OBJECT OF STUDY OF CAUSATOLOGY

Turniyozov Bekhzod Nigmatovich
Doctor of Philology (DSc), Associate Professor of
Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages

Abstract: In linguistic literature, when it comes to «causality», it is said that this term comes from the Latin word «causa», which means the cause of an action (impact). The causative connection is studied in linguistics from this point of view and is associated with the meanings of cause and effect in the analysis of causative situations. Examples of this are complex sentences with an effect clause and a cause clause, sentences with motivation and coercion, forms of the imperative voice of the verb, which are broadly studied under this term. With this in mind, we suggest that the field of linguistics that deals with the study of causative relations can be called causatology. The field of causatology has come a long way before it was formed historically and studied in linguistics.

Key words: Causation, causator, causant, consequent, semantic causation, morphological causation, analytical causation, syntactic causation, causatology.

Introduction: According to the Buddhist scientist V.G.Lysenko, the theory of pratitya-samutpada (education based on interdependence) was founded in ancient India on the basis of Buddhist teachings (mid-1st millennium BC). This theory was the first sutra (path) in the world to philosophically interpret and teach cause and effect[1.327-328].

Over time, the theory of cause and effect became widely studied in philosophy and logic and became a major category in these disciplines. Aristotle's early ideas about the interpretation of causality in philosophy are reflected in his research. He reasoned that the essence of matter is in itself, but in order to know this essence, he creates the law of causality[2.37-39].

The ideal interpretation of cause and effect has also been expounded by Eastern thinkers, and we find its explanation in the writings of our great scientists. For example, Abu Ali ibn Sina in the work «Canons of Medicine» says this: «The causes, depending on what they cause, are in different positions. Often, even if the cause is the same, it can lead to different diseases (consequences) at different times»[3.32]. The scientist-encyclopedist, who made a great contribution to world culture, Abu Nasr al-Farabi, also commented on the cause and effect. «The first part of the suspended sentence is the basis (cause) and the second part is the effect» he said[4.289]. Then, the European classical philosophers F.Bacon and D.Hume also described in detail their views on causality in their writings. Thus, the causative meaning of the cause-and-effect relationship is reflected in all forms of the movement of matter, including in the field of linguistics, causation is the most important factor. Consequently, the concept of causality, following the example of philosophy and logic, entered the field of linguistics.

Literature review: Today this concept is widely studied in linguistics. The interpretation of causal relationships began to arouse interest among linguists thanks to the teachings of the famous German philosopher W.von Humboldt, who laid the foundations of the philosophy of language. «If we look at the current state of politics, art and science, we see that they have been shaped over the centuries by a long chain of cause-and-effect relationships» said Wilhelm Humboldt in his book «On the Difference in the Structure of Human Language and Its Influence on Spiritual Development humanity»[5.47]. The first ideas about causality in grammar were expressed in the studies of Russian linguists

N.I.Grech, A.Kh.Vostokov, I.I.Davydov, F.I.Buslaev. Similarly, we see that the concept of causality has entered the field of linguistics and is being studied by linguists.

In modern linguistics, the problem of causation was studied by scientists A.Meie, L.Tenier, Yu.D.Apresyan, N.DArutyunova, G.A.Zolotova, A.B.Letuchiy, I.A.Melchuk, Yu.Kordi, G.G.Silnitskiy, A.P.Chudinov, S.V.Shutova and others. Monographic works on this topic were also published on the materials of the Turkic languages. It is true that in our linguistics complex sentences with adverbial causes, forms of the imperative voice of the verb have been studied in detail, but these concepts have not been interpreted from a causative point of view. In causatology, the role of each element contributing to the causation of language and speech, their semantic aspect, the relationship between the concepts of causator, causant and consequent (conclusion) are studied in a derivative way. In most cases, the concept of causation is considered from a semantic, lexical, morphological, analytical point of view, and causation explains the reason for the action performed by the performer under the influence of the compulsion. In our opinion, causation should not be limited only to causal meaning. After all, not only the meaning of the cause, but also the meaning of the goal, result, condition, motivation, command, request, motivation can be expressed through an action taken by a person under the influence of another person. Commenting on this, I.A.Shorokhova correctly notes that the concept of causation also means the meanings of «justification», «justification», «motivation», «circumstances», «attitude», «degree»[6.19].

Research Methodlogy: In causatology, the concept of causation can be viewed from a pragmatic-linguistic point of view. In this case, the situation of causative communication, as noted by A.Vezhbitskaya, is studied depending on the following circumstances: a) the relationship between the speaker and the addressee; b) the speaker's reaction to the action; c) subordination of the addressee to the will of the speaker[7.90], also, the specific causes and consequences of the communication situation are analyzed. Because in different situations of a communicative situation, causative meanings arise in different forms of expression, for example, a threat, an order, a request, an exhortation, an incentive:

Sohibqiron motamda qolgan kelini Xorazm malikasi Xonzoda xonimga atab ikki sandiq sovg'a-salom tayyorlatishni buyurdi. Birinchi sandiqqa tilla isirg'a-yu bilakuzuklar, yoqut ko'zli shohonaklar-u kumush kamarlar, zar taqinchoqlar-u marjonlar, oltin zebigardon-u tillaqoshlar, qashqar baldog'i-yu oybaldoqlar, ko'zmunchog'-u tumorlar, Yaman aqiqi, javohir-u zabarjad, la'l-u yoqut, durri Adan, gavhar-u marvaridlar solinsin….

Podshoh kelini sandiqlarga qarab quvonib ketdi, shahlo ko'zlari nurlandi

(Muhammad Ali. Ulug' saltanat. Ikkinchi kitob). – (Sahibkiran ordered to prepare two chests with gifts for his bride, for the queen of Khorezm Khonzoda khanum, who was in mourning. He ordered that gold earrings and bracelets with a ruby, gold jewelry and necklaces, Yemeni agate and jewelry, Aden pearls be placed in the first chest ...

The bride of the provost looked at the chests with joy, and her eyes lit up).

In this example, causative speech is expressed, which reflects the forms of the command. From the locutionary side of speech («locutio» in Latin means «conversation», «speech», «pronunciation», which directly refers to what the speaker says), it is clear that the ruler gives gifts to the bride. In addition to the locutionary character of any sentence, there is also an illocutionary quality («in+locutio» in Latin means «in conversation» or «in speech», which means what the speaker is trying to convey (intrinsic meaning)).

In the example above, from the locutionary side of the text, it can be seen that the ruler orders gifts to be brought, but at that time the illocutionary plan of expression is used to convey the causal meaning of causation. In this case, we are dealing with two different types of causative meaning.

First, the order is in the locution, and second, the reason is in the illocution. Because the death of her husband Khonzoda khanum, the son of the protector, was the reason to give gifts to the bride, so that she would forget at least a little about her grief. In addition, depending on the effectiveness of causative actions, the semantics of the causative reaction, various elements of communication can manifest themselves in the form of signs that form causative constructions. As an example, we can mention, firstly, language signs, and secondly, signaling devices such as pictograms (including traffic rules signs), gestures, Morse code as semiotic signs.

With semantic derivation, semantic derivatives are formed from the expansion of the meaning of the signified aspects of linguistic signs. In this process, we also observe the formation of a causative meaning, because in this case there is an expansion of the meaning of causality. Therefore, we call this type of causative derivation *causasemantic derivation*:

Qiyom vaqti. Og'ilda sigir ma'raydi. Uni podaga yubormaydilar: bir ko'zi ko'r bo'lganidanmi podadan qaytishda shoxi bilan konkaning oynasini sindirib qo'ygan. Bobom qattiq xafa bo'lib, bir so'mmi, yarim so'mmi jarima to'lagan (Oybek. Bolalik).– (End of the day. A cow rushes in the barn. He is not sent to the pasture: since one of her eyes was blind, one day, returning from the pasture, she broke the glass of the tram with her horn. Then the grandfather was very upset and paid a fine of one or one and half sum). The given example is a macro text in the form of a paragraph, in which the nuclear structure plays an important role in its syntactic derivation. Because when forming a macrotext, all its operands depend on the semantic weight of the nuclear structure . In this macrotext, the role of the nuclear structure is performed by its second operand. However, in the causasemantic derivation of this text, its third operand plays an important role. Because the derivative of the causative meaning is the result of the logical connection of this operand with other parts of the text during causation:

1) *Uni podaga yubormaydilar* (oqibat);
   (She is not sent to the pasture (consequence));
2) *bir ko'zi ko'r bo'lgan* (sabab) – *podadan qaytishda shoxi bilan konkaning oynasini sindirib qo'ygan* (oqibat) – birinchi kauzaderivat;
   (one eye was blind (cause) – returning from the pasture with a horn, she broke the glass of a tram (consequence) – the first causal derivative);

3) *podadan qaytishda shoxi bilan konkaning oynasini sindirib qo'ygan* (sabab) – *Bobom qattiq xafa bo'lib, bir so'mmi, yarim so'mmi jarima to'lagan* (oqibat) – ikkinchi kauzaderivat;

(returning from the pasture, she broke the glass of the tram with a horn (reason)–Then the grandfather was very upset and paid a fine of a ruble or fifty dollars (consequence) – the second causaderivate);

4) *Bobom qattiq xafa bo'lib, bir so'mmi, yarim so'mmi jarima to'lagan* (sabab) – *Uni podaga yubormaydilar* (oqibat) – uchinchi kauzaderivat.

(Then the grandfather was very upset and paid a fine of one or one and half sum (reason) – She is not sent to the pasture (consequence)).

As we can see, the causal-semantic derivation of a macrotext is based on a three-stage causal process. Here we see that the word "cow" performs two functions at once: firstly, an element that activates the components of a paragraph in the process of syntactic derivation (syntax operator), and, secondly, a causator that leads to a causative connection. Because it is with the help of this element that the macrotext causal operands begin to be activated in the causal environment in accordance with the semantic principle. In other words, the causator (cow) acts on the subject, prompting him to perform a certain action. In this case, causal-semantic distribution also plays an important role in the formation of causal relationships.

As a result, a complex causative construction (CCC) with a macrotext status is formed. This semantics depends on the function of the performer and the cause. The role of the predicate is also important, because the verb "yubormaydilar" elevates the word "bobo" to the level of the performer of general causation. In other words, in the process of causation, the verb "sindirdi" gives a function to the verb "yubormaydilar". After the phrase "Uni podaga yubormaydilar" the causative operator (sigir) becomes passive. The derivative of a causasemantic derivation consists of two causators, one external (sigir) and the other internal (bobo). However, although the causative operator, denoted by the word "sigir", is passive from the point of view of causation, it does not lose its function as a key element (operator) interacting with elements of the macrotext in syntactic terms.

Morphosyntactic causative derivation reflects the applicative function of morphemes and auxiliary verbs in the expression of causative meaning. At the same time, the emergence of causation with the help of affixal morphemes is considered. As in many languages (Rwandan, Eskimo, Buryat, Hungarian, Quechua, Turkish, Tajik, Duala, Nivkh, etc.), Uzbek also has affixal morphemes that express a causative attitude and are used when inciting to action. These include the imperative verb affixes *-t,-dir(-tir), -giz(-kiz),-qiz(-giz),-gaz(-kaz,-qaz),-ir,-ar,-iz,-sat*, reflexive verb *-n,-l,-in,-il*, imperative-desirable mood *-(a)y,-(a)yin,-gin(-kin,-qin)-(i)ng,-sin, -(a)yilik,-(i)nglar*. Forms of the imperative-desirable mood of the verb are not indicated in any linguistic literature as causative.

I.A.Melchuk emphasizes the need to distinguish causative affixes from the voice forms of the verb and expresses the following opinion: «In many traditional descriptions, the causative is considered as one of the voices. This, however, is a mistake. There are properties of the causative that distinguish it from the voice: 1) the causative expresses a completely definite meaning, while the voice does not express the meaning; 2) in languages that have both a voice and a causative, the forms of the voice have an inflectional character, and the causative is derivational; 3) the voice is never expressed twice in the word form, while double causatives are quite common. For example: *pish* (verb stem), *pish+ir* (causative), *pish+ir+t* (double causative); *ől* (verb stem), *ől+dűr* (causative), *ől+dűr+t* (double causative)»[8.385-387]. It should be noted that the grammatical meaning of collateral forms does not require explanation. Therefore, one cannot agree with the scientist's opinion that the causative expresses a completely definite meaning, while the pledge does not express the meaning. In addition, the forms of the imperative voice of the verb serve to express causative meanings and can be added to the stem of the verb twice, even three times. In the book of G.Gleason «Introduction to Descriptive Linguistics», the forms of the compulsory voice of the verb of the Turkish language are described as causative, not derivational . Therefore, causative suffixes in Turkish cannot be called derivational.

It should be noted that with the addition of a verb-forming affix to the stem, a derivative is formed:

–*Kimsanboy kelishi bilan to'yni boshlab yuboraveringlar* (O'.Hoshimov. Saylanma. II jild). – (–Start the wedding with the advent of Kimsanbay).

In this example, the derived verb in the form *bosh+la* is the product of lexical derivation. The causative form of a verb is called a gramme:

Oxiri, qaytg'onimda Termizda kutib olasizlar, deya Samarqandga jo'natdi (Muhammad Ali. Ulug' saltanat. To'rtinchi kitob). – (Meet me in Termez when I return , he said, and sent me to Samarkand).

In this example, we see that there is a gramme in the form *jo'na+t*. If a causative form is added to a derived word, then in the end the word remains a derivative: *bosh+la+t*. However, the causative form of a word is its main constant (*k* - is a constant state or conclusion in a causative situation)[10.8-9]. Because the imperative form of the verb added after the productive suffix determines that the

word is specific to a certain type of grammatical meaning. Proceeding from this, it will be correct if we call such a form a *causateme.* In turn, the constant is determined by the situation and the participants. As the causative situation expands, so does the number of participants, and the next situation becomes more macro-characteristic than the previous one. As a result, with the help of morphological means, a derivation occurs that determines the participants. This is causaderivation. For example, the constant (k) of the second and third words from the words *bosh+la+t, quyuq+lash+tir, g'iyq+illa+t* is equal to three: 1-causative environment (C- causative situation), 2-causative subject (S - subject), 3-caused person (I). But if we take into account the position of the first word (*bosh+la*) in the form of a command in speech, then its constant is five. This is due to the fact that the derivative form of the verb *boshla* also has the meaning of compulsion. Compare: *(Sen) boshla* – the first individual is causated in the initial situation; *(Sen) boshlat* – The second person must again causate someone in the next macro-situation. In this case, it is equal to: $k=C_1+S{\rightarrow}I_1+C_2{\rightarrow}I_2$. But we cannot use this form of the formula for verbs like *quyuq+lash, g'iyq+illa* because they don't apply to a person.

The constant of a causative situation can appear with such expressions as productive, purposeful, conditional:1. ...*utsa* (yutsa) *tegaman, utdirsa* (yutqizsa) *so'yaman* (Kuntug'mish)– (condition). 2.*Afandi amirni xijolatdan chiqazmoqchi bo'ldi* (Afandi latifalari)–(purposefulness). 3. *Xonzoda begim uning musavvir ham ekanligini bilib qolib, o'zining suratini chizdirgan* (P.Qodirov. Yulduzli tunlar)–(produvtiviness).

When causation is expressed in the method of affixation, factive and permissive forms of causative meaning are formed. The dissertation provides detailed information about the features of factual causation. With factual causation, the causator is active:

...(*Mirzo Sohruh*) *sulton Mahmud ko'ksig'a minub,* **uyg'otib**,...*sulton Zaynobiddin qoshig'a* **kelturdi** (Salohiddin Toshkandiy. Temurnoma). – ...(Mirzo Shahrukh sat on the chest of Sultan Mahmud, woke him up and ... brought him to Sultan Zainabiddin).

With permissivity, the causator permits or prevents the commission of the causant's action. In this case, the causant is active:

Xolmatjon...Zaychenkoga murojaat qildi:−**Ruxsat eting**, *o'rtoq general, men* **boray**! *General o'ylab turib:* −*Ruxsat,-dedi* (S.Ahmad. Ufq). – Kholmatjon... turned to Zaichenko: −Allow me, comrade General, I'll go! -Alright said General while pondering over.

Analytical causation explains the causative situation that occurs with the help of auxiliary verbs. The emergence of causation with the help of analytical means is considered by some linguists as causation in syntactical terms[11.91-93]. In this situation, the analytical form is considered as a part of speech. For example, the predicate in the sentence *men uni haydab yubordim* is expressed in the analytic form *haydab yubordim*. But this function can be performed by the words *haydatdim.* Then why is the causativeness formed by the voice form of the verb not considered in syntactic terms? Because in this situation, it is not the function of the verb in the sentence that is taken into account, but its morphological category. Considering that *haydab yubordim* is an analytic form, is it not correct to interpret it as an analytic type of morphological causation? In the expression of causation, we interpret compound words with auxiliary verbs, compound and some independent verbs as analytical forms that cause expressions of excitement, influence. In this, of course, intonation also participates as an analytical tool. In the monograph, we give an example for the analysis of some of the listed analytical forms based on actual language materials:

Shahar sovetiga meni yetaklab borib, nomimga qaror chiqazdirib berdi (S.Ahmad. Yo'qotganlarim va topganlarim). − He brought me to the city council and ordered that they make a decision in my name and give it to me.

In the above example, the causative relation is formed with the help of the auxiliary verb «*bermoq*», which is an analytical form. In this case, the subject activates two faces at once. Firstly, it affects the previous person and directs him to one point, and secondly, he influences the next person and makes him perform a certain action. The resulting causative relation is expressed with the help of analytical causatems *yetaklab borib, chiqazdirib berdi*. In this case, the analytical causateme *yetaklab borib* means that a movement is made from one point to another, that is, the causator induces the causant to go to a certain place. The peculiarity of analytical causatems is that the combination of two verbs constitutes a syntactic derivation, and their meanings give the product of a semantic derivation: *yetaklamoq, bormoq* is an operand; *-b* –operator; *yetaklab bormoq*–microsyntagmatic relation; values

of the duration of movement to a certain point – a semantic derivative; a combination of two verbs that gives the meaning of compulsion is an analytical causateme. In a causal derivative situation, which is expressed by the analytical causateme chiqazdirib berdi, due to the action of the causator on one individual, the expression of the resulting action is intended for another person. Because the causator causes one person to another and, as a result, is the complete completion of the causative action. This is because the auxiliary verb is combined with the main verb in an analytic form. In this case, although the leading part of the analytic form contains the affixes *-az, -dir,* this form of causation cannot be called affixative. However, this does not negate the importance of affixes in analytic causation. Because it is thanks to these affixes that the causative meaning is expressed. We call it analytic because the last dimension requires the combination of the main and auxiliary verbs.

In the causative derivation of macrosyntactic constructions, the process of syntactic derivation of complex syntactic constructions in the form of microtext and simple sentences surrounded by causative meaning is studied. The integrative feature of the sentence is manifested in the organization of language units. It conveys a message and is also the smallest unit of speech. This, of course, is due to the fact that a person chooses elements from the paradigmatic series that the causative situation requires and actualizes for the integration of his thoughts. By integration, we mean the generalization of the elements of speech in the expression of thought. In this process, they are first autonomously combined, and then they acquire a common solidity. Therefore, in the syntactic paradigm, their integration differs from each other. For example, when the integration of sentences is based on the activation of linguistic signs, the sentences act as an integrant in complex syntactic constructions. Macrotext, in turn, is based on paragraphs and CSC. This activity of units of language and speech in speech is a complex hierarchical process, scientific the study of which requires derivation. Because human speech is essentially a derivation. The applicative method, the transformational method, the method of immediate constituents are the working mechanisms of derivation. For example: *Echkimiz…tipirchilab odamni **bezor qilardi**. Shunda birontamiz uning orqa oyoqlarini ushlab turishga **majbur boʻlardik*** (Oʻ.Hoshimov. Saylanma. II jild). – (The goat fluttered, making everyone annoyed. Then one of us was forced to hold its hind legs).

The meaning given in this example is based on what the speaker is saying. However, the speaker may express his thoughts in other ways. We will explore this with the transformation method. The interaction of elements of speech units is studied on the basis of an applicative model. Given their logical relationship, the law of semantic derivation is applied. To find out what elements these units consist of, we turn to the method of direct components. In particular, in this example, analytic causatems constitute separate Deep Structures. However, if the speaker presents speech in a different form (transforms), the analytical causateme (*bezor qilardi*) that takes the place of the Deep Structure in the first of the simple sentences becomes the operand linking the operator (participle form *-(a)yotgan)* in the third stage of derivation. Compare: *Echkimiz…tipirchilab odamni **bezor qilardi**. Shunda*

birontamiz uning orqa oyoqlarini ushlab turishga **majbur bo'lardik**.– *(Shunda) birortamiz tipirchilab odamni* **bezor qilayotgan** *echkining orqa oyoqlarini ushlab turishga* **majbur bo'lardik**– (The goat fluttered , making everyone annoyed . Then one of us was forced to hold its hind legs. – (Then) one of us was forced to hold the hind legs of the fluttering goat that annoyed everyone). The analysis of this example is carried out by the *contamination* transformation method, in which we observe the appearance of a complex independent sentence based on two elementary sentences. As we have already mentioned, the analytic causateme in the first sentence passes into the category of adjectives, creating the phenomenon of functional transposition. In this case, we see that the phenomenon of transposition is a tool for the formation of the transformation process. Since the content of the transformed sentence is not violated, the causator of the causative construction does not change, including the word «*echki*» in the example remains the causator. Because the concept of causation is a semantic phenomenon. If we analyze the direct components of this sentence (causative construction), which has turned into contamination, then we observe the existence of a set of elements based on an algorithm that are syntactically related to each other:

1. $P = GN + GV$; $GN = N_{1(X\text{-kauzator})} + d$; $GV = N_{2(Y\text{-kauzant})} + V_{(Z\text{-faktivlik (jismoniy ta'sir)})}$.

2. $P = GN + GV$; $GN = d_1 + N_{1(Y)}$; $GV = d_{2(X)} + d_3 + N_2 + N_3 + V$.

Transform→$P = GN + GV$; $GN = d_1 + N_{1(Y)} + d_2 + N_2 + d_3 + d_{4(X)}$; $GV = d_5 + N_3 + N_4 + V$.

The applicative model of this sentence is extended by semiions and episemiions. Only in this case, as a sentence generator, does the adconnector play a primary role. An adnector is an element that performs the function of a semion operator for the formation of any sentence. More precisely, an adnector is a modal operator that is represented by a verb and defines how an action is performed. In sentence derivation, this role is played by the Deep Structure. At the level of syntactic structure, it acts as a predicate that forms the basis of information. Thus, we can observe the emergence of causation on the syntactic plane. In addition, in the causative process, causative clauses differ from decausative clauses by a higher degree of valency:

1. *Bir marotaba lola navlarini sanashlarini buyurdim* (Bobur. Boburnoma)–(I ordered them to count the varieties of tulips) - the valency of the verb is 3: I ordered, I ordered them, I ordered them to count; high degree of activity; the relation of X – causator, Y – causant and Z – consequent.

2. *Dadamiz Azimjon amaki bilan suhbatlashar edilar* (Sherkon Qodiriy. 37-xonadon)– (The father talked with Uncle Azimjon) – the valence of the verb is 2: the father talked, talked with Uncle Azimjon.

The components of an equal-component CSC depend on the position of individual deep structures. These deep structures form the semantic basis of operands, independent sentences in the syntactic derivation of an equal-component CSC. At the basis of these deep structures, first the nuclear structures are formed, and then the general form of the CSC:

Bag'dod xalifasi An-Nosirning Chingizxon ila olib borgan maxfiy muloqotlari o'z mevasini bergan, yovuz mo'g'ullarning yuz o'ttiz minglik qo'shini saltanat hududlariga allaqachaon bostirib kirgandi (N.Qobul. Buyuk Turon amiri yoxud aql va qilich). – (Secret conversations between the Caliph An-Nasir of Baghdad and Genghis Khan have borne fruit , and an army of one hundred and thirty thousand evil Mongols has already invaded the state).

In the syntactic derivation of the CSC, we see operands, each of which are independent sentences. The deep structure of the first of these operands is represented by the set phrase (*o'z mevasini bergan*), and the deep structure of the second operand is represented by the analytic causateme *bostirib kirgandi*. In this derivational process, it should be noted that since the basic structure of the second component of the CSC is causative, the general structure of the existing microtext is also a causative construction. Because, in general, the operands of the CSC in the

distribution plan are surrounded by a causal relationship. The execution of the existing causal decision is observed in the deep structure of the next component of the CSC. It is true that the first operand of the CSC is a decausative construction in which the causal relationship is not expressed. However, as soon as it enters into syntactic relations with the second component, it becomes an operand of the microtext of causal content in the generator field. In turn, the consequence of this phenomenon is caused by the second generator field, which expresses the meaning of compulsion. As a result, the rings of generator fields are rounded off with the formation of a complex syntactic causative construction (CSCC), based on the connector of distributive relations.

V.S.Khrakovsky argues that causative constructions differ from causal constructions in that they consist of a single clause, and that they consist of simple sentences, not complex sentences. Emphasizes that causative constructions are multisubject, unlike causal constructions, causal constructions cover causal situations while causative constructions cover investigative situations[12.64-70]. To prove his opinion, he gives the following example: *Петров взял такси, **потому что** (он) опаздывал на работу. (Petrov took a taxi because (he) was late for work.)* We find it difficult to agree with this. First, it is illogical to say that causal constructions cover causal situations and causative constructions cover consequential situations. Because when we talk about a causative construction, we mean the construction of cause-and-effect constructions. Secondly, it cannot be said that the causative construction consists of a simple sentence (of a clause). The conclusion that subordinate-component CSCs formed on the basis of a causal expression will be only single-subject does not provide a complete description of the problem. For example: *Bosmachilarni qiyratganimiz uchun, komandirimiz o'ynab kelinglar, deb yubordi* (O'.Hoshimov. Saylanma. I jild). – (Since we destroyed the Basmachi, our commander sent us to rest).

And so, in the example presented by us, the cuspative CSC with a dependent causal component can be seen to cover several subjects, such as *biz*, *bosmachilar* and *komandir*.

Causative texts are analyzed by dividing into single-component and multi-component types. But one-component must be understood relatively. For example, causative text may appear to be one-component, but it is not. After all, when the causative process proceeds in the form X(causator) – Y(causant) –Z(consequent – semantic inference), then there is always a sign of multicomponent. For example, one of Hamza Niyazi's poems is called «Uyg'on» («Wake up») and has the same form as the one-component text. But since directive causation is performed in it, causation is obtained here in the form «Sen uyg'on» («Wake up»). In addition, since one-word causative texts in the form of orders or commands consisting of verbs are used in conjugated form, it is not necessary to explain that another person is involved in the causative situation. Therefore, we think that this type of text is conditionally one-component. Two- or three-component causative texts include titles such as «Yig'la, Turkiston!» («Cry, Turkestan!»), «Qalbingga quloq sol» («Listen to your heart»). CSCC, despite their large form, are part of the text. Therefore, we analyze them as microtext within a text:

Olloh ko'ngilga joylag'on niyatlarni ado etmak lozim. Niyatni ham O'zi ardoqlag'on bandalariga ravo ko'radur… Necha yildirki, Xitoyga safar qilmak niyatidasen. Valiahd shahzoda Muhammad Sultonni atay Mo'g'uliston sarhadiga yubordingki, toki qal'ani mustahkamlasun, deb (M.Ali. Ulug' saltanat. To'rtinchi kitob). – (The intentions that Allah placed in the soul must be fulfilled. He also approves intentions of your beloved servants... You planned for many years to make a campaign to China. You specially sent the heir, Prince Mohammed Sultan, to the lands of Mongolia to strengthen the fortress).

The macrotext structure in the form of a paragraph consists of three simple sentences (decausative constructions) and one complex syntactic causative construction with a subordinate component. The deep structure of this causative construction is the analytical causateme, which is

conjugated in the singular of the second person in the past participle. In this case, when the causant is causated, the value of the direction to a specific object is reflected. In turn, in the adjunctive component of the CSC, the causateme based on the derivative (*mustahkam+la+sun*) expresses the purpose for which the action is performed in the direction. Of course, the goal of a causative action is realized not only through the causatem. When expressing this meaning, syntactic operators like *toki, deb* also play an important role.

Sometimes in speech we observe the manifestation of factive and permissive types of causation in the same text:

Mard Alpomish og'a, munda kelsang-chi,
Qaldirg'ochning bir so'zi bor ko'rsang-chi,
Erkakman, deb yuribsan jurtingda,
Boshingdagi to'pping menga bersang-chi!
O'z yoringdan qo'rqib yursang Qo'ng'irotda,
Sovutingni men ustima kiyayin,
Chovkar oting men ustiga minayin (Alpomish).

– ((My brave brother Alpamish, come here. Listen to what Kaldirgach tells you. You walk in your country saying that you are a man. Give me the cap that you wear in your head! If you are that afraid of your beloved one in Kungirat , I will put on your armor and become the rider of your horse).

The causative derivation of this causative text consists of two parts, in which the activity of the causator is observed at the beginning of the text. In the last part of the text, the causator becomes the causal referent. At the same time, when the factivity of ruling at the beginning of the causation situation gives way to permissiveness, the role of the causator and causant also changes. This indicates that a *substitutive* causation is formed in this process. In this case, factivity is expressed with the help of causative operators as the conjugative form of the conditional mood of the second person verb *-sa* and the particle *-chi*, which replace the imperative-desirable mood of the verb of the second person singular *-gin*. Permissivity is expressed by the causal operator in the form of the imperative mood of the singular verb. Therefore, this form of causation is formed in a complex macrocausative situation. In the part of the text that relies on factivity, the word «*Alpomish*» is a syntactic operator, and in the permissive part, the word «*men*». But its syntactic formation occurs on the basis of a single deep structure. This function is performed by a causative construction in the form of *Qaldirg'ochning bir so'zi bor ko'rsang-chi.* Thus, we observe the emergence of causation in the macrotext.

Analysis results: In the course of analyzing the problems of studying causation in world linguistics, as well as the derivational properties of causative constructions, we came to the following conclusions:

1. In linguistic literature, when talking about «causality», it is said that this term comes from the Latin word «causa» («cause»), which means the cause of an action (impact). The causative connection is studied in linguistics from this point of view and is associated with the meanings of cause and effect in the analysis of causative situations. With this in mind, we propose that the branch of linguistics that deals with the study of causative relations can be called causatology.

2. In our linguistics, complex sentences with clauses of cause, forms of the forced voice of the verb were studied in detail, but these concepts were not interpreted from a causative point of view. In causatology, the role of each element that contributes to causation in language and speech, their semantic aspect, the relationship between the concepts of causator, causant and consequent (inference) are studied in a derivative manner.

3. Causation should not be limited to only the causal meaning. After all, not only the meaning of the cause, but also the meaning of the goal, result, condition, motivation, command, request, incentive can be expressed through an action taken by a person under the influence of another person.

4. Some linguists argue that the suffixes that form the forced voice of the verb in the Karachay-Bulgarian and Turkish languages are like word-formers. However, from their examples we see that these suffixes, as in the Uzbek language, are only formative.

5. Like many languages, Uzbek also has affixal morphemes that express a causative attitude and are used to motivate action. These include affixes of the compulsory voice of the verb, the reflexive voice of the verb, and the imperative-desirable mood. Therefore, we consider such affixes in Turkic languages as operators of causative derivation.

6. When causation is expressed in the method of affixation, factive and permissive forms of causative meaning are formed. In factive causation, the causator is active. When permissive, the causant is active.

7. In causation, the position of the constant is determined by the situation and the participants. As the causative situation expands, the number of participants begins to increase, and the next situation becomes more macro-characteristic than the previous one. As a result, derivation occurs around the situation and morphological means that define the participants. We call this causation. Causatema is formed as a product of causaderivation.

8. In linguistics, the formation of causation in analytical terms is considered as syntactic causation. In this case, the analytical form is considered as a part of speech. But this does not fully explain the syntactic character of causation, since syntactic causation is considered to be macro-characteristic. Therefore, it is correct to consider that the expression of causation by analytical means is an analytical type of morphological causation.

9. In most works, the concept of causation is interpreted as a grammatical category. However, we do not consider it appropriate to study causation as a grammatical category. In our opinion, firstly, the concept of causation does not mean that languages belong to any morphological type. Secondly, it does not serve to connect words as case forms. Therefore, it is appropriate to study causation as a means of expressing grammatical meaning.

10. From a pragmatic point of view, causation is studied depending on the following circumstances: a) the relationship between the speaker and the addressee; b) the speaker's reaction to the action; c) subordination of the addressee to the will of the speaker; the specific causes and consequences of the communication situation are also analyzed. Because in different situations of a communicative situation causative meanings arise in different forms of expression, for example, threat, order, request, exhortation, encouragement.

11. With semantic derivation, semantic derivatives are formed by expanding the meaning of the signified aspects of linguistic signs. In this process we also observe the formation of causative meaning, because in this case there is an expansion of the meaning of causality. Therefore, we call this type of causative derivation causative derivation.

12. In event-based derivation, one or another text syntactic operator acts not only as an activator of text components, but sometimes also as a causator, bringing text components into a causative relationship. After all, it is through this element that the causaoperands of the macrotext begin to act in the causal environment according to the semantic principle.

13. The applicative model of a sentence is expanded by semiions and episemions. Only in this case, as a proposal generator, the adnector plays a primary role. An adnector is an element that performs the function of a seminal operator to form any sentence. More precisely, an adnector is a modal operator that is represented by a verb and determines how the action is performed. When

derivating a sentence, deep structure plays this role. At the level of syntactic structure, it acts as a predicate that forms the basis of information. Thus, we can observe the emergence of causation on the syntactic plane.

14. In syntactic derivation of the causative type of CSC, two or one of the deep structures can be causal. In both cases of the formation of the CSC, it takes on the status of a complex syntactic causative construction (CSCC). Because the operands of the CSC are rounded in a cause-and-effect relationship.

15. Causative texts are analyzed dividing into single-component and multi-component types. But one-componentity must be understood relatively. For example, causative text may appear to be one-part, but it is not. After all, when the causative process occurs in the form X(causator) – Y(causant)–Z(consequential–semantic inference), then there is always a sign of multicomponentity. But causative passages from epics are a causative component of a particular text.

References:

1. Новая философская энциклопедия. Том III//Пратитья-самутпада (Лысенко В.Г.). -М.: Мысль, 2010 (New philosophical encyclopedia. Volume III//Pratitya-samutpada (Lysenko V.G.). -M.: Mysl).

2. Аристотель. Метафизика (Перевод с греческого П.Д.Первова и В.В.Розанова). -М.:Институт философии, теологии и истории св.Фомы, 2006 (Aristotle. Metaphysics (Translation from Greek by P.D.Pervov and V.V.Rozanov). -M.: Institute of Philosophy, Theology and History of St. Thomas).

3. Abu Ali ibn Sino. Tib qonunlari: (Uch jildlik saylanma). I jild. -Toshkent: A.Qodiriy nomidagi xalq merosi nashriyoti, 1993 (Abu Ali ibn Sina. Laws of Medicine: (Three-Volume Selection). Volume I. -Tashkent: Publishing House of People's Heritage named after A. Qadiri,).

4. Аль - Фараби. Логические трактаты. -Алма-ата: Наука, 1975 (Al-Farabi. Logical treatises. -Alma-ata: Science).

5. Гумбольдт В.фон. Избранные труды по языкознанию. -М.: Прогресс, 2000 (Humboldt V. Selected works on linguistics. -M.: Progress).

6. Шорохова И.А. Семантика каузативных глаголов в русском и польском языках//Дис. канд. филол. наук. -Челябинск, 2007(Shorokhova I.A. Semantics of causative verbs in Russian and Polish//Dis. Ph.D. Philol. Sci.   -Chelyabinsk).

7. Вежбицкая А. Язык. Культура. Познание. -М.: Наука, 1997 (Vezhbitskaya A. Language. Culture. Cognition. -M.: Science).

8. Мельчук И. А. Курс общей морфологии. Том II. Часть вторая: морфологические значения. -Москва-Вена: Язык русской культуры, 1998. (Melchuk I. A. Course of general morphology. Volume II. Part two: morphological meanings. -Moscow-Vienna: The language of Russian culture)

9. Глисон Г.А. Введение в дескриптивную лингвистику.   -М.:Иностранная лит-ра, 1959 (Gleason G.A. Introduction to descriptive linguistics. -M.: Foreign literature).

10. Холодович А.А. Типология каузативных конструкций. Морфологический каузатив. -Л.: Наука, 1969 (Kholodovich A.A. Typology of causative constructions. Morphological causative. -L.: Science).

11. Баклагова Ю.В. Аналитический каузатив с глаголом *help* в английском языке: категориальная парадигма конструкции *helpsomebody (to) dosomething*//Филологические науки. Вопросы теории и практики.-Тамбов: Грамота, №12(78), 2017. (Baklagova Yu.V. Analytical causative with the verb help in English: the categorical paradigm of the construction helpsomebody (to) dosomething//Philological Sciences. Questions of theory and practice.-Tambov: Certificate, No. 12(78))