

CASE FORMS, PARTICIPLES, CONVERBS AND CAUSATIVES: MORPHOLOGICAL MEANS OF EXPRESSING CAUSALITY IN MODERN KARAKALPAK

Abdalieva Sarbinaz Bakhtiyarovna
Independent Researcher, Uzbekistan

Abstract:

Karakalpak, like other Turkic languages, can express a causal relation inside a single word form: an ablative ending turns fear into the source of silence, a participle with *-liqtan* turns an event into an explicit reason, and a causative affix turns a subject into someone who makes another person act. These forms are among the most frequent means of expressing causality in Karakalpak prose, yet they are usually described one by one, and often as if each affix carried a fixed meaning. This article examines the morphological means of expressing cause and effect in modern Karakalpak (case endings, participles, converbs, verbal nouns, possessive and negative markers, and causative-voice affixes) on the basis of grammatical descriptions and examples from A. Najimov's work on complex sentences and T. Qayıpbergenov's novel *Qaraqalpaq dástanı. Maman biy ápsanası*. Using contextual, transformational and functional-semantic analysis, it shows that causal meaning in these forms arises not from the affix alone but from the interaction of the form with predicate semantics, the relation between subjects, factivity, tense-aspect and context. The study distinguishes "relational causation" (a causal link between two predicative situations) from "action causation" (a causer built into the argument structure of a single verb), proposes criteria for separating cause from time and purpose in polysemous forms such as *-ǵannan keyin*, *-ǵan soń* and *-ǵanı ushın*, and arranges the forms on a scale of explicitness. The scientific novelty lies in the first integrated classification of Karakalpak morphological and non-finite causal forms by degree of explicitness and field position.

Keywords: Karakalpak language, causality, morphology, participle, converb, verbal noun, causative voice, functional-semantic field, explicit and implicit causality.

Introduction

Agglutinative languages give their speakers an unusually compact way of saying why something happened. In Karakalpak, a single participle with a case ending can carry an entire subordinate event and attach it to the main clause as its cause. Qorqınıshtan sóylemey qaldı "He fell silent from fear" needs no conjunction at all; the ablative ending on qorqınısh "fear" does the work. Bolǵanlıqtan "because (it) was" turns a whole situation into an abstract fact and marks it explicitly as a reason. The causative affix in jazdırdı "had (someone) write" introduces a new participant, the person who causes the writing, directly into the verb.

These forms have been described in Karakalpak grammar, but mostly piecemeal. The standard university morphology describes the causative voice as the verbal voice richest in affixes [1]; M. Dáwletov has devoted a special study to forms in -ǵannan/-gennen and shown that they serve a range of syntactic-semantic functions [2]; A. Najimov describes causal subordinate clauses built on synthetic and analytic forms including -ǵanlıqtan, -may, -ıp, -ǵanı ushın, -ǵanı sebepli, dep, -ǵannan keyin, -ǵan soń and -ıwı sebepli [3]. A. A. Musaev's comparative study of causatives notes that morphological structure alone cannot reveal the semantic relation in a sentence; syntactic links and the relations between components must also be taken into account [4]. What is still missing is an account that treats these forms as one system, explains how they share the work of expressing causality, and gives criteria for deciding when a polysemous form is actually causal.

Comparative Turkic work makes clear why such an account is needed. Kh. M. Esenov's study of Kazakh complex sentences built on case-and-postposition forms of participles shows that causal meaning in Turkic languages arises from the combination of synthetic and analytic means [5]. L. G. Valieva's work on Tatar shows causality realised across many unit types [6], and A. M. Amatov treats cause-effect relations as a phenomenon operating at every level of language [7].

The questions this article addresses are: Which morphological forms express causality in modern Karakalpak? How is their causal meaning separated from the temporal, spatial, modal and purposive meanings the same forms can carry? And how are these forms distributed within the functional-semantic field of causality?

Methodology

The material was drawn from three sources: the standard morphology of modern Karakalpak, which provides the inventory and formal description of verb forms and voice affixes; A. Najimov's description of complex sentences, which supplies a large set of literary examples of causal subordinate constructions; and T. Qayıpbergenov's historical novel Qaraqalpaq dástanı. Maman biy ápsanası, which provides examples in extended narrative context. M. Dáwletov's work on -ǵannan/-gennen and on complex sentences and the standard syntax were used for comparison.

The analysis combined morphological description (identifying the components of each form), contextual analysis (reading each example within at least several surrounding sentences, since causal force often appears only in later text), transformational testing, and functional-semantic analysis. The transformational test is central to the method: an unmarked or polysemous construction is reformulated with an explicit causal form (C bolǵanlıqtan E or C sebepli E). If the reformulation preserves the basic meaning, a causal reading is supported; if it distorts the manner or the sequence of the action, the example is not classified as causal.

For each example, five parameters were recorded: the type of form; whether the cause is explicit or implicit; whether the causality is objective, epistemic or speech-act; the relation between the subjects of cause and effect; and the function in the text. Additional parameters were the factivity of the cause, temporal order, and the domain of the result (emotional, physical, social or cognitive). Karakalpak examples are given in the official Latin alphabet with English translations.

Results

1. Two kinds of morphological causation

Morphological causality falls into two broad groups. The first consists of relational means, which present one event as the cause of another: the ablative and dative attached to participles and verbal nouns, the -lıqtan/-likten composite, -ğanı ushın, -ğanı sebepli, -ıw sebepli and similar forms. The second consists of the causative-voice affixes, which express the causative character of an action directly. In the first type, the logical relation between two predicative situations receives grammatical form. In the second, the subject is coded as a causer who brings about another participant's action [8]. The two are related, but they cannot be equated. We will call the first "relational causation" and the second "action causation."

2. The ablative case

The ablative is especially important in Karakalpak causal expression. Its general meaning of source and separation is abstracted to indicate the situation from which a result arose. After nouns it appears as -dan, -den, -tan, -ten, -nan, -nen according to phonetic environment. In qorqınıshtan sóylemey qaldı "fell silent from fear," fear is the direct cause of the silence; in quwanıshtan jılap jiberdi "burst into tears from joy," a positive emotion is the source of the tears. The causal reading is determined by the semantics of the result predicate [9].

The ablative's causal meaning is distinguished from its spatial and temporal meanings by context. In awıldan keldi "came from the village," -dan marks the starting point of motion; in suwıqtan qaltıradı "shivered from the cold," it marks the cause of a physiological state. Since the formal marker is the same, interpretation depends on the valency of the governing verb. With verbs of motion such as keliw "come" or shıǵıw "go out," the source meaning dominates; with verbs of resulting state such as qorqıw "fear," qaltıraw "shiver," jılaw "cry" or qıynalıw "suffer," the causal meaning appears. The question neden? "from what?" fits both readings, so the question test alone is not enough; the determining link between the events must also be considered.

3. Participles with the ablative: -ǵannan/-gennen

When the past participle in -ǵan/-gen/-qan/-ken combines with the ablative, a whole action or state is formed into a source of cause: kelgennen, kórgennen, esitkennen, qorıqqannan. The participle keeps its predicative content and the case subordinates it to the next predicate. With a possessive suffix, the subject of the causing action is also marked: onıń kelgeninen "from his coming," balanıń qorıqqanının "from the child's being frightened."

Causal and temporal meanings are close in this form:

Temirbek buǵan juwap bermegennen keyin, Dármenbay oǵan tullanıp qaldı.

"After Temirbek did not answer this, Dármenbay became irritated with him."

Temirbek's failure to answer is both an earlier point in time and the reason for Dármenbay's irritation. The postposition keyin "after" marks the sequence explicitly; the content of the predicates gives it a causal interpretation. M. Dáwletov's study shows that this form serves temporal, causal and other adverbial functions depending on context [10]. Calling -ǵannan/-gennen a ready-made "causal affix" is therefore inadequate. It is a polysemous morphological model, and the semantic link between the two events, not the affix, must be the main criterion of classification.

4. The explicit model: -ǵanlıqtan/-genlikten

One of the most firmly established synthetic models of causal meaning is -ǵanlıqtan/-genlikten/-qanlıqtan/-kenlikten. It consists of the verb stem, the participle marker, the nominalising suffix -lıq/-lik and the ablative: bolǵanlıqtan, kelgenlikten, kórmegenlikten. The form turns an action or state into an abstract fact and marks it as the source of the following event.

Búgin jalǵız ózim ábden jalıqqanlıqtan, bir nársem túsip qalǵanday bolıp tur.

"Because I have grown thoroughly weary being alone today, I feel as if I have lost something."

The weariness in the subordinate part has produced the feeling of emptiness in the main part. This model is the most morphologically explicit expression of causal meaning in Karakalpak.

Its functional advantage is that it can express a real action, a permanent property, a psychological state or an epistemic ground within the same subordinate model:

Onıń ózi bir túrli ersilew adam bolǵanlıqtan, basqalar da oǵan ersi qatnas jasaydı. [3]

"Since he himself is a somewhat odd person, others also treat him oddly."

Yolshı bul adamnıń minez-qulqın burınnan sınap kórgenlikten, onıń bala tábiyatına ishinen kúlip otıra berdi. [3]

"Since the traveller had long since tested this man's character, he kept laughing inwardly at his childish nature."

In the first, a personal trait is a stable social factor; in the second, previous experience is the epistemic ground for a later evaluation: a reason for knowing rather than a physical cause [11]. The negative form -maǵanlıqtan/-megenlikten presents a non-occurring action as the cause of a real result: xabar bermegenlikten, olar bilmey qaldı "because no one informed them, they did not find out." Negation operates at two levels: it makes the subordinate predicate negative and turns this "non-existence" into a causal factor. In fiction such constructions are productive for showing the consequences of indifference, silence or neglected duty.

5. Possessive participles with ushın and sebepli

When a participle takes a possessive suffix and is followed by ushın or sebepli, a construction with an explicit causal subject arises: bolǵanı ushın, kelgenim ushın, aytqanı sebepli. The possessive codes the agent of the subordinate action; ushın marks the relation of cause or purpose.

Biziń jámaáatımız ... pidákarlıq penen miynet etkeni ushın, miynetkeshler sheksiz algısqa bólendi. [3]

"Because our community ... worked with self-sacrifice, the workers were showered with gratitude."

The work is a realised fact and the gratitude its result; ushın has a causal reading because the subordinate action precedes the result and produced it. The same model, however, also expresses purpose:

Kózleri jumılıp ketpewi ushın, alǵa jılısadı. [3]

"So that his eyes would not close, he moves forward."

Kolxoz bolǵanıńız ushın ... qutlıqlaw sózim bar. [3]

"Because you have become a collective farm, ... I have words of congratulation."

In the first, ushın expresses the aim of preventing an expected future state; in the second, becoming a collective farm is an accomplished fact and the reason for the congratulation. The formal model is identical, but the subordinate event is oriented forward as a purpose in one case and backward as a ground in the other. Factivity, tense and the subject's intention are therefore the criteria that decide between cause and purpose.

A literary example shows two causal ushın constructions side by side:

Neflyuev ... Dmitriy Gladyshevті kóp waqıttan beri kórmegeni ushın saǵınǵanın aytıp, qaraqalpaq eline barıp pitkergeń isleri ushın algısladı. [8]

"Neflyuev ... said that he had missed Dmitriy Gladyshev since he had not seen him for a long time, and thanked him for the work he had accomplished in the Karakalpak land."

Kórmegeni ushın presents long separation as the cause of longing (an emotional result); pitkergeń isleri ushın presents the work done as the ground for gratitude (a social-evaluative result). The same model thus covers different causal domains within a single sentence. It also illustrates the negative pattern "an event that did not occur → a result that did": not seeing produced longing.

By contrast, verbal noun + ushın usually expresses purpose:

Bul toǵaydın amanlıǵı ushın kúshli, jaraqılı qarawıl kerek.

"For the safety of this forest, a strong, armed guard is needed."

Here the forest's safety is a state to be secured in the future, not a cause that preceded the result. This example is a reminder that *ushın* cannot be mechanically labelled a causal marker.

6. The dative participle: -ǵanǵa/-genge

The participle in the dative can also express a cause:

Bárimiz bas qurap birden kelgenge, siz hawlıǵıp ta qalǵan shıǵarsız? [3]

"You must have been flustered because we all came together at once?"

The simultaneous arrival of everyone is presented as the cause of the addressee's agitation. The basic directional meaning of the dative shifts here to the ground of a reaction: the reaction is directed at a certain event [12]. Because *-ǵanǵa* can also express purpose, object and time, its causal function is clearest when it combines with predicates of emotion and evaluation such as *quwanıw* "rejoice," *qorqıw* "fear," *ashıwlanıw* "become angry" or *tańlanıw* "be surprised."

7. Verbal nouns: -ıwdan and -ıw sebepli

The verbal noun in *-ıw/-ıw/-w* can express causality with the ablative. Forms such as *shıǵıwdan*, *keliwden*, *suwıq tiyiwden* objectify an action and link it as a source to the governing predicate:

Teńiz ortasına samolet túsiwden, balıqshılar qorshap aldı. [3]

"Since a plane came down in the middle of the sea, the fishermen surrounded it."

The landing of the plane is interpreted as the reason the fishermen gathered. Combined with *sebepli*, the verbal noun expresses causality more explicitly still:

Qarasatuǵın qawenderleri bolmaw sebepli, ol kóp xorlıq kórdi. [3]

"Because he had no patrons to look after him, he suffered much humiliation."

The negative verbal noun *bolmaw* names the absence of protectors as an abstract fact, and *sebepli* marks it as the cause of the humiliation. The verbal noun nominalises the event, while the auxiliary word marks the type of relation explicitly. This model provides the precision typical of official and scientific prose, but in fiction it also serves to explain a character's fate concisely and to summarise the consequences of a social situation. The verbal noun is neutral with respect to tense; its factivity and temporal position are determined by context.

8. Converbs: implicit causality

The converb in *-ıp/-ıp/-p* is a polyfunctional device that can express sequence, simultaneity, manner, circumstance and cause [13]. Najimov treats the following as a subordinate action that caused the failure of the work:

Paxta terimine járdemge kelgen qala xalqınıń bári qaytıp ketip, jumıs barınsha bijnadı. [3]

"All the townspeople who had come to help with the cotton harvest went back, and the work fell into complete disorder."

This is not simple succession: the people's departure reduced the workforce and so led to the breakdown of the work. The cause is not marked by a dedicated unit; the link is recovered from background knowledge about labour and the work process. With *-ıp*, causality is implicit and can shift to another meaning when the context changes: *Ol úyge kelip, kitap oqıdı* "He came home and read a book" expresses sequence, while *Ol quwanıp, kúlip jiberdi* "He was overjoyed and burst out laughing" shows an inner state causing an outward reaction.

Not every converbal construction is causal. *Maman basın kóterip* "Maman, raising his head" usually describes the manner of the main action or an accompanying action [14]. The transformational test applies here: if the construction can be reformulated as *C bolǵanlıqtan E* without loss of meaning, the causal reading is strong; if the reformulation disrupts the manner or sequence of the action, the example is not causal. Converbial chains also intensify narrative dynamics. In *Maman selk ete qaldı. Biylerdin*

hámmesi qozgalań taptı "Maman started. All the biys stirred", a collective reaction follows a first reaction; if Maman's start is interpreted as what alarmed the biys, an implicit cause emerges from the juxtaposition of predicates alone.

The negative converb -may/-mey presents an unrealised action as the cause of a result:

Zamanında baxıt darımay, / Meniń babam ótken eken jarımay. [3]

"Happiness never touched him in his time, / My grandfather passed away without prospering."

In this model the cause is usually a "zero event": lack, not knowing, not seeing, not hearing, not doing. But -may/-mey also expresses manner: Ol úndemey otırdı "He sat in silence" describes how he sat, while Ol xabardı bilmey, jıynalısqqa kelmedi "Not knowing about it, he did not come to the meeting" presents not knowing as the reason for not coming. The difference lies in whether the main event logically depends on the first. A negative result predicate such as bilmey qaldı "did not find out," bara almadı "could not go," tınıshlanbadı "did not calm down" favours the causal reading. Sometimes the causal force of -may/-mey becomes visible only in later text. In Gladyshevtiń oyı jamanlıqqa barmay Jarlıqtı shıǵardı "Without suspecting anything bad, Gladyshev issued the Decree" , the converb describes his lack of suspicion; only the following events (the disclosure of the document's content and the Khan's fury) turn that carelessness into a cause. This shows why non-finite forms must be analysed at the level of text.

The converb dep, formed from the verb "to say," expresses epistemic and motivational causality:

Kúniń ıssısında qarıqtaǵı suw nállerdi quwratıp taslaydı dep, ol túngi suwǵarıwǵa kóbirek kúsh beretuǵın edi.

"Thinking that in the heat of the day the water in the ditch would wither the saplings, he used to put more effort into watering at night."

The cause here is not the event itself but the subject's belief or prediction about it. In a model such as Jaw keldi dep, el kóshti "Thinking the enemy had come, the people moved away," the report may be false, but believing it produces a real action. Such constructions allow the difference between an objective event and a cause existing in a character's mind to be shown.

9. Time-cause syncretism: -ǵan soń and -ǵannan keyin

The postpositions soń and keyin with participles primarily express time, but in certain contexts they also create a causal meaning:

Húkimet Ómirzaqqa on eki tanap jer bergen soń, onıń xojalıǵında úlken ózgerisler boldı. [3]

"After the government gave Ómirzaq twelve tanap of land, great changes took place in his household."

The granting of land preceded the changes and brought them about. A literary example shows the same syncretism:

Xan Jarlıqtı dawıslatıp oqıtıp, awdartıp mańızına túsingennen keyin áwelgisinen betterirek qáhárlendi. [8]

"After the Khan had the Decree read aloud and translated and grasped its meaning, he became even more enraged than before."

Externally, túsingennen keyin marks a temporal boundary: the Khan first understands the decree and then becomes angry. But the emotional semantics of qáhárlendi "became enraged" turns the sequence into a psychological cause: understanding the content is the cognitive ground for the rage. Temporal and causal meanings are realised here syncretically. The same sentence also contains two causative converbs, dawıslatıp "having (it) read aloud" and oqıtıp "having (someone) read," which show the Khan as the causer of other people's actions.

Three criteria were established for classifying -ǵan soń and -ǵannan keyin as causal: (1) the event precedes the result; (2) the event influences the result; and (3) the speaker presents it as an explanatory ground. If only chronological succession is present, the construction remains temporal: shay ishkennen

keyin, sırtqa shıqtı "after drinking tea, he went outside" expresses simple sequence, while dawani esitkennen keyin, onıń kewli buzıldı "after hearing the verdict, he became upset" presents hearing as the cause of an emotional change. Grammatical homonymy must be resolved by semantic assessment, and it would be wrong to classify every construction with keyin automatically as causal.

10. Attributive participles and hidden causality

A participle in attributive function can conceal a cause inside the description of a person:

Barlıq biydiń ǵázepli sózlerin esitken shayıq Mamangá tiklendi. [8]

"The sheikh, having heard the angry words of all the biys, turned on Maman."

Esitken "having heard" formally modifies shayıq "sheikh," but in context hearing the biys' angry words is the psychological cause of the sheikh's turning on Maman. No causal clause is visible; the relation is expressed implicitly through the semantic link between the attributive group and the main predicate. The sentence can be transformed into *Shayıq biylerdiń ǵázepli sózlerin esitkenlikten, Mamangá tiklendi* "Because the sheikh had heard the biys' angry words, he turned on Maman." In the original, the cause is folded naturally into a description of the sheikh; in the transformation, -genlikten separates the cause logically and puts stress on it. The transformation preserves the basic content but changes the artistic perspective and the distribution of information. Functional synonymy, in other words, is not full equivalence.

11. Tense-aspect and subjects

Tense and aspect forms determine the temporal structure of the causal relation. A realised cause is usually expressed by the -ǵan participle; a habitual or recurring factor by -atuǵın/-etuǵın:

Molla ... belgi salıp jiberetuǵın bolǵanlıqtan, suwǵa shomılıw hesh múmkin emes. [3]

"Since the mullah would ... (habitually) leave a mark (as punishment), swimming was quite impossible."

The habitual threat of punishment produces a permanent prohibition. The aspectual character of the cause affects the duration of the result: a recurring danger produces lasting caution.

Possessive suffixes mark the subject of the causing event: *kelgenim ushın, aytqanıń sebepli, onıń barmaganınan*. When cause and effect have different subjects, the possessive clarifies the relation between the two predicative centres: *in balanıń awırǵanı ushın anası jumısqa barmadı* "because the child was ill, the mother did not go to work," the child is the subject of the cause and the mother of the result. When the subjects coincide, the construction typically shows a transition from an inner state to a subsequent action; when they differ, the influence of one person or event on another.

12. The causative voice: action causation

The causative-voice affixes express a different kind of causality. A causer acts on another person or object, bringing about its action or a change in its state. In Karakalpak the causative voice is formed with -dır/-dir, -tır/-tir, -t, -ıt/-it, -ǵız/-giz, -qız/-kiz, -ır/-ir, -ar/-er and their phonetic variants: *jazdırdı* "had (someone) write," *otırǵızdı* "seated (someone)," *ishirdi* "made (someone) drink," *quwandırdı* "made (someone) happy." In these forms the valency of the verb expands and a new causer participant appears [15]. The standard morphology notes that this is the voice richest in affixes and that it is formed from both intransitive and transitive stems. Added to an intransitive verb, it means the subject brings about an action or state in another participant: *bala úkesin oynattı* "the child got his younger sibling playing." Added to a transitive verb, the grammatical subject becomes the one who orders or commissions the action: *muǵallım oqıwshılarga násheler ektirdi* "the teacher had the pupils plant saplings."

The allomorphs are distributed by phonetic and morphological conditions. After voiced consonants -dır/-dir is usual, after voiceless ones -tır/-tir (*aldır, bildir, arttır*), though some verbs have normative forms that depart from the general rule, such as *keltir*. The suffix -t attaches mainly to polysyllabic

stems ending in a vowel (sanat, sóylet, islet, oqıt, aydat), and appears as -ıt/-it after some consonants (qorqıt, úrkit) . In bala qorıqtı "the child was frightened," the child experiences the state; in dawıs balanı qorqıttı "the sound frightened the child," the sound is the causer and the child the affected participant. The variants -ǵız/-gız/-qız/-kız mostly express having another person perform an action: alǵız, aytqız, kórgız, jazǵız, otırǵız. Less productive formants occur in a limited set of verbs: batır, túsir, pitker, kórset, awdar, emiz. A synchronic analysis must distinguish productive suffixes from historically fused formants; external morphemic similarity does not always mean a new causative is being formed.

The semantic model of the causative voice takes two forms: "X makes Y perform Z," typical of volitional causation (başlıq jumısshılardıǵa xat jazdırdı "the boss had the workers write a letter"), and "under X's influence Y comes into a state," where the affected participant is not active (xabar onı quwandırdı "the news made him happy"). The causer may be a person, a natural phenomenon, a piece of news or a whole situation. The affix makes this participant the subject of the sentence, and the original subject becomes an object. Causatives can be stacked (oqıtıw, jazdırw, turǵızıw, túsiriw), which increases the mediation of influence: the subject does not do the work himself but has it done through another. Not every double-affixed form, however, denotes two independent causers; some have lexicalised into single verbs.

The difference between the morphological and the lexical causative lies in the degree of formalisation. In jazdırdı causation is expressed by a voice affix on the root; in jazıwǵa májbúr etti "forced (him) to write" by a separate lexical predicate. The first is compact and may leave the manner of influence unexpressed; the second states compulsion explicitly. The causative voice does not always mean force: Ol balasına xat jazdırdı "He had his son write a letter" may express a task, a request or an educational aim. The pragmatic type of influence is determined by context.

In literary text, causative forms express relations of control, influence and responsibility among characters. Abılqayır xannıń bizge tezek tergizip, marapat ornına basımızǵa tezek qap kiygizip júrgenin úǵıp qayttım "I came back having learned that Khan Abılqayır was making us gather dung and, instead of honours, making us wear dung sacks on our heads" shows the Khan as the causer through tergizip and kiygizip, while úǵıp qayttım "I came back having understood" expresses the result of grasping these facts. In Kelgen soń ... ahidnamalardı aldırdı "Having arrived, ... he had the treaties brought", the participle with soń marks a time-cause boundary between predicates, while aldırdı codes the relation between agents within one predicate. The first expresses relational causation, the second action causation: the distinction drawn in Section 1, confirmed here in a single literary sentence.

13. A scale of explicitness

The forms analysed differ in how explicitly they mark causality. The results are summarised in Table 1.

Table 1. Morphological and non-finite means of expressing causality in modern Karakalpak

No.	Model	Form	Semantic function	Explicitness	Field position
1	Noun / participle + ablative	-dan, -den, -tan, -ten, -nan, -nen	source or ground of the cause	Medium	Near centre
2	Participle + -lıqtan	-ǵanlıqtan/-genlikten	explicit, realised cause of the result	High	Centre
3	Possessive participle + ushın	-ǵanı ushın	cause or, by context, purpose	High	Near centre

No.	Model	Form	Semantic function	Explicitness	Field position
4	Participle + ablative	-ǵannan/-gennen	cause, source or time-cause relation	Medium	Near centre
5	Verbal noun + sebepli	-ıw sebepli	action presented as explicit cause	High	Centre
6	Participle + dative	-ǵanǵa/-genge	ground of an emotional or evaluative reaction	Medium	Near centre
7	Positive converb	-ıp/-ip/-p	sequence, state, or implicit cause	Low	Periphery
8	Negative converb	-may/-mey	unrealised action as cause of the result	Medium	Periphery
9	Participle + soń / keyin	-ǵan soń, -ǵannan keyin	time-cause syncretism	Low	Periphery
10	Causative voice	-dır, -tır, -t, -ǵız, -qız, -ır, etc.	causer brings about another's action or a change of state	High	Centre (action causation)

Discussion

The main finding of this study is that, in Karakalpak, the causal function of a morphological form does not come from the form alone. It arises from the interaction of the form with predicate valency, the relation between subjects, factivity, tense-aspect, modality and textual context. The same ablative marks a source in awıldan keldi and a cause in suwıqtan qaltıradı; the same -ǵanı ushın marks a ground in one sentence and a goal in the next. A "one affix, one meaning" description cannot account for this, and the scale of explicitness proposed here describes the material more accurately.

The second finding concerns the choice between explicit and implicit forms. A -lıqtan subordinate gives the cause openly as an explanatory background, usually presenting a known or explanatory cause first and the result in the main clause as new information. A converb dissolves the cause into the flow of events and quickens the narrative pace. An attributive participle hides the cause inside a description of a person or object. A verbal noun generalises the event and makes it a convenient object for authorial evaluation. When the same situation is expressed in different forms, the focus of information and the pragmatic effect change. Form choice in Karakalpak is not only a grammatical norm; it is the author's decision about how to present information. This is consistent with the general principle, noted in Najimov's description of complex sentences, that semantic links are created by content, intonation and connecting devices working together.

Third, the distinction between relational and action causation is not merely terminological. In a causal subordinate construction, two events each have their own predicative content: X happened, so Y happened. In a causative verb, the two actions merge into the argument structure of a single predicate: X made Y do something. Keeping these apart prevents morphological causatives from being treated as

if they exhausted the causal field. This also clarifies the relation between the present study and Musaev's work, which focused on causative constructions: the causative voice is central to the causal field, but it is one part of it, alongside the relational forms.

The Karakalpak forms are typologically close to those of related languages. Uzbek -gani uchun, -ganidan, -ganligi sababli, -ish sababli, -ib and -may, and Kazakh -ǵandıqtan/-gendikten, -ǵanı úshın, -ǵan soń, -ıp/-ip and -may/-mey perform similar functions. What they share rests on the nominal character of participles and verbal nouns, the relational semantics of the cases, and the subordinating potential of converbs. The Karakalpak distribution of variants, their phonetic adaptation and their frequency in literary use, however, require independent analysis.

Some limitations should be noted. Many of the examples come from grammatical reference works, where they were selected to illustrate particular constructions; a randomly sampled corpus may show a different balance between explicit and implicit forms. The literary material comes chiefly from one novel. And frequencies were not counted, so statements about productivity rest on grammatical description and qualitative observation rather than corpus statistics. A quantitative study using the five-parameter annotation scheme proposed here would be the natural continuation.

Conclusion

This article examined the morphological means of expressing cause-effect relations in modern Karakalpak. The ablative marks the source of a cause and the dative the ground of a reaction; -ǵanlıqtan/-genlikten and -ǵanı ushın express an extended predicative cause; -ıw sebepli expresses a cause based on a verbal noun. The converbs -ıp/-ip/-p and -may/-mey create contextual, implicit causal relations, while -ǵan soń and -ǵannan keyin combine time and cause. The causative-voice affixes introduce a causer into the argument structure of the verb and form action causation, as distinct from the relational causation expressed by the other forms.

Ranked by explicitness, -ǵanlıqtan/-genlikten, -ıw sebepli and the causative voice form the morphological centre of the causal field; -ǵanı ushın, -ǵańa/-genge and the ablative participles form the near-centre layer; and -ǵannan keyin, -ǵan soń, -ıp/-ip/-p, -may/-mey and attributive participles form a periphery whose causal meaning merges with time, circumstance and manner and depends heavily on context. In literary text, central forms clarify explanation and evaluation, while peripheral forms compress events and embed the cause in a character's viewpoint or the flow of the plot. The next step is to examine how these forms function within the structure of the simple and the complex sentence, and how their distribution varies across authors and genres.

References

- [1] D. S. Nasırov, E. B. Berdimuratov, A. D. Dáwletov, and A. B. Bekbergenov, Eds., *Házirgi qaraqalpaq tili. Morfologiya* [Modern Karakalpak: Morphology]. Nukus: Qaraqalpaqstan, 1981.
- [2] M. Dáwletov, "Deeprichastnye formy s affiksami -ǵannan/-gennen v karakalpakskom yazyke" [Converbal forms with the affixes -ǵannan/-gennen in Karakalpak], *Vestnik Karakalpakskogo filiala AN UzSSR*, no. 2, pp. 72-77, 1982.
- [3] A. Najimov, *Házirgi qaraqalpaq tili: jup sózler hám qospa gápler* [Modern Karakalpak: Paired Words and Complex Sentences]. Nukus, 2025.
- [4] A. A. Musaev, "Kauzativ konstruktsiyalarning kognitiv va lingvopragmatik tahlili (ingliz va qoraqalpoq tillari misolida)" [Cognitive and linguopragmatic analysis of causative constructions (on the material of English and Karakalpak)], PhD dissertation, Nukus, 2023.
- [5] Kh. M. Esenov, "Slozhnopodchinennye predlozheniya s padezhno-poslelozhnymi formami prichastiy v kazakhskom yazyke" [Complex sentences with case-postposition forms of participles in Kazakh], in *Padezhi i ikh ekvivalenty v stroe slozhnogo predlozheniya v yazykakh narodov Sibiri*. Novosibirsk, 1981, pp. 89-96.

- [6] L. G. Valieva, *Kauzal'nost' v tatarskom literaturnom yazyke* [Causality in the Tatar Literary Language]. Kazan, 2015.
- [7] A. M. Amatov, *Prichinno-sledstvennye svyazi na raznykh urovnyakh yazyka* [Cause-Effect Relations at Different Levels of Language]. Moscow, 2003.
- [8] T. Qayıpbergenov, *Qaraqalpaq dástanı. Maman biy ápsanası* [The Karakalpak Epic: The Legend of Maman Biy]. Nukus: Bilim, 2018.
- [9] M. Dáwletov, *Qaraqalpaq tilindegi qospa gáplerdiń geypara teoriyalıq máseleleri* [Some Theoretical Problems of Complex Sentences in Karakalpak]. Nukus: Bilim, 1993.
- [10] A. Dáwletov, M. Dáwletov, and M. Qudaybergenov, *Házirgi qaraqalpaq ádebiy tili. Sintaksis* [Modern Karakalpak Literary Language: Syntax]. Nukus: Bilim, 2009.
- [11] E. Sweetser, *From Etymology to Pragmatics: Metaphorical and Cultural Aspects of Semantic Structure*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- [12] L. Johanson, "On Turkic converb clauses," in *Converbs in Cross-Linguistic Perspective*, M. Haspelmath and E. König, Eds. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 1995, pp. 313–347.
- [13] B. Comrie, *Language Universals and Linguistic Typology: Syntax and Morphology*, 2nd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989.
- [14] M. Shibatani, Ed., *The Grammar of Causative Constructions* (Syntax and Semantics, vol. 6). New York: Academic Press, 1976.
- [15] J. J. Song, *Causatives and Causation: A Universal-Typological Perspective*. London: Longman, 1996.