CAUSAL RELATIONS AS A PART OF THE FUNCTIONAL SYNTAX OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE

Khamrayeva Zebiniso Khaydar qizi
Teacher of SamSIFL

Abstract

This article presents the results of a study of the functional syntax of causal relations in the English language. Causal connections can be traced not only in the text, but also in the sentence, which is a unit of the highest level of the structural hierarchy. Only such units' function directly as propositions.

Keywords: Causation, syntax, function, agent, conditionality.

Introduction

Syntax, unlike other levels of the language, is directly correlated with the process of thinking and the process of communication: units of other levels of the language system are involved in the formation of thought and its communicative expression. This is the specificity of syntax as a real phenomenon and as a scientific object. This determines its role as the "organizational center of grammar", as well as the need for a single functional criterion for all syntactic means, units and constructions. In the process of communication, the role of each of the units in the construction of coherent speech is revealed: "what - for what?"

Many modern scholars speak of the significance of the notion of function for syntax. So, A. Martinet considers functions to be the central problem of syntax. The concept of a function, introduced into linguistics by the glossematics L. Hjelmslev and K. Togeby with the mathematical meaning of a relation, becomes a concept arising from the essence of language, expressing the role of one or another linguistic element in a communicative act, in accordance with the principle of functionality, which was once put forward by Baudouin de Courtenay.

The greatest merit in developing the concept of function belongs to the Prague School of Linguistics, for which functionalism is the basis of scientific methodology. As F. Danesh writes, in whose works the modern methodological principles of this school are clearly expressed, the concept of a function includes both a goal and a means (if something serves as a means for the goal F, then we say that this something has a function f). Since we are talking about a property, a function always implies a carrier phenomenon ("function of what?"). It is in this that one should see the essence of functional linguistics [4, p. 88].

The problem of connections is of key importance in functional grammar. In the fields of the functional-semantic plan, the interconnections of grammatical and lexical components are carried out due to their meaningful correlation, the ability to combine in one semantic complex. Such semantic complexes expressed in speech are always the result of the interaction of several grammatical categories in their connections with vocabulary, various types of contextual and situational environment.

One of the possible types of research of inter-categorical relationships is that a certain type of utterance is chosen as the main subject of analysis and then the interconnected categories that characterize it are studied.

In this case, we mean such a type of statement as causal constructions that form the central zone of the functional-semantic field of causation and characterized by the most stable and regular connections of categorical meanings. The organization of linguistic elements of different levels into a field structure is based on the fact that the same semantic content finds a solution in numerous means that differ from each other in terms of interpreting the semantic variant. In a certain situation, sentences of different structures and lexical content may turn out to be synonymous. The invariant in these sentences is the denotation of a certain concrete situation. Semantically invariant, therefore, are any constructions that convey the same meaning as a whole.

Causal relationships are characterized by a number of features that ontologically distinguish them from other types of relationships. The essential features of a causal connection are the necessary nature of the connection between cause and effect, the genetic nature of this connection, and its asymmetry. The necessary nature of the connection between cause and effect is manifested in the fact that the effect does not just appear after the cause, not just accompanies it, but is connected with it by an internal link. The connection between cause and effect is genetic in nature, which is expressed in the qualitative correspondence between cause and effect: the structure of the effect reproduces the structure of the cause to a certain extent. The causal relationship is an asymmetric relationship, since cause and effect are not two equal entities, but two quantities, one of which determines the other, one-sidedly depends on the other.

Thus, at the ontological level, the relationship of cause and effect can be represented as a combination of the three named features that unite them into a single causal correlation. In reality, the connection between cause and effect turns out to be very complex, suggesting the existence of a number of different relationships (target, conditional, temporary, etc.), without which the connection is not realized and from which it can be abstracted only in abstraction.

As the researchers note, the causal relationship operating in objective reality can be direct, main, stronger, and indirect, secondary, weaker. The linguistic expression of these dialectical properties of objects is constructed accordingly. Along with direct, basic causality, causal semantics can act in conjunction with other relationships: spatial, temporal, target, object, conditional, etc.

Cause-and-effect conditionality is characteristic of the events reflected in the statement and text. Therefore, there must be certain linguistic means of expressing such connections. In language, as in the movement of matter, cause and effect can change places. Causal connections and relationships as moments of universal interconnection and interdependence are easily traced not only in the sentence, but also beyond it. The study of the expression of cause-and-effect relationships reveals the essence of important regularities in the construction of the text.

Among the ways of reflecting the causal dependence of the content of sentences in the text, a significant place belongs to the informal organization of the semantic connection between segments of the text (utterances) without the participation of special lexical and syntactic units that determine the type of subordinating relations. Such a phenomenon, not reflected in the surface structure of the text, is called implication. Implicit categories are the connecting elements of the text, they follow from the nature of the statement and are due to the presence of close semantic links between the components of a sentence or statement. The semantic connections of the components of the statement reflect the relationship of processes, phenomena, objects of the world around us.

Causal connections occupy a special place in the semantic development of the text. Implication, in turn, acts as one of the ways to implement the causal relationships of the text. In implication, the means of designating causal relations are not pronounced.

Causal connections can be traced not only in the text, but also in simple, complex or complex sentences. Any sentence (complex or simple) reflects an event. At the heart of each event are causal relationships fixed by the language. The peculiarity of simple and complex sentences expressing causal relationships is their semantic complexity, which is manifested in the fact that they express at least two causally related situations: the causal situation of the cause and the causal situation of the effect. Since the causal connection necessarily involves two events: the event of the cause and the event of the effect, connected by the causation relation. In addition to the defining constant of causation, the causal situation contains four more constants:

1. The subject of the causal situation of the cause
2. The causative attribute
3. The subject of the causative situation of the effect
4. The causal attribute.

A characteristic feature of the explication of causal relationships in a prepositional phrase is the absence of isomorphism of semantic and syntactic means of expressing the causal correlate of a causal macro-situation. From the point of view of syntactic semantics, both the event of the cause and the event of the effect are characterized as predicate expressions, however, at the superficially syntactic level, in the component of the phrase expressing the cause, there is a folded predicate expression, the designation of the situation of the cause by a nominalized predicate, i.e. the name of pro-positive semantics, while the investigative component of a phrase is an expanded predicative construction [1, p. 108].

The functional-semantic field is based on the assignment of all its components to one complex functional-semantic category, to one conceptual sphere. In this case, the functional correlation of all components of the field plays an important role. The categorical situation and the functional-semantic field mutually condition each other. The categorical situation is a more concrete phenomenon, since it is represented by the facts of individual statements. It is these facts that form the basis for such a complex paradigmatic generalization as the functional-semantic field.

A characteristic feature of causality is that it can be expressed both with the help of lexical (explicit) causal indicators, and by means of a theme-rhematic relationship in a linear sequence of events reflected by linguistic means. The dominant role in the mechanism of actualization of the causal relationship belongs to the language invariant, the program, which is a generalized typified causal situation. Accordingly, all constructions of the English language that formulate causal relationships should be considered not only from the point of view of their form, but also from the point of view of the objective meaning, the function that is conditioned by the language system (potential aspect) and the function that the language implements. structure, representing in speech this or that causal situation (effective aspect) [5, p. 5]

The causative meaning can be conveyed in the following ways:

1. Lexical - the opposition causative / non-causative is expressed by the opposition of heterogeneous lexemes (believe - persuade, die - kill).

2. Derivative - a pair of lexemes, a generating and a derivative, of which the first one names a certain situation, and the second - the same situation, only as a causal one, using the root (base) and the causal effect - a word-building tool (beauty - to beautify, rich –to enrich).

3. Syntagmatic / contextual-syntactic - the non-causative / causative opposition is expressed by the opposition of the intransitive and transitive use of the same verb (to grow - to grow vegetables).

4. Lexico-syntactic - constructions with factitive (to force, to compel) and permissive (to allow, to permit) causative verbs, interpreted, respectively, through the semes "force" and "allow".

5. Syntactic - the implementation of the meaning of causation by a discrete part of the sentence / prepositional phrase, correlating at the semantic level with the causative or locative syntaxeme or the whole sentence, organized either by a performative verb of imperative semantics (to ask), or by a verb in the form of an imperative mood.

6. Contextual (he told me I could go - he let me go) [8, p. 10].

The functional-semantic field of causation as a system of linguistic means realizing the meaning of causation, on the one hand, and the totality of linguistic units of causative semantics functioning in the text, on the other hand, consists of three zones: the core, the intermediate region, and the periphery. The core of the field is formed by linguistic units that express the meaning of causation - causative verbs (represented both by separate lexemes and included in the analytical causative) and imperative sentences. The intermediate area is formed by language units that acquire the meaning of causation due to their syntagmatic characteristics and contextual reading: imperative sentences, designed as declarative or interrogative, and prepositional phrases as a discrete part of the sentence. The periphery of the field is formed by auxiliary means of implementing causative semantics - modal verbs, as well as words and phrases that describe paralinguistic means of communication.

In addition to the above, there are various ways of expressing causality in a simple sentence. In sentences with causal implication, only markers like as, since, because, etc. are implied, which makes it difficult to find cause and effect in a sentence. However, the absence of a causal connective does not affect the expression of the semantic relations of the causal implication, which are transmitted using various linguistic means - lexical and grammatical - indicating the existence of cause and effect. In addition, the listener or reader has a certain life experience, knowledge (besides, the ability to think logically), which he correlates with the information obtained from the text. This prior experience, knowledge, is the presupposition on which any proposal is based. Presupposition and following parts of a sentence constitute the implication of a segment of the text [7, p. 18].

If the sentence functions as the main syntactic unit at the communicative level of syntax, then at the pre-communicative level, at the level of building syntactic material, the syntactic form of the word can be taken as the primary, minimal unit of syntax. And here it should be noted that causation is a functional-semantic verbal category. The understanding of this category is ambiguous, which finds expression in its two interpretations: narrow and wide. Within the framework of a narrow interpretation, the term "causation" refers only to the actual causal relationship, and a broad interpretation is based on the understanding of causation as an expression of a cause-and-effect relationship between two states. Differences in the definition of causation are the result of linguists conducting analysis at different levels.

There is no doubt that the analysis within the framework of a narrow interpretation is carried out at the semantic level: for example, the semes "cause" and "change the state" are distinguished in verbal meanings.

Based on the presence of these semes in the semantic structure of verbs, the following units are referred to as causative verbs: to build, to repair, to change, to ruin, to please, etc. Indeed, the semes "cause" and "change the state" can be distinguished with a definition analysis, for example: to change - make or become different.

A structure representing a causative situation can be considered as causative. Mandatory elements of the causative structure are the subject and object of causation.

1. Subject (causator) - a person who has an impact on the object of causation, that is, the concept of a causator is associated with the concepts of an actor, an initiator, a source of action, an active participant in a causative situation.

2. The object of causation is a person acting as a carrier of the state, that is, a patient or a patient participant in a causative situation).

3. The fact of causation, represented by a causative verb. Causative verbs function in a causative structure, in which the causator, as a rule, must satisfy three criteria:

- Always Be an Animated Name (A Sign of Agency);
- The Causer Makes an Impact Stimulated by A Volitional Impulse (A Sign of Volition);
- The Will May Be Accompanied by A Speech Act (A Sign of Initiative).

Agentivity is defined as the correlation of an action with an agent, that is, an object that has its own internal energy and is the cause of the action denoted by the verb. An indicator of agency can be considered the presence of a predicate position for an object that is affected or efficacious as a result of an action. Causative verbs belong to the category of intentional verbs, therefore, intentionality is considered as an obligatory component of a causative situation. Intentionality, that is, dependence on the will and intention of the causer, is inherent primarily in human actions. However, in the broad sense of the word, purposefulness is also characteristic of the processes produced by machines, due to their purpose, as well as social processes and processes occurring in living organisms, due to their inherent law of development.

Intentionality should be understood as the connection of linguistic meanings with the intentions of the speaker, with the communicative goals of speech and thought activity, that is, the ability of the content expressed by a given linguistic unit, in particular, a causative verb, to be one of the actual elements of the speech sense. The question of the relation of linguistic meanings to the intention of the speaker is relevant for the broad range of issues of speech activity. The concept of intentionality has two aspects:

1. The aspect of the actual connection with the intentions of the speaker in the act of speech, with the communicative goal, with the purposeful activity of the speaker, that is, with what he wants to express in the given conditions of communication (the actual intentional aspect).

2. The aspect of semantic informativity is the ability of a given function to be one of the elements of the expressed meaning [9, p. 99].

Emotionally and informatively modifying causatives manifest the meaning of causation either by communicating a motive or by a direct urge. These values can be updated by various language means. The message of motivation involves the use of lexical, lexico-syntactic and syntactic language means. When expressing immediate motivation, both explicit and implicit means of expressing the meaning of causation are used. The actualization of the semantics of causation is due to the presence of such criteria as the nature of the impact on the object of causation, the nature of the success of

the completion of the process of motivation, the temporal relevance of the changes caused in the object of motivation, the presence / absence of the seme of the method of performing the causated action and the presence / absence of the evaluative seme.

V.F. Velivchenko identifies four types of motivation depending on the semantics of the causative verb, in particular, on the designation of the nature of the impact on the object of motivation. These are impulses that change the mental, physical, emotional-psychological states and sensory sensations of the object, respectively. It is also advisable to single out the fifth type - an impulse that changes the informative state of the object (the person's belief system). In the process of actualization of the semantics of causation, the factor of coincidence / non-coincidence of the semantic content of the causative structure with the communicative intention of the causator as the subject of motivation is the relevant direct motivation. Immediate motivation is divided into direct and indirect, the latter combines two varieties: indirect motivation and hidden motivation. Direct motivation is actualized in speech by an appellative statement (imperative syntactic construction) or a performative directive statement, that is, a sentence organized by a performative verb of incentive semantics. Indirect motivation can be seen as a secondary way of nominating the referent situation and the intentions of the causator. Indirect motivation in this case has a complicated illocution. This corresponds to a complex (indirect) directive speech act. Indirect (indirect and hidden) motivation acts as an effective tactical means of verbal communication, is an etiquette form of expression of both categorical (directive) and non-categorical (optative) motivation [2, p. 12].

An optative utterance expresses the speaker's desire to perform the action indicated in the sentence. The value of optativity is updated in an optative situation. Optative situations are those modal situations that include the desire modality, the desire modality subject (corereferential to the speaker), the desired action, and the desired action subject (both animate and inanimate).

The interpretation of the imperative and optative as two varieties of the same communicative type - voluntariness - is due to the fact that these meanings have much in common. The semantic component of desire, the subject of which is the speaker, is common to imperative and optative utterances. The difference between them lies in the fact that, firstly, an optative utterance does not contain a semantic component of causation, and secondly, in an optative situation, the subject of the desired action can be both animate and inanimate. This is a sign of addressing, defining the imperative as an addressed expression of will, and the optative as unaddressed.

From the point of view of E.E. Cordy, the distinction between the imperative and the optative should be based on the presence of a causation component in the semantic structure of the will. And the difference in relation to the sign of addressing is as follows: the imperative is always addressed to the performer (directly or indirectly), while the optative can be both addressed and unaddressed, depending on which subject (person or non-person) the speaker's desire refers to. Cordy identifies four types of causation situations:

1. The impact of a person on a person
2. The impact of a person on an event (objects)
3. The impact of events on a person
4. The impact of some events on others.

Of all the noted types, the most obvious causative, according to the scientist, is the first, since only here it is possible to use any causative verb [6, p. 111].

A broad interpretation of causation is based on the assertion that there is a generalized causative situation denoted by a verb. At the same time, the analysis is often carried out at the referential level, which is primarily reflected in the study of the semantic structure of sentences with causative predicates. Some researchers believe that it is necessary to single out two semantic roles: the role of the Agent and the role of the Agent-causator. For example, in the sentence **John threw the stone**, a causative situation is indicated, since an animated object causes another object to perform an action, so **John** plays the role of Agent-causator. A different situation is presented in the sentence **John dropped the stone**. Unlike the first sentence, an animated object only removes what prevented another object from performing an action. At the same time, it is considered that the role of the Agent is present in the semantic structure of this sentence. This difference finds its expression in the language: the role of the Tool can be included in the semantic structure of the sentence with the Causator Agent.

It seems that relations at the referential level should be taken into account by linguists in the study of causation, as this will allow more accurately delineate the range of causative situations. Most often, sentences are analyzed, in the semantic structure of which the **Agent-causator** is included:

❖ He changed his plans;
❖ I made a house;
❖ He pleased me.

However, this is not the only way of linguistic expression of causal relationships. Consider the following situation: The balloon start gathered a little crowd. The launch of the balloon causes a crowd to gather. Of course, the real subject of action is people who gather in one place. The event that occurs causes them to converge in one place, it causes them to unite. Here it is necessary to dwell in detail on the analysis of the situation-referent. The fact is that the analysis of referential relations is not always justified and distracts from linguistic realities.

The complexity of a real event, the relationship between its participants creates a certain difficulty for the researcher in search of an adequate description of the linguistic refraction of this event in terms of semantic roles. The researcher faces a choice: either the event-cause can be interpreted as another variant of the subject of the action, or this phenomenon can be classified in another category. Turning to transformational analysis should help in resolving this issue. The following comparison can be made: As a result of the balloon start a little crown gathered. This is another way of expressing the situation in question. In the first case, an event (more precisely, two events connected by causal relationships) is presented as a situation of an action that is characterized not as agentive, but is addressed to the reason for its commission (The balloon start gathered a little crowd). In this regard, apparently, it is necessary to take into account different types of causal relations. One type is a causal relationship linking a person and an object, or several objects, or interpersonal causal relations. There is a fundamentally different type of causal relations - inter-event causation.

Causal relations of the first kind find their expression in the role structure: Agent-causator, predicate, object, tool (the last role is optional). Inter-event causal relations can be represented by a special subclass of the situation of the action of the action, which proceeds not from the agent, but from the cause that prompted

him to take action. Such an actional model allows us to comprehend the event - the cause as an objective concept from which the action proceeds. This makes it possible to use names denoting events in the subjective position [3, p. 55].

Syntactic forms of words that are not able to independently act as communicative units function in sentences with causal relationships as constructive parts of the sentence or distributors of its constructive parts - for example, adverbs (I don't know why they don't have a hotel), prepositional phrases (He died of fever), etc.

Thus, we can say that causality is a universal typological category that reflects the objective connections of the phenomena of reality, noted and classified by consciousness as causal. The category of causation forms a micro-field within the functional-semantic field of causality with the semantic invariant "causing" and semantic variants of causation of action, state, being, possession, quality. The structure of the functional-semantic field of causation is characterized as polycentric, with factitive and permissive centers, and nuclear, intermediate, peripheral areas formed by a certain inventory of multi-level means of expression.

In each stage (both communicative and pre-communicative) the general communicative function of syntax finds a partial expression. In addition, a well-known is functionality, parallelism of functions between classes of different structures is revealed: sentences and primary building elements.

List of used Literature

1. Boltunova, S.T. Oboznachenie prichinno-sledstvenix otnosheniy prostimi pervoobraznimi predlogami v angliyskix nauchnix tekstax – 1985. – S. 107 – 118.
2. Velivchenko, V.F. Yazikovie sredstva realizatsii kauzativno-sledstvenix otnosheniy v tekste: avtoref. dis. kand. filol. nauk – Kiev, 1990.
3. Zemskova, Ye.V. O sposobax virajeniya kauzalnix otnosheniy. Voprosi romano-germanskogo yazikoznaniya. – 1999. – № 13. – S. 55 – 57.
4. Zolotova, G.A. Ocherk funktsionalnogo sintaksisa russkogo yazika – M., 2009.
5. Kaminina, L.I. Funktsionalno-semanticheskoe pole kauzalnosti v sovremennom angliyskom yazike: – M., 1992.
6. Novikova, N.L. Leksicheskie i sintaksicheskie sredstva virajeniya kauzalnoy implikatsii v predlojenii – Saransk, 1989. – S. 16 – 23.
7. Tereshina, Yu.V. Mejkategorialnie svyazi kauzativnix konstruktsiy – Ijevsk, 2008.
8. Shustova, S.V. Kauzativnaya situatsiya – 2006. – № 3. –S. 97 – 101.
9. Furkatovna, A. N., & Furkatovna, A. F. (2021, january). innovative activity in the field of tourism. in euro-asia conferences (vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 308-309). http://papers.euroasiaconference.com/index.php/eac/article/view/97.