CAUSATIVE SEMANTICS IN ENGLISH AND KARAKALPAK

Musaev Abish Abilkazievich*

*Lecturer,
Karakalpak State University named after Berdakh,
Nukus, UZBEKISTAN
Email id: musaevabish@mail.ru

ABSTRACT

The article is considered to represent typological research on causative category in English and Karakalpak languages. Essential point of the article deals with causative semantics of both languages and done comparative analysis using the examples that were taken from literary text. It is stated that causality is an event that takes place in interpersonal relationships, in the process of communication, and it is coded using transitive verbs and is expressed in the expression of the influence of one person on another. Moreover, causative expression is distinguished by the fact that each language has its own means of expression, syntactic structures, lexical and grammatical forms.

KEYWORDS: *Causative Semantics, Causative Structure, Morphological Structure, Causer, Subject, Object.*

INTRODUCTION

In terms of semantics, causative verbs in many languages express similar meaning, but when it comes to say about their structure, they can differentiate from each other. The objectives of this article is to study comparatively the semantic differences of causative verbs in the English and Karakalpak languages. Analysis on causative semantics in both languages were done relying on some linguists' views.

Many investigations have been done in both English and Karakalpak languages on causative category, but a comparative-typological analysis of the semantic occurrence of this category still remains important. We can point out that causality differs in both languages not only in terms of form and lexical means, but also in terms of semantics. Researching the issue the presence of cognitive factors is also important in the comparative analysis of this category as causality is directly related to the psycho-emotional state of a person, as well as to the cognitive activity of the subjects involved in the situation. Both languages have a number of verb lexemes with causative meanings.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Causative constructions are a linguistic phenomenon that expresses a complex macro-situation. They consist of two micro-states: 1) the causer acts on another object in order to cause an event; 2) under the influence of causative action, a qualitative change occurs in the object subjected to causality (Song, 2001; 257). It should be noted that a causative event not only represents the result of the action of the causer and the object, but also the person can participate in the function of the causative. In this case, in addition to qualitative changes in the causative subject, there are mental changes and psycho-emotional changes. Extensive researches have been conducted on the category of causality. Nedyalkov and Silnitsky (1969: 1973) argue that causality should be studied in relation to resultatives. They consider that a change in an object or subject appears as a result of

a causative effect, and also results effect on transition from one state to another (Nedyalkov, 1971). Kulikov emphasizes that the valence property of the verb plays an important role in causative constructions (Kulikov, 2001). His opinions on the subject are in line with Dixon's considerations. According to Dixon's analysis, the amount of valence increases by adding a new argument (S) (causative) to the argument in the function A (causer) (Dixon 2000: 31). He avoids the notion that the conclusion of this analysis is applicable to all languages. The author argues that if a language has two or three causative constructions, there is always a semantic difference between them (Dixon 2000: 64). The semantic differences in causality and the classification of their types have already been made by Nedyalkov, Silnitsky (Nedyalkov, Silnitsky 1964: 28-35). The authors distinguish two main semantic types of causality. This situation is also divided into direct and indirect, causative semantic types. These semantic types are referred to by the authors in terms of contact and non-contact (Nedyalkov, Silnitsky 1969: 28-35). This causativeness is expressed by Shibata in the form of manipulative and direct observation (Shibata 1976: 31-38). It should be noted that there are also proponents of differentiating between direct and indirect causality depending on the semantic feature, controlled and uncontrolled by the subject (Kulikov, 2001). We believe that it is also important to pay attention to the degree of causality in causative semantics and differentiation. In this case, it is important to define semantic differences in a mandatory causative and permissible causative way. This is because these differences are due to the use of separate lexical tools, the formation of syntactic structures.

Causatives semantically close in many languages, but structurally different. The causative semantic differentiation in Karakalpak language depends on certain morphological forms as in other Turkic languages. The lexical meaning of the verb is also important. Including *-ip, -ıp, -dır, -giz* and others. Forms the compulsory voice of the verb as a means of morphological expression. Although sufficient investigations have been done in both English and Karakalpak languages on the category of causality, a comparative-typological analysis of the semantic occurrence of this category still remains important. This is because causality differs in both languages not only in terms of form and lexical means, but also in terms of semantics. The presence of cognitive factors is also important in the comparative analysis of this category. This is because causality is directly related to the psycho-emotional state of a person, as well as to the cognitive activity of the subjects involved in the situation. Both languages have a number of verb lexemes with causative meanings. However, in English, the diachronic point of view corresponds to the verbs *"make", "let", "give"* as causative indicators (Kuchimov. 2001 895). There are also researchers who have included the verbs *"do"* and *"take"* in the group of causative verbs (Heine, Kutwa 2002: 327).

DISCUSSION

Changes in event structure in canonical causative structures are directly related to syntactic content. Therefore, in typological research there is a problem of identifying the main linguistic units that form the basis of a particular category and comparing it with this basis in another language. Typological works on the linguistic expression and semantic occurrence of the causative category (Nedyalkov 1969; Plungyan 2002: Shibatani 1976: Dixon 2000) contain comments on the linguistic units that make up this category, as well as on the basis of this category. The interdependence of two or more actions, situations, events, expressed in the framework of causative structures, makes it possible to distinguish between direct and indirect semantic types. In both cases, there is a difference as a result of the physical or other influence of the causer or the causative argument on each other. In the action of the direct type of causality, the effect on the object, takes place on the basis of the desire, purpose of the causative subject. In this case, the movement occurs within the temporal reality and space. Indirect causative semantics is not built on the will of the causative subject. For example:

(In English) *The moster* **made** *the labourer* **slaughter** *the sheep.*

(In Karakalpak) *Бирақ, оның менен ойнас болыўға мени сол ҳаялдың өзи **мәжбүр қылды**. (Бекимбетов А. Тууысқанлар 1978: 71)*

Translation: *But, the lady herself **made** me **be** her lover. (Bekimbetov A. Relatives 1978: 71)*

The examples given above form causative structure in both languages. Causative structure *made the labourer slaughter* consists of causative verb, causator, causatee. In Karakalpak analytic form *мени… мәжбүр қылды* compose the causative structure. The causatives differ from the structures in terms of event structure, situation structure, syntactic point of view. In the given example, it consists of a causative (coercive) event and the actions of the causative, i.e., two sub-situations are formed. In this case, exposure to causality or movement observation is considered to depend on the behavior of the affected subject. It should be noted that in causative structures, the interdependence of two events is not always the same, the occurrence of the other under the influence of one, so in causal structures it is important to take into account the pragmatic content in determining the semantic differentiation of small events and actions. Hence, the occurrence of causative content in an event is more important than the presence or absence of grammatical factors in these structures. The causative expression in a particular inner reality is associated with a meaning that represents a clear lexical unit. In particular, *make, force, get, have* in English form directly emphasized causative realities. For example:

(In English) *a) M: Clara, the coloured maid, found the door locked at ten the next day, and they forced it open (O`Henry; 20); b) Joe and what made you ever upset (O`Henry 25);*

(In Karakalpak) *c) — Жеңгеңниң көзи көрмей қалды, — деди Қаржаўбай аға мени қасына **отырғызып атырып**. (Муратбай Нызанов. 119); d) Алдындағы бир топар баспақтың шетке шыққанына жуўырыўы менен ети қызған мәҳәлде, тоңғанын умытып, қойнындағы нанының шетинен **сындырып**, аўзына салып гүйсейди (**Т.Кайпбергенов** 17).*

Translation: *c) - Your sister's-in-law become blind,+ - said Karjaubay brother **letting** me **sit** nearby him. (Nizanov M. 119) d) He forget being cold running after the herd of cattle in front of him which going aside and taking the bread from the pocket he **broke** a piece and chewed it putting into mouth. (Kaipbergenov T. 17)*

In these examples, (a) the causative meaning is the result of a causative wish, while in (b) the causative meaning is directed to the subject. The causator, on the other hand, participated as an abstract subject or reality. The causative meaning (c) is implicit, directed to a person, while in (d) causative directed to destruction.

Indirect causality can be observed in structures related to permission semantics. For example, the structures in which the English verbs *let, allow* are involved. *M: Shall I tell you why? I let lust come between me and my wits (G.Lynne, 25); b) Bella never, ever allowed herself to be with a man (G.Lynne, 38).* In these causative structures, the semantics of causality is weakened, which is explained by the fact that the causative subject did not prevent reality or allowed this phenomenon to occur. The negative form of the stressed verbs retains information as evidence that causation is allowed in the structures (example b).

Indirect causality can be observed in the qualitative changes in the object, which are carried out under the influence of abstract natural forces in the Karakalpak language. In this case, the lexical meaning of the verb, the presence of grammatical forms plays an important role. Compare:

*a) Сөйтип оларды ийесиз қалған жекке жайларға, алыстағы үңгирлерге бөлеклеп айырып жат**қар**ды. (Бекимбетов А., «Туўысқанлар» 1978, 117);*

*b) Қыз бир нәрселерди жаздыда, қағазды бүклеп, оның қолына тут**қыз**ды ҳәм тарс еткизип әйнекшесин жапты. (Абдирахманов О., Бир мухаббат тарийхы, 1974, 34).*

Asian Journal of Research in Social Sciences and Humanities
ISSN: 2249-7315   Vol. 12, Issue 05, May 2022   SJIF 2022 = 8.625
A peer reviewed journal

Translation: *a) Then he **made** them **lie down** in the houses that were without host and in the caves. b) A girl wrote something, and folding the paper **made** him **hold** it, and closed the window bumping it.*

In the given examples (a) the transitive use of the verb "жатқарды" formed a weak, indirect observation semantics, while in the example (b) the accusative relative form of this verb gave a direct observational meaning. Apparently, the semantics of causality can also be changed using grammatical pointers in a verb example. In English, this is the relationship between subject and object, as well as in individual structures of individual verb lexemes, while in Karakalpak it is much more difficult to define. This is because the Karakalpak language has separate morphological suffixes that form a causative meaning. These morphological suffixes are known by the name of the compulsory voice of the verb. However, not all compulsory voice category also have the ability to express causative meaning.

Comparing only certain structures in the formation of causative meaning does not give the desired result. This is because causative structures in different languages differ not only syntactically but also morphologically or lexically. Taking into account these differences, the expression hierarchy of causative semantics is formed:

lexical causatives → morphological causatives → periphrastic causative structures

The first of these hierarchies is considered to be more directly related to causality than the latter. This is because lexical causatives are a phenomenon common to almost all languages (Comrie 1981: De Lancy 1984). Morphological and periphrastic causative structures in this hierarchy are not common to all languages. However, the morphological and periphrastic structures of the Karakalpak language are characteristic of this hierarchy. Thus, causality in Karakalpak language is characterized by having a morphological form in relation to lexical expression. For example, in English the verbs to kill and to break have a lexical causative meaning, while in Karakalpak the causative semantics of the verbs *сындырыў* and *қылдырыў* are formed by the addition of the suffix -dır.

Expression of causality in Karakalpak language can be formed as follows:

morphological → analytical → lexical

Apparently, the Karakalpak language does not have causative verb structures such as *make smb do, have smth / smb do* like in English, but analytic compound structures are more developed. Compare:

(In English) *a) The last drop **makes** the cup **run over** (J.Darling (J.Spech, 148):*

(In Karakalpak) *Қазыўшылардың биреўи отырса төбесине, турса тирсегине қамшы урып, **тыным тапқызбайды** екен. (Т. Кайпбергенов «Қарақалпақ қызы» 1980, 325).*

Translation: *Whipping on the head of the diggers when they sat, or on the body when they stand **did not let** them **have a rest**.*

Causative verbs in the Karakalpak language not only have this kind of special meaning, but also causative causality. In this case, the leading verb, which has a causative meaning, creates a specific additional meaning through the combination of the auxiliary verb. Syntactically it is governed by a leading verb. The direct or indirect expression of a causative meaning is imposed on the lexical meaning of the verb. Both causatively occur in the process of interpersonal verbal communication. Hence, these structures show that they can be realized within any verb using a special causative morphological form. This allows the means of expressing causality in the Karakalpak language to be interpreted as an infinitely productive category. This is because, although the possibility of adding causative semantic morphological suffixes to certain verbs is

Asian Journal of Research in Social Sciences and Humanities
ISSN: 2249-7315   Vol. 12, Issue 05, May 2022   SJIF 2022 = 8.625
A peer reviewed journal

limited, the analytical connections made with them can indirectly produce causative meanings. For example: *Жумагүлдиң үмити үзилди. Иши жылағандай бир жуўап ала алмаған соң бөпесин жерге **жатқыз**ып қундақлай берди. (Т. Кайпбергенов, «Қарақалпақ қызы» романы, 1980, 161).*

Translation: *Jumagul lost hope. As she did not get answer she seemed like crying and **lied** her baby **down**.*

The "***жатқызып***" structures in these example indirectly created causative semantics formed by infix "***қыз***".

Although special forms of causative structures in English are limited, this meaning is present in the lexical meaning and semantics of some verbs. This is why causality in English occurs as a result of separate syntactic adaptations. Syntactic adaptation depends on the transitive nature of the verb and the fact that the argument in the complementary function comes in the animate (person), inanimate (subject) function. In determining the syntactic structure of units denoting causality in the Karakalpak language, adjectives attached to the verb (compulsory voice), analytical devices are taken into account. This is because the syntactic placement of some non-causative verbs corresponds to the syntactic placement of verbs with causative meaning.

In distinguishing this, the morphological sign is used as a means of distinguishing the permeability of a non-causative verb. In general, in determining causality, a common typological pattern is important to separate them from intransitive verbs and link them to the intransitive filler. Compare: *a) But his repeated commiseration over her widowhood made her wary, and when he decried the difficulty of doing parish work without a wife, she decided that he had an ulterior motive for seeking her out. (L.Allison, 25); b) She pushed the memory aside, wishing her own feelings had remained aloof. Grief still cast a pall over most of her days. (L.Allison, 49); c) Қыз шақалақлап күлди Әширбай да қосылды. Қыз бир нәрселерди жаздыда, қағазды үклеп, оның қолына **тутқыз**ды ҳәм тарс еткизип әйнекшесин жапты. (Абдирахманов О., Бир мухаббат тарийхы, 1974, 34); g) «Бурынғыны айтпайман, тек еки бузаўлы сыйыр, бес кийим тап та ала ғой» – дейди. Оны табыў қайда. Ол түўе көйлекке, елдиң қәде-қәўметине түгимиз жоқ. Болмаса қыздын ана сүтиниң ҳақысы да бар. Оны **айтқыз**бай-ақ бер**гиз**ер едим. (Т. Кайпбергенов «Қарақалпақ қызы» романы, 1980, 363).*

While the meaning in Example (a) is expressed using a purely causative structure, in Example (b) causative semantics is the result of the use of the verb push in the pushed the memory aside structure in a figurative sense.

Examples of the Karakalpak language involved both lexical and syntactic causative structures. Although causative semantics in these examples is a verb-specific feature, it is considered to belong to the whole context from the point of view of analysis. In this case, the complements are arguments directly related to causality. The linguistic units in the given function served to illuminate the space, time, and passage in which causality occurred.

CONCLUSION

It should be noted that causative structures do not have syntactic content or word order in Karakalpak. However, in this language, all lexical-semantic features of the verb, morphological (compulsory voice) form, auxiliary verbs, which directly determine the scope of action on the object or person in the complementary function of the causator, play an important role. For example: when he asked for a trip to the song; ordering a book reader. In these structures it is possible to observe the presence of a causator, a causative object and a person subject to causation. When there is an indirect participant in the causative context, the causative person is also understood by the content. Only the causative object appears to be clearly involved in the saparyn

kaldyryo, book okyo, and so on. When the verbs are interrogative, the lexical-semantic occurrence of the command determines the degree of causative meaning. In particular, the causative semantics of the verb soragan meant a weaker causative meaning than the command verb. The mentioned structures are related to the cognitive activity of this ethnos thinking and "encode in basic cognitive categories such as time, space, object, subject, cause" (Dirven, 1995).

Causality is an event that takes place in interpersonal relationships, in the process of communication, is coded using transitive verbs and is expressed in the expression of the influence of one person on another. This, in turn, is inextricably linked with the ethnospecific features of each language. Because interpersonal relations have a national-cultural character. In this regard, the interaction of native speakers in interpersonal relations is carried out using the means of linguistic expression specific to this ethnos. It is not without its ethnospecific features, which are also emphasized in the expression of causative semantics. This is because causative expression is distinguished by the fact that each language has its own means of expression, syntactic structures, lexical and grammatical forms. Also, in certain languages individual structures have a causative meaning, while in other languages they have grammatical features. Such a distinction reflects the ethnospecific aspects of communication, relationships, and interactions between speakers of these languages, and the linguistic occurrence of these interactions.

REFERENCES

1. Dixon, Robert M. W. A typology of causatives: Form, syntax and meaning. In Robert M. W. Dixon & Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald (eds.), Changing valency. Case studies in transitivity, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 2000. –P 30–83.

2. Kulikov, Leonid Causatives. – Martin Haspelmath & Ekkerhard König & Wulf Oesterreicher & Woldgang Raible (eds), *Language typology and language universals. An international handbook. Vol. 2.* Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter. 2001. –P 886–989.

3. Nedyalkov, I. V. Recessive-accessive polysemy of verbal suffixes. – *Languages of the world* 1: 1991. –P 4–31.

4. Nedjalkov, V. P. & Sil'nickij, G. G. Tipologija kauzativnyx konstrukcij. – A. A. Xolodovich (ed.), *Tipologija kauzativnyx konstrukcij. Morfologicheskij kauzativ.* Leningrad: Nauka. 1969. –P 5–19.

5. Shibatani, Masayoshi. The grammar of causative constructons: a conspectus. – Masayoshi Shibatani (ed.), *The grammar of causative constructions.* New York: Academic Press. 1976: 1–40.

6. Бекимбетов А., «Туўысқанлар» «Қарақалпақстан» баспасы, Нөкис, 1978, 117-бет

7. O. Henry, The Four Million, eBook, www.gutenberg.net, p 20.

8. Нызанов М., «Таңламалы шығармалары, VIII, Роман, гүрриңлер, драббллер» Нөкис, «Билим» 2018, 119 б.

9. Абдирахманов О., Бир мухаббат тарийхы, Қарақалпақстан баспасы, Нөкис 1974, 34-бет

10. Кайпбергенов Т., шығармалары 5 томлық, 4-том, «Қарақалпақ қызы» романы, Қарақалпақстан баспасы, Нөкис, 1980, 325-бет