

Ways Of Expressing Causation Of Vertical Movement In Russian, Uzbek, And English: A Typology Of Morphological And Lexical Means

Khamraeva Malikakhon Gayrat kizi

Karshi State University, Lecturer
malikakhamraeva118@gmail.com
+998919495543

<https://orcid.org/0009-0009-9012-1837>

Abstract. This article is devoted to a comparative typological analysis of ways of expressing causation of vertical movement in Russian, Uzbek, and English. The study examines the morphological and lexical means of causativity, as well as their role in expressing direct and indirect causation. In English, morphological causativisation is extremely limited; the main means are lexical causatives (conversion, labile verbs) and syntactic constructions (make, have, get, let, cause). All three languages use lexical causatives for direct (contact) causation, which corresponds to a universal principle: routine situations with an inanimate patient tend towards lexicalisation. The choice of causative means is closely connected with the general grammatical structure of each language: the flexional type (Russian) tends toward lexical and syntactic means, the agglutinative type (Uzbek) toward morphological, and the analytic type (English) toward syntactic. The work also highlights the pragmatic aspect of causative constructions, analysing factors such as social hierarchy, politeness, and degree of coercion.

Keywords: *causativity, vertical movement, typology, morphological means, lexical means, direct causation, indirect causation, directive voice, Russian, Uzbek, English, pragmatics.*

Causativity is one of the fundamental categories reflecting cause-and-effect relationships in language. As I.S. Ryabova and co-authors note, "as a working definition of causativity, we understand a construction in whose semantics there are two situations, one of which (causing) leads to the realization of the other (initial, caused)" [8, 218]. R.M.W. Dixon offers a syntactic interpretation: a causative construction presupposes "the specification of an additional argument, a causer, added to the basic clause" [1, 30-31]. Both approaches complement each other, allowing us to consider causativity as a semantic-syntactic phenomenon.

This article is devoted to a comparative analysis of the ways of expressing causation of vertical movement in three typologically different languages: Russian, Uzbek, and English. The choice of the semantic zone of vertical movement is determined by its universality and representativeness for the study of causative constructions. Verbs with the meaning of rising and lowering are represented in all three languages by both lexical and morphological causatives, which allows for a typological comparison.

In modern linguistics, causativity is understood as a semantic-syntactic category reflecting cause-and-effect relationships between two situations. As I.S. Ryabova and co-authors note, "as a working definition of causativity, we understand a construction in whose semantics there are two situations, one of which (causing) leads to the realization of the other (initial, caused)" [8, 218]. This definition emphasises the dual nature of a causative situation: the presence of a cause (causer) and an effect (caused event or state).

Dixon and Aikhenvald identify four prototypical features of a causative: "(a) Causative applies to an underlying intransitive clause and forms a derived transitive. (b) The argument in underlying S function (the causee) goes into O function in the causative. (c) A new argument (the causer) is introduced, in function A. (d) There is some explicit formal marking of the causative construction" [8, 13]. The authors especially emphasise that "if a language has a causative derivation, it always applies to intransitive verbs, forming transitives. In some, but by no means all languages, a causative derivation will also apply to transitives" [8, 13].

Causativity has deep roots in the Turkological tradition. Mahmud Kashgari (11th century) described causativity through the suffix -t, which is attached to verb roots and forms transitive verbs with two agents: "when -t is added to verb stems, a transitive verb is formed, passing from two agents to an object.

As A.K. Mallayev notes, "causativity is not only a grammatical phenomenon, but also a pragmatic means serving the goals of speech acts" [3, 74]. The author identifies several pragmatic aspects of causativity. First, social role and hierarchy: in English, *make* expresses coercion, a strong causal action, while *let* expresses permission; in Uzbek, this difference is conveyed through constructions *majbur qildi* ('forced') and *ruxsat berdi* ('permitted'). Second, causative constructions can serve to express various speech purposes: orders, requests, criticism, threats, advice. Third, "through causative forms, indirect speech acts arise. The speaker expresses his desire not directly, but through a causative structure. This is an important pragmatic means, especially in communication with strangers, which has cultural significance" [3, 74].

In Russian, causative verbs of vertical movement are formed using several types of morphological means. The most productive is the suffix -i-, which turns intransitive verbs of state into transitive causatives. Thus, from the intransitive verb *viset'* ('to hang') the causative *veshat'* ('to make hang') is formed; from *lezhat'* ('to lie') – *klast'* ('to make lie'); from *sidet'* ('to sit') – *sazhat'* ('to make sit'). As G.A. Zolotova notes, such verbs "are characterised by the fact that in one predication they create two propositions" [1, 287].

Prefixes with spatial meaning also participate in the formation of causatives of vertical movement. The prefix *vz-/voz-* indicates upward movement (*vzdymat'*, *voznosit'*), while the prefix *s-/so-* indicates downward movement (*sbrasyvat'*, *spuskat'*). The attachment of the prefix to an intransitive verb creates a causative meaning: *podnimat'sya* ('to rise') → *podnimat'* ('to raise'), *opuskat'sya* ('to descend') → *opuskat'* ('to lower').

It is important to note that the Russian morphological causative almost does not combine with transitive verbs. It is impossible to form, in one word, a causative from the verb *pisat'* ('to write') in the meaning of 'make write' – this requires an analytic construction. The Russian language has a rich set of lexical causatives of vertical movement. The main ones include: *podnimat'* (and its aspectual correlate *podnyat'*), *opuskat'* (*opustit'*), *vozvyshat'* (*vozvysit'*), *nizvergat'* (*nizvergnut'*).

A feature of Russian lexical causatives is their polysemy. The verb *podnimat'* can mean both the physical movement of an object upwards and a metaphorical action – 'to raise status, to improve' (*podnimat' nastroyeniye* – 'to lift one's spirits', *podnimat' avtoritet* – 'to raise authority'). The verb *opuskat'* also has figurative meanings ('to humiliate', 'to demote'). This phenomenon echoes the observation of Ryabova and co-authors that "some derivatives are polysemous, combining causative and idiomatic meanings" [6, 218].

Lexical causatives encode routine, habitual situations: *podnyat' knigu so stola* ('to lift a book from the table'), *opustit' ruku* ('to lower one's hand'). As Shibatani emphasises, "lexical causatives represent simpler, routine causative situations" [9, 8]. If a situation goes beyond the routine (for example, coercion or a mediator is required), Russian turns to analytic constructions.

To express indirect causation, as well as for causativisation of transitive verbs, Russian uses analytic constructions with causative verbs. The main ones are: *zastavit'*, *vynudit'*, *zastavlyat'*, *velet'*, *poprosit'*, *prikazat'*. For example: *zastavit' podnyat'sya* ('to force to rise'), *vynudit' opustit'sya* ('to compel to descend'), *poprosit' podnyat'* ('to ask to lift').

As Dixon notes, "in English a causative verb is followed by a to-type complement clause, e.g. *I forced him to go; I made him go*. The causee is the original subject of the subordinate clause but is coded with accusative case, as the object of the causative verb" [7, 36–37]. In Russian, similarly, the causee is coded by the accusative case: *ya zastavil ego podnyat'sya* ('I made him rise').

For the Russian language, three main types of vertical movement situations can be distinguished depending on the type of causee (patient):

1. Direct causation with an inanimate patient. The agent directly physically affects the object. Example: *Ya podnimayu knigu* ('I am lifting the book'). Here the lexical causative *podnimat'* is used. The situation is routine and does not require additional formal means.

2. Indirect causation with an animate mediator. The agent forces another person to carry out the raising or lowering of an object. Example: *Ya zastavlyayu Petyu podnyat' knigu* ('I am making Petya lift the book'). An

analytic construction with *zastavit'* is required, since a morphological causative of the transitive verb *podnimat'* is impossible.

3. Indirect causation with an agentive patient. The agent influences the will of an animate person so that they themselves rise or descend. Example: *Ya zastavlyayu bol'nogo podnyat'sya s posteli* ('I am making the patient get up from the bed'). Here too an analytic construction is used, since the situation goes beyond the routine and requires consideration of the volitional component.

In Uzbek, causativity is a highly productive grammatical category. As Professor Rasulov notes, "causative relations in speech are expressed in several ways: 1) semantic causative; 2) morphological causative" [5, 8]. The morphological causative is formed using a system of affixes of the directive voice: *-dir-*, *-tir-*, *-gir-*, *-kaz-*, *-ar-*, *-iz-*, *-giz-*, *-gaz-*, *-qaz-*, *-g'az-*, as well as the suffix *-t* for stems ending in a vowel.

In the sphere of vertical movement, the key causative pairs are formed with the help of these affixes: *ko'taril-* ('to rise') → *ko'tar-* ('to raise'), *tush-* ('to fall, descend') → *tushir-* ('to lower, let down'). The attachment of the affix to an intransitive verb creates a causative meaning and increases the valence of the verb by one.

Unlike Russian and English, the Uzbek morphological causative freely combines with transitive verbs. From the transitive *yoz-* ('to write') is formed *yoz-dir-* ('to make write'). Even a double causative is possible: *yoz-dir-tir-* ('to make make write'). The Uzbek language belongs to those languages where "there are universal causative markers with virtually complete productivity, attaching to all types of verb stems".

Professor Rasulov identifies the semantic causative in Uzbek as a special type of expression of causative relations. "The semantic causative – the meaning of the causative relation is inherent in the verb both in the language (outside context) and in speech (in context)" [5, 9]. Elements expressing causative relation are present in consciousness in potential form. In speech, "the causative relation is organised directly with the presence of separate linguistic expressions" [5, 9].

The semantic causative is observed in state verbs with integral semes "result of action," "execution," "movement," "figurative," "physiological," and "psychic." For example: *qoplamoq* ('to cover'), *tamomlamog* ('to complete'), *yakkalamog* ('to isolate'), *saqlamoq* ('to keep'), *asramog* ('to preserve'), *ko'z-ko'zlamog* ('to sparkle'), *chimirmog* ('to frown'), *yoshlamog* ('to shed tears'), *o'rtamoq* ('to burn'), *chulg'amoq* ('to envelop'). The semantic causative differs from the morphological in that the causative meaning is usual (a linguistic fact), whereas the morphological causative is a speech fact. The causative meaning in semantically transitive verbs of state is usual (a linguistic fact), whereas the causative meaning in morphologically transitive verbs of state should be assessed as a speech fact.

In Uzbek, lexical causatives of vertical movement are represented by the verbs *ko'tar-* ('to raise') and *tushir-* ('to lower'). As in Russian, these verbs contain the meaning of causation in the root and are not formed from other words. In addition, there are compound verbs with modifiers: *baland ko'tar-* ('to raise high'), *pastga tushir-* ('to lower down'), *ko'tarib ol-* ('to lift for oneself'), *tushirib qo'y-* ('to lower completely').

As Mallayev notes, "in Uzbek, causativity is expressed primarily through derivational affixes" [3, 73]. However, lexical causatives are also widely used, especially in routine situations: *men kitobni ko'tardim* ('I lifted the book').

To express indirect causation in Uzbek, analytic constructions with auxiliary verbs and phrases are used. The main means is the construction with *majbur qil-* ('to force'): *uni ko'tarilishga majbur qildim* ('I forced him to rise'). Phrases with *sabab bo'l-* ('to be the cause') are also used: *ko'tarilishga sabab bo'l-* ('to be the cause of the rise'). In Uzbek even for unusual situations the morphological causative is often used, since it is productive and grammaticalised.

English differs significantly from Russian and Uzbek in the degree of use of morphological means for expressing causation. English belongs to those languages where morphological causativisation is limited.

The main morphological means of expressing causation in English is conversion (zero derivation) – a change in the syntactic function of a word without changing its form. Classic examples from the sphere of vertical movement: *rise* → *raise*, *fall* → *fell*. However, these pairs are not productive; they represent historically established lexical relations, not regular derivational models.

Suffixes such as *-en* (*wide* → *widen*, *high* → *heighten*) and *-ify* (*solid* → *solidify*, *beautify*) can form causative verbs, but they are non-specialised and have the general meaning of 'make (adjective)'. For vertical movement,

these suffixes are practically not used. Thus, the productivity of morphological causatives in English is minimal.

In English, lexical causatives of vertical movement are represented by a rich set of verbs. The main ones are: *raise, lift, hoist* (for raising) and *lower, drop, sink* (for lowering). As in other languages, these verbs contain the causative meaning in the root and are not formed from other words.

A feature of English lexical causatives is their lability (ambitransitivity). Many verbs can be used in both transitive (causative) and intransitive (non-causative) functions. Verbs like *trip, dissolve* and *march* are basically intransitive but can be used in a transitive clause and then take on a causative meaning. For example, from the sphere of vertical movement: *sink* ('to sink' vs. 'to make sink'), *march* ('to march' vs. 'to make march'), *walk* ('to walk' vs. 'to make walk').

Dixon identifies two types of ambitransitive verbs: **S = A** (the subject of the intransitive = the agent of the transitive), e.g. *knit* (*Mary is knitting* vs. *Mary is knitting a scarf*), and **S = O** (the subject of the intransitive = the patient of the transitive), e.g. *spill* (*The milk spilled* vs. *John spilled the milk*). For verbs of type **S = O** with a primary intransitive meaning (*trip, explode, melt, dissolve*), "it is plausible to suggest that we have a causative relationship" [2, 39].

4.3. Features of the verbs *make* and *cause*

Dixon makes an important remark regarding the prototypical causative verb in English: "make is the prototypical causative verb in English, not *cause*. *Cause* has a more specialised meaning (implying indirect causation) and is much less common" [1, 36–37].

Based on Shibatani's theoretical provisions on the hierarchy of causativisation (inactive intransitives > active intransitives > transitives), the three languages can be compared:

Verb type	Russian	Uzbek	English
Inactive intransitives (patientive)	Morphological and lexical causatives	Morphological and lexical causatives	Lexical causatives, limited morphology
Active intransitives	Morphological causatives (limited)	Morphological causatives	Syntactic constructions
Morphological causatives	Only syntax		

In Russian and English, strict adherence to the hierarchy is observed: causativisation of transitives is morphologically impossible. In Uzbek, the hierarchy is "violated" due to the highly developed agglutinative morphology, where causativity is a grammatical category with universal productivity.

Situation type	Russian	Uzbek	English
Direct causation (inanimate patient)	Lexical causative	Lexical causative	Lexical causative
Indirect causation (mediator)	Analytic construction	Morphological causative	Syntactic construction
Indirect causation (agentive patient)	Analytic construction	Morphological causative	Syntactic construction

All three languages use lexical causatives for direct (contact) causation with an inanimate patient. This corresponds to Shibatani's observation that "contact causation tends to be found more often than distant causation in typical recurrent situations" [4, 14]. However, for indirect causation, the choice of means differs significantly: Uzbek uses morphology, Russian uses analytic means, and English uses syntax.

Parameter	Russian	Uzbek	English
Productivity of causative affixes	Limited	High	Minimal
Compatibility with transitives	No	Yes	No

Possibility of double causative	No	Yes	No
Main type of expression	Lexical + syntactic	Morphological	Syntactic + lexical

The Uzbek language demonstrates the most developed system of morphological causatives, which corresponds to the characteristic of languages where "there are universal causative markers, possessing practically complete productivity" [6, 222]. The Russian language occupies an intermediate position, while English tends towards analyticism.

In conclusion, all three languages use lexical causatives for direct (contact) causation with an inanimate patient. This corresponds to the universal principle: routine situations with a patientive causee tend toward lexicalisation.

The choice of causative means in each language is closely connected with its general grammatical structure: the flexional type (Russian) tends toward lexical and syntactic means, the agglutinative type (Uzbek) toward morphological, and the analytic type (English) toward syntactic.

The pragmatic aspect of causativity manifests in the expression of social hierarchy, politeness, and degree of coercion. In all three languages, causative constructions can serve to realise indirect speech acts.

Bibliography

1. Dixon R.M.W. A typology of causatives // *Changing Valency: Case Studies in Transitivity* / Ed. by R.M.W. Dixon, A.Y. Aikhenvald. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000. – P. 30–83. – 413 p.
2. Dixon R.M.W., Aikhenvald A.Y. Introduction // *Changing Valency: Case Studies in Transitivity* / Ed. by R.M.W. Dixon, A.Y. Aikhenvald. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000. – P. 1–29. – 456 p.
3. Karimjonova Sh.R. O‘zbek tilida kauzativ fe’llarning yasalish usullari // *Ijtimoiy-gumanitar fanlarning dolzarb muammolari*. – 2023. – № 3(8). – Б. 113–115.
4. Mallayev A.K. Fe’l kauzativ shakllarining kommunikativ-pragmatik potentsiali (ingliz va o‘zbek tillarida) // *International Conference Pedagogical Reforms and Their Solutions*. – 2025. – Vol. 11, Issue 01. – P. 73–75. – 80 p.
5. Shibatani M. Some basic issues in the grammar of causation // *Grammar of Causation and Interpersonal Manipulation* / Ed. by M. Shibatani. – Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2001. – P. 1–22. – 321 p.
6. Золотова Г. А. Очерк функционального синтаксиса русского языка. – М.: Наука, 1973. – 351 с.
7. Расулов Р. Каузатив муносабатнинг феълларда ифодаланиши // *TIL, TA’LIM, TARJIMA / LANGUAGE, EDUCATION, TRANSLATION*. – 2024. 8–18 с.
8. Рябова И.С., Прохоров К.Н., Белецкий С.Б., Дьячков В.В., Макеева Н.В., Косогорова М.А., Иванова М.А. Морфологические средства выражения каузатива в языках нигер-конго // *Вопросы языкознания*. – 2023. – DOI 10.37892/978-5-6049527-2-6-33. – 218–223 с.