

Causativity: Critical Considerations

Turniyuazov Behzod Nigmatovich

Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages Associate Professor, Doctor of Philological Sciences (DSc), E-mail: behzod@samdchti.uz

Annotation. In this article is described the state of the study of the concept of causality in world linguistics. The opinions expressed by linguists on this subject are studied, and the author's critical views on them are stated.

Keywords: causativity, causation, category, superlative causation, analytic causative, morphological causation.

Introduction.

In modern linguistics, a number of scientific studies have been carried out covering the topic of causality, and in this regard, linguists A. Meie, B. A. Musukov, V. I. Filonenko, E. Yu. Gordon, A. R. Gubanov, Yu. V. Baklagova, M. G. Simulov, V. S. Khrakovsky and others expressed their opinions and comments. In modern linguistics, it is necessary to seriously approach the study of causative meaning. In order to clarify these issues, we would like to analyze the opinions and comments expressed by our linguists.

Main part.

The famous French linguist Antoine Maille historically studied causative verbs and emphasized that the meaning of the causative comes through the construction of the verb, and says that the concept of the causative is one of the morphological categories of the verb. In particular, the scientist in his "Introduction A l'Étude Comparative des Langues Indo-Européennes" ("Comparative study of Indo-European languages") material of Sanskrit, Greek, Slavic, Irish and Latin languages, comparison of causative words and illuminates the analysis of verbs. In this work, we read the following sentences: "In Hindi, the suffix -euo:-i(-u-) is always added to the stem, forming the present tense form of the verb, as well as the causative case. For example, in the language of

the Vedas in Sanskrit: vart-aya-ti "turning"; sad-aya-ti "passing", prath-aya-ti "extending"[1.227].

It should be noted that the interpretation of adverbs with a causative meaning as a word-formation is not unique to the Turkic languages. However, in some Turkic languages, suffixes that form the accusative case of the verb are studied as word-building affixes. For example, in the first chapter of B. A. Musukov's doctoral dissertation "Morphological word formation of verbs in the Karachay-Bulgarian language" under the title "The problem of studying verb formation in the Turkic languages", in the Karachay-Bulgarian language such verbs as -t, -dir, -ar underline that accusative prefixes serve to form new words, and thus artificial verbs are formed that expand the vocabulary of the Karachay-Bulgarian language. In addition, he says that the meaning of a call to action has lost its meaning in the semantic structure of verbs formed with these additions, and gives the following as an example: бил-«know» – билдир-«report»; бит-«grow» – битдир-«grows» [2.17].

Yu. M. Taukenova approaches this issue in the same way as B. A. Musukov. We can see the proof of this in the scientist's candidate thesis entitled "Word formation based on the verb in the Karachay-Bulgarian language Zh.M. Taukenova spoke about verb formation in the Karachay-Bulgarian language. He says that several suffixes, which are considered to form the accusative case of a verb in the Turkic languages, serve to form a

verb from a verb:- like -giz, -iz, -ir, -tir, -dir (although a verb cannot be made into a verb). Most of the academic grammars of Turkic languages give the following examples that the affixes, which are recognized as additions to the verb's accusative causation, are actually among the prolific verb builders: kollendir - "inspire", keltir - "bring", kechir - "forgive, excuse", Kyrgyz - "introduce what, introduce someone", tengleshdir - "compare, compare someone something, with someone something", etc.[3.5-9].

It is necessary to think about these thoughts. Because prof. V.I. Filonenko did not add suffixes forming the accusative of the verb to the sentence of the word-formers in the work "Grammar of the Bulgarian language". [4.54-56]. Here we observe that two different attitudes are expressed towards the formation of the morpheme level of one language system. When we read the textbook by V. I. Filonenko, we see that in the grammars of the Uzbek language the situation is the same as the construction of the verb and the formation of relative categories. V. I. Filonenko correctly states that only -ar is a verb-forming affix. For example: «акъ» - white, «агъар» - whiter. We also believe that this is correct. In addition, if we analyze the issue from the point of view of common Turkic languages, we agree with B.A. Musukov's opinion that the meaning of calling to action is not observed in the semantic structure of verbs formed using the suffixes -t, -dir. won't be. Compare: read – teach, write – you must write There is no doubt that it has the meaning of a challenge.

It can be seen that the above examples in the dissertations of B. A. Musukov and Zh. M. Taukenova also have the meaning of an invitation and did not create a new word. In our opinion, it would be correct if scientists did not conclude that accusative affixes (causative affixes) are word-formers, but explained that some of them are in a state of homonymy with verb-formative affixes. : ich (verb) + ir (causative) – sentence (noun) + ir (formative verb).

Today, in world linguistics, the concept of causality is studied in terms of morphological causality, analytic causality, lexical causality, semantic causality, and in almost all works the

phenomena of morphological causality and analytic causality are studied separately.[5]. We can see several verbs as means of creating analytical causation. For example, «encourage», «force», «permit» the accusative forms of some verbs in the Turkish language are interpreted as elements that realize morphological causation. imzala –imzala-t, göster – göster-t, icmek – ic-ir-mek [6.35].

In fact, the phenomenon of analyticity is also studied in connection with the field of morphology of linguistics. The term "analyticism" comes from the Greek word meaning "to divide", "to separate". This concept is manifested in the morphological invariance (invariance) of the word. As a result of the morphological invariance of the word, the grammatical meaning is expressed through auxiliary words (sometimes in combination with independent words), word order, tone. However, it should also be said that the concept of an analytic category, in turn, is distinguished by its division into lexical, morphological and syntactic types according to its function.[7.31]. In this case, we are talking about the interpretation of analyticity from a morphological point of view.

Morphologically auxiliary words (sometimes independent words) are associated with the concept of tone analysis, and the causative meaning is easily expressed by all of the above. Therefore, we believe that there is no linguistic sense in studying the expression of causality by analytical means apart from the field of morphology. Therefore, the formation of causality, in our opinion, is correct to study by analytical means as a kind of morphological causality.

It should be said that in linguistics, the phenomenon of causativeness is studied morphologically and semantically, which is the reason for the interpretation of this concept as a grammatical category: "...causativeness is one of the grammatical categories of the verb. At the same time, it is not only a grammatical, but also a functional-semantic category.[8.86].

We do not consider it appropriate to study causativeness as a grammatical category. In our opinion, the concept of causativeness, first of all, does not indicate that languages are included

in any morphological type (such as inflectional, amorphous, agglutinative). Secondly, it does not serve to connect words as a form of agreement. In addition, the concept of a grammatical category covers a whole group of grammatical meanings. A grammatical category includes at least two grammatical meanings. For example, you can compare singular and plural forms of nouns. One grammatical meaning never has a grammatical category.[9.100]. Therefore, causation cannot be considered a grammatical category, and the above cases are not observed in the concept of causation.

The Russian linguist E. Ya. Gordon also tell the truth when he spoke about this: "It is unlawful to consider causation as a grammatical category, because the causative-semantic expression does not have its own constant indicators." [10.5].

As E. Ya. Gordon noted, causation, of course, is not a grammatical category, but, in our opinion, it is wrong to conclude that there are no constant indicators expressing this concept. Because the very fact that causation is expressed in different ways in languages testifies to its constant indicators. For example, in Sanskrit: *janati* (tug'iladi) – *jan-ay-ati* (tug'diradi) – flexion (causative with marker); in Russia: *die - kill* – suppletive causative; in Uzbek: *saw - showed* – causative with postfix (marker); in Franch: *Je ferai écrire une lettre au directeur par Jean* (I will make Jean write a letter to the principal) – analytic causative. The fact that causation is expressed using morphological elements (indicators) does not require an explanation. In addition, operators such as *so, -sa, because*, which introduce the operands of complex syntactic devices with a subordinate component into the derivational relationship, are undoubtedly tools that form syntactically causative devices. Even in the 15th century, our great-grandfather Alisher Navoi mentioned the existence of his indicators expressing this concept in the Turkish language, although it was not called causativeness at that time: « There are also two passive verbs in Arabic conjugation, the most common of which are *motabar* and *kulli*. Andean varieties - *Oria*. And they answer him with even greater wisdom. In Arabic, "A'taytu Zaidan

dirhaman" (I was ordered to give Zaid's dirham), there are three words in this composition. They add one letter to a word and add a pronoun similar to mine, which is very concise and useful. "yugurt and qildurt and yashurt and chiqart" These words meaning are: «Arabiyy ikki maf'ulluk fe'llar (vositali obyektli buyruq ma'nosi) ham sortlarda yo'q, turkiylar bir harf qo'shish orqali bu ma'noni juda qisqa va aniq ifodalaydilar» [11.9].

Mahmoud Koshgari, a great linguist who lived and worked several centuries before Hazrat Alisher Navoi, also expressed the following opinion: "When it comes to the manqus and four letters of the verb, t is added to them, and it changes from two foils to maful." a transitive verb is formed. One of them is the commander and the other is the executor. For example **er bitik bitidi** – the man wrote a letter. This verb means that the work is done by one worker. But **ol angar bitik bititti** – In the sentence he wrote a letter to him, the verb "bititti" has changed to a preposition. *Biri xat yozishga buyurgan, ikkinchisi yozgan*» [12.376]. After all, isn't this the definition of the phenomenon studied as "causativeness" in modern linguistics?

In addition, we can see the expression of this concept in the work of unknown author "Attuhfatuz zakiyatu fillugatit turkiya" ("A unique gift about the Turkish language (Kipchak language)", created in the 14th century. For example, in the "Section of forgiving people" of the work, the following information is given: « Transient processes have several signs (indicators). One of them is the -dir character. For example: like in a pillow. Other - m. For example: as in *olturt - kill*. One more -g': promote - raise" [13.122].

Therefore, we can safely say that the concept of causality has constant indicators. Otherwise, causality could not be defined either in language or in speech. In addition, it is correct to study this concept not as a grammatical category, but as a means of expressing grammatical meaning. As for its semantic expression, causation is analyzed in connection with the premise of the sentence, the semantic distribution of the components of a micro or macro text.

If causativeness is a means of expressing grammatical meaning, then it is natural to ask the question: what does it have to do with the logical semantic process? For example, let's take the phenomenon of inflection, which expresses grammatical meaning. Despite the fact that this phenomenon is a grammatical tool, it also represents time or number categories in languages. Including in Arabic: **قلب - قلوب** (qalbbun - qulubun) – heart - hearts (number category expression); in German: **sang - gesungen** – sang- had sang (expression of past and past perfect tense). Therefore, despite the fact that causativeness is a means of expressing grammatical meaning, it is easily expressed by logical presupposition.

In the article "Category of Causation: Causality and Causative Relationships" written jointly by Professor A.R. Gubanov and his student N.I. Res, the concepts of causality and causativeness are distinguished. According to scientists, causality explains the cause expressed through conditional meaning, while causation refers to the cause expressed through inducement.[14.247]. We can see that other linguists support this opinion. For example, Yu. V. Baklagova in her article "On the interpretation of issues of causality and causality in the language system" says the following: "In the literature on linguistics, we find such correlative terms as "causality" and "causativity" associated with the category of cause and effect . These terms express the meanings of the Latin causa "cause, justify, encourage". But causality combines such concepts as confirmation, proof, justification, purpose, foundation, which are expressed through the expression of the meaning of the condition and, in turn, are formed by syntactic elements. For example, we can say the elements of a complex sentence. Causality is a grammatical category of a verb that is associated only with the meaning of the cause.[15.30].

As we mentioned above, firstly, causality is not a grammatical category of the verb, and secondly, mixing the essence of the issue by studying causality and causality separately, in our opinion, causes confusion when studying this phenomenon by our linguists.

M. G. Simulov comes to the conclusion that the causal meaning expressed by the affixation method of morphological causality becomes more active than the realization of the causal meaning expressed by analytical means.[16.6].

In our opinion, regardless of the grammatical means by which the causal meaning is realized, its active or passive character is determined by the communicative relations between the speaker and the listener. In other words, the acquisition of the emphatic nature of the causal meaning is expressed through the speaker's intention to use linguistic signs (illocutionary relation) and the impact of the speaker's speech on the listener (perlocutionary relation). We observe the study of causality according to the word-formation principle in the scientific views of the Russian linguist V. S. Khrakovskiy. For example, in the article "Causal derivation (concrete process)" the scientist explains his reasoning on the materials of the Arabic language. According to V. S. Khrakovskiy, a new (external) participant is added to the structure of the argument of an intransitive (one-actant) or transitive (two-actant) verb, which acts as a causal (active or causal) and is the first syntactic actant. (owner) holds a position. As a result, the participant who previously held this position takes the place of the second syntactic actant (indirect complement). This word-formation process, in turn, is carried out through special causative indicators of artificial verbs in Arabic. He calls this situation "actant derivation". In some places in the article, this is also explained as "applicative derivation". For example: the child sat down – Umar let the boy go [17.184-192].

In our opinion, it is more correct to interpret this situation as "applicative derivation" (derivative process based on the applicative model). Because the applicative model is one of the specific mechanisms of the syntactic derivation phenomenon. In addition, in the process of word formation according to the applicative model, the valency of the word also matters. In particular, from the point of view of word formation, the extension of the syntactic form of the sentence based on the valency of the

verb deserves attention.[18.84-85].

It should be said that the formation of a verb in Arabic is related to its division into chapters (categories). Accordingly, Arabic verbs are divided into 15 different chapters and, as shown in Arabic language textbooks, they are marked with Roman numerals. From these chapters (categories), the verbs belonging to the first category are mainly primary, and each of them has a separate meaning and serves as a basis for creating derivatives - related bases. From this point of view, it is logical to call them root or primary verbs. The affixation method is widely used in the formation of derivatives[19.169]. For example, passive verbs of type II express the strength and intensity of the action, and the second sound of the root (stress is placed in the recording) doubles (doubling phenomenon): beat – ضَرَبَ (daraba); to strike with force – ضَرَّبَ (darraba). In this way, from verbs consisting of tripartite stems belonging to different chapters XV, verbs with different meanings are formed. For example, artificial causatives are formed from type IV verbs with the hamza sign (prefix) above the alif at the beginning of the word: to sit – جَلَسَ (jalasa); to pass – أَجْلَسَ (ajlasa)[20.125]. Therefore, in our opinion, it was better to analyze this phenomenon as a lexical causation, and, in turn, it was necessary to study this situation according to the rules of lexical derivation. After all, we think that there was no need to use the concept of "actant derivation" at a time when studies of derivation into lexical, semantic and syntactic types in the field of linguistics have a scientific justification. But we observe that many linguists are conducting scientific research in this direction.

It should be noted that in any type of derivation we use the terms "operator", "operand", "derivative". Although V. S. Khrakovski himself assessed the operator as the absolute owner of the derivation, he does not use such terms in this article. [21.496-497]. The scientist's use of such terms as "addressee", "beneficial", "harmful", "tool" makes the work more gravitating towards the area of semantic syntax. In this case, it is necessary to analyze the materials of the article within the framework of semantic derivation.

Conclusion

Thus, in this article we have expressed our thoughts and opinions on the state of the study of causality in world linguistics. Due to the lack of research on the problem of causality in Uzbek linguistics, dissertations and published monographs written by Russian, Bulgarian, Kazakh, Kyrgyz linguists were mainly used to cover the topic. We think that the comments presented in this article will serve as a necessary source for the creation of new scientific works in this area in the future.

List of literature

1. Meie A. Introduction to the Comparative Study of Indo-European Languages (translated from French by D. Kudryavsky, edited by R. Shor). - M.; L.: Publishing House of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, 1938.
2. Musukov B.A. Morphological derivation of verbs in the Karachay- Bulgarian language // Abstract of the thesis of Doctor of Philology. - Nalchik, 2011.
3. Taukenova Zh.M. Intra-verbal word formation in the Karachay-Balkar language//Author's abstract of the dissertation of the canal of philological sciences. -Nalchik, 2011.
4. Filonenko V.I. Grammar of the Balkar language. Phonetics and morphology. - Nalchik: Kabardino-balkarskoe gosudarstvennoe izdatelstvo, 1940.
5. Dlugosh A.M. English analytical causative with the service verb GET//Avtoref. dis. cand. philol. Sciences: -Kiev, 1980; Cui Wang, Bochina T.G. Causative construction in Russian and Chinese//Philological sciences, No. 3, 2014.
6. Amatov A.M., Filimonov N.G. Kauzativnye affiksy v sovremennom angliyskom yazyke//Nauchnye vedomosti, No. 6, 2012.
7. Big encyclopedic dictionary. Linguistics. -M.: Great Russian Encyclopedia, 1998.

8. Bessalov A.Yu. Causative verbs as a means of expressing cause-and-effect relationships in English and French// Vestnik MGOU, No. 6, 2010.
9. Abduazizov A.A. An Introduction to Linguistic Theory. -Tashkent: Sharq, 2010.
10. Gordon E. Ya. Causative verbs in modern Russian// Author's abstract of Candidate of Philology Sciences: -M., 1981.
11. Alisher Navoi. Muhokamat-ul lug'atayn (Preparers for publication: Oybek, Porso Shamsiev). -Tashkent: State Publishing House of Uzbekistan, 1948.
12. Mahmoud Koshgari. The dictionary is Turkish. Volume II (Translator and publisher S.M. Mutallibov). -Tashkent: Publishing House of the Academy of Sciences of the Uzbek SSR, 1963.
13. Atuhfatuz zakiyatu fillugatit turkiya Translator and preparer for publication S.M.Mutallibov). - Tashkent: Science, 1968.
14. Retz N.I., Gubanov A.R. Category of causality: causal and causative connections // Bulletin of the Chuvash University, No. 1, 2012.
15. Baklagova Yu.V. To the question of causality and causation in the language system//Bulletin of the Adyghe State University. Series "Philology and Art History". Maykop: ASU, 2008. Issue. 10 (38).
16. Simulov M.G. Ways of expressing causative relations in languages of different structures (on the material of English and Chuvash languages) // Abstract of the thesis of Candidate of Philology: -Cheboksary, 2006.
17. Khrakovsky V.S. Causative derivation (special case)// International conference dedicated to the 50th anniversary of the St. Petersburg typological school: materials and abstracts. -SPb., 2011.
18. Turniyozov N.Q. Uzbek language derivational syntax//Extension of sentence form. -Tashkent: Navroz, 2011.
19. Talabov E. Arabic language textbook. - Tashkent: Uzbekistan, 1993.
20. Grande B.M. The course of Arabic grammar in comparative historical coverage. 2nd edition. - M.: Eastern Literature, 2001.
21. Khrakovsky V.S. Transformation and derivation//Problems of structural linguistics. - M.: Nauka, 1973.