

СТРУКТУРНА, ПРИКЛАДНА ТА МАТЕМАТИЧНА ЛІНГВІСТИКА

UDC 811

DOI <https://doi.org/10.32782/2710-4656/2024.4.1/14>**Malikli K.**

Azerbaijan University of Languages

THE PHENOMENON OF CONVERSION IN LINGUISTICS AS A MEANS OF EXPRESSING MORPHOLOGICAL TRANSPOSITION

All languages in existence have undergone extensive historical evolution, becoming increasingly refined while enriching their lexicon through interaction with other languages. Over time, the internal structure and grammatical categories of each language develop, attaining their contemporary forms. Numerous morphological processes contribute to this refinement and modernization of a language's internal structure. One of the primary contentious issues concerning the phenomenon of conversion in linguistics is whether it should be classified under morphology or syntax. Morphology, a branch of grammar, specifically studies the structure of words, whereas syntax examines not just individual words but also the word combinations and sentences that arise from the arrangement of these words according to specific rules.

Most linguists contend that word classes used within the same context can only be distinguished in relation to other words, i.e., through syntax. Consequently, whether a word functions as a noun, verb, adjective, or adverb is determined by its relationship with other words in discourse. Therefore, it is deemed appropriate to classify the phenomenon of conversion under syntax because it pertains to the syntactic transposition of words. In general, conversion in linguistics is considered at the intersection of syntax, morphology, and lexical semantics. As noted, conversion signifies the syntactic transposition and functional change of a word. Since syntactic transposition is purely a grammatical issue, it does not pertain to word formation and derivation.

Regarding productivity, the first and third types of conversion are more commonly encountered, whereas the second type is characteristic of informal language and is not widely used. This is undoubtedly due to the fact that auxiliary words involved in minor conversion do not possess semantic meaning, making it difficult for language users to comprehend the meaning of the expression addressed to them.

Key words: *transposition, morphological transposition, derivation, conversion, word formation, nominalization.*

Relevance of the Problem. The majority of morphological processes that contribute to the formation of new lexical units in a language are predicated on the amalgamation of morphemes. From this perspective, morphological processes can be categorized into two groups: combinatory and non-combinatory. Combinatory morphology refers to the creation of a new linguistic unit through the conjunction of two morphemes. This encompasses processes such as compounding and affixation. Non-combinatory morphological processes, conversely, include reduplication, conversion, deaffixation (or back-formation), and internal modification. Unlike the processes in the first group, the morphological processes in the second group generate new words by altering the internal

structure of the morpheme itself and the syntactic category of an extant word without appending any morpheme [Guzman & O'Grady, 1997; Martsa, 2007].

In his publication "Explanatory Dictionary of Linguistic Terms," M. Adilov elucidates the phenomenon of **derivation**, one of the prevalent methods of word formation in contemporary linguistics, as the creation of new words with the assistance of suffixes based on extant models in the language. He posits that if a new word is formed by appending a suffix to a root, this constitutes *primary derivation*; however, if a new word is derived from an already derived word using a suffix, it falls under secondary derivation [Adilov, 2020: 89].

A. Akhundov, when examining methods of word creation, includes the formation of words by affixa-

tion, root compounding, semantic shift, and functional shift, whereby a word transitions from one part of speech to another. The linguist asserts that in languages with few or no derivational suffixes, the phenomenon of conversion, a subset of derivation, assumes a predominant role. He further notes that conversion is not confined to the mere functional shift of parts of speech but includes instances where the morphological and syntactic characteristics of a word are altered. Akhundov identifies four levels of conversion: syntactic, morphological-syntactic, semantic-syntactic, and purely semantic, and enumerates various types such as nominalization, adjectivization, pronominalization, verbalization, adverbialization, and others [Akhundov, 2006: 159–163].

An example of syntactic conversion as noted by the linguist is as follows: *Əgər elə qonşuların varsa oradan köç!* (“If you have such neighbors, move away from there!”) In this sentence, the noun *köç* (“move”) is syntactically verbalized.

In comparison to syntactic conversion, morphological-syntactic conversion exhibits a more advanced degree of transformation. Consider this example from K. Abdulla’s novel “Valley of the Magicians”: *Dərənin üstündən məmləkətə gedən bu yol sehrbazlar üçün əsas həyat mənbəyi idi, bu yolla gedənlərin nəzir-niyazına, pay-peşqəşinə ümidli idilər* (“This road leading from the valley to the homeland was the primary source of sustenance for the magicians; they relied on the offerings and gifts from those who traveled this road...”) [Abdulla, 2018: 15]. In this sentence, the term *gedənlərin* (“travelers”) has acquired plural and case suffixes characteristic of nouns, resulting in a transition at both the syntactic and morphological levels.

Semantic-syntactic conversion, which often involves nominalization and adjectivization, includes terms with noun-adjective homonymy. For instance, *qoca* (“elderly”), *kəndli* (“peasant”), and *qalayçı* (“tinsmith”). This category also encompasses adjectives derived from verbs, such as *ölü* (“deceased”), *satıcı* (“merchant”), and *süzmə* (“strained”). It should be noted that some of these terms in the Azerbaijani language have fully separated from adjectives through complete nominalization over the course of historical development.

The final level of conversion, semantic conversion, involves a term from one part of speech losing all its semantic and morphological characteristics and transitioning to a new part of speech. This type of conversion includes proper nouns such as “*Gözəl*” (beautiful), “*Nərgiz*” (Narcissus), “*Güllü*” (flowered), “*Qorxmaz*” (fearless), “*Gülər*” (smiling), “*Yətər*” (sufficient), etc.

A. Akhundov refers to conversion, a branch of word formation, as semantic word creation because it generates new words by assigning new meanings to existing terms.

Degree of Problem Elaboration. In his book “The Story of English in 100 Words,” D. Crystal notes that the most straightforward method to create new words in a language is by using an existing term in a different function within a sentence, effectively transforming it into another term. The linguist explains that through this method, verbs can become nouns, and adjectives can become verbs. He indicates that during the linguistic phenomenon known as conversion, any part of speech can alter its grammatical categories and undergo functional transformation. Since Anglo-Saxon times, English-speaking peoples have utilized this method to generate new terms.

D. Crystal aptly identifies William Shakespeare as the “expert in linguistic conversion” of his time [Crystal, 2011: 13]. This comparison is compelling because Shakespeare indeed adeptly transformed words, as exemplified by phrases such as “I earned her language” and “He words me.”

The term “conversion” was initially employed in English linguistics by H. Sweet in his publication “A New English Grammar” in 1892. However, it had been used earlier, in 1880, by the English linguist A. Bain in his own work. Scholars posit that English allows for unrestricted conversion, facilitating the transition of words between parts of speech without overt modifications to the term itself. Bain discusses grammatical conversion, focusing on the shift of words from one part of speech to another but does not exclusively regard conversion as a linguistic phenomenon.

Subsequently, H. Sweet elaborates extensively on the conversion process in his subsequent writings. For instance, he illustrates the transformation of the sentence “The snow is white” into the phrase “the whiteness of the snow” through the combination of the word “white” with the suffix “-ness”. Sweet notes that in English, as in languages with minimal or absent inflectional changes, words can transition between parts of speech without necessitating significant affixation, apart from essential inflectional adjustments [Sweet, 1892: 38].

When discussing conversion, Sweet disregards obligatory inflectional changes and modifications to a linguistic unit without undergoing alteration or accepting a suffix. According to his analysis, the principal characteristic of conversion lies in the alteration of lexical categories or parts of speech. He confines conversion solely to the formal attributes of the newly formed part of speech, such as its capacity to adopt inflections, if applicable. For instance:

“She never liked long walks, especially in autumn. We can take a walk in the street, if you like.”

Therefore, while A. Bain first introduced the term “conversion” in English linguistics, it did not immediately gain recognition as a linguistic phenomenon. Nevertheless, H. Sweet acknowledges that conversion embodies certain features of word formation despite not necessarily generating novel words. According to him, during conversion, the word assimilates paradigms of the part of speech into which it transitions.

R. Quirk and others regard conversion as a component of derivation and describe it as the alteration of a word’s part of speech without accepting any affixes [Quirk, 1987: 441]. Similarly, Karsteyns Mac Karsi characterizes conversion as a process wherein one lexeme can shift to another without necessitating any formal indications [Carstairs, 2002: 48].

In the “Encyclopedia of Linguistics,” the term “conversion” is elucidated in two contexts. Primarily, conversion denotes equivalence between two linguistic units, also termed as an equivalence relation. For example, if we use the sentence *Qız oğlandan kökdür* (“The girl is a boy”), we can also say *Oğlan qızdan ariqdir* (“The boy is a girl”). While such instances are typical of adjectives, analogous cases can arise with verbs and nouns, such as “mother-child,” “buy-sell,” etc. Additionally, the encyclopedia defines conversion as the modification of a part of speech to create new words, despite primarily involving root morphemes, with some affixes potentially being utilized. Instances include “*yağ-yağlamaq*” in Azerbaijani, “comb-to comb” in English, “*kurz-kurzen*” in German, signifying “to shorten,” and so forth [12, 355]. Upon reviewing examples, particularly those borrowed from the Azerbaijani language, we discern that words formed with prefixes and suffixes are also encompassed within the concept of conversion.

Purpose and Objectives. The principal objective of the article is to explicate the essence of conversion as a primary means of full or morphological transposition, investigating the substitution of one linguistic unit for another in the morphological domain, thereby undergoing a shift from its original sphere to develop a new function. To achieve this, the following objectives are delineated:

- To explore conversion as a tool of expression in morphological transposition and as a pathway to word formation.

- To scrutinize the content, nature, functional-cognitive characteristics, scholarly positioning, and contentious issues surrounding conversion.

Methodology. The study employs linguistic analysis and descriptive methods to address contradic-

tory issues and achieve outcomes related to conversion in linguistics.

Main Section.

Conversion in Linguistics.

In the process of creating new words, conversion refers to associating the same lexeme with various word groups without altering its initial form [Katamba, 1993: 54]. Despite extensive exploration of conversion as part of morphological transposition by many linguists, unresolved issues persist. Defining conversion, directional issues in conversion, syntactic approaches to conversion, and productivity challenges are critical aspects related to this linguistic phenomenon.

In linguistics, H. Marchand (1969), V. Adams (1973), G. Sanders (1988), P. Kiparski (1997), and J. Don (2005) conceptualize conversion as denoting the syntactic transposition of a word, labeling it zero-derivation. Linguists contend that conversion primarily addresses grammatical concerns and forms part of affixation, dismissing its role in word formation. Linguists recognizing the presence of zero morphemes in language also classify word formation involving zero morphemes as zero-derivation: “She turned her head away from him.” “He headed the corporate-finance department.” As illustrated by examples borrowed from English, in the first sentence, the word “head” (noun) transitions to a verb in the second sentence without phonetic alterations, adopting the grammatical categories of the new part of speech.

During transitions between parts of speech without affixes, the derived linguistic unit becomes homographic and homophonic with its original unit. Sometimes, minimal differentiation occurs due to changes in stress placement or the presence of a voiced final consonant. For instance, in English, disyllabic verbs primarily stress the final syllable, but during noun-to-verb or vice versa conversion, stress placement shifts: a record (noun) – to record (verb); import (noun) – to import (verb), and so forth. Moreover, when certain nouns convert to verbs, the final consonant of the derived unit becomes voiced. For example, a house [s] – to house [z]; an advice [s] – to advise [z], and so on.

In linguistics, although the terms *conversion* and *zero-derivation* are employed interchangeably, linguist B. Katnaroshka (1993: 14–19) elucidates that each term has distinct theoretical underpinnings. Katnaroshka categorizes conversion as a morphological or syntactic phenomenon, whereas she regards zero-derivation purely as a lexical creation process. Conversely, linguist R. Lieber (2004) posits that conversion, as implicit transposition, is unconnected to morphological or grammatical phenomena, instead manifesting as a result of lexical creation with prag-

matic nuances, and refers to conversion as a process of re-listing. In other words, a pre-existing word re-enters the lexicon as part of a different lexical category due to conversion. This delineation distinguishes conversion from zero-derivation, as it does not necessitate the addition of any suffix. Despite the utilization of terms like functional shift (Neef, 2005), functional movement, semantic transition, zero affix, and others in subsequent periods, we contend that the term conversion remains the most predominant.

The phenomenon of conversion is more prevalent in Germanic languages with fewer derivational affixes, such as English. We posit that the higher frequency of this linguistic phenomenon in English is attributable to the absence of specific indicators for parts of speech in the language. The grammatical structure of English prioritizes the syntactic function of a word over its morphological characteristics. Consequently, the grammatical nature of a linguistic unit is entirely determined within the context of the sentence. For example:

– *What is the right way to start combing hair?*

– *Well, the right way is to always begin from the middle section and stroke by stroke moving downwards. Use a comb towards the upper section only if the hair is tangle-free. In order to ensure a painless experience, never use the comb from the roots as you may face even more tangles and knots* [<https://www.vega.co.in/blog/post/the-right-way-to-comb-your-hair.html>].

From the given example, it is evident that the word “comb” functions as both a noun and a verb, adopting the paradigms of the respective part of speech it belongs to. In the syntactic structure provided, the word “comb” demonstrates its verbal characteristics in the sense of “*to comb*” by being used as a gerund, one of the non-finite forms of the verb, and by taking an object. In the subsequent sentences, the word “*comb*” is used in the sense of a “*comb*” as a noun, expressing both the indefinite and definite categories, and serves as a complement in the sentence.

S. Orujova notes that in the English language, parts of speech are either indistinguishable or differentiated primarily through affixation as part of word formation. This contributes to the widespread occurrence of conversion in English, thereby enriching the lexicon through the creation of new words [Orujova, 2018: 25].

I. Balteiro mentions that the scope of the conversion phenomenon is extensive. For instance, she notes that some linguists view conversion not only as a change between parts of speech but also as a functional shift within the same part of speech. Addition-

ally, linguists emphasize changes in overall functions without alterations in the form of the newly created word. G. Leech describes this term similarly to other linguists but focuses more on the semantic shift aspect of conversion [Balteiro, 2007: 21].

R. Quirk, L. Bauer, and other linguists assert that the phenomenon of conversion is linguistically significant and describe it as a linguistic event that assigns an existing word to a new word class [Quirk, 1985: 722]. L. Bauer, like R. Quirk, indicates that a linguistic unit undergoes minor semantic or syntactic changes within the same part of speech [Bauer, 1983: 227]. For example, the verb “run” in English: in the sentence “*He is running her fingers over the keyboard,*” the verb phrase “*is running*” functions as a transitive verb requiring an object, while in the sentence “*Run downstairs and get my glasses,*” the verb “run” is intransitive, functioning without an object. This illustrates a conversion from transitivity to intransitivity.

R. Quirk and S. Greenbaum also consider conversion as a linguistic phenomenon that facilitates the creation of new words without altering the form of the existing word. For example, the use of the noun “hammer” as a verb in English without any change in its form exemplifies conversion:

“*She killed him by a hammer.*”; “*The machine can hammer out metal very thin.*” [<https://sentencedict.com/hammer.html>]

H. Marchand asserts that not all such homophones constitute instances of conversion. For example, the English words “mind” and “manner” can function both as nouns and verbs, but they cannot be classified as conversions. The linguist explains that this is because when employed as verbs, the meanings of these words bear no relation to their meanings as nouns. Consider the following sentences:

– Keep your mind on what you are saying. (Focus on what you are saying.); I wouldn’t mind the cold weather. (I do not mind the cold weather.);

– It doesn’t seem to matter how much the boy troubled the girl. (It does not seem to matter how much the boy troubled the girl.); I would like to talk with him about this matter. (I would like to discuss this matter with him).

In the aforementioned examples, the terms “*mind*” and “*matter*” are more appropriately associated with homonymy than conversion. As is well-known, homonyms are words that are identical in spelling and pronunciation but differ in meaning. Homonyms can belong to the same grammatical category or different categories.

The Homonymy of Words Generated Through Conversion

In linguistics, whether words generated through conversion constitute homonyms remains contentious. Some linguists categorize words resulting from conversion as homonyms, while others consider the words involved in conversion as lexical-grammatical homonyms. S. Orujova notes that while conversion in Old English did not create homonymy, in modern English, this linguistic phenomenon is associated with homonymy. She also elucidates that an essential condition for homonymy is that in conversion pairs, the nominative case of the noun and the infinitive form of the verb are phonetically identical. For example, *comb-to comb*, *hate-to hate*, *love-to love*, etc. This leads to the conclusion that homonymy brings some phonetically identical words closer together through conversion. The same source also highlights several characteristic features of suffix-less transition:

1. The newly converted word does not form in isolation but in conjunction with other words.

2. The newly created word through conversion establishes homonymy with the original word.

3. The new word differs from the original word in its grammatical category [Orujova, 2018: 14–15].

Despite the contradictory aspects concerning conversion and homonymy in linguistics, the opinions of scholars lead to the conclusion that lexical pairs in a language that have identical phonetic and orthographic forms can be considered homonyms only when the meanings of the newly generated lexemes are entirely different from the original terms. It is also noteworthy that semantic differences can arise even during the conversion process. These factors indicate that the issues of conversion and homonymy, which are evaluated differently across various languages, remain contentious.

G. Yule (2002: 53–58) identifies several linguistic phenomena involved in the formation of new lexical forms in English, with the most productive being conversion, where a lexeme transitions from one syntactic category to another without the addition of a suffix. G. Booij (2005: 51) categorizes lexical units involved in word formation processes into two groups: open and closed. Booij includes nouns, adjectives, and verbs in the first group, which enrich the lexicon through various methods of word formation. These primary syntactic categories participate in major conversion, which is particularly characteristic of English (*major, minor, and secondary conversion*) [Velasco, 2009: 1165]. G. Booij (2005) notes that closed lexical units, including determiners, conjunctions, pronouns, and prepositions, are less frequently utilized in

word formation methods. However, despite being less productive, these units can undergo conversion into nouns, verbs, and adjectives, known as minor conversion. For example, conjunction to noun (*ifs and buts*); affix to noun (*patriotism and other isms*); preposition to verb (*The boy will off and do his work*), etc.

Secondary Conversion Cases in Linguistics

In addition to the major and minor types of conversion mentioned, there are also instances of secondary conversion. Some scholars examine conversion in a narrower context, including only changes in stress position, quantitative alterations in the linguistic unit undergoing conversion, the use of adjectives as nouns (e.g., *the old, the rich*), and the transition of proper nouns to common nouns (e.g., *wellington, newton*) [Huddleston & Pullum, 2002]. Many linguists analyze conversion more as a syntactic process than a word formation process [Bauer, 1983; Don & van Lier, 2007; Farrell, 2001]. According to this syntactic approach to conversion, a linguistic unit changes its category within the same word class without altering its part of speech. Examples include the transformation between countable and uncountable nouns (*tea – three teas*), proper and common nouns (Bob – Which Bob does she mean?), and intransitive and transitive verbs (*to run – She is running a horse*). These transitions, occurring within the same syntactic category, lead linguists to consider conversion a syntactic rather than a morphological process. Contrary to the syntactic approach to conversion, I. Balteiro (2007) investigates full and partial conversion cases and does not classify the aforementioned transitions as conversion since they do not create a new linguistic unit despite resembling conversion.

Consequently, conversion primarily emphasizes the syntactic orientation in the understanding of any linguistic unit [Bauer & Valera, 2005]. Some linguists assert that conversion is a linguistic phenomenon that reclassifies an existing word into a new word class or syntactic category [Quirk, Greenbaum, Leech & Svartvik, 1985]. Additionally, scholars regard conversion as a linguistic process that facilitates the creation of new words without altering the form of the original word [Quirk & Greenbaum, 1987]. Summarizing these perspectives in linguistic literature, it can be concluded that conversion pertains to both morphology and syntax. From a morphological standpoint, conversion is a word formation process, where, as many linguists have noted, a new word emerges through zero derivation without any formal markers. Syntactically, the newly formed elements change their functions according to their roles in sentences. It is also important to note that semantics plays a crucial

role in conversion, as the newly formed word derives its meaning from the original word.

In English, this linguistic phenomenon lies at the intersection of lexicon, grammar, and word formation, whereas approaches to conversion in Germanic linguistics are somewhat different. A group of linguists, including R. Ginzburg and Y. Molhova, consider conversion a type of functional change. According to the functional approach, a word can belong to multiple parts of speech. S. Orujova and other linguists regard conversion as a morphological-syntactic word formation method, noting that conversion involves transitions not only in grammatical categories but also in syntactic functions [Orujova, 2018: 20–21]. Although conversion emerged in the late Middle Ages, it can be considered a new method of word formation due to its increased productivity in recent times. The historical development of English, characterized by the simplification of its grammatical structure, resulted in the loss of inflections in words, leading to the derivation of verbs from nouns. For example, the verb “*agen*” is derived from the noun “*age*”. However, conversion occurs not only from nouns to verbs but also from verbs to nouns. For example, the noun “*breke*” is derived from the verb “*breken*”.

Conversion, as a means of expressing complete or morphological transposition, is a complex process despite its seemingly simple nature. Another contentious issue in linguistic literature regarding conversion is the relationship between the newly formed word and the original word, specifically identifying the direction of transition. While some linguists adopt a bidirectional analysis for conversion, most linguists prefer a unidirectional approach.

L. Bauer and S. Valera suggest approaching the issue of directionality between the constituents in conversion from both synchronic and diachronic perspectives. In a diachronic approach, the etymology of the words in conversion pairs is examined to ascertain which word serves as the root and which is derived. Conversely, a synchronic approach analyzes the semantic relationship between the word pairs [Bauer & Valera, 2005: 10–12]. P. Kiparsky also adopts a synchronic perspective, noting that the transformation of a noun into a verb, or vice versa, occurs at different levels of morphology, indicating lexical stratification [Kiparsky, 1982: 3–91].

R. Lieber’s perspective is that conversion lacks directionality as a process. For instance, while many linguists assert that the verb “*to bottle*” derives from the noun “*bottle*,” R. Lieber, based on his “relisting” theory, argues that the new form of the word “*bottle*” belongs to a new category of verbs and is thus

reintroduced into the lexicon. This implies that there is no derivational relationship between two related words in the language. Therefore, Lieber emphasizes that there is no directionality between the words in a conversion pair, and they are only lexically associated [Lieber, 1981: 183].

H. Marchand (1972: 242–252) identifies several aspects to determine which word in a conversion pair is the original and which is derived. These aspects include semantic dependency (the word whose meaning is derived from the other word is the converted word), range of usage (the word with a narrower range of use is the converted word), semantic nuance (the word used in fewer semantic domains is the converted element), and phonetic form (if certain suffixes indicate the word class, and if this is not the case, then it is a derived word created during conversion). V. Adams (2001: 21) highlights the importance of three criteria (meaning, frequency of use, and etymology) for resolving the directionality problem in conversion. I. Plag approaches the directionality issue from a historical perspective, noting that the noun “*moan*” first appeared in 1225 and was converted into the verb “*to moan*” in the 16th century [Plag, 2003: 108]. However, the noun “*moan*” is defined in the dictionary as “*the act of moaning*”, suggesting that the noun “*moan*” derived from the verb “*to moan*”. Therefore, Plag notes that it is more appropriate to consider the word’s semantics, its inflectional nature, the shift in stress, and its frequency of use when addressing the directionality issue in conversion [Plag, 2003: 116].

In our view, considering all these aspects facilitates determining the directionality of word pairs in the conversion process. However, from a descriptive standpoint, the criterion of meaning plays a more significant role [Huddleston & Pullum, 2002]. In conversion pairs, the word with greater semantic nuance is considered the converting element, while the word encompassing only one of the semantic domains is considered the converted element.

Scholars observe that through processes such as conversion, which are productive methods of lexical expansion from early childhood, vocabulary increases steadily. For instance, an English-speaking child may possess a lexicon of 50–600 words at age two, which can expand to 14,000 words by age six, facilitated specifically by conversion, altering the lexical category of words. Examples include:

- *Don’t hair me.*
- *Is Ann going to babysitter me?*
- *Will you chocolate my milk?*

In our perspective, such transitions in early childhood are innate. The child utilizes familiar words as

different parts of speech simply to articulate their thoughts, with these words not necessarily becoming permanent fixtures in their lexicon.

Typical instances of conversion in language

Typical instances of conversion in language involve nouns, verbs, adjectives, and occasionally adverbs participating in transformations. Effective conversions in English occur between pairs such as:

- Verb-noun (*to run-a run*)
- Noun-verb (*a hammer-to hammer*)
- Adjective-verb (*a clean cloth-to clean the cloth*)
- Adjective-noun (*a rich boy-the rich*)
- Noun-adjective (*mahogany-a mahogany table*)
- Adverb-noun (*in, out- ins and outs*)
- Adverb-verb (*up-to up*)

These newly formed words inherit the characteristics of the part of speech they are converted into, hence they are referred to as complete conversions. It should be noted that alongside complete conversions, there are also cases of incomplete conversion

in linguistics, where certain grammatical categories of words undergo changes. For instance, in English, non-count nouns can function as count nouns, as exemplified by “*Coffee*” (non-count noun) becoming “*2 coffees*” (count noun), meaning “*two cups of coffee*”. Linguists also discuss contentious issues related to nominalization (poor-the poor) and adjectivization (then-the then president) in this context, which are not classified as forms of conversion.

Conclusion. Linguists observe that conversion is acknowledged not solely between nouns and verbs or vice versa. However, in our perspective, conversion also extends to relations between nouns and adjectives. Nominalization, featuring both complete and incomplete manifestations, holds equivalent standing alongside other conversion types. Consequently, unlike full conversion, which encompasses both morphological and syntactic processes, incomplete conversion may be construed as a syntactic phenomenon.

Bibliography:

1. Adams V. An Introduction to English Word-Formation. London : Longman. 1973.
2. Adams V. Complex Words in English. Longman, Harlow, 2001.
3. Adilov M. İ., Verdiyeva Z. N., Ağayeva F.M. İzahlı dilçilik terminləri. Bakı : Elm və Təhsil, 2020. 656 s.
4. Axundov A. Ümumi dilçilik. Bakı : Şərq-Qərb, 2006. 280 s.
5. Balteiro I. A Contribution to the Study of Conversion in English. Münster : Waxman, 2007.
6. Bauer L. English Word-Formation. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.
7. Bauer L.& Valera, S. Approaches to Conversion/Zero-Derivation. Münster: Waxman, 2005.
8. Booij G.E. The Grammar of Words. An Introduction to Linguistic Morphology. New York : Oxford Univ. Press Inc., 2005.
9. Carstairs-McCarthy Andrew. (2002). An Introduction to English Morphology: Words and Their Structure. Edinburgh : Edinburgh University Press, 160 pp.
10. Cetnarowska B. The Syntax, Semantics and Derivation of Base Nominalization in English, Katowice: Uniwersytet Slaski, 1993.
11. Crystal D. The Story of English in 100 Words. London : Profile Books LTD., 2011, 262 pp.
12. Dilçilik ensiklopediyası: 2 cildə, I cild. F. Veysəllinin redaktəsi ilə. Bakı : Mütərcim, 2006. 514 s.
13. Don J. (2005). On Conversion, Relisting and Zero-Derivation. SKASE, Journal of Theoretical Linguistics 2, 2–16.
14. Don J., van Lier, E. ‘On the lack of word-class distinction: flexibility and conversion’ paper presented at the Workshop on Flexible Languages April 20, University of Amsterdam. 2007.
15. Farrell P. Functional Shift as Category Underspecification. English Language and Linguistics, 2001, 5(1), 109–130.
16. Huddleston R. & Pullum, G.K. The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
17. Katamba F. Morphology. MacMillan, London, 1993.
18. Kiparsky P. ‘Lexical morphology and phonology’. In Linguistics in the Morning Calm: Selected Papers from SICOL-1981, Linguistic Society of Korea (ed.). Seoul: Hanshin. 1982, pp. 3–91.
19. Kiparsky P. ‘Remarks on denominal verbs’ in Alsina, A., Bresnan, J., Sells, P. (eds.), Argument Structure. CSLI, Stanford, 1997. 473–499.
20. Lieber R. Morphology and Lexical Semantics. University of Cambridge Press: Cambridge. 2004.
21. Marchand H. Categories and types of Present-Day English Word-Formation. München: Beck, 1969.
22. Marchand, H. Studies in Syntax and Word-Formation. München : Wilhem Fink. 1972.
23. Martsa S. ‘Construction of meaning during conversion’ paper presented at the 8th Conference of Hungarian Society for the Study of English, University of Szeged. 2007.
24. Neef M. ‘On some Alleged Constraints on Conversion’ in Laurie Bauer and Salvador Valera (eds.), Approaches to Conversion/Zero-Derivation. Münster : Waxman, 2005. pp. 103–130.

25. Nurhayati D.A.W. The Morphological Process of English Conversion. *Lingua Scientia*, 2013. Volume 5, Nomer 1, 47–60.
26. Orucova S. *Dildə konversiya hadisəsi*. Bakı: Elm və Təhsil. 2018.
27. Plag I. *Word-formation in English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 2003.
28. Quirk R et al. *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. Essex : Longman. 1997.
29. Quirk R. & Greenbaum, S. *A University Grammar of English*. London : Longman. 1987.
30. Quirk R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G., and Svartvik, J. *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London & New York : 1985. Longman.
31. Sanders G. 'Zero Derivation and the Overt Analogue Criterion' in Hammond and Noonon (eds.), *Theoretical Morphology*. San Diego and London: Academic Press, 1988, pp. 155–175/
32. Sweet H. *A New English Grammar: Logical and Historical*. Oxford : Clarendon Press, 1892. 534 pp.
33. Velasco D.G. Conversion in English and its Implication for Functional Discourse Grammar. *Lingua*. 2009, pp. 119, 1164–1185/
34. William O'Grady & Guzman, V. *Morphology: the Analysis of Word Structure*. Contemporary Linguistics. An Introduction, London & New York : Longman. 1997. pp. 132–180/
35. Yule G. *The Study of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 2002.
36. Abdulla K. *Sehrbazlar dərəsi*. Bakı: Qanun nəşriyyatı, 2018, 168 s.
37. Top1000 word. URL: <https://sentencedict.com/top1000/>
38. The right way to comb your hair. URL: <https://www.vega.co.in/blog/>
39. Phrases. URL: <https://sentencedict.com/hammer.html>

Маліклі К. ФЕНОМЕН КОНВЕРСІЇ В ЛІНГВІСТИЦІ ЯК ЗАСІБ ВИРАЖЕННЯ МОРФОЛОГІЧНОЇ ТРАНСПОЗИЦІЇ

Усі існуючі мови пройшли значну історичну еволюцію, стаючи все більш удосконаленими, одночасно збагачуючи свій лексикон завдяки взаємодії з іншими мовами. З часом внутрішня структура і граматичні категорії кожної мови розвиваються, набуваючи своїх сучасних форм. Цьому вдосконаленню та модернізації внутрішньої структури мови сприяють численні морфологічні процеси. Одне з головних суперечливих питань щодо явища конверсії в лінгвістиці полягає в тому, чи слід його класифікувати як морфологію чи синтаксис. Морфологія, розділ граматики, спеціально вивчає структуру слів, тоді як синтаксис вивчає не лише окремі слова, але й словосполучення та речення, які виникають із розташування цих слів відповідно до певних правил. Більшість лінгвістів стверджують, що класи слів, які використовуються в одному контексті, можна відрізнити лише по відношенню до інших слів, тобто через синтаксис. Отже, те, чи функціонує слово як іменник, дієслово, прикметник чи прислівник, визначається його зв'язком з іншими словами в дискурсі. Тому вважається доцільним віднести явище конверсії до синтаксису, оскільки воно стосується синтаксичної транспозиції слів. Загалом конверсія в лінгвістиці розглядається на стику синтаксису, морфології та лексичної семантики. Як зазначалося, конверсія означає синтаксичну транспозицію та функціональну зміну слова. Оскільки синтаксична транспозиція є суто граматичним питанням, вона не стосується словотворення та похідного походження. Що стосується продуктивності, то перший і третій типи перетворення зустрічаються частіше, тоді як другий тип характерний для неформальної мови і не широко використовується. Це, безсумнівно, пов'язано з тим, що допоміжні слова, які беруть участь у мінорній конверсії, не мають семантичного значення, що ускладнює розуміння змісту зверненого до них виразу для користувачів мови.

Ключові слова: транспозиція, морфологічна транспозиція, деривація, конверсія, словотвір, номіналізація.