

ON CONVERSIVE NOMINATION

Rahimov Abror Akhmadovich
PhD, Associate-professor of SamSUVMAHB
*Email: **stipendiat.abror@gmail.com***

The term conversion originally comes from the field of economics, referring to the equivalence or mutual convertibility of monetary units, and is derived from the Latin word *conversio*. It was introduced into linguistics by G. Sweet in 1891 to describe phenomena that lead to word formation through categorical shifts and morphosyntactic adaptation according to syntactic context [3; 5–7].

On this basis, a tradition developed of studying the essence and scope of conversion in connection with word formation. In particular, sources authored by A.I. Smirnitsky, I.V. Arnold, L. Bloomfield, and N.M. Shansky define conversion as one of the methods of word formation [2;15].

Since the second half of the last century, conversion has increasingly been interpreted in relation to transposition. In particular, V. Adams distinguishes between total conversion and partial conversion, the latter occurring on the basis of syntactic transposition [1; 16]; M.V. Nikitin identifies transpositive and lexical types of conversion [7; 516]; and in L.A. Telegin's candidate dissertation, phenomena such as substantivization, adjectivization, adverbialization, and verbalization are studied as instances of affixless transposition. He also investigates a type of transposition manifested through the reanalysis of various syntactic constructions as compound words, which he terms metamorphic transposition [9].

Furthermore, L.N. Murzin and N.D. Golev, evaluating lexical conversion from a derivational perspective, interpret it as semantic conversion [6; 47]. This approach is also reflected in works by English linguists such as Laurie Bauer, Randolph Quirk, Geoffrey Leech, Rodney Huddleston, Salvador Valera, and Bram Balteiro, who regard conversion as a means of word formation. This tradition can also be observed in a number of candidate dissertations defended in recent years.

In Uzbek linguistics, dedicated studies on conversion remain relatively scarce. Notable among the few existing works are those by G'. Abdurahmonov, M. Mirtojiyev, and T.Q. Turdiboyev (Abdurahmonov, 1950; Mirtojiyev, 1963; Turdiboyev, 1996). Important information regarding the scope and theoretical foundations of conversion is presented under the heading "Conversion" in A. G'ulomov's *Grammar of the Uzbek Language* [5].

The disparity between English and Uzbek linguistics in this area is reflected in O.D. Meshkov's observation: "Although conversion, to some extent, is characteristic of all languages, it holds particular significance in English. This is due to the lack of specific morphological markers in the language. This very feature is also connected to the relatively prominent role conversion plays in English word formation" [4; 248]. The fact that conversion is recognized in English-language sources as one of the active methods of word formation, while in Uzbek—where morphological and compositional methods are more productive—it is recorded as a relatively limited means, further supports this view [10;5–8].

According to A.I. Smirnitsky, examples such as *lufu* (love, noun) – *lufian* (to love), *broc* (fragment) – *brocian* (to crush, to harm) demonstrate that, in earlier stages of the English language, morphological types were dominant, while the semantic-grammatical type leading to homonymy was comparatively less prevalent [8; 167]. Another source notes that "by the 13th century, due to the weakening of the inflectional system in Middle English, morphological markers distinguishing nouns and verbs disappeared, and as a result, conversion became a means of deriving homonymous forms in the modern language" [2; 39].

In research on the history of Turkic and Uzbek languages, conversion is noted as one of the productive mechanisms leading to lexical homonymy. M.M. Mirtojiyev, for instance, argues that "before other word-formation processes had emerged, conversion served as the primary means of enriching the vocabulary of Turkic languages and expanding lexical categories through root words." To support this view, the source provides examples of semantic-grammatical conversions

such as to'y (noun and verb), shish (noun and verb), tin (noun and verb), ko'ch (noun and verb), tot (noun and verb), ko'r (verb and noun), ko'k (adjective and noun), chuqur (adjective and noun), qo'sh (adjective and noun), and yumaloq (adjective and noun) [5; 29].

These observations point to divergent developmental paths of conversion in the histories of English and Uzbek. Specifically, in English, the decline of formative conversion gave rise to the predominance of the semantic-grammatical type, while in Turkic and Uzbek languages, the weakening of analytic devices fostered the dominance of morphological and syntactic conversion [3;28]. This fundamental divergence is one of the factors underlying the quantitative difference in the scholarly treatment of conversion in the two languages.

REFERENCES

1. Adams V. An Introduction to Modern English Word-formation. Longman. 1987. 240 pages.
 2. Rahimov A.A. The role of internal form in formation of secondary nominative units (on the basis of scientific works of Alexander Potebnja). Proceedings of the III International Scientific and Practical Conference "Topical Problems of Modern Science and Possible Solutions. № 10(14), Vol.4, October 2016 P. 14-16.
 3. Rahimov A.A. Genesis of early linguistic outlook on nominative activity // East European Scientific Journal) #2(30), 2018 part 5. –P. 27-29
 4. Sweet Henry. New English Grammar Part I. Adamant Media Corporation (December 5, 2000). – 536 p.
 5. Загоруйко А. Я. Конверсия морфолого-синтаксический способ словообразования: Автореф. дис. ... канд. филол. наук. - М., 1961. -24с.
 6. Мешков О. Д. Словообразование современного английского языка. – М.:Наука, 1976. – 248 с.
 7. Миртожиев М. Ўзбек тилида лексик омоним манбалари. Т.: Фан, 2014. – 128 б.
 8. Мурзин Л.Н. Основы дериватологии. Конспект лекций. - Пермь: Перм. ун-т, 1984. - 56 с.
 9. Никитин М.В. Курс лингвистической семантики. Учебное пособие. 2-е издание, дополненное и исправленное. — СПб.: Изд-во РГПУ им. А.И.Герцена, 2007. — 819 с.
 10. Смирницкий А.И. Древнеанглийский язык М.: Изд-во МГУ, 1998. - 319 с.
 11. Телегин Л.Б. Безаффиксальная транспозиция и влияние на процесс деривации в современном английском языке: [Дис. ... док. фил. наук.](#) – Самарканд,1992. – 259 с.
 12. Ulashevna O. G. COMPARATIVE-ETYMOLOGICAL STUDY OF KINSHIP TERMS //Лучшие интеллектуальные исследования. – 2025. – Т. 38. – №. 4. – С. 158-163.
- Ҳожиёв А. Ўзбек тили сўз ясашиши. –. Тошкент, 1989. -111 б.