Semantics of Causative Constructions of the Modern Russian Language

Bimbetov Alimjan Utarbaevich

Nukus State Pedagogical Institute named after Ajiniyaz, Nukus, Karakalpakstan, and Republic of Uzbekistan

Abstract: The article elucidates the content and differentiates between the notions of "causative constructions," "causativity," and "causalness," which have a significant position in social communication. Diverse language events can signify causal constructs based on the efficacy of the causative influence, the semantics of the causative response, and the intensity of the causative activity. These categories possess a diverse array of implementation methods. Causality as a motivator for action can be articulated through many persuasive constructs, ranging from courteous and non-assertive to incisive and relentless.

Keywords: causative constructions, causality, cause-and-effect relationships, causative verbs, linguistic semantics, functional-semantic category, motivation to action, comparative-typological approach, lexical-semantic approach, causal constructions, grammatical structures.

Causative constructions are significant for study because they embody predicative structures that express a rich array of categorical meanings related to cause, consequence, and the relationships between predicative centres [13, p. 5].

Various scientific approaches were employed to examine causal constructions: comparative-typological (M.G. Simulov [2006], S.K. Bevova [2002]) and lexical-semantic (G.G. Silnitsky [1974], O.N. Zhuravleva [2002]). Although causation has been extensively examined, the phrase remains contentious and possesses numerous definitions, the principal one being as follows: "Causality is a complex and multifaceted concept that represents the genuine relationships between external objects, identified and classified by consciousness as causal, and originates from the philosophical notion of causality." [13, c. 5]. Causality refers to the genetic linkage between phenomena, wherein one phenomenon— the cause— under specific conditions, always develops or generates another phenomenon— the consequence (or effect).[14, p. 371]. The concept of causality fundamentally denotes the self-activity of matter, signifying the capacity of material entities and phenomena to generate other entities and phenomena. The cause may arise from either the characteristics of the external effect, analysed via the intrinsic nature of the entity experiencing it, or the dynamics of the interaction among components, resulting in a transformation of the entire system. [11, p. 119]. The concept of cause primarily denotes the influence of one entity on another based on its characteristics, resulting in a specific alteration contingent upon the nature of the influence and the attributes of the affected entity. Causality is an essential relationship between things, whereby one invariably leads to the other.

A.A. Potebnya defines causality as follows: "The notion of action, akin to that of subject and object, is inextricably linked to the concept of cause... is causative, causation (action), caused (perfection, made): the reflection of the action on the subject is caused by the action of the subject." Causality arises from the subject's activity and its concurrent or sequential relationship with the object's state" [Cit., 1, p. 117]. The proper articulation of the causality category in language is accomplished by lexical elements and grammatical structures. The outcome of any "cause" is a "result," and when examining the notion of "causative construction," it is essential to contemplate the idea of "result." B.N. Golovin characterises the concept of consequence as "the authentic linguistic unity of a grammatical meaning and the means of its material expression" [5, p. 311]. K.G. Krushel'nitskaya and N.I. Kovtunova occupy these stances, characterising causality as a grammatical category of the non-morphological type [16, p.9].

Consequence is defined as "a result that arises from an antecedent, a conclusion, an essential element of the cause-and-effect relationship." 423. The examination of linguistic units employed to express reflected relations aids in identifying the distinctive characteristics of these units for the linguistic interpretation of causation. Cause-and-effect relationships are a fundamental semantic category inside natural languages [1, p. 118].

The issue of cause-and-effect links is extensive and complex. Another term in linguistic literature that corresponds with this category is causation. This concept, like to "causativeness," pertains to cause and consequence; however, causality encompasses a broader category that represents the full range of links between real-life occurrences and is expressed in language through syntactic mechanisms. Causality is understood as conditioning—a multifaceted interplay of conditions, objectives, outcomes, and causes [3, p. 89].

The semantics of the category of causativity is very broad, as it intertwines causative, causal, resultative and purposeful meanings. In general, the semantic meaning of causative constructions is based not only on the concept of "causal," but also is considered as "incitement" - from the point of view of the pragmatic approach. Indeed, a person not only communicates their thoughts to their interlocutor or group of people with the help of language, but also motivates them to perform certain actions. And the motivation for action is always based on a social and psychological factor. When prompted to action, a person puts forward and realizes the purpose of their action, that is, this process is a phenomenon of logical and psychological order. The motivation to act also depends on the situations and conditions of communication, which are determined by the following moments of the act of communication: a) the relationship between the speaker and the addressee; b) the attitude of the speaker to the action; c) the dependence of the addressee on the will of the speaker; d) the absence of dependence between the speaker and the addressee. Communication conditions, the status of the interlocutors, their age, rules and etiquette features characteristic of this society and people are important factors in the causation of the object by the subject. Thus, the strong causation variant is used directly depending on the status of the participants in the causative situation, where the initiator (subject) is the senior in rank, position or age. In such cases, the authors use the verbs of the same semantic series expressing a prompt, order, in contrast to other semantic fields expressing a request or permission. In other words, the use of causative constructions of different semantic fields is determined by the writer's genre, context, and style. [3, p. 90].

Therefore, different linguistic phenomena can represent causative constructions depending on the effectiveness of the causative impact, the semantics of the causative reaction, and the intensity of the causator's actions.

The category of causality has a very rich range of means of implementation. Thus, the meaning of causativity, such as prompting to action, can be expressed in a wide variety of compelling constructions - from polite and non-categorical to sharp and persistent [15, c.14] (in the examples we emphasized, A.M.):..." 82 participants met the inclusion criteria and responded to a series of eight vignettes in which they determined guilt based on the level of violence and type of abuse. Results let people note no significant gender differences but indicated differences between several testing conditions to suggest that the level of violence and offender abuse type are significant predictors of guilt among jurors in sexual offense cases" [17]. "Eighty-two participants met the criteria and a number of clichés in which they determined the degree of their guilt depending on the level of cruelty and abuse of something. The research results allowed people to say that all this has nothing to do with gender differences, but some existing tests suggest that the level of violence and ill-treatment of offenders is significant in the case of sexual crimes." "There is also a potential to encourage and improve therapeutic interventions aimed at sexual offenders and victims of child abuse" [17]. "There is also potential to support and improve treatment measures aimed at individuals who have committed these crimes, as well as victims of child abuse."

A.V. Bondarko argues that any functional-semantic category has a field structure, the main feature of which is the commonality of the semantic function of means of different language levels [2, p.77], and the core of the functional-semantic field of causativity is the causative verb [15, p.14]. According to E.E. Kordi, causality is related to the expression of cause-and-effect relations in the system of the verb without limitations on the semantics of individual elements of the construction [6, p.112].

The linguistic category of causality is a rich and comprehensive construct that mirrors the actual relationships between external objects and is intricately linked to the notion of causality. The semantic interpretation of causal formulations is regarded as "motivation to action." The concept of causality can be expressed through a diverse array of persuasive constructions, conveying its meanings in various forms of word formation, lexicon, and context. The essence of the functional-semantic domain of causativity comprises causative verbs, categorised as auxiliary and substantive verbs. The semantics of causal constructions in contemporary russian is quite complex and necessitates thorough examination.

References:

1. Arutyunova N.D. Predlozhenie i ego smysl. – M.: Nauka, 2008. – 116-118 s.

2. Bondarko A.V. Teoriya grammaticheskikh kategoriy. – L.: Slovo, 1976. – 77-78 s.

3. Vezhbitskaya A. Yazyk. Kul'tura. Poznanie. – M.: Nauka, 1997. – 88-90 s.

4. Vsevolodova M.V. Prichinno-sledstvennye otnosheniya v sovremennom russkom yazyke. – M.: Shkola, 1988. – 52-53 s.

5. Golovin B.N. Vvedenie v yazykoznanie. 3-e izd. – M.: Vysshaya Shkola, 1977. – 311 s.

6. Kordi E.E. Modal'nye i kauzativnye glagoly v sovremennom frantsuzskom yazyke. – M.: Nauka, 2004. – 111-114 s.

7. Layonz Dzh. Vvedenie v teoreticheskuyu lingvistiku. – M.: Flinta, 1978. – 77-79 s.

8. Loyfman I.Ya. Kategoriya prichinnosti v dialekticheskoy kontseptsii svyazi // Vestnik Uralskogo Gosudarstvennogo Universiteta. – 1974. – 8-11 s.

9. Nedyalkov V.P., Sil'nitskiy G.G. Tipologiya kauzativnykh konstruktsiy. Morfologicheskiy kauzativ. – L.: Nauka, 1969. – 5-11 s.

10. Pantshava I.D., Pakhomov B.Ya. Dialekticheskiy materializm v svete sovremennoy nauki. – M.: 1962. – 117-120 s.

11. Svechnikov G.A. Prichinnost' i svyaz' sostoyaniy v fizike. – M.: Nauka, 1976. – 118-121 s.

12. Slovar' russkogo yazyka v 4-kh t. pod red. E.P. Evgenevoy. T.1. M.: Russkiy yazyk, 1981. – 423 s.

13. Tereshina Yu.V. Mezhkategoriya'lnye svyazi kauzativnykh konstruktsiy: Avtoreferat dissertatsii na soiskanie uchenoy stepeni kandidata filologicheskikh nauk. – Izhevsk, 2008. – 5 s.