Conversion in English: homonymy, polysemy and paronymy[1]

S A L V A D O R   V A L E R A   and   A L B A   E .   R U Z
University of Granada
(Received 1 October 2018; revised 30 October 2019)

Conversion is a key type of word-formation process in English, but the precise nature of the relation between base and derivative in conversion is rarely discussed, even if conversion is considered as a dynamic process. When it is considered explicitly, the relation has been described in terms of paradigmatic relations between lexemes, specifically homonymy or polysemy. This is usually without any specification of how converted words accommodate the conditions set by the definition of each of these relations, and as a special type of one or the other, because conversion-related words violate some of those conditions. This article is intended as a systematic review of the literature that discusses the relation between conversion-related words in English. We show that a wide range of proposals have been made to describe the relation: homonymy, heterosemy, homomorphy, zero-derivation (as a relation), polysemy, lexical extension, synsemy, hyponymy and paronymy. We review the extent to which each of these terms fits the relationship in major types of conversion, and argue that, if a relationship is to be described between conversion-related pairs, then Cruse's (1986) separation of semantic relations of a paradigmatic type from paronymic relations is of special relevance here. We propose that, regardless of the direction and type of meaning, paronymy applies across the various specific semantic patterns that conversion may involve. We emphasize, however, the possibility of several relations according to the type of conversion, i.e. different types of conversion may need description in terms of a different relation.

Keywords: conversion, lexical semantics, homonymy, polysemy, paronymy

1 Introduction

In 1968, Miloš Dokulil (1968: 215) placed derivation by conversion at the crossroads of morphology, syntax and lexical semantics. Barely a decade later, Dieter Kastovsky (1977) located word-formation 'at the crossroads of morphology, syntax, semantics, and the lexicon', again for the intricate connections that these levels of language description manifest in word-formation.[2] This article finds inspiration in Dokulil and Kastovsky for the description of a rather neglected side of the process known as CONVERSION,[3] namely the relationship between conversion-related pairs.

---

[1] We would like to thank the editor and two anonymous reviewers for their insightful comments on a previous version of this article. This article has been supported by the Spanish State Research Agency (SRA, Ministry of Economy and Enterprise) and European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) (Ref. FFI2017-89665-P).

[2] Cf. also Kastovsky (1995: 166): 'word-formation itself as a borderline area between syntax and the lexicon, and that it therefore has to be described from both points of view.'

[3] Also described as *zero-derivation* (e.g. in Marchand 1969: 359; Kastovsky 1989; Lipka 1990: 85–6; among many others), hereafter referred to only as *conversion*.

This is a relevant question because, even if conversion shares morphological, syntactic and lexical properties with other word-formation processes, it raises questions of its own as a result of the formal identity involved in conversion, and these questions do not apply in other word-formation processes. The relevance of the issue is shown by the number of interpretations available in the literature for the relationship between conversion-related words and also by the lack of a precise term or by the uncertainty of the terms of the description. This is witnessed, among others, by such major texts as Bauer, Lieber & Plag (2013: 546, our emphasis), which cites this as one of the issues that are still to be answered in conversion:

> [s]omewhere in the range between homonymy and polysemy is a set of homophonous words which are generally taken to be derivationally related. The base forms or citation forms of two lexemes are homophonous, but the two lexemes belong to different word classes …, despite being semantically related.

Similar references can be found in the literature at least since as far back as Quirk, Greenbaum, Leech & Svartvik (1985: 70), who pointed out that '[t]here is no standard term for words which also share the same morphological form'. The same point can be found in Persson (1988: 271):

> [i]n many cases one 'parent lexeme' (cf. Clark & Clark 1979) is seen to yield two or more phonologically identical forms which are not analyzable in terms of either homonymy or polysemy [and] some other solution will have to be sought for.

These and other texts show repeated attempts in the literature at the identification of the relationship between conversion-related pairs as homonymy, as polysemy, or in other terms (see section 2). As pointed out by an anonymous reviewer, it should be stated first why and whether such a relationship needs description. The formal identity inherent in conversion refers converted words to relations of formal identity, more evidently in word-based than in stem-based or root-based conversion, i.e. more evidently e.g. in English ($work^V$ vs $work^N$) than in German ($arbeit \cdot en^V$ vs $Arbeit^N$) or Spanish ($trabaj \cdot ar^V$ vs $trabaj \cdot o^N$). Otherwise, and despite the literature on the subject, it can be argued whether the relation between base and derivative in conversion is in special need of description compared with the relation between base and derivative in other word-formation processes.

The article conducts a systematic review of material that deals with conversion in English as a dynamic word-formation process whereby a base is used for formation of a derivative under the conditions of formal identity (with the usual exceptions of stress shift, final voicing or vowel reduction) and word-class contrast (Leech 1974: 214; Lieber 1981: 187 *et passim*; Bauer 1983: 32; Quirk *et al.* 1985: 1520, 1558; Don 1993; Štekauer 1996: 15 *et passim*; Vogel 1996: 258 *et passim*; Bauer & Huddleston 2002: 1640; Manova 2011: 55 *et passim*; Bauer *et al.* 2013: 562–3). Comparatively few of these titles discuss the topic at issue here, so any material within the recent literature on word-formation and/or lexicology involving conversion and/or lexical relations was reviewed for potentially relevant reference to this topic.

This article does not consider views that do not involve a relationship between words, e.g. the interpretation of conversion as 'multifunctionality' or 'word-class

underspecification' (originally in Whorf 1945; later recalled e.g. in Lipka 1971: 213–15; Nida 1975: 99; Robins 1987: 58 under the term 'grammatical neutrals' and, more recently, in Farrell 2001: 109, 116, 128 and Bauer *et al.* 2013: 565–6, among others). Under the latter interpretation, these words are not the result of a process and behave as roots unspecified for word class, such that the same lexical element can surface as various arbitrary linguistic categories, i.e. as various word classes. A similar case can be made for the interpretation of these examples as transflexion (e.g. in Ivanová & Ološtiak 2015), described as 'a word-formation procedure common in Slavic languages in which a new word is coined by a change of grammatical morpheme' (Ivanová 2016: 22; cf. similarly 'dérivation immédiate', 'transfert grammatical' and 'unmittelbare Ableitung' in Pennanen 1984 and Kastovsky 1994, 'paradigmatic derivation' in Nagórko 2015 or mere 'inflection' in Riese 2015).

The contents of the article are arranged as a review in order to consider the most common interpretations of the relationship between conversion-related pairs attested in the literature. For easier reading, section 2 is arranged according to which side of conversion-related pairs can be used for the description of their relationship: form or meaning. This arrangement does not assume any formal or semantic priority to the material reviewed. Section 3 reviews types of conversion with respect to these relationships. Section 4 argues for a description in terms of none of the relations reviewed, and section 5 closes with a conclusion and a recapitulation of the relationship between conversion-related words available in the literature and of their descriptive accuracy. As a result, the article identifies an area that has been dealt with very dissimilarly, and one on which no agreement has been reached and is often unnoticed. The article brings together titles from three fields (morphology, syntax, lexicology), many of which are unknown to specialists outside their own field, and argues for a redefinition of this relation away from the homonymy/polysemy debate in which recent and authoritative titles (e.g. Bauer, Lieber & Plag 2013) describe the relation.

2   The relationship in conversion-related pairs

This section reviews the relationships that are proposed in the literature for conversion-related pairs. The review considers general material, and texts in lexical semantics and in morphology, and separates the description of conversion into relationships according to formal identity (section 2.1.1) and according to morphological identity (section 2.1.2).

2.1   Relationships according to identity

2.1.1   Mere formal identity: homonymy

Conversion-related pairs are most often described in terms of HOMONYMY. In some cases, the use of this term can be considered to stand for mere formal identity rather than for the relationship in the strict sense:

> The notion of zero-morpheme … accounts for the fact that two *homonymous* lexemes, which
> are superficially identical, are in a synchronically directed relationship. One lexeme is the
> base, while the other one is derived from it by means of a zero-suffix. (Lipka 1990: 86,
> our emphasis; cf. similarly Adams 1973: 38; 2001: 100; Robins 1987: 56, among many
> others)

Even if the use of the term is not intended as the lexical relation but as plain formal identity,
the literature offers texts that view conversion-related pairs as homonymy, or as a type of
homonymy (Jespersen 1909–49, vol. VI: 84; 1933: 43; Lyons 1977, vol. II: 560; Paul
1982: 305; Lipka 1986: 134, 137; 1990: 138, 140; Bauer & Huddleston 2002: 1641,
1644). Thus, Lipka (1990) continues by arguing that:

> it is nevertheless advisable to include zero-derivation with homonymy, since there are clear
> grammatical differences (word class) and there is also the close parallelism with overt
> suffixal derivatives (Lipka 1990: 140)

Some of these texts qualify the term in one way or the other, e.g. as 'grammatical
homonyms' or 'grammatical homophones' (Jespersen 1933: 43; Marchand 1963: 176;
cf. also Kerleroux 1999: 99).

   Various interpretations of homonymy are available in the literature. The traditional and
most widely accepted view treats homonymy as the paradigmatic relation between two
units, words or morphemes, which accidentally have the same phonological and
orthographic form (Ullmann 1962: 159; Leech 1974: 228–30; Lyons 1977, vol. II:
550; 1981: 146; Cruse 1986: 80; Lipka 1986: 128–9; 1990: 75; Magnusson & Persson
1986: 27–34; Persson 1988: 269–70; 1990: 141–3, 160; van Sterkenburg 1996: 401;
Saeed 1997: 63;[4] Tournier 2007: 337; Goddard 2011: 22; Martsa 2013: 201). By
'accidentally' (as, e.g., in Goddard 2011), 'coincidental' or 'causally unrelated' (as,
e.g., in Magnusson & Persson 1986: 31–4; cf. also Persson 1988: 269–70), it is meant
that the units are historically or morphologically unrelated (Quirk *et al.* 1985: 70), their
meanings being unrelated too (Plag, Braun, Lappe & Schramm 2007: 164), as
emphasized in Stockwell & Minkova (2001: 147–8). By implication, no relation can
be established between homonymous words beyond the form, as lexemes are
semantically, etymologically and morphologically unrelated, and the formal identity is
unmotivated.

   Of the conditions set in the literature for so-called absolute homonymy (semantic
unrelatedness, formal identity and syntactic equivalence), only the former seems to be
a necessary condition (Lyons 1977, vol. II: 560). This is because special types of
homonymy ('partial homonymy') are considered when the second condition does not
apply (i.e. they are homographs or homophones), or when the third condition does not
apply (i.e. where two formally identical and semantically unrelated lexemes belong to

---

[4]   Saeed (1997: 64) deviates from tradition in considering homonymy as dealing with multiple unrelated senses of the
      same phonological word, instead of unrelated meanings of two words or lexemes. Leaving aside this terminological
      difference, the implications of his description are similar.

different syntactic categories or word classes). Of these two less central cases of homonymy, only the latter is of relevance for this article.

Most texts appear to relate homonymy only to lexemes of the same word class, perhaps because it is in pairs of the same category where the lexical ambiguity usually associated with homonymy typically emerges. Word-class contrast is not one of the conditions for homonymy, even if some variation can be noticed in the literature in this regard. Thus, Lyons (1977, vol. II: 560) argues that 'no two lexemes can be absolutely homonymous if they are members of different parts-of-speech'.[5] Ullmann (1962: 159), Lipka (1990: 138, 140) and Saeed (1997: 64) accept homonymy across different word classes, and Bergenholtz & Agerbo (2014) argue that a separate type of homonymy may obtain when there is word-class contrast.

The description of conversion-related pairs as homonymy accounts successfully for the condition of formal identity mentioned in section 1, but not for the fact that 'the two functions are nonaccidental variants of the same fundamental linguistic unit' or for the 'basic invariance of core meaning across these [two different syntactic] functions' displayed in conversion (both as described by Sanders 1988: 157). The different etymological origins and the semantic contrast that are usual tests for identification of formally identical terms as separate words do not apply in conversion-related pairs:

(i) In the first test, there seems to be little discussion as to whether a new word is formed in conversion or not:[6] conversion-related pairs are morphological base and derivative with respect to each other and their formal identity is, unlike in homonymy, not unmotivated.

(ii) In the second test, because the semantic contrast in conversion usually limits itself to contrast in categorial meaning, and this contrast entails a relatedness that has even been described as *senses* (e.g. in Murphy 2010: 96 and Koskela & Murphy 2006: 743; the contrast in terms of categorial meaning can be seen in the semantic patterns found, e.g. in noun-to-verb conversion as summarized, among others, in Plag 1999: 219–20; cf. also Štekauer 1996, and Bauer & Valera 2005, on the interpretation of conversion in terms of what belongs in specific lexical classes or word classes). The description of homonymy across word classes depends partly on the semantic proximity perceived in the words in question, and this proximity has been valued differently in the literature: from change of meaning across the word classes involved (e.g. as in Leech 1974: 214–16 or Akmajian, Demers, Farmer & Harnish 2001: 28) to little difference in 'relevant information content' (as in Deane 1988: 350; cf. similarly Beard 1998: 60 on transposition in general).

---

[5] Lyons (1977, vol. II: 560, 562) accepts as homonymy 'members of different parts-of-speech', but not as absolute homonyms, e.g. *row*[N] 'sequence' vs *row*[V] 'move boat with paddle' as partial homography, and *sea*[N] 'large body of water' vs *see*[V] 'to perceive with the eyes' as partial homophony.

[6] As mentioned in section 1, the view that conversion is not a dynamic process and responds to grammatically different expressions of one psycholinguistic category does not lend itself to this analysis on the grounds that word class is a surface feature.

The description of conversion-related pairs as homonymy in the light of these tests leads to contradictions in terms. These manifest themselves, e.g. in the report of homonymous lexemes that share a 'common meaning' (Lipka 1990: 138, 140; cf. also Lipka 1986: 134, 137), 'etymologically related' homonyms (Koskela & Murphy 2006: 743), or homonymy, even if 'this entails that some of the homonymous meanings are semantically closer connected than others' (Bergenholtz & Agerbo 2014: 32). Homonymy has therefore been explicitly disqualified as a description of conversion-related pairs on these grounds in a number of texts (cf. Magnusson & Persson 1986: 45–6 and Persson 1988: 277–8).

2.1.2 Morphological identity: heterosemy, homomorphy

In the second possibility under review, identity as a morphological property, the relation between conversion-related pairs is described by terms that lay emphasis on the semantic diversity associated with one form (HETEROSEMY) or on the occurrence of one morpheme associated with various meanings (HOMOMORPHY), i.e. focusing in each case on one of the conditions for conversion to obtain.

'Heterosemy' has been proposed as a middle term between homonymy and polysemy (Persson 1990: 156, 158), as Persson (1988: 276) argues, 'because of the "split but united" relation which is thus one of its [conversion's] chief characteristics' and that disqualifies both homonymy and polysemy. 'Heterosemy' has been interpreted variously, also because Persson's (1988) words may be interpreted as applying to the terms related by conversion[7] and also to the various senses within one derivative by conversion. Of these, the latter sense has been adopted in the literature, e.g. in Kreidler (1988: 75) to define heterosemy as 'the relation between co-hyponyms of a homophonous superordinate', in line with Magnusson & Persson (1986: 42–5), and Persson (1988: 276–7).[8] This view of heterosemy requires a manifest causal link between the members of the relation, such that the loss of this link results in plain homonymy even if the terms are originally related by a causal link as derivatives of the same parent lexeme (Persson 1988: 278–9; cf. similarly Magnusson & Persson 1986: 36–7, 41–2).

---

[7] 'For this particular lexical relation, which is quite frequent in English because of the numerous instances of conversion or zero-formation in this language, we propose to use the term *heterosemy*, which is designed to hint at **both the semantic difference** at the "horizontal" level between the homophonous co-hyponyms **and at their joint semantic source or parent lexeme**' (Persson 1988: 276, italics as in the original, our bold for emphasis).

[8] In view of the possible interpretations of the term, this note cites all the definitions of heterosemy by Persson. None of them seems to apply to conversion-related pairs.
  – The term 'heterosemy' is intended to cover the particular lexical relation that arises when two phonologically identical items which are causally unrelated and hence have different senses and denotations, are derivationally related through their common superordinate parent lexeme. (Magnusson & Persson 1986: 42)
  – Heterosemy is the relation between two terms which are co-hyponyms of a superordinate and whose relation of contrast is morphologically unmarked. (Magnusson & Persson 1986: 43; also in Persson 1988: 276)
  – 'Heterosemy' … is defined as a 'horizontal sense relation between phonologically identical co-hyponyms of a common superordinate'. (Persson 1990: 156)
  – 'Heterosemy': the relationship between phonologically identical but semantically contrastive lexemes separately derived from the same parent lexeme. (Persson 1990: 160)

For this reason, Persson (1988: 278–9) limits heterosemy to synchronic derivation, meaning that heterosemy refers only to where the link between the terms of the relation is clear, i.e. not obscured or lost over time.

Magnusson & Persson (1986: 43–4) and Persson (1988: 274–6) do not use 'heterosemy' for the relationship between words across word classes but, e.g., for two nouns derived from the same verb (e.g. the various nouns *drive* derived from the verb *drive*). Still, the term 'heterosemy' has been interpreted as applicable to the relation between conversion-related pairs (Persson 1988, cited in Lichtenberk 1991: 476; Enfield 2006: 297), and has also been adapted to apply to cases 'where two or more meanings or functions that are historically related, in the sense of deriving from the same ultimate source, are borne by reflexes of the common source element that belong in different morphosyntactic categories' (Lichtenberk 1991: 476). In the latter case, Lichtenberk's (1991: 476) interpretation does not necessarily assume that conversion qualifies as heterosemy, nor does it assume a common core sense across terms, as usually happens in conversion. At least in Lichtenberk (1991), 'heterosemy' is therefore applied only to instances of grammaticalization.[9] Thus, Brugman (1984, cited in Heine 1997: 9) notes that *over* 'is an instance of polysemy even if it has prepositional, adverbial, and derivational uses and hence is associated with different morphosyntactic categories'. In this view, heterosemy is considered a special type of polysemy.

A partly similar case to Lichtenberk (1991) is Enfield (2006). Unlike Magnusson & Persson (1986) and Persson (1988), Enfield (2006: 297–8, 310) uses 'heterosemy' for conversion, if a word is both polysemous and a member of two word classes. Enfield (2006: 297 *et passim*) distinguishes three types of heterosemy:

(i) open-class heterosemy, in which central conversion belongs,
(ii) closed-class heterosemy (e.g. *to* as the infinitive mark and as a preposition), and
(iii) cross-class heterosemy (e.g. *have* as a main verb and as an auxiliary verb).

Leaving aside the potential conceptual ambiguity of the occurrence of 'meanings or functions' as in Lichtenberk's (1991: 476) quotation above, and the uneven use of the term 'heterosemy', this definition in principle covers central cases of conversion and avoids some of the contradictions raised by the use of the concept 'homonymy' listed at the end of section 2.1.1. Despite the disparate use of the term, it offers advantages for the higher descriptive accuracy and for the avoidance of the said contradictions. It also allows higher internal homogeneity within homonymy by excluding conversion-related pairs and the additional possibility of occurrence of homonymy across word classes.

Whereas heterosemy lays emphasis on semantic contrast, homomorphy lays emphasis on formal identity. 'Homomorphy' was specifically proposed for conversion-related pairs, or cases where a relation by conversion may be posited and, unlike

---

[9] 'A lexical element undergoing grammaticalization may display certain new properties – semantic as well as formal – while at the same time retaining some of its original properties' (Lichtenberk 1991: 477).

ZERO-DERIVATION (as used in Sanders 1988), it is specific to the relationship, i.e. it is not used for both the process and the relationship. Originally coined in this sense by Quirk *et al.* (1985: 70–1), homomorphy is presented alongside other equivalence relations between words, namely homonymy and synonymy. Of these, homonyms and their subtypes, homographs and homophones, are defined as morphologically unrelated words that have the same phonological or orthographic shape. For words with the same morphological form (i.e. not just formally identical) and different syntactic function, Quirk *et al.* (1985: 70) propose the term 'homomorph'. Quirk *et al.* (1985: 71) thus account for instances of conversion, i.e. where words share the same stem morpheme and are related through a process of word-formation in a semantically systematic way. Remarkably, the term is ambiguous in several respects (cf. Valera Hernández 1996): e.g. regarding its use with reference to grammatical or lexical words (Quirk *et al.* 1985: 70–1), and regarding other processes where words share the same stem or morphological form and belong to different syntactic categories, including cases where grammatical words are formed from apparently open word classes (i.e. potentially involving grammaticalization, as in *down*[Adv] and *down*[Prep]). In the latter respect, Quirk *et al.*'s (1985) use of 'homomorphy' and Lichtenberk's (1991) use of 'heterosemy' coincide, despite the substantial differences between conversion and grammaticalization, both from an output-oriented and from a process-oriented point of view.

2.2 *Relationships according to semantic contrast: polysemy, synsemy, hyponymy*

The relationship between conversion-related pairs has also been described with a focus on semantic contrast. The most frequent interpretation under this approach is in terms of POLYSEMY (cf. e.g. Miller 1978: 102–5 on a rule for sense extension from a core sense as a semantic link between verbs and nouns, cited in Martsa 2013: 208; cf. also Lehrer 1990: 208–9, cited in Martsa 2013: 207–10; Tătaru 2002, cited in Frățilă 2011: 56). Under this approach it is assumed that conversion is a non-standard, non-prototypical type of polysemy (Martsa 2013: 209–10; cf. also Martsa 2002, cited in Martsa 2013: 202), 'intercategorial polysemy' (cf. Zawada 2006: 247, cited in Martsa 2013: 210), or 'functional polysemy' (Tătaru 2002), applicable to formally identical, semantically and derivationally related, and syntactically different word pairs.

Polysemy is typically described as the paradigmatic lexical relation between different, related senses (for some authors, *meanings*, e.g. Lipka 1990: 75, 136; Heine 1997: 8; Saeed 1997: 64; Stockwell & Minkova 2001: 147–8) of one lexeme, lexical entry or word (Ullmann 1957: 117; 1962: 159; Leech 1974: 228–30; Lyons 1977, vol. II: 550 *et passim*; 1981: 146; Cruse 1986: 80; Magnusson & Persson 1986: 27–34; Persson 1990: 141–3; van Sterkenburg 1996: 409; Plag *et al.* 2007: 163; Goddard 2011: 23; Rainer 2014: 338 *et passim*).

Unlike homonymy, polysemy attests a semantic connection between senses of the general meaning of one lexeme. For this reason, it has sometimes been described under the condition that the senses be 'causally related' (Persson 1988: 270; 1990: 143–6,

152–3, 160). The connection is often one of a literal versus a figurative or extended sense, and this is one of the respects where polysemy does not cover all the properties of the relationship between conversion-related pairs: while, unlike homonymy, an interpretation in terms of polysemy accounts for the formal identity, for the morphological relation resulting from the use of one and the same morpheme, and for the common etymological origin, it does not account for the semantic contrast, and this in two senses:

(i) the semantic contrast in polysemous pairs is usually understood as a contrast between literal and figurative senses, and the contrast in categorial meaning is not typically accounted for in most cases of polysemy or in regular polysemy, and

(ii) the semantic contrast between conversion-related pairs is usually understood as a contrast between categorial meanings,[10] even if figures of speech like metonymy or metaphor may be involved in conversion too.

Lexical extension mechanisms, mainly METAPHOR and METONYMY, have been proposed to account for or to occur in conversion (Paul 1982: 305; Crocco-Galeas 1990: 27–8; Twardzisz 1997: 35 *et passim*; Kövecses & Radden 1998: 54–5; Dirven 1999: 277–9; Radden & Kövecses 1999: 37; Schönefeld 2005: 149–50; Martsa 2013: 202, 205, 211; cf. also Manova 2011: 62–4 and Bauer 2018, the latter especially on noun/verb conversion). Under this view, semantic change and word-class change are taken as the result of figurative extension in conversion.

Metaphor and metonymy are extremely productive semantic processes in the lexicon (Lipka 1990: 163–5), and major processes involving figurative extension of meaning and word-class change. These processes are sometimes explained as 'dual categorization' (Lipka 1988, cited as 'Lipka 1988b' in Lipka 1990: 124), as 'secondary' or 'multiple categorization' (Lipka 1990: 186, for metaphor), or as 'semantic' or 'inner derivation' (Lipka 1986: 134), on the grounds that metaphor and metonymy occur within one and the same lexeme. Of these, metaphorical extension of meaning creates new relations (Ullmann 1962: 212–18), e.g. *to* fish *for information/for a rich man* (Dirven 1999: 281), and is typically described as:

a LINGUISTIC INSTRUMENT whereby a linguistic form designating an element from one conceptual sphere is used (figuratively) to talk about an element from another conceptual sphere. (Lichtenberk 1991: 478, emphasis as in the original)

By contrast, metonymy is simply described as 'a word used for another, with which there is some special association, as in space or time' (Stockwell & Minkova 2001: 149) or as belonging:

---

[10] '[I].e., the meaning a word has by virtue of being noun or verb, etc.' (Pounder 2000: 98). This is also described as 'categorial semantic properties' in Magnusson & Persson (1986: 15–20), with emphasis on the syntactic properties associated with the semantic profile of each word class.

to the wider set of strategies of finding a point in the common reference space between a speaker and a listener that can serve as a bridge or link to the intended referent. (Langacker 1991: 170 *et passim*, cited in Dirven 1999: 275)

This is often within the same word class (cf. e.g. Ullmann 1962: 218–20). Dirven (1999: 277–9) cites a special type of metonymy, 'event-schema metonymy' for cases of conversion, on the argument that a salient feature or participant becomes the main designation for the event itself, as in e.g. *The waitress* cleaned *the table*. Dirven (1999: 277 *et passim*) also distinguishes mainly between the action schema e.g. *to fish*, the location or motion schema e.g. *to bottle*, and the essive schema e.g. *to author*. In line with Dirven, Colman & Anderson (2004: 547) argue that lexicalized metonymies are conversions, and that they do not result in polysemy.

Conversion is therefore related via metaphor and metonymy to polysemy, which is often claimed to be the result of metaphorical extension (e.g. in Ullmann 1962: 185; Lyons 1977, vol. II: 567; Tournier 2007: 49; Saeed 1997: 307). Specifically, it has been argued that:

> [t]he polysemous nature of the semantic link between conversion pairs … is based on the assumption that the senses of converted words are largely predictable through metonymic and/or metaphoric mappings from the relevant senses of parent words, or, perhaps more frequently, from the language users' encyclopaedic knowledge encapsulated in the lexical meanings of parent words. (Martsa 2013: 224)

Thus, even though the view of polysemy as the lexical relation between conversion-related pairs may not be frequent in the literature, it lies behind the descriptions that argue that figurative or lexical extension of meaning may give rise to conversion.

The description of conversion-related pairs as cases of polysemy has been explicitly excluded on the grounds of the existence of a word-class contrast (cf. e.g. Béjoint 2010: 299; Manova 2011: 62–4, also against metaphor in conversion; cf. also Goddard 2011: 25), and on the grounds of the existence of separate words instead of senses of one word (cf. Magnusson & Persson 1986: 45–6 and Persson 1988: 277–8). In general, descriptions of conversion-related pairs as polysemy are fewer than as homonymy, and usually use some specification of the term: besides the abovementioned 'intercategorial polysemy' and 'functional polysemy', the literature also features reference to 'closed referential polysemy' in Deane (1988: 349) and in Dirven (1999, cited in Rainer 2014: 339), or to 'regular polysemy' in Koskela & Murphy (2006: 743). Another example is Nida's (1975: 97–9) description of homophones that are semantically related, versus homophones that are not, and where the former are 'a single morpheme' and the latter are not.[11]

A second relationship can be listed in this section: SYNSEMY. Various interpretations are available in the literature. This is partly because Magnusson & Persson (1986: 47–51) and

---

[11] This, partly because in Nida's framework polysemy does not have a place.

Persson (1988: 277–8) use 'synsemy' for cases where there is causal relation, co-sense, same category and phonological identity (e.g. transitive and intransitive *stand*[V]), and which are graphically represented and described as a '"[v]ertical" sense relation between phonologically identical *superordinate* and *subcategorial* hyponyms' (our emphasis). In a later publication, Persson (1990: 156, 159) defined synsemy as 'the sense relation that obtains between a parent lexeme and a phonologically identical subcategorial hyponym', exemplified again with transitive and intransitive *stand*[V], but where it seems clear that synsemy does not apply across word classes (despite the use of the term 'zero-derivation' in this regard: '[t]he most typical cases occur among verbs with intransitive and zero-derived transitive versions', Persson 1990: 159; cf. also Magnusson & Persson 1986: 50–1).[12]

This interpretation of 'synsemy' differs from Magnusson & Persson's (1986, cited in Steinvall 2002: 146, emphasis as in the original), where Steinvall notes:

> there is a qualitative distinction between homophonous transcategorial derivatives and polysemous items belonging to the same category. The transcategorial relation (i.e. involving shift of word class) is called **synsemy**.

In a review of Magnusson & Persson (1986), Kreidler (1988: 75, our emphasis) argues that the term 'synsemy' is used for:

> the vertical sense relation between superordinate and hyponym *of the same category* which are phonologically identical, as the transitive causative verb *stand* is a hyponym of the intransitive verb *stand*.

Kreidler explains that Magnusson & Persson (1986) use 'categorial hyponymy' for conversion instead of 'synsemy'. Specifically, Persson (1988: 273–4; 1990: 157–8) and Magnusson & Persson (1986: 8–10, 35–8, 40–1, 44) refer to it as 'categorial hyponymy' of a morphologically unmarked transcategorial type, i.e. by contrast with morphologically marked cases (*discover*[V] vs *discovery*[N] or *discoverer*[N]) and with subcategorial cases (e.g. as transitive *stand*[V] vs intransitive *stand*[V]). The term 'categorial hyponymy' is used analogously to 'lexical hyponymy', e.g. *flower–rose–tulip*, where *rose* and *tulip* would be hyponyms of the superordinate *flower* but co-hyponyms to each other. For Magnusson & Persson, the difference between categorial hyponymy and lexical hyponymy lies in the fact that categorial hyponymy is concerned with derivation across word classes and also across subclasses, e.g. transitive and intransitive verbs, gradable and non-gradable adjectives, etc. An example of categorial hyponymy is *wide*[Adj]/*width*[N]/*widen*[V]. However, it is noted that in categorial hyponymy:

---

[12] An additional definition of synsemy can be found in Persson (1990: 160–1):

> the relation between a semantically complex derived lexeme and a phonologically identical parent lexeme within the same category serving as the core concept of the derivate.

there is sometimes a problem in determining which lexeme is the superordinate and in what order that various hyponyms are derived from the superordinate and/or from one another. (Kreidler 1988: 75; cf. also Magnusson & Persson 1986: 38–40)

This issue about directionality is similar to what often happens in conversion. From the examples cited above, it can be seen that not only zero-derived terms are considered, but word-class-changing derivation in general falls under the term 'categorial hyponymy'.

The following section reviews the major cases of conversion and the adequacy of the relationships reviewed above for each of the cases.

3   Conversions and relationships

This section reviews the adequacy of the above relationships with respect to specific types of conversion. Like the preceding sections, it is based on the literature. For a comprehensive summary and, in view of the dissimilar profile that conversion-related pairs may display, this section relies on Bauer *et al.*'s (2013: 546–62) list of cases that can be or have been described in terms of conversion, namely the central type described in Bauer *et al.* (2013: 545–9; see section 3.1), which also covers compounds and phrases in this article, 'formations related to prepositions', 'minor phonological modification', 'participles', 'type coercion', 'adverb formation' and 'compounds and phrases'. All these are briefly reviewed in this subsection for convenience, except participles (discussed in section 3.2), except the type on adverb formation, for whose description this article follows Bauer *et al.* (2013: 559–60) and refers to Valera Hernández (1996), and except the type of compounds and phrases, which falls within the type described in section 3.1 for the reasons argued at the beginning of that section.

As the identification of central conversion with respect to less central cases is not the objective of this article, the types described by the above source as syntactic and therefore not central cases of conversion are not considered below. This exclusion refers to instances of mentioned words (i.e. 'mention versus use', e.g. *but me no buts*), the so-called 'adjective to noun cases' (Bauer *et al.* 2013: 549–51), and instances of type coercion.

Of these, the former diverge from the latter two in several respects, like the type of bases and the productivity, and in that it is not as common as the other two cases or as central conversion. Adjective-to-noun cases cover three types of structures which are described as syntactic developments rather than as conversion:

  (i)   the types *the rich* with plural reference and the type *the new* with singular reference,
 (ii)   the type *an intellectual*, and
(iii)   the type *news*, *burnables*.

The latter is described as less clearly syntactic. As far as this article is concerned, and as a number of structures may hide under this formal profile, only when the latter type becomes lexicalized as a word with different lexical content (e.g. as in *hopeful*[Adj] 'full of hope' vs *hopeful*[N] 'candidate') is it considered to qualify as central conversion. In that case, it can be argued that it shares the essential properties of formal identity,

semantic contrast and grammatical contrast and can be subsumed under the description of central conversion in section 3.1 as far as the relationship is concerned. Finally, and although type coercion has been marginally associated with conversion in the literature (e.g. in Magnusson & Persson 1986: 6–12, 47–9, 54–9), it is usually acknowledged that conversion occurs between primary (not secondary) word-class categories.

Otherwise, it is unclear whether less central cases of conversion can be described in the same terms as central conversion not only as regards the identity of the process, but, as pointed out by an anonymous reviewer, also as regards the relation between base and derivative.

3.1 Central conversion

Central conversion refers to examples like *leaflet*^{N} vs *leaflet*^{V}, *dirty*^{Adj} vs *dirty*^{V} and *spy*^{N} vs *spy*^{V}, which have been identified with 'a definable type of homophony between homonymy and polysemy' (Bauer *et al.* 2013: 546–7). This section also covers conversion of compounds and phrases, insofar as they:

> fairly straightforwardly meet the criteria for conversion set out in Section 25.2: the … forms are homophonous, they clearly belong to distinct word classes, they are semantically related, and their semantic relationships are similar to those found between bases and overtly affixed forms derived from them. (Bauer *et al.* 2013: 561)

The intermediacy of this type of homophony between homonymy and polysemy may find justification in the interpretation of these relationships as ends of a gradient instead of as an opposition (cf., among others, Lipka 1986: 138; 1990: 138–9, 186; Robins 1987: 66; Murphy 2010: 91–3; or Rainer 2014: 339). The relationship that holds in conversion-related pairs would display an intermediate degree of formal/semantic unity that does not fit either end, i.e. it does not fit standard homonymy or standard polysemy. It does not fit standard homonymy, because there is semantic relatedness and because there is a common source. It does not fit standard polysemy, because the semantic contrast is between two words instead of between two senses of one word, and because it is not always in terms of literal versus figurative meaning, but in terms of contrast in categorial meaning, regardless of whether figurative meaning is involved or not. Finally, it does not fit the two of them, homonymy and polysemy, because word-class contrast is a necessary condition in conversion, but is not a condition either in standard homonymy or in standard polysemy. Still, what conversion-related pairs show, and what these authors prove in terms of semantic properties (dependency, scope) and of productivity, is that the relationship between the members of these pairs is derivational, that it is across word classes and entails grammatical contrast, and that it is between at least two words. The point here is that this derivational link, word-class contrast and the existence of two words are not in the definition of homonymy, of polysemy, or in any of the intermediate degrees that may be defined between the two.

In terms of the cases of central conversion, pairs that are perceived in present-day English as conversion, even if their formal identity results from diachronic leveling of inflections, are in a better position to qualify as homonymy, at least as far as

their identity is, as in standard homonymy, accidental. Nonetheless, neither these nor present-day formations for which leveling cannot be attested display the semantic or the historical unrelatedness of homonymy, or the semantic contrast of polysemy.

The terms of this review may also apply to less central types or cases which are described in Bauer *et al.* (2013: 552–5) as formations related to prepositions, and as formations with minor phonological modification, e.g. with devoicing or stress shift. Extension of these arguments to prepositions is in line with other descriptions where open and closed word classes are treated alike (e.g. Persson 1988, cited in Lichtenberk 1991: 476 with respect to 'particles'). Although some of these cases have been considered cases of polysemy, the literature also includes texts where the analysis in terms of polysemy alongside similar word-class transfer between nouns and verbs has also been discarded on the grounds presented above in this section for the rejection of polysemy in conversion (e.g. Goddard 2011: 25 with respect to examples like *behind*).

3.2 Participles

The description of participles as instances of conversion refers to present and past participle forms. The relationship between verbs and other categories under one form in both cases has been described as categorial hyponymy alongside standard conversion, e.g. in Magnusson & Persson (1986: 10–12).

The present participle ending *-ing* qualifies in part as a case of homonymy and as a case of polysemy. The former functions as the contemporary counterpart to the Old English participial suffix in verbs and the Old English derivational suffix for the formation of deverbal nouns *-ung* (cf., among others, titles in historical linguistic work such as Quirk & Wrenn 1957: 112; Wik 1973 and titles in morphological work such as Marchand 1969: 302–5; Dalton-Puffer 1996: 37–9 or Tabor & Traugott 1998: 240–4). The profile of the original inflectional *-ing* form and the derivational form *-ing* has been interpreted in terms of homonymy but also in terms of polysemy, such that contemporary English *-ing* is polysemous in that it may form deverbal adjectives or deverbal nouns (cf. O'Grady & De Guzman 1996: 171). This type of participle thus appears to illustrate, according to several authors, the ends of the gradient between homonymy and polysemy often referred to in the literature.

A similar point can be raised with reference to the past participle, regular and irregular. It can be interpreted as involving both an inflectional suffix and as a derivational suffix for the formation of deverbal adjectives and, therefore, as a case of two separate coexisting affixes (thus, homonymy, e.g. in Adams 1973: 22–3; cf., however, the description in Adams 2001: 6–7 without explicit reference to homonymy or to a different relation). A gradient from pure inflectional to derivational meaning can, however, be traced back from the scale between purely participial instances and purely adjectival instances (cf. Granger 1983), the latter supplying an analogical basis for derivational instances without attested verbs (e.g. *unknown*).

4 Conversion outside paradigmatic relationships

Section 2 reviewed a number of relationships described in the literature for conversion-related pairs. This section reconsiders the main arguments why the relationships may be adequate or not, in addition to the points raised in the above review.

For reasons of space, this section focuses on the relationships most often cited in the literature, specifically homonymy and polysemy. In terms of the relationships that deal with identity (section 2.1), heterosemy and homomorphy are not discussed beyond what was presented in section 2. Both are comparatively less frequently accepted, are relatively ambiguous according to how they are applied, and also involve cases that are not conversion, thereby giving rise to conceptual heterogeneity too. In particular, homomorphy is also listed as an equivalence relation between words and, whereas it may be in wide use in certain forums, it does not feature in the research literature.[13] In terms of the relationships that deal with semantic contrast (section 2.2), no further arguments are given below against the adequacy of synsemy and categorial hyponymy, largely for similar reasons: the two concepts have been interpreted in rather different ways in the literature (in the case of synsemy with substantial conceptual conflict), and both are assumed to involve cases within the same word class, i.e. they are assumed to apply in cases that are described as secondary word-class conversion or type coercion and which are not frequently considered to be cases of conversion.

This section also shows that the use of the concepts of homonymy and polysemy with respect to conversion-related pairs often occurs in a vague sense (presumably intended as mere formal identity). Otherwise, the use of these terms needs some qualification to set them apart from the standard cases that do not involve conversion, or as interpretations of these relationships that encompass a range of cases, one of which (precisely, conversion) is less prototypical in that it involves a word-class contrast or grammatical contrast associated with various word classes. Still (as shown in previous sections), both homonymy and polysemy have been disqualified for the relation between conversion-related pairs.

This section proposes a view that lays emphasis on the separation between a process and a relationship (unlike, e.g. in Sanders 1988, where zero-derivation is seen as both a relationship and a process, or in Bauer 2018, where metonymy is seen as both a relationship and a process). For higher descriptive accuracy in terms of the relationship between conversion-related pairs and in terms of the type of relationship used for the description, this view is also intended to avoid the heterogeneity that the inclusion of conversion adds to the relationships discussed in section 2, e.g. the heterogeneity that conversion as homonymy (or within polysemy) entails with respect to canonical cases of homonymy (or of polysemy).

---

[13] E.g. at Charles University, Prague, 'homomorphy' is a widely used concept (this was pointed out by the audience of a talk delivered within the Fred Jelinek Seminar Series, Institute of Formal and Applied Linguistics, Faculty of Mathematics and Physics, Charles University, Czech Republic).

This view refers specifically to Cruse's separation of semantic relations of a paradigmatic type from paronymic relations. Paronymic relations are described in Cruse (1986: 55) as 'involving identity of root, but difference of syntactic category' between words, e.g. *act > actor*. The term 'paronym', reportedly used as early as in Aristotle's *Categories*, is rare in the discussion of conversion. Aristotle apparently used it for substantives named for their qualities, e.g. *grammarians* get their name from *grammar* (cf. Jones 1972: 117–18; Malcolm 1981: 291–2), and the *brave* get theirs from *bravery* (Jones 1972: 118; 1975: 148). The term also appears, e.g., in Hintikka (1959: 141, cited in Jones 1975: 147): 'two things are paronyms when they are called by different "names" (terms) of which one is nevertheless derived (grammatically) from the other'. Other authors translate or describe Aristotle's notion of paronymy with a focus on the change of word class by modification of the word ending (e.g. Owen 1960: 175, cited in Jones 1975: 147; Ackrill 1963, cited in Jones 1972: 118). The same type of relationship seems to have been given a different name by other authors: Malcolm (1981: 286–7) describes the term 'eponymy' as Plato's equivalent to Aristotle's 'paronymy'. Still, Malcolm (1981: 291–2) notes that Allen (1970: 126) also treats cases such as *the just* and *just*, in which there is no formal difference between the terms, as deviant cases of eponymy or paronymy. Ross (1981: 137) also uses the term in a broader sense, such that '[p]aronyms are morphologically variant (and, for the most part meaning related, but not univocal) n-tuples derived (synchronically) from a common root', with 'morphologically variant' referring to both inflection and derivation. Overall, Cruse (1986) uses the term 'paronymy' not only for the relation in cases involving class-changing derivation where the word ending indicates the change of word class, but also for ZERO-DERIVED PARONYMS, i.e. where there is no overt sign of category change (Cruse 1986: 132), e.g. *hammer*[N] vs *hammer*[V]. Under this view, then, paronymy is the relation between any two derivatives that can be identified as members of different word classes:

> The relationship between one word and another belonging to a different syntactic category and produced from the first by some process of derivation will be called **paronymy**; the derivationally primitive item will be called the **base**, and the derived form the **paronym.** (Cruse 1986: 130, emphasis as in the original)

Paronymic relations involve another relationship, ENDONYMY, defined as a lexical relation 'based on the notion of semantic encapsulation, and [that] involves the incorporation of the meaning of one lexical item in the meaning of another' (Cruse 1986: 123). Although endonymy is initially used by Cruse for 'proportional series' of related words (of different origins), and of the same word class, e.g. *horse* vs *stable* or *cow* vs *byre*, it is also applied to series where the contrast involves lexical items of different syntactic categories, e.g. the relation between *dig* and *spade*. The relevance of this contrast may appear to be far-fetched in that these examples do not involve conversion, but it is not if we consider that the semantic relation between *spade*[N] and *dig*[V] is claimed to be virtually identical to that between *comb*[N] and *comb*[V] (Cruse 1986: 133). The following parallelism can therefore be inferred in these pairs:

[Exonym: dig^{V} (endonym: $spade^{N}$)]
[Exonym: $comb^{V}$ (endonym: $comb^{N}$)]

The two relationships referred to above as 'paronymic relations' are connected to each other: 'in a normal case of base and paronym, the base is an endonym of the paronym' (Cruse 1986: 130).

The profile of conversion-related words is different from that of words which, as in paradigmatic relations, display formal identity or contrast, alongside semantic contrast or identity, and vice versa, without additional grammatical considerations. In this sense, it is not just a lexical relationship, because it involves grammatical contrast. In turn, the profile of conversion-related words is different from that of words which are morphologically related by any other class-changing word-formation processes, because formal identity in conversion is a necessary condition. This brings the question of the form to the fore, so much so that it may have prompted their classification as paradigmatic relations at the cost of the grammatical contrast.

If all the facets of the profile of conversion-related words are to be covered by one relationship, then it must be one that is not only a lexical relationship. Like conversion itself, it must comprehend properties of morphology, syntax (or, in broad terms, grammar) and lexical semantics (as regards both contrast in categorial meaning and lexical formation) because, as in the opening lines of the article, conversion displays properties of morphology, syntax, semantics and the lexicon. This condition seems to be satisfied not by standard paradigmatic relations, but by paronymic relations of the type described by Cruse (1986). Even so, and considering the range of cases that the term 'conversion' covers in the literature, not all instances of so-called conversion may be adequately described as conversion. Aside from the issue of the identification of conversion, this prompts the question whether different types of conversion may involve different types of relations between their bases and their derivatives.

The type discussed as central in section 3.1 qualifies as a paronymic relation in Cruse's (1986) sense: paronymy describes the relation between base and derivative in central conversion more accurately than any of the relations discussed in section 2, because it responds to conversion's profile of formal identity, grammatical contrast and semantic relatedness. Very relevantly for this article (as pointed out in section 1, to cite an anonymous reviewer on the relevance of the description of the relationship between conversion-related pairs), paronymy occurs between derivatives regardless of whether there is formal identity, as in conversion, or not, as in other word-formation processes.

Also, the relation between base and derivative in these examples is not adequately described by any of the relations reviewed in section 2, among others, because the standard definitions of those relations do not cover grammatical (word-class) contrast. The qualifications of those relations that incorporate the grammatical component are, as far as the cases under consideration here are concerned, an unnecessary addition of peripheral cases that is redundant with other relations (in this case, paronymy), and this introduces unnecessary heterogeneity.

This applies to central conversion regardless of the specific semantic pattern involved, e.g. noun-to-verb conversion; i.e. it holds equally well for the converted verb *to widow* when it expresses a resultative meaning ('make into [noun]') as when it expresses an inchoative meaning ('become [noun]'), because the relation between the base noun *widow* and the derived verb *to widow* does not change according to whether the semantic pattern is one or the other.

In principle, the same applies regardless of other variables, like the word classes involved, the directionality, or whether literal or figurative meaning is involved, because the above examples with *widow* are described in terms of paronymy as accurately as when other word classes are involved (e.g. adjective-to-verb conversion *to clean* 'make [adjective]'), as when a different direction is involved (i.e. verb-to-noun conversion *say* 'an instance of [verb]' compared with noun-to-verb conversion in *widow*), or when literal or figurative meaning is involved (e.g. *to watermark* 'provide with [noun]', whether it is a physical or figurative hallmark). In all these cases, the relation between base and derivative involves 'identity of root, but difference of syntactic category', as in Cruse's (1986: 55) quotation above in this section: the identity of root entails semantic relatedness (whether literal or figurative), and the difference of syntactic category responds to the word-class contrast inherent in conversion. As pointed out by two anonymous reviewers, opposite directions and the occurrence of figures of speech respectively may lead to different types of paronymic relations, because e.g. noun-to-verb conversion has rather different semantic properties and uses different semantic patterns than verb-to-noun conversion, and conversion involving metaphor and metonymy involves different semantic properties than conversion involving literal meaning. Even so, all these cases are expected to fall within Cruse's description above and, ultimately, paronymy qualifies for this type of conversion better than the other relations reviewed here. Also, Cruse's (1986: 132) qualification 'zero-derived paronyms' does not introduce heterogeneity to the concept of paronymy, it only specifies the type of units in which paronymy may be found.

By contrast, the type involving participles discussed in section 3.2 lends itself to description as homonymy or polysemy better than as paronymy. Unlike the central type, this type of conversion results from the polyfunctionality and/or polysemanticity of affixes, some of which are known to produce word-class contrast partly as a result of homonymy (cf. the case of *-ing* in section 3.2), some others possibly as a result of polysemy (cf. both the case of *-ing* and of *-ed* in section 3.2). Which of the two possibilities (homonymy or polysemy) fits each best is a more complex question than this article can solve, and one that probably needs different answers for different words, even if broad patterns can be identified. At any rate, what matters here is that in participial conversion homonymy and polysemy fit better than any of the other relations reviewed in this article, including paronymy, because the word-class contrast results from relations of identity: the leveling of several forms as one (homonymy) or the polysemanticity of participial units in *-ed* as states (polysemy).

At a more general level, the point of this article is that two types of conversion, central and participial, involve two types of relations between their respective bases and

derivatives, that only one relation cannot adequately describe the relation between several types of conversion-related words, and that relations between conversion-related pairs do not necessarily have to be in terms of paradigmatic lexical relations: they must also be in terms of paronymic relations, of which even several subtypes may be found according to the participation of figures of speech or according to directionality in conversion.

5   Conclusion

The relationship between conversion-related words has been considered and reconsidered for decades, probably for the reasons listed in the first lines of the article: conversion lies at the crossroads of morphology, syntax and lexical semantics, and each field views the relation differently, from something that is unimportant (and sometimes not even mentioned) to one among various types of relations. Conversion-related pairs have been described in terms of a process (zero-derivation, metonymy), in terms of an ad hoc relationship (homomorphy) or, more often, without special consideration, i.e. very much like bases and their derivatives formed by affixation or compounds. When they have been described in terms of a paradigmatic relation, this is usually homonymy or polysemy, but even in those cases they have been presented as special or non-prototypical cases of each relationship.

   There may not be a need for a relation to describe these words, as in affixation, but if one is considered necessary, then it seems that the usual description in terms of paradigmatic relations like homonymy or polysemy is not entirely accurate, at least for all that is described as conversion, or it may be more accurate for some cases (participial forms) than for others (central cases of conversion). This is because the best framework for the description of the relation between conversion-related pairs should be able to respond to Persson's (1990: 161, our emphasis) claim that:

> phonological identity may disguise a number of different underlying *syntactico*-semantic relations and that the interplay between meaning and form may be much more than the traditional division into homonymy and polysemy seems to imply.

The literature on derivational morphology seldom brings lexical relations in line with morphological properties, and limits itself to the occurrence of formal identity or not, and of semantic relatedness or not. The literature on lexical semantics seldom relates the description of lexical relations based on semantic structures with the morphological connection that may exist between semantically related terms. This approach, which is made explicit e.g. in Magnusson & Persson (1986: 2–4), allows us to describe the relation between conversion-related pairs as lexical relations with a grammatical qualification, as in categorial hyponymy (cf. Magnusson & Persson 1986; Persson 1988), or as a paronymic rather than paradigmatic relation (cf. Cruse 1986). This approach to the relationship between conversion-related terms has received comparatively less attention than any other reviewed above. This is paradoxical considering that the words under discussion display a unique profile that brings together formal, semantic and grammatical conditions, as in the quotations from

Dokulil ([1968](#)) and Kastovsky ([1977](#)) that open the article, and that these three are better covered in the definition of paronymic relations than in terms of the paradigmatic relations that are usually cited and are recalled in the opening paragraph of this section.

Not all the pairs that meet the profile of conversion respond equally well to the conditions or the definitions of each of the relationships discussed here: paronymic relations respond well to central cases of conversion, but paronymic relations do not cover all the possible cases that meet the profile of conversion. Homonymy and polysemy may respond well to the type involving participial forms.

Use of a relationship-oriented rather than an output-oriented approach to conversion, where processes and relationships are clearly separated, may contribute to the identification and separation of the range of formations that meet the profile of the definition of conversion in English.

Authors' address:

Departamento de Filologías Inglesa y Alemana
Facultad de Filosofía y Letras
Campus de Cartuja s/n
University of Granada
Granada 18071
Spain
svalera@ugr.es
albaruz94@correo.ugr.es

References

Ackrill, John L. 1963. *Aristotle:* Categories *and* De interpretatione. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Adams, Valerie. 1973. *An introduction to Modern English word-formation*. London: Longman.

Adams, Valerie. 2001. *Complex words in English*. London: Routledge.

Akmajian, Adrian, Richard A. Demers, Ann K. Farmer & Robert M. Harnish. [1995] 2001. *Linguistics: An introduction to language and communication*, 5th edn. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Allen, Reginald E. 1970. *Plato's 'Euthyphro' and the earlier theory of forms*. London: Routledge.

Bauer, Laurie. 1983. *English word-formation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bauer, Laurie. 2018. Conversion as metonymy. *Word Structure* 11(2), 175–84.

Bauer, Laurie & Rodney Huddleston. 2002. Lexical word-formation. In Rodney Huddleston & Geoffrey K. Pullum, *The Cambridge grammar of the English language*, 1621–721. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bauer, Laurie, Rochelle Lieber & Ingo Plag. 2013. *The Oxford reference guide to English morphology.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bauer, Laurie & Salvador Valera. 2005. Conversion or zero-derivation: An introduction. In Laurie Bauer & Salvador Valera (eds.), *Approaches to conversion/zero-derivation*, 7–17. Münster: Waxmann.

Beard, Robert. 1998. Derivation. In Andrew Spencer & Arnold M. Zwicky (eds.), *The handbook of morphology*, 44–65. Oxford: Blackwell.

Béjoint, Henri. 2010. *The lexicography of English*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bergenholtz, Henning & Heidi Agerbo. 2014. There is no need for the terms *polysemy* and *homonymy* in lexicography. *Lexikos* 24, 27–35.

Brugman, Claudia. 1984. *Metaphor in the elaboration of grammatical categories in Mixtec*. Linguistics department, University of California, Berkeley.

Clark, Eve V. & Herbert H. Clark. 1979. When nouns surface as verbs. *Language* 55(4), 767–811.

Colman, Fran & John M. Anderson. 2004. On metonymy as word-formation: With special reference to Old English. *English Studies* 85, 547–65.

Crocco-Galèas, Grazia. 1990. Conversion as morphological metaphor. In Julián Méndez Dosuna & Carmen Pensado (eds.), *Naturalists at Krems. Papers from the Workshop on Natural Phonology and Morphology*, 23–32. Salamanca: Ediciones de la Universidad de Salamanca.

Cruse, Alan. 1986. *Lexical semantics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dalton-Puffer, Christiane. 1996. *The French influence on Middle English morphology*. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Deane, Paul. 1988. Polysemy and cognition. *Lingua* 75, 325–61.

Dirven, René. 1999. Conversion as a conceptual metonymy of event schemata. In Panther & Radden (eds.), 275–87.

Dokulil, Miloš. 1968. Zur Frage der Konversion und verwandter Wortbildungsvorgänge und -beziehungen. *Travaux linguistiques de Prague* 3, 215–39.

Don, Jan. 1993. Morphological conversion. PhD dissertation, Utrecht University.

Enfield, N. J. 2006. Heterosemy and the grammar-lexicon trade-off. In Felix K. Ameka, Alan Dench & Nicholas Evans (eds.), *Catching language: The standing challenge of grammar writing*, 298–320. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Farrell, Patrick. 2001. Functional shift as category underspecification. *English Language and Linguistics* 5(1), 109–30.

Frățilă, Loredana. 2011. *Words about words: An introduction to English lexicology*. Timisoara: Editura Universității de Vest.

Goddard, Cliff. [1998] 2011. *Semantic analysis: A practical introduction*, 2nd edn. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Granger, Sylviane. 1983. *The 'be' + past participle construction in spoken English: With special emphasis on the passive*. Amsterdam: North-Holland.

Heine, Bernd. 1997. *Cognitive foundations of grammar*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hintikka, Kaarlo J. 1959. Aristotle and the ambiguity of ambiguity. *Inquiry* 2, 137–51.

Ivanová, Martina. 2016. Variation and variants in the dictionary of multiword expressions (focussing on complex nominals/noun compounds). *SKASE Journal of Theoretical Linguistics* 13(3), 14–28.

Ivanová, Martina & Martin Ološtiak. 2015. Slovak. In Müller *et al.* (eds.), 2892–912.

Jespersen, Otto. 1909–49. *A Modern English grammar on historical principles*, vol. VI. Copenhagen: Munksgaard.

Jespersen, Otto. 1933. *Essentials of English grammar*. London: Allen & Unwin.

Jones, Barrington. 1972. Individuals in Aristotle's 'Categories'. *Phronesis* 17(2), 107–23.

Jones, Barrington. 1975. An introduction to the first five chapters of Aristotle's 'Categories'. *Phronesis* 20(2), 146–72.

Kastovsky, Dieter. 1977. Word-formation, or: At the crossroads of morphology, syntax, semantics and the lexicon. *Folia Linguistica* 10, 1–33.

Kastovsky, Dieter. 1989. Typological changes in the history of English word-formation. In Heinz-Joachim Müllenbrock & Renate Noll-Wiemann (eds.), *Anglistentag 1988, Göttingen: Vorträge*, 281–93. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer.

Kastovsky, Dieter. 1994. Verbal derivation in English: A historical survey or Much Ado About Nothing. In Derek Britton (ed.), *English Historical Linguistics 1994. Papers from the 8th*

International Conference on English Historical Linguistics (8. ICEHL, Edinburgh, 19–23 September 1994), 93–117. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Kastovsky, Dieter. 1995. The syntactic aspects of word-formation: Where are we today? In Gunnel Melchers & Beatrice Warren (eds.), *Studies in Anglistics*, 157–69. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell.

Kerleroux, Françoise. 1999. Identification d'un procédé morphologique: La conversion. *Faits de Langues: Revue de Linguistique* 14, 89–100.

Koskela, Anu & M. Lynne Murphy. 2006. Polysemy and homonymy. In Keith Brown (ed.), *Encyclopedia of language and linguistics*, 742–4. Oxford: Elsevier.

Kövecses, Zoltán & Günter Radden. 1998. Metonymy: Developing a cognitive linguistic view. *Cognitive Linguistics* 9(1), 37–77.

Kreidler, Charles W. 1988. Review of Ulf Magnusson & Gunnar Persson, *Facets, phases and foci: Studies in lexical relations in English*, 1986. In Garland Cannon, Ellen L. Barton & Charles W. Kreidler (eds.), Reviews, *Word* 39(1), 74–8.

Langacker, Ronald W. 1991. *Foundations of cognitive grammar*, vol. II: *Descriptive application*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Leech, Geoffrey. 1974. *Semantics*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Lehrer, Adrienne. 1990. Polysemy, conventionality, and the structure of the lexicon. *Cognitive Linguistics* 1–2, 207–46.

Lichtenberk, Frantisek. 1991. Semantic change and heterosemy in grammaticalization. *Language* 67(3), 475–509.

Lieber, Rochelle. 1981. On the organization of the lexicon. PhD dissertation, MIT.

Lipka, Leonhard. 1971. Grammatical categories, lexical items and word-formation. *Foundations of Language* 7, 211–38.

Lipka, Leonhard. 1986. Homonymie, Polysemie und Ableitung im heutigen Englisch. *Zeitschrift für Anglistik und Amerikanistik* 34(2), 128–38.

Lipka, Leonhard. 1988. A rose is a rose is a rose: On simple and dual categorization in natural languages. In Werner Hüllen & Rainer Schulze (eds.), *Understanding the lexicon: Meaning, sense and world knowledge in lexical semantics*, 355–66. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer.

Lipka, Leonhard. 1990. *An outline of English lexicology: Lexical structure, word semantics, and word-formation*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer.

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

Lyons, John. 1981. *Language and linguistics: An introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Magnusson, Ulf & Gunnar Persson. 1986. *Facets, phases and foci: Studies in lexical relations in English*. Umeå: University of Umeå.

Malcolm, John. 1981. Semantics and self-predication in Plato. *Phronesis* 26(3), 286–94.

Manova, Stela. 2011. *Understanding morphological rules: With special emphasis on conversion and subtraction in Bulgarian, Russian and Serbo-Croatian*. Dordrecht: Springer.

Marchand, Hans. 1963. On a question of contrary analysis with derivationally connected but morphologically uncharacterized words. *English Studies* 44, 176–87.

Marchand, Hans. [1960] 1969. *The categories and types of present-day English word-formation: A synchronic-diachronic approach*, 2nd edn. Munich: C. H. Beck.

Martsa, Sándor. 2002. Homonymy vs. polysemy: Conversion in English. In Henrik Gottlieb, Jens E. Mogensen & Arne Zettersten (eds.), *Proceedings of the Tenth International Symposium on Lexicography*, 211–29. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer.

Martsa, Sándor. 2013. *Conversion in English: A cognitive semantic approach*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Miller, George. 1978. Semantic relations among words. In Morris Halle, Joan Bresnan & George A. Miller (eds.), *Linguistic theory and psychological reality*, 60–118. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Müller, Peter O., Ingeborg Ohnheiser, Susan Olsen & Franz Rainer (eds.). 2015. *Word-formation: An international handbook of the languages of Europe*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

Murphy, M. Lynne. 2010. *Lexical meaning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Nagórko, Alicja. 2015. Polish. In Müller *et al.* (eds.), 2831–52.

Nida, Eugene A. 1975. *Exploring semantic structures*. Munich: Wilhelm Fink.

O'Grady, William & Videa P. de Guzman. 1996. Morphology: The analysis of word structure. In William O'Grady, Michael Dobrovolsky & Francis Katamba (eds.), *Contemporary linguistics: An introduction*, 132–80. London: Longman.

Owen, G. E. L. 1960. Logic and metaphysics in some earlier works of Aristotle. In Ingemar Düring & G. E. L. Owen (eds.), *Aristotle and Plato in the mid-fourth century. Papers of the Symposium Aristotelicum held at Oxford in August, 1957*, 163–90. Gothenburg: Almqvist & Wiksell.

Panther, Klaus-Uwe & Günter Radden (eds.). 1999. *Metonymy in language and thought*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Paul, Peter. 1982. Homonyms, semantic divergence and valency. *Lingua* 58(3–4), 291–307.

Pennanen, Esko V. 1984. What happens in conversion? In Håken Ringbom & Matti Rissanen (eds.), *Proceedings from the Second Nordic Conference for English Studies, Hanasaari/Hanaholmen, 19th–21st May 1983*, 79–93. Åbo: Åbo Akademi.

Persson, Gunnar. 1988. Homonymy, polysemy, heterosemy: The types of lexical ambiguity in English. In Karl Hyldgaard-Jensen & Arne Zettersten (eds.), *Proceedings of the Third International Symposium on Lexicography*, 269–80. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer.

Persson, Gunnar. 1990. *Meanings, models and metaphors: A study in lexical semantics in English*. Umeå: University of Umeå.

Plag, Ingo. 1999. *Morphological productivity: Structural constraints across speech and writing*. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Plag, Ingo, Maria Braun, Sabine Lappe & Mareile Schramm. 2007. *Introduction to English linguistics*. Berlin and New York: De Gruyter Mouton.

Pounder, Amanda. 2000. *Processes and paradigms in word-formation morphology*. Berlin and New York: De Gruyter Mouton.

Quirk, Randolph & Charles L. Wrenn. 1957. *An Old English grammar*. London: Methuen.

Quirk, Randolph, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech & Jan Svartvik. 1985. *A comprehensive grammar of the English language*. London: Longman.

Radden, Günter & Zoltán Kövecses. 1999. Towards a theory of metonymy. In Panther & Radden (eds.), 17–59.

Rainer, Franz. 2014. Polysemy in derivation. In Rochelle Lieber & Pavol Štekauer (eds.), *The Oxford handbook of derivational morphology*, 338–53. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Riese, Timothy. 2015. Mari. In Müller *et al.* (eds.), 3275–88.

Robins, Robert H. 1987. Polysemy and the lexicographer. In Robert W. Burchfield (ed.), *Studies in lexicography*, 52–75. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Ross, James F. 1981. *Portraying analogy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Saeed, John I. 1997. *Semantics*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Sanders, Gerald. 1988. Zero derivation and the overt analogue criterion. In Michael Hammond & Michael Noonan (eds.), *Theoretical morphology: Approaches in modern linguistics*, 155–75. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Schönefeld, Doris. 2005. Zero-derivation – functional change – metonymy. In Laurie Bauer & Salvador Valera (eds.), *Approaches to conversion/zero-derivation*, 131–59. Münster: Waxmann.

Steinvall, Anders. 2002. *English colour terms in context*. Umeå: Umeå University.

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

Sterkenburg, Piet van (ed.). 1996. *A practical guide to lexicography*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Stockwell, Robert & Donka Minkova. 2001. *English words: History and structure*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tabor, Whitney & Elizabeth C. Traugott. 1998. Structural scope expansion and grammaticalization. In Anna G. Ramat & Paul J. Hopper (eds.), *The limits of grammaticalization*, 229–72. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Tătaru, Cristina. 2002. *An outline of English lexicology: Word formation*. Cluj-Napoca: Limes.

Tournier, Jean. [1985] 2007. *Introduction descriptive à la lexicogénétique de l'anglais contemporain*, 2nd edn. Paris and Geneva: Champion-Slatkine.

Twardzisz, Piotr. 1997. *Zero derivation in English: A cognitive grammar approach*. Lublin: Uniwersytetu Marii Curie Skłodowskiej.

Ullmann, Stephen. [1951] 1957. *The principles of semantics*, 2nd edn. Oxford: Blackwell.

Ullmann, Stephen. 1962. *Semantics: Introduction to the science of meaning*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Valera Hernández, Salvador. 1996. *Adjetivos y adverbios en inglés: La relación de homomorfia*. Granada: Servicio de Publicaciones de la Universidad de Granada.

Vogel, Petra M. 1996. *Wortarten und Wortartenwechsel: Zu Konversion und verwandten Erscheinungen im Deutschen und in anderen Sprachen* (Studia Linguistica Germanica 39). Berlin and New York: de Gruyter.

Whorf, Benjamin L. 1945. Grammatical categories. *Language* 21, 1–11.

Wik, Berit. 1973. *English nominalisations in -ing: Synchronic and diachronic aspects*. Uppsala: Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis.

Zawada, Britta E. 2006. Linguistic creativity from a cognitive perspective. *Southern African Linguistics and Applied Linguistics* 24(2), 235–25.