*hereafter*$_N$, *inside*$_N$; Martsa 2013, 189), prepositions (*down*$_N$ "grudge," *in*$_N$ "influence," *out*$_N$ "way out of a difficulty"; Adams 1973, 55), or conjunctions (*but*$_N$ "hesitation, resilience," *if*$_N$ "things that may possibly happen"; Martsa 2013, 189).

1.6.6 CONVERSION TO ADJECTIVE

In order to qualify as an adjective, the output of conversion must manifest the following characteristics:

- **Morphologically**, it can be specified for degree, either via inflection by means of the comparative *-er* and superlative *-est* or periphrastically, via premodification by *more* or *most*; in addition, it can become input to derivation to adverb or abstract noun by means of the suffixes *-ly* and *-ness* respectively (Adams 1973, 19).
- **Syntactically**, it can be premodified by adverbs, particularly by intensifiers, such as *so*, *very*, *quite*, *rather*, *almost*, *highly*, or *completely* (Brinton and Brinton 2010, 137). In a sentence, it may appear in an attributive as well as predicative position (Adams 1973, 17).
- **Semantically**, it expresses some kind of property or attribute (Balteiro 2007a, 74).

Conversion to adjective as defined on the basis of the above criteria can be presumed to be of rather limited productivity in view of the large depository of competing adjective-forming

derivational affixes like *-able*, *-al*, *-ful*, *-ic*, *-ish*, *-ive*, *-ly*, *-ory*, *-ous*, or *-y* (Lieber 2005, 413–414, 416). In Cannon's (1985) corpus, 19.92% of all conversions, a fairly large portion, had an adjective as output; however, Cannon's criteria for acknowledging adjectivalising conversion were more liberal than those assumed in this paper, since Cannon did not require the outputs to comply with the above-described morphological conditions for adjectives. In Balteiro's (2001) study, conversion to adjective is not acknowledged at all.

Once the above criteria are strictly followed, there are 2 kinds of possible input for adjectivalising conversion: certain nouns and certain adverbs, with nouns being apparently the prevalent kind of input, as seen from Cannon's (1985) data in Table 8. Examples of admissible adjectivalised nouns include *average*$_{\text{ADJ}}$, *commonplace*$_{\text{ADJ}}$, *dainty*$_{\text{ADJ}}$, *level*$_{\text{ADJ}}$ "flat; equal in height/position," *partisan*$_{\text{ADJ}}$ "one-sided, biased," or *shoddy*$_{\text{ADJ}}$ (Adams 1973, 19); adjectivalised adverbs, in whose case the condition of sufficient semantic differentation between the two lexemes is particularly essential, include *backward*$_{\text{ADJ}}$ "behind, late in progress," *downhill*$_{\text{ADJ}}$ "easy," or *inward*$_{\text{ADJ}}$ "unexpressed; kept hidden in one's mind" (Balteiro 2007a, 92–93).

2 CONVERSION TO VERB

Verb-producing conversion, or verbification, has been traditionally considered one of the most productive conversion patterns in English (e. g. Adams 1973, 37; Brinton and Brinton 2010, 101; Hernández Bartolomé and Cabrera 2005, sec. 3, par. 3); often, in fact, it is recognised even as the very most productive one (Martsa 2013, 133). However, there seems to exist a rather tight competition in terms of productivity (or at least frequency of occurrence) between verbification and nominalising conversion, as apparent from Balteiro's (2001) and Cannon's (1985) corpus data in Table 7, according to which verbification was even surpassed in frequency by nominalisation in Cannon's corpus (albeit not so in Balteiro's).

The alleged high productivity of verbification likely resides, at least partly, in the lack of other productive verb-forming means in contemporary English, especially affixes: besides verbification and various minor techniques (such as blending or backformation), basically the only productive method to create a verb in current English is suffixation either by *-ify* or *-ize* (Lieber 2004, 89), against both of which verbification furthermore holds two significant advantages in that it can process compound bases practically without restriction (Plag 1999, 232) and it is endowed with a considerably wider range of conveyable meanings than any verbalising affix, thus allowing better expressivity (Plag 1999, 231). Possibly for these reasons, Plag (1999, 105, 117) in his dictionary- as well as corpus-based study on productivity identifies verbification as the most productive English verb-forming method of the 20th century.

Verbification has also been regarded as the most prototypical and the least controversial kind of conversion in English; it is recognised either as a whole or via some of its subtypes in virtually any work that addresses conversion, including sources that provide a very concise account of the phenomenon or make only a passing reference to it, such as Aronoff (1976, 70–71), Booij (2016, 107), or McArthur (1992, 263). This state of affairs may be partly due to the easiness of verification of the process, since in synchronic English, verbs are the most inflectionally developed word-class and therefore allow straightforward morphological evidence of conversion. Accordingly, the criteria for an output of conversion to be acknowledged as a verb are as follows:

- **Morphologically**, it can inflect for person, number, tense, mood, and aspect and therefore can take the 3rd person singular present indicative *-s*, past tense *-ed*, present participle [and gerundial] *-ing*, and past participle *-ed*; additionally, it is capable of nominalisation by *-er* (Brinton and Brinton 2010, 137–138).

- **Syntactically**, it serves as the predicator in a clause (Balteiro 2007a, 74). It can always follow an auxiliary verb, the negative particle *not*, or the marker *to* in order to form a *to*-infinitive (Brinton and Brinton 2010, 138).
- **Semantically**, it generally refers to an action or activity (Balteiro 2007a, 74).

Of the multitude of possible input word-classes, scholars generally agree that the most frequently used ones are nouns and, to a somewhat lesser degree, adjectives (Adams 1973, 38; Balteiro 2007a, 100, 106–109; Bauer 1983, 229; Plag 2003, 107–108); other kinds of input are rarely encountered. These assumptions have been confirmed by both Balteiro (2001) and Cannon (1985), in whose corpora the portion of verbifications created from some other word-class than noun or adjective constitute only 0.62% and 0.99% respectively.

In the rest of this chapter, the individual subtypes of verbification according to the input word-class are characterised in more detail.

2.1 N→V

There seems to be broad agreement that by far the most frequent input to verbification is a noun, an assumption corroborated by both Balteiro (2001) and Cannon (1985), as seen in Table 8. The outcomes of both studies also support the prevalent opinion in the literature that verbification of nouns is the most common conversion pattern in English with both the input and output word-classes specified (e. g. Aronoff 1976, 71; Martsa 2013, 95).

2.1.1 MEANING CATEGORIES OF VERBIFIED NOUNS

N→V conversion is well-known for its highly variegated semantics, the most diverse of all types of conversion, enabling the language user to express a large number of possible meanings—many of them strongly context-sensitive, as indicated earlier in Section 1.5—with one and the same, formally simplistic process (Clark and Clark 1979; Jespersen [1909–1949] 1949, 6:93). Nevertheless, even with the potential to create contextuals, verbification of nouns still appears to show an inclination towards patterning behaviour as far as its semantic nature is concerned, in that the meaning of the output seems to be compatible in most cases with one of a relatively small set of generic semantic categories formulable for this type of conversion. In the remainder of this section, the outline is provided of 10 prototypical semantic categories of verbified nouns as proposed by Martsa (2013), who puts forward one of the most comprehensive classifications of the possible meanings of converted items, based on a synthesis of principles of cognitive grammar (particularly the notions of conceptual metonymy and metaphor, as explained in Section 1.3.2) and several earlier influential semantic categorisations of products of conversion, most prominently those proposed by Marchand (1969) and also Clark

and Clark (1979) for verbification in particular. Specifically, Martsa (2013, 138–167, 211–218) recognises the following semantic classes of verbified nouns:

a) **locatum verbs**
b) **location verbs**
c) **duration verbs**
d) **agent verbs**
e) **experiencer verbs**
f) **goal verbs**
g) **source verbs**
h) **instrument verbs**
i) **animal verbs**
j) **miscellaneous verbs**

2.1.1.1 LOCATUM VERBS

As Martsa (2013, 138–140, 212) explains, these denominal verbs express motion of the entity designated by the input noun in some kind of spatial relationship ("on," "in," "around," "from" etc.) to another entity; hence, these verbifications may be said to be underlain by the generic semantic pattern "OBJECT OF MOTION FOR THE MOTION." Four subclasses of this pattern can be formulated, in which the word "put" is to be understood in a most general sense:

a) "**put N on/along/over/etc. X**" (*blanket the bed*; *marmalade the toast*; *man the ship*; *shawl the child*; *date the check*; *festoon the room*; *bridge the stream*; *subpoena the president*)
b) "**put N in X**" (*spice the food*; *cream the coffee*; *buttonhole the shirt*)
c) "**remove N from the surface of X**" (*skin the rabbit*; *shell the peanuts*)
d) "**remove N from the inside of X**" (*pit the cherries*; *bone the fish*)

As illustrated above, the input nouns may denote various types of coverings, but also clothes, attachments, decorations, seasonings, unwanted parts of eatables, objects sent to a certain person, or even people being transported to a particular place. This is possible thanks to the wide meaning of the word "put" in the first two formulations, which are consequently also interpretable figuratively as "**provide/equip X with N**" (Martsa 2013, 139).

2.1.1.2 LOCATION VERBS

Similarly to locatum verbs, location verbs express motion of an entity in a spatial relation to another entity; in this case, however, the input noun is the destination, rather than the object being moved. Therefore, the generic pattern for this class of verbifications may be formulated

as "DESTINATION OF THE MOTION FOR THE MOTION," with the following three subpatterns:

a) "**put X on N**" (*shelve the books*; *bench the players*; *map the area*; *list the participants*)
b) "**put X in N**" (*jail the prisoner*; *cellar the wine*; *sack the potato*; *picture the man*; *photograph the children*)
c) "**remove X from N**" (*mine the gold*; *pod the peas*)

(Martsa 2013, 140–142)

Here, too, the word "put" in the formulations of the first two subpatterns is to be understood in a wide sense and may also be interpreted figuratively, as in the case of the verbifications *map*V, *list*V, *picture*V, and *photograph*V above, where no physical motion is involved; instead, the verbs designate only a metaphorical transfer of the given entity onto (or into) a map, list, picture, or photograph.

2.1.1.3 Duration Verbs

Duration verbs denote staying in some place for a time period that is expressed by the input noun. Their generic semantic pattern is therefore "TIME PERIOD FOR A CHARACTERISTIC ACTIVITY IN THAT TIME PERIOD," formulable also as "**spend N in X**." Examples include *summer in France*, *holiday in Spain*, or *honeymoon in Hawaii* (Martsa 2013, 141).

2.1.1.4 Agent Verbs

Agent verbs refer to a particular action associated with the person or instigator designated by the base noun; the generic semantic pattern for this class of verbifications is therefore "AGENT FOR A CHARACTERISTIC ACTIVITY OF THAT AGENT," or "**act as typical of N**," reflected in examples like *umpire the match*, *tutor the boys*, *monitor an exam*, or *boss the employee* (Martsa 2013, 142–143).

2.1.1.5 Experiencer Verbs

These verbifications denote an activity that is performed by an observer, expressed by the parent noun. As in the case of agent verbs, the generic semantic pattern may be described as "act as typical of N"; a more specific formulation is "EXPERIENCER OF AN EVENT FOR THE EVENT." Apparently, experiencer verbs are rarely found in current English. Examples include *witness the accident* or *boycott the store* (Martsa 2013, 142–143).

2.1.1.6 Goal Verbs

Goal verbs express an action producing a certain result, where the input noun refers to this result. Their fundamental meaning is therefore formulable as "RESULT FOR THE ACTION THAT BRINGS ABOUT THAT RESULT" or "**make N / turn X into N**," reflected in verb phrases like *orphan the child*, *fool the man, pile the money*, *loop the rope*, *powder the aspirin*,

or *fingerprint the immigrants* (Martsa 2013, 143–144). As illustrated, goal verbs often signify social or mental states as well as the act of grouping, (re)shaping, or disintegrating entities.

2.1.1.7 SOURCE VERBS

Source verbs denote producing a certain entity (usually inanimate) from its component parts, where the input noun designates the components; hence the generic semantic pattern "COMPONENT PARTS OF A WHOLE FOR THE ACTION THAT PRODUCES THE WHOLE" or "**make X from N**." Like experiencer verbs, source verbs are quite infrequent. Examples include *piece the quilt together*, *word the sentence*, or *letter the sign* (Martsa 2013, 143–144).

2.1.1.8 INSTRUMENT VERBS

According to Clark and Clark (1979, 776), instrument verbs represent the most frequent semantic type of denominal verbifications. As described by Martsa (2013, 145–147), their generic semantic pattern is simply "INSTRUMENT FOR THE ACTION INVOLVING THAT INSTRUMENT," i. e. "**act using N**" (or, alternatively, "**act using X as if [it were] N**"); in result, this broad category comprises verbs denoting actions carried out (as if) by means of all kinds of instruments, which, however, may differ quite significantly in terms of their canonicality for the given action, as well as in terms of how "literal" or "direct" instruments they are. Thus, verbifications of this kind may refer to means of transport (*scooter*$_V$), fasteners (*staple*$_V$, *glue*$_V$), restrainers (*chain*$_V$, *handcuff*$_V$), locks (*latch*$_V$), parts of clothes (*buckle his belt*), cleansers (*shampoo*$_V$), instruments for hitting (*hammer the nail*), various weapons (*knife the man*, *torpedo the ship*), but also places—especially facilities—where the particular action is carried out by some specific activities or tools characteristic of the given place, rather than by the place itself (as with *laundrette the clothes* or *school the children*); in yet other cases, the instrument verb refers to a situation where the "instrument" is in fact the activity denoted by the verbification itself (as with *track the criminal*, where the very activity of tracking may be considered instrumental, specifically, in catching the person). As seen, this category allows a considerable freedom in the interpretation of the term "instrument."

2.1.1.9 ANIMAL VERBS

Animal verbs are a class of denominal verbifications whose input refers to an animal. They are characterised by a particularly frequent involvement of metaphoricity in their creation and interpretation. A representative of these verbs can be underlain by one of three[6] distinct semantic patterns, out of which the third one is always partly or wholly based on metaphor:

[6] Martsa's (2013, 155–158) original classification is more complex, distinguishing between purely metonymically motivated animal verbs (patterns a) and b) on the following page) on the one hand and 3 different

a) "**hunt for the animal N; or, hunt for some other animal by means of the animal N**" (e. g. *the sea has been fished intensely*; *the dogs went ratting*; *to ferret rabbits* "to hunt rabbits using ferrets")
b) "**bring forth the animal N**" (e. g. *cub*V, *foal*V, *kitten*V)
c) "**act/behave in ways perceived as (similar to) the typical actions/behaviour of the animal N**," a pattern underlain by the metaphors "HUMANS ARE ANIMALS" and "ANIMALS ARE HUMANS" (e. g. *she ferreted in her bag for a pen*; *Steve wormed his way out of going to the meeting*; *to fox* "trick, confuse somebody"; *to ape* "imitate, mimic, usually unsuccessfully"; *to hare* "run or go very fast")
(Martsa 2013, 154–160)

2.1.1.10 Miscellaneous Verbs

This residue class consists of verbifications matching one out of 4 remaining, fairly common semantic categories, for which, however, no common generic semantic pattern can be formulated. Their list is provided below:

a) "A MEAL/FOOD FOR EATING THAT MEAL/FOOD" (e. g. *lunch*V, *breakfast*V, *snack*V, *cheeseburger*V)
b) "CROPS FOR COLLECTING THOSE CROPS" (*blackberry in the woods*; *hay the top field*)
c) "A PART FOR THE ACTION INVOLVING THAT PART" (*the car rear-ended the van* "crashed into the rear-end of the van")
d) "ELEMENTS FOR THE ACTION INVOLVING THESE ELEMENTS" (*rain*V, *snow*V, *hail*V, *sleet*V)
(Martsa 2013, 147–148)

2.2 ADJ→V

In comparison to N→V conversion, ADJ→V shifts are said to be significantly less common (Adams 1973, 49), although they are allegedly used fairly often in everyday language (Martsa 2013, 167); accordingly, in Balteiro's (2001) and Cannon's (1985) studies, ADJ→V conversions constituted only 6.27% and 5.45% respectively of all verbifications, and 3.58% and 1.94% respectively of all conversions in the given corpus. Balteiro (2007a, 107) assumes that the relative scarcity of this conversion pattern may be due to its competition especially with *-en* suffixation, which creates verbs from adjectives (e. g. *deafen*V, *ripen*V, *sadden*V), although

subtypes of animal verbs partly or wholly motivated by metaphoric mappings on the other. However, for the purposes of this paper, it suffices to postulate a single, broad category (pattern c)) with a simplified description to accommodate all animal verbs of the latter, metaphoric type.

according to Plag (1999, 104), *-en* is no longer productive in English. Another possible factor limiting the productivity of ADJ→V conversion may be semantics: when compared to nouns, adjectives have a more specific meaning and therefore represent a less semantically flexible input to verbification (Balteiro 2001, 18). Indeed, the semantic patterns of ADJ→V conversion, as described by Martsa (2013), are much less numerous and diverse than those underlying N→V conversion:

a) "**make X ADJ**," i. e. "PROPERTY FOR THE ACTION THAT BRINGS ABOUT THAT PROPERTY"—a transitive type, denoting an action whereby a patient, via active participation of an agent or instrument, is assigned the property expressed by the input adjective (e. g. *I'd blacked my eyebrows*; *clean the machines*; *the hot sun had stilled the weather*)

b) "**X becomes ADJ**," i. e. "PROPERTY FOR THE PROCESS THROUGH WHICH THAT PROPERTY IS ASSIGNED"—an intransitive variation on the previous pattern, whereby the change bringing about assignation of a certain property is not caused by any external agent or instrument's active participation (e. g. *the lights dimmed*; *he fainted in the mud*; *unripe fruit mellows with the months*)

(Martsa 2013, 167–169)

Some deadjectival verbifications, such as *clear*$_V$, *narrow*$_V$, or *still*$_V$, may manifest either the transitive or the intransitive pattern, depending on the context of use (Martsa 2013, 168).

2.3 ADV→V

This conversion type is scarcely encountered; in Balteiro's (2001) corpus, only 0.45% of verbifications were derived from adverbs, representing 0.26% of all conversions in general. Cannon (1985) reports no instances of ADV→V conversion at all. In view of the diversity of adverbial meanings, Martsa (2013, 170) suggests a very generic semantic pattern for these verbifications, namely "GOAL/END-STATE FOR THE MOTION ORIENTED TO THAT GOAL / REACHING THAT END-STATE," reflected in verbifications from adverbs such as *near*$_V$ or *down*$_V$, which consequently express the goal of the given kind of locomotion (as in *we neared Binz* or *they downed tools in protest*; Balteiro 2007a, 109). Other instances of verbified adverbs include *forward*$_V$, *further*$_V$, or *upstage*$_V$ (Balteiro 2001, 18). As seen, most—if not all—inputs to this type of verbification are adverbs of place, perhaps due to the physicality and specificity of their meaning; in contrast, hypothetical verbifications from adverbs of time (e. g. *?today*$_V$, *?early*$_V$), frequency (*?often*$_V$, *?never*$_V$), or manner (*?quietly*$_V$, *?warmly*$_V$) seem too semantically obscure to occur, and especially verbified adverbs of manner furthermore appear

unnecessary to derive in the first place in view of the availability of verbs like *quiet(en)*$_V$ or *warm*$_V$.

2.4 PREP→V

Verbified prepositions are often difficult to distinguish from verbified adverbs; for example, both *near*$_V$ and *down*$_V$, mentioned in the previous section, might be in theory alternatively analysed as derived from prepositions, rather than adverbs (especially *near*$_V$ seems ambiguous in this respect). This is perhaps the reason why no PREP→V conversions, but a few ADV→V conversions are attested in Balteiro's (2001) corpus; in Cannon's (1985) data, no shifts of either kind are reported. Available examples of verbified prepositions include *up*$_V$, *out*$_V$, or *round*$_V$ (Adams 1973, 51); however, the possibility is not excluded of existence of verbifications derived from items that are more straightforwardly prepositional, such as *?among*$_V$, *?beside*$_V$, *?between*$_V$, or *?during*$_V$.

For the attested examples, all of which are—analogously to verbified adverbs—based on a locative meaning, the same generic semantic pattern may be formulated as for verbifications from adverbs, i. e. "GOAL/END-STATE FOR THE MOTION ORIENTED TO THAT GOAL / REACHING THAT END-STATE," applicable for instance to *up*$_V$ in the sentence *She ups her stick and begins to belabour him across the shoulders* (Martsa 2013, 171).

According to Quirk et al. (1985, 1563), verbified prepositions, as well as any other verbifications created from closed-class items, are "chiefly informal."

2.5 CONJ→V

The literature on conversion seems to provide a single potential example of a verbified conjunction, *but*$_V$, which is discussed in Jespersen ([1909–1949] 1949, 6:107) in relation to a special subcategory of nonce verbifications that are characteristically used in retorts, following the nowadays strongly archaic pattern "X$_V$ *me no* X(s)$_N$," of which the phrase "*but*$_V$ *me no buts*$_N$" is an example. It is debatable what kind of meaning this apparent verbification may denote in such an established, rather idiomatic phrase; further, it remains unclear whether verbification of conjunctions also occurs outside the above obsolete retort structure, since no CONJ→V conversions are reported either in Balteiro (2001) or in Cannon (1985). Presumably, however, verbified conjunctions may serve as a sort of speech act verbs, similarly to verbified interjections discussed in the following section; if that is the case, a verb such as *but*$_V$ may generally denote roughly "express disagreement and/or hesitation (possibly by uttering 'but')."

2.6 INTERJ→V

Martsa (2013, 167) asserts that interjections are the most frequent verbification input of all closed classes, a claim that is supported by Cannon's (1985) study but challenged by Balteiro (2001), in whose corpus INTERJ→V was actually the least frequent type of verbification both specifically from closed classes and in general, as seen in Table 8. Both corpus-based studies also suggest that from a general perspective, interjections are converted into verbs extremely rarely.

Martsa (2013, 171) observes that most verbified interjections are formed either from exclamations, such as *nay* or *hurrah*, or from onomatopoeic words, such as *boo*, *boom*, *tut*, or *miaow*. Hence, he postulates 2 semantic patterns for INTERJ→V conversion, according to the nature of the input interjection:

a) "EXCLAMATION FOR THE VERBAL ACTION PERFORMED BY THAT EXCLAMATION", inasmuch as after an exclamation is verbified, it comes to serve as a verb expressing the speech act associated with the input exclamation, such as refusal (*nay*$_V$) or encouragement (*hurrah*$_V$);

b) "ONOMATOPOEIA FOR THE VERBAL ACTION PERFORMED BY THE UTTERANCE OF THAT ONOMATOPOEIA," whereby the resulting verbification, similarly to verbified exclamations, functions as a kind of speech act verb that expresses the stance underlying the input interjection (e. g. dislike with *boo*$_V$, disapproval with *tut*$_V$) or evokes the characteristic sound produced by a particular thing (*boom*$_V$) or animal (*miaow*$_V$).

3 VERBIFICATION: A CROSS-DISCOURSE ANALYSIS

The main purpose of this thesis is to examine verbification as a distinct type of conversion by means of a corpus-based analysis in order to ascertain specific assumptions concerning the nature of both conversion to verb in particular and conversion in general. The assumptions addressed, the methodology applied in the analysis, and the findings and their discussion are provided in the following sections.

3.1 ASSUMPTIONS

The assumptions underlying the analysis can be divided into 2 categories. The first one consists of selected academic assumptions about the phenomenon of conversion in general that have been previously made in the literature and whose validity was tested specifically on verbification in the analysis, in view of the fact that verbification is the most thoroughly described and simultaneously the most widely acknowledged type of conversion. The second category of assumptions, again tested in the analysis with the focus on verbification, are related to the central hypothesis of this paper, namely, that the nature of conversion may be influenced by discourse-specific factors.

3.1.1 GENERAL GOALS OF THE ANALYSIS

The following list comprises selected assumptions of scholars about the general character of conversion that have been referred to throughout the theoretical part of this paper. One of the primary aims of the analysis was to determine, by means of evaluation of recent, corpus-based data, whether these assertions can be proclaimed valid particularly for verbification.

1. **Conversion is an (extremely) productive process in English.** The analysis focused on a single facet of productivity, namely, the potential to produce words that become formally established in the given language in the sense of being listed in a dictionary.[7] For this parameter, the label "*lexicalisation potential*"[8] was applied.
2. **Inflection is a sign of complete conversion.** For the purposes of the analysis, the fundamental idea of this assumption was extended to its potential relation to the degree of establishment and item-familiarity of converted items among language users, which was here tested through the abovementioned parameter of *lexicalisation potential*. Hence, in this regard, the analysis aimed to find out whether there is any correlation

[7] All theoretical limitations of this measurement method were taken into account, especially the frequently proposed notes of caution in the literature referring to the not necessarily direct link between a word's attestation in a dictionary and a high productivity, or (synchronic) productivity at all, of the corresponding process (Aronoff 1976, 37, 45; Bauer 2005, 319–320).

[8] This use of the notational term "lexicalisation" is in line with that of Kastovsky's "Lexikalisierung" (1982, 155) and corresponds to the term "institutionalisation" used by Bauer (2003, 81).

between a product of conversion occurring in an inflected form and its being listed in a dictionary (which may be perceived as a higher stage of completion of the conversion process).

3. **Any word-class can become the input to conversion.** By implication, one of the aspects monitored in the analysis was whether all existing word-classes (except for verb) would be represented in the corpus as the input to verbification.
4. **Different word-classes have different potentials to become input to conversion.** For verbification, then, the claim tested was whether the most common input is a noun, asserted e. g. by Aronoff (1976, 71) and supported by the two corpus-based studies by Balteiro (2001) and Cannon (1985).
5. **The most frequent output of conversion is a verb.** As shown in Chapter 2, this belief, albeit widely shared, may be possibly called into question—especially in view of Cannon's (1985) findings, according to which the most frequent conversion pattern is actually nominalisation.
6. **Conversion is subject to formal constraints on the input.** With the focus narrowed down to verbification in particular, one of the subjects of investigation in the analysis was the morphological structure of the input lexemes and its compliance with, or divergence from, the alleged restrictions in Section 1.4.3.2.1.
7. **Conversion is pattern-forming on its semantic side, despite the general context-sensitivity of its outputs.** In this respect, the analysis examined the range of meaning categories of verbifications identified in the corpus data with the aim to assess if there are any that have not yet been described in the available literature and find out whether any notable patterns can be observed in the semantic behaviour of verbification.

3.1.2 CONVERSION AS A DISCOURSE-SPECIFIC PHENOMENON

The second primary goal of the analysis was an evaluation of verbification against a more general hypothesis specifically proposed for this thesis, according to which the overall nature of conversion might be influenced by the type of discourse[9] in which it occurs. The motivation for this hypothesis stems from the fact that no such proposition seems to ever have been explicitly stated in the literature and any potential relation between conversion and discourse appears as a seriously under-researched subject, although there are indications that such a relation may well exist. Most importantly, these indications concern remarks (albeit sparse)

[9] In this paper, the term "discourse" is intended to serve as a general, theoretically neutral label for a group or category of texts, spoken or written, which share specific characteristics that set them apart from other text categories.

in the literature about certain types of conversion being discourse-specific; for example, as mentioned earlier, ADJ→V conversion is a rather infrequent pattern from a general perspective, but according to Martsa (2013, 167), it is quite common in everyday communication. Similarly, the generally rare verbifications from closed-class items are believed by Quirk et al. (1985, 1563) to belong to the domain of informal language. Hence, the analysis was performed across multiple different discourses that were subsequently compared to one another with regard to the character of verbification in them.

Any arising discourse-related differences were interpreted with the application of the theoretical framework for stylistic description by Biber and Conrad (2019), in terms of which the discourses analysed were approached as different types of **register**, i. e. a specific text variety distinguished on the basis of its communicative purposes and typical situational context of use, both of which are presumed to be reflected in the text's pervasive linguistic features (Biber and Conrad 2019, 2, 6).

A total of 4 written registers were selected for the analysis: **scientific academic prose** (for its emphasis on precision, specificity, and dealing with mostly abstract concepts, manifested in a large amount of nominal features; Biber and Conrad 2019, 118, 124, 131–132), **advertising texts** (characterised by a strategic use of linguistic innovation and playfulness; Danesi 2015, sec. "The Evolution of Advertising", par. 6), **fiction writing** (linguistically similar to everyday conversation, oriented primarily on dynamic action and real-world phenomena; Biber and Gray 2016, 104–110), and **forum posts** (reflecting the linguistic fluidity of the Internet discourse (Crystal 2006, 16, 71), with a distinctive focus on problem-solving (Biber and Conrad 2019, 191–192)).

3.2 METHODOLOGY

Based on the research goals presented in the previous sections, the analysis conducted had a partly comparative character and was performed on the 4 different registers described in Section 3.1.2. Within each register, 100 instances of conversion (without regard to its output) were collected and analysed, yielding a corpus comprising the total of 400 conversions. The data were analysed with the application of the following parameter scheme:

1) the proportional frequency of occurrence of verbification as compared to that of nominalising and adjectivalising conversion;
2) morphological properties of verbification—namely:
    - types of input word-classes, their relative proportional frequencies, and the morphological structure of the input words (e. g. simplex, affixed, compound, etc.),
    - the measure of inflection of the verbified items and its possible relation to their *lexicalisation potential*;
3) semantic properties of verbification—namely, the range and distribution of meaning categories of verbified items in the corpus and their potential interaction with contextuality and/or various kinds of meaning shift;
4) the possible influence of discourse type on the above 3 parameters.

Specific remarks relating to the above scheme follow. In line with the mainly synchronic view on conversion adopted, the direction (and therefore the type) of conversion was determined by means of the predominantly synchronic criteria described in Section 1.6.3. For ascertainment of the dates of first record, applied in dubious or ambiguous cases only, the server *Etymonline.com* (Harper, 2001–) was consulted. Unclear cases where even diachronic data proved inconclusive or unavailable were excluded from the analysis; those possibly representing verbification were commented on in Appendix E.

A verbified item was considered inflected in a given subcorpus as long as it occurred in an inflected form at least once in the given meaning in the text analysed; it was, therefore, not obligatory for its first occurrence in the text to be inflected if an inflected form of the same verb, with the very same meaning, followed later. This was the case of the verb *order*$_{V}$ in the fiction subcorpus in the meaning "to ask for food and/or drink in a restaurant, bar, etc.," whose first representation in the fiction text was an infinitive (App. C, 60)), but an inflected form, a 3rd person singular past simple indicative, followed 2 sentences later. In such circumstances, a single instance (rather than two) of conversion was noted, as an inflected one; the above finding of one uninflected *order*$_{V}$ and one inflected *order*$_{V}$ in the same meaning, therefore, yielded in the fiction subcorpus the total of 1 denominal verbification, *order*$_{V}$, in the meaning "to ask for food and/or drink in a restaurant, bar, etc.," inflected.

The (non-)lexicalisation of verbified items in the corpus was checked by means of consulting the total of 3 dictionaries: *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary* or OALD (2020), *Cambridge English Dictionary* or CED (1999–), and *Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary*

or MW (2003–). An item was considered lexicalised as long as it was listed in at least one of the dictionaries used.

The semantic classification of verbified items was based on the meaning categories provided by Martsa (2013), which were described throughout sections 2.1–2.6.

The individual registers analysed were constituted by the following texts. **Scientific academic prose** was represented by 3 research articles from the area of medicine (Partanen et al. 2021, Rypens et al. 2022, Sarnella et al. 2022). The **advertising** subcorpus consisted of product descriptions collected from the UK and US websites of the Vermont-based company Ben & Jerry's, a renowned manufacturer of ice-cream and related products (Ben & Jerry's, n.d.a; Ben & Jerry's, n.d.b). For **fiction** discourse, the corpus material comes from the introductory pages of the bestselling popular novel *Beautiful World, Where Are You* by Irish author Sally Rooney (2021), which was chosen primarily for its overall conservative (rather than experimental) narrative style that generally matches the profile of fiction writing in the academic literature on which assumptions concerning the stylistic nature of this register were based. Finally, texts from the subcorpus of **forum posts** were taken from the forum website dedicated to the life-simulation videogame series *The Sims* (Electronic Arts Inc. 2021, 2022a, 2022b, 2022c).

Lastly, certain instances of conversion were discarded from the analysis even if they allowed an indubitable establishment of the direction of conversion. These included, firstly, any lexemes in whose creation conversion was involved, but not as the last step of the word-formation process (e. g. verbifications to which a derivational affix was attached after the conversion, or converted words entering a compound—including cases where a special particle or set of particles were added to the product of conversion to create a phrasal verb).

Secondly, if there were multiple occurrences within a particular subcorpus of one and the same conversion with one and the same meaning, the second and all subsequent instances were discarded from the analysis of the given subcorpus (across the subcorpora, however, the record of identical converted items was permitted). This applied to all kinds of conversion; thus, for instance, the record of the deadjectival nominalisation *individual*$_{N}$ (App. A, 6)) in the academic subcorpus in the meaning "a person considered separately, rather than as part of the group" automatically prevented the records of all subsequent occurrences of *individual*$_{N}$ in this sense in the academic subcorpus. In contrast, the double occurrence of the deverbal nominalisation *control*$_{N}$ in the academic subcorpus was permitted, since the two instances of *control*$_{N}$ (App. A, 5), 34)) were clearly differentiated in meaning. With regard to verbification in particular, the above identity-exclusion measure had the following effect: either—as

illustrated earlier on *order*$_V$—the first instance of the given verbification in the given subcorpus was uninflected, but some later instance was inflected, in which case all the later instances were merged together with the first occurrence and the given item was then considered inflected; or, already the first instance of the verbification was inflected, in which case all subsequent instances of this verbification in the same meaning within the given subcorpus were simply ignored. This latter possibility was the case of the verbification *rent*$_V$ (App. C, 63)) from the fiction subcorpus, which was recorded in the meaning "occupy, live in, in exchange for rent" and whose first occurrence was already inflected (*renting*$_V$); hence, all subsequent occurrences of *rent*$_V$ in the above meaning were ignored in the fiction text analysed.

3.3 RESULTS OF THE ANALYSIS

3.3.1 RELATIVE FREQUENCY OF VERBIFICATION

In terms of evaluating the overall frequency of verbification in comparison to other types of conversion, the outcome of the analysis challenges the widely shared assumption that the most common output of conversion is a verb: as shown in Table 1 below, the conversion pattern characterised by the highest frequency in the corpus as a whole was actually nominalising conversion (identified in 56.5% of all conversions), rather than verbification, which represented only the second most common conversion pattern. The same conclusion was achieved in the corpus-based study by Cannon (1985), but not in the more recent study by Balteiro (2001), in whose corpus verbification was the prevalent type of conversion. However, in the analysis conducted, the average gap between these two conversion types reached only 13.75 percentage points; a very similar finding is reported in Balteiro's (2001) data, where the difference represents 14.39 percentage points. In Cannon's (1985) study, the difference was even smaller, constituting only 7.05 percentage points. These observations suggest, firstly, that nominalising and verbifying conversion indeed are in a quite strong competition in terms of type frequency, and secondly, that over the last several decades, the state of affairs within this competition may have been going through a sort of fluctuation: while in 1985, the generally prevalent conversion pattern may have been nominalisation, around the beginning of the new millenium this role may have been overtaken by verbification with the frequency gap deepening almost twice between these two processes, and recently, the frequency and/or productivity of nominalising conversion may again be on the rise, proficient enough to surpass verbification in the present analysis.

Table 1: Relative distribution of types of conversion in the corpus (Q = quantity; ACAD = academic discourse; ADVT = advertising discourse; FIC = fiction discourse; ForP = forum post discourse)

CONVERSION TYPE	DISCOURSE									
	ACAD		ADVT		FIC		FORP		OVERALL	
	Q	%	Q	%	Q	%	Q	%	Q	%
→N	52	52%	57	57%	56	56%	61	61%	226	56.5%
→ADJ	1	1%	—	—	1	1%	1	1%	3	0.75%
→V	47	47%	43	43%	43	43%	38	38%	171	42.75%
TOTAL	**100**	**100%**	**100**	**100%**	**100**	**100%**	**100**	**100%**	**400**	**100%**

As also seen in Table 1, contrastively to both nominalising and verbifying conversion, the amount of conversion to adjective was negligible, representing only 0.75% of all corpus conversions. In this respect, the data achieved differ radically from Cannon's (1985), where adjectivalising conversion reached the corpus frequency of 19.92%; this divergence is in all probability mainly due to the less restrictive criteria for acknowledgement of conversion to adjective in Cannon's study, especially as far as the morphological potential of the output is concerned. Hence, the conclusion follows that the frequency of adjectivalising conversion is strongly sensitive to the criteria adopted for acknowledgement of its output.

With regard to the relative frequency of verbification within the individual subcorpora, the analysis yielded perhaps even more unanticipated data: not only was verbification overcome by nominalising conversion in all registers examined, but the portions of these two conversion types were fairly balanced and, in fact, nearly identical all across the individual registers, oscillating roughly around the proportional value of 56% for nominalisation and 43% for verbification. Furthermore, still less expectably, the size of the proportional difference between the said processes was the greatest in the register of forum posts (61% nominalisation vs. 38% verbification) and the smallest in academic prose (52% nominalisation vs. 47% verbification), the latter representing a discourse type where the very opposite result had been expected, in view of the heavy reliance of academic texts—especially scientific research articles—on nominalisations in general (Biber and Gray 2016). While these findings may seemingly suggest that in this regard, there is no significant influence of discourse on the character of verbification (or conversion generally), it will be argued below that even with the overall cross-discursive similarity in the portions of the individual conversion types, there are discourse-specific explanations for the data obtained as the nature of each register contributes to the above results in its own, unique fashion.

Starting with the academic register, where the measure of verbification was the highest, conversion to verb proved to have two important roles. Firstly, a significant proportion of verbifications in this discourse were of a technical-specialist nature, referring to various laboratory and/or analytic techniques (e. g. *culture*$_{V}$ [cells], *dilute*$_{V}$, *flood*$_{V}$, *harvest*$_{V}$, *sample*$_{V}$, *screen*$_{V}$, *stain*$_{V}$) as well as computational and graphic methods applied in data assessment (*plot*$_{V}$, *smooth*$_{V}$, *total*$_{V}$, *weight*$_{V}$). It is in these expressions where most of the dynamic action taking place in the discourse of research articles was encapsulated; this fact alone favours their rendition by verbs, the traditional linguistic form for expressing activities. Furthermore, because these methodological concepts are highly specific, both precision and economy of expression are ensured when these ideas are expressed by a single word, in this case, a verb. The other large group of academic verbifications, then, had an evaluative-argumentative character and usually occurred in more theoretical passages where some kind of relation was being described or argued for (e. g. *benefit*$_{V}$, *combat*$_{V}$, *favor*$_{V}$, *highlight*$_{V}$, *leverage*$_{V}$, *limit*$_{V}$, *link*$_{V}$) or where observations of researchers—either the authors themselves or earlier researchers in the field—were being characterised (*feature*$_{V}$, *focus*$_{V}$, *note*$_{V}$, *report*$_{V}$). Since all these conceptual domains—meticulous description of methodology, data evaluation and interpretation, a careful analysis of relations among concepts, and possible implications of the findings for both the past and future research—constitute essential and, in fact, mandatory parts of any modern scientific article, it follows that verbification can be expected to contribute to a quite large degree to the lexeme inventory of even such a pervasively nominal register domain. Naturally, the role of nominalising conversion in research articles was just as significant, manifested especially in the well-known rhetoric tendency in academic texts to replace potential clauses by phrasal structures (*the previous estimate*, *4-fold increase*, *data release*, *aberrant repair*, *metastatic spread*), which may be motivated by the effort to limit the overall number of verbs in the paper to the absolutely indispensable ones (i. e. mostly those with a technical or evaluative denotation) and thereby clearly distinguish actions and argumentation from abstract ideas for a more efficient textual orientation. Apart from immaterial concepts, nominalising conversion in the articles also frequently designated participants in the given study (*control*$_{N}$, *female*$_{N}$, *individual*$_{N}$, *male*$_{N}$) and the substances as well as tools or techniques used in the analysis (*compound*$_{N}$, *insert*$_{N}$, *isolate*$_{N}$, *saline*$_{N}$, *scan*$_{N}$, *transplant*$_{N}$, *wash*$_{N}$). With this wide range of nominal functions, the prevalence of nominalising conversion—albeit considerably less resolute than expected—in the academic register is certainly understandable.

In the advertising texts, the portion of verbification (43%) was somewhat smaller than in the academic register, to the benefit of nominalising conversion, which represented the remaining 57% of all conversions in the advertising subcorpus. Just like research articles, the product descriptions analysed were marked by a visible endeavour to reduce the number of verbs in the discourse; however, in this case, this tendency was motivated by the aim to produce a light, syntactically simplistic text that reads smoothly and effortlessly while attracting the reader with vibrant, colourful, sensual descriptions, which were concentrated mainly in nominal and adjectival structures and often relied on deliberately artificial words (e. g. *Caramelville*, *chillacious*, *flavourite*, *fudge-tastic*). Due to this accumulation of most of the descriptive force in nouns and adjectives, verbification had a limited potential in this register: to stylistically balance the text, the authors usually opted for interspersing the highly expressive nominal and adjectival phrases with basic, often semantically light verbs like *be*, *get*, *give*, *go*, *have*, *need*, or *put*. The discourse's environment was therefore more favourable to nominalising conversion, rather than verbification, as reflected in the wide variety of nominalisations ranging from those related to eating or senses in general (*bite*$_{N}$, *crunch*$_{N}$, *grip*$_{N}$, *lick*$_{N}$, *taste*$_{N}$) over emotional expressions (*craving*$_{N}$, *s'cream*$_{N}$, *surprise*$_{N}$, *thrill*$_{N}$) and culinary terms (*brew*$_{N}$, *chip*$_{N}$, *crumble*$_{N}$, *serving*$_{N}$, *topping*$_{N}$) to various informal and/or slang expressions (*fix*$_{N}$, *getaway*$_{N}$, *gimme*$_{N}$, *on the go*$_{N}$). However, verbification was sometimes combined with the nominal techniques or even used as the primary creativity tool in order to attract the reader's attention and demonstrate the copywriter's flexibility in manoeuvring words; in result, apart from occasional well-established and more or less unmarked verbifications like *balance*$_{V}$, *limit*$_{V}$, *mention*$_{V}$, or *name*$_{V}$, the advertising register featured a number of functionally strategic verbified items classifiable into similar conceptual fields as those described above for nominalisations, as illustrated by verbifications like *chunk*$_{V}$, *coat*$_{V}$, *dream*$_{V}$, *hand-cut*$_{V}$, *lace*$_{V}$, *nail*$_{V}$ (in the sense "achieve sth"), *party*$_{V}$, *rock*$_{V}$ ("be awesome"), *scoop*$_{V}$, *spoon*$_{V}$, or *wow*$_{V}$; some were partly motivated by wordplay, such as *chilll*$_{V}$ or *cone*$_{V}$ (~ *come*$_{V}$). In conclusion, then, the communicative functions of the advertising register, above all the need to engage the reader by original and non-repetitive linguistic techniques, naturally constitute a discourse where both nominalising and verbifying conversion have their place, although nominalisation is more favoured due to the register's general reliance on noun- and adjective phrases, rather than complex sentences.

In the fiction register, the distribution of the two main types of conversion was virtually identical as in the advertising discourse: 56% of the conversions identified in the part of the novel analysed were nominalisations and 43% were verbifications. With fiction representing

a traditionally verb-oriented text type, the question arises why the proportion of verbifications was actually lower in fiction than it was in the scientific articles, nowadays a predominantly noun-centered discourse. As with the advertising texts, the answer may lie in the character of the nominalisations observed: firstly, similarly to the copywriters, the author of the novel often preferred to concentrate the expressivity in nouns and adjectives, rather than verbs. This strategy was employed especially in passages depicting human interaction, where concepts related to emotions and both verbal and non-verbal communication tended to be described by nominalising conversion, rather than by a verb (e. g. *advice*$_{N}$, *gaze*$_{N}$, *glance*$_{N}$, *glare*$_{N}$, *look*$_{N}$, *relief*$_{N}$, *remark*$_{N}$, *reply*$_{N}$, *resolve*$_{N}$). Some of these nominalisations were accompanied by a semantically impoverished verb such as *give*, as in the phrases *give a smile*$_{N}$ or *give a laugh*$_{N}$; this specific combination has been commented on by Jespersen ([1909–1949] 1949, 6:117–118) as characteristic of everyday informal language, which was widely used throughout the novel both in the dialogic and the narrative passages, providing the text as a whole with a perceptibly informal and therefore more intimate dimension. Another reason for the prevalence of nominalising conversion in the fiction discourse might have been the topic, since a large portion of the nominalisations denoted domestic issues, such as household objects and areas (*building*$_{N}$, *carving*$_{N}$, *interior*$_{N}$, *landing*$_{N}$, *sink*$_{N}$), clothing or accessories (*clasp*$_{N}$, *tie*$_{N}$), or personal affairs (*fitting*$_{N}$ "the act of trying on clothes," *invite*$_{N}$ "invitation [for a wedding]," *wedding*$_{N}$).

As an interim conclusion, therefore, there is not necessarily a correlation between the measure of a register's informality, conversationality, and general reliance on clausal (rather than phrasal) language on the one hand, and an increased potential for verbification (rather than nominalising conversion) on the other, as demonstrated by the comparison of fiction and academic discourse in the present analysis.

Finally, the conversion profile of forum posts, which yielded the smallest amount of verbification of all the registers examined, can also be explained via interpretation of the products of nominalising conversion in the register. Firstly, in line with the predictions based on Crystal (2006, 32–52), forum posts manifested a high number of slang and/or jargon terms from the larger discourse of "Netspeak," specifically from the field of gaming; of these, as far as conversion is concerned, the majority were nominalisations, rather than verbifications (e. g. *backup*$_{N}$, *cheat*$_{N}$, *collectible*$_{N}$, *control*$_{N}$, *preset*$_{N}$, *save*$_{N}$, *update*$_{N}$). Secondly, because *The Sims* game series, on which the forum in question centres, pertains to the life-simulation genre that generally revolves around building households and managing the appearance and everyday life of the characters created, the posts—in fact, just like the fictional novel analysed—contained a lot of expressions from the area of domestic life, fashion, or hobbies, many of which were

again products of nominalising conversion (e. g. *accessory*$_{N}$, *braid*$_{N}$, *clothing*$_{N}$, *dress*$_{N}$, *makeover*$_{N}$, *makeup*$_{N}$, *painting*$_{N}$, *swim*$_{N}$). The third fairly large resource of nominal conversions was the posts, or parts of posts, related to problem-solving and/or debating, where a user put forward a question or idea and the other users provided suggestions or opinions; accordingly, nominalisations from these passages included *advice*$_{N}$, *help*$_{N}$, *mistake*$_{N}$, *must*$_{N}$ "sth that one must have," *practice*$_{N}$, or *reply*$_{N}$. Additionally, similarly to the fiction discourse, some nominal conversions in the forum posts denoted emotions that the author decided to express by means of a noun, rather than verb; these included *desire*$_{N}$, *feel*$_{N}$, *feeling*$_{N}$, *hope*$_{N}$, *surprise*$_{N}$, or *wish*$_{N}$ and could refer to the emotions of either the players themselves or their in-game characters.

Although the verbifications in the forum post subcorpus also reflected the above four thematic domains on the forum, i. e. gaming jargon (*copy*$_{V}$, *exit*$_{V}$ [the game], *glitch*$_{V}$, *pause*$_{V}$), in-game features (*date*$_{V}$ "[of clothes] become old-fashioned," *fish*$_{V}$, *plant*$_{V}$), problem-solving and/or personal opinions of the users (*contact*$_{V}$, *note*$_{V}$, *post*$_{V}$, *vote*$_{V}$), and emotions (*respect*$_{V}$), they were less numerous than nominalisations, generally more abstract, and also more thematically diffuse, perhaps again because the authors generally preferred to use semantically lighter verbs such as *be*, *have*, *like*, *look*, or *take* while rendering the most specific and expressive pieces of information by means of nouns or adjectives. It appears, therefore, that the main factors responsible for the relatively small measure of verbification in forum posts were the gaming orientation of the website, the presence of problem-solving or discussion threads, and concentration of expressivity mainly within nouns and adjectives, all of which represented a more favourable environment for nominalising conversion than for verbification.

In conclusion, although the portion of nominalising conversion as contrasted to verbification was more or less the same across the registers analysed, this outcome can be explained differently for each register with reference to its specific communicative functions and pervasive linguistic features.

3.3.2 MORPHOLOGICAL PROPERTIES OF VERBIFICATION

3.3.2.1 INPUT WORDS

The data presented in Table 2 below suggest that, in accordance with the stance accepted by most authors in the literature, different input word-classes indeed do have different potentials for entering conversion, or at least verbification. Three input word-classes for verbification were identified in the corpus: nouns, adjectives, and interjections, with the nouns clearly representing by far the most frequent input, responsible for 93.57% of all verbifications in the corpus. This result is very similar to the findings of Balteiro's (2001) and Cannon's (1985), in whose studies nouns yielded 93.10% and 93.56% respectively of the verbifications identified;

in this regard, then, the present analysis further corroborates the traditional academic belief mentioned in Section 2.1 that most verbifications have a noun as the base. The other input word-classes recorded, adjectives and interjections, occurred very rarely in the corpus, representing mere 5.26% and 1.17% respectively of all inputs; this outcome is in line with the previously mentioned claims by Adams (1973, 49) regarding adjectives and Quirk et al. (1985, 1563) regarding closed word-classes that these kinds of input words play only a minor role in the process of verbification. Both Balteiro (2001) and Cannon (1985) report similar values for deadjectival and deinterjectional verbification, as seen in Table 8 in Appendix F; however, unlike Balteiro (2001), the present analysis did not reveal any instances of verbification from other closed word-classes than interjections. In this respect, the data obtained seem to support Martsa's (2013, 167) claim that as far as closed classes are concerned, the one with the largest potential to yield verbified items is interjections.

Table 2: Verbification potential of different word-classes

INPUT TO VERBIFICATION	DISCOURSE									
	ACAD		ADVT		FIC		FORP		OVERALL	
	Q	%	Q	%	Q	%	Q	%	Q	%
N	44	93.62%	39	90.7%	41	95.35%	36	94.74%	160	93.57%
ADJ	3	6.38%	3	6.98%	2	4.65%	1	2.63%	9	5.26%
INTERJ	—	—	1	2.32%	—	—	1	2.63%	2	1.17%
TOTAL	**47**	**100%**	**43**	**100%**	**43**	**100%**	**38**	**100%**	**171**	**100%**

Since besides the above three word-classes, no other types of input were identified in the corpus, the general assumption that any kind of word-class can enter conversion cannot be validated by the analysis performed. On the basis of the present data, verbification from other items than nouns, adjectives, and interjections can be proclaimed extremely rare, unproductive and/or nonexistent in contemporary English.

With respect to the possible influence of discourse on the input word-classes, one pattern is clearly observable from Table 2: the generally uncommon verbification from interjections, allegedly associated with informal language (Quirk et al. 1985, 1563), indeed occurred only in perhaps the two least formal types of discourse analysed, advertising texts (*wow*$_{V}$) and forum posts (*welcome*$_{V}$). The colloquiality, but at the same time high expressivity of verbified interjections is well compatible with the communicative needs of both these registers, the former aiming to linguistically stimulate the reader's senses and emotions and the latter oriented (*inter alia*) towards creating and maintaining social bonds among the community members. In

addition, specifically the advertising register manifested the highest diversity of all registers in terms of the input word-class for verbification, in the sense that it contained the proportionally smallest amount of the archetypal N→V pattern. It may be the case, then, that the more creativity is permitted and/or applied in a discourse, the more diversity in types of input word-classes can be expected among the verbifications present.

As regards the morphological composition of the input words, verbification proved not to be (always) outright blocked by the input's complex structure: as shown in Table 3 below, although the most common input was a simplex word, the analysis also revealed affixed as well as compound inputs, with at least one of this type of input within each register. Furthermore, albeit rare, there were verbifications coming from clippings (*email*$_V$, *sim*$_V$), from words bearing a combining form (*biobank*$_V$, *immunoblot*$_V$, *photograph*$_V$), and, in one case, even from an inflected word-form (*lower*$_V$). In total, about 7% of all verbifications had bases affected by some of the above processes. This result constitutes a radical difference from Cannon's (1985) study, where as much as 72.77% verbifications had non-simplex bases; even in comparison to Balteiro's (2001) corpus, in which non-simplexes were responsible only for 14.75% of verbifications, the proportion of non-simplex bases observed in this analysis is considerably smaller. Therefore, it seems that although verbification does have the potential for a quite diverse array of structurally differentiated inputs, in contemporary English it is almost exclusively performed on simplex bases, unaffected by any former morphological processes.

Table 3: Morphological structure of the verbifications' inputs

STRUCTURE OF THE INPUT	DISCOURSE									
	ACAD		ADVT		FIC		FORP		OVERALL	
	Q	%	Q	%	Q	%	Q	%	Q	%
SIMPLEX	41	87.23%	41	95.35%	41	95.35%	36	94.74%	159	92.982%
AFFIXED	2	4.26%	—	—	1	2.325%	—	—	3	1.754%
COMPOUND	1	2.13%	1	2.325%	—	—	1	2.63%	3	1.754%
COMBINING FORM	3	6.38%	—	—	—	—	—	—	3	1.754%
CLIPPING	—	—	—	—	1	2.325%	1	2.63%	2	1.17%
INFLECTED	—	—	1	2.325%	—	—	—	—	1	0.585%
TOTAL	**47**	**100%**	**43**	**100%**	**43**	**100%**	**38**	**100%**	**171**	**100%**

In terms of the specific constraints on affixed and compound inputs, the following observations have been made. The profile of the affixed inputs in the corpus was in line with

the restrictions on verbification described in Section 1.4.3.2.1: there were no verbifications from adjectives bearing derivational suffixes (although there was one instance, *lower*$_V$, of an adjective bearing an inflectional suffix) and no denominal verbifications ending in *-ness* or *-ity*, suffixes that allegedly constitute quite strong obstacles to verbification. Of the supposedly rare, but not impossible verbification of nouns derived by Germanic affixes, the analysis revealed one instance, *weight*$_V$; the remaining two affixed inputs were nouns bearing the Latinate suffix *-age* (*leverage*$_V$, *package*$_V$), which, together with other non-native derivational affixes, apparently indeed does not constrain the noun from entering conversion as severely as native affixes. As regards compound inputs, however, the alleged condition has been disproved according to which, of compound adjectives, only those ending in *-proof* can be verbified, since the analysis revealed the deadjectival verbification *hand-cut* (App. B, 69)). Verbification, therefore, is probably more open in this respect than was presupposed in the literature.

With regard to the possible influence of discourse on the morphological make-up of the input, Table 3 contains several discourse-specific patterns. Firstly, the greatest overall structural diversity of the input words was observed in the academic discourse, which, apart from verbified simplexes, manifested 2 verbified affixed words (*leverage*$_V$, *weight*$_V$), one verbified compound (*highlight*$_V$), and 3 verbified words bearing a combining form (*biobank*$_V$, *immunoblot*$_V$, *photograph*$_V$). The latest finding is particularly relevant, since in no other register were any verbifications involving a combining form detected. Accordingly, because fields such as biology, biochemistry, or medicine commonly feature hybrid concepts and methods combining multiple different technologies or ideas, verbifications bearing combining forms (especially those of Greek or Latin origin, such as *bio-*, *immuno-*, or *-graph*) can be expected to occur in scientific articles with an increased frequency. Similarly, affixed inputs, particularly those bearing a Latinate affix, can be presupposed to appear in scientific texts more often than in some other registers, in view of the general tendency to employ Latinate words in academic registers in a large measure due to their perceived higher stylistic status than native lexemes.

The second possibly discourse-specific feature in this regard is the distribution of the clipped inputs, both of which occurred outside the formal academic register (*email*$_V$ was found in fiction, *sim*$_V$[10] in forum posts). This finding correlates with the claims that clippings generally

[10] *Sim*$_V$ can be alternatively analysed as a verbification from a proper name, since its derivation was apparently motivated primarily by the name of the videogame, *The Sims*. However, *sim* itself originated as a clipping from *simulation* and is used in other contexts as well, in reference not only to *The Sims*, but also to the simulation videogame genre in general, or, even more widely, in various fields of IT technology; therefore, *sim*$_V$ can also be interpreted, for example, along the lines of "playing a/the (life-)simulation videogame." Hence, the clipping interpretation of this form was preferred in the analysis.

belong to the sphere of informal language (Quirk et al. 1985, 1580), but simultaneously, they tend to be associated with various technical and/or specialist discourses, often as a kind of slang expression (Steinhauer 2015, sec. 2.1, par. 2–4; sec. 4, par. 1): both *email*$_V$ and *sim*$_V$ can be said to have originated in a rather specialist discourse, the first related to information technology and nowadays already conventionalised in common language, and the other related to the jargon of one specific gaming community. *Sim*$_V$ in particular also reflects the fact that the use of clippings frequently serves the implicit purpose of expressing in-group familiarity and maintaining social bonds within the given speech community, outside which the clipping is often unknown and its meaning difficult to decode (Steinhauer 2015, sec. 4, par. 1): the phrase *Happy simming!*, in which the said verbification occurs regularly on the forum, is in all likelihood perfectly comprehensible to most or all members of the player community and its use on the forum reinforces the feeling of communion and perhaps even a certain uniqueness, considering that to an outsider, the above phrase (at least in isolation) would probably seem obscure and unfamiliar. On the basis of these observations, verbification from clipped inputs can be expected to appear more often in informal and simultaneously fairly specialist and/or slang contexts.

3.3.2.2 INFLECTION AND LEXICALISATION

In examining the relationship between inflection of the verbified items and their (non-)lexicalisation, no straightforward correlation was confirmed: as may be inferred from Table 4 below, although most verbifications (77.19%) were either inflected and lexicalised, or uninflected and non-lexicalised, a not insignificant part of the verbified items identified (22.81% in total) went against this pattern, manifesting either only lexicalisation but not inflection (19.3% of verbifications), or, more rarely, only inflection but not lexicalisation (3.51% of verbifications). This outcome leads to the conclusion that even if a verbification represents an established, item-familiar lexeme, in many cases it appears in such a syntactic context that prevents inflection, and—what is a more substantive insight—that innovative and/or specialist verbifications, albeit unrecorded in official dictionaries, are open to inflection; in fact, of the 9 non-lexicalised verbifications found in the corpus, the majority (6) were inflected, while only 3 were used in their basic form. Apparently, therefore, novelty and/or stylistic restrictedness of a verbification constitute no perceived hindrance for language users to use the item in an inflected form.

Table 4: The measure of inflection and/or lexicalisation of verbified items in the corpus (INFL. = inflected; UNINFL. = uninflected; LEX. = lexicalised; NON-LEX. = non-lexicalised)

	DISCOURSE									
	ACAD		ADVT		FIC		FORP		OVERALL	
	Q	%	Q	%	Q	%	Q	%	Q	%
INFL. & LEX.	41	87.24%	30	69.77%	40	93.02%	18	47.37%	129	75.44%
UNINFL. & LEX.	3	6.38%	9	20.93%	3	6.98%	18	47.37%	33	19.3%
INFL. & NON-LEX.	3	6.38%	2	4.65%	—	—	1	2.63%	6	3.51%
UNINFL. & NON-LEX.	—	—	2	4.65%	—	—	1	2.63%	3	1.75%
TOTAL	**47**	**100%**	**43**	**100%**	**43**	**100%**	**38**	**100%**	**171**	**100%**

Overall, most verbifications in the corpus (94.74%) were established, item-familiar lexemes, such as *focus*$_V$, *dream*$_V$, *order*$_V$, or *influence*$_V$; on the basis of these data, the assumption can be confirmed as valid that verbification successfully contributes to the (relatively) permanent lexical inventory of English and in this sense it can be deemed a productive process. At the same time, most verbifications (78.95%) were inflected. However, with respect both to lexicalisation and inflection, there were noticeable discourse-related differences. Starting with inflection, the largest measure of inflection among verbifications was found in the academic and fiction registers, in which, as can be deduced from Table 4, as much as 93.61% and 93.02% of verbifications respectively were inflected, in line with the prevalence of reporting rhetoric (and, therefore, pervasive reliance on the past tense and/or perfect aspect) in both research articles and fiction novels. In contrast, in the advertising and forum post registers, neither of which necessarily features reporting or narration, the measure of inflection among verbifications reached only 74.42% and 50% respectively: rather than past and/or perfect forms, these registers made use of the present or future tense, imperatives, and infinitives, the last often in combination with a modal verb. Any of these forms could be used, in the advertising texts, to build closeness with the reader and evoke a greater sense of availability of the product (*let's party together*, App. B, 61); *we lace the ice cream with plump sweet cherries and dark chocolatey chunks*, App. B, 87)), and in the forum posts, to express a player's opinion or wish concerning the game (*I still dream of that blue sparkly magical dress*, App. D, 64)) or to imply advice, instruction, or suggestion (*keep that one at home and focus on needs*, App. D, 94); *you need to place the wall mirror into the Wellness Centre*, App. D, 76)).

Similarly to non-inflected verbifications, the 9 non-lexicalised verbifications were also distributed unevenly across the discourses analysed. Four of them (*chunk*$_V$, *hand-cut*$_V$, *luge*$_V$, and *pack*$_V$ in one of the 3 senses of this lexeme recorded) were concentrated in the advertising texts, in accordance with the register's frequent reliance on neologisms in order to attract the potential customer by linguistic creativity. The second largest number of non-lexicalised verbifications was found in the research articles, featuring the specialist verbifications *biobank*$_V$, *immunoblot*$_V$, and *seed*$_V$ (cells), which reflected the discourse's common use of scientific slang, whose products are only rarely adopted in more ordinary speech and get listed in dictionaries. The remaining 2 non-lexicalised verbifications, *sim*$_V$ and *trig*$_V$, occurred in forum posts, a discourse where neologisms can be expected to occur on a regular basis as the result of experimentation with language, part of the search for new possibilities of expression that pervades the Internet domain as a whole (Crystal 2006, 71). No non-lexicalised verbifications were found in the fiction subcorpus; in fiction in general, the amount of non-lexicalised items seems to be more of a matter of genre, topic, and perhaps also individual style, rather than a matter of register, since the novel analysed was a fairly conventionally written work of contemporary fiction depicting ordinary life affairs in a realistic urban setting and as such it exploited mostly verbifications that represented quite commonplace lexical items, related to processes of human perception (*notice*$_V$, *sense*$_V$, *view*$_V$), interpersonal communication (*gesture*$_V$, *message*$_V$, *pause*$_V$), housing (*rent*$_V$), or designing a household (*curtain*$_V$, *pad*$_V$). A different situation, however, might be observed for example in a text from the genre of science fiction and/or dystopia, where coinages in general are a common literary strategy to render the fictional world created more authentic.

3.3.3 SEMANTIC PROPERTIES OF VERBIFICATION

Table 5 below provides an overview of the semantic categories underlying the verbified items identified. In the first place, as regards testing whether the semantic categories for verbification available in the literature are sufficient for an appropriate semantic description of verbified items, the analysis revealed that this assumption is mostly, but not completely valid. Firstly, as much as 18.13% of all verbifications could not be unambiguously classified into any single semantic category of the set proposed by Martsa (2013): either they could possibly fit multiple categories (as in the cases of verbifications referring to manifestation of specific attitudes or feelings, such as *honour*$_V$ or *respect*$_V$, which are interpretable either as figurative locatum verbs expressing "convey N to X" or as instrument verbs expressing "act using N"), and/or the item seemed to be underlain by such a semantic pattern that did not correspond to any of Martsa's (2013) categories. For the latter group of semantically disputable verbifications, hypothetical

semantic patterns were proposed in the analysis, of which several arose repeatedly: these were, firstly, "**have (as) N; manifest N**," which could accommodate verbifications like *total*$_{V}$ "have X as the *total*$_{N}$; manifest the *total*$_{N}$ of X" (App. A, 71)) and possibly also the even more questionable verbifications *cost*$_{V}$ (App. D, 99)), *dream*$_{V}$ (App. B, 75); App. D, 64)), and *feature*$_{V}$ (App. A, 67); App. B, 88)); secondly, "**(passively) experience N**," possibly fitting verbifications like *age*$_{V}$ "experience *age*$_{N}$, be exposed to (the effects of) *age*$_{N}$; become older" (App. D, 86)) and alternatively perhaps also *dream*$_{V}$; and thirdly, "**be N (of X)**," with which the verbifications *cost*$_{V}$ and *feature*$_{V}$ could also be identified.

The second reason why Martsa's (2013) semantic categories for verbification were only partially utilisable was that a large portion of the verbified items (a total of 54 verbifications, i. e. 31.58% of all 171 verbifications and 38.57% of the 140 semantically classifiable ones) manifested some kind of meaning shift in their semantic structure, which apparently took place either during the very process of conversion or sometime after. Meaning shifts were most commonly observed among locatum and location verbs as within each of these categories over 50% of verbifications had undergone a more or less substantial semantic shift; in contrast, goal and instrument verbs were rarely affected by a meaning shift, with only 16.22% of goal verbs and 13.04% of instrument verbs showing signs of such an operation. Crucially, while the (hypothetical) literal and/or original meaning of verbifications influenced by semantic shifts was usually more or less predictable and quite easily classifiable into one of Martsa's categories, the precise nature and direction of the meaning shift that had taken place proved essentially unforeseeable. Even where the shift was based on a metaphor, which is generally motivated by the seemingly quite predictable pattern of drawing on an outer semblance or analogy relating two entities or activities, it was impossible to predict which, or even what kind of entity or activity would be selected as the model for the metaphorical extension of the verbification's meaning, how actually similar the two entitites or activities would be, and how the semantic development of the given verbification would continue further; thus, *coat*$_{V}$ (App. A, 88); App. B, 68)) came to signify the act of covering a surface with a rather thin layer of liquid, although it might have just as well developed, for instance, the hypothetical sense "to wrap (up), as if by putting a coat on sb/sth" or "to support sb or express solidarity, as if by the charitable act of giving them one's coat." Equally unpredictable was the meaning shift of *nail*$_{V}$ (App. B, 64)) from the original "to fix, fasten with a nail" to "to succeed in doing sth."

Table 5: Semantic categories of the verbified items (based on Martsa 2013); BASIC = unaffected by any kind of semantic shift, whether during conversion or after; (FIG.) SHIFT = based on (but not directly motivated by) any kind of semantic shift, figurative or other, either after the conversion or during the very process of conversion (e. g. by drawing on the input's figurative meaning, and/or by reflecting the pattern of the given semantic category in a figurative way); PURE (FIG.) SHIFT = verbifications directly motivated by a semantic shift, figurative or other; INSTR. VERB = instrument verb

SEMANTIC CATEGORY		**DISCOURSE**									
		ACAD		**ADVT**		**FIC**		**FORP**		**OVERALL**	
		Q	**%**	**Q**	**%**	**Q**	**%**	**Q**	**%**	**Q**	**%**
LOCATUM VERB	BASIC	2	4.26%	3	6.98%	5	11.63%	—	—	10	5.85%
	(FIG.) SHIFT	6	12.77%	5	11.63%	2	4.65%	2	5.26%	15	8.77%
LOCATION VERB	BASIC	1	2.13%	2	4.65%	4	9.30%	3	7.89%	10	5.85%
	(FIG.) SHIFT	7	14.89%	2	4.65%	2	4.65%	3	7.89%	14	8.19%
AGENT VERB	BASIC	2	4.26%	1	2.33%	—	—	1	2.632%	4	2.34%
	(FIG.) SHIFT	—	—	—	—	1	2.33%	—	—	1	0.58%
GOAL VERB	BASIC	9	19.15%	7	16.28%	8	18.60%	7	18.42%	31	18.13%
	(FIG.) SHIFT	2	4.26%	1	2.33%	2	4.65%	1	2.632%	6	3.51%
SOURCE VERB	BASIC	—	—	—	—	1	2.33%	—	—	1	0.58%
	(FIG.) SHIFT	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
INSTR. VERB	BASIC	6	12.77%	4	9.30%	7	16.28%	3	7.89%	20	11.7%
	(FIG.) SHIFT	—	—	1	2.33%	1	2.33%	1	2.632%	3	1.75%
ANIMAL VERB	BASIC	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	2.632%	1	0.58%
	(FIG.) SHIFT	—	—	—	—	1	2.33%	—	—	1	0.58%
"MAKE X ADJ"	BASIC	2	4.26%	3	6.98%	1	2.33%	1	2.632%	7	4.09%
	(FIG.) SHIFT	1	2.13%	—	—	1	2.33%	1	2.632%	3	1.75%
"CONVEY EMOTIONAL STATE INTERJ"		—	—	1	2.33%	—	—	1	2.632%	2	1.17%
PURE (FIG.) SHIFT		—	—	3	6.98%	5	11.63%	3	7.89%	11	6.43%
DISPUTABLE / UNCLASSIFIABLE		9	19.15%	10	23.26%	2	4.65%	10	26.32%	31	18.13%
TOTAL		**47**	**100%**	**43**	**100%**	**43**	**100%**	**38**	**100%**	**171**	**100%**

Similarly, with verbifications directly motivated by a semantic shift performed on one of the input's meanings, it could not be predicted which meaning facet of the input was to be selected as the most salient for the semantic shift: the verbification *head*V (App. C, 68)), for

example, has developed a number of senses based on all kinds of connotations more or less indirectly associated with the human head, out of which the one recorded in the corpus was "to move in a particular direction," drawing on the quite obscure link between the act of moving somewhere and (usually) having one's head tilted in that direction.

The above findings favour the conclusion that while the proposed semantic categories designed for verbifications may be fairly efficient at least most of the time for determining the "physical" and/or straightforwardly derivable meanings of the verbified items (if there are any), the compatibility of conversion with figurative extensions and other semantic shifts often renders the ultimate meaning(s) of verbified items unpredictable, ungoverned by any specific rules. It is, therefore, precisely in respect of this compatibility with possibly very extensive and complex meaning changes that verbification—or even conversion in general—can be proclaimed a "totally free process" (Bauer 1983, 226).

In terms of the different semantic categories identified, the analysis revealed representatives of locatum verbs, location verbs, agent verbs, goal verbs, one source verb, instrument verbs, animal verbs, the deadjectival pattern "make X ADJ," the pattern for verbified interjections "convey the emotional state associated with INTERJ," and verbifications motivated purely by a semantic shift (such as *head*V, commented on above). Several semantic categories postulated by Martsa (2013) for verbifications were therefore not found at all, including duration verbs, experiencer verbs, the animal verb subpattern "bring forth animal N," the deadjectival subpattern "X becomes ADJ," or locatum and location verb based on removal; these may, accordingly, be proclaimed rare and/or occurring in other, perhaps more specific types of discourse. As inferable from Table 5 above, the findings disproved the claim of Clark and Clark's (1979, 776) that most denominal verbifications are instrument verbs: in this analysis, by far the most frequent semantic category both of denominal verbifications and of verbifications in general was that of goal verbs, representing the total of 37 verbifications (26.43% of the 140 semantically unambiguous verbifications and 28.9% of the 128 unambiguous denominal ones). The second most common category in the corpus was locatum verbs (17.86% of all unambiguous verbifications), closely followed by location verbs (17.14% of all unambiguous verbifications); instrument verbs were only the fourth most frequent category, representing 16.43% of all unambiguous verbifications. Of the types of denominal verbifications identified, the least frequent were agent verbs, animal verbs, and source verbs, altogether representing mere 8 instances among the 128 unambiguous denominal verbifications. In view of these preferences involved in exploiting different semantic categories, the

assumption can be proclaimed verified that it is possible to find distinct patterns in the semantic behaviour of verbification.

Next, in line with the hypothesis assumed in this paper, the semantic nature of the verbifications detected appears to have been influenced by discourse type in certain respects. To begin with, the registers of fiction and forum posts manifested the highest semantic diversity of verbified items (each exhibiting the total of 9 semantic categories for verbifications); in contrast, the lowest diversity was observed in research articles, where only 6 semantic classes of verbified items were identified. Accordingly, unlike in a fictional story from the domain of everyday life or on an Internet forum revolving around a life-simulation videogame, both of which hold the potential for a semantically greatly varied discourse, in scientific articles, verbifications—and verbs in general—have carefully assigned roles, serving mostly either to describe the methodology and the course of the experiment or analysis, or to explain and evaluate mostly abstract concepts and relations, as already argued in Section 3.3.1. On this account, besides goal verbs, locatum or location verbs, and instrument verbs, not much semantic heterogeneity of verbified items can be expected of scientific academic prose, where many semantic categories of verbifications usually have no place (such as metaphorical animal verbs or pure semantic shift, as also demonstrated below).

On the other hand, it was the academic register where the highest proportional quantity was identified of verbifications involving some kind of semantic shift (mostly of a figurative nature), which in the scientific articles represented 42.11% of all semantically categorisable verbifications (contrasted to 39.29% in forum posts, 36.59% in fiction, and 36.36% in advertising).[11] Most of these were either locatum or location verbs and all fulfilled one of the two above-described communicative functions of verbs in the scientific register, i. e. either delineating the methodological tools or measures applied, for which a range of specialist, metaphorically oriented verbifications was employed for a higher descriptive value (e. g. *coat*$_V$, *flood*$_V$, *screen*$_V$, *smooth*$_V$, *weight*$_V$), or characterising abstract concepts mostly related to the implications of the study or evaluation of past research in the field, where a slight figurative extension could support the argumentative potential of the proposition (*combat*$_V$, *focus*$_V$, *highlight*$_V$, *limit*$_V$). Hence, perhaps unexpectably, figurative shifts seem to play an important role even in such a formal, technical, and real-world oriented discourse as scientific articles, reinforcing the descriptivity and increasing the evaluative force in crucial passages.

[11] For every register, the proportional value mentioned in this sentence comprises verbifications from the categories "(FIG.) SHIFT" as well as "PURE (FIG.) SHIFT" in Table 5. Research articles, however, as specified below, did not feature any verbifications of the "PURE (FIG.) SHIFT" type.

The distribution of certain semantic categories of verbifications across the registers analysed also seems to have been influenced by discourse-specific factors. Firstly, locatum verbs were proportionally rare in forum posts (7.14% of the 28 semantically classifiable verbifications), but comparatively more frequent in fiction (17.07% of the 41 classifiable verbifications) and even more so in research articles (21.05% of the 38 classifiable verbifications) and advertising (24.24% of the 33 classifiable verbifications). This is a rather surprising result in view of *The Sims*' extensive building, clothing, and face-making features, which may potentially generate large numbers of locatum verbs like *roof*$_{V}$ *(the house)*, *fence*$_{V}$ *(the yard)*, *tile*$_{V}$ *(the floor)*, *shawl*$_{V}$ *(the child)*, or *beard*$_{V}$ *(the actor)* (examples from Clark and Clark 1979, 770–771); however, no such verbifications were found, perhaps due to the relatively small corpus size. Nevertheless, the absence was understandable of locatum verbs expressing the players' providing one another with something, considering the chiefly online (rather than physical) environment of the register and the fact that specifically on forums, personal messages or e-mails, i. e. potentially exchangeable entities, are rarely sent. In contrast to forum posts, especially in the academic and advertising discourses, locatum verbs—particularly figurative ones—proved to be much more relevant, increasing descriptivity in both technical and evaluative-argumentative passages in the scientific articles (as with *benefit*$_{V}$, *flood*$_{V}$, *limit*$_{V}$, or *supplement*$_{V}$) and enabling to depict with sensuality the ingredients and decorations of the individual ice-cream desserts in product descriptions (*coat*$_{V}$, *lace*$_{V}$, *load*$_{V}$, *salt*$_{V}$, *stuff*$_{V}$). In fiction, locatum verbs were represented moderately and usually had a non-figurative meaning, referring to interpersonal communication (*email*$_{V}$, *message*$_{V}$) or various household articles (*curtain*$_{V}$, *pad*$_{V}$, *pattern*$_{V}$).

Location verbs, too, were proportionally distributed unevenly in the corpus, representing, of semantically identifiable verbifications, the portion of 21.43% in forum posts and 21.05% in academic prose, but only 14.63% in fiction and 12.12% in advertising. In forum posts, location verbs could refer to the players' relocating a particular object in the game, one of the most routine activities in *The Sims* (as with *place*$_{V}$), to accessing various controls of the game (*exit*$_{V}$, *view*$_{V}$), or, figuratively, to gaming strategy (*focus*$_{V}$). In research articles, the semantic pattern of an entity being moved towards a certain target, denoted by the input word, also had a large potential for exploitation, especially in view of the frequent use of imaging and plotting processes in scientific analyses, reflected in location verbs such as *image*$_{V}$, *photograph*$_{V}$, *plot*$_{V}$, or *screen*$_{V}$. In contrast, fiction and advertisements manifested lower proportions of location verbs; in the novel, despite its everyday life setting and therefore a very similar potential for location verbs as *The Sims* forum, the relative portion of location verbs

might have been somewhat reduced by the register's quantity of locatum verbs, which was comparatively larger in fiction than in forum posts (as outlined earlier). For a similar reason, location verbs might have been overshadowed in the advertising texts, which had a virtually exclusive focus on ice-cream desserts and where the copywriters relied more on locatum verbs describing the various ingredients or decorations being added to the desserts, rather than on the reverse scheme of verbifying the name of the dessert (or its part) as the target, likely because the latter strategy would lead to undesirable repetition as the ingredients or decorations were much more numerous and varied in designations than the desserts or their parts. Thus, the only location verb referring to the desserts that occurred repeatedly in the product descriptions was *top*$_{V}$ (App. B, 79), 81)), commonly used in confectionery and also allowing the playful semantic ambiguity, taken advantage of by the authors, between "putting sth on the top of the given dessert" and "surpassing sth, being better than sth."

Finally, verbifications directly motivated by a semantic shift on the base were completely absent in the academic register, where the resulting indirect semantic relationship between the input and the output would not have been compatible with the emphasis on precision and accuracy required in scientific articles and would have likely also gone against the stylistic norm of the register, since most verbifications of this kind identified in the analysis had a colloquial nature. In contrast, in the generally informal discourses of product descriptions, the fictional novel, and forum posts, these verbifications could be used without restriction to increase figurativity, support the informality of the discourse, and therefore approximate the text to the member of the general public and build affinity with the reader. The highest proportion of these verbifications was found in fiction, where they, unlike in advertising or forum posts, could be generated not only in the narrative passages (*face*$_{V}$, *pique*$_{V}$, *scroll*$_{V}$), but also during the dialogues between literary characters (*chance*$_{V}$, *head*$_{V}$).

4 CONCLUSION

This paper examined the nature of English verbification across several types of written discourse in order to verify selected theoretical claims about conversion as a whole and the possible influence of discourse type on the relative frequency, morphology, and semantics of the verbification process.

The theoretical part defined conversion as a cross-linguistic directional word-formation technique on a par with affixation, compounding, and other derivational methods that is determined by a combination of morphological, syntactic, and semantic conditions, with the morphological ones being assigned the uppermost relevance in this paper. With a focus on its realisation in the English language, conversion was described as an intricate process compatible in manifold ways with other word-formation methods as well as various semantic shifts. Upon establishing a primarily synchronic view on conversion, which led to the selection of predominantly synchronic criteria for ascertaining its direction and to admittance of certain instances of conversion with slight formal modifications, a word-based conversion typology was put forward with a characterisation of the 3 conversion patterns in contemporary English—nominalising, adjectivalising, and verbifying conversion. The last type, representing the focal point of this thesis, was also provided with a description of its individual subtypes, particularly in respect of their frequency and semantics, the latter with reference to the semantic categories proposed by Martsa (2013).

The practical part analysed the character of verbification in 4 different written registers. The aim of this analysis was, firstly, to assess via verbification the validity of 7 academic assumptions about the nature of conversion in general that were earlier proposed in the literature; and secondly, to test specifically on the case of verbification the more general hypothesis that the concrete manifestation of conversion, apart from other possible factors, is influenced by discourse type.

The following conclusions have been achieved. Out of the 7 theoretical assumptions about conversion as a whole, 4 may be said to have been confirmed, at least in part: firstly, verbification has proven to represent a highly productive process in English, in the sense that it is endowed with a large potential to produce lexemes that become established in official written resources of the permanent lexicon of the English language. Secondly, different word-classes clearly do exhibit different potentials to enter conversion (at least in the case of verbification), since a radical disproportion has been observed in the corpus in the frequency of exploitation between nouns on the one hand, which, as a type of input, accounted for nearly 94% of all

verbifications, and other word-classes, constituting only a small minority of inputs, on the other. Thirdly, conversion, at least its verbifying pattern, is subject to certain morphological restrictions on the input and therefore does not represent a completely unrestricted phenomenon in this regard; however, it appears that not all of these restrictions are equally strong and some of them should be seen as tendencies or preferences, rather than absolute constraints. Notably, the strictness of the alleged restriction on compound adjectives should be re-evaluated, as the analysis has demonstrated. Lastly, verbification has manifested a propensity to patterning behaviour on its semantic side: most verbifications could be classified into one of the semantic categories proposed by Martsa (2013), where some categories—namely goal verbs, locatum verbs, location verbs, and, to a lesser degree, instrument verbs—have been exploited considerably more often than all the remaining ones. However, almost one fifth of the verbifications could not be classified unequivocally, and the analysis has also shown that once verbification (and, by implication, conversion in general) is combined with semantic shifts, the predictability of the output's meaning decreases significantly or even vanishes altogether. With that said, the remaining 3 general assumptions have not been confirmed or were outright disproved: firstly, there is no necessary link between the establishment and/or item-familiarity of a product of conversion on the one hand, and its occurrence in an inflected form on the other, since not all well-established verbifications were inflected in the corpus and, conversely, most non-established verbifications were found inflected. Secondly, the statement has not been confirmed that any word-class can become input to conversion: in the analysis, only verbifications coming from nouns, adjectives, or interjections have been identified, so that any other possible input word-classes are probably employed very infrequently or perhaps not at all. Finally, the claims have been challenged that verbification is the most common type of conversion: on the basis of the data analysed here, there is a good reason to believe that in contemporary English, the most frequent conversion pattern is actually nominalisation, the prevalent process in the corpus, although both nominalising and verbifying conversion clearly constitute robust patterns and appear to stand in a rather tight competition with each other in terms of type frequency.

With respect to the possible discursive influence on the nature of conversion, a number of discourse-specific features have been ascertained for verbification. In line with the specific situational characteristics and communicative functions of the individual discourse types, **research articles**, out of all the registers analysed, manifested the largest proportion of verbifications in general as well as of the inflected verbifications and verbifications combined with a semantic shift (especially figurative); at the same time, they displayed the greatest

diversity as for the internal morphological structure of the input and were marked by concentration of inputs involving combining forms. Characteristically as well, verbifications from research articles were the least semantically diverse across registers in terms of the number of semantic categories that they fell into, and they included no instances of verbifications directly motivated by a semantic shift. **Advertising texts** featured the greatest heterogeneity of input word-classes, involving verbifications from nouns as well as adjectives and interjections and simultaneously making the least frequent use of the conventional N→V pattern of all registers; additionally, they manifested the highest concentration of non-lexicalised verbifications and had the highest proportional quantity of locatum verbs, contrasting with their cross-discursively smallest proportion of location verbs. **Fiction** and **forum posts** were both characterised by the highest number of semantic categories exploited for verbifications of all discourses and both also featured the generally rare verbification from a clipped base; in addition, fiction had the second highest proportion of inflected verbifications and, as the only register in the analysis, it included no non-lexicalised verbifications. Forum posts, then, had the cross-discursively lowest portion of verbifications in general as well as of inflected verbifications and locatum verbs, but simultaneously, it was in forum posts where the largest proportion of location verbs was recorded. For all registers, then, possible discourse-specific reasons could be postulated that underlay the registers' shared preference for nominalising conversion, rather than verbification.

As the ultimate conclusion of this thesis, therefore, verbification in English may be considered a complex word-formation method operating on multiple levels of the language system simultaneously, whose nature is determined by several factors, including—as demonstrated in this paper—the type of discourse in which it is realised. Certain predictions and assumptions related to its mechanism seem to be valid, while others apparently call for a re-evaluation that should be supported by a sufficient amount of recent, corpus-based data. The outcomes of the analysis presented above, many of which were surprising and in a direct conflict with both conversion-related and stylistic suppositions, only show that in a number of respects, conversion as a whole still represents a significantly under-researched subject that can only be better understood not merely by means of targeting its controversial and/or yet unexplored aspects and conducting a study aiming to resolve these questionable points, but furthermore, due attention must be devoted first of all to a careful evaluation of the variety of theoretical approaches to conversion as well as to appropriate delineation of both formal and semantic boundaries of this distinctive linguistic process.

5 RESUMÉ

Tato diplomová práce zkoumá realizaci anglické verbifikace (neboli konverze do slovesa) v několika typech psaného diskurzu se zaměřením na frekvenční, morfologické a sémantické vlastnosti tohoto procesu. Prostřednictvím korpusové analýzy částečně komparativního charakteru si práce klade za cíl ověřit na případu verbifikace platnost vybraných akademických tvrzení o konverzi jako takové a zároveň posoudit, zdali a do jaké míry může být povaha verbifikace ovlivněna stylistickými rysy příznačnými pro daný typ diskurzu.

Práce sestává z části teoretické a části praktické. První kapitola teoretické části, která se dále dělí do šesti podkapitol, představuje samotnou konverzi a věnuje se jejímu podrobnému vymezení pro potřeby pozdější analýzy na základě rozboru odlišných teoretických přístupů k tomuto jevu. V první podkapitole jsou nastíněny všeobecně uznávané základní poznávací znaky konverze. Druhá podkapitola popisuje rozšíření a produktivitu různých druhů konverze ve světových jazycích s konkrétním zaměřením na angličtinu, v níž lze konverzi definovat jakožto vysoce produktivní proces, který se vyznačuje absolutní formální identitou obou zúčastněných lexémů v jejich slovníkovém tvaru. Třetí podkapitola popisuje 4 okruhy teoretických pojetí konverze a jejich zhodnocením dochází k podrobné definici konverze pro účely práce, podle níž je konverze v prvé řadě morfologicky vymezený způsob tvorby slov, nezávislý na odvozování či jiných slovotvorných metodách, který však též nezbytně zahrnuje syntaktické a sémantické změny a vždy pojímá jeden výchozí a jeden cílový lexém. Čtvrtá podkapitola podává souhrn nejpodstatnějších morfologických vlastností konverze; mimo jiné jsou zde uvedeny možné vstupní i výstupní slovní druhy, interakce konverze s jinými slovotvornými procesy i formální restrikce, které se v těchto ohledech mohou na konverzi vztahovat. V páté podkapitole je popsán sémantický mechanismus konverze se zaměřením na (ne)transparentnost konvertovaných lexémů a kompatibilitu konverze s nejrůznějšími typy přenesení významu. Závěrečná, šestá podkapitola přináší typologii konverze podle výstupního slovního druhu, která zahrnuje výhradně případy takzvané *primární* (primary) a *úplné* (total) konverze a k určení konkrétního typu konverze uplatňuje převážně synchronní kritéria, která zároveň umožňují do celkového rámce konverze začlenit i jisté sémanticky spřízněné dvojice lexémů, mezi jejichž slovníkovými tvary panují drobné formální rozdíly (např. *belief–believe* či *ábstract–abstráct*). Na základě těchto opatření je vytyčena nejprve konverze do podstatného jména a poté konverze do přídavného jména: u obou procesů jsou představeny obecné morfologicko-syntakticko-sémantické podmínky pro uznání příslušného typu konverze, charakteristika jeho produktivity a výčet možných vstupních slovních druhů.

Konverzi do slovesa je coby hlavnímu tématu práce věnována samostatná, druhá hlavní kapitola. Kromě obecného popisu produktivity verbifikace a seznamu morfologických, syntaktických a sémantických kritérií nutných pro uznání lexému jakožto verbifikátu je zde navíc předložena relativní produktivita a sémantický profil jednotlivých podtypů verbifikace podle vstupního slovního druhu, jejichž významové kategorie jsou popsány s využitím sémantické klasifikace verbifikátů podle Sándora Martsy (2013).

Na charakteristiku verbifikace navazuje praktická část práce, která tvoří třetí hlavní kapitolu. Nejprve jsou představeny dva hlavní cíle výzkumu: první se týká 7 akademických tvrzení o frekvenčních, morfologických a sémantických rysech konverze, jejichž platnost je v analýze posuzována prostřednictvím verbifikace. Druhý cíl vychází z širší hypotézy, že charakter konverze (a tudíž i verbifikace) se může částečně odvíjet od typu diskurzu, v němž je konverze přítomna; analýza byla proto provedena napříč 4 psanými diskurzy (jmenovitě byly využity odborné články z oboru medicíny, reklamní texty, literární fikce a příspěvky z internetového fóra), aby bylo možno zmapovat případné ovlivnění povahy verbifikace v rámci výše zmíněných 7 tvrzení funkčními, situačními a lingvistickými vlastnostmi daného registru.

Ve druhé podkapitole této části práce následuje popis metodologie, který mimo jiné specifikuje zdroje korpusových dat, referenční publikace (zejména slovníky) a typy případů, které byly z analýzy systematicky vyřazovány.

Třetí podkapitola třetí kapitoly se věnuje výsledkům provedeného výzkumu. Nejdříve byla hodnocena frekvence verbifikace v porovnání s ostatními typy konverze. V tomto ohledu výzkum naznačuje, že navzdory většinovému názoru v relevantní literatuře nemusí být v současné angličtině nejčastějším typem konverze právě verbifikace, jelikož jak v korpusu jako celku, tak i v jednotlivých čtyřech subkorpusech převládla konverze do podstatného jména, přestože oba procesy byly v korpusových datech dosti frekventované. Naopak téměř nepřítomná byla konverze do adjektiva, jejíž četnost výskytu zjevně silně závisí na přísnosti kritérií pro její uznání, která byla v této práci poměrně striktní. Vliv typu diskurzu na frekvenční vlastnosti verbifikace bylo obtížné prokázat, jelikož mezi jednotlivými registry nepanovaly výraznější rozdíly v procentuálním zastoupení konverze do substantiva a konverze do slovesa a poměr obou těchto typů konverze byl navíc napříč registry relativně vyvážený; přesto bylo možné postulovat specifická vysvětlení, proč v každém registru vzhledem k jeho funkčním a situačním rysům dominovala konverze do substantiva a proč měly zároveň některé registry o něco nižší zastoupení verbifikace než jiné. U odborných článků, které se vyznačovaly největším poměrným zastoupením verbifikace ze všech registrů (47 %), lze tento výsledek interpretovat s ohledem na deskriptivní a argumentačně-evaluativní úlohu sloves ve vědeckých

pracech, která si v tomto registru udržuje svou důležitost i přes tendenci akademických textů omezovat celkové množství sloves ve prospěch nominálních struktur; ostatní registry, u kterých byla míra verbifikace nižší (mezi 43 % a 38 %), naopak z různých stylistických důvodů soustředily většinu deskriptivity a expresivity do podstatných a přídavných jmen, zatímco u sloves často volily sémanticky vágnější formy (např. *get*, *give*, *have*, *put*) a neumožňovaly tak verbifikaci takový prostor pro realizaci jako v odborných článcích.

Následující část analýzy zkoumala morfologické vlastnosti verbifikace. Nejprve byl posuzován charakter výchozích lexémů: v tomto ohledu byla potvrzena domněnka, že různé slovní druhy mají různý potenciál pro vstup do konverze, jelikož celých 93,57 % verbifikátů pocházelo z podstatného jména, zatímco verbifikáty z jiného slovního druhu tvořily jen nepatrnou část korpusu; nebylo však dokázáno tvrzení, že je možné konvertovat kterýkoli slovní druh, jelikož byly nalezeny pouze verbifikáty ze substantiv, adjektiv a citoslovcí. Dále analýza potvrdila, že je verbifikace podmíněna morfologickými restrikcemi na straně výchozího lexému, ačkoli tyto restrikce patrně nejsou absolutní: pouze 7 % verbifikátů pocházelo z jiné než simplexní struktury (konkrétně z derivátu, zkráceniny, standardního či afixoidního kompozita anebo z přídavného jména v komparativu), což poukazuje na tendenci verbifikace postihovat téměř výlučně simplexy, a verbifikáty jmenovitě z derivátů odrážely příslušné formální restrikce představené v teoretické části práce; u verbifikace z kompozit však byla jedna z dříve popsaných formálních restrikcí vyvrácena. Některé morfologické rysy verbifikace pak byly zjevně ovlivněny typem diskurzu: obecně velmi vzácná verbifikace citoslovcí se vyskytla výhradně v neformálních a zároveň lingvisticky vysoce kreativních registrech, konkrétně v reklamních textech a příspěvcích z fóra. Největší diverzita morfologické struktury výchozích lexémů byla zaznamenána u odborných článků, v nichž se zároveň soustředily všechny verbifikáty z afixoidních kompozit, která ve všech případech obsahovala pro vědecký diskurz typické afixoidy latinského či řeckého původu (*bio-*, *immuno-*, *-graph*). Oproti tomu další výstižný druh výchozího lexému, zkrácenina, byl nalezen pouze v neformálnějších registrech, konkrétně ve fikci a v příspěvcích na fóru.

Druhá část morfologické analýzy verbifikace sledovala možný vztah mezi výskytem verbifikátů v časovaném tvaru a jejich *lexikalizací* (tzn. zaznamenáním v uznávaném slovníku). Mezi těmito faktory nebyla v korpusu zjištěna žádná přímá korelace: celých 22,81 % verbifikátů buď tvořilo lexikalizované jednotky, které se ovšem nenacházely ve vyčasovaném tvaru, anebo šlo o inovativní a/nebo dosud nelexikalizovaná, ale přitom vyčasovaná slovesa. Odděleně byly však oba parametry výrazně ovlivněny typem diskurzu: zdaleka největší procentuální zastoupení vyčasovaných verbifikátů měly odborné články (93,61 %) a fikce

(93,02 %), tedy registry, které ve velké míře užívají minulého, předminulého či předpřítomného času během výkladu či vyprávění, a nejvyšší koncentraci nelexikalizovaných verbifikátů obsahovaly reklamní texty, které často uplatňují neologismy za účelem zaujetí potenciálního čtenáře.

Nakonec byla prozkoumána sémantická stránka verbifikace. Zde bylo zjištěno, že převážnou část (81,87 %) verbifikátů lze alespoň v jejich základním a/nebo „doslovném" významu poměrně snadno zařadit do jedné z Martsových (2013) významových kategorií; zároveň však 38,57 % sémanticky klasifikovatelných verbifikátů vykazovalo některý druh významového posunu, jehož konkrétní podobu prakticky nebylo možné předpokládat a který značně ztěžoval předvídatelnost významu daného lexému. Přesto byly v sémantické povaze verbifikace vypozorovány jisté vzorce: více než 75 % verbifikátů spadalo do kategorie *goal verbs*, *locatum verbs*, *location verbs* či *instrument verbs*, zatímco ostatní sémantické kategorie byly buď zastoupeny ve velmi malé míře, nebo v korpusu zcela chyběly. Konečně i v této oblasti byl odhalen vliv diskurzu: nejnižší diverzita sémantických kategorií byla nalezena u verbifikátů z odborných článků, ve kterých, oproti fikci či příspěvkům na fóru, mají slovesa obecně pouze malé množství přesně vymezených funkcí. Přitom však odborné články pojímaly proporcionálně nejvyšší míru verbifikátů zasažených významovým posunem, které zde posilovaly argumentativnost i deskriptivitu technických termínů; na rozdíl od ostatních registrů ovšem články neobsahovaly žádné verbifikáty přímo motivované významovým posunem, jejichž hovorovost a nepřímý sémantický vztah k výchozímu lexému se neshodují se stylistickými rysy akademického diskurzu. I některé další typy verbifikátů byly v určitých registrech příznačně vzácné: *locatum verbs* téměř chyběly v příspěvcích na fóru, kde zpravidla nedochází k žádným výměnám entit mezi uživateli, zatímco *location verbs* byly naopak málo frekventované v reklamních textech a ve fikci, kde míru jejich výskytu tlumil výrazný potenciál těchto diskurzů pro využití *locatum verbs*.

Závěrečná, čtvrtá kapitola připomíná zaměření i základní cíle této práce a přináší souhrn teoretické i praktické části. Zároveň je zde poskytnut přehled jednotlivých testovaných hypotéz společně s příslušnými výsledky a závěry, kterých bylo v analýze dosaženo, jakož i širší obraz fenoménu konverze doplněný o poznatky z provedeného výzkumu.

6 BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adams, Valerie. 1973. *An Introduction to Modern English Word-Formation*. English Language Series 7. London/New York: Longman.

Aronoff, Mark. 1976. *Word Formation in Generative Grammar*. Linguistic Inquiry Monographs 1. Cambridge, Massachussetts, and London: The MIT Press.

Balteiro Fernández, Isabel. 2001. "On the Status of Conversion in Present-Day American English: Controversial Issues and Corpus-Based Study." *Atlantis* 23, no. 2 (December): 7–29.

Balteiro, Isabel. 2007a. *A Contribution to the Study of Conversion in English*. Münster/New York/München/Berlin: Waxmann.

Balteiro, Isabel. 2007b. *The Directionality of Conversion in English: A Dia-Synchronic Study*. Vol. 59 of *Linguistic Insights: Studies in Language and Communication*. Bern/Berlin/ Bruxelles/Frankfurt am Main/New York/Oxford/Wien: Peter Lang.

Bauer, Laurie. 1983. *English Word-Formation.* Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139165846.

Bauer, Laurie. 2003. *Introducing Linguistic Morphology*. 2nd ed. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Bauer, Laurie. 2004. *Morphological Productivity*. Vol. 95 of *Cambridge Studies in Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. PDF.

Bauer, Laurie. 2005. "Productivity: Theories." In *Handbook of Word-Formation*, edited by Pavol Štekauer and Rochelle Lieber, 315–334. Vol. 64 of *Studies in Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*. Dordrecht: Springer.

Biber, Douglas, and Susan Conrad. 2019. *Register, Genre, and Style*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108686136.

Biber, Douglas, and Bethany Gray. 2016. *Grammatical Complexity in Academic English: Linguistic Change in Writing*. Studies in English Language. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Booij, Geert. 2016. "Morphology: The Structure of Words." In *The Routledge Handbook of Linguistics*, edited by Keith Allan, 104–117. Abingdon, Oxon/New York: Routledge.

Brinton, Laurel J., and Donna M. Brinton. 2010. *The Linguistic Structure of Modern English*. Rev. ed. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company. https://doi.org /10.1075/z.156.

Cambridge English Dictionary. 1999–. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Continually updated at https://dictionary.cambridge.org/.

Cannon, Garland. 1985. "Functional Shift in English." *Linguistics* 23:411–431. https://doi.org/10.1515/ling.1985.23.3.411.

Clark, Eve V., and Herbert H. Clark. 1979. "When Nouns Surface as Verbs." *Language* 55, no. 4 (December): 767–811. https://doi.org/10.2307/412745.

Crocco-Gàleas, Grazia. 1990. "Conversion as Morphological Metaphor." In *Naturalists at Krems: Papers from the Workshop on Natural Phonology and Natural Morphology*, edited by Julián Méndez Dosuna and Carmen Pensado, 23–32. Salamanca: Ediciones de la Universidad de Salamanca.

Crystal, David. 2006. *Language and the Internet*. 2nd ed. Cambridge/New York: Cambridge University Press. PDF.

Danesi, Marcel. 2015. "Advertising Discourse." In *The International Encyclopedia of Language and Social Interaction*, 3 vols., edited by Karen Tracy, 34–44. Chichester/Malden: Wiley Blackwell. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118611463.wbielsi137.

Dirven, René. 1999. "Conversion as a Conceptual Metonymy of Event Schemata." In *Metonymy in Language and Thought*, edited by Klaus-Uwe Panther and Günter Radden, 275–287. Vol. 4 of *Human Cognitive Processing: Cognitive Foundations of Language Structure and Use*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Don, Jan. 1993. *Morphological Conversion*. Utrecht: LEd.

Don, Jan. 2005. "On Conversion, Relisting and Zero-Derivation: A Comment on Rochelle Lieber: English Word-Formation Processes." *SKASE Journal of Theoretical Linguistics* 2 (2): 2–16. http://www.skase.sk/Volumes/JTL03/02.pdf.

Don, Jan, Mieke Trommelen, and Wim Zonneveld. 2000. "Conversion and Category Indeterminacy." In *Morphology: An International Handbook on Inflection and Word-Formation*, edited by Geert Booij, Christian Lehmann, and Joachim Mugdan in collaboration with Wolfgang Kesselheim and Stavros Skopteas, 943–952. Vol. 17.1 of *Handbooks of Linguistics and Communication Science*. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter.

Farrell, Patrick. 2001. "Functional Shift as Category Underspecification." *English Language and Linguistics* 5, no. 1 (May): 109–130. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1360674301000156.

Harper, Douglas. 2001–. *The Online Etymology Dictionary*. Continually updated at https://www.etymonline.com/.

Hernández Bartolomé, Ana I., and Gustavo Mendiluce Cabrera. 2005. "Grammatical Conversion in English: Some New Trends in Lexical Evolution." *Translation Journal* 9, no. 1 (January). http://www.translationjournal.net/journal/31conversion.htm.

Hockett, Charles F. 1958. *A Course in Modern Linguistics.* New York: The Macmillan Company.

Iacobini, Claudio. 2000. "Base and Direction of Derivation." In *Morphology: An International Handbook on Inflection and Word-Formation*, edited by Geert Booij, Christian Lehmann, and Joachim Mugdan in collaboration with Wolfgang Kesselheim and Stavros Skopteas, 865–876. Vol. 17.1 of *Handbooks of Linguistics and Communication Science*. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter.

Jespersen, Otto. (1909–1949) 1949. *A Modern English Grammar on Historical Principles*. Phototyped ed. 7 vols. Copenhagen: Einar Munksgaard; London: George Allen & Unwin. Citations refer to the phototyped edition.

Kastovsky, Dieter. 1968. *Old English Deverbal Substantives Derived by Means of a Zero Morpheme*. Esslingen/N.: Langer.

Kastovsky, Dieter. 1982. *Wortbildung und Semantik*. Tübingen/Düsseldorf: Francke/Bagel.

Katamba, Francis. 1993. *Morphology*. Modern Linguistics Series. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Kiparsky, Paul. 1982. "From Cyclic Phonology to Lexical Phonology." In *The Structure of Phonological Representations (Part 1)*, edited by Harry van der Hulst and Norval Smith, 131–175. Linguistic Models 2. Dordrecht/Cinnaminson: Foris Publications.

Kövecses, Zoltán, and Günter Radden. 1998. "Metonymy: Developing a Cognitive Linguistic View." *Cognitive Linguistics* 9 (1): 37–77. https://doi.org/10.1515/cogl.1998.9.1.37.

Kreidler, Charles W. 2000. "Clipping and Acronymy." In *Morphology: An International Handbook on Inflection and Word-Formation*, edited by Geert Booij, Christian Lehmann, and Joachim Mugdan in collaboration with Wolfgang Kesselheim and Stavros Skopteas, 956–963. Vol. 17.1 of *Handbooks of Linguistics and Communication Science*. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter.

Kruisinga, Etsko. 1932. *English Accidence and Syntax 3*. 5th ed. Vol. 2, bk. 3, of *A Handbook of Present-Day English*. Groningen: P. Noordhoff.

Lieber, Rochelle. 1980. "On the Organization of the Lexicon." PhD diss., Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Lieber, Rochelle. 1981. "Morphological Conversion within a Restrictive Theory of the Lexicon." In *The Scope of Lexical Rules*, edited by Michael Moortgat, Harry van der Hulst,

and Teun Hoekstra, 161–200. Vol. 1 of *Linguistic Models*. Dordrecht/Cinnaminson: Foris Publications.

Lieber, Rochelle. 1992. *Deconstructing Morphology: Word Formation in Syntactic Theory*. Chicago/New York: The University of Chicago Press.

Lieber, Rochelle. 2004. *Morphology and Lexical Semantics*. Vol. 104 of *Cambridge Studies in Linguistics*. New York: Cambridge University Press. PDF.

Lieber, Rochelle. 2005. "English Word-Formation Processes." In *Handbook of Word-Formation*, edited by Pavol Štekauer and Rochelle Lieber, 375–427. Vol. 64 of *Studies in Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*. Dordrecht: Springer.

Lieber, Rochelle. 2017. "Derivational Morphology." *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Linguistics*, March 2017. https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780199384655.013.248.

Lipka, Leonhard. 1992. *An Outline of English Lexicology: Lexical Structure, Word Semantics, and Word-Formation*. 2nd ed. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag.

Lyons, John. 1977. *Semantics*. 2 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Manova, Stela, and Wolfgang U. Dressler. 2005. "The Morphological Technique of Conversion in the Inflecting-Fusional Type." In *Approaches to Conversion / Zero-Derivation*, edited by Laurie Bauer and Salvador Valera, 67–102. Münster/New York: Waxmann.

Marchand, Hans. 1969. *The Categories and Types of Present-Day English Word-Formation: A Synchronic-Diachronic Approach*. 2nd rev. ed. Munich: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung.

Martsa, Sándor. 2013. *Conversion in English: A Cognitive Semantic Approach*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing. PDF.

McArthur, Tom, ed. 1992. *The Oxford Companion to the English Language*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.

Mel'čuk, Igor. 2000. "Morphological Processes." In *Morphology: An International Handbook on Inflection and Word-Formation*, edited by Geert Booij, Christian Lehmann, and Joachim Mugdan in collaboration with Wolfgang Kesselheim and Stavros Skopteas, 523–535. Vol. 17.1 of *Handbooks of Linguistics and Communication Science*. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter.

Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary. 11th ed. 2003. Springfield, MA: Merriam-Webster Incorporated. Continually updated at https://www.merriam-webster.com/.

Naumann, Bernd, and Petra M. Vogel. 2000. "Derivation." In *Morphology: An International Handbook on Inflection and Word-Formation*, edited by Geert Booij, Christian Lehmann, and Joachim Mugdan in collaboration with Wolfgang Kesselheim and Stavros Skopteas,

929–943. Vol. 17.1 of *Handbooks of Linguistics and Communication Science*. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter.

Neef, Martin. 1999. "A Declarative Approach to Conversion into Verbs in German." In *Yearbook of Morphology 1998*, edited by Geert Booij and Jaap van Marle, 199–224. Dordrecht: Springer Science/Business Media B. V.

Nida, Eugene A. 1948. "The Identification of Morphemes." *Language* 24, no. 4 (October–December): 414–441. https://doi.org/10.2307/410358.

Nida, Eugene A. 1949. *Morphology: The Descriptive Analysis of Words*. 2nd ed. Michigan: Ann Arbor, University of Michigan Press.

Olsen, Susan. 2000. "Composition." In *Morphology: An International Handbook on Inflection and Word-Formation*, edited by Geert Booij, Christian Lehmann, and Joachim Mugdan in collaboration with Wolfgang Kesselheim and Stavros Skopteas, 897–916. Vol. 17.1 of *Handbooks of Linguistics and Communication Science*. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter.

Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary. 10th ed. 2020. Oxford: Oxford University Press. Continually updated at https://www.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com/.

Plag, Ingo. 1999. *Morphological Productivity: Structural Constraints in English Derivation*. Topics in English Linguistics 28. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Plag, Ingo. 2003. *Word-Formation in English*. New York: Cambridge University Press. PDF.

Quirk, Randolph, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech, and Jan Startvik. 1985. *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London/New York: Longman.

Radden, Günter, and René Dirven. 2007. *Cognitive English Grammar*. Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Radden, Günter, and Zoltán Kövecses. 1999. "Towards a Theory of Metonymy." In *Metonymy in Language and Thought*, edited by Klaus-Uwe Panther and Günter Radden, 17–59. Vol. 4 of *Human Cognitive Processing: Cognitive Foundations of Language Structure and Use*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Schmid, Hans-Jörg. 2015. "The Scope of Word-Formation Research." In *Word-Formation: An International Handbook of the Languages of Europe*, edited by Peter O. Müller, Ingeborg Ohnheiser, Susan Olsen, and Franz Rainer, art. 1. Vol. 40.1 of *Handbooks of Linguistics and Communication Science*. Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter Mouton. EPUB.

Steinhauer, Anja. 2015. "Clipping." In *Word-Formation: An International Handbook of the Languages of Europe*, edited by Peter O. Müller, Ingeborg Ohnheiser, Susan Olsen, and

Franz Rainer, art. 19. Vol. 40.1 of *Handbooks of Linguistics and Communication Science*. Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter Mouton. EPUB.

Sweet, Henry. 1891–1898. *A New English Grammar, Logical and Historical*. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Szymanek, Bogdan. 2005. "The Latest Trends in English Word-Formation." In *Handbook of Word-Formation*, edited by Pavol Štekauer and Rochelle Lieber, 429–448. Vol. 64 of *Studies in Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*. Dordrecht: Springer.

Štekauer, Pavol. 1996. *A Theory of Conversion in English*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

Twardzisz, Piotr. 1997. *Zero Derivation in English: A Cognitive Grammar Approach*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej.

Valera, Salvador. 2015. "Conversion." In *Word-Formation: An International Handbook of the Languages of Europe*, edited by Peter O. Müller, Ingeborg Ohnheiser, Susan Olsen, and Franz Rainer, art. 17. Vol. 40.1 of *Handbooks of Linguistics and Communication Science*. Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter Mouton. EPUB.

Valera, Salvador. 2017. "Conversion and Figurative Extension of Meaning." *SKASE Journal of Theoretical Linguistics* 14 (2): 2–17. http://www.skase.sk/Volumes/JTL35/pdf_doc/01.pdf.

PRIMARY SOURCES

Ben & Jerry's. n.d.a. "Ice Cream Tubs." "Non-Dairy." "Sundaes." "Moo-phoria Light Ice Cream." "Bites & Sticks." "Mini Cups." "Scoop Shop Flavours." Flavours. Accessed May 9, 2022. https://www.benjerry.co.uk/flavours.

Ben & Jerry's. n.d.b. "Ice Cream Pints." Flavors. Accessed May 10, 2022. https://www.benjerry.com/flavors/ice-cream-pints.

Electronic Arts Inc. 2021. "I Need Hellpp!" The Sims Mobile General Discussion & Feedback. *The Sims* (forum website). Last modified November 2021. https://forums.thesims.com/en_US/discussion/950628/i-need-hellpp.

Electronic Arts Inc. 2022a. "Glitch in the Sims Mobile." The Sims Mobile General Discussion & Feedback. *The Sims* (forum website). Last modified February 24, 2022. https://forums.thesims.com/en_US/discussion/996893/glitch-in-the-sims-mobile.

Electronic Arts Inc. 2022b. "New Simmers, Welcome! – Community's Tips & Tricks to Get Started." The Sims 4 General Discussion. *The Sims* (forum website). Last modified May 10, 2022. https://forums.thesims.com/en_US/discussion/974004/new-simmers-welcome-community-s-tips-tricks-to-get-started.

Electronic Arts Inc. 2022c. “Which The Sims Game Has the Best Wardrobe?” The Sims Franchise Discussion. *The Sims* (forum website). Last modified May 11, 2022. https://forums.thesims.com/en_US/discussion/997029/which-the-sims-game-get-the-best-wardrobe.

Partanen, Juulia J., Paavo Häppölä, Wei Zhou, Arto Aleksanteri Lehisto, Mari Ainola, Eva Sutinen, Richard J. Allen, Amy D. Stockwell, Justin M. Oldham, Beatriz Guillen-Guio, Carlos Flores, Imre Noth, Brian L. Yaspan, R. Gisli Jenkins, Louise V. Wain, Samuli Ripatti, Matti Pirinen, Global Biobank Meta-Analysis Initiative (GBMI), Riitta Kaarteenaho, Marjukka Myllärniemi, Mark J. Daly, and Jukka T. Koskela. 2021. “Leveraging Global Multi-Ancestry Meta-Analysis in the Study of Idiopathic Pulmonary Fibrosis Genetics.” Preprint, submitted December 2021. https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2021.12.29.21268310v1.article-info.

Rooney, Sally. 2021. *Beautiful World, Where Are You*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

Rypens, Charlotte, François Bertucci, Pascal Finetti, Fredika Robertson, Sandra V. Fernandez, Naoto Ueno, Wendy A. Woodward, Kenneth Van Golen, Peter Vermeulen, Luc Dirix, Patrice Viens, Daniel Birnbaum, Gayathri R. Devi, Massimo Cristofanilli, and Steven Van Laere. 2022. “Comparative Transcriptional Analyses of Preclinical Models and Patient Samples Reveal MYC and RELA Driven Expression Patterns that Define the Molecular Landscape of IBC.” *npj Breast Cancer* 8 (January): 12. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41523-021-00379-6.

Sarnella, Annachiara, Ylenia Ferrara, Luigi Auletta, Sandra Albanese, Laura Cerchia, Vincenzo Alterio, Giuseppina De Simone, Claudiu T. Supuran, and Antonella Zannetti. 2022. “Inhibition of Carbonic Anhydrases IX/XII by SLC-0111 Boosts Cisplatin Effects in Hampering Head and Neck Squamous Carcinoma Cell Growth and Invasion.” *Journal of Experimental & Clinical Cancer Research* 41, no. 1 (April): 122. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13046-022-02345-x.

7 APPENDICES

7.1 APPENDIX A: CORPUS OF ACADEMIC DISCOURSE

7.1.1 CONVERSION TO NOUN

1) Leveraging global multi-ancestry meta-analysis in the **study** of Idiopathic Pulmonary Fibrosis genetics
2) **Abstract**
3) The **research** of rare and devastating orphan diseases such as Idiopathic Pulmonary Fibrosis (IPF) has been limited by the rarity of the disease itself.
4) The prognosis is poor – the prevalence of IPF is only ~4-times the incidence of the condition, limiting the recruitment of **patients** to trials and studies of the underlying biology of the disease.
5) Here we describe the largest meta-analysis of IPF, with 8,492 patients and 1,355,819 population **controls** from 13 biobanks around the globe.
   (here in the sense "a group of people used in a scientific experiment serving as a standard of comparison with another group of people, showing some different characteristics")
6) We identify seven novel genome-wide significant loci, only one of which would have been identified if the analysis had been limited to European ancestry **individuals**.
7) The prevailing model of IPF pathogenesis suggests recurrent epithelial injury followed by aberrant **repair** and dysregulated interstitial matrix deposition with cell senescence playing an important role in promoting lung fibrosis[1].
8) As IPF has, by definition, no identifiable **cause**, genome-wide approaches are especially attractive as they may provide insight into underlying causes, pathogenesis, and might potentially reveal novel therapeutic avenues.
9) As IPF has, by definition, no identifiable cause, genome-wide **approaches** are especially attractive as they may provide insight into underlying causes, pathogenesis, and might potentially reveal novel therapeutic avenues.
10) These studies have mainly been restricted to individuals of European **descent** and common variants, and have identified few associations to conclusively functional variants.
11) These studies have mainly been restricted to individuals of European descent and common **variants**, and have identified few associations to conclusively functional variants.

12) In addition, considerable genetic **overlap** between IPF and severe coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) has been reported[13–16].

13) To further explore the genetics of IPF susceptibility, we performed the first multi-ancestry study on the genetics of IPF in six populations, altogether comprising a 4-fold **increase** in the number of patients compared to the largest IPF study to date, via meta-analysis of the Global Biobank Meta-Analysis Initiative (GBMI) with the most recent published IPF study[2].

14) Fine-mapping the identified loci in the Finnish population, making **use** of reduced allelic heterogeneity of a population isolate, identified a functional causal variant in the previously reported KIF15 locus.

15) Fine-mapping the identified loci in the Finnish population, making use of reduced allelic heterogeneity of a population **isolate**, identified a functional causal variant in the previously reported KIF15 locus.

16) The LD score regression **intercept**[17] for the joint meta-analysis was not inflated (1.012) indicating independence of included studies (see Methods).

17) Further replication of the novel loci was attempted in two individual European ancestry cohorts (case **count** = 792 and 664), where six loci were polymorphic and imputed at high quality (minimum imputation $R^2 = 0.98$).

18) Three of the six potentially novel **findings** were replicated (at p-value < 0.01 and with consistent direction of effects, Table S5).

19) In addition to FVC, rs9380529 was in LD with the **lead** variant (and included in the 95% credible set) for trunk and leg fat percentages in UKB Neale v2 analysis ($r^2 = 0.65$, http://www.nealelab.is/uk-biobank/).

20) In **contrast** with other pulmonary diseases attributed to tobacco smoke exposure, such as COPD and lung cancer, no association signal was seen in the *CHRNA3/5* locus (OR[95% CI] = 1.05[1.02-1.08], p = 0.0034 for rs16969968), a known nicotine dependence locus[28].

21) As considerable genetic overlap between IPF and severe COVID-19 caused by SARS-CoV-2 infection has been reported[13–16], we assessed the shared genetic background of IPF and severe COVID-19 using the largest sample sizes available for both traits: the joint IPF meta-analysis reported here and the most recent COVID-19 Host Genetics Initiative (HGI) results (data **release** 6, previous release has been published[13]).

22) We discovered that, in addition to the four previously reported loci (*MUC5B*, *DPP9*, *KANSL1/CRHR1*, and *ZKSCAN1*)[13,14,15,16] associated with both IPF and COVID-19 hospitalization at a genome-wide level, three other genome-wide significant loci in the IPF meta-analysis passed the FDR-adjusted p-value threshold of 0.05 in the COVID-19 **scan** (7/25, 28%, Figure 2, Table 4).

23) Genetic correlation determined by LDSC[30] between the traits was 0.31 (95% CI 0.15-0.47, p = 0.0001), in complete agreement with the previous **estimate**[14] but with less uncertainty.

24) Sex-stratified meta-analysis in the GBMI identified a 1.6-fold larger effect for the strongest IPF associated variant rs35705950 in the *MUC5B* locus in **males** (OR[95%CI] = 3.50[3.11-3.93], p = 8.5E-100) compared with females (OR[95%CI] = 2.20[1.91-2.52], p = 2.06E-29), Cochran's Q p-value for heterogeneity = 3.58E-07.

25) Sex-stratified meta-analysis in the GBMI identified a 1.6-fold larger effect for the strongest IPF associated variant rs35705950 in the *MUC5B* locus in males (OR[95%CI] = 3.50[3.11-3.93], p = 8.5E-100) compared with **females** (OR[95%CI] = 2.20[1.91-2.52], p = 2.06E-29), Cochran's Q p-value for heterogeneity = 3.58E-07.

26) MUC5B carrier status did not have an effect on the number of IPF deaths or lung **transplants** among IPF cases in FinnGen (Table S8).

27) As we observed heterogeneous effects across biobank and ancestry at nearly half of the IPF genome-wide significant loci (11 / 25, 44%, FDR-adjusted Cochran's Q p-value < 0.05, mean heterogeneity index I^2 = 0.62, Figure S4, Table S2), we explored whether there was a systematic difference between the effects observed in the latest IPF meta-analysis, involving carefully curated clinically defined IPF, and biobank defined IPF, generally coming from ICD-codes in electronic health **records**.

28) **Scatter** plot of absolute value of latest IPF meta-analysis beta against absolute value of meta-analyzed GBMI NFE beta with inverse variance weighted linear regression line (weights from Allen et al. study) and accompanying slope estimate.

29) Scatter plot of absolute value of latest IPF meta-analysis beta against absolute value of meta-analyzed GBMI NFE beta with inverse variance weighted linear regression line (weights from Allen et al. study) and accompanying **slope** estimate.

30) Cross-ancestry fine-mapping, however, still has notable **challenges** to be resolved[32].

31) However, this has limited **impact** on our novel findings, as only one of the novel loci showed evidence of heterogeneity (*DNAJB4*).

32) Third, even though samples representing four non-European ancestries were included, the sample was still dominated by **participants** of European ancestry.

33) **Material** and Methods

34) Phenotype definition and quality **control**
(here in the sense "the act of controlling sb/sth, i. e. limiting, regulation; checking whether a given set of rules or limits is being followed")

35) **Liftover** results were verified by comparing the results to LiftOver results from Picard (Supplementary Results).

36) Phenome-wide **lookup**

37) Hypoxia is a common **characteristic** and negative prognostic factor in the head and neck squamous carcinomas (HNSCC) and is correlated with aggressive and invasive phenotype as well as with failure to chemo- and radio-therapies.

38) The carbonic anhydrase isoenzymes IX and XII (CA IX/XII), regulators of extra and intracellular pH, are overexpressed in TME and are involved in adaptative **changes** occurring in cancer cells to survive at low O_2.

39) Molecular imaging using NIR-Annexin V and NIR-Prosense was performed in HNSCC xenografts to detect tumor growth and metastatic **spread**.

40) In HNSCC xenografts the treatment with cisplatin plus SLC-0111 caused an inhibition of tumor growth and an induction of apoptosis as well as a reduction of metastatic spread at a higher **extent** than single agents.

41) It is well-known the crucial role played by microenvironment in promoting aggressiveness of solid tumors in terms of metastases, disease **relapse** and radio/chemoresistance [3–5].

42) A characteristic of advanced cancer is the presence of a hypoxic microenvironment, due to an aberrant vascularization and a poor blood **supply**, driving a lethal phenotype [6].

43) The co-administration of this drug with temozolamide caused a substantial **decrease** in the growth of glioblastoma patient-derived xenografts as well as a significant reduction of therapy-resistant brain tumor initiating cells [12].

44) FaDu cells were cultured in Dulbecco Minimum Essential Medium (DMEM) whereas SCC-011 cells in the Roswell Park Memorial **Institute** (RPMI), supplemented with 10% fetal bovine serum (FBS) and 1% L-glutamine-penicillin-streptomycin and grown at 37 °C with 5% CO_2.

45) Cell migration was performed as previously reported using 24-well Boyden chambers (Corning, NY) with **inserts** of polycarbonate membranes (8 μm pores).

46) After **washes** with DPBS, cells were fixed and stained with 0.1% crystal violet in 25% methanol.

47) FOXN1^{NU} nude mice were subcutaneously injected in the right flank with 2 × 106 FaDu cells, resuspended in 0.1 ml of 1:1 **mix** of physiological saline and Matrigel.

48) FOXN1^{NU} nude mice were subcutaneously injected in the right flank with 2 × 106 FaDu cells, resuspended in 0.1 ml of 1:1 mix of physiological **saline** and Matrigel.

49) To this **aim**, we subcutaneously implanted FaDu cells in athymic nude immunocompromised mice.

50) These results were corroborated by *in vitro* findings obtained on untreated and treated FaDu and SCC-011 cell lines, stained with Annexin V/PI and subjected to **flow** cytometry analysis, that showed a significant increase of apoptosis when they were treated with Cis-Pt plus SLC-0111 respect to the single drugs (Supplementary Fig. 1A and C).

51) These preliminary *in vivo* evidences, together with the results obtained *in vitro*, strongly suggest the **potential** of SLC-0111 to enhance Cis-Pt effect not only on tumor growth but also on metastatic spread.

52) This **compound** entered in phase Ib/II clinical trials in patients with previously treated advanced solid tumors to determine its safety and tolerability and establish the recommended clinical dose [37].

7.1.2 CONVERSION TO ADJECTIVE

53) Cis-Pt is the **standard** chemotherapy regimen to treat advanced/metastatic HNSCC although after treatment majority of patients develop drug resistance and disease relapse [2].

7.1.3 CONVERSION TO VERB

7.1.3.1 LIST OF UNITS

54) **Leveraging** global multi-ancestry meta-analysis in the study of Idiopathic Pulmonary Fibrosis genetics

55) The research of rare and devastating orphan diseases such as Idiopathic Pulmonary Fibrosis (IPF) has been **limited** by the rarity of the disease itself.

56) However, global **biobanking** efforts can dramatically alter the future of IPF research.

57) We also **note** a significant unexplained sex-heterogeneity effect at the strongest IPF locus *MUC5B*.

(Later inflected: *While genome-wide associations for both IPF and COVID-19 hospitalization have been reported separately in the 17q21.31 locus, we **noted** a shared signal at the locus with very high LD between the index variants (r^2 = 0.97).*)

58) Genome-wide association studies (GWAS) of IPF have thus far **reported** at least 23 associated loci[2–11] highlighting genes involved with telomere maintenance[12], cell adhesion, airway clearance, and innate immunity

59) Genome-wide association studies (GWAS) of IPF have thus far reported at least 23 associated loci[2–11] **highlighting** genes involved with telomere maintenance[12], cell adhesion, airway clearance, and innate immunity.

60) Results from the joint meta-analysis are **plotted** in the top panel and results from the GBMI meta-analysis in the bottom panel.

61) Nearest gene and most severe consequence information form Variant Effect Predictor (VEP), AF_alt = within the meta-analysis sample size **weighted** GRCh38 alternate allele frequency across studies included, max MAF population = population with highest minor allele frequency (MAF), MAF enrichment is calculated as highest MAF divided by MAF in the non-Finnish European population.

62) Three of the seven novel loci have been previously implicated with lung function; at 6p21.31, the index variant rs9380529 in *FKBP5* was found in the 95% credible set for **Forced** Vital Capacity (FVC)[19].

63) This **resulted** in eight independent loci with suggested causal alleles (Table 3), while none of the novel loci were successfully fine-mapped (with good quality credible sets, i. e. minimum LD between variants $r^2 \geq 0.25$) in FinnGen.

64) Fine-mapping suggested deleterious **coding** causal variants at three loci.

65) In addition to the previously reported coding variants in *TERT* and *SPDL*[14,6], fine-mapping identified a coding variant in *KIF15* (predicted missense, rs138043992, AF = 0.29%, OR[95% CI] = 1.71[1.39-2.10], PIP = 0.24), enriched 2.6-fold in the Finnish population compared to non-Finnish non- Estonian Europeans (NFEE, gnomAD v2.1.1) and predicted as probably **damaging** by Polyphen and deleterious by SIFT.

66) As previously reported, the effect of *MUC5B* was **reversed**: the strong, established risk allele in IPF is clearly protective for severe COVID-19 (OR = 0.89, p = 1.2E-8).

67) The meta-analysis with contributing biobanks **featuring** a wide variety of sampling strategies enabled studying between-study heterogeneity, which revealed that case ascertainment has a large effect on IPF effect size estimates.

68) The meta-analysis with contributing biobanks featuring a wide variety of **sampling** strategies enabled studying between-study heterogeneity, which revealed that case ascertainment has a large effect on IPF effect size estimates.

69) For genome-wide association studies, however, the substantially larger number of patients available from biobanks **benefits** discovery even given the attenuated effect size estimates.

70) Multiple novel loci are discovered, the vast majority of which are driven by non-European populations and many of which have been **linked** to lung traits.

71) 13 biobanks in Europe, Asia, and USA encompassing 6 ancestries contributed to the Global Biobank Meta-analysis Initiative (GBMI) IPF meta-analysis, **totaling** 8,492 cases and 1,355,819 controls (Table 1, Table S1).

72) For GBMI, GWASs stratified by ancestry and sex were conducted in each biobank after standard sample-level and variant-level quality control and fixed-effect meta-analyses based on inverse-variance weighting were performed for all biobanks across all ancestries, and all biobanks by sex, **detailed** description elsewhere[35].

73) Illustrations are graphically **smoothed** to respect the privacy of study participants.

74) Illustrations are graphically smoothed to **respect** the privacy of study participants.

75) In this study, we aim to investigate in HNSCC cells and murine models the possibility to **target** CA IX/XII by the specific inhibitor SLC-0111 to potentiate the effects of cisplatin in hampering cell growth, migration and invasion.

(Later inflected: *Many findings demonstrated that the tumor hypoxic microenvironment contributes to the development of resistance to anticancer therapies including radiotherapy and chemotherapy, immunotherapy and **targeted** therapy [7].*)

76) The effects of cisplatin, CA IX/XII specific inhibitor SLC-0111, and the combinatorial treatment were **tested** on proliferation, migration, invasion of HNSCC cells grown in 2D and 3D models.

77) Molecular **imaging** using NIR-Annexin V and NIR-Prosense was performed in HNSCC xenografts to detect tumor growth and metastatic spread.

78) Our results highlight the ability of SLC-0111 to sensitize HNSCC to cisplatin by hindering hypoxia-induced **signaling** network that are shared among mechanisms involved in therapy resistance and metastasis.

79) The head and neck squamous carcinomas (HNSSC) are **placed** at the sixth place in the world for incidence among all solid human malignancies.
(here in the figurative sense "assign a certain rank or position")

80) At present, the five-years survival for these tumors is less than 50%, despite the gradual implementation of **screening** programs and primary prevention against the well-known risk factors such as tobacco and alcohol or infections with human papillomavirus (HPV +) in prevalence of sexually-transmitted type 16.

81) Therefore, many studies have **focused** on the development of small-molecules and antibodies to therapeutically target CA IX/XII as single agents or in combination with conventional therapies [10].

82) FaDu cells were **cultured** in Dulbecco Minimum Essential Medium (DMEM) whereas SCC-011 cells in the Roswell Park Memorial Institute (RPMI), supplemented with 10% fetal bovine serum (FBS) and 1% L-glutamine-penicillin-streptomycin and grown at 37 °C with 5% CO_2.

83) FaDu cells were cultured in Dulbecco Minimum Essential Medium (DMEM) whereas SCC-011 cells in the Roswell Park Memorial Institute (RPMI), **supplemented** with 10% fetal bovine serum (FBS) and 1% L-glutamine-penicillin-streptomycin and grown at 37 °C with 5% CO_2.

84) The chamber was **flooded** with the hypoxic gas mixture for 7 min and then sealed and stored in an incubator at 37 °C in 5% CO_2.

85) The chamber was flooded with the hypoxic gas mixture for 7 min and then **sealed** and stored in an incubator at 37 °C in 5% CO_2.

86) FaDu and SCC-011 cells (0.5 × 105 /well) were re-suspended in 100 µL of serum-free medium in the presence or absence of Cis-Pt and SLC-0111 (100 µM) and **seeded** in the upper chamber.

87) The non-migrated cells were removed with cotton swabs, whereas the cells that had migrated were visualized by **staining** the membrane with 0.1% crystal violet in 25% methanol.
(Later also inflected in *-ed*: *After washes with DPBS, cells were fixed and* ***stained*** *with 0.1% crystal violet in 25% methanol.*)

88) The invasion assay was performed using the Boyden chamber with membranes (8 μm pores) **coated** with 50 μL of diluted Matrigel (1:5 in PBS) (Corning, NY, USA). FaDu and SCC-011 cells (1×10^5 /100 μL serum free medium per well) were harvested, suspended in serum free medium alone or containing Cis-Pt (1 μM) and SLC-0111 (100 μM) and placed in the top chamber.

89) The invasion assay was performed using the Boyden chamber with membranes (8 μm pores) coated with 50 μL of **diluted** Matrigel (1:5 in PBS) (Corning, NY, USA). FaDu and SCC-011 cells (1×10^5 /100 μL serum free medium per well) were harvested, suspended in serum free medium alone or containing Cis-Pt (1 μM) and SLC-0111 (100 μM) and placed in the top chamber.

90) The invasion assay was performed using the Boyden chamber with membranes (8 μm pores) coated with 50 μL of diluted Matrigel (1:5 in PBS) (Corning, NY, USA). FaDu and SCC-011 cells (1×10^5 /100 μL serum free medium per well) were **harvested**, suspended in serum free medium alone or containing Cis-Pt (1 μM) and SLC-0111 (100 μM) and placed in the top chamber.

91) The invasion assay was performed using the Boyden chamber with membranes (8 μm pores) coated with 50 μL of diluted Matrigel (1:5 in PBS) (Corning, NY, USA). FaDu and SCC-011 cells (1×10^5 /100 μL serum free medium per well) were harvested, suspended in serum free medium alone or containing Cis-Pt (1 μM) and SLC-0111 (100 μM) and **placed** in the top chamber.
(here in the literal sense "put in a particular place")

92) Spheroid formation was analyzed under a phase-contrast microscopy and the size and number of **formed** spheroids were calculated using ImageJ [22].

93) After the spheroids were embedded, cell invasion out of the spheroids was **monitored** each 24 h.

94) Following 30 min at RT, culture dishes were washed with DPBS and colonies were **photographed**.

95) Next, to evaluate the capability of the tumor cells organized into a 3D structure, **mimicking** a tumor micro-region with stemness features, to invade matrix they were embedded in Matrigel for 72 h (Fig. 5A).

96) Furthermore, low levels of O_2 in TME **favor** cancer cell migration, invasion, stemness and establishment of secondary metastases [6].

97) Lysates from recovered tumors were **immunoblotted** with antibodies anti pro-caspase-3/cleaved-caspase-3 and PARP/cleaved-PARP.

98) Interestingly, Lock et al. [28] demonstrated that the CA IX inhibitor U-104 (synonym of SLC-0111), depleting CSCs from breast cancer xenografts, enhanced the effect of paclitaxel in **delaying** tumor growth and reducing spontaneous metastasis in vivo.
(Later also inflected in *-s*: *Addition of carbonic anhydrase 9 inhibitor SLC-0111 to temozolomide treatment **delays** glioblastoma growth in vivo.*)

99) Furthermore, our results showing the ability of the specific CA IX/XII inhibitor SLC-0111 in sensitizing HNSCC cells and animal models to Cis-Pt in terms of reduced tumor growth and dissemination, highlight the possibility to use it as an integrated therapeutic approach to **combat** metastatic progression and overcome therapy resistance.

100) Our analyses also suggest important roles for NMYC, MXD3, MAX, and MLX in **shaping** MYC signaling in IBC.

7.1.3.2 FEATURE ANALYSIS

UNIT NUMBER	VERBIFIED ITEM	MORPHOLOGICAL STRUCTURE OF THE INPUT	INFLECTED	LEXICALISED	SEMANTIC CATEGORY (FOR DENOMINAL VERBIFICATIONS)	SEMANTIC PATTERN
54	*leverage*	N, suffixed (*-age*)	YES	OALD, CED, MW	**goal verb** + figurative extension (→ "achieve as much advantage/profit from sth as possible; exploit")	"make X into N" + figurative extension
55	*limit*	N, simplex	YES	OALD, CED, MW	**locatum verb (figurative)** (*limit*$_V$ = "put (figuratively) *limits*$_N$ on(to)/along sth; assign *limits*$_N$ to sth")	"put (fig.) N on(to)/along X"
56	*biobank*	N, combining form (*bio-*)	YES	—	**instrument verb**	"act using N"
57	*note*	N, simplex	YES	OALD, CED, MW	**goal verb** (can be said to be figurative as the *note*$_N$ made here is only mental; however, the lexeme *note*$_N$ also has the meaning "notice, observation, attention", which, if being the input meaning for *note*$_V$, renders the pattern of the resulting goal verb literal, rather than figurative)	"make X into N"
58	*report*	N, simplex	YES	OALD, CED, MW	**goal verb**	"make X into N"

59	*highlight*	N, compound	YES	OALD, CED, MW	**goal verb** + figurative extension (→ "give prominence to sth, emphasise sth so that it is paid more attention, as if it were a *highlight*$_N$")	"make X into N" + figurative extension
60	*plot*	N, simplex	YES	OALD, CED, MW	**location verb (figurative)** (*plot*$_V$ = "mark sth on a *plot*$_N$ 'map'", i. e. "(figuratively) put X in a *plot*$_N$"	"put (fig.) X in N"
61	*weight*	N, suffixed (*-t(h)*)	YES	OALD, CED, MW	**locatum verb** + figurative extension (→ "assign different values, i. e. as if '*weights*$_N$', to things—rather than physical *weights*$_N$")	"put N on X" + figurative extension
62	*force*	N, simplex	YES	OALD, CED, MW	**instrument verb**	"act using X"
63	*result*	N, simplex	YES	OALD, CED, MW	**goal verb**	"make N"
64	*code*	N, simplex	YES	OALD, CED, MW	**goal verb**	"turn X into N"
65	*damage*	N, simplex	YES	OALD, CED, MW	**goal verb**	"make, cause N"
66	*reverse*	ADJ, simplex	YES	OALD, CED, MW	—	"make X ADJ"

67	*feature*	N, simplex	YES	OALD, CED, MW	**?** a) **goal verb (figurative)**: *feature*$_V$ = "make (fig.) sth into a (distinct) *feature*$_N$ of sth" b) theoretical pattern: "have (as) N, manifest N" → *feature*$_V$ = "have, include (as) a *feature*$_N$" c) theoretical pattern: "be N" → *feature*$_V$ = "be the (distinguishing) *feature*$_N$ of X"	a) "make X into N" b) "have (as), manifest N"? c) "be N"?
68	*sample*	N, simplex	YES	MW (listed in OALD and CED too, but only in different meanings)	**goal verb**	"make N"
69	*benefit*	N, simplex	YES	OALD, CED, MW	**locatum verb**	"provide X with N"
70	*link*	N, simplex	YES	OALD, CED, MW	**?** a) **goal verb**: *link*$_V$ = "make, establish a *link*$_N$" b) **instrument verb**: *link*$_V$ = "connect sth to sth else, (as if) with a *link*$_N$"	a) "make, create N" b) "act (as if) using N"

71	*total*	N, simplex	YES	OALD, CED, MW	**?** a) **location verb (figurative):** *total*$_N$ = "bring (fig.) some numbers or items to a *total*$_N$" b) **goal verb (figurative):** *total*$_N$ = "make (fig.) sth into a *total*$_N$" c) theoretical pattern: "have (as) N, manifest N" → *total*$_N$ = "have (as), manifest a *total*$_N$ (of…)"	a) "put (fig.) X to N" b) "make (fig.) X into N" c) "have (as), manifest N"?
72	*detail*	N, simplex	YES	OALD, CED, MW	**locatum verb (figurative)**	"put (fig.) N in X; provide X with N"
73	*smooth*	ADJ, simplex	YES	OALD, CED, MW	—	"make X ADJ" + figurative extension
74	*respect*	N, simplex	NO	OALD, CED, MW	**?** a) **locatum verb (figurative)**: *respect*$_V$ = "convey (fig.) *respect*$_N$ to sb/sth; provide sb/sth with *respect*$_N$" b) **instrument verb**: "act using *respect*$_N$"	a) "put (fig.) N to X" b) "act using N"
75	*target*	N, simplex	YES	OALD, CED, MW	**goal verb**	"turn X into N"
76	*test*	N, simplex	YES	OALD, CED, MW	**instrument verb**	"act using N"
77	*image*	N, simplex	YES	MW	**location verb (figurative)** (*image*$_V$ = "create an *image*$_N$, representation of sb/sth"; i. e. "put (fig.) sb/sth in an *image*$_N$")	"put (fig.) X in N"
78	*signal*	N, simplex	YES	OALD, CED, MW	**goal verb**	"make, create N"

79	*place*	N, simplex	YES	OALD, MW	**location verb** + figurative extension (→ "assign sb/sth a certain rank or position, among other entities")	"put X in N" + figurative extension
80	*screen*	N, simplex	YES	OALD, CED, MW	**location verb** + figurative extension (→ "expose sb/sth to a *screen*$_N$, i. e. examination")	"put X to/under N" + figurative extension
81	*focus*	N, simplex	YES	OALD, CED, MW	**location verb (figurative)** (*focus*$_V$ = "put (fig.) sb/sth into one's *focus*$_N$" + figurative extension (→ "give most attention and/or effort to sb/sth", rather than the optical sense "keep sb/sth within one's *focus*$_N$, i. e. a point or distance from which sb/sth can be seen clearly")	"put (fig.) X into N" + figurative extension
82	*culture*	N, simplex	YES	OALD, CED, MW	**goal verb** (*culture*$_V$ = "make, produce a *culture*$_N$, i. e. a group of cells or bacteria)	"make N"
83	*supplement*	N, simplex	YES	OALD, CED, MW	**locatum verb** (*supplement*$_V$ = "provide sb/sth with a *supplement*$_N$")	"provide X with N"
84	*flood*	N, simplex	YES	OALD, CED, MW	**locatum verb** + figurative extension (→ *flood*$_V$ sth with gas, rather than water)	"put N into X" + figurative extension
85	*seal*	N, simplex	YES	OALD, CED, MW	**instrument verb**	"act using X as if it were N"

86	*seed*	N, simplex	YES	— (listed in all of the 3 dictionaries, but only in different senses and constructions)	**?** a) **agent verb (figurative)**: *seed*$_V$ *cells* = "spread cells into a vessel for cell culture activities to function analogously to *seeds*$_N$", i. e. "act (figuratively) as typical of *seeds*$_N$" b) **goal verb (figurative)**: *seed*$_V$ *cells* = "turn (fig.) cells into *seeds*$_N$; equip cells with the function of *seeds*$_N$"	a) "act (fig.) as typical of N" b) "turn (fig.) X into N"
87	*stain*	N, simplex	YES	OALD, CED, MW	**instrument verb** (*stain*$_V$ = "apply *stain*$_N$, i. e. coloured liquid, to sth")	"act using N"
88	*coat*	N, simplex	YES	OALD, CED, MW	**locatum verb** + figurative extension (→ "cover sth with a layer of a substance, as if with a *coat*$_N$")	"put N on(to) X" + figurative extension

89	*dilute*	ADJ, simplex	YES	OALD, CED, MW	—	"make X ADJ"
90	*harvest*	N, simplex	YES	OALD, CED, MW	**?** a) **locatum verb (figurative)**: *harvest*$_V$ = "bring in (fig.) the *harvest*$_N$, i. e. the time of the year when crops are collected, upon sth (and therefore reap it)" b) a special kind of **agent verb**: *harvest*$_V$ = "act as typical of the *harvest*$_N$ (time)—and therefore reap crops" c) **goal verb**: *harvest*$_V$ = "turn sth into a *harvest*$_N$ (by reaping it)" + figurative extension (→ "collect cells, rather than crops")	a) "put (fig.) N upon X" b) "act as typical of N" c) "turn X into N" + figurative extension
91	*place*	N, simplex	YES	OALD, CED, MW	**location verb**	"put X in N"
92	*form*	N, simplex	YES	OALD, CED, MW	**?** a) **locatum verb**: *form*$_V$ = "provide sth with a *form*$_N$, give sth a *form*$_N$ (so that it comes to being)" b) **goal verb**: *form*$_V$ = "make sth into a *form*$_N$, i. e. sth of shape, sth existing"	a) "provide X with N" b) "make X into N"
93	*monitor*	N, simplex	YES	OALD, CED, MW	**agent verb**	"act as typical of N"
94	*photograph*	N, combining form (*-graph*)	YES	OALD, CED, MW	**location verb (figurative)** (*photograph*$_V$ = "put (fig.) in a *photograph*$_N$")	"put (fig.) X in N"

95	*mimic*	N, simplex	YES	OALD, CED, MW	**agent verb**	"act as typical of N"
96	*favor*	N, simplex	NO	OALD, CED, MW	**?** a) **locatum verb (figurative)**: $favor_V$ = "regard sb with $favor_N$", i. e. "put (fig.), convey $favor_N$ to sb" b) **instrument verb**: $favor_N$ = "act using $favor_N$" + semantic shift (→ "support, help, facilitate sth")	a) "put (fig.) N to X" b) "act using N" + semantic shift
97	*immunoblot*	N, combining form (*immuno-*)	YES	—	**instrument verb**	"act using N"
98	*delay*	N, simplex	YES	OALD, CED, MW	**locatum verb (figurative)** ($delay_V$ = "put, bring (fig.) $delay_N$ upon sb/sth")	"put (fig.) N upon X"
99	*combat*	N, simplex	NO	OALD, CED, MW	**location verb (figurative)** ($combat_V$ = "put, bring (fig.) sb/sth into $combat_N$") + semantic shift (→ "prevent sth harmful from happening or getting worse")	"put (fig.) X into N" + semantic shift

100	*shape*	N, simplex	YES	OALD, CED, MW	**?** a) **locatum verb**: *shape*$_V$ = "give a specific *shape*$_N$ to sb/sth" b) **goal verb**: *shape*$_V$ = "make sth into a particular *shape*$_N$" + figurative extension (→ "decide or influence the form or development of a process")	a) "provide X with N" b) "make X into N" + figurative extension

7.2 APPENDIX B: CORPUS OF ADVERTISING DISCOURSE

7.2.1 CONVERSION TO NOUN

1) Whether you're digging into your favourite tub of ice cream or going right for the dough with snackable Cookie Dough Chunks, there's a Ben & Jerry's sweet **treat** for everyone.
2) Go ahead, give it a **swirl**...
3) With salted caramel swirls, chocolate cookies and brownies, it's the feast of the **taste** buds and you're invited!
4) Dough-ble Chocolate Cookie Dough **Twist**
   (here in the sense "something having a shape formed, or as if formed, by twisting; a swirl"—in reference to the ice cream's swirly chocolate cookie dough centre)
5) And with global climate **change** a more pressing issue than ever before, there's no better time to dig in to the pint that reminds us about the importance of keeping frozen things, well, frozen.
6) We also included a generous **helping** of cake pieces for you traditionalists out there who need to have your cake and eat it, too—but kept it real for you rebels out there by floating those swirls and cake pieces on a base of vanilla cake batter ice cream, so you can get all of the thrill of licking clean the mixing bowl.
7) We also included a generous helping of cake pieces for you traditionalists out there who need to have your cake and eat it, too—but kept it real for you **rebels** out there by floating those swirls and cake pieces on a base of vanilla cake batter ice cream, so you can get all of the thrill of licking clean the mixing bowl.
8) We also included a generous helping of cake pieces for you traditionalists out there who need to have your cake and eat it, too—but kept it real for you rebels out there by floating those swirls and cake pieces on a base of vanilla cake batter ice cream, so you can get all of the **thrill** of licking clean the mixing bowl.
9) Birthday Cake is also made with Fairtrade-certified sugar, cocoa, and vanilla, and wrapped up in responsibly sourced **packaging** for a gift you can feel good about giving and receiving.

10) Fulfilling those caramel **cravings** since the late 90's, with caramel ice cream, caramel-filled chocolatey cups & a caramel swirl to boot, this flavour takes you to a whole new level of rich, caramel euphoria.
11) So, if a caramel **kick** is what you're craving then chew chew choose me!
12) **Chip** Happens
13) When smooth chocolate ice cream meets chocolatey chips & salty swirls, they pack a serious one-two **crunch**.
14) This fudge-tastic phenomenon has been a part of our flavour family since 1991 & we've always used brownies from the Greyston Bakery in Yonkers, New York – not only are they the best brownies we've ever tasted but Greyston help the homeless gain **work** skills & become self-sufficient so they do good AND taste good too.
15) We can call on our leaders to protect & advance the **rights** of refugees & people seeking asylum.
16) Back by popular **demand** for the chilly season, one of Ben & Jerry's most wintry flavours...
17) You've been asking us to bring peanut butter over here, so here you have it and, with peanut butter ice cream & a whole host of peanut butter cup chunks for you to uncover, this certainly packs a peanut buttery **punch**!
18) But they're not the only stars in the **mix** – we work with Fairtrade certified producers and Caring Dairy farmers, who produce milk and cream in a sustainable way.
19) In the **lineup** you'll find Non-Dairy versions of our classic ice cream flavours, as well as plenty of exciting Non-Dairy exclusives.
20) In the lineup you'll find Non-Dairy versions of our classic ice cream flavours, as well as plenty of exciting Non-Dairy **exclusives**.
21) First **stop**: caramel vegan ice cream with salted caramel swirls so rich you might lose your spoon if you're not careful.
22) The fabulously fudgy brownies in the non-dairy version of this fan **favourite** come from New York's Greyston Bakery, where producing great baked goods is part of their greater-good mission to provide jobs and training to low-income city residents.
23) The fabulously fudgy brownies in the non-dairy version of this fan favourite come from New York's Greyston Bakery, where producing great baked goods is part of their greater-good mission to provide jobs and training to low-income city **residents**.
24) Introducing Ben & Jerry's Sundaes with NEW whipped **topping**!
25) No **ifs**, ands, or buts about it, this flavour is nuttin' but a hazelnutty chocolatey dream!

26) No ifs, **ands**, or buts about it, this flavour is nuttin' but a hazelnutty chocolatey dream!
27) No ifs, ands, or **buts** about it, this flavour is nuttin' but a hazelnutty chocolatey dream!
28) Berry **Revolutionary** Sundae
29) Fewer calories and less **fat** than regular ice cream means it's even sweeter to dig into a tub of your favourite sweet ice cream treat!
30) Caramel Cookie **Fix**
31) With each 100ml **serving** containing just 124 calories, it's the lightest way to enjoy Ben & Jerry's.
32) Ice Cream **Bites** and Sticks
33) We put our Fairtrade ice cream on a stick, added a cookie dough centre and covered it in a chocolatey **coating**!
34) It's a whole new way to enjoy our legen-dairy Cookie Dough **classic**!
35) Take your love for salted caramel, brownies, and ice cream on the **go**!
36) Caramel and Salted, Cookie Dough and Ben & Jerry's… we're all about perfect **pairings** and this dough-licious treat is just that!
37) It's packed to the lid with euphoria, all without a **lick** of dairy
38) We named this flavour in 1987 for the legendary American guitarist Jerry Garcia after one of our fans sent us the idea on a postcard, and it's been one of our top **hits** ever since.
39) Here's a spirited **twist** on a dearly missed favorite.
(here in the sense "a variant (approach or method); an alternative, variation")
40) Thanks to our friends at Wheyward Spirit, this flavor's got the same taste with less **waste**!
41) Cold **Brew** Coffee Ice Cream with Marshmallow Swirls & Fudge Brownies
42) Vanilla Pudding Ice Cream with Chocolate Sandwich Cookies & Chocolate Cookie Swirls Topped with Milk Chocolatey Ganache & Chocolate Cookie **Crumble**
43) Founded in fudge-covered waffle cones, this caramel-swirled concoction is the only flavor that gets a **s'cream** of approval from The Late Show host, Stephen Colbert.
44) Founded in fudge-covered waffle cones, this caramel-swirled concoction is the only flavor that gets a s'cream of approval from The Late **Show** host, Stephen Colbert.
45) What's sweeter is this flavor supports charitable **causes** through The Stephen Colbert AmeriCone Dream Fund.
46) Chocolate Peanut Butter **Split**

47) We've loaded our banana and chocolate ice creams with a chocolatey lot of bite-size PB **surprises**, so if you find your chocolate-covered, peanut-buttered banana fantasies aren't fulfilled in every spoonful, we suggest a bigger spoon.
48) You could just scream, or you could grab a spoon, get a **grip**, and treat yourself to some primal s'cream therapy of the sublimest chocolate kind.
49) Our cool **salute** to cinnamon buns is so cinnamon-streuseled & dough-loaded, there's no telling where the cinnamon buns end or the ice cream begins.
50) It's a **gimme**: there's always room for s'more.
51) Inspired by glampfire tales of outdoorsy **getaways** filled with indoorsy perks, our trail mix is uber-chocolatey, nutty, marshmallowed-&-pretzeled, so you can get lost in the dessert without leaving the yurt.
52) Imagine a wild **ride** through the wintriest, chocolate mintiest wonderland of ice cream filled with crunchy cookie swirls and marshmallowy drifts.
53) Imagine a wild ride through the wintriest, chocolate mintiest wonderland of ice cream filled with crunchy cookie swirls and marshmallowy **drifts**.
54) Ben, having little taste for negative **press**, decided to create a flavor tailor-made for the New York state of mind.
55) Ben's new recipe called for an intensely rich chocolate syrup to be pumped into our classic chocolate ice cream mix, plus enough **add-ins** to fill a skyscraper: pecans, walnuts, chocolate covered almonds, white chocolate chunks and dark chocolate chunks.
56) Altogether, this special **blend** contained 40% more chunks than any other Ben & Jerry's flavor, making it by far the most expensive product we've ever made.
57) After a super **launch** for the NYC market in 1985, Ben's chunky-chic blend spread far beyond the big city.

7.2.2 CONVERSION TO VERB

7.2.2.1 LIST OF UNITS

58) Caramel Ice Cream with Brownies, Chocolate Cookies & a **Salted** Caramel Swirl
59) For strawberry cheesecake lovers who've always wanted to have their cheesecake & **scoop** it, too, we've created a flavour jam-packed with strawberry cheesecake ice cream-greatness, strawberry pieces & a fantastic cookie swirl.
(Later inflected: *No spoons or **scooping** required, just a passion for life's sweetest treats.*)
60) After all, if it's melted, it's **ruined**!

61) Grab a scoop of Birthday Cake & let's **party** together!

62) Birthday Cake is also made with Fairtrade-certified sugar, cocoa, and vanilla, and wrapped up in responsibly **sourced** packaging for a gift you can feel good about giving and receiving.

63) Turns out, it doesn't really **matter**, especially if we make a flavour with both in there…& we did.

64) Sometimes "chip" happens and everything's a mess, but we **Nailed** It! with this chip-filled limited batch.

65) Sometimes "chip" happens and everything's a mess, but we Nailed It! with this chip-filled **limited** batch.

66) When smooth chocolate ice cream meets chocolatey chips & salty swirls, they **pack** a serious one-two crunch.

(here in an unclear figurative sense, perhaps "make, form, create", "deliver", or "contain"; later inflected: *You've been asking us to bring peanut butter over here, so here you have it and, with peanut butter ice cream & a whole host of peanut butter cup chunks for you to uncover, this certainly **packs** a peanut buttery punch!*)

67) **Cone** Together

68) Vanilla dairy ice cream with chocolatey **coated** waffle cone pieces (8%) & a salted caramel swirl (8%).

69) We had to **hand-cut** the chunks & throw them into the vanilla ice cream!

70) We've packed in all the festive peppermint & chocolatey chunks you should need to **fuel** your coolest yule.

71) Co-founder Ben's First Law of Ice Cream Eating Dynamics claimed that you could feel warmer when it's chilly by **lowering** their inner body temperature, so it's more balanced with the outside temperature - and what better way than by eating ice cream!

72) Co-founder Ben's First Law of Ice Cream Eating Dynamics claimed that you could feel warmer when it's chilly by lowering their inner body temperature, so it's more **balanced** with the outside temperature - and what better way than by eating ice cream!

73) Netflix & **Chilll'd**

74) We think this flavour **rocks**.

75) Next up: brownies so fudgy & decadent you'll be **dreaming** about them for weeks to come.

76) This flavour **honours** Colin's activism in pursuit of racial justice & his portion of the proceeds from Change the Whirled go to Know Your Rights Camp.

77) Thirdly, you might need to sit down for this… it's **loaded** with cookie dough chunks, now… VEGAN!

78) Discover some of our chunkiest, swirliest flavours, **layered** with never before seen creamy whipped topping and finished with sticky sauce and chocolate chunks.

79) Chocolate Hazelnut Ice Cream with Brownie Pieces and Sea Salt Chocolatey Swirls, **Topped** with Creamy Whipped Ice Cream, Chocolatey Hazelnut Swirls and Chocolatey Chunks.
(here in the sense "have sth on top")

80) It's chock full of chunks, **stuffed** with swirls, and finished with a whipped ice cream layer that simply can't be topped.

81) It's chock full of chunks, stuffed with swirls, and finished with a whipped ice cream layer that simply can't be **topped**.
(here in a deliberately ambiguous sense, "have sth put on the top" and "be surpassed by sth else in quality")

82) Inspired by our home state of Vermont, this sundae-in-a-tub is **packed** with euphoria in every scoop.
(here in the sense "fill completely, with a large amount of sth")

83) We've **freed** the chunks!

84) Here's to cookie dough fans who love **tunneling** through our ice cream on the way to get the dough.

85) We **named** this flavour in 1987 for the legendary American guitarist Jerry Garcia after one of our fans sent us the idea on a postcard, and it's been one of our top hits ever since.

86) Ben had the genius idea to **pack** their iconic ice cream flavors into pint-sized packages to sell in grocery stores.
(here in the literal sense "put into a pack(age)")

87) Then we **lace** the ice cream with plump sweet cherries and dark chocolatey chunks.

88) Ben & Jerry's Mint Chocolate Chance **features** mint ice cream loaded with fudge brownies.

89) Inspired by Chance the Rapper's love of mint ice cream, this pint has all the refreshing mint flavor you're craving, plus brownies so fudgy and delicious you'll be **rapping** in delight.

90) Whether he's **wowing** his fans with his own brand of lyrical storytelling or joining forces with other artists for dazzling collaborations, he's always at the top of his game.

91) The fusion of milk chocolate and coconut ice creams with crunchy cookies & gooey caramel **results** in what some claim to be a modern day miracle of flavor alchemy.

92) Now the most euphoric assortment of cookies we ever dunked, **chunked** & swirled are submerged in milk chocolate ice cream & topped with rich, indulgent ganache.

93) In your cheesecake dreams, is it like you're **spooning** through a world of caramel cheesecake ice cream swirled with chocolate cookies in a wonderland filled with chunks of cheesecake?

94) Our cool salute to cinnamon buns is so cinnamon-streuseled & dough-loaded, there's no telling where the cinnamon buns **end** or the ice cream begins.

95) Ben & Jerry's is proud to **partner** with fellow B Corps Greyston & Rhino Bakeries to bring you half baked.

96) In case you've ever wondered what makes this wintry flavor so wicked cool to **luge** a spoon through: it's the pepperminty excellence we packed in it, not to mention all those chocolate sandwich cookie moguls.

97) In case you've ever wondered what makes this wintry flavor so wicked cool to luge a spoon through: it's the pepperminty excellence we packed in it, not to **mention** all those chocolate sandwich cookie moguls.

98) Ben's new recipe called for an intensely rich chocolate syrup to be **pumped** into our classic chocolate ice cream mix, plus enough add-ins to fill a skyscraper: pecans, walnuts, chocolate covered almonds, white chocolate chunks and dark chocolate chunks.

99) And ever since, chocolate fanatics everywhere have **voted** with their spoons to make New York Super Fudge Chunk® one of our most popular flavors—proving that no matter where you live, you can go big AND go home!

100) We interrupt our regularly **scheduled** programming to remind you how much you love ice cream that's perfectly peanut buttery & peanut butter cuppity at the same time.

7.2.2.2 FEATURE ANALYSIS

UNIT NUMBER	VERBIFIED ITEM	MORPHOLOGICAL STRUCTURE OF THE INPUT	INFLECTED	LEXICALISED	SEMANTIC CATEGORY (FOR DENOMINAL VERBIFICATIONS)	SEMANTIC PATTERN
58	*salt*	N, simplex	YES	OALD, CED, MW	**locatum verb**	"put N in X"
59	*scoop*	N, simplex	YES	OALD, CED, MW	**instrument verb**	"act using N"
60	*ruin*	N, simplex	YES	OALD, CED, MW	**goal verb**	"turn X into N"
61	*party*	N, simplex	NO	OALD, CED, MW	semantic shift (→ "revel, enjoy oneself, especially at / as if at a *party*$_N$")	semantic shift
62	*source*	N, simplex	YES	OALD, CED, MW	**?** a) **instrument verb**: *source*$_V$ = "act using a *source*$_N$ in order to get sth" b) **source verb**: *source*$_V$ = "make sth from a certain *source*$_N$")	a) "act using N" b) "make X from N"
63	*matter*	N, simplex	NO	OALD, CED, MW	**?** (resembles an **agent verb**: *matter*$_V$ = "act as (typical of) a *matter*$_N$, i. e. be marked with the need to be dealt with, be important"; possible semantic shift included)	"act as typical of N"? + semantic shift?

64	*nail*	N, simplex	YES	OALD, CED, MW	**instrument verb** + figurative extension (→ "do, accomplish successfully and/or impressively—as if by hitting a metal *nail*$_{N}$ on the head, or perfecting a sculpture with one's *(finger)nails*$_{N}$"	"act using N" + figurative extension
65	*limit*	N, simplex	YES	OALD, CED, MW	**locatum verb (figurative)**	"put (fig.) N to X"
66	*pack*	N, simplex	YES	— (not in the meaning recorded)	**?** the meaning intended is unclear: a) **location verb** + figurative extension: *pack*$_{V}$ = "put sth into a *pack*$_{N}$" → "load, endow with sth"? "carry, deliver, be capable of delivering sth, as if in a *pack*$_{N}$"? b) **goal verb** + figurative extension: *pack*$_{V}$ = "make, form a *pack*$_{N}$ (either 'group of animals/people with close bonds among one another', or 'a package')" → "make, produce sth, either thanks to cooperation of 2+ agents or from combination of 2+ different elements"? "contain sth—as if it were a *pack*$_{N}$"?	a) "put X in N" + figurative extension b) "make N" + figurative extension

67	*cone*	N, simplex	NO	MW	**goal verb** + figurative extension (→ "to gather and unite—spiritually, ideationally, ideologically, for a certain cause—as if to make a *cone*$_N$ or form a circle out of people") + wordplay: *cone together ~ come together*	"make N" + figurative extension + wordplay
68	*coat*	N, simplex	YES	OALD, CED, MW	**locatum verb** + figurative extension (→ "cover sth with a layer of a substance, as if with a *coat*$_N$")	"put N on(to) X" + figurative extension
69	*hand-cut*	ADJ, compound	NO	—	**—**	"make X ADJ"
70	*fuel*	N, simplex	NO	OALD, CED, MW	**locatum verb** + wordplay: *fuel ~ yule*	"provide X with N"
71	*lower*	ADJ, inflected (comparative *-er*)	YES	OALD, CED, MW	**—**	"make X ADJ"
72	*balance*	N, simplex	YES	OALD, CED, MW	**location verb (figurative)**	"put (fig.) X into N"
73	*chilll* (deliberate misspelling of *chill*)	N, simplex	YES	OALD, CED, MW (in the standard spelling)	deliberately ambiguous: a) **locatum verb (figurative)**: *chill*$_V$ = "bring (fig.) *chill*$_N$ (in)to sb/sth; "make sb/sth cold" (such as ice-cream) b) figurative extension of a) above (→ "calm down, slow down, relax")	"put N into X" (+ figurative extension)

74	*rock*	N, simplex	YES	OALD, CED, MW	**semantic shift** (→ "be/look cool, be (extremely) awesome, enjoyable, excellent, full of life—like (the act of enjoying) rock music")	semantic shift
75	*dream*	N, simplex	YES	OALD, CED, MW	**?** a) **locatum verb**: $dream_V$ = "put a $dream_N$ upon sb" b) **location verb**: $dream_V$ = "put sb into a $dream_N$" c) **goal verb**: $dream_V$ = "make, produce a $dream_N$" d) theoretical pattern: "have, manifest N" → $dream_V$ = "have a $dream_N$" e) theoretical pattern: "experience N" → $dream_V$ = "experience a $dream_N$"	a) "put N upon X" b) "put X into N" c) "make N" d) "have, manifest N"? e) "experience N"?
76	*honour*	N, simplex	YES	OALD, CED, MW	**?** a) **locatum verb (figurative)**: $honour_V$ = "convey, express $honour_N$ to sb/sth; confer $honour_N$ on sb/sth" b) **instrument verb**: $honour_V$ = "act using $honour_N$"	a) "put (fig.) N to X" b) "act using X"
77	*load*	N, simplex	YES	OALD, CED, MW	**locatum verb** + figurative extension (→ "supply, charge sth with an abundance of sth—as if by putting a $load_N$ upon it"	"put N upon X" + figurative extension

78	*layer*	N, simplex	YES	OALD, CED, MW	**goal verb**	"turn X into N"
79	*top*	N, simplex	YES	OALD, CED, MW	**location verb**	"put X on N"
80	*stuff*	N, simplex	YES	OALD, CED, MW	**locatum verb**	"put N in X"
81	*top*	N, simplex	YES	OALD, CED, MW	deliberately ambiguous: a) **location verb**: top_V = "put on top of sth else" b) figurative extension of a) above (→ "be better than sth else")	"put X on N" (+ figurative extension)
82	*pack*	N, simplex	YES	OALD, CED, MW	**figurative extension** (→ "fill sth completely, with a large amount of sth") (orig. probably a **location verb**: "put sth in a $pack_N$")	figurative extension
83	*free*	ADJ, simplex	YES	OALD, CED, MW	—	"make X ADJ"
84	*tunnel*	N, simplex	YES	OALD, CED, MW	**goal verb**	"make N"
85	*name*	N, simplex	YES	OALD, CED, MW	**locatum verb (figurative)**	"provide X with N"
86	*pack*	N, simplex	NO (inflected only in different senses or figurative uses in the corpus texts)	OALD, CED, MW	**location verb**	"put X into N"

87	*lace*	N, simplex	NO	OALD, MW	**locatum verb** + figurative extension (→ "add a particular quality into sth; add a small amount of sth into sth; adorn sth with sth—as if by applying a decorative *lace*$_N$")	"provide X with N" + figurative extension
88	*feature*	N, simplex	YES	OALD, CED, MW	**?** a) **goal verb (figurative)**: *feature*$_V$ = "make (fig.) sth into a (distinct) *feature*$_N$ of sth" b) theoretical pattern: "have (as) N, manifest N" → *feature*$_V$ = "have, include (as) a *feature*$_N$" c) theoretical pattern: "be N" → *feature*$_V$ = "be the (distinguishing) *feature*$_N$ of X"	a) "make X into N" b) "have (as), manifest N"? c) "be N"?
89	*rap*	N, simplex	YES	OALD, CED, MW	**goal verb**	"make N" (or, better: "perform N")
90	*wow*	INTERJ, simplex	YES	OALD, CED, MW	—	"convey to X the (effect of the) speech act associated with INTERJ"
91	*result*	N, simplex	YES	OALD, CED, MW	**goal verb**	"make N"
92	*chunk*	N, simplex	YES	—	**goal verb**	"turn X into N"
93	*spoon*	N, simplex	YES	OALD, CED, MW	**instrument verb**	"act using N"
94	*end*	N, simplex	NO	OALD, CED, MW	**location verb (figurative)**	"put (fig.) X to N"
95	*partner*	N, simplex	NO	OALD, CED, MW	**agent verb**	"act as typical of N"

96	*luge*	N, simplex	NO	—	**instrument verb**	"act using N"
97	*mention*	N, simplex	NO	OALD, CED, MW	**goal verb**	"make X into N"
98	*pump*	N, simplex	YES	OALD, CED, MW	**instrument verb**	"act using N"
99	*vote*	N, simplex	YES	OALD, CED, MW	**?** a) **locatum verb**: *vote*$_V$ = "give a *vote*$_N$ to sb/sth" b) **instrument verb**: *vote*$_N$ = "act using one's *vote*$_N$"	a) "put N to X" b) "act using N"
100	*schedule*	N, simplex	YES	OALD, CED, MW	**?** a) **location verb**: *schedule*$_V$ = "include sth in a (particular place in a) *schedule*$_N$" b) a kind of **instrument verb**: "be in accordance with a *schedule*$_N$; follow a *schedule*$_V$"—possibly similar to verbifications like *shadow the suspect* or *track the criminal*	a) "put X in N" b) "act using N"

7.3 APPENDIX C: CORPUS OF FICTION DISCOURSE

7.3.1 CONVERSION TO NOUN

1) When the man returned and put the **drinks** down, a drop of lager spilled over and she watched its rapid progress down the side of his glass.
2) When the man returned and put the drinks down, a **drop** of lager spilled over and she watched its rapid progress down the side of his glass.
3) When the man returned and put the drinks down, a drop of lager spilled over and she watched its rapid **progress** down the side of his glass.
   (here in the meaning "physical movement")
4) You're hardly here for **work**, are you?
   (here in the sense "job, employment")
5) A momentary **glance** between them seemed to confirm that he was expecting more of an explanation.
6) Her expression flickered, as if she were trying to make a decision, and then she gave a little informal, almost conspiratorial **smile**.
7) Toward the end of her **remarks** she seemed to have become slightly nervous, which expressed itself in a shortness of breath and a kind of self-mocking expression.
8) Outside the window the sky had grown darker, and the lights down at the caravan park were coming on: the cool salt **glow** of the outdoor lamps, and the warmer yellow lights in the windows.
9) She dropped her **gaze** into her lap, and taking his seat again he seemed to suppress a smile.
10) Felix looked exactly the same as he had when he had entered the bar, no **change** in manner or tone.
11) He frowned to himself at this question, or at the phrasing of the question, or at the **use** of the word 'romantic'.
12) The **walk**, that is.
13) To this he offered no **reply** at all, just nodded, with a vaguely grim expression of forbearance, as if this aspect of her personality, her tendency to be 'witty' and verbose, was, after an hour or two of conversation, a quality he had noted and determined to ignore.
14) The tide broke in a low soothing **rush** behind them and the air was cold.

15) She seemed to have recognised a kind of **challenge** or even repudiation in his tone, and rather than cowing her, it was as though it had hardened her resolve.
16) She seemed to have recognised a kind of challenge or even repudiation in his tone, and rather than cowing her, it was as though it had hardened her **resolve**.
17) He didn't ask her anything in **return**, perhaps warned off by her diffident responses to the questions he'd posed earlier, or perhaps no longer interested.
18) She apologised for the **delay** and switched on the torch function on her phone, lighting the interior of her bag and casting a cold grey light on the front steps of the house also.
19) A marbled glass lampshade hung overhead, and a delicate, spindly table along the wall displayed a wooden **carving** of an otter.
20) Over the **sink** was a window overlooking the back garden.
21) He stood in the doorway while she went searching in one of the **presses**.
22) He yawned unselfconsciously and looked out the window, or rather at the window, since it was dark out now and the glass only reflected the **interior** of the room.
23) On the upstairs **landing** was a Turkish rug with grey tassels.
24) Felix wandered over to the window and leaned close to the glass, so his own shadow darkened the **glare** of the reflected light.
25) Something in the calm coolness of her **look** seemed to unsettle him, and he gave a quick, yelping laugh.
26) Something in the calm coolness of her look seemed to unsettle him, and he gave a quick, yelping **laugh**.
27) In my defence I've gathered up too much **material** now, and if I wait for you I'll start forgetting things.
28) Other cities have metro systems, which add depth, and steep hills or skyscrapers for height, but Dublin has only short squat grey **buildings** and trams that run along the street.
29) The connection is not obvious, at least to me, since markets preserve nothing, but ingest all aspects of an existing social landscape and excrete them, shorn of **meaning** and memory, as transactions.
30) Just look at what **conservatives** make of the environment: their idea of conservation is to extract, pillage and destroy, 'because that's what we've always done' – but because of that very fact, it's no longer the same earth we do it to.

31) All the various brands of soft drinks in plastic bottles and all the pre-packaged lunch deals and confectionery in sealed bags and store-baked pastries – this is it, the culmination of all the **labour** in the world, all the burning of fossil fuels and all the back-breaking work on coffee farms and sugar plantations.

32) It was as if I suddenly remembered that my life was all part of a television **show** – and every day people died making the show, were ground to death in the most horrific ways, children, women, and all so that I could choose from various lunch options, each packaged in multiple layers of single-use plastic.

33) It was as if I suddenly remembered that my life was all part of a television show – and every day people died making the show, were ground to death in the most horrific ways, children, women, and all so that I could choose from various lunch options, each packaged in multiple layers of single-use **plastic**.

34) Of course, a **feeling** like that can't last.

35) An **update** on my rural life and then I'll sign off.

36) She had very dark hair, swept back loosely into a tortoiseshell **clasp**, and she was wearing a grey sweater tucked into black cigarette trousers.

37) When she reached the end of the document, she opened a **search** command, selected the Match Case option and searched: 'WH'.

38) When she reached the end of the document, she opened a search **command**, selected the Match Case option and searched: 'WH'.

39) She scrolled back up to the top of the document, words and paragraphs flying past so quickly as to seem almost certainly illegible, and then, apparently satisfied, saved her **work** and closed the file.
(here in the sense "piece of work, product of work; performance done so far")

40) He was wearing a suit and **tie**, with a plastic lanyard around his neck, and speaking into his phone.

41) Well, he said, can I buy you a **takeaway** coffee and walk you back to work?

42) How was Lola's **fitting** in the end?

43) You know my mother's in town, we're all meeting up tomorrow to look for our **wedding** outfits.

44) He smiled benignly, watching the **progress** of their coffees behind the counter.
(here in the meaning "process of development, or of getting nearer to completing sth")

45) Of every **demographic**, I actually think I like them best.

46) Joining her on the walk back up the street toward her office, he told her he wanted her **advice** on a situation that had arisen between two of his friends, both of whom the woman seemed to know by name.
47) Which was a **relief**, actually, he added, because my instinct is not to get too involved.
48) My wedding **invite** arrived, by the way, the man remarked.
49) With an exaggeratedly weary expression, the woman tossed her coffee cup in the **waste** bin outside the office door.
50) Then, after some length of time, with no apparent **trigger**, she closed the browser window and reopened the text editor.
51) After a twenty-eight-minute walk, she stopped at a new-build apartment **complex** on the north quays and let herself in, climbing two flights of stairs and unlocking a chipped white door.
52) No one else was home, but the **layout** and interior suggested she was not the sole occupant.
53) Through the window, the street below was visible, and the slow **swell** of the river.
54) They passed her room, shadows visible briefly through the **slit** under the door, and then went through to the kitchen.
55) The user's most recent update, posted three hours earlier, was a photograph of a pigeon in a gutter, its head buried inside a discarded **crisp** packet.
56) The post had 127 **likes**.

7.3.2 Conversion to Adjective

57) Her **outward** attitude had become more alert and lively since the man had entered the room.

7.3.3 Conversion to Verb

7.3.3.1 List of Units

58) She glanced at the screen of her phone, on which was displayed a **messaging** interface, and then looked back at the door again.
59) The woman at the window **noticed** him but, beyond watching him, made no additional effort to catch his attention.
60) He asked her what she wanted to drink and then went to the bar to **order**. (Later inflected: *He **ordered** a vodka tonic and a pint of lager.*)
61) Rather than carrying the bottle of tonic back to the table, he **emptied** it into the glass with a quick and practised movement of his wrist.

62) She **paused**.

63) Collecting orders off the shelves and putting them in a trolley and then bringing them up to be **packed**.

64) She asked where he was living and he said he was **renting** a house with friends, nearby.

65) She blushed visibly at this remark, which seemed to take him by surprise and even **alarm** him.

(Later inflected: *I looked over at him a lot, feeling I suppose **alarmed** by his seriousness, and he just glanced back at me in a friendly way, as if to say: Yes, this is Mass, what did you expect?*)

66) Or I wouldn't **chance** it, anyway.

67) Do you, she **murmured**.

68) Yeah, let's **head** on, why not, he said.

(Later inflected: *Where are we **heading**?*)

69) He watched her fold back one sleeve cuff to **match** the other.

(Later inflected: *She attended the leaving parties, wearing her dark-green dress with the buttons, or her yellow dress with the **matching** belt.*)

70) To this he offered no reply at all, just nodded, with a vaguely grim expression of forbearance, as if this aspect of her personality, her tendency to be 'witty' and verbose, was, after an hour or two of conversation, a quality he had **noted** and determined to ignore.

71) She seemed to have recognised a kind of challenge or even repudiation in his tone, and rather than **cowing** her, it was as though it had hardened her resolve.

72) My curiosity was **piqued** by your remark about the girl behind the bar 'having an idea' what we were doing there.

73) He didn't ask her anything in return, perhaps warned off by her diffident responses to the questions he'd posed earlier, or perhaps no longer **interested**.

74) She was holding the gate open for him, and, with his eyes still on the figure of the house, which loomed above them **facing** out onto the sea, he followed her.

75) Inside was a large hallway with red-and-black **patterned** floor tiles.

76) A **marbled** glass lampshade hung overhead, and a delicate, spindly table along the wall displayed a wooden carving of an otter.

77) As if **sensing** a new significance in this question, she glanced at him once more and then went back to pouring the water.

78) The seats were **padded** with cushions in crinkled russet cloth.

79) The seats were padded with cushions in **crinkled** russet cloth.

80) She didn't look perturbed by this; it seemed to confirm some suspicion she had been **nursing**, and when she continued to speak it was in the same dry, almost sardonic tone.

81) Something in the calm coolness of her look seemed to unsettle him, and he gave a quick, **yelping** laugh.

82) I include this paragraph chiefly to make you feel guilty about not replying to me before now, and therefore **secure** myself a swifter response this time.

83) What are you doing, anyway, if not **emailing** me?

84) All the various brands of soft drinks in plastic bottles and all the pre-packaged lunch deals and confectionery in **sealed** bags and store-baked pastries – this is it, the culmination of all the labour in the world, all the burning of fossil fuels and all the back-breaking work on coffee farms and sugar plantations.

85) It was as if I suddenly remembered that my life was all part of a television show – and every day people died making the show, were ground to death in the most horrific ways, children, women, and all so that I could choose from various lunch options, each **packaged** in multiple layers of single-use plastic.

86) Rilke has a poem that **ends**: 'Who is now alone, will long remain so, / will wake, read, write long letters / and wander restlessly here and there / along the avenues, as the leaves are drifting.'

87) At twenty past twelve on a Wednesday afternoon, a woman sat behind a desk in a shared office in Dublin city centre, **scrolling** through a text document.

88) Seeing the woman **seated** by the window, his face changed, and he quickly lifted his free hand, mouthing the word: Hey.

89) Seeing the woman seated by the window, his face changed, and he quickly lifted his free hand, **mouthing** the word: Hey.

90) While he went to the counter, she stood up and **brushed** away the sandwich crumbs that had fallen into her lap.

91) I can't agree with this negative cultural **imaging** around middle-aged women.

92) He **gestured** his hand from side to side in the air to indicate friction, uncertainty, sexual chemistry, indecisiveness, or perhaps mediocrity.

93) You could **loan** her some money, the woman said.

94) She looked at him as if to ascertain whether he was **joking**, and then raised her eyebrows.

95) Oh, you make me **sound** very desperate, she said.
(Later inflected: *That **sounds** nice, she said.*)

96) A small dim living room, with one **curtained** window facing the river, led onto a kitchenette with an oven, half-size fridge unit and sink.

97) Opening a private browser window on her laptop, the woman **accessed** a social media website, and typed the words ‘aidan lavin’ into the search box.

98) Opening a private browser window on her laptop, the woman accessed a social media website, and **typed** the words ‘aidan lavin’ into the search box.

99) A new profile opened on-screen, displaying the name ‘Aidan Lavin’ below a photograph of a man’s head and shoulders **viewed** from behind.

100) The user’s most recent update, **posted** three hours earlier, was a photograph of a pigeon in a gutter, its head buried inside a discarded crisp packet.

7.3.3.2 FEATURE ANALYSIS

UNIT NUMBER	VERBIFIED ITEM	MORPHOLOGICAL STRUCTURE OF THE INPUT	INFLECTED	LEXICALISED	SEMANTIC CATEGORY (FOR DENOMINAL VERBIFICATIONS)	SEMANTIC PATTERN
58	*message*	N, simplex	YES	OALD, CED, MW	**locatum verb**	"provide X with N"
59	*notice*	N, simplex	YES	OALD, CED, MW	**instrument verb** (*notice*$_V$ = "act using one's *notice*$_N$, i. e. knowledge of, or paying attention to sb/sth")	"act using N"
60	*order*	N, simplex	YES	OALD, CED, MW	**goal verb**	"make N"
61	*empty*	ADJ, simplex	YES	OALD, CED, MW	—	"make X ADJ"
62	*pause*	N, simplex	YES	OALD, CED, MW	**goal verb**	"make N"
63	*pack*	N, simplex	YES	OALD, CED, MW	**location verb**	"put X in N"
64	*rent*	N, simplex	YES	OALD, CED, MW	**instrument verb**	"act using N"
65	*alarm*	N, simplex	YES	OALD, CED, MW	**locatum verb (figurative)** (*alarm*$_V$ = "bring the state of *alarm*$_N$, i. e. unease, distress, upon sb")	"put (fig.) N upon X"
66	*chance*	N, simplex	NO	OALD, CED, MW	**semantic shift** (→ "risk sth") (orig. possibly an agent or instrument verb)	semantic shift
67	*murmur*	N, simplex	YES	OALD, CED, MW	**goal verb**	"make N"
68	*head*	N, simplex	YES	OALD, CED, MW	**semantic shift** (→ "move towards, in a certain direction"—since doing so, people typically follow the direction where their *head*$_N$ is tilted, i. e. where they are looking)	semantic shift
69	*match*	N, simplex	YES	OALD, CED, MW	**goal verb**	"make X into N"

70	*note*	N, simplex	YES	OALD, CED, MW	**goal verb**	"make X into N"
71	*cow*	N, simplex	YES	OALD, CED, MW	**animal verb**	"act/behave in ways perceived as (similar to) the typical actions/behaviour of the animal N"
72	*pique*	N, simplex	YES	OALD, CED, MW	**semantic shift** (→ "stimulate, provoke, excite") (orig. a locatum or goal verb)	semantic shift
73	*interest*	N, simplex	YES	OALD, CED, MW	**locatum verb (figurative)** (*interest*$_V$ *sb* = "put (fig.), implant the feeling of *interest*$_N$ in sb's mind")	"put (fig.) N in X"
74	*face*	N, simplex	YES	OALD, CED, MW	**semantic shift** (→ "be opposite sb/sth", i. e. with one's *face*$_N$—literal or figurative—pointing towards sb/sth")	semantic shift
75	*pattern*	N, simplex	YES	OALD, CED, MW	**locatum verb**	"put N on(to) X"
76	*marble*	N, simplex	YES	MW	**goal verb (figurative)** (*marble*$_V$ = "give sth the appearance of a *marble*$_N$, i. e. (as if) turn sth into *marble*$_N$")	"(as if) turn X into N"
77	*sense*	N, simplex	YES	OALD, CED, MW	**instrument verb**	"act using N"
78	*pad*	N, simplex	YES	OALD, CED, MW	**locatum verb**	"put N on/in X"
79	*crinkle*	N, simplex	YES	OALD, CED, MW	**goal verb**	"make (X into) N"

80	*nurse*	N, simplex	YES	OALD, CED, MW	**agent verb** + figurative extension (→ "develop a strong feeling or idea in one's mind, as if *nursing* it, i. e. caring for it, nourishing it, as if by a *nurse*$_{N}$")	"act as typical of N" + figurative extension
81	*yelp*	N, simplex	YES	OALD, CED, MW	**goal verb**	"make N"
82	*secure*	ADJ, simplex	NO	OALD, CED, MW	—	"make X ADJ" + figurative extension
83	*email*	N, clipping	YES	OALD, CED, MW	**locatum verb**	"provide with N"
84	*seal*	N, simplex	YES	OALD, CED, MW	**instrument verb**	"act using X as if it were N"
85	*package*	N, suffixed	YES	OALD, CED, MW	**location verb**	"put X in N"
86	*end*	N, simplex	YES	OALD, CED, MW	**location verb (figurative)**	"put (fig.) X to N"
87	*scroll*	N, simplex	YES	OALD, CED, MW	**semantic shift** (→ "move text on a computer screen up or down so as to read different parts of it—as if it were a *scroll*$_{N}$")	semantic shift
88	*seat*	N, simplex	YES	OALD, CED, MW	**location verb**	"put X on N"
89	*mouth*	N, simplex	YES	OALD, CED, MW	**instrument verb**	"act using N"
90	*brush*	N, simplex	YES	OALD, CED, MW	**instrument verb**	"act using X as if it were N"

91	*image*	N, simplex	YES	MW	**location verb (figurative)** (*image*$_N$ = "form an *image*$_N$ of sb/sth, i. e. put (fix.) sb/sth in an *image*$_N$") + figurative extension (→ "create a mental picture or conception of sb/sth within the given culture")	"put (fig.) X in N" + figurative extension
92	*gesture*	N, simplex	YES	OALD, CED, MW	**?** a) **goal verb**: *gesture*$_V$ = "make a *gesture*$_N$" b) **instrument verb**: *gesture*$_V$ *one's hand* = "use one's hand to make a *gesture*$_N$"	a) "make N" b) "act using N"
93	*loan*	N, simplex	NO	OALD, CED, MW	**?** a) **goal verb**: *loan*$_V$ *money* = "turn money into a *loan*$_N$" b) **instrument verb**: *loan*$_V$ *money* = "use a *loan*$_N$ in order for sb to get money"	a) "turn X into N" b) "act using N"
94	*joke*	N, simplex	YES	OALD, CED, MW	**goal verb**	"make N"
95	*sound*	N, simplex	YES	OALD, CED, MW	**goal verb** + figurative extension (→ "seem, appear")	"make N" + figurative extension
96	*curtain*	N, simplex	YES	OALD, MW	**locatum verb**	"provide/equip with N"
97	*access*	N, simplex	YES	OALD, CED, MW	**instrument verb** (similar to verbifications like *track the criminal* or *trail a deer*: the very activity denoted by *accessing*$_V$ serves as the instrument for the goal of *accessing*$_V$ sth)	"act using N"
98	*type*	N, simplex	YES	OALD, CED, MW	**source verb**	"make X from N"

99	*view*	N, simplex	YES	OALD, CED, MW	**location verb**	"put X in(to) N"
100	*post*	N, simplex	YES	OALD, CED, MW	**instrument verb** ("send sth, e. g. a letter, by $post_N$") + semantic shift (→ "put information or pictures on social media")	"act using N" + semantic shift

7.4 APPENDIX D: CORPUS OF FORUM POSTS

7.4.1 CONVERSION TO NOUN

1) So many **design** options.
2) While TS4 has a lot of **clothing**, the textures and colors they chose are sometimes downright hideous (at least to me! YUCK!)
3) In TS3 I could take something that was 😢😢😢😢😢😢 in my eyes and change up the texture and give it an entirely new **look** into something that I would use.
4) There's many, many textures, themes, **materials** & colors to use on any clothing, footwears, accessories, etc, etc...
5) There's many, many textures, themes, materials & colors to use on any clothing, footwears, **accessories**, etc, etc...
6) I hated cas as [a] **whole** in ts3
7) it looked like everyone was wearing **plastic** and i had to get tons of cc to make anything so thats out
8) Formal: TS1 I still dream of that blue sparkly magical **dress** that was made of hopes and dreams yes i would wear that if you know you do because i cannot find screen of it
9) Formal: TS1 I still dream of that blue sparkly magical dress that was made of **hopes** and dreams yes i would wear that if you know you do because i cannot find screen of it
10) **Sleep**: mmmmh honestly i don't remember
    (*sleep*$_{N}$ here refers to "clothes for sleep(ing)", i. e. nightwear; part of a post in which the author was listing individual categories of clothing, providing their opinion on which particular piece of clothing they liked the best throughout the videogame series)
11) **Swim**: I'll do TS4 only because i can use clothes from any category i like and as nice as sexy bikini is it just ain't always what i need
    (part of the same post as 8)–10) above; *swim*$_{N}$ here refers to "clothes for a swim, i. e. swimming")
12) Party: heck yeah I'll party like its early 2000 TS2 for the **win** sdf
13) Just has limited swatches and some of the outfits kind of make my **male** look like they have a feminine chest or makes them look like they have bumps that their bodies don't have.

14) Just has limited swatches and some of the outfits kind of make my male look like they have a feminine chest or makes them look like they have **bumps** that their bodies don't have.
15) But if you take that out and could only use the **presets** the Sims team made I would probably prefer sims 4 wardrobe 😜
16) It is actually a **tie**, 2 and 4.
17) Though, it is highly lacking in jewelry, tattoos, **makeup**, and finger & toenail options.
18) And, why do I have to pick between the double-eyebrow **piercings** on the outside, and the single ones on the inside?
19) In lots of various **braid** options!
20) Therefore, TS2 and TS3 offer the player more **variables** than TS4.
21) TS4. By a long **shot**.
22) There are so many hair types, textures and styles, we finally have thick and curly hairs and some longer ones, we have a bazillion shoe types and can change them independently, we have so many hats, **wraps** and even heads, scars, teeth, body types and frames, cool jewelry...
23) For 4, I actually like the Maxis clothing more than most of the CC that I have downloaded for it (which isn't much, because I don't feel the **need** for much in 4).
24) Fitness Stuff has some truly one-of-a-kind fitness and athleisure **wear**.
25) The nostalgic 2000s **feel** is cool too.
26) If we were comparing CASs and the effect on clothing, 3 would be the QoL **runaway** for create a style and saving options.
27) I also wish I could save clothes sets, but 4 is about the only game I have really needed the extra outfit slots/**saves**.
28) The Sims 4 does some good like having nail **polish**, seperate hats and gender neutural clothing but as long as I have Create-A-Style I could keep making my denim aliens and baggy camoflague pants to go as simplistic to as mid 2000s as I wanted.
29) The Sims 4 does some good like having nail polish, seperate hats and gender neutural clothing but as long as I have Create-A-Style I could keep making my denim **aliens** and baggy camoflague pants to go as simplistic to as mid 2000s as I wanted.
30) I really need **help**..
31) so i went ahead and created another girl... but **surprise** surprise... I couldn't remove her..
32) Does anyone know where I do the **dance** in structure career?

33) It seems as if I have to store all the items, shrink the room + move them around like **puzzle** pieces.
34) This **update** to the game makes me not even want to play anymore.
35) So I gave one of the neighbourhood sims a **makeover** yesterday, and today when I saw her walking around, she has the same clothes, shoes, jewelry, and hair and make-up that I gave her, but she is now skinny, when she never was before.
36) That's one of the reasons I don't play the mobile games, buying something by **mistake**.
37) I need **advise** on my gameplay.
(misspelling of *advice*)
38) Ohhhh I see no one gets **replies** in here 😱
39) And today, I am not able to start the eco workshop **shift** at all ....
40) Is anyone else having issues with the sweet **treat** festival not working right?
41) Trying to do Deep Undercover in the Top **Secret** Mission, but this one won't work when I tap the couch.
42) **Practice** makes perfection!
43) When you're comfortable with the game, there are a lot of **challenges** to keep things spicy: 100 Baby Challenges, Rags to Riches Challenges, Ask the Devs for Dragons Challenges, etc.
44) I cannot build and have absolutely no **desire** to build.
45) There are so many awesome builders in the community so I download all my lots and then make any necessary design **changes** to suit my purposes.
46) Learn how sims age and how you want to play - start with one household, but check out if rotational **play** is for you.
47) But the content might also be overwhelming, resulting in getting the **feeling** of not staying on top of it all.
48) It changes how you'll see each of your worlds and lots - it brings tons of visual variety to the game, and also challenges you to plan your events differently (who wants their garden **wedding** in Winter anyway?).
49) Same with clubs system in Get Together, it can be used as a plain club system, but it's also very in handy for bringing sims together - like gathering **relatives**!
50) Just came back and now trying to play The Sims 4 on console and the **controls** take some getting used to jeeeeeez!
51) Save early - save often - use "save as" to make a **backup** of a particular time.

52) Instead of motherlode I think using the: money 10000000 **cheat** may be easier than motherlode because you can just add the amount you want up to 99999999 or somewhere near that amount you can also use it to take away money.

53) Focus on needs first, **wants** later.

54) I would definitely agree that Seasons is a **must**.

55) Fulfilling a **wish** gives typically 25-50 points.

56) If you find or create high-value items like **paintings**, for instance.

57) I like to buy one of the storage chests available in build/buy to allow my Sims to keep **collectibles** in them.

58) I absolutely love to play an active Scientist from the Get to **Work** pack.

59) Yes, a hybrid is a **mix** of two or more occults - alien/mermaid, vampire/alien, etc.

60) Yes, a hybrid is a mix of two or more **occults** - alien/mermaid, vampire/alien, etc. (The word "occult" may not occur as a noun in ordinary language; however, it does occur in this form regularly in the discourse related to *The Sims* universe, where it represents a label for a special kind of the playable characters, distinguished by having the appearance and abilities of sci-fi or fantasy beings. Hence, *occult*$_{N}$ can be considered a slang term.)

61) Pick an empty lot from the town overview (not the lot your family is living on, that adds pressure and costs money) and just play around in free build mode, getting the feel of the building tools, don't actually try building any thing, just get the **hang** of the tools, how the room and wall tools work, how roofs work and how you can combine them to cover an odd shaped house, that sort of thing.

7.4.2 CONVERSION TO ADJECTIVE

62) I had a **hybrid** child once and she disappeared, so I had to age her up to a teenager in an old save file and she came back!

7.4.3 CONVERSION TO VERB

7.4.3.1 LIST OF UNITS

63) Had to **vote** 4 because of the better guy clothes.

64) Formal: TS1 I still **dream** of that blue sparkly magical dress that was made of hopes and dreams yes i would wear that if you know you do because i cannot find screen of it

65) Party: heck yeah I'll **party** like its early 2000 TS2 for the wins

66) Just has **limited** swatches and some of the outfits kind of make my male look like they have a feminine chest or makes them look like they have bumps that their bodies don't have.
67) TS4 has a CAS that is amazing in its ability to mix and **match** parts and accessories, something that TS2 can't do.
68) And, I want truly long hair. As in, it's going to drag on the snow as I **snowboard**.
69) It's why I **respect** Will Wright still to this day, he believed players should have all the tools to create the game their way instead of just a developer's idea.
70) Sims 3 because it purposely avoided leaning too far into fads that were out in no time, so the clothes are less shockingly **dated** than those in 4
71) Sims 3 look but ugly, their faces their clothes their hair -- with CC its manageable but still i just look at the screen with **squinted** eyes so I dont have to think about it.
72) Now I will feel bad for comparing the Sims 1, being what it is, it feels like **bullying** to compare, so I won't mention it.
73) Now I will feel bad for comparing the Sims 1, being what it is, it feels like bullying to compare, so I won't **mention** it.
74) I know this might not be the place to **post** this but..
75) This link **lists** the player level needed to do each of the hobbies
76) You need to **place** the wall mirror into the Wellness Centre.
(Later inflected: *I **placed** down the towels.*)
77) I **noticed** there are rubber ducks in my inventory.
78) Fingers **crossed** 🙂
79) I think that if a special event quest had been started before special event had **ended**, and completed before event end that even if you haven't logged in before the event end you should still get the special reward for your goody bag.
80) Ok so how come friends cant **view** your multiple properties?
81) No one at EA returns my inquiries and I've **contacted** them four or five times… the game is glitching so bad.
82) No one at EA returns my inquiries and I've contacted them four or five times… the game is **glitching** so bad.
83) To all of you who have been playing this 'virtual dollhouse' for a while now: let's **welcome** new players by helping them discover what makes The Sims special and showing them what's so great about this game: the community!:
84) It's a great pack that can greatly **influence** and enhance your gameplay.

85) Happy **simming**! :)

86) Learn how sims **age** and how you want to play - start with one household, but check out if rotational play is for you.

87) A rotation brings more variety, and it might also **trig** your stories in many ways.

88) Understanding how sims ageing, career promotions, bills etc are affected by moving about vs staying on one lot is essential to **plan** a good routine.

89) But the content might also be overwhelming, **resulting** in getting the feeling of not staying on top of it all.

90) Throwing a wedding allows your sim to only invite sims s/he already met, but with a club **packed** with relatives old Auntie will no longer be left out :)

91) You can **pause** the game and then choose what you want your sims to do & in what order to do them.

92) You can make backups of all of your games by **copying** the folder "Saves" from your "The Sims 4" folder in Documents to a safe place like an external drive

93) You CAN **exit** without saving, which will mean you restart the game from the point you last saved.

94) Keep that one at home and **focus** on needs.
(Later inflected: *They will help boost your Sim's emotional state in a given direction like "**Focused**."*)

95) Downside, plants grow only during certain seasons (different types for different seasons) unless you **plant** them indoors. ;)

96) She's my test-Sim for how the fame system works, finding **fishing** spots, etc.

97) The **cloning** machine will allow your Sim to replicate endless potions and many collectibles.

98) **Note** that most of the time any combination of a mermaid, vampire, alien, magic user or sim can have a kid and it will just turn out to be one of the 2, for example not an alien vampire from Outer Spaaaace!, just an alien or vampire.

99) Pick an empty lot from the town overview (not the lot your family is living on, that adds pressure and **costs** money) and just play around in free build mode, getting the feel of the building tools, don't actually try building any thing, just get the hang of the tools, how the room and wall tools work, how roofs work and how you can combine them to cover an odd shaped house, that sort of thing.

100) Then try building something simple, doesn't even have to be livable or good looking, just something to **test** what you know.

7.4.3.2 FEATURE ANALYSIS

UNIT NUMBER	VERBIFIED ITEM	MORPHOLOGICAL STRUCTURE OF THE INPUT	INFLECTED	LEXICALISED	SEMANTIC CATEGORY (FOR DENOMINAL VERBIFICATIONS)	SEMANTIC PATTERN
63	*vote*	N, simplex	NO	OALD, CED, MW	**?** a) **locatum verb**: *vote*$_V$ = "give a *vote*$_N$ to sb/sth" b) **instrument verb**: *vote*$_N$ = "act using one's *vote*$_N$"	a) "put N to X" b) "act using N"
64	*dream*	N, simplex	NO	OALD, CED, MW	**?** a) **locatum verb**: *dream*$_V$ = "put a *dream*$_N$ upon sb" b) **location verb**: *dream*$_V$ = "put sb into a *dream*$_N$" c) **goal verb**: *dream*$_V$ = "make, produce a *dream*$_N$" d) theoretical pattern: "have, manifest N" → *dream*$_V$ = "have a *dream*$_N$" e) theoretical pattern: "experience N" → *dream*$_V$ = "experience a *dream*$_N$" + figurative extension (→ "wish sth, yearn for sth")	a) "put N upon X" b) "put X into N" c) "make N" d) "have, manifest N"? e) "experience N"? + figurative extension
65	*party*	N, simplex	NO	OALD, CED, MW	**semantic shift** (→ "to revel, enjoy oneself, especially at / as if at a *party*$_N$")	semantic shift

66	*limit*	N, simplex	YES	OALD, CED, MW	**locatum verb (figurative)**	"put (fig.) N to X"
67	*match*	N, simplex	YES	OALD, CED, MW	**goal verb**	"make X into N"
68	*snowboard*	N, compound	NO	OALD, CED, MW	**instrument verb**	"act using N"
69	*respect*	N, simplex	NO	OALD, CED, MW	**?** a) **locatum verb (figurative)**: *respect*$_{V}$ = "convey (fig.) *respect*$_{N}$ to sb/sth; provide sb/sth with *respect*$_{N}$" b) **instrument verb**: "act using *respect*$_{N}$"	a) "put (fig.) N to X" b) "act using N"
70	*date*	N, simplex	YES	OALD, CED, MW	**semantic shift** (→ "cease to be fashionable; become old-fashioned")	semantic shift
71	*squint*	N, simplex	YES	OALD, CED, MW	—	"make X ADJ" + semantic shift (→ "look with eyes partly shut, rather than *squint*$_{ADJ}$")
72	*bully*	N, simplex	YES	OALD, CED, MW	**agent verb**	"act as typical of N"
73	*mention*	N, simplex	NO	OALD, CED, MW	**goal verb**	"make X into N"
74	*post*	N, simplex	NO	OALD, CED, MW	**instrument verb** ("send sth, e. g. a letter, by *post*$_{N}$") + semantic shift (→ "put information or pictures on social media")	"act using N" + semantic shift
75	*list*	N, simplex	YES	OALD, CED, MW	**location verb (figurative)**	"put (fig.) X on N"
76	*place*	N, simplex	YES	OALD, CED, MW	**location verb**	"put X in N"
77	*notice*	N, simplex	YES	OALD, CED, MW	**instrument verb** (*notice*$_{V}$ = "act using one's *notice*$_{N}$, i. e. knowledge of, or paying attention to sb/sth")	"act using N"

78	*cross*	N, simplex	YES	OALD, CED, MW	**goal verb (figurative)** (no actual *cross*$_N$ is created, only its shape is indicated—which can itself be meant only figuratively, since upon the utterance of the phrase "fingers crossed", fingers are rarely physically crossed in the modern times)	"make (fig.) N"
79	*end*	N, simplex	NO	OALD, CED, MW	**location verb (figurative)**	"put (fig.) X to N"
80	*view*	N, simplex	NO	OALD, CED, MW	**location verb**	"put X in(to) N"
81	*contact*	N, simplex	YES	OALD, CED, MW	**?** a) **location verb (figurative)**: *contact*$_V$ = "bring (fig.) into *contact*$_N$" b) **goal verb**: *contact*$_V$ = "make *contact*$_N$; or, make sb into a *contact*$_N$" c) **instrument verb**—similar to *access*$_V$: *contact*$_V$ = "perform *contact*$_N$, i. e. communicate with sb, in order to establish *contact*$_N$ or accomplish *contacting*$_V$"	a) "put (fig.) X into N" b) "make N" c) "act using N"
82	*glitch*	N, simplex	YES	OALD, CED	**?** a) **goal verb**: *glitch*$_V$ = "make, produce a *glitch*$_N$" b) theoretical pattern: "experience N" → *glitch*$_V$ = "experience a *glitch*$_N$"	a) "make N" b) "experience N"?
83	*welcome*	INTERJ, simplex (synchronically)	NO	OALD, CED, MW	—	"convey to X the (effect of the) speech act associated with INTERJ"

84	*influence*	N, simplex	NO	OALD, CED, MW	**locatum verb (figurative)**	"put (fig.) N upon X"
85	*sim*	N, clipping	YES	—	**?** a) **instrument verb**: sim_N = "act using *The Sims*$_N$", i. e. "play *The Sims* (and enjoy it)" b) **location verb**: sim_N = "be within a sim_N, i. e. *simulation (videogame)*" (if sim_N is analysed in its broad sense)	a) "act using N" b) "put X into N"
86	*age*	N, simplex	NO	OALD, CED, MW	**?** a) **locatum verb (figurative)**: age_V = "have age_N brought upon oneself; be affected by age_N" b) theoretical pattern: "experience N" → age_V = "experience age_N; be exposed to (the effects of) age_N"	a) "put (fig.) N to X" b) "experience N"
87	*trig*	ADJ, simplex	NO	MW	**—**	"make X ADJ"
88	*plan*	N, simplex	NO	OALD, CED, MW	**goal verb**	"make N; turn X into N"
89	*result*	N, simplex	YES	OALD, CED, MW	**goal verb**	"make N"
90	*pack*	N, simplex	YES	OALD, CED, MW	**figurative extension** (→ "fill sth completely, with a large amount of sth") (orig. probably a **location verb**: "put sth in a $pack_N$")	figurative extension

91	*pause*	N, simplex	NO	OALD, CED, MW	**?** a) **locatum verb (figurative)**: *pause*$_V$ *the game* = "bring a *pause*$_N$ into the game" b) **instrument verb**: *pause*$_V$ *the game* = "cause the game to stop, using the *pause*$_N$ button as a tool"	a) "put (fig.) N into X" b) "act using N"
92	*copy*	N, simplex	YES	OALD, CED, MW	**goal verb**	"make N; turn X into N"
93	*exit*	N, simplex	NO	OALD, CED, MW	**location verb** (may be said to be figurative: upon *exiting*$_V$ a game, a figurative, rather than physical *exit*$_N$ is reached)	"put X to N"
94	*focus*	N, simplex	YES	OALD, CED, MW	**location verb (figurative)** (*focus*$_V$ = "put (fig.) sb/sth into one's *focus*$_N$" + figurative extension (→ "give most attention and/or effort to sb/sth", rather than the optical sense "keep sb/sth within one's *focus*$_N$, i. e. a point or distance from which sb/sth can be seen clearly")	"put X into N" + figurative extension
95	*plant*	N, simplex	NO	OALD, CED, MW	**?** (possibly a **goal verb**: "turn X into a *plant*$_N$ (over time), create a *plant*$_N$—by putting seeds in the ground")	"turn X into N"?
96	*fish*	N, simplex	YES	OALD, CED, MW	**animal verb**	"hunt for the animal N"
97	*clone*	N, simplex	YES	OALD, CED, MW	**goal verb**	"make N"
98	*note*	N, simplex	NO	OALD, CED, MW	**goal verb**	"make X into N"

99	*cost*	N, simplex	YES	OALD, CED, MW	**?** a) **goal verb (figurative)**: *cost*$_V$ *money* = "make (fig.) a particular amount of money into a *cost*$_N$, i. e. the specific amount of money needed to buy sth, or to be paid to sb" b) theoretical pattern: "have (as) N" → *cost*$_V$ = "have the *cost*$_N$ (of X dollars, pounds, etc.)" c) theoretical pattern: "be N" → *cost*$_V$ = "be the *cost*$_N$ of sth"	a) "make (fig.) X into N" b) "have (as) N"? c) "be N"?
100	*test*	N, simplex	NO	OALD, CED, MW	**instrument verb**	"act using N"

7.5 APPENDIX E: DISPUTABLE CASES OF VERBIFICATION

7.5.1 ACADEMIC DISCOURSE

1) A notable fraction of proposed loci have previously been associated with lung function **measured** by spirometry.

   —In the pair *measure*$_{N}$–*measure*$_{V}$, the direction of conversion is difficult to establish particularly on the semantic grounds, both due to the quite wide semantic range and diversity of each item (whose development might have been partly affected by reconversions between *measure*$_{N}$ and *measure*$_{V}$, e. g. possibly: *measure*$_{N1}$ "size, quantity" → *measure*$_{V}$ "to ascertain the size/quantity of sth" → *measure*$_{N2}$ "the instrument for ascertainment of the size/quantity of sth") and due to the apparent mutual semantic dependence between the two items, where neither can be said with certainty to be derived from the other: *measure*$_{V}$ can be taken to mean "to ascertain the *measure*$_{N}$ of sth," but at the same time, the meaning of *measure*$_{N}$ is formulable as "the product or outcome of *measuring*$_{V}$," i. e. a certain value specifying the size or quantity of the object measured. Historically, the noun is attested first, but with neither the noun nor the verb is the meaning related to (ascertaining) size or quantity original as both words originally referred to "moderation" or "temperance." Hence, from a synchronic perspective, the direction of conversion is questionable in this case.

2) Mice were checked and **weighted** twice per week, and tumor mass were measured with a manual caliper during these operations.

   —To convey the meaning intended in the above sentence, i. e. "ascertain the weight of sb/sth," the verb *weight*$_{V}$ is not normally used; the standard form associated with this meaning is *weigh*$_{V}$, although, according to Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary, *weight*$_{V}$ has occasionally been used as a synonym of *weigh*$_{V}$. In contrast, neither OALD nor CED list *weight*$_{V}$ in the above sense. Considering this state of affairs, it cannot be determined whether *weight*$_{V}$ in this case was truly produced consciously with the intention to refer to ascertainment of weight, or whether it was either a typographical or a grammatical error on the side of the authors. Hence, this verb was excluded from the analysis.

7.5.2 ADVERTISING DISCOURSE

1) Here are two reasons to **love** our latest Non-Dairy.

—With *love*$_{V}$, the establishment of the direction of conversion is problematic, since the verb form and the corresponding noun form appear to be mutually dependent on each other as far as their semantics is concerned. As a result, neither member of the pair seems unequivocally more basic than the other: *love*$_{V}$ can be paraphrased as "to treat with *love*$_{N}$, to express *love*$_{N}$," but equally well, *love*$_{N}$ can be paraphrased as "the product/target of *loving*$_{V}$." Furthermore, both lexemes are very old words, attested in the language since the OE period, with neither proving to be more basic than the other in this respect either. Therefore, it is impossible to determine with certainty whether this finding should or should not be regarded as a verbification from a synchronic perspective.

2) **Hazel-nuttin'** but Chocolate Sundae

—This nonce structure may be interpreted as a contextual verbification whose creation was, however, primarily motivated by wordplay (*hazel-nuttin'* ~ (*hazel-*)*nothing*, resulting in the implicature "a sundae that consists of nothing else than [hazelnut] chocolate"). Semantically, the form seems to behave more like a verb, establishing some kind of vague relationship between chocolate and hazelnuts; this vagueness, typical of contextual verbifications, might have been strategic, in the sense that the word was probably coined in order to provoke interest and curiosity in the reader so as to motivate them to click the link to the product description of the sundae in whose name the coinage occurs and thus find out, or ascertain, exactly what kind of role of hazelnuts in the dessert the coinage indicates (in this case, that the said sundae consists of chocolate hazelnut ice-cream and topping containing chocolate hazelnut swirls). From a syntactic point of view, however, the coinage is ambiguous, behaving more like a pronoun (in particular the pronoun *nothing*, on which it was apparently modelled), rather than like a verb—although the conjunction *but* in the above structure may be at least in theory also interpreted as an adverb meaning "only," in which case *hazel-nuttin'* might be technically acknowledged as a verb (~ *hazel-nuttin' only chocolate*). In view of this syntactic ambiguity, *hazel-nuttin'* was excluded from the corpus of verbifications in the advertising discourse.

3) No ifs, ands, or buts about it, this flavour is **nuttin'** but a hazelnutty chocolatey dream!

—This structure occurs in the product description of the "Hazel-nuttin' but Chocolate Sundae" dessert, whose name was commented on in the previous paragraph, and represents an analogous case to *hazel-nuttin'*; here, the parallel with the pronoun *nothing* and the probability of the coinage's creation as being motivated primarily by wordplay is even more obvious. Therefore, it has been excluded from the analysis as well—although in this sentence too, *nuttin'* might be chiefly technically analysed as a verb (with *but* being an adverb).

4) Inspired by glampfire tales of outdoorsy getaways filled with indoorsy perks, our trail mix is uber-chocolatey, nutty, **marshmallowed-&-pretzeled**, so you can get lost in the dessert without leaving the yurt.

—The above structure was excluded from the analysis chiefly due to the orthography involved, in view of which it is impossible to determine whether the structure should be regarded as 2 separate contextual verbifications or as a single verbification of a phrase; in the latter case, it should be discarded automatically from the analysis as this paper does not deal with conversions whose input is a unit above the level of a lexeme. Provided that the structure is acknowledged as 2 separate verbifications, the meaning of both of them can be interpreted as corresponding to the category of locatum verbs, i. e. "put N in X" (here "put *marshmallows*$_{N}$/*pretzels*$_{N}$ in ice-cream").

7.5.3 FICTION DISCOURSE

1) The waitress asked how he was getting on, and he **answered**: Good yeah, yourself?

   —With the lexeme *answer*, it proved impossible to determine whether it represents a case of N→V or V→N conversion: the criterion of semantic dependence can possibly point to either direction (*answer*$_{V}$ can be rephrased as "to make, produce an *answer*$_{N}$"; *answer*$_{N}$ can be rephrased as "an act, product of someone's *answering*$_{V}$"), neither member of the pair has a significantly more restricted semantic range than the other, the word is frequently used as a verb as well as a noun, and both *answer*$_{N}$ and *answer*$_{V}$ are very old words, attested in OE with no precise specification of the date of the first record. For this reason, all instances of *answer* in the corpus text were excluded from the analysis.

2) Apparently they've been trying to sell it forever and eventually they just started looking for someone to **live** there in the meantime.

   —Similarly to *answer*$_{N/V}$, *live*$_{V}$ seems impossible to distinguish from its nominal counterpart *life*$_{N}$ as both words date back to OE and they appear to be semantically dependent on each other (*live*$_{V}$ = "to have a *life*$_{N}$" **X** *life*$_{N}$ = "the process of *living*$_{V}$"). In this case as well, therefore, the lexemes are too closely associated to determine whether this word represents an instance of N→V conversion or rather an input to V→N conversion to *life*$_{N}$.

3) She apologised for the delay and switched on the torch function on her phone, **lighting** the interior of her bag and casting a cold grey light on the front steps of the house also.

   —In synchronic terms, it is difficult to say whether the verb should be considered derived from the noun (*light*$_{N}$ "brightness" → *light*$_{V}$ "to bring *light*$_{N}$ in(to) sth"), or from the related adjective (*light*$_{ADJ}$ "not dark, luminous, bright" → *light*$_{V}$ "to make *light*$_{ADJ}$"). All three words, i. e. the noun, the adjective, and the verb, are attested in OE.

4) And they're not **charging** me any rent.

   —With *charge*$_{N}$–*charge*$_{V}$, the direction of conversion cannot be established with certainty: both lexemes have a wide range of usage and a variety of meanings, where the complexity of their semantic profiles might be partly due to reconversion(s) involved between the two lexemes (possibly e. g. *charge*$_{N1}$ "load, burden" → *charge*$_{V}$ "to load, burden"; later "rush in to attack" → *charge*$_{N2}$ "a sudden attack"); further, both are first attested at approximately the same time, around the beginning of the 13th century. Even only within the sense related to "the money/payment for goods and/or services," it is difficult to determine whether the noun or the verb was the base.

7.5.4 FORUM POST DISCOURSE

1) **Hated** the options in ts3 when I had tried it.

   —In terms of establishing the direction of conversion, the verb *hate*$_{V}$ raises a similar problem as the verb *love*$_{V}$, commented on among disputable instances of verbification in the advertising discourse: in the pair *hate*$_{N}$–*hate*$_{V}$, neither member seems semantically more basic than the other, and the first attestation of both words dates back to OE, where both lexemes are first recorded at approximately the same time (although the noun *hatred*$_{N}$, a synonym of *hate*$_{N}$ that is derived from *hate*$_{V}$, is only attested for the first time in the 13th century). Therefore, analogously to the case of *love*$_{V}$, it cannot be ascertained whether *hate*$_{V}$ should be synchronically regarded as a product of verbification or as the input to the nominalising conversion to *hate*$_{N}$.

2) If you have any sims born in-game or you wish to use your **skilled** sim in a different save, be sure to save them to My Library in Your Gallery.

   —*Skill*$_{V}$ "have knowledge or understanding; to know how (to)" is an existing verb that may be considered a verbification from *skill*$_{N}$; however, in present English, it is rarely used in another form than the past participle, which may be said to have essentially gained the status of an adjective. For this reason, it was excluded from the corpus of forum post verbifications.

3) Figure the game out, have fun, build them a mansion and buy an **oversized** ice cream machine.

   —*Oversized* constitutes an analogous case to *skilled* in the previous point: outside the participial form, the verb *oversize*$_{V}$ occurs rarely in present English and is listed in none of the 3 dictionaries consulted for the purposes of the analysis. As such, it was excluded from the corpus of forum post verbifications.

7.6 APPENDIX F: CORPUS DATA BY BALTEIRO (2001) AND CANNON (1985)

Table 6: Distribution of input word-classes in Balteiro (2001) and Cannon (1985)

INPUT	BALTEIRO (2001) (total: **5,329** conversions)	CANNON (1985) (total: **567** conversions)
N	2,836 (**53.22%** of all conversions)	266 (**46.91%** of all conversions)
ADJ	251 (**4.71%** of all conversions)	132 (**23.28%** of all conversions)
V	2,216 (**41.58%** of all conversions)	133 (**23.46%** of all conversions)
CLOSED CLASS	26 (**0.49%** of all conversions)	19 (**3.35%** of all conversions)

Table 7: Distribution of conversion types in Balteiro (2001) and Cannon (1985) according to output only

CONVERSION TYPE	BALTEIRO (2001)	CANNON (1985)
→N	2,279 (**42.77%** of all conversions)	242 (**42.68%** of all conversions)
→ADJ	—	113 (**19.92%** of all conversions)
→V	3,046 (**57.16%** of all conversions)	202 (**35.63%** of all conversions)

Table 8: Proportional distribution of conversion types in Balteiro (2001) and Cannon (1985) according to both input and output; %₁ = portion of conversions of the given output class (nominalising/adjectivalising/verbifying); %₂ = portion of all conversions in the given corpus (5,329 in Balteiro 2001, 567 in Cannon 1985); CF = combining form

CONVERSION TYPE		BALTEIRO (2001)		CANNON (1985)	
		%₁	%₂	%₁	%₂
→N	ADJ→N	2.45%	1.05%	50%	21.34%
	V→N	97.23%	41.58%	47.11%	20.11%
	ADV→N	0.08%	0.04%	0.41%	0.18%
	CONJ→N	0.04%	0.02%	—	
	INTERJ→N	0.17%	0.08%	0.41%	0.18%
	CF→N	—		2.07%	0.88%
→ADJ	N→ADJ	—		68.14%	13.58%
	V→ADJ			16.81%	3.35%
	ADV→ADJ			8.85%	1.76%
	PREP→ADJ			0.88%	0.18%
	INTERJ→ADJ			1.77%	0.35%
	CF→ADJ			3.54%	0.71%
→V	N→V	93.10%	53.22%	93.56%	33.33%
	ADJ→V	6.27%	3.58%	5.45%	1.94%
	ADV→V	0.46%	0.26%	—	
	INTERJ→V	0.16%	0.09%	0.99%	0.35%