

УДК 811.512.133'366.58:811.111'366.58  
ББК Ш163.31-21+Ш143.21-21

**L. I. Sadullaeva**

*Tashkent, Uzbekistan*

## TYPOLOGICAL CATEGORY OF CAUSATIVE VOICE FORMS IN UZBEK AND ENGLISH LANGUAGES

**ABSTRACT.** Having studied the ways of expressing typological category of causative voice forms of compared languages is that there are definite morphological markers used in order to express this category in Uzbek language; mainly the category of causative voice forms can be expressed by the help of units of the morphological, lexical and syntactical levels of the language, but the typological characteristics of the causative voice forms of English in comparison with Uzbek is that in English we defined absence of markers of the causative voices forms, instead of them there are number of verbs are used as the markers of causative voices forms of lexical and syntactical levels.

These typological differential features as the expression means of the typological category of the causative voices forms in both languages presents some difficulties in learning causative voices forms.

It should be noted that there are number of affixes in Uzbek language so called "morphological markers" for expressing this category. Such as: *tir - dir*, *giz, -ir, tir*, and *- ar* and these affixes are used with verbs in the meaning force (*d + infinitive*); *make (d + infinitive)*. Thus, causative verbs have the meaning reason are cause of performing in action in comparable languages.

Obviously, that affixial form of expressing causative category is peculiar only to Uzbek language. Hence, one can consider it as the grammatical category in Uzbek language. However, causative verbs are used comparatively rarely in English.

**KEY WORDS:** causative voice forms, passive voice, passive constructions, typological category, lexico-syntactical markers, causative constructions.

**About the author:** *Sadullaeva Lailo Islambaevna, Teacher of the Department of Theoretical Disciplines of the English Language, Uzbek State University of World Languages.*

**Л. И. Садуллаева**

*Ташкент, Узбекистан*

## ТИПОЛОГИЧЕСКАЯ КАТЕГОРИЯ ФОРМ КАУЗАТИВА В УЗБЕКСКОМ И АНГЛИЙСКОМ ЯЗЫКАХ

**АННОТАЦИЯ.** Сопоставляя способы выражения типологической категории понудительного залога в двух языках, мы видим, что типологической характеристикой выражения этой категории в узбекском языке служат морфологические маркеры глагола. В основном, форма понудительная залога выражается с помощью единиц морфологических, лексических и синтаксических уровней языка; выявлено, что в английском языке, в противоположность узбекскому, отсутствуют маркеры понудительного залога. Ряд глаголов употребляется в качестве маркеров лексического и синтаксического уровня понудительного залога.

Эти расхождения в средствах выражения типологической категории понудительного залога в обоих языках представляют некоторые трудности при овладении формой понудительного залога.

Следует отметить, что в современном узбекском языке существует ряд аффиксов, так называемых "морфологических маркеров", служащих для выражения этой категории: *tir - dir* (ср.: *уевоқ - есть, уедирмоқ - заставлять есть, make to eat*); *giz - kiz* (ср.: *ичмоқ - пить, ichkirmoq - поить - make to drink; ir - tir - ar* (ср.: *pishirmoq - готовить пишу, pishirtirmoq - заставлять готовить пишу - to make cook*) и др. Таким образом, каузативные глаголы имеют значение причины или повода для действия в сопоставляемых языках.

Очевидно, что аффиксальная форма образования понудительного залога свойственно только для узбекского языка. Исходя из этого можно называть ее грамматической категорией в узбекском языке. В английском языке каузативные глаголы употребляются сравнительно редко.

**КЛЮЧЕВЫЕ СЛОВА:** каузативные глаголы, страдательный залог, пассивные конструкции,

типологическая категория, лексико-синтаксические маркеры, каузативные конструкции.

**Сведения об авторе:** Садуллаева Лайло Исламбаевна, преподаватель кафедры теоретических дисциплин английского языка, Узбекский государственный университет мировых языков; 100137, Узбекистан, г. Ташкент, Учтепинский р-н, Кичик Халка йўли, 48, Г9а, д. 21а; e-mail: happy.pretty@mail.ru

Causative voice forms are considered to be the most difficult complex among the voice forms. There are different approaches to the study of causative voice forms in Turkic studies. Some scholars [Serebrennikov 1958: 61-72] consider that the causative voice forms are not part of the voices system, and that they should be studied from the point of view of transitivity and intransitivity in general. But the others [Gulomov 1954: 55-58], [Tursunov, Mukhtarov, Rakhmatullayev 1992: 325-326] point out that causative voice forms are equal and notional as the other voices of the verb.

As is generally known, causative voice forms change an intransitive verb into a transitive, and a transitive verb becomes more transitive. The other voice of the verb operate vice-versa, change a transitive verb into an intransitive. It is known that the voices of the verb express a relation between the subject and object with the help of a verb. It is clear that there are three notions in order to express the voices: subject, object and action. When each affix of the voice is added to transitive verb, it changes the relation between the subject and object.

But causative voice forms can't change the subject and object relation, because they are added to the intransitive verb and form the object; if they are added to the transitive verb, the number of objects is increased. Having studied such peculiarities of the causative voice forms B.A.Serebrennikov said: "There is no point of separating the causative voice forms as an independent category in Turkic and Finno-Ugric Languages" [in the same place]. In order to prove this notion one can compare causative voice forms with other voice forms of verbs in Uzbek language:

1. Active voice express S + O + A notions. Verbs with the affix of causative forms also express the same notions: S + O + A and S + O1 + O2 + A. From this point of view they are similar. There is not any special indicator in the active voice. Transitivity proceeds from the meaning of the verb. Causative voice form affixes are added to intransitive verbs and form transitive ones, if they are added to transitive verb it becomes more transitive. The active voice can be a partial basis to form other voices. The verbs of causative voice form carry the same function. Let's compare them: yuvmoq-yuvinmoq-moq-yuvishmoq; yuvmoq-yuvdirmoq-yuvdirilmoq-yuvdirishmoq; kelmoq-keltirmoq-keltirilmoq etc.

2. The causative voice form construction comes into the same contradictory relation with the passive voice like active and passive constructions. For instance:

Active voice form construction	Passive voice form construction
Yozuvchi roman yozdi	Roman yozildi
S + O + A	S + A
Causative voice form construction	Passive voice form construction
Yozuvchi asar yaratdi	Asar yaratildi
Otasi bolasini o'qitdi	Bola o'qitildi

3. Comparing the reflexive voice construction with causative voice form construction shows that they are different phenomena. In the reflexive voice the subject carries both functions: subject and object; in the causative voice the subject becomes closer to the object. For ex. U yuzini yuvdi - u yuvindi; u suv sepdı - onasi unga suv sepdı.

It becomes clear that there is a voice forming affix as the characteristic feature which can distinguish reflexive voice from causative. The reflexive voice's affixes - (i) n and (i) l are added to the transitive verb and change it into intransitive. Causative voice's affixes change an intransitive verb into transitive and when they are added to the transitive verb it does not change them into intransitive. In this comparison one can see that the reflexive voice corresponds with its mechanism, but the causative voice does not.

4. There are following contradictions between causative and reciprocal voices:

1. Causative indicators can be added to both verbs: intransitive and transitive. But the reciprocal voice's indicator is added only to transitive verbs. The availability of causative voices is comparatively unlimited and has no bounds. They can be added to the most intransitive and transitive verbs. The reciprocal voice is formed only from

intransitive verb. This is its specific limitation. It is formed only from certain transitive verbs. It is the specific limitation for the reciprocal voice.

Let's compare these examples:

Verbs of the causative voice form

a) forming from intransitive verb:

o'stir, kuldir, yotqiz, oqiz pishir, gullat etc.

b) Forming from transitive verb:

sezdir, ko'rsat, boshlat, sanat etc.

Reciprocal voice

sozlash, tortish, bellash,

so'rash, ko'rish, urish

mushlash, otish etc.

2. There may be more than one subject of a causative voice form. The number of subjects is also more than one in the reciprocal voice. But those form-making verb's subjects are different according their essence and function. One of the subjects of the causative voice form moves towards the object. The action is only in one direction. But the subjects carry both of the two functions in reciprocal voice: subject and object. The action is in the opposite direction:

1. Murabbiya bolani yoqitdi. Raqiblar sinasha boshladilar.

2. Bog'bon ishchilarga olma tergizdi. Do'stlar quchoqlashdi.

3. When causative voice forms' indicators are added to an intransitive or transitive verb there occurs a word in the accusative case in this construction, but there is no word in the accusative case with any construction where the reciprocal voice form's affix is present.

For ex. 1. U gul keltirdi

S+O+A

2. Ular quchoqlashdilar

S=O+A

These comparisons show that the mechanism of the causative voice form construction is similar to the active voice construction's mechanism. As it is known the active is used as a basis for forming other voices, like/active voice/ to active voice the causative voice form's affix carries the same function.

Reference works always say that the causative voice form's affixes are added to all intransitive verbs and change them into transitive ones. It becomes clear that there are some verbs which are not used in the causative voice. For ex.: alaxsiramoq, mizg'imoq, uyqisramoq, hayallamoq. Let's add the causative voice form's affix above-mentioned verbs: Bola alaxsiradi - bolani alaxsiratdi, bobo mizg'idi - boboni mizg'itdi.

One can see that using above-mentioned verbs with the causative voice form's affixes has no logic, because the moods expressed by these verbs are not direct to the subject from outside, maybe it appears as a result of subject's internal inspiration.

### Conclusion

1. A comparison of transitiveness and intransitiveness has shown that the mechanisms of the categories of voice are independent categories, because the mechanisms of transitiveness and intransitiveness express two notions: action and object, but voice expresses a triple notion: subject+object+action.

2. The category of the voice of verbs is closely connected with the category transitiveness and intransitiveness. The forms which can be added to the transitive verb and change the subject-object relation are able to form voices. If such forms of the verb are added to the intransitive verb, the relation between the subject and object does not change. In such cases there is no sense in speaking about voice.

3. The category of transitiveness - intransitiveness is the phenomenon which covers the category of the voice from both sides; the transitive verb is the basis for forming voice, when the voice affix is added to the verb it becomes intransitive.

4. Active voice covers nearly all transitive verbs.

5. If the active voice forms an active construction then the passive voice forms a passive construction. From this point there is a contradiction between them.

6. If a passive voice affix is added to one ruling transitive verb, the direct object changes into subject and the subject becomes passive. When the passive voice is formed from a double-ruling transitive verb, the direct object changes into subject, so that the word in the accusative case changes into the nominative case. But the indirect object remains unchanged. This case shows that only the accusative case is under the influence of voice.

7. There is a contradiction between the reflexive and active voices. The notion is a subject in the active voice is expressed by a word in the nominative case and the notion

of an object is expressed by a word in the accusative case. But both notions in the reflexive voice are expressed by a word in the nominative case.

8. There is a contradiction between the reflexive voice and the passive owing to the doer of an action. If the doer of an action becomes passive in the passive voice, a word expressing the object of an action in the accusative changes into the nominative case; however the doer of an action in the reflexive voice remains in active voice in the form of nominative case, the word expressing the object of an action doesn't form part of the construction.

9. When the reflexive voice is formed from certain verbs, subject is changed into object, so the word in the nominative case turns into dative case and vice-versa, the object is changed into subject, the word in the accusative case turns into the nominative case: *Ona bolani erkaladi - Bola onaga erkaladi*. So the connection of the verb in the reflexive case with other words depends on the transitive and its inner meaning.

If the subject and object are able to perform the same action which is expressed by verbs, in the reflexive case the subject and object aren't expressed by one notion, perhaps the subject turns into the object or vice-versa.

10. Reflexive voice is also formed from a transitive verb. If (I) *sh* affix is added to a transitive verb and there is a change between the subject and object relations, i.e. if the subjects become an object to each other it means that the reflexive voice is formed. If there is no change in subject and object relations a verb with (I) *sh* affix means the plural form.

11. Comparing with other voices causative voice forms of verbs has shown that voice forming affixes cannot change relations between the subject and object. For this reason of this verb is present in the construction we follow the basic construction rule, i.e. a concept of triples-subject+object+action.

12. By adding affixes of the optional realized members to intransitive verbs we form transitive verbs. The active includes transitive verbs.

13. Affixes of causative voice forms cannot be put together with any transitive and intransitive verbs. They are selected in accordance with semantic peculiarities of a verb's subject and object, and the speech situation is of important significance in this case. So, we have to make an amendment to a traditional point of view which has been used up to these until now days, that optional realized members' affixes can absolutely be used together with any intransitive and transitive verbs.

14. Verbs using with the affixes of the causative voice forms in the mechanism of voice and comparing them with verbs in active, passive, reflexive and reciprocal voices has shown that optional causative voice forms cannot form an independent voice like aforementioned active, passive, reflexive and reciprocal voices, they form only the active voice. Proceeding from this point of view, it would be correct if causative voice form are considered as main forms in forming voices in the structure of the active voice. We have made the following conclusions as a result of studying the peculiarities of voices: there is a necessity to introduce changes to the system of verb in Uzbek, i.e. there are four verb voices in Uzbek; active, passive, reflexive and reciprocal voices.

15. It becomes clear that active voice construction requires the presence of words in the nominative and accusative cases. A word in the accusative case in the passive voice takes the form of the nominative case. In reflexive voice meanings of words of nominative and accusative cases are found in a word in the nominative case. In reciprocal voice a word in the accusative case takes the form of the nominative case. So, the category of voice in verbs is expressed through the category of case. A transitive verb is required to form a voice.

As is generally known causative voice forms are widely used and there are different causative constructions if Modern English. At the same time it is very arguable point in comparative grammar of English and Uzbek languages. Professor

J.B. Buranov also studied and compared causative voices forms in the both languages. As to him: Typological category of causative voice forms are used to express the performance of action or process owing to only subject's order, make, compel, command (заставлять, в.п. + инф.)

However, one can be mentioned the following ways of expressing typological category of voice forms in Modern English:

1. Morphological way: a) primary causative verbs:  
English active: NP1+VP+NP2;

He raised his hand  
He raised his sister

passive:

His hand was raised (by him (sel))  
His sister was raised (by him)

b) by the help of verb forming affixes:

They wid(en)ed the canal → They widened the canal

2. Syntactic way:

a) secondary causative verbs using without affixes:

English active: intransitive: NP1+VP+NP2

1) The child stood his doll → the doll stood

2) He walked the horse → the horse walked

passive: The doll was stood (by the child)

The horse was walked (by him)

b) causative constructions using good special markers:

English active: NP1+VP1caus+NP2+V2inf+NP1+VPcaus+N2-NP2inf+NP3

John ordered Mary to come. John caused Mary to read books.

passive: NP2+VPcaus+VPign+byNP1

Mary was asked to come; Mary was ordered to come; Mary was caused to read books (by John).

The following verbs can be used as the lexico-syntactic markers of causative forms in Modern English:

advice, allow, ask, beg, cause, challenge, command, compel, dare, direct, drive, expect, force, intend, invite, head, mean, motion, oblige, order, press, remind, teach, make, get, implore and etc.

Thus, typological category of causative voice can be expressed only by means of lexical and syntactical levels in the English language. But, in Uzbek language it can be expressed with the help of morphological, lexical and syntactic levels.

#### REFERENCES

1. Аракин В. Д. Сравнительная типология английского и русского языков. М: Просвещение, 1991. 251 с.
2. Буранов Дж. Сопоставительная грамматика английского и узбекского языков. Т: Укитувчи, 1973. 282 с.
3. Буранов Дж. Сравнительная типология английского и тюркских языков. М: Высшая школа, 1983. 266 с.
4. Гуломов А. Г. Глагол. Т: Укитувчи, 1954. 225 с.
5. Качалова К. Н, Израилевич Е. К. Практическая грамматика английского языка. Бишкек: 2002. 672с.
6. Серебренников Б.А. Доклад II Проблемы создания описательной грамматики языков народов СССР. Уфа, 1958. С. 61-72.
7. Турсунов У., Мухтаров А., Рахматуллаев Ш. Современный узбекский литературный язык. Т: Узбекистан, 1992. 394 с.
8. Ходжиев А. Формообразование в узбекском языке. Т: Укитувчи, 1979. 79 с.
9. Юсупов У. К. Теоретические основы сопоставительной лингвистики. Т: Фан, 2007. 126 с.
10. Юсупов У.К. Универсальное пособие по грамматике английского языка. Т: Академ, 2011. 367 с.
11. Ярцева В. Н. Принципы типологического исследования родственных и неродственных языков. Проблемы языкознания. М., 1957. 207 с.
12. Varabash T.A. A Guide to Better Grammar. М.: Международные отношения, 1975. 288 с.
13. Blokh M.Y. A Course III Theoretical English Grammar. М: Высшая школа, 1983. 373 с.
14. Buranov J, Yusupov U. Iriskulov M., Sadikov A. The Grammatical Structures of English, Uzbek and Russian. Part I. Т.: Ukituvchi, 1986. 369 с.
15. Ilyс B, The Structure of Modern English. Л: Просвещение, 1971. 363 с.