

A COGNITIVE APPROACH TO PROTOTYPICAL CASES OF BETWEEN-CLASS ZERO DERIVATION IN MACEDONIAN

Marjana Vaneva, PhD

University American College Skopje, School of Foreign Languages

Abstract

Zero Derivation is a type of word formation whereby from a lexeme that belongs to one lexical category or subcategory a new element is derived that has the same form (in the case with isolating languages) or similar form (with inflecting languages), similar or expanded meaning, and, what is most importantly, it is a member of a different word class or subclass. This process relies on cognition – the ability to understand things by connecting the new, unknown and inexperienced with the old, known and already experienced. The prototypical cases of zero derivation in Macedonian which illustrate formal overlapping between the starting and the resulting lexeme, and, in addition, their subgroup - between-class types will be analysed by showing that the direction of the process is between two classes at a time, that is, the process moves from a lexeme from one class to a lexeme in another class.

Keywords: Cognition, between-class, prototypical, zero derivation

Introduction

The process of zero derivation is primarily derivational because a new element is derived, and is closely connected with lexicology since the newly derived element is a new lexeme, with morphology - because the form of the word plays a crucial role in the process, semantic – since it is the meaning of both lexemes that gives ground for their matching, and, eventually syntactic because the new element receives different function and distribution in a sentence. This formal overlapping, semantic transfer and expansion, and class change are aided and analysed by using the cognitive approach. Namely, the ability to connect the new information with the old one is the driving force in the process of zero derivation, which allows the participants in the conversation to derive new lexemes absolutely freely and non-obstructively, by using cognitive transfer and metaphoric associations. On the basis of the fact whether the new lexeme takes all or some of the

characteristics of the new lexical category or subcategory, **full** and **partial** types of zero derivation can be distinguished. The **full** is otherwise called *total* or *derivational*, while the **partial** is considered to be *syntactic* (Bauer 1983: 227). On the other hand, when taking into consideration the directionality of the process, the following kinds can be analysed: **between-class** zero derivation, **within-class** zero derivation, zero derivation from **minor** to **major** class, and vice versa, zero derivation from **major** to **minor**.

In this paper, as far as the absence of inflectional material is concerned, it is the **prototypical** zero derivation in Macedonian that will be analysed, and its subtype: the **between-class** zero derivation.

There are different terms used to name the process that is subject to our interest, all elaborated by Arnold (1986: 153), but they all have different definitions and imply different interpretations. The term *conversion* defines the process as syntactic, since it means that what happens is that the existent lexeme is converted, actually it only changes its position in the surroundings, and its function is different due to the different position of the same lexeme in the sentence. It claims that nothing derivational happens: we rather deal with one and the same element which is being placed differently, and not two different elements with the same form. Another similar term that goes in favour of this explanation is *functional shift*, which alludes to the fact that only the function of the lexeme is changed or shifted, not its category or subcategory. *Root formation* insists on the explanation that only roots (simple words) are used in the process, not leaving room for derivationally affixed items and compounds. But, the first two definitions are considered to be unacceptable because they are against our tendency to treat this process derivational, not syntactic, and, in continuation, we try to give evidence and proof for our considering this phenomenon to be a derivational one. The third name is again being regarded as inappropriate because complex words also undergo this process, for example in English: **featherbed** *n.* → **featherbed** *v.* Nevertheless, of all these, the term *conversion* is very commonly used in the literature (also by Jackson 1980: 110), referring to the process that we actually name *zero derivation* – a term which gradually fights its place in the modern linguistic analysis. Katamba (1993: 55), like Marchand (1969) and Adams (1973), refers to this process as zero derivation, by analogy to zero derivation in inflectional morphology. It is claimed that zero morphs are used as suffixes in derivational morphology as well. Plag (2003: 197) also states that it is best to assume that zero-forms are possible forms in a language. But, in this kind of derivation, the directionality problem or the natural class is important in determining which element in the pair is the derived part of speech. According to Marchand (1969), 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. This approach of determining the natural class in analyzing the elements that undergo the process of zero derivation is also used by Quirk, Greenbaum, Leech and Svartvik (1972). Bauer (1983: 226) claims that this process allows any lexeme to undergo this process as the need arises and there are no morphological restrictions.

But, it is the *cognitive approach* that has been chosen as the most referential for explaining this process because if we aim at zero deriving a lexeme, which means producing a lexeme with the same form, but different word class or subclass, it is only the meaning that should be seriously considered in order for it to be expanded. Yet, its proper understanding requires from the participants in the conversation to share common background, and to have obtained similar knowledge, so that they can match the two lexemes metaphorically, establish association links, and successfully make cognitive transfer from the first to the second lexeme. The process is pretty simple, both for using and for understanding it, from the speaker's and from the hearer's perspective, and it is only the cognition that should be employed for fruitful communication.

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*. Marchand (1969) 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 by the base, in the case with ornative verbs, and with privative verbs - a lexeme that means to remove from the object the thing denoted by 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.*²⁸

²⁸ These examples, as some other listed previously, are taken from English because this language is abundant with prototypical cases of between-class zero derivation, and in order to manifest the process through examples that exist in the world literature. Of course, the further discussion will focus on the situation in Macedonian.

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.

According to Saeed (1997: 299), linguistic knowledge is part of the general, basic cognition. Cognitive linguists emphasise the difference between formal and functional approach towards the language. The first, to which generative grammar belongs, is very often connected with the claim that knowledge of linguistic structures and rules forms an autonomous model, independent of the other mental processes for attention, memory, and thinking. Thus, studies in cognitive semantics dilute the difference between linguistic knowledge and encyclopedic knowledge of the real world. When it comes to the second, functional approach, taken by the cognitive linguists, making difference among linguistic levels of analysis will not have a positive effect on our language conceptions, because syntax can never be independent of semantics and pragmatics.

In the cognitive-linguistic literature, knowledge is based on conventional structures. In this way, semantic structure is formed to show mental categories that people create from their behaviour and experience in the world. Cognitive linguists agree with Lakoff and Johnson's suggestion (1980) that metaphor is a basic element in our categorization of the world and reasoning processes, hence, in cognitive linguistics the metaphor is a basic instrument for semantic expansion of the word, a model that maps the meaning of a lexeme from one domain to another, in that way connecting the meanings that superficially cannot be connected, but the speaker considers them to be similar and able to connect.

Cognitive linguistics, being a separate branch of linguistics, has its own approach to language, and the language development depends on a person's power to perceive, but people perceive finding similarities between the new elements and the relevant prototype of the category in question. This approach undoubtedly sheds new light on our understanding of the inner structure of the word meaning. This structure turns out not to be autonomous and already determined, but it depends on our basic attitude to the world, while the word meaning is analysed on the basis of similarity with the prototype, that is, with the natural class of the lexeme.

As far as the prototype is concerned, it is the most remarkable element of a category, and Rosch (1977), as cited in Lazarevska-Stancevska (Лазаревска-Станчевска 2004), investigating psychology, classifies the new concepts on the basis of similarity with such an element. Namely, the more the concept resembles the prototype, the bigger the chances are that it is placed in a certain category. This means that the role of the prototype is of immense importance in the cognitive study of lexical meaning, since all

variants in the meaning of one lexeme are connected with the prototype. This connection is by closer or farther metaphoric links, while the speakers understand the abstract concepts through their physical experience. Hence, the principles of the cognitive semantics are: identifying the prototype of a category, making similarities and connections between the prototype, the other meanings of the lexeme, and the metaphor as a means for semantic expansion. Therefore, the metaphor needs to be defined, and here we will take Saeed's quote (1993: 304) of Lakoff and Turner (1989) as cited in Lazarevska-Stancevska (Лазаревска-Станчевска 2004: 2) "Metaphors allow us to understand one domain of experience in terms of another. To serve this function, there must be some grounding, some concepts that are not completely understood via metaphor to serve as source of domains.", or as Alan Cruse (2000: 202) cites the Oxford American Dictionary of metaphor: "The use of a word or phrase to mean something different from the literal meaning." Lazarevska-Stancevska also cites Hopper and Traugott (1993: 77) who define metaphor as understanding and experiencing one kind of thing in relation to and with the help of another kind, when there is direction of transfer from concrete to abstract meaning, as well as Taylor (1995: 132) who explains metaphor as a means with which the more abstract domains are explained and experienced with more familiar and concrete domains. As a matter of fact, by using metaphor we perceive and experience two entities as same and equal although there is no objective 'equality' between those two objects. We suppose equality between two concepts on the basis of perceived similarity between them. But that similarity or mapping is not accidental, it is rather motivated by the analogy that the speakers make, which is based on our cognitive structuring of the world around us (Лазаревска-Станчевска 2004: 3). The two concepts that are involved in a metaphor are the described concept, called the *target* domain, and the other with which the comparison or the analogy is being made, called the *source* domain.

However, from what has been shown up to now that exists in the literature, mainly, about English, which is a language that is rich in this notion, and what will be explored in the continuation of this paper, it is absolutely inevitable to conclude that there is great future awaiting for the process of zero derivation due to the fact that this phenomenon is an enormously easy, productive and creative way of forming new words in the Macedonian language.

Before we direct this analysis to the prototypical cases of zero derivation, we need to have explained the difference between derivation and inflection, something that will differentiate between *prototypical* and *non-prototypical* cases of zero derivation. More explicitly, we ought to say that our subject matter is a lexical-grammatical, or a syntactic process connected with derivation and inflection. The lexical part of the process is reflected in

the lexical changes that happen in the word, and in creation of a new lexeme, while the grammatical or syntactic aspect is visible in the different function that the element acquires depending on its position in the sentence. Certainly, there is derivation in this case, because as the name suggests – **zero derivation**, there is creation of a new lexeme, and the process is zero since this is conducted through the use of covert or zero affix. The inflectional part is also present in this process in a way that in most cases, due to the addition of inflectional suffixes, from the source lexeme, the target lexeme – a result of the process of zero derivation – is being derived.

According to Carter (1998: 10), the general difference between the categories inflection and derivation is that from the stem or stems of a given lexeme, the first forms all word forms which are syntactically determined, while derivation results in forming different lexemes. Thus, the characteristic of inflectional suffixes is to show grammatical variations of a given stem. They don't form new lexemes, nor change the lexical category of the element, but derivations signal lexical variations of the stem, and very often do not change the word class. This means that when there are no formal changes in the stem, derivation happens. To put it more simply, inflectional morphology deals with changes in the word form, which are grammatically caused, while derivational morphology is concerned with lexico-semantic changes.

Inflection is regarded as a part of the grammar when there is addition of suffixes in order to form new word forms, which are grammatical words, but not to form new lexemes, whereas derivation and forming compounds are part of derivation.

In the case with inflectional languages, such as Macedonian, this type of zero derivation does exist although the number of such examples is small due to abundance of inflections, which influence on the word form. Namely, when all inflectional suffixes are removed from the word, what remains is the base, whose structure is studied by derivation:

игра v. (=MB+ØDS) → игра n. (=MB+ØDS)²⁹

In this way, during the process of zero derivation, the target lexeme belongs to a different word class compared with the source one, but in both languages the form of these two lexemes is the same. Therefore, this type of zero derivation is called *prototypical*, since it corresponds to the original, basic definition of the phenomenon when the form is the same, the part of speech is different and the meaning is similar. The clear or prototypical type of zero derivation is analysed at word level (citation entry form, taken from

²⁹ In this and in the other schemes, the interpretation of the symbols is the following: **MB** – motivating base, **DS** – derivational suffix.

dictionary) when nothing is added, that is to say, the derivational suffix is naturally zero, it is formally empty, but also inflectional suffixes are absent, so that the starting and the ending lexeme are absolutely identical.

Prototypical Cases of Between-Class Zero Derivation in Macedonian

In Macedonian, this process is represented through the following types: *from verb to noun, from noun to verb, from noun to adjective, from adjective to noun, from noun to adverb, from adverb to noun, from adjective to adverb, from adverb to adjective, from countable to uncountable noun, from uncountable to countable noun, from proper to common noun, from static to dynamic verb, from transitive to intransitive verb, from intransitive to transitive verb, from static to dynamic adjective, from non-gradable to gradable adjective, from major to minor, and from minor to major* lexical category. In order to discuss this word formation process in Macedonian, we have used the Dictionary of the Macedonian Language (Речник на македонскиот јазик, 1994), which actually doesn't give us information about the etymology of the words and their origin, that is, doesn't offer the information about the natural class which is of immense importance to us for this study, but we take the lexeme, and by using the native speaker's intuition, determine the direction of the process. Hence, we rely on the native speaker's intuition method that is the only one to be used in determining the natural class of lexemes.

Koneski (1995: 23-24) talks about the word formation element in Macedonian that is added to the word derivation base as a formal or a semantic sign of converting the motivating word in a derivative called a word formation formant. It can be expressed with a zero word formation morpheme, when the word form is being semantically changed without any formal shift and, of course, change the word class: *учен човек* → *учен, богати луѓе* → *богати*. More discussion of this will follow in continuation.

Zero derivation from verb to noun

In contemporary Macedonian, the most productive way of noun formation is from verbs. These are words whose original meaning of doing an action produces a lexeme that names a thing, concept or entity. Macedonian is a verbal language, meaning that an enormous number of nouns have been formed from verbs, and the native speaker's intuition tells us that in most cases it is the verb that is created first, while the noun is zero derived from it. More explicitly, by doing the action, we experience the process, the condition, the situation, and the concept.

Here are some cases in which the verb is basic, and the noun is zero derived from it:

игра → **игра**: *Детето си игра во дворот.* → *детска игра*
проба → **проба**: *го проба автомобилот* → *отиде на проба кај шивачката*

сирка → **сирка**: *сирка низ клучалката* → *никаде нема сирка*
штрпка → **штрпка**: *штрпка леб* → *лебот има една штрпка*
кривулка → **кривулка**: *цветката кривулка* → *има една кривулка на цветката.*

The semantic analysis of the examples shows us that the noun comes from the verb by using a metaphor. In the case with **игра**, we first know the action, what it means *to play, to do something in order to have fun*, and then the need to name the action arises, *to name the thing that is done*, which, in the simplest way, would get the same name. This explains how the nominal lexeme that names the result of the action is zero derived from the verbal element that describes the action. This kind of explanation can be used for the other examples, making the association link between the verb and the noun, and following the metaphoric development of the idea in the speaker's mind on the basis of cognition.

Zero derivation from noun to verb

The change from noun to verb does exist in Macedonian, but this is a not very productive group due to the fact that in most cases it is the verb that is basic, and the noun is zero derived from it. Yet, there are examples when the verbal slot in the language system is filled in by using the nominal concept. The following are some of them:

вечера → **вечера**: *Послужија топла вечера.* → *Девојчето вечера во собата.*

ужина → **ужина**: *добива ужина напладне* → *редовно ужина*

санка → **санка**: *Зем ја санката!* → *Везден се санка надвор.*

пумпа → **пумпа**: *оди кај пумпата* → *пумпа вода*

шмиргла → **шмиргла**: *го чисти стаклото со шмиргла* → *го шмиргла стаклото*

четка → **четка**: *четка за заби* → *си ги четка забите.*

In the example with **вечера**, we start with the mental concept for this notion, the one we have in our mind as native speakers of language, when we say that *it is one of the three main meals*, which, as a noun, is first formed and basic, denoting *a meal at night*, and hence the verb is zero derived, meaning *doing the action of eating at night*. The case with **ужина** is very similar, the only difference being a different meal, *having a snack*; otherwise, it is the same concept and the same cognitive transfer is used from noun to verb.

Zero derivation from noun to adjective

Zero derived adjectives from nouns that denote the *material* from which the noun is made are the following:

камен → **камен**: *мост направен од камен* → **камен** *мост*
пламен → **пламен**: *Куката е во пламен.* → **пламен** *столб.*

Zero derived adjectives from nouns of this type, which determine the material from which the noun is made, in the frame of the adjective-noun phrase to the right are the following:

јачмен → **јачмен**: *леб од јачмен* → **јачмен** *леб*

камен → **камен**: *мост направен од камен* → **камен** *мост.*

The example with **камен** shows that the noun stands for the object, and when it changes its natural class, as in the case with the other lexeme, the adjective denotes the material from which the object is made. We start with the noun **камен**, which is *a name of the material*, and in the speaker's mind it can be easily zero derived in an adjective, again referring to *what the noun is made of*, that actually is the base of the semantic-metaphoric expansion.

Here are more examples that, in the productive and creative process of word formation, illustrate the use of nouns like adjectives, when two nouns stand one by another. In such a case, the second remains to be the centre of the noun phrase, while the first receives a function of a determiner and is changed, that is, zero derived in a new, adjectival element, and consequently the attention is being drawn to it because it determines the type of the next lexeme – the noun:

ручек → **ручек**: *Ручекот е готов.* → **ручек** *време*

свер → **свер**: *голем свер* → **свер** *човек*

ветер → **ветер**: *Силен ветер дува.* → **ветер** *работа*

сладолед → **сладолед**: *овошен сладолед* → **сладолед** *торта*

поет → **поет**: *голем поет* → **поет** *револуционер*

лекар → **лекар**: *млад лекар* → **лекар** *специјалист*

домаќин → **домаќин**: *Домаќинот не е дома.* → **домаќин** *човек.*

What is noticeable here and is the same as in the whole group of this type of zero derivation in Macedonian is that in the last example the noun **домаќин** stands before another noun and determines it, assigning to it characteristics that are contained in the noun, so that now the noun **човек** is being modified by the natural noun, but in this case zero derived in an adjective.

Zero derivation from adjective to noun

Some examples that are analysed in this type of zero derivation are the following:

Часовите се држат во лекторска.

Лекторската може да собере најмногу шест студенти.

„Носете ме на железничка.“

Ја обновува железничката.

Денеска има прослава на Филолошки.

Филолошкиот денеска слави.

By giving the previously listed lexemes, Topolinjska (Тополињска, 1998: 65-66) talks about the universal rule that languages with an article make substitution of the adjectives by adding article, and, of course, this also goes for the Macedonian language. In this way nominalized adjectives have been created, such as: **ранетиот** (*ранет човек*), **болниот** (*болен човек*), which are common nouns, and have generic reference since we refer to anyone who is wounded (**ранет**) or ill (**болен**), while the nicknames **Стариот** (*The Old*), **Келавиот** (*The Bald*) have an identifying reference behind which there are specific referents.

This situation shows that we drop part of the name that is well-known and implied, and what we shorten is the noun, while the adjective remains to be part of the phrase. This is a case of zero derivation, because the adjective takes a nominal role. It is evident in the examples below:

свинско месо - свинско

зелено светло – зелено

and the others:

Имате ли јагнешко? (=јагнешко месо)

Дајте ми еден бел. (=бел леб)

Нека влезе болниот. (=болниот човек)

Вариме слатко од јагоди.

Женско кога се раѓа, *стреите плачат.* The examples are taken from Markov (Марков 1986: 72).

When from the structure adjective + noun we come to one word, it is the adjective that remains and takes the denominative function in the whole structure. Some more examples of this type are given by Rose, Pashoska, Karanfilovski (Роус, Пашоска, Каранфиловски 1985: 42) and they are the following:

ликовно *воспитување – ликовно*

класен час – класен

писмена работа – писмена

хируршко отделение – хируршко

зелено светло – зелено

црвено светло – црвено.

We can also look at the following examples:

устен → **устен: устен испит** → **устен**

безопасна → **безопасна: безопасна акција** → *закачува со*
безопасна

женско → **женско: женско чедо** → **Женско** *кога се раѓа, стреите плачат.*

Actually, the starting lexeme on the left is used as an adjective in an adjective-noun phrase, while the result of the process – the lexeme on the right is being zero derived into a noun, when it proves to be enough to mention only the first element from the adjective-noun phrase, since the second element is implicitly present and understood. Thus, the process happens without obstructions, but also the morphological-semantic preconditions for its occurrence are met: the form is not changed and the meaning is expanded.

In all these cases, the cognitive transfer of the meaning from the source to the target lexeme justifies the semantic relation between the members of zero derivation, marking only the syntactic function, and especially emphasizing the fact that a new lexical element is being produced.

Markov (Марков, 1979: 42-43) is another author who lists nouns that are zero derived from adjectives, and such are the following: **дебелко**, **дрвенко**, **црвенко**, **мрзливко**, **плашливко**, **страшливко**, **жолтко**. Let us see the behaviour of these adjective-noun changes through the following examples:

дебелко → **дебелко**: *дебелко дете* → *Дебелко, дојди вamu!*

мрзливко → **мрзливко**: *мрзливко момче* → *Стани, мрзливко!*

жолтко → **жолтко**: *жолтко лице* → *Што ти е, жолтко?*

In these examples, the starting and the resulting lexemes fully maintain the form of the cited lexemes given before the phrases, actually the sentences, and it is without an article. By describing the child as **дебелко**, we refer to its *bigger weight*, and that child is named with the same word form, but with a different word class. This is how that new lexeme, a noun, is zero derived from an adjective. With the expression on the left, we *describe the noun*, while the structure on the right is *an address, vocative form that names the person*.

Namely, B. Koneski (Блаже Конески, 1967) talking about the verbal noun in the contemporary Macedonian prose says that the system of adjectives in the Macedonian standard language is becoming richer, and the attributive use of the verbal noun is increasing. In the Macedonian language, the verbal noun is closer not only to the verb from which it originates, but also to the noun, which is seen in its substantivisation. This is evident in the following examples:

Меѓу нив имаше и работници, и селани, и учени.

*Тој го изживуваше сето **останато**.*

*Не ме интересира твоето **минато**.*

*Ги закопаа **умрените**.*

The processes of shortening are a mutual characteristic of the modern European languages, such as English, Russian, Serbian, French, German and

many others, including Macedonian, especially because this is not a rare case in our language.

Zero derivation from noun to adverb

As parts of speech, the adverbs explain the action and determine it by time, place, manner, quantity and frequency. The examples in this group will show the change of masculine, feminine and neuter nouns in this category:

одред → **одред**: партизански **одред** → *Ги убија сите одред.*

поручек → **поручек**: дојде еден **поручек** → *поручек ќе одиме*

вечер → **вечер**: убава **вечер** → *Ќе дојдат вечер.*

вистина → **вистина**: Ова е чиста **вистина**. → *Послушај ме, вистина ти велам.*

светло → **светло**: Запали **светло**! → *гледа светло на работите*

зло → **зло**: *нужно зло* → *не мисли зло.*

The example with **поручек** shows that the noun denoting a part of the day refers to *the part of the day that is after lunch or in the afternoon*, while as a temporal marker that shows when the action takes place, it is an adverb, and by using it the speaker says *when he or she, as one of the subjects, will go to the designated place.*

Approximately the same explanation can be given for the example with **вистина**, that is, the noun which means *facts, true information*, in the sentence on the right is shown as an adverb of manner implying that *what is said is true.*

The example with **зло** denotes that the noun that means *something bad and inappropriate* is transformed in an adverb when it implies opinion, which is, *not meaning evil*, so that the adverb is a nominal derivative.

In all these cases, the expanded semantic content is transferred from the first to the second lexeme when, besides the expanded meaning, the surroundings and the function of the basic word are being changed.

According to Markov (Марков, 1982-1983: 10-17), the adverbs that end in *-ица* in the Macedonian language are nominal formations derived from a verbal base or stem. The most common ones of this type are the following: **брзаница**, **јаваница**, **итаница**, **трчаница**. A characteristic of all these is that they are used both as nouns and adverbs.

For example:

трчаница → **трчаница**: *Силна трчаница настана* → *дојдовме трчаница*

јаваница → **јаваница**: *Десеттиот коњ е јаваница.* → *дојдоа јаваница.*

Zero derivation from adverb to noun

In contemporary Macedonian, the formations with nominal function are rare and they are mainly the following examples: **малку**, **многу**,

повеќе, готово, etc. Of course, it is the adverb that is first recorded in the language and then the noun.

малку → **малку**: *зема малку* → *со малку е задоволен*

многу → **многу**: *многу добар* → *од многу глава не боли*

готово → **готово**: *Ви плативме толку и **готово*** → *од **готово** вересија.*

The example with **малку** is explained in a way that is also valid for the other previously mentioned instances. In the phrase on the left, the adverb denotes *the quantity*, saying *to which extent the action is being performed*, while on the right, the same lexeme and word form has a nominal function from syntactic and lexical point of view, and it *names the quantity of the thing which is being discussed*.

When we talk about zero derivation from adverb to noun, most of the resulting nouns are of neuter gender, as is shown in the examples that follow:

пијанисимо → **пијанисимо**: *свири пијанисимо* → *Неговото пијанисимо беше*

вистински подарок за публиката.

арно → **арно**: *Како си? – Арно.* → *Од арно да не куртулиш.*

вчера → **вчера**: *Вчера се вратив од одмор.* → *Неговото **вчера** не важу.*

Here we should say that the zero derivation of nouns from adverbs has a limited character and, while the adverbial function is basic, the change of a particular adverb into another lexical category has an accompanying role. In the last example, with **вчера**, from an adverb that *determines the time of the action*, the zero derivation goes to a noun that *names the time period which is inherently present in it*, and that new element acquires a nominal function in the sentence. The cognitive links in the speaker's mind reflect the formal identity and the semantic similarity from the source adverbial element, which tells us when the action happens, to the target nominal lexeme that *names the day before today*.

Zero derivation from adjective to adverb

Adverbs are such parts of speech that show most connection with the other lexical categories, regardless of the fact whether they are lexical or function words. Yet, there are most deadjectival adverbs – adverbs formed from adjectives, and there are many adverbs which are formally identical to the neuter gender of the relative adjectives.

In order to achieve formal similarity, most of the adjectives are of neuter gender and, along with the adverbs, they end in *-o*, shown by the examples below:

претпазливо → **претпазливо**: *претпазливо однесување* → *зборува претпазливо*

природно → **природно**: *природно држење* → *се држи природно*

јавно → **јавно**: *јавно мнение* → *Јавно го изразува своето мислење.*

In the last example of this type, it can be seen that these lexemes are not different at all, not in the form, or in the semantics. The only intervention is made in choosing the lexeme in neuter gender, both as an adjective and as an adverb, and that shows the change of the lexical category. As a matter of fact, this change results from the different syntactic function of these lexemes in the sentence. If in one of these cases the adjective describes the opinion as **јавно** - *public*, in the other case, the adverb explains *the way in which the action is done*, that is, *it is not secret, but in front of the eyes of the others*.

Examples where the adjectival and the adverbial form are the same, the meaning is expanded and the zero derivation takes place; namely, the adjective is zero derived into an adverb, where the singular masculine form of the noun is the same with the plural form for any gender and person.

This can be seen in the following paradigms:

кралски → **кралски**: *кралски двор* → *живее кралски*

мајчински → **мајчински**: *мајчински грижи* → *се грижи мајчински*

човечки → **човечки**: *човечки однос* → *разговара човечки.*

This shows that the adjective **човечки**, from a lexeme that determines the noun, zero derives an adverb which explains *the way the action is done*.

Zero derivation from adverb to adjective

The examples that will be listed in continuation form a small group which shows zero derivation of adjectives from adverbs, when *the explanation about the way in which the action is done* is transferred to *description of the noun*. This direction of the process can be seen in the following examples:

бадијала → **бадијала**: *седи бадијала* → *бадијала работа*

плитко → **плитко**: *Плитко сте ја замислиле работата.* → *плитко дно*

тивко → **тивко**: *тивко говори* → *тивко езеро.*

Of these two lexemes, the adverb exists first in the language and it explains how the action is being performed. From this, the speakers of the Macedonian language transfer this semantics to a new adjectival lexeme through a metaphoric connection. The genuine lexeme determines the way the action is done, while the result, the zero derived lexeme, explains and modifies the object and precedes it in the adjective-noun phrase on the right. Thus, the adverb **тивко** *modifies the action of speaking*, saying that *it is not loud*, while the adjective says that the noun - **езеро** has the same semantics

and *it is not noisy* either. Hence, we can notice the forms that are subject to analysis can have *-a*, and *-o* ending, which later agrees with the gender of the noun.

Zero derivation from major to minor word class

From adverb to preposition

Some groups of adverbs lose their independent use and are zero derived in prepositions. This kind of process is very alive, so that continuously words with prepositional function are being formed. By definition, the main feature of the prepositions as function words is to express the relationship among the nominal words in the sentence and the relationships of the verbal action towards its complements.

For example:

близу → **близу**: *живее близу* → **близу** *училиштето*

This example shows the adverb **близу** as a place adverbial, because *it determines the place where the action is taking place*, while the zero derived preposition on the left explains *the space relation that the thing or the person has with the noun 'училиште'*.

From adverb to conjunction

Having defined adverbs, we now move to the lexical category of conjunctions that links the lexemes or sentences within one complex sentence and, by doing so, they show their meaning.

The examples in continuation show how the starting adverbs and the resulting conjunctions act in temporal sentences:

кога → **кога**: *Кога дојде, кога си отиде!* → *Се зачудивме кога го видовме.*

откога → **откога**: *Поминаа четириесет години откога се ожени.* → *Откога го прегледа болниот, лекарот стана.*

The first example shows **кога** as a time adverbial that is a question word, while the semantic transfer shows us that after applying the process of zero derivation, we come to a conjunction that shows a very tight connection between the source and the target, since the temporal moment is present and kept in both lexemes.

The same process is active in cause-effect sentences:

што → **што**: *Што си замислен?* → *Јас сум крив што не дојде.*

where the adverb that *asks for the reason* becomes a conjunction that *connects the reason with the verbal form*.

The similar thing happens in the following example:

така → **така**: *Како што ми рече, така постанив.* → *Тоа беше добро како за нас, така и за вас.*

Here, both the adverb and the conjunction mean *in that way*, when the adverb tells us about *the way in which the action was done*, while the conjunction *connects both pieces of information*.

From adverb to particle

In Macedonian, this kind of zero derivation is being illustrated with the sentences below:

уште → **уште**: *Јас уште на почеток знаев за тоа.* → *Ти уште и се лутии!*

веќе → **веќе**: *Веќе е полноќ.* → *Дојди веќе!*

просто → **просто**: *Тој се облекува просто.* → *Ти си просто невозможен.*

The example with **веќе**, as an adverb *intensifies the performance of the action* on the right, but as a particle on the left *intensifies what has already been said*.

From adverb to exclamation

In the contemporary South-Slavic languages, this kind of transfer of adverbs into exclamations has not been much elaborated so far, but yet there are examples when the time, place, manner, quantity, and frequency of the action are being replaced by words whose function is to display expressive reflexes towards the notion in question. Such examples are the following:

здраво → **здраво**: *изгледа здраво* → *Здраво!*

надвор → **надвор**: *играат надвор* → *Надвор!*

доста → **доста**: *доста добро* → *Доста веќе со тоа!*

In the case with **надвор**, the adverb explains *the place where the action is happening*, whereas as an exclamation, it is used to show *direction of the action*, when it again refers to the place of the action, since somebody is being sent out from the place where that person is at the moment.

From adverb to modal word

As the adverb has been sufficiently described, here we ought to define the modal words as parts of speech that show the speaker's modal attitude towards what is being said. In Macedonian, modal words that are zero derived from adverbs are: **безусловно**, **веројатно**, **несомнено**, **решително**, **никако**, **бездруго**, **главно**, **неоспорно**, **очигледно**, **нормално**, **природно**, **сигурно**, **секако**, **никако**, **навистина**, **белки**, **божем**. В. Koneski (В. Конески, 1967) explains the last two words saying that **белки** *emotionally shows hope that something can be done as we like it*:

Белки ќе му дојде еднаш умот!

while with **божем** there is *lack of belief about the reality of the thing said*:

... и од него божем ќе стане некогаш нешто.

Zero derivation from minor to major word class

In Macedonian, the direction of this transfer is from a lexical category of minor/closed type to a major/open type, like nouns, verbs, adjectives, adverbs, nouns and numbers. The examples in continuation will include lexemes of different type, but in all of them there is formal

overlapping and semantic expansion in the starting and resulting lexeme, while the necessary criterion for word class change is undoubtedly met.

Here are only some of them:

оф *excl.* → **оф** *n.* **Оф!** *Се Удрив!* → *Ранетиот војник извика оф.*
за *prep.* → **за** *n.* *Ова е за тебе.* → *Тој употреби на наместо за.*
но *conj.* → **но** *n.* *Ќе дојдев, но не можев.* → *Горан често употребува него наместо но.*

The first example with **оф** shows the transfer of the meaning from an exclamation as *a sign of pain*, and on the other side *names the thing that has been done*. The same explanation would be given for the other examples from this group.

All the cases listed in the study so far are prototypical and, as the process of zero derivation demands, the lexemes in question do not display any formal changes, they are semantically similar, so that it is needless to say that they belong to different lexical categories.

Conclusion

The aim of this paper is to fully mirror the process of zero derivation in Macedonian presented through groups in which the lexemes subject to our research are classified according to the natural class to which they belong, that is to say, the lexeme is taken in its original category, and then by using cognition the participants in the conversation zero derive a new lexeme, which means they fill in the slot of another category by expanding the meaning, but retaining the form of both elements. This is how a new lexeme is produced as a result of the process of zero derivation, with the cognitive moment playing an extremely significant role, since the speaker and the hearer(s) should understand the transfer – that the meaning is expanded and the new lexeme semantically relies on the old one.

It is of utmost importance to correctly determine the natural class or subclass to which the chosen lexeme belongs, simply because by adding a zero affix to it, the word formation process of zero derivation takes place, which, being portrayed as a lexico-derivational process is, hereby, analysed from cognitive point of view.

References:

- Adams, V. *An Introduction to Modern English Word-formation*. London: Longman, 1973.
- Arnold, I.V. *The English Word*. Москва: Высшая школа, 1986.
- Bauer, L. *English Word-Formation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.
- Carter, R. *Vocabulary: Applied Linguistic Perspectives*. Second edition. London and New York: Routledge, 1998.

- Cruse, A. *Meaning in Language: An Introduction to Semantics and Pragmatics*.
Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Jackson, H. *Analysing English: An Introduction to descriptive linguistics*.
Oxford: Pergamon Press Ltd., 1980.
- Katamba, F. *Modern Linguistics: Morphology*. London: Macmillan, 1993.
- Конески, Б. *Граматика на македонскиот литературен јазик: дел I и II*.
Скопје: Култура, 1967.
- Конески, К. *Зборообразувањето во современиот македонски јазик*.
Скопје: Бона, 1995.
- Лазаревска-Станчевска, Ј. *Метафоризација на over, under и out кај комплексните зборови во англискиот јазик и нивните еквиваленти во македонскиот јазик*. Doctoral dissertation, Скопје: Универзитет „Св.Кирил и Методиј”, Филолошки факултет „Блаже Конески”, 2004.
- Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1980.
- Marchand, H. *The Categories and Types of Present-day English Word formation*. 2nd edition. Munich: Beck, 1969.
- Марков, Б. “Именки со значењето носител на својство”. In *Годишен зборник: annuaire*, книга 5, Скопје: Филолошки факултет на Универзитетот, 42-63, 1979.
- Марков, Б. “Типови прилози образувани од именки”. In *Годишен зборник: annuaire*, книга 8-9, Скопје: Филолошки факултет на Универзитетот, 7-18, 1982-1983.
- Марков, Б. “Појавите адјективизација и супстантивизација во современиот македонски јазик”. In *Македонски јазик*, година XXXVI-XXXVII, 1985-1986, Скопје: Институт за македонски јазик „Крсте Мисирков”, 65-77, 1986.
- Plag, I. *Word-Formation in English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G., & Svartvik, J. *A Grammar of Contemporary English*. London: Longman Group Limited, 1972.
- Речник на македонскиот јазик со српскохрватски толкувања*. том: I, II, III:
редактор Блаже Конески, Скопје: Детска радост, 1994.
- Роус, Д., Пашоска, М., & Каранфиловски, М. “Универбизацијата како тип на

зборообразување во чешкиот, рускиот и македонскиот јазик”. In
Литературен збор

2, Скопје, 39-44, 1985.

Saeed, J. I. *Semantics*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd., 1997.

Тополињска, З. “За еден интересен механизам на супстантивизација”. In
Прилози:

Contributions XXIII 1-2, Скопје: Македонска академија на науките и
уметностите,

Одделение за лингвистика и литературна наука, 65-69, 1998.