INDICE

ON THE STATUS OF CONVERSION IN PRESENT-DAY AMERICAN ENGLISH: CONTROVERSIAL ISSUES AND CORPUS-BASED STUDY.[1]

Mª Isabel Balteiro Fernández

Universidade de Santiago de Compostela

This paper examines both theoretical and practical issues related to conversion. A quite detailed characterization of the 5329 instances identified in a 300.000-word corpus of American English written in the late 90s is provided. The examples are grouped according to the type of conversion involved. Frequency and the internal structure of words are also considered and compared with the results obtained by earlier scholars. In spite of the limitations that a corpus study imposes, the conclusions obtained seem to suggest that any item, independent of its morphological structure, may undergo conversion and this may happen in any register. Moreover, conversion seems to be an important source of new items in American English nowadays.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Definition and Terminological Issues.

Different definitions and/or interpretations of the process that relates word pairs like *stone* (n) – *stone* (v), usually known as *conversion*, can be found in literature. To begin with, Sweet (1891: 38-39) defines conversion as "the *use* of a word as a different part of speech [which] naturally leads to a divergence of meaning", though it "can hardly be said to make a new word of it". Similar views are those of Anderson (1962: 93), Lee (Pennanen 1971: 18) and Hussey (1995: 71). Unlike these, Lieber (1981: 172-73) speaks of "the derivation of two lexical items which are phonologically identical and semantically related, but which differ only in category". Similarly, Sanders (1988: 156) and Katamba (1993: 54) admit the

[1] This research has been funded by the Galician Ministry of Education (Secretaría Xeral de Investigación, PGIDT00PXI20407PR). This grant is hereby gratefully acknowledged.

existence of more than one word. However, the most widely accepted view, or at least that which has apparently received more support, is that arguing for a change or *shift* from one part of speech to another. Thus, Bally considers conversion, or *transposition* as he calls it, to be "the process of moving a word into another word class" (Marchand 1967: 330). Adams (1973: 16), Zandvoort (1977: 265), Malkiel (1978: 132), and Asher (1994b: 5081) also follow this line of thought. Note also that Quirk *et al.* (1985: 1558) speak of a "derivational process whereby an item is adapted or converted to a new class without the addition of an affix".

Finally, two views which explicitly relate the phenomenon to the field of syntax must also be mentioned, namely Leech (1974) and Mel'Cûk (1982). Leech (1974: 214) defines conversion as a change in the syntactic function (and usually the meaning) of an item without a corresponding change in morphological form. Likewise, Mel'Cûk (1982: 102) defines conversion as an "elementary sign whose signifiant is a substitution applied to the syntactics of another (segmental) sign".

Apart from *conversion*, some other terms have also been used. Thus, we see terms such as *zero-derivation* (among others, Selkirk 1981: 250; and Jensen 1990: 88 who use it almost exclusively), *functional change* (Krapp in Cannon 1985: 412; Quirk-Wrenn and Lee in Marchand 1963: 227; Hill 1949: 59), *internal derivation* (Malkiel 1978: 132), and even *drift* (Aronoff 1976: 20) or *transposition* and *transpositional derivation* (Marchand 1967: 330 and 1969: 229).

1.2. The Justification of Zero-morphemes and other proposals of analysis.

The term *zero derivation* seems to have emerged from the perception of cases such as *cash* (n) – *cash* (v) as parallel or analogous to derivations with overt affixes such as *atom* (n) – *atomize* (v) (Marchand 1969: 360; Lieber 1981: 173; Bauer 1988: 31; Lipka 1990: 86). According to the widely supported *Overt Analogue Criterion* (Adams 1973: 37; Lipka 1990: 86; Copstake and Briscoe 1996: 17):

> one word can be derived from another word of the same form in a language (only) if there is a precise analogue in the language where the same derivational function is marked in the derived word by an overt (nonzero) form. (Sanders 1988: 160)

However, Pennanen (1971), Kastovsky (1978) and Katamba (1993) have denied the value of the zero concept in morphology, qualifying it as "secondary and redundant ... violent, if not distortive" (Pennanen 1971: 43). They allude to "a somewhat absurd situation where a zero suffix ... is said to contrast with (another) zero suffix" (Katamba 1993: 55), even saying that "zero morphemes set up in word-formation cannot be explained in Modern English" (Kastovsky 1978: 232).

Sanders (1988) has also mentioned some crucial problems: the *quantity problem* (or problem of whether there is a sufficient number of examples of an overtly marked derivational relation for us to be sure that there is a pattern involved in the zero-derivation we may be analyzing), the *quality problem* (or the difficulty of

determining the clearness of the cases and the parallelism between two relations), the *multiplicity of distinct analogies* (that is, that "different analogies may intersect upon a pair of elements in such a way as to suggest that there are contrary or contradictory relations between the elements of the pair", Sanders 1988: 166), and the *absence of overt analogues* (perhaps the most serious inadequacy, that there are clear cases of zero derivation that do not have parallel overt analogues). Thus, "the overt analogue criterion is clearly not a necessary condition for the appropriate recognition of zero derivation relations in all cases" (Sanders 1988: 171).

An alternative analysis is Lieber's. In 1981 she proposed the existence of both members of conversion pairs as basic lexical items, listed separately in the permanent lexicon. This analysis would remedy the defects of the zero affixation analysis since members of conversion pairs "can differ from other conversion items in lexical class, argument structure, and in general, whatever ways random lexical items can differ" (Lieber 1981: 183). However, such a "non-directional" analysis does not consider speakers' intuitions about which member of a given pair is basic and which derivative. To account for this, a *semantic rule* is needed. Thus, whereas neither member of a conversion pair is structurally more basic, one member of a pair will always be semantically more basic and the other semantically derived (Lieber 1981: 185). Though Lieber argued in favour of this analysis and described it as "desirable", eleven years later she changed her mind completely, defending the so-called *relisting analysis* which, unlike the zero-affixation analysis, predicts no uniformity of outcome since the relisting of items takes place one at a time. Moreover, "the sort of intuition that native speakers have is that one of a pair of items related by conversion is more basic than its partner" (Lieber 1992: 164). Thus, according to Lieber, when a noun like *breakfast* is relisted, turning it into a verb, a new lexical entry is created and the Lexical Conceptual Structure (LCS) of the noun will form the innermost layer in the LCS of the verb.

Accounting for the existence of zero-morphemes has proved to be a difficult task precisely because of its nature. As seen, scholars show great discrepancies on the subject and even some (e.g., Kastovsky 1978: 232) have acknowledged that they cannot explain the existence of zero morphemes or zero derivation.

1.3. The "Chicken-and-egg" Problem. Criteria for Deciding on the Direction of Conversion.

In spite of the semantically motivated relation(ship) between the two members of a conversion pair, the absence of overt affixes showing a derivational relationship gives rise to the so-called *directionality* problem.

While Leech (1974: 224) argues for a bi-directional analysis, most linguists opt for a uni-directional one. Thus, for example, in synchronic approaches, semantics plays a prominent role. Lipka (1990: 85), for example, considers an item to be derived when the other member of the pair (the base) is used in its paraphrase. Other scholars, however, establish a set of criteria that may help to elucidate the problem. Thus, Marchand (1964) provides the following criteria: semantic dependence, range

of usage, semantic range, semantic pattern, phonetic shape, morphologic type, and stress. Morphological and phonological criteria are also mentioned by Kiparsky (1976 and 1982). Adams (1973) uses speaker's intuitions (*wolf* (v) derived from *wolf* (n) since *to wolf* means "behave like a wolf"), frequency (the derived word will be less common), form and accentuation (which may be somewhat confusing). But when all these fail she resorts to historical records though they may not be complete enough to be reliable and sometimes they may even be in conflict with intuition. Finally, Sanders (1988) puts forward four criteria: the developmental precedence criterion; the principle of relative markedness; the lexical dependency on semantic-pragmatic dependence criterion and, the overt analogue criterion. The latter two are also controversial. First, it is not true that one cannot saw without a saw since we can say *saw off with a pocket knife*. Moreover, the paraphrases *saw* (v) "to cut as with a saw" and *saw* (n) "instrument used for sawing things" make it impossible to determine a unique direction. Secondly, the overt analogue criterion by which *empty* (v) is said to be derived from *empty* (adj) through the analogy with form as *legal* (adj) > *legalize* (v) is not exempt of problems either (see § 1.2).

In my view, the problem of directionality can be easily solved, in most cases, by resorting to etymological information (see § 2.2.).

1.4. Total and Partial Conversion.

In conversion, the "converted word" may adopt "all the formal characteristics (inflection, etc.) of the part of speech it has been made into" or it may "partake of the formal peculiarities of two different parts of speech" (Sweet 1891: 39). These two 'tendencies' have received their own names and so two types of conversion have to be differentiated: in the former case "total or complete conversion", and in the latter, "partial conversion".

As to complete conversion, Zandvoort (1977: 266) agrees with Sweet that "the converted word has to all intents and purposes become another part of speech, taking the adjuncts and endings proper to that part of speech". This type of conversion can frequently happen as follows: Noun > Verb (*bottle*), Adjective > Verb (*slow*), Adverb > Verb (*up*), Preposition > Verb (*down*), Conjunction > Noun (*althoughs*), Verb > Noun (*laugh*), and Adverb > Noun (*ups and downs*).

Unlike the former type, partial conversion has often been viewed as a syntactic rather than a morphological matter (Adams 1973: 16). The most typical cases apparently being: Adjective > Noun (*the poor*), Noun > Adjective (*car* in *car maintenance*), Adverb > Adjective (*then* in *the then secretary*). However, I believe that, in these cases, there is no conversion but rather words simply assume a function that is different to their prototypical one. Thus, in *car maintenance* the noun *car*, though used in the place of an adjective and functioning as modifier of a noun, is still a noun as evidenced by the fact that it cannot assume characteristics of the adjective word-class: **carest maintenance*, **the maintenance is car*. To support our argument we may mention the fact that the first element of combinations of the type *car maintenance* has often been called *attributive noun* (Gove 1964: 163-175).

Similarly, instances of the so-called partial conversion from adjective to noun such as *the rich* cannot be regarded as such. The reason that justifies this conclusive remark is that *rich* is unable to behave functionally like a noun, **the richs*. However, its status as adjective can clearly be proved: it is gradable, cf. *the richer, the richest* and it may be modified by an adverb, *very*: *the very rich*. All this does not mean, however, that conversion from adjective to noun may not exist. On the contrary, it may very well exist, but only in certain cases and it is total conversion. (e.g., *compared with 22 per cent of blacks and 12 per cent of non-Hispanic whites*). Finally, in *The then secretary gave us the forms* there is, in my view, no conversion from adverb to adjective. In spite of its function as a modifier of the noun secretary, *then* is not an adjective since it cannot be graded: **The very then*, **The then-er*. In opposition to this, it may be said that using an adverb with an overt derivative marker would not have been possible: **The quickly secretary gave us the forms*. However, this does not seem to negate the argument above. Probably, such a phrase/sentence is not possible because there is an adjective, *quick*, that blocks this possibility. In the case of *then*, however, as there is no adjective available in the language, the adverb is used in its place but, as said, more evidence is needed to speak of a "converted" adjective.

Thus, these three examples suggest that partial conversion does not exist. What happens in each of these instances is solely concerned with modification and position in the sentence.

2. THE STUDY

2.1. Aims of the Study.

As explained above, the present study aims at shedding new light on the status, nature and characteristics of conversion in present-day American English. It analyses and describes 5329 converted items (nouns, verbs and adverbs) from a corpus of 300.000 words. Word classes, frequencies, meanings, figurative and slang uses as well as internal structure of words are considered.

The study draws on both synchronic and diachronic linguistics. It draws on synchronic linguistics because it analyses present-day conversions (conversions in the late 90s), and on diachronic linguistics because it considers the etymology and origin of words. However, the purpose of the study is mainly synchronic. In spite of this, I included some conversions that took place in Old or Middle English (e.g., *smoke*: *smoca* / *smocian*) because the resulting forms can still be seen in present-day American English.

2.2. Methodology and related issues.

Samples of American English produced in the 20th century, more precisely in the late 1990s (period 1997-1999), were collected. Two reasons justify this selection: first, it was my aim to study conversion as it occurs at the present time, and secondly, American English was chosen because conversion is said to have an

extensive range of applicability in this variety (see Soudek 1968). So, it was thought to be interesting to study.

Considering that the material used in the compilation of a corpus is of the utmost importance for the results, I tried not to limit my research to a single text type, subject field, or register. Thus, journalistic, literary, legal, and technical-scientific language were taken into account (see References: A.1). Within these, different articles, books, journals, and sections dealing with different subjects and written by different authors were considered.

As already stated, although conversion is considered here mainly as a process for extending the lexical resources of the language rather than as a historical process, the research seems more reliable by checking the history of words or their etymology. The *Oxford English Dictionary* (henceforth, *OED*) has proven to be a useful tool to corroborate the existence of conversion processes. It has helped both to determine and decide whether or not there is conversion by providing information not only on the etymology of words but also on their meanings (and uses). Thus, by providing etymological information, the *OED* has solved (in most cases) the "chicken-and-egg problem" or the problem of directionality posed by the non-existence of overt affixes to mark the potential derivational relation between the two identical forms. Thus, cases such as *quarrel*, *account*, *study*, or *travel* among many others, usually treated as conversions in former studies (Marchand 1969, Adams 1973, Quirk *et al.* 1985, among others), have been ruled out as such. Both the noun and the verb in all three cases have their origin in French and therefore, I argue, are not cases of conversion in the English language. Their semantic relationship is, however, undeniable. Similarly, words from other foreign origins have also been excluded from the study (e.g., *act* (v) from Latin).

So far I have discussed those cases which could be classified by the *OED* as examples of conversion or which were not considered. Then, the *OED* has proved to be a valuable tool (for overcoming the problem of directionality) to which this study is greatly indebted. However, there are also unclear cases in which the information provided does indeed fail our expectations. Cases in point are: *boast* (ME *bost* (n) and ME *bôsten* (v)) both found before 1300, their mutual relation and origin are unknown; *hurry* (n and v): it is uncertain which of them has priority etymologically and the order of sense development is not clear. Similarly, the origin, on the one hand, of *plot* (n and v) and, on the other, of *bounce* (n and v), according to the *OED*, is also obscure or uncertain and the mutual relations between both complicated. Cases such as these have obviously been omitted from this study.

Apart from the examples above and others which follow such patterns, other forms which may be labelled as partial conversion from noun to adjective, phrases filling noun slots, *-ed* and *-ing* forms, and several miscellaneous forms as well as those cases that may be included in the controversial "change of secondary word class" (Quirk *et al.* 1985) were also excluded from the present study (Balteiro 2000: 169-73).

2.3. Results.

2.3.1. Introduction

The results from the study of the 300.000-word corpus compiled from the journalistic, literary, legal, and technical-scientific genres of written American-English of the period 1997-1999 have revealed that conversion is a prolific source of new items in American English nowadays. Note Pinker's comments (1994: 379): "conversion ... has been part of English grammar for centuries; it is one of the processes that make English English". The study contains 5329 instances of total conversion, distributed in 3046 verbs, 2279 nouns, and 4 adverbs. All these cases correspond to ten types of total conversion, as follows (Note that, as said, conversion to adjective was discarded. No converted prepositions, interjections or conjunctions were identified.):

a) noun to verb: e.g., "their offspring turned out to be *fathered* by outsiders".

b) verb to noun: e.g., "... gave the sheets and blanket a *shake*".

c) adjective to verb: e.g., "he sees that the boxes have been *emptied*".

d) adjective to noun:, e.g., "compared with 12 per cent of non-Hispanic *whites*".

e) adjective to adverb: e.g., "laymen were *pretty* much free to worship".

f) adverb to verb: e.g., "Yugoslavia claimed credit for *downing* a U.S. fighter jet".

g) adverb to noun: e.g., "you can score only one run and still win, but you must get 27 *outs*".

h) interjection to verb: e.g., "who else but a morally indifferent ingenue would *coo* over his feeling sorry for himself".

i) interjection to noun: e.g., "he heard *whoops*, music and gunshots".

j) conjunction to noun: e.g., "the Administration has yet to explain all the *ifs*".

2.3.2. Adverbs

Only four examples of conversion to adverb were identified: *pretty* (1), *right* (1), *round* (2). The four examples were found in two genres of the four considered. Three cases were provided by literary language and the other instance by legal language. None were found in journalistic or technical-scientific language.

The four were converted from adjectives. Their meanings prove the existing relation between the converted item and the preceding form, as in:

> *Round*: "motion with a circular course": bending round and round with the breeze, the flames burned for several minutes, until, their fuel spent, a burst of wind blew them out.

The number of examples identified suggest that conversion to adverb is rare. Note that neither Nida nor Jespersen, Marchand, Adams, Zandvoort or even Quirk *et al.* have included this type in their studies. Cannon (1985: 425), however, reports three adverbials from three different classes: *hors d'oeuvre* from noun, *live* from adverb, and *plus* from preposition. Reasons that account for the rarity of this type seem to lie on adverbs' semantic load. The notions of quantity, time and manner may be conveyed by a deadjectival adverb. As new references to these notions do not seem to increase with time, that is, these notions do not change, there is no need for the creation of new lexical items of this sort. Comparing this to nouns, for example, new nouns are needed almost every day as long as new entities come into use.

From the above information it can be inferred that conversion to adverbs does not contribute a great amount to the increase of lexical items in the language.

2.3.3. Nouns

2.3.3.1. Frequencies and types of converted nouns

Unlike the preceding type, conversion to noun is numerically significative in the corpus. It is the second type of conversion in higher frequency, following conversion to verbs. The occurrence of converted nouns reaches almost 50% of the examples of conversion. More precisely they constitute 2279 cases, that is, 42.76% of the data.

As Table 1 below shows, open classes were proved to undergo conversion more easily than closed classes. While conversion to noun from open classes accounts for 99.70% of the total number of nouns, closed classes have only undergone conversion in 0.30%. Reasons that justify this contrast correspond to the semantic load of each type: open classes carry lexical meaning that may be easily transferred so that the new word may also be easily understood. Closed classes, however, carry only grammatical meaning.

		Types of Conversion	N	%	Sub-total	Total
Total Conversion	from open classes	verb > noun	2216	97.23%	2272 (99.70%)	2279
		adjective > noun	56	2.45%		
	from closed classes	interjection > noun	4	0.17%	7 (0.30%)	
		adverb > noun	2	0.08%		
		conjunction > noun	1	0.04%		

Table 1: Types of conversion to noun (numbers of examples and percentages; % corresponding to the relation number of examples of each type / total number of nouns).

As the table displays, five types of total conversion to noun must be reported:

a) Conversion from verb to noun (yielding deverbal nouns): the most common type of conversion to noun corresponding to 97.23% of the nouns (see Table 1 and Appendix 1), equivalent to 41.58% of the total data. Note that Marchand (1969: 373), Potter (1969: 168) and Cannon (1985: 418) provide similar results.

b) Conversion from adjective to noun (yielding de-adjectival nouns): much less numerous than the preceding type though the second most frequent kind of conversion to noun. The 56 examples found (*Belgian(s)* (1), *black(s)* (4), *blue(s)* (1), *compound(s)* (2), *mean(s)* (29), *single(s)* (1), *slack* (1), *uniform* (1), *violet(s)* (1), *white(s)* (13), *wrong(s)* (2)), corresponding to 1.05% of the total data and representing only 2.45% of the nouns, corroborate Quirk *et al*'s (1985: 1560) statement that there is no very productive pattern of adjective to noun conversion. Note also that conversion from adjective to noun was included, but only in those cases where the conversion is complete (see §2.2).

c) Conversion from adverb to noun (de-adverbial nouns): they are quite rare. Their percentage of occurrence only reaches 0.1% of either the noun or the total data (cf. *Table 1*). *Out* (1), and *up and down* (1) belong to this type.

d) Conversion from interjection to noun: this and the following two types of conversion show little presence in my corpus (see Table 1). Only *boo-hoo* (1) and *whoop* (3) have been gathered. Other authors had obtained similar results (cf. Cannon 1985: 420).

e) Conversion from conjunction to noun: *ifs* (1).

Finally, it should also be noted that, as expected, all converted nouns assume the prototypical characteristics of the noun class. However, there are three exceptions: *pick* in *take your pick, kinks* in *she said it got the kinks out* and *shivers* in *sends world-class shivers down my whole body*. The former cannot be made plural while the latter two cannot be used in the singular. Note also that some nouns behave this way, e.g., *salmon* and/or *scissors*.

2.3.3.2. Morphologic Type or Internal Structure of Converted Nouns

Though the internal structure of the 2279 nouns is primarily simple there are also examples of prefixation, suffixation, compounding and even a phrase. Then, it seems that any item may be susceptible to undergoing conversion, that is, the internal structure of the words does not apparently block conversion processes. However, this statement needs some qualifications, as shown below.

Any verb, be it simple, derivative (either by prefixation or suffixation) or compound, may undergo conversion to produce a noun. There is no evidence, however, of compound adjectives or adverbs undergoing conversion to a noun.

Over 90% of the total number of converted nouns, that is, 2061 nouns, have been converted from simple words while only 5.52% from derivative bases and 4.03% from compound forms. Note also that most of the 5.52% nouns from derivative bases are derived from prefixal forms (4.51%), suffixation representing

only 1%. My results are strikingly different from Cannon's (1985: 419) who accounts for 114 (converted nouns that are) compounds, the exceptions being 18 simplexes, 13 prefixations, and the phrase *work-to-rule.*

Prefixes present in the forms are *dis-*, *em-*, *fore-*, *mis-*, *over-*, *re-*, *trans-* and *uni-*. Note that though Marchand (1969) considers that there are no deverbal substantives from verbs prefixed by *en-*, the form *embrace* has been identified in my corpus. He also regards forms with *dis-*, *fore-* and *mis-* as very weak but I found two examples of the former and one of the other two forms, namely *discharge*, *display*, *forecast* and *mistake.* Other forms with *re-* that Marchand suggests as productive have also been identified: *reform*, *refund*, *remake*, *remove*, *rerun* and *resolve.* I should note that forms such as *overhaul*, *overlap*, *overthrow*, or *overview*, regarded by Marchand as unproductive, are controversial: they are susceptible to being interpreted as prefixal (Sinclair 1991 and *OED*) or as compound forms (Marchand 1969). In my view, though the verbs should be considered as derivatives "*over-* + stem", the corresponding nouns are produced or created from the verb by conversion. Therefore, no prefixation or compounding is involved.

Suffixal forms include the following suffixes: *-le*, *-er*, *-ure*, *-(i)an*, *-ion*, *-ness*, and *-y*. Like prefixes, suffixes also present problems. Thus, Marchand's (1969) account on suffixation does not seem to be clear when dealing with forms in *-er* such as *glitter* or *shudder* among others. He argues that *-er* forms disyllabic verbs expressive of sound or movement suggesting reiteration, continuation or the like. However, he also affirms that *-er* verbs are not suffixal derivatives (Marchand 1969: 273).

As regards compounds, all but *boo-hoo* show the structure "verb+preposition/adverb" since they have been converted from phrasal or prepositional verbs.

From all this, it may be argued that the internal structure of words does not block conversion processes. However, as Marchand has claimed, forms such as **a calcify* or **a legalize* have not been found. Suffixal derivatives such as *calcification* and *legalization* are used instead. It may be thought then that it is precisely the existence of such forms that blocks conversion: synonyms are not economical and so English tends to avoid them, unless they are independently specialized in meaning.

2.3.3.3. Use and usage of converted nouns

Only 70 examples (3.07%) of the nouns in the corpus are used in colloquial, informal or slang contexts. A total of 11 of those items are deverbal nouns used colloquially: *comeback* (1), *kickback* (3), *knockout* (2), *run-in* (1), *shriek* (1), *takeoff* (1), *treat* (1) and *whip* (1); while 51 examples correspond to informal uses of deverbal nouns: *break* (1), *deal* (22), *haul* (1), *move* (21), *tangle* (1), *washout* (5). I also gathered 8 examples of slang uses from deverbal nouns and deadjectival nouns: *drop* (1), *dump* (1), *hangup* (1), *rap* (1), *scoop* (1), *sell* (1), and *spin* (1) are the deverbal nouns; *slack* (1) is the only example of a deadjectival noun used in slang context in the corpus. (Note that the labels colloquial, informal and slang are here used following the *OED*).

2.3.4. Verbs

2.3.4.1. Frequencies and Types of Converted Verbs

As said, converted verbs provide the largest number of examples of the corpus, 3046 verbs that amount up to 57.15% of the total number of converted items (cf. *Table 2*).

As Table 2 below indicates, total conversion to verbs comprehends four main shifts. Note that Zandvoort (1977) does also mention these four types: from noun to verb, from adjective to verb, from adverb to verb and also from interjection to verb. Unlike Zandvoort's observations, Jespersen (1954) and Marchand (1969) mention only three types: verbs from noun, adjective or adverb, and verbs from noun, adjective or minor particles (interjection), respectively. Adams (1973) includes conversion to verbs from noun, adjective and other sources, namely interjection, adverb and particles, and Quirk *et al.* (1985) speak of converted verbs from nouns, adjectives and closed-class items.

		Type of Conversion	N & %		Sub-Total	Total
			N	%		
TOTAL CONVERSION	from open classes	noun > verb	2836	93.10%	3027 (99.37%)	3046
		adj > verb	191	6.27%		
	from closed classes	adv > verb	14	0.46%	19 (0.62%)	
		interj > verb	5	0.16%		

Table 2: Types of conversions to verb, number of examples and percentages in relation to the total number of verbs.

As shown above, both open and closed classes may undergo conversion. But conversion from open classes is far more common (99.37% in verbs) than closed classes conversion (0.62%). Reasons for this lie in the difference between lexical and grammatical meaning or, in other words, in the semantic load of the corresponding categories.

Types of conversion to verb:

a) From noun to verb (yielding denominal verbs): they are the most frequent type of conversion not only within verb conversion but also in the corpus as a whole. This is not surprising if we take into account Pinker's estimation (1994: 379) that "about a fifth of all English verbs were originally nouns". The 2836 denominal verbs recorded (see Appendix 2) correspond to 93.10% of the total number of verbs and to 53.21% of the total data. In Cannon's (1985: 420) this is also the most productive type within conversion to verb.

b) From adjective to verb (de-adjectival verbs). This is much less numerous than the preceding type (Cannon 1985: 420 also shows this tendency). Only 6.27%

(191 examples) of the verbs recorded belong to this type, which correspond to 3.58% of the total data: *alert* (3), *best* (1), *blind* (1), *bloat* (1), *blunt* (3), *calm* (4), *clean* (15), *clear* (25), *compact* (1), *complete* (7), *complex* (1), *cozy* (1), *dim* (3), *dry* (11), *empty* (3), *fit* (13), *fool* (5), *frisk* (1), *frolic* (1), *gentle* (1), *lean* (1), *lower* (9), *mature* (1), *narrow* (10), *obscure* (3), *open* (2), *own* (14), *parallel* (7), *perfect* (4), *ridicule* (2), *round* (3), *secure* (3), *slope* (3), *slow* (16), *smooth* (1), *sooth* (1), *steady* (1), *tame* (1), *thin* (2). The low percentage of deadjectival verbs may probably be due to the specificity in the meaning of the adjectives. Although it appears that this feature would facilitate conversion as the interpretation of the new converted items would offer no difficulty, this does not seem to be the case. Thus, while one noun (nouns denote entities which have different properties and uses) may derive a verb with different meanings, that is, referring to different actions, adjectives may only derive verbs that refer just to one action.

Two types of conversion from closed classes were extracted from the corpus. Though none of them presents a high frequency, they cannot be regarded as irrelevant. Rarity, in this case, does not imply lack of importance. Thus, there are not many converted verbs from adverbs and interjections:

c) From adverb to verb only fourteen cases were recorded in my data (0.45% of the verbs or 0.26% of the total data): *down* (3), *forward* (2), *further* (4), *near* (1), *slap* (1), *up* (2), *upstage* (1).

d) *From interjection to verb* only *boo* (1), *coo* (1), *hail* (2), *wow* (1) were identified.

2.3.4.2. Morphologic Type or Internal Structure of Converted Verbs

The internal structure of the 3046 verbs, as in the case of nouns above, is primarily simple though there are also cases of prefixation, suffixation, compounding and even phrasal verbs. Then, the internal structure of the words does not apparently block any conversion process to verb.

A number of 2597 verbs (85.25% of the total number of verbs) has been converted from simple words while only 7.22% from derivative bases and 2.10% from compound forms. Note also that 5.41% of the converted verbs are phrasal verbs. It is also important to highlight that while the tendency followed by converted nouns as regards conversion from derivative bases showed a predominance of shifts from prefixal forms, verbs reverse this tendency. As suffixal forms are predominant, 188 suffixal forms were found versus the less numerous 32 prefixations.

Prefixes present in the verbs are *co-*, *dis-*, *inter-*, *out-*, *photo-*, *re-*, *sur-*, *tele-*, *up-* and *video*. I am aware that some may disagree with the inclusion of some of the mentioned forms (specially *photo-* and *tele-*) as prefixes. For the purposes of the present study Sinclair (1991) is followed.

Suffixal forms include the suffixes *-age*, *-ance*, *-ence*, *-or*, *-ure*, *-ee(r)*, *-al*, *-ion*, *-le*, *-ment*, *-er* and *-ship*. Like prefixes, suffixes also offer problems.

Marchand's (1969) account on suffixation does not seem to be clear when dealing with *-er* forms (Marchand, 1969: 273).

As regards compounds they show varied patterns and/or structures, e.g., adjective+noun (*safeguard*), noun+participle (*bankrupt*), noun+noun (*safety-pin*), verb+(complement-)noun (*singsong*), adverb+verb (*welcome*).

Finally, as regards phrasal verbs, they also display different particles which provide an added element of meaning to the verb.

2.3.4.3. Use and usage of converted verbs.

It is a remarkable feature of conversion that converted words adapt their meaning to the linguistic and extra-linguistic contexts in which they are used. Their meanings are the result of adding extra-linguistic meaning/information, mainly information of the social context in which those items are used, to their "intrinsic" meaning, which derives from that in their former use. Thus, conversions are available for use in very different extralinguistic contexts, from formal registers to informal or colloquial ones and they may even have slang uses.

As already indicated (see §2.3.3.3), nouns in my corpus show only 3.07% of slang, colloquial or informal uses while verbs are used even less in those contexts: 2% of the verbs are used in colloquial or slang uses as follows: 61 colloquial and slang cases were found. Thus, 32 colloquial uses of which 29 are denominal verbs: *back* (1), *contact* (3), *date* (2), *drum* (2), *foot* (2), *gun* (1), *mess* (4), *mind* (1), *pair* (1), *roost* (1), *size* (2), *surface* (3), *sweet-talk* (1), *tackle* (1), *wheel* (2), *wine* (2); 1 de-adjectival verb: *cozy* (1); and 2 de-adverbial verbs: *up* (1) and *upstage* (1). Together with these there are 29 slang uses, 28 of which are denominal verbs: *beef up* (1), *belt* (2), *bottle* (1), *clam* (1), *corral* (1), *ditch* (1), *fire* (2), *land* (2), *mainline* (1), *nail* (1), *pin* (1), *rear-end* (1), *sack* (2), *shepherd* (1), *spook* (1), *sport* (4), *stonewall* (1), *stump* (1), *tool* (1), *warehouse* (1), and *whipsaw* (1); and 1 de-adjectival verb: *frisk* .

3. CONCLUSIONS

In the foregoing pages I tried to account for both the nature and the features of conversion in present-day American English. For this purpose, data from a 300.000-word corpus have been considered. Special attention has been paid to types of conversion, frequencies, uses or registers, and internal structure of words.

The study has proven the following points:

1. Zero-morphemes cannot be held. First, speakers are not trying to create new words but rather use them differently. The final result is, however, the creation of a new word. Then, they do not derive one word from another. This does not mean, however, that the existence of a derivational connection is not admitted. But this needs some clarification. A derivational connection is here understood as the converted word shares certain semantic characteristics of the former or base word, that is, it is semantically motivated by this. Therefore, studying their semantic

relations seems interesting since it reveals how much meaning or semantic content is transferred to the new use and, consequently, to the new word.

Secondly, positing zero implies contrasting one zero with another and this does not seem to make any sense. Moreover, as there is no overt marker, there is no indication of derivation. Thirdly, a zero-morpheme cannot be postulated on the basis of the existence of overt analogues since, as Sanders (1988) has acknowledged, there may be either multiplicity of overt-analogues (e.g., *cover* "put covers on" (*chain* > *enchain*), *cover* "instrument for covering" (*cleave* > *cleaver*) or absence of overt-analogues. And, even in the case of existing analogies, how strong are the parallelisms (quality problem)? And how many examples do we need to establish the parallelism (problem of quantity)?

2. The problem of directionality arising from the lack of overt affixes marking a derivational relation between a word pair can easily be solved by resorting to etymological information. This problem (and some related ones) derived from the contradictory information arising from the use of different criteria to assess conversion has clearly been overcome in the study by resorting to historical evidence. Thus, the *OED*, usually regarded as the best historical dictionary of the English language, has been used to trace the etymology of items which, apparently, were examples of conversion. Thus, it was discovered that word pairs, regarded in previous studies as conversions (Marchand 1969; Adams 1973; Quirk *et al.* 1985), were not such (remember word pairs borrowed from French, as seen above). The semantic relationship that led scholars to speak of conversion is justified quite differently here. In my opinion, both items are semantically related because they were related in French but this semantic relation is not enough to speak of conversion. Thus, the present study invalidates speaker's intuitions and the semantic-pragmatic criteria.

3. The distinction Total vs. Partial Conversion may be eliminated. Total conversion has been used to denote that process or phenomenon by which the converted word adopts all the formal and functional characteristics of the part of speech into which it has been made, e.g., *He stoned the burglar* (*stone* (n) > *stone* (v)). Partial conversion is used for those cases in which one item shares formal characteristics of two different parts of speech, e.g., *boy king* (n > adj), *the poor* (adj > n). Against these two types, I have argued that only the former can be regarded as conversion. The latter, however, is a syntactic matter which does not result in the creation of a new word, though, in my view, in certain cases like *the blacks live in that area,* total conversion may be assumed since the adjective not only occupies the noun slot but it also functions inflectionally like it. Moreover, if we were to modify it, it would not admit an adverb but an adjective. Thus, **the importantly blacks*, **the interestingly blacks* but *the important blacks, the interesting blacks.*

4. At least ten types of (total) conversion seem to be at work at present, namely, noun to verb, verb to noun, adjective to verb, adjective to noun, adjective to adverb, adverb to verb, adverb to noun, interjection to verb, interjection to noun, and conjunction to noun. The study has revealed that items created by conversion

processes are mainly nouns and verbs which may be converted from any grammatical category, the number of adverbs being scarce. Nouns, verbs, adjectives, adverbs, and interjections undergo conversion. As Cannon (1987: 65) puts it: "All form classes except pronouns, determiners, and conjunctions are represented".

Most converted nouns (97.23%) come from verbs, the controversial adjective to noun conversion following in importance. Nouns from adverbs, conjunctions, or interjections do not seem to be very productive patterns nowadays.

Verbs form the largest number of examples of the corpus (57.15%). Denominal verbs are the most productive, being followed in number by de-adjectival conversions. As in the case of nouns, conversions from adverbs and interjections are almost non-existent.

5. Data have also demonstrated that the internal morphological characteristics of words do not block conversion. Both nouns and verbs have been created from the corresponding items which were either simple, derivative (by either prefixes or suffixes) or compounds. Thus, converted words showed the following prefixes: *dis-, em-, fore-, mis-, over-, re-, trans-, uni-* (in nouns), *co-, dis-,inter-, out-, photo-, re-, sur-, tele-, video* (in verbs). Suffixes: *-le, -er, -ure, -(i)an, -ion, -ness, -y* (in nouns) and *-age, -ance, -ence, -or, -ure, -eer, -al, -ion, -le, -ment, -er* and *-ship* (in verbs).

It seems important to underline, however, that items with suffixes such as *-ify* or *-ize*, for instance, have not been found. This fact should be further examined in order to discover whether these and other similar affixes may be blocked to undergo conversion.

As regards compounds, they also show varied patterns: adjective+noun, noun+ participle, noun+noun, verb+complement, adverb+noun (in verbs) and verb+ particle (in nouns). Furthermore, my research has revealed that borrowings may undergo conversion once established in the English language. Thus, *spy* (n), a borrowing from French when meaning "one who spies (upon)" undergoes conversion from one of the meanings of the verb so that it also means "the action of spying".

In addition to this, it should also be noted that acronyms may also undergo conversion (see Rodríguez González 1987: 139-48). No examples of this type were identified in the corpus.

Though conversions do not seem to be morphologically blocked, there may be extralinguistic factors that may cause blocking. Thus, the following example has been discovered in the study: *a dark bird ... landing in slender branches*, why not *a dark bird branching?* If *landing* means "put onto land" why not *branching* "put onto branches"?

6. As seen, the corpus has also revealed that conversion may be used in any register, be it formal, colloquial, informal, slang or neutral. Most of the examples may be considered as neutral. However, 3.07% of nouns have proved to belong to either colloquial, informal or slang uses while 2% of the verbs were colloquial or

slang. These results are slightly lower than expected if compared with Cannon's (1985). Does this mean that conversion is gaining ground in neutral or more formal contexts?

7. Finally, it should be remembered that the best way to approach conversion seems to be by combining both a diachronic and a synchronic approach as they complement one another. So, the approach followed in the present study has tried to consider both perspectives so that some inconsistencies of preceding studies have been discovered, mainly as regards the assignment of conversion labels to word pairs that were not such.

8. Though the results of the study should not be taken as conclusive since the data used are quite limited in number, it seems certain that, by comparing the results with those of previous studies, the status of conversion does not seem to be changing in the late 90s. Conversion continues to be an important source of new items in present-day American English as the new denominal verbs *fax, e-mail,* and *video-conference*, identified in my data and not yet recorded in the *OED*, demonstrate.

Yet many issues still remain unsolved or unclear. Productivity, blocking, "partial conversion" from noun to adjective, *-ed* and *-ing* forms, among others, seem to require further study. The latter two issues call for a satisfactory account of the parts of speech considering both grammatical function and form of words in sentences.

REFERENCES

A. Primary Sources:

A.1. Corpus Sources:

A.1.1. Legal and Technical-Scientific Journals:

Accounts of Chemical Research, Vol. 32, No. 2, February 1999.

Accounts of Chemical Research, Vol. 32, No. 8, August 1999.

American Criminal Law Review, Vol. 35, No. 2, Winter 1998.

American Criminal Law Review, Vol. 35, No. 3, Spring 1998.

American Criminal Law Review, Vol. 36, No. 1, Winter 1999.

American Journal of International Law, Vol. 91, No. 1, January 1997.

American Journal of International Law, Vol. 91, No. 4, October 1997.

American Journal of International Law, Vol. 92, No. 4, October 1998.

American Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Vol. 179, No. 6, Part I, December 1998.

American Journal of Physiology, Vol. 277, No. 1, July 1999.
Applied and Environmental Microbiology, Vol. 65, No. 1, January 1999.
Chemical Reviews, Vol. 99, No. 2, February 1999.
Chemical Reviews, Vol. 99, No. 8, August 1999.
Harvard International Law Journal, Vol. 38, No. 2, Spring 1997.
Harvard International Law Journal, Vol. 40, No. 2, Spring 1999.
Harvard International Law Journal, Vol. 38, No. 1, Winter 1997.
Infection and Immunity, Vol. 67, No. 2, February 1999.
Infection and Immunity, Vol. 67, No. 8, August 1999.
Journal of Forensic Sciences, Vol. 43, No. 5, September 1998.
Journal of Forensic Sciences, Vol. 43, No. 6, November 1998.
Journal of Structural Biology, Vol. 126, No. 3, June 30, 1999.
Journal of the American Chemical Society, Vol. 121, No. 33, August 25, 1999.
Journal of the American Chemical Society, Vol. 120, No. 51, December 30 1998.
Molecular Pharmacology, Vol. 55, No. 1, January 1999.
Molecular Pharmacology, Vol. 56, No. 2, August 1999.
Pharmacological Reviews, Vol. 50, No. 4, December 1998.
Pharmacological Reviews, Vol. 51, No. 1, March 1999.
The American Journal of Comparative Law, Vol. 46, No. 2, Spring 1998.
The American Journal of Comparative Law, Vol. 46, No. 3, Summer 1998.
The American Journal of Dermatopathology, Vol. 21, No. 4, August 1999.
The American Journal of Medicine, Vol. 105, No. 5, November 1998.
The American Journal of Medicine, Vol. 105, No. 4, October 1998.

A.1.2. Novels:

Green, David 1998: *Atchley.* New York: Station Hill Arts, Barrytown, Ltd. New York.

Morrison, Toni 1988: *Paradise.* New York: Random House.

Smith, Lee 1997: *News of the Spirit.* New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons.

Steel, Danielle 1998: *The Long Road Home.* London: Corgi Books.

Theroux, Paul 1998: *Sir Vidia's Shadow. A Friendship across Five Continents.* London: Penguin Books.

A.1.3. Newspapers:

Herald Tribune, March 25, 1999.
The New York Times, New York, Friday, April 9, 1999.
The Washington Post, Monday, April 12, 1999.

USA Today, March 29, 1999.

A.1.4. Magazines:

Newsweek, March 22, 1999.

Time, March 15, 1999.

Time, March 22, 1999.

A.2 Dictionaries:

Cowie, Anthony Paul and Ronald Mackin 1993: *Oxford Dictionary of Phrasal Verbs*, Vol. I. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

OED 1999: *The Oxford English Dictionary 2nd ed. on Compact Disc. Oxford: Oxford University Press.*

Yerkes, David, ed. 1989: *Webster's Encyclopedic Unabridged Dictionary of the English Language*. New York: Grolier, New York: Portland House.

B. Secondary Sources:

Adams, Valery 1973: *An Introduction to Modern English Word-Formation*. London: Longman.

Anderson, Wallace 1962: *Introductory Readings on Language*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Aronoff, Mark 1976: *Word-Formation in Generative Grammar*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Asher, Robert E. ed 1994b: *The Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*, Vol. 9. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Bauer, Laurie 1983: *English Word-Formation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

——— 1988: *Introducing Linguistic Morphology*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Cannon, Garland 1985: Functional Shift in English. *Linguistics* 23: 411-431.

——— 1987: *Historical Change and English Word Formation. 'Recent Vocabulary'*. New York: Peter Lang.

Copstake, Ann and Ted Briscoe 1996: "Semi-productive Polysemy and Sense Extension". *Lexical Semantics. The Problem of Polysemy*. eds. J. Pustejovsky and B. Boguraev. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Faiß, Klaus 1992: *English Historical Morphology and Word-Formation: Loss versus Enrichment*. Trier: Wissenschaftlicher Verlag.

Gove, Philip B. 1964: "Noun often Attributive and Adjective". *American Speech 39*: 163-75.

Huddleston, Randolph 1984: *Introduction to the Grammar of English*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hussey, Stanley 1995: *The English Language. Structure and Development*. London: Longman.

Jensen, John T. 1990: *Morphology. Word Structure in Generative Grammar*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Jespersen, Otto 1954: *A Modern English Grammar on Historical Principles, Part VI: Morphology*. London: George Allen.

Kastovsky, Dieter 1978: "Zero in Morphology: a Means of Making up for Phonological losses?" *Historical Morphology*. Ed. J. Fisiak. The Hague: Mouton.

Katamba, Francis 1993: *Morphology*. London: Macmillan.

Lieber, Rochelle 1981: "Morphological Conversion within a Restrictive Theory of the Lexicon". *The Scope of Lexical Rules*. Eds. M. Moortgat, H. van der Hulst and T. Hoekstra. Dordrecht: Foris.

——— 1992: *Deconstructing Morphology. Word Formation in Syntactic Theory*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Lipka, Leonhard 1990: *An Outline of English Lexicology. Lexical Structure, Word Semantics and Word-Formation*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag.

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

Malkiel, Yakov 1978: "Derivational Categories". *Universals of Human Language, Vol. 3: Word Structure*. Ed. J.H. Greenberg. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Marchand, Hans 1963: "On a Question of Contrary Analysis with Derivationally Connected but Morphologically Uncharacterized Words". *Studies in Syntax and Word-Formation, "Selected Articles by Hans Marchand"*. Ed. Dieter Kastovsky. München: Fink, 1974.

——— 1964: "A Set of Criteria for the Establishing of Derivational Relationship Between Words Unmarked by Derivational Morphemes". *Indogermanische Forschungen*: 10-19.

——— 1967: "Expansion, Transposition, and Derivation". *Studies in Syntax and Word-Formation, "Selected Articles by Hans Marchand"*. Ed. Dieter Kastovsky. München: Fink, 1974.

——— 1969: *The Categories and Types of Present-Day English Word-Formation. A Synchronic-Diachronic Approach*. München: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuch-Handlung.

Mel'Cûk, Igor Aleksandrovic 1982: *Towards a Language of Linguistics. A System of Formal Notions for Theoretical Morphology*. Rev. and ed. Ph. Luelsdorff. München: Wilhem Fink Verlag.

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

Pennanen, Esko V. 1971: *Conversion and Zero-Derivation in English*. Tampere: Acta Universitatis Tamperensis, Ser. A, Vol. 40, Tampereen Yliopisto.

Pinker, Steven 1994: *The Language Instinct. 'How the Mind Creates Language'.* New York: William Morrow.

Potter, Simeon 1969: *Changing English.* London: Andre Deutsch.

Quirk, Randoph et al. 1985: *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language.* London: Longman.

Rodríguez González, Félix 1987: "Naturaleza Sintáctica de las Formas Siglares. El Cambio Funcional". *Estudios de Lingüística* 4: 139-48.

Sanders, Gerald 1988: "Zero Derivation and the Overt Analogue Criterion". *Theoretical Morphology. Approaches in Modern Linguistics.* Eds. M. Hammond, and M. Noonan. San Diego: Academic Press.

Selkirk, Elisabeth O. 1981: "English Compounds". *The Scope of Lexical Rules.* Eds. M. Moortgat, H. van der Hulst and T. Hoekstra. Dordrecht: Foris.

Sinclair, John 1991: *Collins Cobuild English Guides – 2: Word Formation.* London: Collins ELT.

Soudek, Lev 1968: "Conversions in British and American Substandard English". *Recueil Linguistique de Bratislava* 2: 64-72.

Sweet, Henry 1891: *A New English Grammar. Logical and Historical,* Part I. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Zandvoort, Reinard W. 1977: *A Handbook of English Grammar.* London: Longman.

APPENDIX 1: DEVERBAL NOUNS

acclaim (1)
address (2)
advance (7)
affront (1)
aim (7)
ally (4)
amount (16)
approach (123)
ask (1)
attack (38)
attempt (59)
ban (7)
bark (2)
bend (2)
bid (6)
bite (2)
blend (2)
block (7)
bluff (1)
boost (3)
boycott (4)
break (9)
breakdown (3)
breakthrough (1)
breakup (2)
breed (2)
burst (3)
buzz (2)
call (24)
cast (4)
chat (1)
chaw (1)
chuckle (1)
clap (1)
clean-up (1)
click (2)
climb (1)
close-up (1)
comeback (1)
command (6)
concern (58)
construct (1)
contest (5)
control (120)
convert (3)
cough (1)
cover (2)
coverup (2)
crackdown (1)
crackle (1)
crash (21)
crawl (1)
crush (1)
curl (2)
cut (8)
dab (1)
dare (1)
dawn (1)
daze (1)
deal (22)
decay (11)
defeat (4)
discharge (13)
dismay (2)
dispatch (1)
display (7)
dispute (16)
dissent (1)
drain (1)
draw (2)
drawback (2)
dread (1)
dress (25)
drink (10)
drive (1)
drop (5)
dump (3)
embrace (2)
endeavor (1)
escape (4)
exile (5)
export (11)
extract (10)
fall (11)
fallout (1)
fare (1)
fight (11)
flare-up (1)
flash (4)
flashback (14)
flourish (1)
flow (28)
fold (5)
follow-up (4)
forecast (1)
freeze (1)
fun (1)
gasp (1)
gaze (3)
glance (3)
glare (1)
glimpse (3)
glitter (1)
glow (4)
grant (3)
grin (2)
grip (3)
grunt (2)
hangover (1)
hangup (1)
haul (1)
help (28)
hike (2)
hiss (1)
hit (5)
hug (1)
hunt (1)
hush (1)
import (35)
incline (2)
increase (80)
jam (1)
kickback (3)
kinks (1)
knock (1)
knockout (2)
laugh (4)
launch (6)
layoff (4)
lead (4)
lean (1)
leap (2)
lock-out (1)
look (22)
makeup (3)
mistake (13)
mix (5)
move (21)
nap (1)
nod (6)
overhaul (1)
overlap (3)
overthrow (1)
overview (8)
paint (3)
permit (5)
pick (2)
pickup (3)
play (12)
plunge (2)
practice (77)
praise (5)
produce (1)
pull (2)
punch (1)
push (14)
quote (6)
ramp (1)
rap (1)
reach (10)
reform (27)
refund (1)
remake (1)
remove (1)
rent (1)
repair (3)
reply (4)
rerun (1)
rescue (3)
resolve (1)
result (235)
revenge (1)
rise (24)
roar (2)
roll (2)
rumble (2)
run (12)
rundown (1)
run-in (1)
rush (3)
rustle (1)
scare (2)
scent (2)
scoop (1)
scrub (1)
search (13)
sell (1)
set (15)
setback (1)
shag (1)
shake (3)
shakeout (1)
shine (1)
shivers (1)
shoot (1)
shoot-out (2)
shout (1)
shove (1)
show (35)
showdown (1)
shriek (3)
shudder (3)
sigh (1)
sink (3)
sip (1)
slice (2)
slide (2)
smile (20)
smoke (1)
smudge (1)
snore (1)
sob (2)
spin (2)
spit (1)
split (6)
spot (3)
spread (3)
squiggle (1)
stain (4)
stamp (2)
stand (1)
stand-in (1)
standoff (2)
stare (1)
start (11)
stay (11)
sting (1)
stop (6)
strain (5)
stretch (3)
stride (1)
stroke (1)
struggle (17)
suck (1)
supply (14)
support (62)
survey (22)
swell (1)
swing (1)
take (2)
take-away (1)
takeoff (1)
talk (16)
tangle (1)
tax (13)
test (41)
thrill (4)
tie-up (1)
toll (2)
touch (6)
transfer (12)
transport (9)
treat (1)
trend (2)
trim (1)
trip (3)
try (1)
turmoil (2)
turn (27)
turnout (1)
turnover (18)
twist (1)
venture (5)
visit (22)
walk (15)

wash (27)
washout (5)
wave (2)
wear (1)
whimper (1)
whip (2)
whisper (5)
will (14)
win (2)
wince (1)
wish (9)
workout (1)
worry (4)
wraparound (1)
yawn (3)
yield (15).

APPENDIX 2: DENOMINAL VERBS

access (1)
afflict (1)
age (5)
air (8)
alarm (5)
answer (44)
average (3)
awe (1)
back (24)
backtrack (1)
badger (1)
ban (7)
bank[1] (1)
bank[2] (1)
bankrupt (1)
base (120)
bathe (4)
beam (3)
beat (7)
beef up (1)
belt (2)
benefit (18)
bias (1)
bill (2)
billow (1)
blast (1)
blaze (2)
block (44)
bloom (3)
blossom (1)
blot (3)
board (2)
bolster (1)
bomb (13)
book (2)
border (3)
bottle (1)
boycott (2)
brand (1)
breach (2)
breast (1)
breathe (13)
brief (8)
bristle (1)
brush (3)
bundle (1)
burden (2)
burrow (1)
cake (1)
campaign (1)
can (2)
cap (4)
capture (1)
catalogue (2)
catapult (1)
cater (1)
caution (2)
cement (2)
censor (2)
center (9)
centrifuge (1)
champion (1)
chance (2)
channel (1)
chart (3)
chauffeur (1)
cheer (5)
chronicle (1)
churn (1)
circle (8)
clam (2)
clash (1)
clasp (3)
clog (1)
clone (2)
cloud (1)
cluster (7)
coat (3)
coauthor (1)
cock (1)
comb (2)
comment (10)
complement (3)
compromise (7)
contact (4)
cook (9)
cork (1)
corral (1)
court (2)
cowboy (1)
craft (3)
credit (3)
crest (1)
crop (1)
cross (37)
cup (1)
curb (2)
curse (1)
dart (2)
date (7)
diagram (2)
dial (1)
disadvantage (2)
dish (1)
distance (1)
ditch (2)
dive (1)
dock (1)
document (13)
domicile (5)
doom (2)
draft (5)
dream (21)
drift (7)
drum (2)
dye (1)
echo (9)
edge (3)
effect (10)
e-mail (5)
engineer (2)
evidence (11)
exercise (18)
exit (5)
experience (39)
eye (3)
face (49)
factor (2)
fan (5)
fancy (1)
fashion (4)
father (2)
fault (1)
fax (2)
feature (11)
fence (1)
festoon (1)
field (1)
figure (11)
file (17)
film (5)
finance (13)
finger (1)
fire (12)
flaw (2)
flick (3)
flood (4)
floor (1)
fluff (1)
focus (59)
foot (1)
forfeit (2)
frame (1)
fraught (1)
fuel (10)
function (10)
fund (8)
fuss (2)
gang (1)
garden (1)
garner (1)
gear (2)
gesture (4)
gift (1)
gleam (5)
gossip (2)
grin (3)
ground (2)
guarantee (20)
guard (8)
gum (1)
gun (2)
half (1)
halt (6)
hammer (2)
hamper (1)
hand (18)
handicap (1)
harbor (1)
harm (12)
harrow (1)
harvest (3)
head (26)
headline (1)
henna (1)
hide (3)
highlight (6)
hint (6)
hire (8)
hood (1)
hook (3)
host (1)
house (11)
implement (11)
inch (1)
influence (17)
ink (3)
interview (3)
issue (22)
jail (4)
jockey (2)
joke (5)
key (2)
kid (2)
knight (1)
label (14)
lack (36)
land (11)
lash (1)
launder (1)
lecture (3)
level (2)
license (3)
line (7)
link (29)
list[1] (1)
list[2] (9)
load (11)
lob (1)
lock (10)
loot (3)
love (96)
lunge (1)
lure (2)
lust (1)
mail (4)
mainline (1)
man (2)
manufacture (2)
marshal (1)
mask (5)
massage (2)
master (2)
mat (1)

match (8)
mate (1)
matter (20)
maul (1)
mess (4)
mimic (1)
mind (7)
mire (2)
mirror (1)
moan (4)
model (6)
monitor (26)
moot (1)
motor (3)
mottle (1)
mouth (1)
muscle (1)
mush-room (1)
nail (2)
name (23)
neck (1)
need (153)
needle (1)
network (2)
nickname (1)
nix (1)
notice (40)
ooze (1)
order (30)
outfit (2)
outlaw (3)
outline (7)
outrage (3)
pace (1)
pack (6)
package (1)
pad (1)
paddle (3)
pair (1)
panic (3)
park (1)
partition (1)
partner (1)
party (3)
paste (1)
pat (1)
patch (1)
pattern (2)
pause (8)
peak (6)
pedal (1)
pen (1)
petition (3)
photograph (1)
picture (4)
pile (7)
pin (6)
pine (1)
pinpoint (2)
pioneer (3)
pip (1)
pit (2)
pitch (4)
pity (1)
place (78)
plague (9)
plait (1)
plan (31)
plate (9)
pledge (4)
plot (2)
plug (2)
pock (1)
pocket (1)
point (19)
pool (4)
pose (1)
position (4)
post[1] (7)
post[2] (3)
power (2)
premise (7)
pressure (4)
prickle (1)
pride (1)
principle (1)
print (6)
probe (4)
program (5)
progress (6)
promise (39)
prop (3)
proposition (1)
pulp (1)
pump (1)
query (1)
queue (2)
quip (2)
race (7)
racket (1)
rain (5)
rank (3)
ratchet (1)
rate (5)
rear-end (1)
recourse (1)
reel (1)
reference (2)
reflux (2)
rent (1)
ribbon (1)
roller-skate (1)
roost (1)
root (8)
rout (1)
rumor (2)
sack (2)
sacrifice (7)
saddle (1)
safeguard (7)
safety-pin (1)
salvage (1)
sample (7)
sanction (2)
sap (2)
scale (2)
schedule (9)
scold (2)
score (7)
screen (13)
screw (1)
scroll (1)
seat (4)
section (1)
seed (1)
sense (7)
sequence (2)
serenade (1)
shack (1)
shadow (1)
shame (1)
shape (12)
share (45)
shell (2)
shelter (1)
shepherd (1)
shield (5)
ship (9)
shop (3)
shot (4)
shoulder (2)
shovel (1)
side (4)
side-step (1)
sieve (1)
signal (9)
silence (2)
silhouette (1)
silver (1)
singsong (1)
siphone (1)
size (2)
sketch (1)
skewer (1)
ski (1)
skirt (2)
slap (14)
slate (1)
slaughter (4)
slip (4)
smear (2)
smoke (8)
snake (1)
snow (1)
soft-pedal (1)
sorrow (1)
span (1)
speed (5)
spike (2)
spiral (1)
splinter (1)
sponsor (5)
spook (1)
sport (4)
spot (4)
spray (4)
spur (3)
stage (3)
star (2)
station (2)
steam (1)
stem (3)
stockpile (1)
stone (1)
stonewall (1)
store (11)
storm (3)
strap (1)
stream (6)
stress (2)
stroke (3)
structure (2)
stump (3)
style (2)
sun (3)
supplement (7)
surf (3)
surface (6)
swarm (1)
sweet-talk (1)
swell (1)
switch (5)
tackle (1)
tailor (7)
target (17)
telephone (3)
term (14)
test (55)
thread (2)
throng (1)
tick (3)
tie (2)
tilt (2)
time (1)
tool (1)
top (4)
torch (1)
torture (2)
touch (2)
tour (2)
tower (2)
track (4)
trade (6)
trap (3)
trespass (1)
trigger (1)
trumpet (1)
tune (3)
tunnel (1)
tut-tut (1)
usher (2)
value (8)
verge (1)
veto (3)
video-conference (1)
vie (1)
view (22)
voice (2)
wall (3)
waltz (1)
warehouse (1)
water (3)
water-ski (1)
weather (2)
weed (1)
welcome (20)
wheel (2)
while (1)
whipsaw (1)
whitewash (1)
will (4)
wine (2)
wire (1)
witness (7)
wonder (46)
worship (4)
wound (4)
wreck (1)
zone (2)