

## COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF CAUSATIVE CONSTRUCTIONS IN UZBEK, ENGLISH AND RUSSIAN

*Nasirova X.Sh<sup>1</sup>*

### *Abstract:*

Causative constructions encode situations where a causer makes a causee perform an action or undergo a change. While causativity is universal, its expression varies across languages. Uzbek uses morphological suffixes, English relies on periphrastic forms, and Russian combines morphology, lexical, and periphrastic strategies. This study compares their syntactic, morphological, and semantic patterns.

*Keywords:* Causative constructions, valency, argument structure, Uzbek, English, Russian, morphological encoding, syntactic strategies, direct causation, indirect causation

---

Causativity constitutes a central category in linguistic theory, enabling speakers to represent events in which an agent instigates or compels another participant to execute an action or undergo a transformation. Despite its universal nature, the grammatical and lexical encoding of causative constructions varies widely across languages due to typological differences. Uzbek, as a highly agglutinative language, forms causative verbs primarily through systematic suffixation. This morphological strategy increases verbal valency and explicitly encodes the agentive role of the causer within the verbal complex. English, by contrast, employs periphrastic causative constructions that combine auxiliary or causative verbs with infinitives or past participles. Russian demonstrates a hybrid approach, integrating derivational morphology, lexical causatives, and periphrastic constructions to convey causative meaning. The examination of causative constructions is crucial for understanding argument structure, syntactic flexibility, and semantic distinctions such as direct versus indirect causation. This study aims to provide a detailed comparison of causative encoding in Uzbek, English, and Russian, highlighting typological contrasts, morphological and syntactic strategies, and their implications for contrastive linguistics.

### Methodology

This research adopts a qualitative comparative methodology that integrates both functional and descriptive analysis to examine causative constructions across Uzbek, English, and Russian. The data set comprises examples from multiple sources: Uzbek examples are drawn from literary texts, spoken corpora, and pedagogical materials to illustrate morphological causatives, English data are obtained from contemporary corpora and textbooks to demonstrate periphrastic constructions in context, and Russian examples are collected from literary and journalistic sources, highlighting derivational, lexical, and periphrastic strategies. The analysis primarily focuses on four interrelated aspects: morphological mechanisms, including Uzbek causative suffixes and Russian derivational processes; syntactic and periphrastic strategies, such as English causative verbs and Russian periphrastic constructions and semantic distinctions, specifically the differentiation between direct and indirect causation. By emphasizing these structural patterns and functional roles, the study offers a typologically informed comparison that prioritizes qualitative insights over purely quantitative assessment, thereby providing a nuanced understanding of causative encoding across the three languages.

### Results and Discussion

**Uzbek:** In Uzbek, morphological suffixation constitutes the principal mechanism for expressing causative meaning. The addition of causative suffixes such as *-dir*, *-tir*, *-kaz*, *-giz*

---

<sup>1</sup>Nasirova Xurshedabonu Sharof qizi, Student of Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages Faculty of English Philology and Translation Studies

systematically increases the valency of the base verb, allowing an intransitive verb to take a direct object or a transitive verb to accommodate an additional participant. This morphological strategy not only signals causation but also encodes the agentive role of the causer explicitly within the verbal morphology. Such a system enables speakers to differentiate clearly between direct causation, where the causer exerts immediate control over the action, and indirect or inferred causation, where the effect is realized through mediation or influence rather than direct action. This regular and predictable pattern reflects the highly agglutinative nature of Uzbek, providing a rich and transparent morphological framework for causative constructions.

Examples:

yozmoq → yozdirmoq

Men bolaga xat yozdirdim. (I made the child write a letter.)

Analysis: The suffix *-dir* increases valency, explicitly marking the speaker as the causer of the action. The child is the causee who performs the action of writing under the influence of the causer.

kelmoq → keltirmoq

U do'stini uyga keltirdi. (He caused his friend to come home.)

Analysis: Here, *-tir* signals that the causer instigated the action indirectly, and the argument structure is expanded to include the causee as a participant affected by the causer's intervention.

ichmoq → ichirmoq

Ona bolaga choy ichirdi. (The mother made the child drink tea.)

Analysis: The suffix *-ir* functions to integrate the causer into the verbal action, clearly differentiating the mother's agency from the child's role as causee.

English: English expresses causative meaning predominantly through periphrastic constructions, which combine auxiliary verbs such as *make*, *have*, *let*, or causative predicates with infinitives or past participles. Unlike Uzbek, where causativity is encoded morphologically, English relies on syntactic strategies and lexical selection to signal causation. These constructions are semantically nuanced, allowing speakers to distinguish direct causation, where the causer exerts explicit control, from indirect or permissive causation, where the causee performs the action autonomously or under minimal compulsion. The flexibility of English causatives enables subtle semantic contrasts, such as the difference between *She made him study* (direct) and *They let the children play* (permissive/indirect), illustrating how syntactic structure and verb choice encode causative relations.

Examples:

She made him study. (Direct causation)

The causer enforces the action; control is explicit.

I had him repair the car. (Indirect causation)

The causer arranges for the action but does not perform direct supervision.

They let the children play. (Permission/indirect causation)

Indicates that causation is more permissive than coercive.

She got her car fixed. (Indirect causation)

Focuses on arranging an action through a third party, demonstrating indirect causation.

Russian: Russian employs a hybrid strategy that incorporates lexical causatives, derivational morphology, and periphrastic constructions. Lexical causatives are often direct, signaling immediate effects of the causer's actions, while periphrastic constructions frequently encode indirect or mediated causation. Derivational suffixes (e.g., *-и-*, *-з-*) allow intransitive verbs to become causative, thereby increasing valency and integrating the causer into the argument structure. The flexibility of Russian causatives enables a continuum between strict direct causation and more nuanced, indirect, or forced causation, reflecting both the richness of the fusional verbal system and the interaction between morphology and syntax.

Examples:

Он сломал дверь. (He broke the door. – direct lexical causation)

The action is caused directly by the agent, with clear semantic and syntactic integration of the causer.

Она заставила ребёнка учиться. (She forced the child to study. – periphrastic, direct causation)

Here, the causative meaning is encoded syntactically, emphasizing coercion rather than morphological marking.

Он убил муху. (He killed the fly. – lexical direct causation)

The verb itself encodes causation lexically, without additional morphological or syntactic causative markers.

The comparative analysis of causative constructions in Uzbek, English, and Russian reveals significant typological differences in how these languages encode causative meaning. In Uzbek, the causative system is highly regular and morphologically integrated, with valency increase and agentive marking systematically encoded within the verb itself. This morphological sufficiency ensures that causative constructions are both predictable and transparent, allowing speakers to convey causative relations unambiguously through verbal morphology alone. In contrast, English relies predominantly on syntactic and lexical strategies to express causation. These periphrastic constructions are highly flexible and context-dependent, providing a wide range of meanings including direct, indirect, and permissive causation. However, unlike Uzbek, English lacks integrated morphological markers for causativity, meaning that the causer's role is expressed through verb choice and syntactic structure rather than affixation. Russian demonstrates a hybrid approach, combining derivational morphology, lexical causatives, and periphrastic constructions. This multifaceted strategy accommodates both direct and mediated causation, reflecting the language's considerable syntactic flexibility and its capacity to encode subtle distinctions in agency and causative force. Across all three languages, causative constructions universally function to increase verbal valency and differentiate between direct and indirect causation. Nonetheless, the method of encoding varies typologically: Uzbek achieves this through morphological sufficiency, English through syntactic-periphrastic dependence, and Russian through a combination of both approaches. These findings illustrate that while the concept of causativity is universal, its linguistic realization is profoundly influenced by language-specific typological constraints and structural preferences.

Conclusion

The comparative analysis illustrates that while Uzbek, English, and Russian all encode causative meanings, the strategies employed differ significantly. Uzbek relies on systematic morphological suffixation, English uses periphrastic constructions, and Russian applies a hybrid of derivational, lexical, and periphrastic mechanisms. These differences shed light on typological variation in argument structure, valency modification, and semantic encoding of causative events. The study contributes to contrastive and typological linguistics and lays the groundwork for future research on causative constructions in additional languages, language acquisition, and translation studies.

**References:**

1. Dixon, R. M. W. (2000). A typology of causatives: Form, syntax, and meaning. In R. M. W. Dixon (Ed.), *The semantics of causative constructions* (pp. 1–35). John Benjamins.
2. Huddleston, R., & Pullum, G. K. (2002). *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
3. Karahan, L. (2010). Causatives in Uzbek: Morphology and Syntax. *Central Asian Linguistics Journal*, 5(2), 34–56.
4. Haspelmath, M. (1993). More on the typology of causatives. *Linguistic Typology*, 1(3), 233–282.

5. Abdulhamidov, S. (2022). Lexical and Semantical Meaning of Causative Verbs in Uzbek and English. *JournalNX*, 8(11), 309-311.
6. Alimova, M. Kh., Oripova, M. J., & Karimova, Sh. T. (2025). Cognitive Functional Structuring of Conceptual Causality in English. *International Journal of Pedagogics*.
7. Mallayev, A. K. (2025). A Comparative Study of the Communicative Pragmatic Potential of Causative Verbs in English and Uzbek. *LinguaConnect*.