

LEXICAL MEANS OF EXPRESSING CAUSE-EFFECT RELATIONS IN MODERN KARAKALPAK: A FUNCTIONAL-SEMANTIC FIELD APPROACH

Abdalieva Sarbinaz Bakhtiyarovna
Independent Researcher, Uzbekistan

Abstract:

Studies of causality in Karakalpak have concentrated on grammar: conjunctions, subordinate clauses, case endings and causative affixes. Yet a good part of the work of expressing cause and effect is done by words with their own lexical meaning: nouns such as *sebep* "cause," *nátiyje* "result," *saldar* "consequence" and *aqıbet* "outcome," and verbal phrases such as *sebep bolıw* "to be the cause of," *alıp keliw* "to lead to" and *tuwdırıw* "to give rise to." This article describes the lexical layer of the cause-effect field in modern Karakalpak on the basis of the explanatory dictionary of the Karakalpak language and examples from T. Qayıpbergenov's novel *Qaraqalpaq dástanı. Maman biy ápsanası*. Using component, contextual, valency and functional-semantic analysis, it identifies six groups of lexical units: core cause nouns, nouns denoting the causer, nouns denoting effect and consequence, peripheral nouns of ground and pretext, verbal-analytic units of causation, and units that have moved toward grammatical connectives. The analysis shows that the three result nouns differ systematically (*nátiyje* is neutral and associated with controlled processes, *saldar* with influences outside the subject's will, and *aqıbet* with final, often negatively evaluated outcomes), and that the *sebep* family forms a continuum from a full noun to the connective *sebebi* and the postposition-like *sebepli* and *sebebinen*. The scientific novelty of the study lies in the first semantic-functional classification of Karakalpak causal vocabulary and in the description of its grammaticalisation as a gradual transition rather than a binary split. The results show that lexical choice determines which component of a causal situation is brought into focus, how strongly the link is asserted, and how the speaker evaluates it.

Keywords: Karakalpak language, causality, cause-effect relation, lexical semantics, functional-semantic field, grammaticalisation, literary text, pragmatics.

Introduction

When a grammar of Karakalpak describes how the language expresses cause and effect, it usually begins with sentences: the causal subordinate clause and the compound sentence with *sebebi* or *sonliqtan*. The standard syntax, for instance, distinguishes cause-effect and effect-cause models of asyndetic compound sentences [1], and A. Najimov's description of complex sentences shows that semantic links between clauses are formed by content, intonation and special connecting devices working together [2]. What tends to be taken for granted in such accounts is the word that names the relation itself.

That is a significant omission. A speaker who says *Sonıń sebebinen kóp búlindik* "Because of that we suffered much ruin" and one who says *Sonıń saldarınan kóp búlindik* "As a consequence of that we suffered much ruin" describe the same chain of events, but they put different weight on it. A character who "finds a cause" (*sebeplawıw*) to humiliate a rival is not uncovering a cause at all; he is manufacturing a pretext [3]. Lexical units of this kind do not merely label the parts of a causal situation. They decide which part is brought to the foreground, they grade the strength of the link, and they carry the speaker's evaluation of it. Studying them as a system reveals the semantic basis of causality that exists before, and independently of, any particular syntactic construction [4].

Research in related languages supports this view. G'. Abdurahmonov showed for Uzbek that causal meaning in complex sentences depends not only on conjunctions but on the lexical-semantic elements of the clauses [5]. A. M. Amatov treats cause-effect links as a phenomenon realised at all levels of language, the lexical included [6]. V. B. Evtyukhin places cause, condition, purpose, consequence and concession within a single macro-field of conditionality [7], and L. G. Valieva's study of Tatar shows causal meaning spread across many types of units [8]. For Karakalpak, however, the lexical means have not yet been classified as a system.

This article addresses that gap. Its research questions are: Which lexical units in modern Karakalpak express cause-effect relations? How do they differ semantically and stylistically? And where do they sit within the functional-semantic field of causality?

Methodology

The material for the study comes from two kinds of sources. Dictionary definitions and illustrative examples were taken from the sixth volume of the explanatory dictionary of the Karakalpak language. Literary examples were drawn from T. Qayıpbergenov's historical novel *Qaraqalpaq dástanı*. *Maman biy ápsanası*, a large text that combines narrative, dialogue and authorial commentary and therefore shows causal vocabulary used both by the narrator and by characters with their own motives. Grammatical descriptions from Najimov and the standard syntax were used for comparison.

The analysis used component analysis (to identify the semantic features of each unit), contextual analysis (to determine how meaning is realised in a particular passage), valency analysis (to determine which participants and complements each unit requires), transformational testing (to check whether units can be substituted for one another without changing meaning), and functional-semantic analysis (to place units in the centre or periphery of the causal field). Each example was checked against its source and page. Units were classified not by form but by semantic-functional criteria: what part of the causal situation they name, how independent of context their causal meaning is, and what pragmatic work they do.

Karakalpak examples are given in the official Latin alphabet with English translations. Page numbers refer to the editions listed in the References.

Results

1. The structure of the lexical layer

By the lexical layer of the cause-effect field we mean the set of words and fixed expressions that name the components of a causal link, evaluate them, or indicate the link between events. Some of these units carry causal meaning in their dictionary definition; others acquire it in context. On semantic-functional grounds, six groups were identified:

1. core units naming the cause;
2. units naming the causer (the agent or factor responsible);
3. units naming the effect or consequence;
4. peripheral units of ground, argument and pretext;
5. verbal-analytic units expressing the transition from cause to effect;
6. units that have moved into the function of lexical-grammatical connectives.

2. The core noun *sebe*

The most active and independent core unit of the field is the noun *sebe* "cause, reason." The explanatory dictionary defines it as a factor that influenced the occurrence of an action, event or phenomenon, and, in its philosophical sense, as a phenomenon that ensures the necessary emergence of another result [9]. Its semantic structure thus contains at least three features: precedence, influence, and determination of another situation [10]. In actual use these features are not always realised equally. Sometimes *sebe* names the objective source of an event, sometimes a person's motive, sometimes an explanation offered by the speaker. Its meaning is fixed by the predicate it combines with and by the communicative purpose of the utterance.

When *sebe* functions as an independent sentence member, the causal relation is expressed nominally:

Maman ... kelgen sebebin túsindirip edi. [11]

"Maman ... explained the reason for his coming."

Here *sebebin*, carrying possessive and accusative endings, attaches the cause to a particular person's action and makes it the object of the verb *túsindirip* "explain." The causal meaning is located not in the structure of a complex sentence but inside a noun phrase. Causality, in other words, operates as an independent semantic category even at the smallest syntactic level.

The noun typically combines with verbs of cognition and speech: *sebe* *izlew* "look for a cause," *sebebin biliw* "know the cause," *sebebin aytıw* "state the cause," *sebebin túsindirip* "explain the cause." In these collocations the cause is not a ready-made fact but an object of knowledge. In contexts such as *Jigit endi jańadan báne-sebe izledi* "The young man now looked for a new pretext," *sebe* comes close to *báne* "pretext": it is not the real determinant but a justification the person seeks for his own action. The word therefore spans the range from objective causation to subjective justification, which makes it central to pragmatic analysis.

The adjective *sebe* *siz* "without cause" expresses the negation of a cause or its lack of grounds; the dictionary glosses it as "having no reason, groundless, unauthorised". Negating a cause does not mean that no factor existed. The speaker usually means that the factor was insufficient, illegitimate or unacceptable. *Sebe* *siz* therefore carries a built-in pragmatic evaluation.

3. The causer: *sebe* *ker* and *sebe* *shi*

The nouns *sebe* *ker* and *sebe* *shi* name the person or factor that brings about a result, and they typically carry the idea of responsibility. Consider:

Kóz jaslardıń tógiliwine sebe *ker* *bolsa da, sizler ushın ákeldim.*

"Even if it should become the cause of tears being shed, I have brought it for you."

The phrase *sebe* *ker* *bolıw* links something with a possible negative outcome. The cause has not yet operated, but the speaker already associates it with "tears being shed." The concessive *-sa da* adds a

meaning of concession, while the lexical centre of the causal link is *sebepler*. The example shows lexical causality combining with modality to express a probable result, responsibility and the speaker's decision at the same time. In questions such as *Buğın kim sebepler?* "Who is to blame for this?", the noun serves not only to identify an objective source but also the illocutionary goal of finding someone to blame.

4. Ground and pretext: *tiykar, bane, sıltaw*

The noun *tiykar* "basis, ground" denotes the argument or foundation on which a judgement, decision or action rests. Where *sebepler* tends to show an ontological link between events, *tiykar* more often grounds a person's conclusion, decision or action logically: *tiykar bolıw* "serve as a basis," *tiykar etip alıw* "take as a basis," *tiykarında* "on the basis of," *tiykarlanıw* "be based on." It thus sits on the boundary between causality and argumentation, and is especially productive in scientific, legal and official registers.

The nouns *bane* and *sıltaw* "pretext, excuse" introduce a mismatch between the real cause and the cause the speaker presents. The paired word *bane-sebepler* preserves the general causal sense, but its first component adds doubt and negative evaluation, so that the pair as a whole means "a cause presented as a pretext." In literary speech such units reveal a character's hidden intention, express authorial irony, or set the official explanation of an action against its true motive. The following example shows how the core noun *sebepler* itself can be used to the same effect:

Maman biydiń sırtınan bolsa da, bir sebepler tawıp, kópshilik aldında muqatıwdıń jońn maqset etip atlangan edi.

"He had set out with the aim of finding some cause, even behind Maman biy's back, to humiliate him in public."

Here *sebepler tawıw* does not mean discovering a real cause; it means creating a convenient pretext for a goal fixed in advance. The predicate *maqset etiw* "make it one's aim" reveals the character's intention and shows that the cause is pragmatically false. Although the factor is formally called *sebepler*, it does not bring about any event; it serves to justify, in front of others, an action already planned. Context is decisive here in separating cause, purpose and pretext.

5. The result nouns: *nátiyje, saldar, aqıbet*

The second major side of the field is formed by nouns denoting the result. In Karakalpak *nátiyje* expresses a general and stylistically neutral outcome; *saldar* more often denotes a state brought about under the influence of a cause; and *aqıbet* indicates the final, and in some contexts negative, conclusion of an event.

The explanatory dictionary glosses *saldar* through *nátiyje*, *sebepler* and *aqıbet* and illustrates it with *jawgershiliktiń saldarınan* "as a consequence of the war" and *ayralıq penen jalǵızlıqtıń saldarı* "the consequence of separation and loneliness". In these examples *saldar* denotes the effect of negative events: war produces the feeling of losing one's homeland, separation and loneliness produce spiritual depression. The form *saldarınan* approaches an auxiliary function, but the meaning of consequence is preserved at its root, so it is best placed on the boundary of lexical-grammatical transition.

Aqıbet focuses attention on the last stage of a chain of events. It frequently combines with negatively evaluated outcomes (loss, conflict, decline, illness, misfortune), though negativity is not part of its dictionary meaning; the evaluation comes from context. Units such as *aqır* and *aqıbetinde* bring temporal completion and causal conclusion together: the sequence of events "in the end" leads to a certain state. Here the result is a narrative as well as a logical category, gathering earlier actions of the plot into a whole. The expressive potential of *aqıbet* in literary text lies precisely in this retrospective summing-up.

Nátiyje is used actively in scientific and official discourse to name an established conclusion, and in

fiction to mark the meaning of a sequence of actions or events. Collocations such as nátiyje alıw "obtain a result," nátiyjege jetiw "achieve a result," nátiyje beriw "yield a result," nátiyje shıqpaw "produce no result" are tied to purposeful activity, while the form nátiyjesinde "as a result" presents the preceding state as the cause of the following one. The noun therefore has two-directional valency: it links the result to the process before it, and it requires the content of the result to be developed in what follows. The differences between the three nouns can also be stated through the feature of control. Nátiyje usually corresponds to controlled processes because it is linked to the subject's purpose and activity; saldár more often expresses an influence outside the subject's will; aqıbet evaluates the long-drawn-out or abrupt end of events. One can say miynetniń nátiyjesi "the result of labour" (potentially positive), qáte qarardıń saldarı "the consequence of a wrong decision" (harmful), and kelispewshilikniń aqıbeti "the outcome of discord" (potentially tragic). This is not a rigid rule but a usage tendency based on typical collocations. Replacing one noun with another mechanically changes the meaning and stylistic direction of the text.

6. Verbal causation

Causal meaning is also lexicalised through verbs. Sebep bolıw and sebepker bolıw explicitly mark the source of a result. The verbs tuwdırıw "give rise to," payda etiw "create," keltirip shıǵarıw "bring about" and alıp keliw "lead to" describe the emergence of one situation from another as a dynamic process. In these constructions the cause is usually the subject or an oblique complement, and the result the object or goal. Because their lexical meaning requires two situations, these verbs have causative valency and bring a complex semantic structure (causing situation and resulting situation) into a single clause [12].

Bul haqıyqatlıq ta Esengeldi biy tárepdarlarınıń iliwine, ústemlik etiwine qolaylılıq tuwdırdı.

"This reality, too, gave rise to favourable conditions for the supporters of Esengeldi biy to take hold and dominate."

The predicate tuwdırdı presents the preceding information as the source of a subsequent social and psychological situation. The verb has shifted from its biological meaning "to give birth" to the abstract meaning "to bring a result into being." A whole fact serves as the cause and the abstract noun qolaylılıq "favourable conditions" as the result. The metaphorical shift shows the result vividly as a newly born state, and it allows the author to compress the causal relation into a single predicate instead of two independent clauses.

The analytic verb alıp keliw moves from the meaning of physical movement to the abstract meaning "bring one state into another." It combines with both positive and negative results: jeńiske alıp keliw "lead to victory," ózgeriske alıp keliw "lead to change," qıyınshılıqqa alıp keliw "lead to difficulty," apatqa alıp keliw "lead to disaster." The dative marks the end point of the result, and the verb the process leading to it. In keltirip shıǵarıw the emergence of the result is expressed even more explicitly; in payda etiw and payda bolıw attention shifts from the causer to the state that has come about. Choice of verb thus determines which participant of the causal situation is foregrounded.

Kelip shıǵıw "arise from, follow from" presents the result as a natural consequence of a source or basis. In scientific prose it expresses the logical connection of concepts, rules and conclusions; in fiction the birth of an event from a preceding state. The dictionary's philosophical definition of sebep as "that which ensures the necessary emergence (kelip shıǵıwı) of another result" shows how closely this verb matches the semantics of result. In conversation, however, it can also combine with conjecture, prediction or condition, which means that the strength of lexical causation varies with modal markers. The verb májbúrlew "force, compel" expresses a distinctive type of causation: one person transmits influence to another and pushes him to act. The cause here is not a physical or natural factor but a volitional source of influence; the result is another person's action, performed or required. In the construction májbúr bolıw "be forced," attention moves to the person affected. Unlike causative-voice

forms, these units express causation through an independent lexical predicate. Emotional and physiological verbs such as qorqıtıw "frighten," quwandırıw "make happy," qıynaw "torment," ashıwlandırıw "anger," uyaltıw "shame" fit the model "under the influence of X, Y comes into a certain state." The result is reflected directly in the inner state of the object; even when the cause is not named separately, the subject is understood as the causer. These verbs stand on the periphery of the lexical field, but they are highly productive in literary analysis [13].

7. *From lexeme to connective*

The nouns of cause and result often become parts of phrasal connectives: sol sebepli, usı sebepli, sonıń sebebinen, ne sebepten, sonıń nátiyjesinde, usınıń saldarınan, aqıbetinde. In these units the demonstrative pronoun refers anaphorically to a preceding part of the text, and the causal noun presents it as the cause or result of a following event:

Sonıń ishinde bizler, azdan kelip, alawızlıǵı basımırmaq xalıqpız. Orıslar menen shappatlasqan qolımızdıń barmaqları bir teń qısılmaydı. Sonıń sebebinen kóp búlındik. [10]

"Among them, we are a people few in number and prone to discord. The fingers of the hand we clasped with the Russians do not close evenly. Because of that we have suffered much ruin."

In Sonıń sebebinen kóp búlındik, the pronoun sonıń points back to the discord described earlier, and sebebinen marks it as the reason the people suffered. These units ensure links between sentences and also convey the author's interpretation of the relation between events.

Although close in meaning, sol sebepli and sonıń sebebinen differ syntactically and stylistically. Sol sebepli usually opens the following clause and, like sonıń ushın "therefore," attaches the result to the preceding thought; in sonıń sebebinen the ablative semantics marks the source of the cause more strongly. Ne sebepten "for what reason" expresses the speaker's aim of identifying an unknown cause. These differences arise from the interaction of the lexical root, the pronoun and the case marker.

The unit sebebi was historically formed by adding the possessive suffix to sebep, but in modern Karakalpak it functions as an auxiliary word introducing a causal clause; the dictionary describes it as an auxiliary unit used to link words and form sentences [13]:

Men kóp gezbedim, lekin, Peterburgqa bir barıp dúnyanıń yarımın aralaǵan sekillimen. Sebebi, kóp-kóp xalıq, kóp-kóp úrdis, kóp-kóp kiyim kórdim. [10]

"I have not travelled much, but having been to Petersburg once, I feel as though I have seen half the world. Because I saw many, many peoples, many, many customs, many, many kinds of dress."

Here sebebi introduces the explanation of the preceding subjective conclusion. It is not merely a lexical device but the product of grammaticalisation. The unit sebepli is syncretic: the dictionary gives both an adjectival meaning ("having occurred because of a certain cause") and a postpositional one ("because of, as a result of") [14]. The same form therefore performs both attributive and relational functions.

The root sebep is recognisable in sebebi, sebepli and sebebinen alike, but each has lost independence to a different degree. Sebebi introduces a whole predicative segment; sebepli combines with nominalised forms or verbal nouns to express the relation; sebebinen, through the possessive and ablative, marks a preceding event as the source of the cause. This points to a gradual transition from lexical meaning to grammatical relation. Rather than dividing causal units sharply into "lexical" and "grammatical," it is more accurate to describe them in terms of a core and a transitional zone.

8. *Valency, certainty and style*

The valency of causal nouns determines how they expand in text. Sebepli may require relations answering kimniń? "whose?", neniń? "of what?", nege? "for what?", ne ushın? "why?": wáqıyanıń sebebi "the cause of the event," keliwdiń sebebi "the reason for coming," jánjelge sebep "a cause for the quarrel." Saldar and nátiyje have source and content valency: neniń saldarı "the consequence of

what," *neniń nátiyjesi* "the result of what." Causative verbs open slots for a causer, an affected participant and a resulting state.

The degree of certainty is also expressed lexically. *Anıq sebep* "the clear cause," *tiykarǵı sebep* "the main cause," *birden-bir sebep* "the sole cause" strengthen the link; *báلكim sebep* "perhaps the cause," *sebep bolǵan shıǵar* "may have been the cause" make it conjectural. *Sırtqı sebep* "external cause," *ishki sebep* "internal cause," *tikkeley sebep* "direct cause" classify factors by type, while *sózsiz* "inevitably," *kútilgen nátiyje* "the expected result," *kerisinshe nátiyje* "the opposite result" indicate whether and how the result was expected. Modifiers around causal nouns thus determine the strength, source and epistemic status of the relation.

Stylistically the units are not uniform. *Sebep* and *nátiyje* are neutral and used in all registers; *saldar* and *aqıbet* tend toward evaluative contexts; *tiykar* is productive in scientific, legal and official prose; *báne* and *sıltaw* belong to colloquial and literary style and express a negative attitude toward a character's intention. *Alıp keliw*, *tuwdırıw* and *payda etiw* occur across registers with concrete or abstract meaning depending on context.

9. Classification and field position

The results are summarised in Table 1.

Table 1. Semantic-functional classification of lexical means of expressing cause and effect in modern Karakalpak

No.	Group	Units	Main function	Field position
1	Units directly naming the cause	<i>sebep</i> , <i>tiykar</i>	indicate the origin of an event or state	Centre
2	Units naming the result	<i>nátiyje</i> , <i>saldar</i> , <i>aqıbet</i>	denote a state brought about by a cause	Centre
3	Units naming the causer	<i>sebepkер</i> , <i>sebepsi</i>	indicate the person or factor responsible for the result	Near centre
4	Units evaluating the cause	<i>arqasında</i> "thanks to," <i>kesirinen</i> "on account of (negative)"	evaluate the cause positively or negatively	Near centre
5	Units of ground and pretext	<i>tiykar</i> , <i>dálıl</i> , <i>sıltaw</i> , <i>báne</i>	ground, prove or excuse an action	Periphery
6	Verbs bringing about a result	<i>tuwdırıw</i> , <i>alıp keliw</i> , <i>májbur etiw</i> , <i>tásir etiw</i>	express the process of transition from cause to effect	Near centre
7	Connective units	<i>sebebi</i> , <i>sol sebepli</i> , <i>sonıń ushin</i> , <i>nátiyjesinde</i>	link sentences and text segments by a causal relation	Centre

Discussion

The central finding of this study is that the lexical means of causality in Karakalpak are not simple names for "cause" and "effect." They are instruments for interpreting an event: selecting its source, evaluating its outcome, and ordering information in the text. Three points stand out.

First, lexical choice controls information structure. *Sebep*, *tiykar* and *báne* usually point backward, from a later action to an earlier factor (a retrospective orientation); *nátiyje*, *saldar* and *aqıbet* point forward, from an earlier event to a later state (a prospective orientation). Speakers can reverse the order, stating the result and then explaining it with *sebebi*, or stating the cause and then introducing the result

with *sol sebepli*, but in each case the choice of word determines which component the reader takes as new information and which as explanation. This mirrors the two-directional system of connectives that Najimov describes for Karakalpak complex sentences and that Shalabay describes for Kazakh [15], but shows that the same principle operates at the level of the word.

Second, the result nouns encode evaluation that grammar alone does not. The difference between *miynetniń nátiyjesi* and *kelispewshilikniń aqibeti* is not a difference of syntax. It is a difference in the speaker's stance toward the outcome, and in literary texts it is one of the main ways an author signals that a chain of events is moving toward tragedy. A description of Karakalpak causality that stopped at conjunctions and subordinate clauses would miss this entirely.

Third, the *sebepl* family shows grammaticalisation in progress. The path from the full noun *sebepl* to the connective *sebebi*, the syncretic *sebepli* and the case-marked *sebebinen* is not a single jump but a series of steps, each involving a loss of lexical independence and a gain in relational function. Describing these units as a core and transitional zone, rather than forcing them into a lexical-grammatical binary, fits the data better and links this study to the functional-semantic principle that form and meaning need not correspond one to one.

The Karakalpak system clearly has a common Turkic basis. Uzbek *sabab*, *natija*, *oqibat*, *asos*, *bahona* and Kazakh *sebepl*, *nátije*, *saldar*, *negiz*, *sıltaw* perform similar semantic functions. Formal closeness, however, does not mean identical collocations, stylistic colouring or degree of grammaticalisation; the active use of *sebebi*, *sebepli* and *sebebinen* in Karakalpak, for instance, shows particularly clearly the continuum of the *sebepl* root from noun to connective and postposition. Comparative data are needed to show the general model, but conclusions must rest on the structure and norms of Karakalpak itself. The study has limitations. The literary material comes mainly from one historical novel, whose register (epic narrative, archaic dialogue, political rhetoric) may favour certain units such as *tiykar* or *báne-sebepl* over others. Contemporary prose, journalism and everyday speech may show a different distribution. The classification is qualitative; frequency data from a larger annotated corpus would make it possible to say how often each group is used and in which registers. Finally, the boundary between the lexical layer and the morphological and syntactic layers is deliberately treated as permeable, and further work on case forms, participles and complex sentences is needed to complete the picture.

Conclusion

This article set out to describe the lexical means of expressing cause-effect relations in modern Karakalpak as a system. The analysis showed that the lexical layer is multi-tiered. Core nominal lexemes such as *sebepl* and *nátijje* name the components of the relation directly. *Sebepler* and *sebeplshi* identify the source of influence or the responsible subject. *Saldar* and *aqıbet* distinguish evaluated types of result, while *tiykar*, *báne* and *sıltaw* distinguish genuine and false forms of grounding. Predicates such as *tuwdırıw*, *alıp keliw*, *kelip shıǵıw* and *payda bolıw* express the transition from cause to effect as a dynamic process. And units such as *sol sebepli*, *sonıń sebebinen*, *sebebi* and *nátijjesinde* secure links between sentences and form a transitional zone from the lexical to the grammatical.

Lexical units do not work in isolation. A causal noun names the relation, a case suffix or auxiliary word brings it into a syntactic link, and context determines which event is the cause and which the effect. Lexical analysis is therefore the necessary first step for the morphological and syntactic analysis that follows, and the co-occurrence of these units with morphological markers and syntactic constructions confirms the need to study causality as a functional-semantic field. In literary texts, these units reveal a character's knowledge, intention and responsibility, and give the author a way to explain and evaluate the course of events.

References

- [1] A. Dáwletov, M. Dáwletov, and M. Qudaybergenov, Házirgi qaraqalpaq ádebiy tili. Sintaksis [Modern Karakalpak Literary Language: Syntax]. Nukus: Bilim, 2009.
- [2] A. Najimov, Házirgi qaraqalpaq tili: jup sózler hám qospa gápler [Modern Karakalpak: Paired Words and Complex Sentences]. Nukus, 2025.
- [3] E. Sweetser, From Etymology to Pragmatics: Metaphorical and Cultural Aspects of Semantic Structure. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- [4] Yu. D. Apresyan, Leksicheskaya semantika: Sinonimicheskie sredstva yazyka [Lexical Semantics: Synonymic Means of Language]. Moscow: Nauka, 1974.
- [5] G'. Abdurahmonov, Qo'shma gap sintaksisi asoslari [Foundations of Complex Sentence Syntax]. Tashkent: UzSSR FA nashriyoti, 1958.
- [6] A. M. Amatov, Prichinno-sledstvennye svyazi na raznykh urovnyakh yazyka [Cause-Effect Relations at Different Levels of Language]. Moscow, 2003.
- [7] V. B. Evtyukhin, "Gruppirovka poley obuslovlennosti: prichina, uslovie, tsel', sledstvie, ustupka" [The grouping of fields of conditionality: cause, condition, purpose, consequence, concession], in *Teoriya funktsional'noy grammatiki: Lokativnost'. Bytiynost'. Posessivnost'. Obuslovlennost'*. St. Petersburg: Nauka, 1996, pp. 138-214.
- [8] L. G. Valieva, Kauzal'nost' v tatarskom literaturnom yazyke [Causality in the Tatar Literary Language]. Kazan, 2015.
- [9] Sh. Abdinazimov, Ed., Qaraqalpaq tiliniń túsindirme sózligi [Explanatory Dictionary of the Karakalpak Language], 2nd ed., vol. 6 (P-S). Nukus: Qaraqalpaqstan, 2023.
- [10] T. Qayıpbergenov, Qaraqalpaq dástanı. Maman biy ápsanası [The Karakalpak Epic: The Legend of Maman Biy]. Nukus: Bilim, 2018.
- [11] L. Talmy, *Toward a Cognitive Semantics*, vol. 1: Concept Structuring Systems. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2000.
- [12] P. Wolff, "Direct causation in the linguistic coding and individuation of causal events," *Cognition*, vol. 88, no. 1, pp. 1–48, 2003.
- [13] B. Shalabay, Qazirgi qazaq tili. Sintaksis [Modern Kazakh: Syntax]. Almaty: Qazaq universiteti, 2020.
- [14] P. J. Hopper and E. C. Traugott, *Grammaticalization*, 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- [15] S. Gayupov, "Vyrazhenie prichinnykh otnosheniy v sovremennom uzbekskom literaturnom yazyke" [The expression of causal relations in the modern Uzbek literary language], Cand. Sci. dissertation abstract, Tashkent, 1971.