



DOI: **10.5958/2249-7137.2021.02262.X**

## THE PROBLEM WITH THE FOUR CONDITIONALS OR CAUSALITY IN ENGLISH

**Khamraeva Z.Kh\***

\*Teacher,  
Samarkand State institute of foreign languages,  
UZBEKISTAN

### ABSTRACT

*This article touches on the problem of expressing **causality** in the English language by means of various conditional constructions, such as causal, temporary and concessive shades. Logical-semantic, functional-semantic and functional-grammatical analysis of means of expressing semantics conditions allowed the author to identify those aspects of it that seem important for the formation of a cognitive-functional model of representation of conditional relationships.*

**KEYWORDS:** *Causality; Conditional Constructions; The Concept Of Condition; Concessional Meaning; Conjunction; Cause; Goal; Concession; Consequence; Objective Modality; Semantic Heterogeneity.*

### INTRODUCTION

Starting a conversation about the specifics of the representation of the category of conditionality in the English language, it should be said that in modern linguistics, a certain experience has been accumulated in the analysis of conditional constructions.

Conditional relations have been studied by linguists in various aspects: in the historical plane - from the point of view of the origin of constructions expressing conditional relations; in comparative terms; in terms of identifying means of expressing conditional semantics at the level of a simple and complex sentence, as well as in a wide context; in terms of the formation of various types of complex subordinate sentences with conditional and causal relationships.

Traditionally, when linguists study the means of expressing a condition, the object of study is complex sentences (CS) with subordinate clauses. CS with subordinate clauses are complex structures, within which the subordinate part (situation-condition) and the main part (situation-

consequence) are informationally equal, while the subordinate clause is focused on the predicate of the main part.

The content of the subordinate clause is qualified as a hypothesis, that is, a situation that conditionally corresponds to reality. The relationship between the clause and the main sentences are interpreted as a necessary, natural, obligatory connection. In logic, such relations are considered as a sign of implication.

Thus, in the most general form, the meanings of conditionality (which are also called logical) include the meanings of cause, effect, condition, purpose and concession. Their common feature is that "in sentences with the meaning of conditionality, two situations are correlated, of which one is made dependent on the other" or, in a more generalized formulation, "two states of affairs such that one state of affairs is accompanied by another or leads to it."

The word "condition", are polysemantic and difficult to define, therefore the very presence of these words in the definition cannot be perceived unambiguously and unconditionally be considered an indicator of the concept of a condition. In addition, the concept of a condition itself does not have a full-fledged definition and an exhaustive description: most often there is a description of a condition in conjunction with a description of a cause, and this relationship is characterized as follows: conditionality, causality, i.e. causality in the broad sense of the word, assumes such a connection of situations in which one serves as a sufficient basis for the implementation of the other.

In many works on linguistics, it is said about the possibility of complicating the semantics of a condition with causal, temporary, yielding shades. This is due to the fact that these meanings are included, together with the value of the condition, in one semantic class, that is, they are varieties of the generalized meaning of the condition. In particular, the differences between conditional and other types of sentences can be rather unstable, and standard indicators of a conditional meaning, primarily conjunctions, as well as verb forms in certain contexts have a different meaning.

Conditional meanings differ in the degree of semantic complexity. The most elementary among them are usually the meanings of cause and effect, which boil down to the fact that "phenomenon A causes phenomenon B". The goal additionally presupposes the presence of an agent who sets this goal in front of himself. The condition differs from the cause and the purpose by the assumption of the possibility of an alternative development of events, which either still exists (in the case of a real condition), or took place sometime earlier (in the case of an unreal condition).

Let us compare one of the proposed interpretations of the meaning of an unreal condition, expressed in sentences like "*If you came yesterday, you would find her*": "*It could have been A, but / however [for this] there had to be B; but it was not, therefore there could not be A.*" The most difficult among the meanings of causality is the concessional meaning, in which the meaning of "contradiction" is layered on the "meaning" (causal / conditional) implication; in other words, "in the subordinate clause, a cause is expressed, which should have entailed the opposite effect." Therefore, in the sentence "*Having caught a cold, he did not go to work*" the relationship between situations is interpreted as *causal*, and in the sentence "*Having caught a cold, he (anyway) went to work*" - as *concessive*.

This kind of "implicative" dependence between situations presupposes their obligatory chronological ordering, namely: the conditioning situation either precedes the one which is conditioned by it, or is simultaneous with the latter. Thus, conditional relationships are based on temporal-taxis, representing more or less their semantic complication and modification; Consider the following explicit formulation: "The causal statement" P caused Q "can be interpreted as a conjunction of two statements: 1) the succession of one event after another in time and 2) the presence of the corresponding general law ".

The feeling of a connection between temporal relations and relations of conditionality was reflected in the famous Latin proverb "post hoc, ergo propter hoc" ("after this means, because of this"). E.V. Paducheva comes to the same conclusion, believing that "the circumstance of time after that hints at some reason."

In the works of V. B. Evtyukhin (school AB Bon-darko), conditioning as a whole (cause, condition, goal, assignment, effect) is considered as a functional-semantic category of syntactic type, since 1) as well as categories of morphological type, categories of syntactic types are structures based on opposing forms and meanings; 2) syntactic constructions are the main way of expression; 3) when expressing syntactic categories, morphological forms of different types can be used; 4) morphological categories, working within the expression forms of the syntactic category, transform their paradigmatic meaning and connection. Conditionality relations (including conditions) are interpreted as bi-situational and asymmetrical: one part of the minimal structure is conditional, and the other is conditional; asymmetry is marked with subordinate conjunctions and prepositions.

Wherein the semantics of conditional relations is described as objectively / subjectively motivated hypotheticalness (of varying degrees of activity), allowing for different signs (presence / absence of negation).

As a result, "conditioning" is defined as "an undeniably semantic category of language, as one of the most important categories of linguistic thinking. Logical-semantic, functional-semantic and formal-logical analysis of the means of expressing the semantics of a condition made it possible to identify those aspects of it that are important for the formation of a cognitive-functional model of representation of conditional relations, namely, cognitive, functional and pragmatic.

Cognitive (conceptual) aspect semantics of the condition manifests itself before all through the ratio of conceptual categories "condition / effect", which is realized in discourse as a "condition due to", which means their interaction and interdependence and is reflected both in conditional semantics in general, and at the base of each of the semantic functions (SF) we have identified.

In this case, the functional aspect of the semantics of the condition consists in the implementation of the dominant principle "reality / unreality".

"Imposing" on these values the modality of "assessing the situation from the point of view of its possibility, necessity, desirability, etc." does not fundamentally change the type of condition / consequence (real, hypothetical, unreal).

Finally, the pragmatic aspect of the functional semantics of the condition includes the epistemic attitude (positive, neutral and negative), which reflects "the speaker's assessment of the degree of his confidence in the reliability of what is being reported."

The functional-grammatical approach to the interpretation of conditional relations operates with the concept of functional grammar, the concept of functional-semantic fields (FSF). The functional-semantic field is a two-sided (content-formal) unity formed by the grammatical (morphological and syntactic) means of a given language together with lexico-grammatical and word-formative elements interacting with them, belonging to the same semantic zone. This approach allows assume the following: at the base of the FSF conditions is the ratio of the universal concepts "condition-effect", which at the level of linguistic content categorization are presented by FGC conditions. The expression plan of the FSF condition includes various semantic-structural grammatical unity. The core of the FSF conditions are complex sentences (CS) with subordinate clauses introduced by unions " *if, unless, supposing (suppose) that, assuming (assume) that, in case, provided (providing) that, etc.*", as the most specialized constituent for expressing a given value, conveying it most uniformly and systematically used. Wherein The "functional dominant of the field" (the component with the highest frequency of use) is a sentence with a clause introduced by the union *if*. The periphery of the field includes multilevel lexical and grammatical means of representation of conditional relations: CS with non-union connection (inversion); complex sentences, in particular with an imperative; simple sentences, including structures with gerund, participle, infinitive and prepositional-substantive combinations; simple proposals within the SFU.

The FSA of the condition (as part of the group of fields of "conditioning") is in relations of interconnection and intersection with the complex of FSA of modal-being relations, in particular, with the FSA of modality and its segment - the field of objective modality. At the heart of the content plan of the FSA modality, which has a heterogeneous structure and covers a whole complex of modal meanings, lies the FSC modality, which in the broadest sense expresses the speaker's assessment of the way of existence of the connection between the object of reality and its signs, as well as the degree the knowledge or desirability of this connection by the speaker.

Within the framework of the functional-semantic approach of the FSC, modalities are considered as a universal-linguistic category that correlates with the corresponding conceptual category and representing in the content plan a multifaceted association of more particular functional and semantic unities. In terms of expression, this FSC covers the system of grammatical forms of the verb mood, as well as syntactic and lexical means.

The content plan of the field of objective modality is formed by the relationship between the concepts of reality / unreality and potential (hypothetical). Objective modality shows how the speaker qualifies the reflected reality in his utterance, thereby establishing the relationship of the content of the utterance to reality in terms of its reality or unreality. This type of modality contains the component "it is so" and is present in every utterance.

From the above it follows that

- 1) When speaking about the attitude to reality, we mean "reality in the representation of the speaker";
- 2) the attitude towards reality, associated with modality, receives a qualitative definiteness when it is indicated that this attitude is manifested in the dominant signs of reality / unreality ..

At the same time, the work of N.A. Davydova "Representation of conditional relations in an English discourse" is of particular interest, in which the author models the functional-semantic

field of a condition in modern English. In the FSA conditions in English, N. A. Davydova distinguishes the micro field of a real condition, a micro field of a hypothetical condition, and a micro field of an unreal condition. Each micro field implements semantic functions, the content of which "is made up of the meanings of linguistic units, their components and combinations." As the author notes, the principle of opposition lies at the heart of identifying semantic functions in micro fields of a condition: positive - negative condition, positive - negative consequence.

We will give examples of different statements that differ in linguistic semantic content when expressing conditions, guided by the classification described by N.A. Davydova:

(1) a) an affirmative conditional attributable clause in the indicative expresses a sufficient condition, that is, such, the presence

which is associated with the implementation of some consequence, positive or negative: *If anything happens to us, he will know who is responsible for it;*

b) a conditional clause in a negative form expresses a necessary condition, the absence of which is associated with the failure of the corresponding positive or negative consequence: *"But if we don't get him back, it's*

*a publicity nightmare "*. Or consider the following example: *If I don't leave, he won't / will return*). Here my "non-departure" will entail his non-return or, with the affirmative form of the verb in the main clause, his return.

In the CS indicative mood with subordinate clauses, the verb can be presented in any tense required "by sense", including in the past: *It was a sick and violent history. If the Indians were peaceful and tried to cooperate with the colonists, they were subject to strange diseases - smallpox, measles, yellow fever, influenza, tuberculosis - for which they had no natural defenses. If they did not cooperate, they were slaughtered by men using weapons more sophisticated than arrows and poison darts (Jerome*

*K. Jerome. Three Men in a Boat).*

(2) CS with subordinate clauses with the Subjunctive I non-perfect form in the dependent part and the Subjunctive II non-perfect form in the main part express the following: its factor: *If I had (didn't have) the book, I should / would (not) give it to you.*

(3) The counterfactual consequence-condition related to the past tense is expressed by Subjunctive I perfect in the dependent part of the PSD and the form Subjunctive II perfect in the main part of the CS.

*If I had (not) had the book, I should (not) have given it to you.*

CS expresses an unreal condition and an unreal consequence that follows from it, (in (2) and (3), as in (1), the presence and absence of explicit negation marks the sign (+ or -) of the corresponding condition / consequence).

Thus, on the basis of the review made, we can conclude that, despite the fact that the conditional relations underlying the semantics of the condition and having a universal character, being included in the conceptual picture of the human world, are characterized by, in addition to



semantic heterogeneity, a significant variety of means of expression that require clarification and detailed description.

### THE LIST OF USED LITERATURE

1. Belichova-Krzhizhkova EO About the modality of a sentence in the Russian language // Actual problems of Russian syntax. - M .: Moscow State University, 1984. - S. 49–78.
2. Belichova-Krzhizhkova H. The system of causal relationships between sentences in Russian and Czech languages // New in foreign linguistics. - M., 1985. - Vol. 15. - P. 54–76.
3. Belyaeva E. I. Functional-semantic fields of modality in English and Russian languages. - Voronezh: Voronezh State University Publishing House, 1985. - 180 p.
4. Biryulin LA, Kordi EE Basic types of modal meanings identified in linguistic literature // Theory of functional grammar. Temporality. Modality. -L .: Nauka, 1990.- P. 67-71.
5. Bondarko A. B. Preface. Temporality // Theory of functional grammar: Temporality. Modality. / Ed. A. V. Bondarko. - L .: Science, Leningrad branch, 1990. - S. 3–58.
6. Bondarko A. B. Principles of functional grammar and aspects of aspectology. — M .:URSS, 2003 .-- 208 p.
7. Davydova N. A. Representation of conditional relations in English discourse: Dis. Cand.philol. Sciences. - M., 2006. - 254 p.
8. Evtyukhin VB Grouping of conditional fields: cause, condition, purpose, effect, assignment // Theory of functional grammar: Locativity. Beingness. Possessiveness. Conditionality. - SPb .: Nauka, 1996. - 230 p.
9. Zaliznyak A. A. Polysemy in language and ways of its presentation. - M.: Languages of Slavic cultures, 2006 .-- 672 p.
10. Brief Encyclopedia of Philosophy / Ed. E. F. Gubsky, G. V. Korableva, V. A. Lutchenko. - M .: Progress, 1994 .-- 576 p.
11. Lyapon MV The semantic structure of a complex sentence and text. - Moscow: Nauka, 1986 .-- 200 p.
12. Paducheva E. V. Semantic research (Semantics of type and time in Russian; Semantics of Narrative). - M .: School "Languages of Russian culture", 1996. - 464 p.
13. Podlesskaya V. I. Implicative constructions: some problems of typological classification. // Questions of linguistics. - 1995. - No. 6.
14. Razlogova EE Explicit and implicit propositional attitudes in causal and conditional constructions // Logical analysis of language. Knowledge and opinion. -M., 1988. - S. 31–39.
15. Sannikov V.Z. Semantics and pragmatics of the IF Union // Russian language in scientific coverage. -2001. - No. 2. - S. 68–89.
16. Slyusareva NA Problems of functional morphology of modern English language. - Moscow: Nauka, 1986. - 215 p.
17. Tenier L. Fundamentals of structural syntax. - M .: Progress, 1988. - 656 p.
18. Khrakovsky V.S. Consecutive constructions: semantics, syntax, typology // Typology of concessive constructions: Monograph / Ed. V. S. Khrakovsky. - M .: Science, 2004 .-- 625 p.