

CONVERSION IN PRESENT DAY ENGLISH

Baitova A.D.

*Master of pedagogical sciences, Teacher of English language
Turkestan high multi profile craft college
Turkestan, Kazakhstan*

Түйіндеме: Бұл мақалада ағылшын тілінің сөздік қорын толықтырудың өте тиімді әдісі болып табылатын сөзжасам қарастырылады, өйткені ол қолданыстағы сөздерден жаңа сөздер жасауға мүмкіндік береді. Мақалада сонымен қатар ағылшын тіліндегі сөзжасамның өзекті мәселелері қарастырылады.

Кілт сөздер: трансформация, жұрнақтар, префикстер, сөзжасам, өнімді әдіс, морфологиялық және синтаксистік әдіс

Резюме: В этой статье рассматривается словообразование, которое является очень эффективным способом пополнения словарного запаса английского языка, поскольку позволяет создавать новые слова из существующих слов. В статье также рассматриваются актуальные вопросы словообразования в английском языке.

Ключевые слова: трансформация, суффиксы, приставки, словообразование, продуктивный метод, морфолого-синтаксический метод

Resume: This article discusses word formation, which is a very effective way to replenish the vocabulary of the English language, because it allows you to create new words from existing words. The article also discusses topical issues of word formation in the English language.

Keywords: transformation, suffixes, prefixes, word formation, productive method, morphological and syntactic method.

Conversion is a very productive way of forming new words in Modern English. Recent research suggests that this regular or patterned or model led homonymy has some characteristic features: statistical data obtained at Leningrad University show, for example, that it regularly involves monosyllabic words of a simple morphological structure.

Conversion from suffixed and prefixed words, although quite possible (cf, commission n; commission v) is uncommon. This is easily accounted for, as a word of complete divisibility is already a member of certain structural correlations. There is, of course, no point in forming a verb from the noun *arrival* by conversion when there exists a verb of the same root, *arrive*.

As the percentage of root words among adjectives is smaller than in other parts of speech and as English adjectives mostly show a complex morphological structure, it is but seldom that they serve as basis for conversion.

On the other hand conversion may be considered to be the predominant method of English verb-formation. Actually, apart from the stand up type there are no competitive ways "as far as English verbs are concerned: composition is almost non-existent, prefixation extremely scarce. One might think of the denominal verbs with the suffixes -ate, -ify, -ize, but these are stylistically limited to learned and technical formations.

One more debatable point has to be dealt with Prof. A. I. Smirnitsky and his school consider the paradigm to be the only word-forming means of conversion. A. I. Smirnitsky sees conversion as a case where a word is transferred from one paradigm to another and the paradigm is the only means at work. It is difficult to accept this view as it ignores the syntactic pattern which is in fact of great importance.

If we bear in mind that a new word coined in this way appears not in isolation but only in a definite environment of other words, we shall invariably come to the conclusion that conversion is a combined morphological and syntactic way of word-building. The following example will make it clear: /I one struck lucky, one had a good buy (C. P. Snow). Here buy is a noun, because it occupies the position of a noun and possesses the syntactical ties (it is preceded by the indefinite article and modified by an adjective) and not because being used in the plural it would take the ending -s and so enter the paradigm of nouns. Actually in this case the linguist can go by what he has before him. E.g.: The bus stops. The conductor rips off the platform mid round to the front for a lean on the radiator and a quick drag with the driver.

Conversion here is partly usual and partly occasional. Moreover, it is impossible to identify the paradigm in the isolated form. Having the form buys one cannot say whether it is the plural of a noun or

the third person singular (Present Indefinite Tense) of a verb. Thus, even the paradigm can be recognized only on the evidence of distribution, i. e. by contrasting formal arrangements. It is the context that shows whether a word is to be taken as a noun or as a verb.

In the humorous complaint: Why when quitting a taxi do I invariably down the door handle when it should be upped, and up it when it should be downed? (O. Nash) the fact that down and up are verbs is signalled not by the possibility of upped and downed but by the syntactical function and syntactical ties.

It also seems illogical to introduce a paradigm in an argument about nonce-words or rare words when we have no proof that the word occurs in the other form involved in the corresponding paradigm. There seems no point in arguing for the probability of madamed or madams, although she madams everybody is acknowledged by the English as quite possible. Compare the following: When he saw who it was⁷ he condescended a sarcastic Thank you, but no Madam. He did not madam anybody, even good customers like Mrs Moore (M. Dickens).

Also, if the paradigm is accepted as the only word-building means in conversion, it necessarily follows that conversion does not exist for the parts of speech or separate words where either the prototype or the derived word possess no paradigm, i. e. do not change. What is, for example, the word-building pattern in the following pairs? *must v - must n why adv - why particle down adv -- down a*

These very numerous cases remain then completely out of the general system and there is no telling how they are to be classified.

As has been mentioned above, the bulk of words coined by means of conversion is constituted by verbs. Among them we find those correlating not only with nouns (the predominating pattern) but with adjectives, adverbs and other parts of speech as well.

Among verbs derived from adverbs and other parts of speech there are some that are firmly established in the English vocabulary: *to down, to encore, to pooh-pooh*.

This pattern is highly productive so that many neologisms can be quoted by way of illustration, e. g. *to chair* 'to preside over a meeting'; *to campaign* 'to organize a campaign': Communists in Newcastle are campaigning against rent increases ("Morning Star"). Other examples are: *to microfilm* 'to make a photographic film of a document or a book, which can be enlarged in projection'; *to screen* 'to make a motion picture of a novel or play'; *to star* 'to appear, or to present as a star actor'; *to wireless* 'to send a message by wireless'; *to orbit* 'to travel in orbit, to put into orbit'.

Besides, there is also a purely syntactic approach commonly known as a functional approach to conversion. Certain linguists and lexicographers especially those in Great Britain and the USA are inclined to regard conversion in Modern English as a kind of functional change. They define conversion as a shift from one part of speech to another contending that in Modern English a word may function as two different parts of speech at the same time. If we accept this point of view, we should logically arrive at the conclusion that in Modern English we no longer distinguish between parts of speech, i.e. between noun and verb, noun and adjective, etc. , for one and the same word cannot simultaneously belong to different parts of speech. It is common knowledge, however, that the English word-stock is subdivided into big word classes each having its own semantic and formal features. The distinct difference between nouns and verbs, for instance, as in the case of *doctor - to doctor* discussed above, consists in the number and character of the categories reflected in their paradigms. Thus, the functional approach to conversion cannot be justified and should be rejected as inadequate. Conversion may be regarded as a specific feature of the English categories of parts of speech , which are supposed to be able to break through the rigid borderlines dividing one category from another thus enriching the process of communication not by the creation of new words but through the sheer flexibility of the syntactic structures.

Conversion is extremely productive to increase the English lexicon because it provides an easy way to create new words from existing ones. Thus, the meaning is perfectly comprehensible and the speaker can rapidly fill a meaningful gap in his language or use fewer words. "Conversion is a totally free process and any lexeme can undergo conversion into any of the open form classes as the need arises". This means that any word form can be shifted to any word class, especially to open classes - nouns, verbs, etc.- and that there are not morphological restrictions. Up to date, there has only been found one restriction: derived nouns rarely undergo conversion (particularly not to verbs). This exception is easily understood: if there already exists one word in the language, the creation of a new term for this same concept will be blocked for the economy of language. For example, the noun 'denial' will never shift into a verb because this word already derives from the verb 'deny'. In that case, the conversion is blocked because 'to deny' and 'to denial' would mean exactly the same. However, there are some special cases in which this process seems to happen without blocking. This can be exemplified in the noun 'sign', converted into the verb 'to sign', changed by derivation (suffixation) into the noun 'signal' and converted into a new verb, 'to signal'. In this case there is no blocking because these words have slight semantic differences.

It must be pointed out that the process of conversion has some semantic limitations: a converted word only assumes one of the range of meanings of the original word. For example, the noun 'paper' has various meanings, such as "newspaper", "material to wrap things". The denominal verb, though, only contains the sense of putting that material on places like walls. This shows the converted item has only converted part of the semantic field of the source item. The aim of conversion varies with the user. Adults convey it to use fewer words, whereas children perform it in order to be understood, although they frequently produce ungrammatical utterances. Anyway, it always helps to make communication easier. Thus, trying to gather this double functional *raison d'être* we have compiled our corpus of examples from international newspapers and magazines, such as The New York Times or Newsweek, and popular literature, such as the teenagers' magazines Smash Hits and Teens. The complete list of extracts can be found in the appendix.

Modern English vocabulary is exceedingly rich in conversion pairs. As a way of forming words conversion is extremely productive and new conversion pairs make their appearance in fiction, newspaper articles and in the process of oral communication in all spheres of human activity gradually forcing their way into the existing vocabulary and into the dictionaries as well. New conversion pairs are created on the analogy of those already in the word-stock on the semantic patterns described above as types of semantic relations. Conversion is highly productive in the formation of verbs, especially from compound nouns. 20th century new words include a great many verbs formed by conversion, e. g. to motor - - 'travel by car'; to phone --- 'use the telephone'; to wire - - 'send a telegram'; to microfilm --- 'produce a microfilm of'; to tear-gas --- 'to use tear-gas'; to fire-bomb --- 'drop fire-bombs'; to spearhead --- 'act as a spearhead for'; to blueprint ---- 'work out, outline', etc. A diachronic survey of the present-day stock of conversion pairs reveals, however, that not all of them have been created on the semantic patterns just referred to. Some of them arose as a result of the disappearance of conversion is also very frequent; verbs and adjectives are converted from nouns or vice versa for the sake of bringing out the meaning more vividly in a given context only. These cases of individual coinage serve the given occasion only and do not enter the word-stock of the English language. In modern English usage we find a great number of cases of occasional conversion, e. g. to girl the boat; when his guests had been washed, mended, brushed and brandied; How am I to preserve the respect of fellow-travellers, if I'm to be Billied at every turn? Sound-interchange in English is often combined with a difference in the paradigm.

Nowadays this theory finds increasingly fewer supporters, and conversion is universally accepted as one of the major ways of enriching English vocabulary with new words. One of the major arguments to conversion is the semantic change that regularly accompanies each instance of conversion. Normally, a word changes its syntactic function without any shift in lexical meaning. E. g. both in yellow leaves and in The leaves were turning yellow the adjective denotes a color. Yet, in The leaves yellowed the converted unit no longer denotes color, but the process changing color, so that there is an essential change in meaning. The change of meaning is even more obvious in such pairs as hand - to hand, face - to face, to go - a go.

The other argument is the regularity completeness with which converted units develop a paradigm of their new category of part of speech. As soon as it has crossed the category borderline, the new word automatically acquires all the properties of new category, so that if it has entered the verb category, it is now regularly used in all the forms of tense and it also develops the forms of the participle and the gerund. Such regularity can hardly be regarded as indicating a mere functional change which might be expected to bear more occasional characteristics. The completeness of the paradigms in new conversion formations seems to be a decisive argument proving that here we are dealing with new words and not with mere functional variants. The data of the more reputable modern English dictionaries confirm this point of view: they all present converted pairs as homonymous, i.e. as two words, thus supporting the thesis that conversion is a word-building process.

Conversion is not only a highly productive but also a particularly English way of word-building. Its immense productivity is considerably encouraged by certain features of the English language in its modern stage of development. The analytical structure of Modern English greatly facilitates processes of making words of one category of parts of speech from words of another. So does the simplicity of paradigms of English parts of speech. A great number of one-syllable words is another factor in favor of conversion, for such words are naturally more mobile and flexible than polysyllables.

Conversion is a convenient and "easy" way of enriching the vocabulary with new words. It is certainly an advantage to have two (or more) words where there was one, all of them fixed on the same structural and semantic base.

The high productivity of conversion finds its reflection in speech where numerous occasional cases of conversion can be found, which are not registered by dictionaries and which occur momentarily, through the immediate need of the situation. "If anybody oranges me again tonight, I'll knock his face

off", says the annoyed hero of a story by O'Henry when a shop assistant offers him oranges (for the tenth time in one night) instead of peaches for which he is looking ("Little Speech in Garnered Fruit). One is not likely to find the verb to orange in any dictionary, but in this situation it answers the need for brevity, expressiveness and humour.

The very first example the book is splendid read, though taken from a book-review, is nonce word, which may be used by reviewers now and then or in informal verbal communication, but has not yet found its way into the universally acknowledged English vocabulary. Such example as these show that conversion is a vital and developing process that penetrates contemporary speech as well. Subconsciously every English speaker realizes the immense potentiality of making a word into another part of speech when the need arises.

REFERENCES:

1. Adams, V. An introduction to Modern English word formation. Longman, 1973.
2. Bauer, L. English word-formation. Cambridge. 1983
3. Biese, Y. Origin and development of conversion in English. Helsinki. 1941
4. Антрушина Г.Б., Афанасьева О.В., Морозова Н.Н.. Лексикология английского языка. Москва, 2004.

ЕВРОПА ЕТАКЧИ МИЛЛАТЛАРИ ВА ДАВЛАТЛАРИ НОМЛАРИ ЎРТАСИДАГИ НОМУТАНОСИБЛИК ХОДИСАСИ ҲАҚИДА

Қўлдашев А.М.

*Ф.ф.н., доцент, Ўзбекистон давлат жаҳон тиллари университети,
Тошкент, Ўзбекистон*

e-mail: akramkuldashev@gmail.com

тел: +998903514178

Тарихийлик тамойили у ёки бу шаклда, қамровда, турли тилшунослик мактаблари, йўналишлари вакиллари томонидан қўллаб келинган ва тадқиқотчининг ўз олдида қўйган мақсад ва вазифанинг қай даражада объектив ва аниқлиги, бу мақсадни бажариш учун тилшуноснинг арсеналида керакли даражада адекват ва кучли метод бор йўқлиги, таҳлил қилинадиган конкрет тил материалининг борлиги ва унинг ҳажми ва бу тил материалини танлаб олишда тадқиқотчи томонидан етарли даражада илмийлик билан амалга оширилган-ми ёки тил материалини таҳлил қилишда гипотетик қурилмалар илмий таҳлилдан юқори келганми ва ҳ.к. Каби омиллар тарихийлик тамойилининг тил фактларини тасвирлашда турли натижаларга эришишига олиб келган.

Тиллар тарихини ўрганиш шу тилда сўзлашадиган халқ тарихини ўрганишдир. Ўз навбатида халқ тарихини ўрганиш учун унинг тарихини ўрганиш керак [Қўлдашев, 2021: 28-29].

Француз миллатининг тарихий жиҳатдан шаклланган ҳудуди қадимда Галлия деб аталган ҳудуд бўлиб, у Ғарбий Европада жойлашган. Галлия номи эса галл – кельт қабиаларининг катта бир бўғинининг номидан олинган. «...И хотя английский и французский являются дальними родственниками на языковом древе семьи индоевропейских языков, контакты между ними, продолжающиеся на протяжении многих веков, привели к тому, что словарь обоих языков содержит много общего» [Кулдашева, 2016: 175-176].

Тарихнинг жуда ғалати ҳазилига ўхшаган бир нарса шу ерда кузатилади. Гап шундаки, француз миллати этник бирлик сифатида Рим империяси вайронларида римликларнинг давомчиси сифатида пайдо бўлган миллат бўлиб, улар яшаган ҳудуд аввал “галлар юрти” деб аталган бўлса, кейинроқ у давлат “*франклар юрти*” деб атала бошлади ва шу франк сўзидан миллат ва давлат номи шаклланди. Бу ерда ҳеч бир хайрон қоларли нарса йўқдек туюлади, аммо ҳамма гап шунда-ки, франклар герман тилида сўзловчи халқлар – германлар бўлган. Бундан биз французлар бу роман тилларини қабул қилган германлар деб хулоса чиқарсак ҳам бўлади. Аммо, улар германлар келгунча, ундан аввалроқ римликлар келгунча кельт тилларида сўзлашганлигини инобатга олсак уларни романларнинг тилини ва германларнинг номини қабул қилган кельт халқлари деб атасак янада тўғрироқ, аммо мураккаброқ ном бўларди.

Дунёда ҳозиргача бу каби халқ, мамлакат номлари кам эмас. Масалан, Британия – номи Бриттлар юрти – деб таржима қилинади, Бриттлар эса кельт тилларида сўзлашувчи халқлар бўлиб ҳозир Буюк Британия аҳолисининг юздан бирини ҳам ташкил қилмайди.

Галлия V асргача Рим империясининг провинцияларидан бири эди. Герман қабиаларининг Галлияни босиб олиши 412 йилдан V аср охиригача давом этди. 412 йилдан 426