ПОРІВНЯЛЬНО-ІСТОРИЧНЕ І ТИПОЛОГІЧНЕ МОВОЗНАВСТВО

Abdullayeva Ch. V.
The Academy of Public Administration under the President of the Republic of Azerbaijan

THE WAYS OF EXPRESSING CAUSATIVITY IN ENGLISH AND AZERBAIJANI LANGUAGE SYSTEM

The author shares the viewpoints according to which causality and causative differ from each other in their meanings. Causality embraces such meanings as: argument, reason, basis, cause, stimulus, purposeful motivation. Causality is mainly expressed by conjunctions, conjunctive phrases and their equivalents. Unlike causality, causation forms a lexico-grammatical category expressing causative-consecutive relations between the subject and object. The causative category embraces several levels of the language: morphological, word-building, syntactical. Expression of causation depends on the structure of the given language. One of the central conceptions in causality is causative situation. Its obligatory participants are: a) generator (or source) of causation, which causes the object; b) object of causality or causate. Two main participants of causativity (subject and object) determine the process of causation. The relation of cause and consequence as a philosophical category complete each other. The relation of time and cause acquires certain importance from the point of view of expressing a certain speech situation. Time and cause relations differ from other syntactical relations by their broad sense of expressing opportunities. Undoubtedly, we are interested here not in cause and consequence relations, but in cause and consequence relations within a sentence taking place under the influence of the subject. In other words, we are interested in the phenomenon of causation, which takes place within one sentence. In causative constructions the subject of the sentence functions not as the doer of the intended action, but as its initiator. As a result of one cause a second cause becomes evident. Causality is a semantic units formed on the ground of subject-object relations reflecting the causative seme in itself.
Key words: causative word, cause, speaker, hidden category, transitive verb.

Introduction. Sometimes in the linguistic literature there is a misunderstanding in the usage of the terms of causation and causality. Just because of it there is a need in disclosing the essence of these terms. Causation expresses dependence of cause by syntactical means (conjunctions, means of combining and their equivalents). The expression of causality finds its expression directly in different types of subordinate clauses. Unlike causality causation is a lexico-grammatical category, which reflects the cause and consequence relations between the subject and object. One may make such an inference from this that irrespective of the type of causality verbs forms its basis, its centre, but complex sentences and different preposional combinations form the basis of causality. Proceeding from this difference we think that it is expedient to use the terms causality, causative and causation in our studies. Both causality and causation play an important role in the reflection of reality in the language. These both categories are universal in nature. Depending on the grammatical structure of any language these categories find their expression by different means. The speaker and listener and their knowledge about the objective reality form the basis of communication, it also defines the means and devices used in communication. The means and the cases in which they are used, the information (knowledge) of the speaker and the listener on the objective reality form the basis of the communication. Thus, the functional features are moved to the forefront. It is not accidental that at the beginning of the 60s–70s of the past century there emerged new directions in linguistics, which studied the relations of the speaker and listener in the formation of communication: a) pragmatic linguistics; b) cognitive linguistics.

The purpose of the article is to try to convey the views of different linguists existing in theoretical literature. We think that the universal language

category, that is, causality as a logical-philosophical category reflects the pragmatic-cognitive peculiarities.

The main problem. Pragmatics is the branch of linguistics concerned with meaning in the context, or the senses of sentences in terms of the speaker's intentions in using them.Most of all, pragmatics is a field of linguistics, which studies different aspects of the relations of the speaker and listener in the process of speech.

At present another branch in linguistics is the cognitive linguistics. According to F. Y. Veysəlli, the main purpose of this linguistics is to determine the status of the language in the system of cognition. In general, cognition is the reception, deposit, reutilization and transmission of information in the brain [3, p. 21]. In the frames of the cognitive paradigm the language is the main expresser of the cognitive activity of the man. Language and thinking are closely connected with each other [3, p. 27]. The main idea of cognitive studies reflects the cognitive structures, which reflect the environment mentally. The smallest units or particles of the cognitive structure are the concepts. Concept deposits the knowledge of the man about the world in the memory [3, p. 31]. According to A. A. Abdullayev, concepts emerge in the process of cognition of the reality by the man and reflect the information connected with the environment [1, p. 191]. Another important notion of the cognitive linguistics is the conceptfers, that is, the sphere of knowledge, the units of which consist of concepts. It includes pictures, frames, schemes, notions and scenarios [1, p. 33]. Cognitive linguistics is a field of science, which plays an important role in the precision of the issues of consciousness and thinking, and which seems interesting [3, p. 34–35].

Causality and causation relations form a binary depending on their nature. Each of them has a definite purpose. Causality is based on a certain event, fact or condition. For instance: Hava soyuq olduğuna görə biz evə qayıtdıq (The weather being cold, we returned home). But the causative relation expresses the information for changing the state of the thing, which will take place in something or somewhere obligatorily. For instance: O, məktubu sabah göndərtdirəcək (He will have the letter sent tomorrow). Thus, causation shows the action, which takes place as a conditional dependence; causality shows the action which takes place as a result of instigation. Undoubtedly, the use of causation or causality is not spontaneous. The use of each of them depends on the concrete speech situation and on the background knowledge of the speaker or listener. Causality, cause-consequence relations attract the

attention of philosophers and text critics more than that of the linguists. It is noted that nothing may exist without its cause and the existence of anything may be terminated without a reason. We can make such an inference from the said that the principles of causality play an important role in the formation of obligatory relations existing among the things. The formation of the relations of cause and consequence in the language has always attracted and are still attracting the attention of the linguistics up to the present day. From this point of view, it will be expedient to appeal to the classical literature. Speaking about the relation of causality the French linguist Charles Bally noted that the said relation is connected with the transitive verbs. According to him, the syntactic expression of causality takes place on the grounds of agreement and government. Depending on certain causes the following results are obtained: a) A turns into B as a result of a cause; b) as a result of a cause A is in B, or on the contrary, B is in A; c) the wind compels the leaves fall (külək yarpaqları düşməyə məcbur edir); d) the snow whitens the mountain (qar dağı ağardır); e) Pavel moves the chair towards the table (Pavel stulu stola tərəf itələyir).

Charles Bally makes such a conclusion that such constructions express casual relations in use; it gives us reason to say that there are hidden devices in the language. Such relations are numerous and heterogeneous. He classifies the frequently used syntactical models into 3 groups:

1. The phenomenon of causality takes place as a result of the use of analytical forms of two verbs standing next to each other. The following types of sentences are presented for this purpose. For instance: Pavel compels Petrov to work. Pavel orders the tailor to sew him a new suit (Pavel Petrovu işləməyə məcbur edir. – Pavel dərziyə paltar tikməyi sifariş edir).

It is necessary to note that the verb to make (məcbur etmək) plays an important role in the expression of causality as a universal means. We shall see below that this model functions in English as one of the main means for the expression of causality in English. For instance: The man made them leave the garden. – Kişi onları bağı tərk etməyə məcbur etdi. The man ordered them to leave the garden. – Kişi onları bağı tərk etməyə əmr etdi.

2. Ch. Bally notes the cases when causality takes place as a result of the causative relations, that is, as a result of causality one quality or form changes into another. For instance: Pavel makes his parents happy (Pavel valideynlərini xosbəxt edir). There are cases when causality becomes obvious from the logic. For example, let us take the verb to give (vermək). We

can transform the sentence Pavel kitabı Petrova verir (Pavel gives the book to Petrov) very easily: Pavel elə edir ki, kitab Petrovda olsun (Pavel does so that the book remains in Petrov). As it was noted above, in the sentence models of this type a hidden cause takes place.

3. Causative verbs play an important role in the expression of causality. These verbs fulfill two functions simultaneously: a) they create a relation between the subject and object; b) they are able to change their quality and form by having an impact on them. Ch. Bally includes the following verbs into the group of these verbs: 1) sevindirmək- şən olmağa məcbur etmək (to gladden – to compel to be glad); 2) ağartmaq – ağ olmağa məcbur etmək (to whiten – to compel to be white); 3) rəngləmək-nəyinsə rəngini dəyişmək (to paint, to colour –to change the colour of something).

The verbs dağıtmaq (to destroy), öldürmək (to kill), məhv etmək (to annihilate), bişirmək (to cook) and others are also included into the group of causative verbs.The views of S. D. Katsnelson concerning the causality attract the attention, too. When one gets closely acquainted with his views about the hidden category and causality, it becomes clearly evident that he has developed and improved the views of Ch. Bally concerning these categories. He notes that the hidden categories fulfill many important functions in the language system. Among them the syntactical valency and hidden changes in lexical meanings occupy an important place. It becomes evident that the studies conducted on the materials of different languages prove that the causative verbs do not have distinguishing morphological or syntactical features. Causality finds its expression depending on the lexical meaning and syntactical function of the word in the sentence. The views of L. Tesniere on causality differ from those of other linguists considerably. He relates the causality of verbs to the valency of verbs. In other words, he thinks that causality depended on the actant of the verb, in other words, on the number of members of the sentence, which the verb combines. If the issue is approached from this point of view, he classifies the verbs like the followings by taking into account the actants of the verbs [3, p. 272].

1. Mono-actant verbs: düşmək – to fall, ölmək – to die, getmək-to go, etc. Top düşdü – The ball fell down, Uşaqgetdi – The child went away, Düşmən öldü – The enemy died. As it is seen from the examples, L. Tesniere does not use the term "intransitive verb", but undoubtedly, he means the intransitive verbs.

2. Two-actant verbs: yıxmaq – to kick down, öldürmək – to kill, görmək – to see. By two-oactant verbs the transitive verbs are meant, such verbs are used with objects: O, düşməni öldürdü – He killed the enemy. O, dostunu gördü – He saw his friend.

3. Three actant verbs: göndərmək – to send, göstərmək – to show, demək – to say, vermək – to give, etc. The transitive verbs of this kind admit two objects (direct and indirect) and also an indirect object: For example: Tom sent Mary a book. – Tom Meriyə bir kitab göndərdi. Tom sent Mary a picture. – Tom Meriyə bir şəkil göndərdi.

In three-actant verbs the causality is formed like in the following model. For example: Polis oğrunu yaşadığı ünvanı söyləməyə məcbur etdi – The police made the thief tell his address. It is necessary to note that the demonstrated model is existing in several languages as a universal model. The causality of three actant verbs may take place in the model given below. For example: Şarl kitabı Alfredə verir – Charles is giving the book to Alfred. The causality of four actant verbs may take place in the model below. For example: Daniyel Şarlı məcbur edir ki, kitabı Alfredə versin – Daniel compels Charles to give the book to Alfred. It is natural, because, as a rule, the passive voice of the verb is built with the transitive verbs. The majority of the verbs are known as transitive ones. For instance, in the modern English language in sentences having subject-infinitive composition this case strikes the attention more. For example, Tom was made to leave the room. – Tomu otağı tərk etməyə məcbur etdilər.

Taken wholly, L. Tesniere's arguments are based on the materials of the French language and he discloses his views on causality and on its essence, which are very valuable. Another attractive view of L. Tesniere is that he mentions the idea of translating the causative verbs from one language into another. He devotes a special chapter to the issue under the title "Metataxis and Causative". By metataxis he means the structural changes taking place in the translation from one language into another. As it is known, not only different languages, but even within one and the same language, the means of expression of causality is variegated and different. Causality is expressed analytically in some languages, synthetically in others. The visual example of it can be seen in the means of expression of causality in the Azerbaijani and English languages. In Azerbaijani causality is expressed synthetically, in English – analytically. For instance: Məktubu ona göndərtdim. – I made him send the letter.

In the Azerbaijani language causality finds its expression morphologically in the causative mood of the verb; therefore, it has not so much attracted the attention of the investigators. Nevertheless, we

should like to mention one of such studies conducted recently. That is "Dildə məcburiyyət anlayışının ifadəsi" (The expression of the notion of compulsion in language) by L.B.Yusifova [4]. It becomes evident from the provisions and goals of the study that the investigator imagines the notion of compulsion much broader. We think that though causality expresses some compulsion, yet it is regarded as a part of the notion of compulsion. We think that though causality expresses compulsion in some degree, yet it differs substantially from the notion of compulsion due to its essence and means of expression. So that not all the compulsions express causality. It is fairly noted in the recent researches that in imperative there is performative and in causative there is information [2, p. 141]. Nevertheless the mentioned research work acquires a certain importance for the linguistics of Azerbaijan. We shall try to disclose our attitude to the problems having something in common with our study.

The analysis of the language materials shows that causality finds its expression not only in different languages, but even within one and the same language. Though it is universal in nature, it is important to proceed from the grammatical structure of each language separately. It is not expedient to apply the grammatical phenomenon of one language to another one spontaneously. We observe it in our research work, which is connected with the Azerbaijani and English languages. In Azerbaijani causality is expressed synthetically by means of the causative mood of the verb, but in English in many cases it is expressed analytically, if it is possible to say. For example: Mən məktubu göndərtdim. – I had the letter sent. As it becomes obvious from the examples, the differences between the twolanguages tell of themselves not only from the point of view of expression, but also from the point of view of the doer of the action. In Azerbaijani the sender of the letter is unknown, but in English the doer of the action is known. At the same time the basic difference between these two sentences is the word order inherent to them. Nevertheless, we observe identical things existing in both languages. Depending on the means expressing the meaning and the means expressing causality, we may speak of two forms of causality: a) simple causality, b) complicated causality. Simple causality emerges as a result of a cause. In this case pure causative verbs are used: to order – əmretmək; to cause – səbəbolmaq, to force – məcbur/vadaretmək, etc. The simple causality is built on the following model. The man forced the boy to follow him. – Kişi oğlanı onun ardınca getməyə məcbur etdi. Thus, in simple causality the subject

compels the object to perform an action, that is, the cause leads to the consequence. In complicated causality the subject acts against the object and also compels it to change its position. As a result of it, the object acquires a new form or condition. For instance: The boy broke the window. – Oğlan pəncərəni sındırdı. It becomes known from the examples that causality takes place within a concrete time and space. Because of it three processes of causality are shownwithin the space. Just because of it we think it expedient to take this classification as a basis in our investigation. Action causality is such a kind of causality that someone compels anything, or a part of it, or other thing or a part of it move from one space to some other space. For example: 1. The man made the children leave the garden. – Kişi uşaqları bağı tərk etməyə məcbur etdi. 2. The boy sent his parents a letter. – Oğlan valideynlərinə məktub göndərdi. In both sentences under the influence of the subject the object is compelled to change its space. In the first sentence the children are obliged to change their place at least for several metres, they are compelled to move from one space to another one. It is natural that in the second sentence in consistence with the logic the space is changed for the delivery of the letter from one space to another one. In replacement causality someone influences the replacement of a thing, or a part of it, or another thing, as well as a part of it in a certain space. For example: 1. The pupil put the books into the bag. – Şagird kitabları çantanın içinə qoydu. 2. He moved the table to the corner. – O, stolu küncə qoydu. Paying attention to the examples it is clearly felt that in both sentences the thing, which is subjected to an influence, changes its place. The situation in the first sentence can be imagined like this: the pupil puts the books into the bag after making his lessons. In the second sentence replacement takes place on the same design:a) Any article or thing, or a part of it influences the change of its place. For instance: 1. He slept. – O, yatdı. He lay. – O, uzandı. 2. He raised his hand. – O, əlini qaldırdı. In the first two sentences we have self (auto) causation. Here a hidden grammatical category takes place: O, oyaq idi. Sonra yatdı. O, işləyirdi. Sonra uzandı. He was awake. Then he slept. It means that one condition or state was replaced by another one. In the second sentence the subject changes the state of his hand. By raising his hand he conveys information that he is ready to answer the lesson or wants to say that he has a question to ask. b) A thing changes the state of a thing or a part of it by exerting influence on it or on a part of it. For example: 1. The wind broke the tree. – Külək ağacı sındırdı. 2. The wind broke the branches of the tree. – Külək ağacın budaqlarını

sındırdı. In the first case the object is wholly subjected to an influence. In the second case a part of the object is subjected to an influence. In both cases the part of the object subjected to an influence changes its form in this or some other way and acquies a new form.

Speaking about the essence of the causative in the space it is necessary to proceed from two types of the notion of space: a) subject space or causatorspace; b) object space or causate space. Toshovich notes that causal situation forms the basis of causality. The participants of causality (causator and causate), causative space and causative position form the casual situation. The main participants of causality emerge in two forms: a) generator (source) of causality or causator; b) object or causate subjected to instigation. Just these two participants of causality (causator and causate) play an important role in the execution of causality. In the concrete speech situation causator is instigator, but the causate being subjected to instigation functions as a unit, which changes its form in this or other way. Causator may be a human being, an animal and a phenomenon of nature. For example: The child broke the toy – Uşaq oyuncağı sındırdı. The wolf killed a sheep – Canavar bir qoyun öldürdü. The wind destroyed the house – Külək evi dağıtdı. Sometimes causator may be explicit and implicit. It becomes obvious in the sentences of the type Somebody opened the door. In this sentence somebody as a causator is used explicitly. But in the sentence The door opened the causator functions implicitly. It is simply imagined that the door cannot open itself. Somebody or something has taken part in the opening of the door. Speaking about the position of causality in the space B.Toşoviçh notes that in causal constructions there may be one, two or several causates. Let us appeal to examples: 1. He bent his head – O, hörmət əlaməti olaraq başını əydi. 2. He closed his eyes – O, gözlərini yumdu. 3. They bent their heads – Onlar hörmət əlaməti olaraq başlarını əydi. In the first sentence we have a mono-causator, in the second one – a bicausator, in the third one – a polycausator. It is necessary to note that bicausator is used with the pair members of the human body; hands, eyes, feet, ears, brows- əllər, gözlər, ayaqlar, qulaqlar, qaşlar etc. For example: He raised his hands. – O, əllərini qaldırdı. Causate differs from causator in its position. Causator is subjected to changes under the influence of causator. 1. Causate is expressed by a human being: Mother washed the child. – Ana uşağı yudu. 2. Causate is expressed by an animal: The hunter killed the bear. – Ovçu ayını öldürdü. 3. Causate is expressed by a plant: The man cut the grass. – Kişi otub içdi. 4.Causate is expressed by a lifeless thing: The soldier raised the flag. – Əsgər bayrağı qaldırdı.

Conclusions. We may make the following inferences by generalizing the above mentioned: Causality and causation attracts the attention of the philosophers and linguists as a category of causation. The category of causation functions as a type of mutual interdependence. Though causation and causality differ from each other in essence, they form an interrelated binarity. Causality combines much broader meanings: initial condition, result determined in advance, result, stimule, purpose, etc. Causality finds its expression directly in different types of subordinate clauses. Causality is a lexico-grammatical category, which reflects the relation of cause and consequence. Not depending of the means of expression causality finds its expression in causative transitive verb. As a result of subject-object relation this or another thing is obliged to change its initial form, state, measure and others. Causality emerges in simple and complicated forms. Simple causality takes place as a result of a cause: The man forced the boy to follow him. In complicated causality the subject acts both against the object and also instigates it to change its state: The boy broke the window. Causate and causator form the causal situation. Causator functions as an instigator, causate as something or someone subjected to instigation and is functioning as a unit changing its form. Causate and causator may be used as different parts of speech. The analysis of the language phenomena shows that causality is inherent to the majority of languages as a universal category. Not only in separate languages, but even in a separately taken language causality has different means of expression.

Bibliography:
1. Abdullayev Ə.Ə. Aktual üzvlənmə, mətn və diskurs. Bakı, "Zərdabi LTD" MMC, 2011.
2. Xanbutayeva L.M. Danışıq aktı nəzəriyyəsində sintaktik vahidlərin yeri. Bakı, "Elm vətəhsil", 2018.
3. Veysəlli F.Y. Koqnitiv dilçilik: əsas anlayışları və perspektivləri. Bakı, "Mütərcim", 2015.
4. Yusifova L.B. Dildə məcburiyyət anlayışının ifadəsi. Filol. üzrə f.d. elmi dərəcəsi almaq üçün təqdim olunmuş dis. avtoreferatı. Bakı, 2017.
5. English-Azerbaijani Dictionary. Editor-in-chief. O.I.Turksever (Musayev). Printing House "Qismət", Bakı, 2003.

Абдуллаєва Ч. В. СПОСОБИ ВИРАЖЕННЯ КАУЗАТИВНОСТІ В СИСТЕМІ АНГЛІЙСЬКОЇ ТА АЗЕРБАЙДЖАНСЬКОЇ МОВ

Автор поділяє точку зору, згідно з якою причинність і каузатив відрізняються один від одного за своїми значеннями. Причинно-наслідковий зв'язок охоплює такі значення, як: аргумент, розум, основа, причина, стимул, цілеспрямована мотивація. Причинно-наслідковий зв'язок в основному виражається сполучниками, кон'юнктивними фразами і їх еквівалентами. На відміну від причинності, причинно-наслідковий зв'язок утворює лексико-граматичну категорію, що виражає причинно-наслідкові відносини між суб'єктом і об'єктом. Категорія каузатива охоплює кілька рівнів мови: морфологічний, словотвірний, синтаксичний. Вираз причинності залежить від структури даної мови. Одним з центральних понять в каузальності є каузативна ситуація. Його обов'язковими учасниками є: а) генератор (або джерело) причинно-наслідкового зв'язку, який викликає об'єкт; б) об'єкт причинності або каузат. Два основних учасника каузативності (суб'єкт і об'єкт) визначають процес причинно-наслідкового зв'язку. Ставлення причини і наслідки як філософська категорія доповнюють один одного. Співвідношення часу і причини набуває певного значення з точки зору вираження певної мовної ситуації. Тимчасові та причинно-наслідкові відносини відрізняються від інших синтаксичних відносин своїми широкими можливостями вираження. Безсумнівно, нас тут цікавлять не причинно-наслідкові відносини, а причинно-наслідкові зв'язки всередині пропозиції, що відбуваються під впливом підмета. Іншими словами, нас цікавить феномен причинно-наслідкового зв'язку, який має місце в межах одного речення. У каузативних конструкціях суб'єкт пропозиції функціонує не як виконавець передбачуваної дії, а як його ініціатор. В результаті дії однієї причини стає очевидною друга причина. Причинність – це семантичні одиниці, утворені на основі суб'єкт-об'єктних відносин, що відображають каузативну сему саму по собі.

Ключові слова: каузативне слово, причина, мовець, прихована Категорія, перехідне дієслово.