International Journal of Multidisciplinary and Current Research ISSN: 2321-3124
Research Article Available at: http://ijmcr.com

On the Productivity of the Prototypical Noun to Verb Zero Derivation Process in English

Marjana Vaneva

School of Foreign Languages, University American College Skopje, Skopje

Accepted 15 October 2016, Available online 30 October 2016, **(Sep/Oct 2016 issue)**

Abstract

*In English, the process of zero derivation is **prototypical** or **marginal** depending respectively on the presence or absence of changes in the corresponding lexemes. In the prototypical type of the process, when nothing changes in the source and the target lexeme and, in morphological terms, they are absolutely identical, of all directions, the most productive one is the zero derivation of verbs from nouns. This is due to the fact that English is an analytical language, with very few inflections, so that the formal overlapping of the lexemes is easily achievable. Therefore, all characteristics of this word formation process are portrayed in the noun to verb direction: from the source lexeme – the noun, another lexeme – a verb is created with absolutely the same form; slightly changed, expanded meaning achieved with cognitive transfer and metaphorical association; and which belongs to completely different lexical category, due to the different function and position of the newly created, zero derived lexeme. This direction encompasses several subtypes in itself, depending on the deeper meaning of the target lexeme – the verb. Apart from being productive, the process is also a fairly new, economical way of forming new words in English.*

Keywords: *Noun to verb zero-derivation, Productive process, Prototypical change, Semantic expansion*

1. Introduction

In analytical languages, zero derivation is defined as a change of the lexical category when no interventions happen in the form of the word. But, in linguistic literature the process itself is interpreted differently. Many authors treat it as a branch of derivation [3], [5], whereas some [8] consider it to be a separate type of word formation. The name accepted here – '*zero derivation*' - is also preferred by many distinguished linguists [1], [3], [7], [14].

The process is derivational because a new lexeme is derived, that is, from noun a verb is formed, and it is modified as zero because what is used in the process or added to the source lexeme is *zero morph* – an element that is zero from derivational point of view when it does not cause any derivational changes, and therefore the process is called *zero derivation*, whereas all inflectional interventions that mark the corresponding lexical categories are allowed, so that the source and the target lexeme are inflectionally affected, in compliance with their parts of speech.

Having explained the name of the process, more attention can be paid to its modification - why it is called prototypical, and to its productivity. It is because there are absolutely no formal changes, and both lexemes, before and after the process, totally overlap in form, that this direction: noun to verb is called prototypical.

This prototypical, genuine character is evident in the example:

father n. + zero morph → **father** v. [9]

where, as in the whole process, the change happens at a lexical level, when no derivational modifications are made, and the form is the same, but a new lexeme is formed, the lexical category is changed, and the meaning is transferred from one to another domain.

On the other hand, the process is productive because in English almost every noun can be zero derived to a verb, due to metaphorical transfer and association links which enable the participants in the conversation act to make easy semantic expansion, and, on the basis of that, to connect the old and the new lexeme, thus bridging the gap between the lexical categories, but deriving a new word and enriching the vocabulary.

Some of the most common examples of zero derivation from noun to verb, which are explicit representatives of this direction and are given as the most noticeable in the literature, are the following: to **badger**, to **bottle**, to **commission**, to **mail**, to **mushroom**, to **skin**, to **vacation**, to **chopper**, to **data-bank**, to **leaflet**, to **network**, to **trash**. [7] What is more, many neologisms are created by semantic expansion and contribute to the productive image of this process:

to **chair**, to **campaign**, to **microfilm**, to **screen**, to **star**, to **wireless**, to **orbit**.

Yet, since we talk about direction, the natural class is important in determining which element in the pair is the derived part of speech [4]. In other words, in order to talk about noun to verb zero derivation, we have to be sure that, in every group of examples that is analysed, the noun is our starting lexeme and that the verb is derived. Therefore, semantics is important in determining the direction, that is, the more basic element of the pair is the one whose semantic priority is implied by the other [3]. This approach of determining the natural class in analyzing the elements that undergo the process of zero derivation is also used in [11]. In [7] it is claimed that this process allows any lexeme to undergo this process as the need arises and there are no morphological restrictions. On this note, it is important to emphasise that all the examples analysed in the main part of this paper are taken from reliable English dictionaries - [12], [13].

The fact that the whole process depends entirely on the semantics, which lies in the starting lexeme, and on the surrounding context, is shown in two types of denominal, zero derived verbs: 'ornative' and 'privative'. [3] talks about this distinction and says that when the referent of the second noun is supplied with the referent of the first noun which is being zero derived, we talk about 'ornative' zero derivation, but the same constructions with the same nouns can express quite opposite, 'privative' meaning. They both have a noun as a source, go through the process of zero derivation and, as a result, function as a lexeme that means *to provide the object with the thing denoted with the base*, in the case with 'ornative' verbs, and with 'privative' verbs - a lexeme that means *to remove from the object the thing denoted with the base*. The following examples will illustrate this; the first group being 'ornative', while the second one showing the 'privative' verbs, thus both groups display zero derived denominal verbs:

***carpet** a room ~ put a **carpet** in the room*
***roof** a house ~ put a **roof** on the house*
***paper** the wall ~ put **paper** on the wall* and

***skin** a knee ~ remove **skin** from the knee*
***bone** a fish ~ remove **bone** from the fish*
***dust** the furniture ~ remove **dust** from the furniture.*

These semantic differences can be explained by the relationship among the nouns in the entering structure, but yet, the interpretation of the result of the process will depend on the speaker's common knowledge, not only on their linguistic capacity [10].

2. Noun to verb zero derivation in English

In English, the verbs zero derived from nouns make a group with the biggest number of examples when, by using cognitive transfer and metaphorisation of the meaning of lexemes, it is shown how the source and the target lexeme are semantically connected, thus portraying the way in which the speaker contemplates when zero deriving a verb from a noun [2], [6].

In this type of zero derivation several subgroups are distinguished and they will be analysed in continuation.

The first one that will be commented on is for the agent *to have the role of what is denoted with the noun*. The following are examples of this sort:

mother → mother: *She is the **mother** of this baby. → She **mothers** this baby.*
father → father: *He is a **father** of three children. → He is supposed to **father** the children.*
host → host: *Great Britain plays **host** to the Summer Olympics. → The British **host** the Olympics.*

The context in which these lexemes are used clearly shows their semantic expansion when from a noun, which is concrete, accepted and with specified meaning and function, a verb is developed with the same form but different meaning. As a matter of fact, the meaning changes because the function is different, so that in the first example from the noun **mother**, which is an agent, with the development of the language and the wish for its enrichment, the native speakers of English found it acceptable to use the same, nominal form of the lexeme as a verb, which, on the other hand, will denote performing the action contained in the noun. In this way, the syntactic role of the noun **mother** on the left, changes to verb on the right, and means *to have the mother's role/to be mother* or *to behave like/act as a mother*.

The metaphorical transfer that is in favour of the semantic analysis shows us that the meaning is different due to lexical change, that is, a new word is formed, and, in parallel, the syntactic function changes, thus, the newly formed element has a different role in the sentence. More specifically, in this subgroup, from a noun that denotes the person who does the action, the change is in a verb that means by performing the action, the subject will have the role of the basic noun lexeme, that is, will behave like the person who has the role or the function of the source word, and that is the noun.

As far as the morphological analysis is concerned, the form of both lexemes – the source and the target one – is the same and unchanged from derivational point of view. This most authentically illustrates the process of zero derivation, which, as stated before, is conducted by using *zero morph*, whereby the form remains the same, but the function and the meaning are different.

This kind of semantic transfer from noun to verb is also mirrored in verbs zero derived from names of animals. Such are the following:

dog → dog: *The **dog** that our neighbours have is very dangerous. → They are trying to **dog** his footsteps.*
fox → fox: *The hunted **fox** is in the cage. → The puzzles **fox** me completely.*

parrot → parrot: *A **parrot** flew in the room. → Don't **parrot**!*

Here, again the name of the animal is first created, but the development of the meaning from one to another syntactic role will be determined by the main characteristic of the animal from whose basic name the notion for the action is developed. In this way, in other to develop new verb lexemes from names of animals, the past creators of this type of lexemes in English have started with the characteristic that distinguishes the animal and have used that feature to mark the action. This tendency now characterizes this subtype of the process of zero derivation from nouns to verbs at both present and future creators of these lexemes; when the action is understood through the noun from which the verb is zero derived, with the same form, similar meaning, but different function. Because **dog** is explained to be an animal which is loyal to humans and a man's loyal/faithful friend, the metaphorical transfer takes us from the meaning of the noun and makes the verb to mean *to follow someone's footsteps, to show loyalty*, as **fox** symbolizes cunning behaviour, shrewdness, deceit, trickery and takes us to the verb to mean *to deceit or trick somebody*, while **parrot** is an animal that constantly repeats words, so the verb would be used to denote an action typical of the animal and to mean *to repeat words*.

Very similar to these are the examples with **wolf**, **chicken** and **sponge**:

wolf → wolf: *I saw a pack of **wolves**. → He **wolfed** down his breakfast.*
chicken → chicken: *Nobody wants to keep **chickens** in this region. → He had an appointment to see the dentist but he **chickened** out at the last moment.*
sponge → sponge: *You should clean the sink with a **sponge**. → He **sponged** the car with clean water.*

These, too, are verbs which mean *to be or to behave as the basic noun shows*. The noun **wolf** denotes a strong and greedy animal, so that the metaphorical transfer takes us to a verb to mean – *to eat greedily like a wolf*, from the noun **chicken** that denotes a small, weak and timid animal, the verb means *to be afraid and to retreat due to fear*, while **sponge** names a sea animal whose body has numerous holes, so that the verb means *to clean or wash something by using a sponge and thereby absorbing the liquid*.

This means that whichever animal is mentioned, by means of a metaphor and making association links between the animal's character and the subject's behaviour, it will be possible to zero derive a verb from the noun.

These examples show that, in this kind of forming new words, urged by the need to identify the action with the noun and to fill in the verbal slot, what is created is a lexeme with the same form, and expanded, a bit different meaning. In this case, the existing word, having a role of a noun, formally remains unchanged, as far as the derivational aspect is concerned, but it undergoes semantic and lexical changes and becomes a verb. The semantic change is embodied in transferring the word from one domain to another, when from concrete, basic and known meaning, an abstract, expanded and metaphorical interpretation is developed, which connects the two domains and enriches the speakers' knowledge. On the other hand, when talking about the lexical change that is a precondition for the existence of zero derivation, the explanation is that when trying to form a word with similar meaning, on a place which is empty and not filled in the sentence, we actually form a word that belongs to another lexical category and thus gains a different syntactic role.

There is a subgroup of verbs which zero derived from nouns mean *to feel, experience or undergo the thing denoted with the noun:*

experience → experience: *It's wonderful work **experience**. → She never **experienced** difficulty.*
pity → pity: *I have no **pity** for convicted murderers. → **Pity** the poor sailors at sea in this storm.*
hunger → hunger: *They have an insatiable **hunger** for danger. → They **hunger** for adventure.*
panic → panic: *The thought of flying fills me with **panic**. → Don't **panic**! We've got plenty of time.*

In all these examples, the noun is the source lexeme because it names the situation, the feeling, the notion, whereas the action means *feeling, experiencing and undergoing of the situation or the event denoted with the noun*. Thus, these examples mentioned on the right mean *to experience something, to feel pity, to feel hungry,* and *to panic.*

Another type of zero derivation includes nouns that denote *climate and meteorological phenomena*. Such are the following examples:

rain → rain: *heavy **rain** → It has been **raining** for two days.*
snow → snow: *thick **snow** → It's **snowing** heavily now.*
thunder → thunder: *You can hear the **thunder** of the falls in the distance. → Voice **thundered** in my ear.*
wind → wind: *After running hard, I had to stop and regain my **wind**. → We were **winded** by the steep climb.*
sun → sun: *He was sitting in the **sun**. → He sat in a deck-chair **sunning** himself.*
storm → storm: *There's a **storm** brewing. → She **stormed** at him.*

The examples illustrate the same tendency: by knowing the meaning of the noun, the speaker is allowed to use the same form of the word in another position and with an expanded semantic message, so that a new lexeme is

formed that displays different behavior in the sentence. In that way, the noun **rain** zero derives a verb with the meaning – *to rain/to make raindrops fall*, from **snow** - *to snow/to make snowflakes fall*, from **wind** – *to wind/to blow wind*, from **sun** – *to sun/to expose somebody/something to sun*, and from **storm** – *to start storming*, or as in our last example, the metaphorical transfer zero derives a verb, which means *to become angry or mad at somebody*. In all these examples, the meaning of the target lexeme is not unknown, but it is developed from the known, concrete and source meaning contained in the existent lexeme and, this time, is connected with more abstract semantics.

The explanation is that the same meaning that the noun has is now transferred to the word in a verbal role, which is a result of zero derivation and denotes the action, the happening, the event, or the condition on the right.

The next group shows verb lexemes which zero derived from nouns mean *to transform the object into something*. Those are nouns which come from objects and nonhuman beings like the following:

group → group: *work in **group** → **group** the papers*
cash → cash: *pay in **cash** → **cash** a check*
heap → heap: *a **heap** of books → **heap** stones to form a damage*

In these examples, the verbs that are zero derived from the nouns mean *to transfer the object into a group, cash and heap*. This again shows that, by using the noun when performing the action, a verb that denotes that action is zero derived from the noun - the same noun from which the process starts.

Another kind of verbs zero derived from nouns are lexemes developed from noun lexemes which denote human beings and show status, whereas the result – the verb denotes *beginning of that status*. We illustrate this type with the examples in continuation:

cripple → cripple: *My friend is a **cripple**. → The accident **crippled** my friend.*
beggar → beggar: *a poor **beggar** → John **beggars** Bill.*
fool → fool: *What a **fool** I was to do this. → Don't **fool** me!*

With semantic transfer and moving from concrete to abstract meaning, the noun produces the result: *the object to receive the status denoted with the noun: the friend to be cripple, Bill to become a beggar, somebody to be fooled*. The verb denotes the action whose result is to receive the status or become the thing contained in the noun: *a cripple, a beggar and a fool*. Here, the association is from the noun, as already known and understood, to a verb on the right that denotes the action performed – action that creates a result as indicated and named with the noun on the left.

Other verbs zero derived from nouns are those whose action means *the object to receive the form denoted with the noun*:

bundle → bundle: *a **bundle** of clothes → **bundle** up the clothes*
bale → bale: ***bales** of hay → **bale** the hay*
circle → circle: *draw **circles** → The two dogs **circle** each other.*

In these examples, by applying cognitive transfer, we are enabled to conclude that the previously mentioned verb lexemes mean *the object to get the form of a bundle, bay or circle,* when by metaphorical expansion we derive the verb meaning.

This is just another proof of the productivity of the process of zero derivation from noun to verb when, by using the knowledge we have about the noun lexeme, we perform an action, which is totally understood due to the source lexeme, and in this way we zero derive a new, verb lexeme that has the same form like the source element, expanded and thus slightly different meaning, but a different and completely changed function.

The following examples represent another type of this process:

mine → mine: *a copper **mine** → They **mine** coal.*
bone → bone: *a collar **bone** → **bone** fish*
dust → dust: *throw **dust** → **dust** the shelf*
skin → skin: *sensitive **skin** → **skin** the knee*
milk → milk: *drink **milk** → **milk** a cow*

Here, the meaning is no longer to form a noun through the verb action which is mapped in the semantic domain of the noun, but it is about *removing the noun from its location by performing the action named with a lexeme that shares the same name*. In the examples, the nouns denote a concrete notion which, when zero derived to a verb, produces a lexeme that denotes an action which starts from the object that determines the place and is a source, whereas the aim of the action is to remove the thing denoted with the noun from the place where it is. Thus, in these last listed examples, the verbs mean *to remove/take out coal, bone, remove dust, to remove skin, to take out milk from a cow*.

Some verbs zero derived from the corresponding nouns mean *to create the notion or to cause the notion denoted with the noun to exist*. This is seen in the following examples:

garden → garden: *work in the **garden** → Ruth **gardens** every day.*
shade → shade: *a nice **shade** → This tree **shades** the garden.*
copy → copy: *make a **copy** → **copy** the report*

The metaphorical expansion is the same when from the noun **garden**, we mean *to plough soil to make garden*; when with **shade**, we mean *to throw shade onto the object*; and from **copy**, the meaning is expanded so that we allude *to get a copy as a result of the action*. This semantic transfer from noun to verb is very similar to

what has been shown in the previous examples, and these verbs presented here are transitive, whereas the following ones are intransitive:

bloom → bloom: *an exotic **bloom** Daffodils → **bloom** in the spring.*
blossom → blossom: *apple **blossom** → The cherry trees **blossomed** early this year.*
flower → flower: *a purple **flower** → These plants will **flower** in the spring.*

Cognition certainly helps us to properly understand and interpret the semantic transfer from the source lexeme – the noun, to the target one – the verb. Indisputably, this aids the productivity of the process, and the zero derived verb from the noun names the process of creating the noun, from which it originates and is directly developed, so that in all three examples the result is *producing flower(s)*. All in all, in both cases, regardless of the fact whether we are dealing with intransitive or transitive verbs, the verbs accept inflectional suffixes in order to satisfy the grammar and achieve congruence with the subject of the sentence.

Very similar to these are the examples in continuation, when again the verbs formed from nouns mean *to develop or create what is denoted with the noun*:

foam → foam: *a dog with **foam** at its mouth → The dog was **foaming** at the mouth.*
wrinkle → wrinkle: *She's beginning to get **wrinkles** around her eyes. → She **wrinkled** her nose in distaste.*
crease → crease: *iron a **crease** → Pack the clothes carefully so that you don't **crease** them.*

The meaning of these verbs is *to make foam, wrinkle, crease*, that is, the same effect that the nouns themselves denote; therefore, in these cases, it is the thing denoted with the noun that is being created, by simple performance of the action.

What connects these subgroups is that the action is performed over the object and it creates the thing represented by that same lexeme when used as a noun.
Here again, depending on the tense and on the type of the action, the lexemes on both sides can take suffixes which will further mark the lexemes for lexical categories.

Similar connection between the condition or the effect, and the action with the meaning *to exhale, ignite, exhaust something* is portrayed in the following examples:

smoke → smoke: *black **smoke** → **smoke** a cigarette*
spark → spark: *The fireworks exploded in a shower of **sparks**. → The explosion **sparked** a fire.*
steam → steam: ***steam** coming out of a boiling kettle → The kettle was **steaming** on the stove.*

where the noun **smoke**, when zero derived to a verb, means *to exhale smoke*; the noun **spark** is metaphorically transferred to a verb that means *to ignite sparks*; and in the case with **steam**, the noun produces a verb that means *to exhaust steam*.

In this subgroup too, by performing the action that is morphologically and semantically mapped from the noun, the subject makes the same effect that the noun has. This explains the close semantic and morphological connection between the source word – the noun, and the target one – the verb, which are main participants in the process of zero derivation. This process displays lexical changes too, because the word's part of speech is changed, but the syntactic modification is also significant, since the newly derived lexeme receives new function in the sentence, in accordance with the requirements of the derivational process.

Examples of verbs zero derived from nouns with the meaning *to place the object in the space denoted with the noun* are the following:

bag → bag: *She unpacked her **bags**. → Customers **bagged** their groceries*.
bottle → bottle: *a **bottle** of wine → **bottle** the wine*
can → can: *a **can** of Coke → **can** the pineapple*

Here, the connection between the noun and the verb is in the metaphor '*container*', which connects the domain of the noun – the naming of the container, and the domain of the verb – expressing the action with which the object is placed in the container, from whose name the process of zero derivation starts. Thus, from physical objects named as **bag**, **bottle**, and **can**, the transfer goes to *placing the object, that is, the noun in a bag, bottle and can*. The result of the process is new location or place where the object is after the action has been performed, and what is zero derived through the noun is the container.

Other lexemes of a similar kind are the nouns that denote space for living or staying temporarily, from which verbs are zero derived that mean *to stay or live in what is denoted with the noun*, and, in our cases, that stands for *to live in a tent, camp, or to share a room*:

tent → tent: *The soldiers slept in a **tent**. → The circus **tented** in this area.*
camp → camp: *a holiday **camp** → Where are we going to **camp** tonight?*
room → room: *a dining **room** → We **roomed** together.*

These are examples when the noun denotes a place, and by cognitive transfer and metaphorical expansion of the meaning, a verb is derived, whose semantic implication shows that an action is received from the noun. These nouns produce intransitive verbs, which do not need object to denote the action.

But, there is another type that requires an object to perform the action, since the object is a recipient of the action. This type is classified in two subtypes.

The first group consists of lexemes where the action means *to provide the object with the noun, while performing the action*. This is manifested in the following group:

belt → belt: *fasten the **belt** → The officer **belted** his sword on.*
label → label: *apply a **label** to something → **Label** each item carefully.*
mask → mask: *a stocking **mask** → The thief **masked** his features with a stocking.*

It is obvious that the verb zero derived from the noun **belt** means *to tie something with a belt, to put a belt*; from the noun **label**, the verb means *to put or stick label on something*; as well as with **mask**, we get a verb that implies *to put a mask*. This shows that the newly derived verb denotes an action, during which performance the object in the sentence on the right will be supplied with the starting noun from the sentence structure on the left.

The noun to verb zero derivation is characterized by a group of verbs, which derived from the noun mean *to apply the noun*:

water → water: *mineral **water** → **water** the plants*
butter → butter: *bread and **butter** → **butter** the toast*
oil → oil: *engine **oil** → **oil** a lock*

when the nouns denote notion and concrete substance, so that the verb marks the transfer of the notion pointed out with the noun, that is, it stands for applying the noun to the object. In this case, what is zero derived is the substance that is applied and therefore the verbs mean: *to put water, butter, and oil onto the object*.

Another type of verbs zero derived from nouns has the meaning *to prepare/cook something by using the noun* and this is when it comes to food supplements or drinks:

pepper → pepper: ***peppers** stuffed with meat and rice → **pepper** the food*
salt → salt: *Pass me the **salt**, please! → **Salt** the soup!*
sugar → sugar: *two lumps of **sugar** → **sugar** the tea*

The meaning of the examples in this subgroup is that when preparing food and drinks, the substances or ingredients that are used to facilitate the performance of the action and by applying them in the process of cooking, the final result contains the noun which has been used during the action. In such a way, by using the noun which begins the cognitive and the metaphorical transfer, an action is performed that is named with the zero derived verb and the result contains the basic, noun lexeme. Consequently, what is created in our examples is *peppered food* (food with pepper), *salty soup* (soup with salt), and *sweetened tea* (tea to which sugar has been added). This means that the food, the soup, and the tea have the corresponding substances (**pepper, salt, sugar**) as nouns in themselves, respectively.

The following examples show verbs which mean *to perform the action by using the noun*:

lock → lock: *a door **lock** → Harry **locked** the door.*
bolt → bolt: *a door with a **bolt** → Remember to **bolt** all the doors and windows.*
nail → nail: *drive a **nail** → **nail** the edge framing to the wall*

when the cognitive interpretation makes association links and metaphorical connections in the speaker's mind, so that from the noun **lock**, the meaning of the verb – *to use a lock* is cognitively justified, from the noun **bolt**, the verb means *to use a bolt*, and the verb **nail** means *to use a nail*. This implies that the action is performed with the use of the noun, so that we eventually get the result with the help of the source lexeme.

Intransitive verbs that mean *to play the instrument denoted with the noun from which the verbs are derived* are the following:

drum → drum: *play **drums** → He **drums** in a band.*
trumpet → trumpet: *play the **trumpet** → He's been **trumpeting** for ten years.*
whistle → whistle: *use a **whistle** → The audience **whistled**.*

Here, the meaning of the verb **drum** is *to play drum*, as it is with **trumpet**, when it means *to play trumpet*, while in the example with **whistle**, we understand the action like *play whistle by using it as an instrument,* or *to produce sound without using this instrument but by rounding the lips and emitting air so what is formed as sound is whistle*. This second meaning of the verb **whistle**, as a matter of fact, is semantic interpretation of our third example from the previously given group.

In favour of the whole group, which is of our interest because of their specific features, we can consider the following two examples:

pen → pen: *a red **pen** → **pen** a note*
voice → voice: *speak in a gentle **voice** → **voice** an opinion*

The nouns **pen** and **voice** are means, objects which when used cause a new condition, that is, the object over which the action is performed is supplied with the thing that is a characteristic of the noun, both literally and metaphorically. In this way, because **pen** is an instrument for writing, the verb **pen** zero derived from the noun means *to write the note with a pen*, and because **voice** is used for pronouncing or expressing something, the verb means *to express the opinion*.

This subgroup also contains the following noun-verb lexemes:

answer → answer: *write your **answer** → **answer** the questions*
bug → bug: *put a **bug** in a telephone → The telephones in the presidential palace were **bugged**.*

seat → seat: *a classroom with twenty **seats** → Owen **seated** his guests in the hall.*

As opposed to the previous two examples where the metaphorical and semantic transfer are bigger and there is a much more accentuated abstraction, here the abstraction is at lower level and the connection between the noun and the verb is stronger and firmer, because by using the noun we supply the object with what is implied in it. Thus, in our examples, the verb **answer** means *to provide an answer*, that is, *to give an answer*, **bug** means *to put bugs as eavesdroppers*, while **seat** means *to find places for seating (seats)*. This association is so clear and transparent that there is no need to think much about the transfer to find the connection between the noun and the verb through which the object in the new sentence is supplied with the starting lexeme. Simply, the process indicates that by using the cognitive approach we understand that the verb means *supplying the object with the thing denoted with the noun*.

It is difficult to separate the instrumental group which means *perform the action by using some means or an instrument*, which actually is the noun as a representative of the first lexical category from where the transfer leads us to the second lexical class – the verb. The zero derived lexeme means *to apply the ingredient denoted with the noun*, because the verb can be classified as instrumental, when it shows *the instrument used to perform the action* - zero derived from the noun **salt**:

*John seasons the food with **salt**. → John **salted** the food.*
But also to mean *apply something* as in:
*John puts **salt** on the food → John **salted** the food.*

Viewed from the aspect of zero derivation, both meanings are the same, because when a verb is derived from a noun, the semantic implication created at the participants in the conversation is *use of the noun in order to get something that will contain it* and the result is *salty* food, that is, food *cooked with salt*.

There are numerous verbs which show *transport* or *means of transport*, and they refer to the vehicle with which the action is performed:

bus → bus: *Shall we walk or go by **bus**? → I usually **bus** to work in the morning.*
bike → bike: *I'm going by **bike**. → People are encouraged to **bike** to work.*
ship → ship: *go by **ship** → **ship** the goods*

The verbs that are zero derived from these nouns mean *to perform the action by using the corresponding noun as a means of transport*, which in our examples means *travelling by bus, bike and transporting goods by ship*.

The last group of the noun to verb zero derivation in English represented in this paper is manifested with lexemes that show *period for which something lasts, or happens*. Such are the lexemes in continuation:

winter → winter: *I spent the **winter** in Australia. → I have **wintered** with him.*
summer → summer: *go on holiday in the **summer** → She **summered** in Spain last year.*
noon → noon: *eat at **noon** → They **nooned** at the hostel.*
holiday → holiday: *He spends every **holiday** abroad. → He always **holidays** abroad.*

By making semantic transfer from noun to verb and by using the same lexeme, the result is an action that means *to spend the winter, summer, noon, or holiday*, when the noun which stands for the period in the sentence on the left, on the right is already converted to a verb and means to perform the action over the period contained in the noun. The last subtype shows examples that are rare and uncommon to illustrate the verbal function of the lexemes derived from the names of seasons and, because of this, the realisations of the verbs are given in a full sentence structure.

This is the point where we should also make room for the lexemes **spring** and **autumn**, whose zero derivation from noun to verb is illustrated in the following sentence formations:

spring → spring: *In the **spring** leaves begin to grow on the trees. → They usually **springed** here.*
autumn → autumn: *It's been one of the coldest **autumns** for years. → My parents **autumned** on that mountain.*

The examples show that at these two lexemes the cognitive transfer from noun to verb is equally possible, as it is in the case with the previously given lexemes: **winter**, **summer**, **noon**, **holiday**, and the speaker has the same freedom to transform the word from one type to another by metaphorical expansion. The only difference between the groups of this subtype is the fact that the lexemes **spring** and **autumn** are not yet realized as verbs, but still, there are cognitive conditions for it, which in future should encourage the speaker to use these lexemes as members of the verbal part of speech.

In all the examples and subtypes from this group, the transfer and the meaning expansion from one to another category, through metaphor, by changing the lexical type, but without derivational intervention in the form, occur in an absolutely equal way. Namely, the semantic changes start with the concrete, basic and original meaning, thus going to expansion in a more abstract and broader domain than the first one, when the verb embodies the noun in its frames.

Conclusion

This analysis of the prototypical noun to verb zero derivation in English leads to several conclusions, concerning the behaviour of the new lexeme. That is, the verb can take inflectional suffixes depending on the context in which it is used, thus meaning that it can accept *-s* for third person singular in present simple tense,

-ing in combination with the present or past form of the verb *to be* to express present progressive or past progressive, *-ed* for past simple of regular verbs, or the combination of *-ed* or the past participle form with the present simple or past of the auxiliary *have* to make either present perfect or past perfect. This means that, for the needs of grammar and in order to achieve congruence with the subject of the sentence, the verb derivatives take inflectional suffixes for tense, person, type, number and voice. But, no other changes can happen and therefore this kind of zero derivation from noun to verb is called full, nonrestrictive, genuine, typical and **clear**. Otherwise, in all subgroups of this type of zero derivation, the grammatical behaviour of the noun and the verb is mirrored in phrases or sentences that provide good context to understand the characteristics of this process. Thus, the noun is surrounded by a verb, whereas the verb, depending on its type, can be followed by an object, if it is a transitive verb; or by a verb complement, if the derived lexeme is an intransitive verb.

It is doubtless that what adds to the productivity of the process is the semantic expansion of the lexemes and their easy, unobstructed, direct conversion from one part of speech to another, when the form is absolutely maintained, the meaning slightly modified, and the lexical category explicitly changed.

References

[1] F. Katamba, (1993), Modern Linguistics: Morphology, London: Macmillan.
[2] G. Lakoff, and M. Johnson, (1980), Metaphors We Live By. Chicago: University of Chicago.
[3] H. Marchand, (1969), The Categories and Types of Present-day English Word formation. 2nd ed. Munich: Beck.
[4] I. Plag, (2003), Word-Formation in English. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
[5] J. Lyons, (1977), Semantics, vol. 2, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
[6] J.I. Saeed, (1997), Semantics, Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.
[7] L. Bauer, (1983), English Word-Formation. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
[8] M.H.B. Strang, (1968), Modern English Structure, 2nd ed. London: Edward Arnold.
[9] M. Vaneva (2009), Zero derivation in English and Macedonian Language, Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Skopje: University "St. Cyril and Methodius, Faculty of Philology" Blaze Koneski.
[10] M. Vaneva, (2013), "A Cognitive Approach to Prototypical Cases of Between-class Zero Derivation in Macedonian", *European Scientific Journal*, vol. 9, No. 20, pp. 82-84.
[11] R. Quirk, S. Greenbaum, G. Leech, and J. Svartvik, (1972), A Grammar of Contemporary English. London: Longman Group Limited.
[12] The New Oxford Dictionary of English, (1998), J. Pearsall and P. Hans (eds.), 1ed ed, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
[13] The Oxford American College Dictionary, (2002), New York: Oxford University Press.
[14] V. Adams, (1973), An Introduction to Modern English Word-formation. London: Longman.