LEXICAL CHARACTERISTICS OF CAUSAL DERIVATION

Turniyazov Bekhzod Nigmatovich
Associate Professor of the Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages, Doctor of Philological Sciences
behzodsamdchti@gmail.com

Abstract. *Lexical causal derivation is related to the process of word formation, in which the aspects of the verbs related to the meaning of motivation and the issue of the connection of these meanings with the concept of cause are analyzed. Word formation is considered an object of examination of microsyntax and relies on the law of lexical derivation. Word formation is studied on the basis of the principles of syntactic derivation, and the formation of a derivative structure on the basis of a certain base structure is interpreted based on the operand+operator+ derivative scheme. The existing model serves as a general criterion for all types of derivation.*

Keywords: *causatology, lexical causal derivation, microsyntax, word formation, operand, operator, derivative, applicative model, generator.*

Introduction

The issue of word formation has long been of interest to linguists, and this field has been widely studied both in Turkic studies and in world linguistics. For example, the chapters in the scientific heritage of our great teachers Mahmud Koshgari, Mahmud Zamakhshari, Mirza Mehdikhan, in the work «Attuhfa» that illuminate the problem of word formation are a bright example of the interpretation of this issue. The paradoxical side of the matter is that in diachrony, they paid great attention to lexicography and tried to promote word formation as a separate direction, while in synchrony, word formation was «floating» in

etymology until the beginning of the 20th century. Even the first part of the grammar was in this position. After the teachings of F.Fortunatov, although it was called by the term related to biology, in any case, it began to be studied as an independent object of linguistics, and its small unit was founded by I.A.Beaudoin de Courtenay.

Literature review

At the beginning of the 20th century, the famous linguist A.A. Shakhmatov's statement that word formation should be studied as an independent field of linguistics[1.104-113] was not supported by scientists, and for many years it was recognized as a personal opinion of a linguist. But at that time, in Uzbek linguistics, even though word formation was not studied as an independent field, very advanced ideas in this regard were being put on the agenda. As an example, we can cite the linguistic views of devotees of our language such as Abdurauf Fitrat and Ashurali Zahiri [2].

 In our opinion, the non-standard approach to word formation had its own reasons. First, word formation was viewed as a lexicological concept. Secondly, at the end of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th century, there was no practical general theory of word formation. The foundations of the general theory of word formation began to be expressed in the works of such linguists as A.Gulomov, A.I.Smirnitsky, V.V.Vinogradov, G.O.Vinokur, from the 40s and 50s of the previous century. For example, A.Ghulomov writes the following about it: "Word formation is a separate branch of linguistics, an independent linguistic field, branch, which deals with the formation of words, the rules and models of new word formation, examines the means, in connection with the structure of words»[3].

Thus, word formation is being studied as an independent branch of linguistics. In particular, a number of scientific works dedicated to the interpretation of the issue of word formation in Uzbek linguistics were published by our leading scientists such as Y.Tojiyev and A.Hojiyev and presented to students and researchers[4].

Research Methodology

In modern linguistics, the rules, models, means of creating new words, and in connection with this, the structure of words are studied on the basis of syntactic regularity[5]. In this, in turn, the applicative model method, which is one of the working mechanisms of syntactic derivation, is followed [6.210-211].

A language sign is essentially an abstract concept that serves to call a certain concrete thing or event conditionally. For example, it does not matter if we call a tree iron. After all, we don't even know why we call tree a tree. So, people create language signs based on the thought given by God. In other words, to distinguish one thing from another, we mark them. Abstract abstractors also serve for abstraction in the applicative model generator. But in doing so, we try to make things as clear as possible. In other words, the word serves not for what it represents, but only to call it by some name.

The word is an empty semicolon denoted as O in the generator field, which occupies the status of an operand. And to it, in turn, the x relator semion is attached and serves to present the x episemion. As a result, a derivative of semions is created. For instance, if the relator x.aβ is attached to the empty semion O, an episemion of the form aβ is formed. And O serves only as an operand. After the blanks are filled, a word concept occurs in the generator. In this way, xα , x . αα , x : αα . αα , x . αβ , x: αβ . αβ as a result of the application of abstract affixes in the style, microderivation of artificial words begins to occur one after another. It is somewhat awkward to talk about the use of concrete semions and relator semions in vertical organizations, because language is virtual and static according to its observation. Since the above signs can represent different affixes, in order to add brevity to the abstract generator, we use the concept of R and define it as R1 and take it as a verb-forming suffix. The word generator contains elements such as W1, W2, W3, which represent elementary words and morphemes. These elements are the primary object with its own structure. But they act as empty semions. After the creation of the R1O application, the passive verb derivation takes place.

In general, the derivational operation applies to semantic, lexical and syntactic phenomena, and problems related to word formation are studied in lexical derivation. Including, the issue of lexical causation, which we are studying, is

checked on the basis of the law of lexical derivation. In that case, it is natural to ask what is the difference between lexical derivation and lexical causation. In lexical derivation, the problem of word formation in general is studied, while in lexical causation, only the problem of lexical causal derivation is analyzed. In other words, lexical causation investigates the issues of the occurrence of derivative structures surrounded by meanings such as prompting, stirring, commanding, which are related to causation. Therefore, semantic, lexical and syntactic types of causation differ from the general object of derivation. Accordingly, it is called the term causal derivation and is the object of investigation of the c a u s a t o l o g y of linguistics.

It should be said that in lexical causative derivation, artificial causative verbs are studied, and in this process, as we mentioned above, syntactic rules apply. After all, construction means syntax. But in this object, the syntax of small elements is analyzed. In turn, this situation requires a syntagmatic relationship. For example let`s take verbs such as kuch+an (strain), kech+ik(be late), boy+i (be rich). This artificial causative verb structure is based on the R1O form model of the application. As a result, a causative applicit semion derivation occurs in the generator. In this situation, as a result of syntactic communication, it is observed that object+action, state+action, attribute+action relations exist.

Results of the analysis

Minor syntactical relationships are different from major syntactical relationships. For example, in large syntactic relations, the forms of agreement, possession, and person-number ensure the interaction of language units, while in small syntactic relations, the combination of stem and suffix forms a syntactic connection. From the existing derivation, the expression of microsyntagmatic relations as above emerges. However, it should be said that in some works, it is observed that there are cases where the object of checking the syntax of word formation is not different from the object of study of the big syntax. For example, in E.R.Hasanov's article «On the specifics of semantic and lexical derivation in modern Russian» the need to approach word formation dynamically, its

connection with the formation of the text, the need to study word formation in the communicative plan and all of them are emphasized one by one[7.200].

It is true that any language unit and symbol is of great importance in the communicative plan, but this cannot be the basis for interpreting word formation as a dynamic phenomenon. Word formation, indeed, is a syntactic phenomenon, but its derivation is considered a product of minor syntax, and the power of a synthetic word is not enough to fully form a sentence. For example, let's pay attention to the sentence Olim came after it got dark outside(Olim qosh qoraygach keldi) This sentence contains the word got dark (qora+y), which is new word formed with suffix. According to the rules of syntactic derivation, the derivation of the given sentence is not done with the operator of new formed words (lexical derivation), but with the help of the syntactic derivation operator expressed by the adverbial form after(-gach). Compare:

Olim qosh qora+y… keldi (Olim came…got dark)– Olim qosh qora+y+gach keldi (Olim came after it got dark outside)

It seems that the word-formation operator -y (from qora+y) serves only to form words and cannot give a dynamic tone to the formation of a sentence. More precisely, there is structure, formation, but it remains a word. The word is a product of a paradigmatic series, static, virtual, general. The sentence becomes dynamic as follows:

1) came – stem structure (V);

2) Olim came -supporting structure (N+V);

3) Olim came after it got dark outside- derivative (N+X1+V) operator: -gach. (after)

It should be said that in the dynamization of the sentence, the choice of operator is free, and it is introduced into the derivation process from the outside by the speaker. In other words, the syntactic derivation operator is not readily available in a speech situation. The derivation of this sentence could also be served by operators of the type -until, -after. When the expression is further expanded, the next operator negates the second one:

1) came – stem structure (V);

2) Olim came -supporting structure (N+V);

3) Olim came after it got dark outside- derivative (N+X1+V) operator: -gach. (after)

4) Olim came tired after it got dark outside (Olim qosh qoraygach charchab keldi)- derivative (N+X2+V) operator: -b.(from charcha+b (tired))

In the derivation of words formed with suffix, the operators are ready-made in the paradigmatic series. More precisely, they come into contact with the operand as a result of a microsyntagmatic relationship at the level of a paradigmatic line. But they remain static in the association. As for the issue of text formation, in fact, all language units are expressed using phonemes, because human language exists through sounds. In other words, speech sounds are the main raw material of our language. Therefore, the main raw material of speech is phonemes, not words. True, we do not want to deny the importance of the word, but here it is important to take into account the hierarchical relationship of language and speech units. In fact, the formation of language and speech units depends on a hierarchical relationship. We see this in a hierarchy such as phoneme → morpheme → word → sentence → complex syntactic device (CSD) → paragraph → chapter → unit. Therefore, to conclude that the word forms the text, in our opinion, seems more foolish. However, texts consisting of only one word are excluded, of course. For example, if the name of a work is called «Worker», it cannot be denied that the text is expressed in one word. In particular, Y.S.Maslov's opinion in this regard is noteworthy: the term « «Text» means not only a written source, but also a sample of oral creativity created by a person in various forms. It can consist of one word, a story, a poem, a large volume book» [8.11].

In our opinion, it seems that the author of the article has not studied the teachings of F. de Saussure, and is not familiar with the work of the representatives of the Samarkand School of Derivatology.

It should be noted that lexical causal derivation is similar to the affixal form of morphological causation, because in this type of causation, both causative connection and relationship can be observed that occurs with help of suffixes.

But in this process, causative affixes serve to create words, so we call it lexical causal derivation. By lexical causative affixes we mean verb-forming suffixes. These adverbs are causative operators, and when forming verbs, they create semantic relations such as urge, stir.

But it is important to note that a lexical causal derivative is a product of lexical causal derivation only if it is formed with the help of a word-forming suffix. In other words, if the verb-formative suffix is followed by the relation of the accusative ratio or imperative-desiring suffixes, then the derivation is related to morphological causation. Already, according to the law of derivation, the next operator negates the previous one. For example, ish+la (work (v)) – ish+la+t – (force to work) ish+la+t+gin (force to work). In this case, the first derivative is considered a product of lexical causation giving the meaning of motivation, and the following ones require the microstructure of derivatives belonging to the affixal type of morphological causation. It cannot be denied that there is a motivational relationship that expresses causation in these derivatives, but these relationships also differ according to whom the motivational meaning is aimed at. For example, the causatum of the ishla (work (v)) is directed towards the II person, and the ishlat (force to work)implies the use of another referent by the II person. And ishlatgin (force to work) exaggerates the motivation of the second person. In turn, the difference between these meanings depends on the function performed by the causative operators attached to the operands. In the current process, we observe the diversity of causative means of communication and causative meaning relation.

Below we will focus on verb-formative adverbs expressing causativeness:

-a affix. This suffix forms a verb from nouns, adjectives, and similes, and is a causative operator: o'yna (play (v)), qiyna (torture (v)), shildira (rattle, stream(v)) etc.

1. Beshik to'yida xizmat qilasan. Hozir o'yna (O'.Umarbekov. Odam bo'lish qiyin).

 (You will serve at the crib wedding. Play now (O'. Umarbekov. It's hard to be a man)).

2. Bu afsona meni uzoq qiynadi.

   Ergashdi, chirmashdi oʻy-hislarimga (A.Muxtor. Dol qoya).

  (This myth has been torturing me for a long time.

   Followed and clung on my thoughts (A. Mukhtar. Dol rock)).

3. Sayragin bir, doʻmbira!

   Toʻkil, toʻkil, navolar,

   Togʻ suviday shildira,

   Kuyga toʻlsin havolar! (I.Jonsugʻurov. Doʻmbira)

  (Sing for once, drum!

  Spill, spill, melody

  Stream like mountain water,

 Let the air be filled with music! (I. Jonsugurov. Dombira))

All the given examples are causative devices, in which, in addition to the lexical causative themes such as play, torture, stream morphological causatives such as you will serve, followed, clung, sing, spill, and fill with music are involved.

   -an affix. This adverb, along with forming a verb from a noun in uzbek language, also serves to express causation: like kuchan (strain (v)).

   1. Suyun nimanidir demoqqa chogʻlanib kuchandi, ammo ogʻzidagi skotch xalaqit berdi (A.Yoʻldosh. Hayot shafqatsiz). (Suyun strained to say something , but the scotch tape in her mouth got in the way (A. Yoldosh. Life is cruel)).

   In the given example, there is a lexical causathema in the form of kuchan (strain (v)), through which we observe that a person is performing an act of motivation towards himself.

   -i affix. This suffix forms a causathema from words whose root and base are adjectives: boyi (be rich (v)), tinchi (be calm(v)). For example, in the causathema boy+i (be rich (v)), the lexical causative operator is attached to the adjective stem, while in the lexical causative theme tin+ch+i (be calm (v)), the operator is attached to the adjective base. After all, the core of this microdevice is tin (calm (v))verb. It, in turn, serves as the basis for quality. After that, when the lexical causative indicator -i is attached to it, the adjective formed from the verb serves as the basis. In other words, the causal operator is not directly attached to the stem.

1. Qiy-chuv bir zumda tinchidi (U.Yoqubov. Yurakning to'rt sanchig'i).

The tumult suddenly calmed down (U.Yakubov. The four thorns of the heart).

In the given example, as mentioned above, there is a form of tinchi (be calm (v)), which is in the quasi-causative status of the sentence. After all, causation has not been realized through it. If you are in the form of a command, Calm down! it was considered causative. Or we could see the causation of the person being carried out against himself when it was said that his heart calm down.

-ik, (-iq) affix. It forms a causative verb from an additional adverb and a noun stem. But this concept should be understood relatively. Because when we say formation, we understand that the verb is formed. Although these adverbs perform the task of forming causatives, in fact, their main function is to form verbs. Causativeness is essentially a means of expressing grammatical meaning. In other words, the verb is formed and the causative meaning is also expressed, so we give it the status of lexical causative.

1. Avtobus...

Men unga chiqmayman,

Sen esa yugurgin, kechikkin.

O endi baxt olib bormayman,

Men kabi siqilgin, ichikkin

(Sanjar Mashriqiy. Avtobus bekatdan jo'nadi…).

(1.The bus...

  I will not get on

  And you run, be late.

 I will not be happy anymore

  Be tight-lipped like me

(Sanjar Mashriqi. The bus leaves from the station...)).

2. Qizining qiynalayotganini ko'rgan sayin Basiraning kasali zo'riqardi (R.Rahmon. Mehr ko'zda).

(As she saw her daughter suffering, Basira's illness worsened (R.Rahman. Mercy in the eye)).

In the given example, there are lexical causathemas in the kechikkin (be late) and the morphological indicator in the form of -kin is added to this. Although, according to the derivational law, the following operator negates the previous one, the existing indicator does not give them the status of morphological causation. Because this addition only imposes the meaning of emphasis on the causative. The main causative remains with the creator. Compare:

I shaxs. Men kechik+ay

II shaxs. Sen kechik+kin

III shaxs. U kechik+sin

(I person. I'm late

II person. You are late

III person. He is late)

As we can see, it is not mandatory to use the affix -kin in the second person.In the causative device of the second example, we observe the presence of a lexical causative operand in zo`riqmoq(to tense, to strain)form with the causative operator -iq. In this situation, one person is affected by the mental state of another person, and the process of causation is taking place. In other words, this situation acts as a causative agent.

Conclusion. In general, the lexical causative operators in the form -ik, -q (-iq) are combined with different operands and express the meaning of being affected by what is understood as a result of the derivation operation: ko'zik, kechik, chiniq, zo'riq (Balki, muhabbat shudir? Bo'lmasa, nega yuragim orziqadi? (Shuhrat. Shinelli yillar)). (Maybe this is love? If not, why does my heart yearn (orziqadi)? (Shuhrat. Shinelli yillar)).

-ir, -ur affixes. The given suffixes form a causatheme from the noun stem.

1.– O'ynab gapirsang ham o'ylab gapir (O'.Hoshimov. Osmondan tushgan pul).

(- Even if you speak while playing, think and speak (O'. Hoshimov. Money from the sky)).

2. Kostyumni yelkangga il-da, chiq-ket. Hammasiga tupur (A.Yo'ldoshev. Puankare).

(Put on the suit and go. Don't give a crap (A.Yoldoshev. Poincaré)).

In the given examples, we observe the causative in the command form. Already one person is encouraging the other to speak and perform the action.

Depending on the meaning of cause, lexical causative devices can be divided into causatives with words such as sana (count(v)), tuna (rob(v)), o'yna(play(v)), qiyna(torture(v)), ishla(work(v)), yo'qol(get lost (v)) referring to physical effect or tinchi (be calm, calm down), boyi(be rich), kuchay (be strong), do'stlash (be freinds), o'zgar (change(v)) implying to the transition from one state to another due to the impact. Regardless of the meaning of these causatives, they are formed in the form causator → object of causation → result.

Reference

1. Романова Н.П. Взгляды А.А.Шахматова на словообразование. -ГПИБ, 1966 (Romanova N.P. A.A.Shakhmatov's views on word formation. -State Historical Public Library, 1966).

2. Fitrat A. Tilimiz//Ishtirokiyun. 1919, 12-iyun; Zohiriy A. Til va imlo masalasi// Qizil O'zbekiston. 1929, 29-mart (2. Fitrat A. Our language//Ishtirokiyun. 1919, June 12; Zahiri A. The issue of language and spelling//Qizil O'zbekiston. 1929, March 29).

3. Гулямов А.Г. Словообразование путем внутренних изменений слова в узбекском языке//Научная сессия Академии наук УзССР. -Ташкент, 1947; Смирницкий А.И. Некоторые замечания о принципах морфологического анализа основ//Доклады и сообщения филологического факультета. -М.: МГУ Вып. 5. 1948; Виноградов В.В. Русский язык в школе. 1951, № 2. -С 136; И.Т.Вепрева, С.Ю.Данилов. Г.О.Винокур и современная словообразовательная наука. -Екатеринбург: Изд-во Уральского ун-та. 2001 (Gulyamov A.G. Word formation by means of internal changes of a word in the Uzbek language//Scientific session of the Academy of Sciences of the Uzbek SSR. -Tashkent, 1947; Smirnitsky A.I. Some remarks on the principles of morphological analysis of bases//Reports and communications of the philological faculty. -M.: Moscow State University Issue. 5. 1948; Vinogradov V.V. Russian language at school. 1951, No. 2. -P 136; I.T.Vepreva, S.Yu.Danilov. G.O.Vinokur and modern word-formation science. -Ekaterinburg: Publishing house of the Ural University. 2001).

4. Тожиев Ё. Ўзбек тилида шахс отлари ясовчи аффикслар синонимияси. -Тошкент: ТошДУ, 1987; Ҳожиев А. Ўзбек тилида сўз ясалиши. -Тошкент: Ўқитувчи, 1989 (Tojiev Yo. Synonymy of affixes forming personal nouns in the Uzbek language. -Tashkent: TashSU, 1987; Hojiev A. Word formation in Uzbek. -Tashkent: O'qituvchi, 1989).

5. Turabov A.M. Kichik sintaksis muammolari//Filol. fan. dok. diss. avtoref. -Samarqand: SamDCHTI, 2023 (Turabov A.M. Small syntax problems//Philol. science. doc. diss. autoref. -Samarkand: IFL, 2023).

6. Шаумян С.А. Аппликативная модель. Генератор слов//Структурная лингвистика. -М.: Наука, 1965 (Shaumyan S.A. Applicative model. Word generator//Structural linguistics. -M.: Nauka, 1965).

7. Хасанов Э.Р. О специфике семантической и лексической деривации в современном русском языке//Вестник Челябинского государственного университета. 2018. № 6 (416). Филологические науки. Вып. 113 (Khasanov E.R. On the specifics of semantic and

lexical derivation in the modern Russian language//Bulletin of the Chelyabinsk State University. 2018. No. 6 (416). Philological sciences. Issue 113).

8. Маслов Ю.С. Введение в языкознание. -М.: Высшая школа, 1998 (Maslov Yu.S. Introduction to linguistics. -M.: Visshaya shkola, 1998).