

EPISTEMIC CAUSAL RELATIONS IN GERMAN AND KAZAKH DISCURSIVE TEXTS

Lyazzat DALBERGENOVA¹, Gulden TLEUBERDINA²,
Raushan AMRENOVA³, Aygul ZHAKUPOVA³, Assem DUISENBINA¹

¹Department of English Language and Teaching Methods,
Sh. Ualikhanov Kokshetau University, Kokshetau, Republic of
Kazakhstan

²Department of Kazakh Philology, Sh. Ualikhanov Kokshetau
University, Kokshetau, Republic of Kazakhstan

³Department of Russian Philology and Librarianship, Sh. Ualikhanov
Kokshetau University, Kokshetau, Republic of Kazakhstan

Abstract: *This article is aimed at making a cross-linguistic analysis of explicit and implicit means of verbalization of epistemic causal relations in German and Kazakh. It provides an overview of similarities and differences of causal connectives in two typologically different languages: German and Kazakh. This study proves the linguistic reliability of the subject involvement scale. Causal relations and their segments reflecting the speaker's assumptions and actions may influence the degree of subject involvement. In the present paper we made an attempt to define the principal types of information that determine epistemic conditions since they contribute greatly to the development of cognitive-pragmatic functions in the discourse. An epistemic causal relation expresses the degree of the speaker's knowledge of the objective situation and his/her beliefs, assumptions, and attitudes to objective reality.*

Keywords: subject involvement scale; subjective meaning; epistemic causal relations; discourse connectives.

The present article's relevance lies in its conformity to the current anthropocentric linguistic paradigm. In the context of the latter, the cognitive-pragmatic aspect of the study of causal relations is becoming more and more significant. Clear evidence of the anthropocentric principle lies in the particular attention paid to the study of cognitive mechanisms reflecting objective causal events in the subject's linguistic consciousness.

The research presented in this article is aimed at making a cross-linguistic analysis of explicit and implicit means of verbalization of epistemic causal relations in German and Kazakh. Here we provide an overview of the similarities and differences between German and Kazakh causal connectives. In this article we assume that the subjective meaning of causal relations is reflected on the subject involvement scale. We have applied descriptive-analytic, transformational methods, and contextual analysis and used belles-lettres discursive texts in German and Kazakh as the research materials.

To achieve the goals, we made an attempt to identify epistemically modified segments of the causal discourse, define the type of information that forms the basis of the epistemic mode and specify the means of its verbalization in German and Kazakh. The main hypothesis of this paper is as follows: subjective meanings manifest themselves in the segment of

consequence that contains the mode of assumption resulting from some non-factive information.

The present paper focuses on the cognitive aspect of causal relations that reflects the activation of linguistic consciousness, knowledge/lack of knowledge, and the speaker's confidence in the issue under discussion. The classification of causal relations also includes the scale of subject involvement that measures the subject's degree of involvement in the causal relations and shows the absence of isomorphic connection between a certain causal relation and the speech situation. The less isomorphic is the causal relation in the statement, the higher is the involvement of the speaker. The scale of subject involvement reflects not the primary cause-effect relations in the real world but the transposition of the given relations into the subject's mental sphere.

In this paper we also focus on the study of the so-called backward causal connectives¹, which are used to introduce a causal connection existing between the two discourse segments – the antecedent and the consequent. The German backward causal connectives mostly include *weil*, *denn*, and *da*. In Kazakh, these connectives include such units as *oitkeny*, *nege desen*, and *sebeby* – affixed participial forms of the compound predicate with *dyktan/dikten*, past participle ending with *son* and used in post-position. These connectives convey a causal meaning but are not interchangeable when we deal with epistemic causal relations.

Literature review

Causal relations and the scale of subject involvement

Subjectivity is understood to be the self-expression of the speaker in discourse in which he expresses his attitude towards the predicative part of the utterance and his degree of knowledge and certainty about the object of the utterance: *Surely, Jan is in Paris*². The subjectivity markers of the utterance comprise the categories of modality (*Jan must be in Paris*), predication (*I think that Jan is in Paris*), condition (*... if Jan is staying in Paris*) and evaluative attitude (*Jan is staying in Paris, unfortunately*). The speaker uses these markers to place himself at the forefront by subjectifying the utterance: this way the speaker becomes the object and part of the discourse (*ibid.*).

In the cognitive-pragmatic aspect, causality is studied as a thinking, logical-semantic category that has an epistemic form of thinking as its basis.

¹ L. Degand, H.P. Maat, "A contrastive study of Dutch and French causal connectives on the speaker involvement scale", in *LOT Occasional Series*, 2003, vol. 1, p. 175-199; S. Zufferey, B. Cartoni, "English and French causal connectives in contrast", in *Languages in Contrast*, 2012, vol. 12, no. 2, p. 232-250.

² J. Sanders, W. Spooren, "*Perspective, subjectivity, and modality from a cognitive linguistic point of view*", in: W.A. Liebert, G. Redeker, L. Waugh (Eds.), *Discourse and Perspective in Cognitive Linguistics*, Benjamins, Amsterdam, 1997, p. 85-112.

Scholars see the cognitive process of reflection of causal relations when they are manifested in the human mental activity of forming logical conclusions³. Pragmatically, the causal relations are considered as justifying utterances, where the speaker creates causal relations between utterances and other circumstances⁴.

The principal theory of this work is the theory of three semantic levels of causal relations in discourse⁵. According to this theory, there are propositional, epistemic and communicative levels of causal relations, and the cognitive-pragmatic contexts of these three levels are functionally and semantically different. The propositional level of causal relations is a causal relation between propositions: circumstances, phenomena and events. The epistemic level of causal relations is a level of causal relations between thoughts and judgments – it is understood as the act of forming logical conclusions or assumptions. In this case definite observed events and circumstances serve as the basis for the speaker to draw a conclusion about the event that caused these circumstances.

³ H. Blühdorn, “Epistemische Lesarten von Satzkonnektoren – Wie sie zustande kommen und wie man sie erkennt”, 2006. Available at <http://www1.ids-mannheim.de/fileadmin/gra/texte/epistemisch.pdf>; L. Dalbergenova, Sh. Zharkynbekova, D. Akynova, A. Aimoldina, “Cognitive approach to the study of causal relations” in *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 2014a, vol. 143, p. 233-237; L. Dalbergenova, Sh. Zharkynbekova, E. Zhuravlyeva, “The subject perspective of causal relations (in the cases of Russian and German)”, in *Studia Slavica*, 2014b, vol. 59, no. 2, p. 291-306; R. Keller, “Das epistemische weil. Bedeutungswandel einer Konjunktion”, in: H.J. Heringer, G. Stötzel (Hg.), *Sprachgeschichte und Sprachkritik: Festschrift für Peter von Polenz* (pp. 219-247), De Gruyter, Berlin–New York, 1993; A.P. Komarov, *On the linguistic status of the causal connection*, Kazakh State Pedagogical Institute, Alma-Ata, 1970; R. Pasch, U. Brauße, E. Breindl, U.H. Waßner, *Handbuch der deutschen Konnektoren. Linguistische Grundlagen der Beschreibung und syntaktische Merkmale der deutschen Satzverknüpfen*, De Gruyter, Berlin, 2003; S.Zh. Tazhibayeva, *Methods of expressing causal relations in the Kazakh language: A comparative aspect*, Siberian Branch of Russian Academy of Sciences, Novosibirsk, 2004; M.V. Vsevolodova, “Fields, category and concepts in the grammatical system of the language”, in *Linguistic Consciousness*, 2009, vol. 3, p. 76-99; M.V. Vsevolodova, T.A. Yashchenko, *Causal relations in the modern Russian language*, URSS, Moscow, 2008; G. Zifonun, L. Hoffmann, B. Strecker, *Grammatik der deutschen Sprache*, De Gruyter, Berlin, 1997; M. Vlad, “The nature of theological language”, in *Astra Salvensis*, 2020, no. 1, p. 151-162.

⁴ A. Knott, T. Sanders, “The classification of coherence relations and their linguistic markers. An exploration of two languages”, in *Journal of Pragmatics*, 1998, vol. 30, no. 2, p. 135-175; R. Pasch, U. Brauße, E. Breindl, U.H. Waßner, *Handbuch der deutschen Konnektoren. Linguistische Grundlagen der Beschreibung und syntaktische Merkmale der deutschen Satzverknüpfen*, De Gruyter, Berlin, 2003; B. Schmidhauser, *Kausalität als linguistische Kategorie. Mittel und Möglichkeiten für Begründungen*, Niemeyer, Tübingen, 1995; N. Stukker, T. Sanders, “Subjectivity and prototype structure in causal connectives: A cross-linguistic perspective”, in *Journal of Pragmatics*, 2012, vol. 44, no. 2, p. 169-190; O.V. Chetverikova, D.A. Kovalchuk, A.A. Bezrukov, N.L. Fedchenko, L.V. Alexandrovich, “The poetic text as a form of language objectification of the semantic sphere of the word-painter”, in *Astra Salvensis*, 2019, no. 1, p. 91-99.

⁵ E.E. Sweetser, *From etymology to pragmatics. metaphorical and cultural aspects of semantic structure*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1991.

The communicative level is a level of causal relations between speech acts or between the subject's speech act and a certain state of affairs.

The theory of three levels clearly demonstrates that causal relations can exist independently from the will and practical activity of the subject (propositional level), but they can also be in direct correlation with the speaker's personality and his or her wishes, views and communicative intentions, thus gaining subjective status. The theory of three levels by E. Sweetser⁶ is further developed in many linguistic studies⁷. The researchers distinguish further detailed classifications at each of the three levels depending on the degree of subject involvement in the causal utterances. By subject involvement, we mean "the degree to which the speaker is implicitly involved in the interpretation of the causal relationship"⁸. The degree of subject involvement is based on the following main criteria:

- involvement of the conscious protagonist;
- lack of isomorphism between causal relations and facts;
- relationship to the speaker;
- time of speech production and the explicit and implicit expressions of the protagonist.

We understand the subject along the lines of H.P. Maat and T. Sanders⁹ to be the subject of consciousness that identifies with all types of protagonist – the subject of consciousness, subject of speech and subject of reference. According to these scientists, the degree of subject involvement increases from minimum to maximum in accordance with the level of causal relations ranging from non-volitional to epistemic. Subject involvement increases with the degree to which causal relations and their segments reflect the assumptions and actions of the speaker.

⁶ E.E. Sweetser, *From etymology to pragmatics. metaphorical and cultural aspects of semantic structure*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1991.

⁷ L. Degand, H.P. Maat, "A contrastive study of Dutch and French causal connectives on the speaker involvement scale", in *LOT Occasional Series*, 2003, vol. 1, p. 175-199; L. Degand, "Contrastive analyses, translation, and speaker involvement: The case of *puisque* and *aangezien*", in: M. Achard, S. Kemmer (Eds.), *Language, Culture and Mind* (pp. 1-20), CSLI Publications, Stanford, 2004; A. Volodina, "*Sweetser's Drei-Ebenen-Theorie*", in: G. Ferraresi (Hg.), *Konnektoren im Deutschen und im Sprachvergleich*, Narrverlag, Mannheim, 2011, p. 127-157; S. Zufferey, B. Cartoni, "English and French causal connectives in contrast", in *Languages in Contrast*, 2012, vol. 12, no. 2, p. 232-250.

⁸ L. Degand, H.P. Maat, "A contrastive study of Dutch and French causal connectives on the speaker involvement scale", in *LOT Occasional Series*, 2003, vol. 1, p. 175-199. L. Degand, "Contrastive analyses, translation, and speaker involvement: The case of *puisque* and *aangezien*", in: M. Achard, S. Kemmer (Eds.), *Language, Culture and Mind*, CSLI Publications, Stanford, 2004, p. 1-20.

⁹ H.P. Maat, T. Sanders, "Subjectivity in causal connectives: An empirical study of language in use", in *Cognitive Linguistics*, 2001, vol. 12, no. 3, p. 247-274.

Differentiation of types of causal relations

Following the above-mentioned authors and according to the scale of subject involvement we distinguish between non-volitional, volitional, epistemic and speech act causal relations.

Non-volitional causal relations. The non-volitional causal relations illustrate uncontrolled action of the protagonist that takes place independently from his wishes and intentions. The greater the involvement of conscious participants in the causal relations is, the greater the degree of subject involvement. Non-volitional relationships do not involve such participants, while volitional relationships do.

Volitional causal relations. The prerequisite for volitional causal relations is the involvement of conscious participants whose actions and deeds lead to certain consequences. Volitional causal relations have a higher degree of subject involvement than non-volitional ones – the speaker can identify with the protagonist in the third person and understands the cause and consequence relations.

Epistemic causal relations. An epistemic causal relation expresses the degree of the speaker's knowledge of the objective situation and his beliefs, assumptions and attitude to the objective events. The epistemic causal utterance does not reflect the primary cause-effect relation in the real world but the relationship between thoughts in the mental domain of conclusions and arguments¹⁰. This explains the higher degree of subject involvement here than in volitional causal utterances.

Speech act causal relations. A maximum degree of subject involvement at the speech act level is caused by the fact that the speaker assumes three roles: the subject of speech, the subject of consciousness and the subject of reference (the protagonist). The degree of subject involvement is greatest in speech act causal relations because the speaker is the author of the causal relationship.

We can therefore see that the basis of this classification is the conscious participation of the protagonist. The next criterion for determining subject involvement is the lack of isomorphism between the linguistic causal relationship and the actual facts. The less isomorphic this relationship is, the higher the degree of subject involvement¹¹.

¹⁰ L. Degand, H.P. Maat, “A contrastive study of Dutch and French causal connectives on the speaker involvement scale”, in *LOT Occasional Series*, 2003, vol. 1, p. 175-199.

L. Degand, “*Contrastive analyses, translation, and speaker involvement: The case of *puisque* and *aangezien**”, in: M. Achard, S. Kemmer (Eds.), *Language, Culture and Mind*, CSLI Publications, Stanford, 2004, p. 1-20.

¹¹ L. Degand, H.P. Maat, “A contrastive study of Dutch and French causal connectives on the speaker involvement scale”, in *LOT Occasional Series*, 2003, vol. 1, p. 175-199; L. Degand, “*Contrastive analyses, translation, and speaker involvement: The case of *puisque* and *aangezien**”, in:

Epistemic causal relations

Linguistic epistemic studies aim at revealing the gnoseological function of the language: knowledge, awareness of the subject about speech objects such as Greek's "*episteme*" and "*wissen*" (*know*)¹², Greek's "*epistemon*", "*wissend*", and "*kundig*" (*knowing, being aware*)¹³ and the knowledge representation phenomenon in the "epistemic world – epistemic state – epistemic mode"¹⁴. The epistemic mode is understood as the "actualization of certain fragments of epistemic reality at the moment of speech, and it is reflected in the fact that the speaker evaluates the authenticity of their utterance" (*ibid.*). Modality is "an instrument for expressing the speaker point of view in which a certain type of consciousness is embedded"¹⁵. The epistemic modality is studied in modern linguistic science in various aspects:

- cross-cultural differences in polite epistemic modal¹⁶;
- epistemic modals and common ground¹⁷;
- role of epistemic mode in child language¹⁸;
- pragmatic interpretation of epistemic modality¹⁹.

The epistemic level of causal relations has become the object of interest in many linguistic studies. These studies are aimed at defining the speaker's scope of knowledge, his/her views on the events described and finding out the speaker's mental representation of the motives leading to the realization of the causal situation²⁰. The present paper lays a particular emphasis on the concept

M. Achard, S. Kemmer (Eds.), *Language, Culture and Mind*, CSLI Publications, Stanford, 2004, p. 1-20.

¹² H. Bussmann, *Lexikon der Sprachwissenschaft*, Kröner, Stuttgart, 1990.

¹³ G. Drosdowski (Hg.), *Duden. Das grosse Fremdwörterbuch. Herkunft und Bedeutung der Fremdwörter*, Dudenverlag, Mannheim–Wien–Zürich, 1994.

¹⁴ T.A. Yashchenko, *Causation in Russian linguistic consciousness*, DIAPI, Simferopol, 2006.

¹⁵ E.S. Yarygina, *Construction of conclusion of justification in the syntactic system of Russian language. PhD Thesis*, Moscow State Regional University, Moscow, 2003.

¹⁶ M. Youmans, "Cross-cultural differences in polite epistemic modal use in American English", in *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 2001, vol. 22, no. 1, p. 57-73.

¹⁷ E. Cook, "Epistemic modals and common ground", in *Inquiry*, 2013, vol. 56, no. 2/3, p. 179-209.

¹⁸ V. Moscati, S. Crain, "When negation and epistemic modality combine: the role of information strength in child language", in *Language Learning and Development*, 2014, vol. 10, no. 4, p. 345-38.

¹⁹ O. Ozturk, A. Papafragou, "The acquisition of epistemic modality: From semantic meaning to pragmatic interpretation", in *Language Learning and Development*, 2015, vol. 11, no. 3, p. 191-214.

²⁰ E. Breindl, M. Walter, *Der Ausdruck von Kausalität im Deutschen. Eine korpusbasierte Studie zum Zusammenspiel von Konnektoren, Kontextmerkmalen und Diskursrelationen*, Institut für Deutsche Sprache, Mannheim, 2009; R. Keller, "Das epistemische weil. Bedeutungswandel einer Konjunktion", in: H.J. Heringer, G. Stötzl (Hg.), *Sprachgeschichte und Sprachkritik: Festschrift für Peter von Polenz* (pp. 219-247), De Gruyter, Berlin–New York, 1993; L. Degand, H.P. Maat,

of subjectivity postulated in the works of W. Keller²¹ and E. Breindl and M. Walter²². Subjectivity characteristics form the basis for studying the subordinate conjunction *weil* and its epistemic functions in oral speech²³ besides, subjectivity characteristics play a great role in investigating cognitive-pragmatic functions of causal markers in the German language²⁴.

A.A. Susov²⁵ investigated epistemic and cognitive states of the speaker, namely the evaluation of the information that entered into the focus of his/her consciousness, basing on the material of the Russian language. According to the author, cognitive levels of modal words reflect the cognitive state of the speaker whose viewpoint occupies the central position in the causal discours. Causal conjunctions are considered prototypical markers of subject involvement:

- French *puisque* and Danish *angezjen* in the translation aspect²⁶;
- conjunctions reversing the causal connection in the Danish (*aangezjen, omdat, want*) and French (*parceque, car, puisque*) languages²⁷;
- contrastive aspect in Danish, German and French²⁸;

“A contrastive study of Dutch and French causal connectives on the speaker involvement scale”, in *LOT Occasional Series*, 2003, vol. 1, p. 175-199; R. Pasch, U. Brauße, E. Breindl, U.H. Waßner, *Handbuch der deutschen Konnektoren. Linguistische Grundlagen der Beschreibung und syntaktische Merkmale der deutschen Satzverknüpfers*, De Gruyter, Berlin, 2003; A.A. Susov, “Causal rhetorical relations”, in *Tver Linguistic Meridian*, 2006, vol. 6, p. 55-81; A. Volodina, “*Sweetsers Drei-Ebenen-Theorie*”, in G. Ferraresi (Hg.), *Konnektoren im Deutschen und im Sprachvergleich*, Narrverlag, Mannheim, 2011, p. 127-157.

²⁰ E.S. Yarygina, *Construction of conclusion of justification in the syntactic system of Russian language. PhD Thesis*, Moscow State Regional University, Moscow, 2003; G. Zifonun, L. Hoffmann, B. Strecker, *Grammatik der deutschen Sprache*, De Gruyter, Berlin, 1997.

²¹ R. Keller, “Das epistemische weil. Bedeutungswandel einer Konjunktion”, in: H.J. Heringer, G. Stötzel (Hg.), *Sprachgeschichte und Sprachkritik: Festschrift für Peter von Polenz*, De Gruyter, Berlin–New York, 1993, p. 219-247.

²² E. Breindl, M. Walter, *Der Ausdruck von Kausalität im Deutschen. Eine korpusbasierte Studie zum Zusammenspiel von Konnektoren, Kontextmerkmalen und Diskursrelationen*, Institut für Deutsche Sprache, Mannheim, 2009.

²³ R. Keller, “Das epistemische weil. Bedeutungswandel einer Konjunktion”, in: H.J. Heringer, G. Stötzel (Hg.), *Sprachgeschichte und Sprachkritik: Festschrift für Peter von Polenz*, De Gruyter, Berlin–New York, 1993, p. 219-247.

²⁴ E. Breindl, M. Walter, *Der Ausdruck von Kausalität im Deutschen. Eine korpusbasierte Studie zum Zusammenspiel von Konnektoren, Kontextmerkmalen und Diskursrelationen*, Institut für Deutsche Sprache, Mannheim, 2009.

²⁵ A.A. Susov, “Causal rhetorical relations”, in *Tver Linguistic Meridian*, 2006, vol. 6, p. 55-81.

²⁶ L. Degand, “*Contrastive analyses, translation, and speaker involvement: The case of puisque and aangezjen*”, in: M. Achard, S. Kemmer (Eds.), *Language, Culture and Mind*, CSLI Publications, Stanford, 2004, p. 1-20.

²⁷ L. Degand, H.P. Maat, “A contrastive study of Dutch and French causal connectives on the speaker involvement scale”, in *LOT Occasional Series*, 2003, vol. 1, p. 175-199.

²⁸ M. Pit, “Cross-linguistic analyses of backward causal connectives in Dutch, German and French”, in *Languages in Contrast*, 2007, vol. 7, no. 1, p. 53-82.

- causal conjunctions of English and French in the contrastive aspect²⁹.

These studies confirm the linguistic reliability of the subject involvement scale. In some studies the concept of epistemic mode is considered identical to that of mental state³⁰. Thus, E.S. Yarygina³¹ notes, "the term mode should be used to refer to the mental state of the speaker". According to J. Nuyts³², epistemic modality as the mental state is expressed by means of mental predicates. The author understands the mental state as "being in state X" or "fulfilling mental process X" and distinguishes the following mental states: knowledge, assumption, thinking:

*"Think is the mental process of reasoning with knowledge; believe is the mental state of faithfully trusting information (from someone) ; guess is the mental process of tentatively estimating something; know is the mental state of having knowledge about something; suppose is the mental process of hypothetically putting forward something in order to be able to use it as a premise in a reasoning process; etc."*³³

The focus of this study is on epistemic causal relations because it is at this level that the subjective nature of causal relations comprising the perspective and opinion of the speaker as the subject of consciousness is particularly strongly reflected. Our task is to identify the types of explicit mental mode and their cognitive-pragmatic functions as the foundation of causal relations. We then aim to ascertain the types of information underlying these types of state as they contribute to the development of cognitive-pragmatic functions in discourse. Our hypothesis therefore comprises the notion that the subjective perspective of the causal relationship, the person, his or her inner world and mental mode occupies the key position in the causal discourse.

We assume the subjective meaning to be the reflection of the objective causal relations in the subject's epistemic mode, in which the subject, his/her mental operations, views and perception of the objective world make the core of the discursive texts. We understand the subjective meaning to be the reflection of objective causal relations in the epistemic mode of the subject

²⁹ S. Zufferey, B. Cartoni, "English and French causal connectives in contrast", in *Languages in Contrast*, 2012, vol. 12, no. 2, p. 232-250.

³⁰ P. Byloo, J. Nuyts, "Meaning change in the Dutch core modals: (Inter) subjectification in a grammatical paradigm", in *Acta Linguistica Hafniensia*, 2014, vol. 46, no. 1, p. 85-116; J. Nuyts, *Epistemic modality, language, and conceptualization: A cognitive-pragmatic perspective (Vol. 5)*, John Benjamins Publishing, Amsterdam-Philadelphia, 2001; A.A. Susov, "Causal rhetorical relations", in *Tver Linguistic Meridian*, 2006, vol. 6, p. 55-81.

³⁰ E.S. Yarygina, *Construction of conclusion of justification in the syntactic system of Russian language*, Moscow State Regional University, Moscow, 2003.

³¹ *Ibidem*.

³² J. Nuyts, *Epistemic modality, language, and conceptualization: A cognitive-pragmatic perspective (Vol. 5)*, John Benjamins Publishing, Amsterdam-Philadelphia, 2001.

³³ *Ibidem*.

where the subject and his or her mental operations, position and awareness of the objective world are at the centre of discursive texts.

The notion of mental modality is of particular interest for this study because it most clearly reflects the ‘work’ of the subject of consciousness at the time of speech production and his or her mental mode with regard to the relative probability and reliability of the propositional content of the utterance. The concepts of epistemic mode and epistemic state are considered synonymous in this study as they express not only the relation of the subject to the propositional content but also the state in which the subject mentally processes the causal information. The subject of consciousness describes the situations, determines the existence of events and links them with each other causally, with his or her mental mode, cognitive understanding of objective reality and degree of knowledge about objective events serving as the reason for the formation of causal relations.

Materials and methods

The following authors speak of the reverse order of cause-effect structures referring to it as the subjectivity of causal relations. Cf.:

Grund (p): *Er ist zu Hause.* Folge (q): *Daher brennt bei ihm das Licht.* Reduktiver Schluss: *ich sehe q, schließe p.* Mögliche Paraphrase: *Ich bin mir sicher, dass er zu Hause ist, und der Grund für meine Annahme ist die Tatsache, dass ich in diesem Moment sehe, dass das Licht bei ihm brennt.* [Reason: (p) *He is at home.* Consequence (q): *That is why the light is on.* Deductive inference: *I see q, conclude that p*]³⁴.

Possible periphrasis: *I am sure that he is at home and the reason for this assumption is the fact that I see light in his place.*

Let us consider another example: (1) *Tschick stand jetzt direkt vor ihnen. Sie starrten ihn an, als ob sie ihn nicht erkennen würden, und wahrscheinlich erkannten sie ihn wirklich nicht. Denn Tschick hatte meine Sonnenbrille auf* [Chik stood in front of them. They stared at him as if they did not recognize him, and, possibly, they did not because Chik wore my sunglasses].³⁵

This epistemic causal discourse does not establish a causal relationship between the facts and the events, but expresses indirect argumentation, i.e. the connection between the observed state of affairs and the speaker’s judgment on the probable consequence of this state. The subject assumes that friends do not recognize Chik (*wahrscheinlich erkannten sie ihn wirklich nicht*), and the assumption results from the fact that Chik wore sunglasses (*Denn Tschick hatte meine Sonnenbrille auf*). The epistemic mode of assumption is expressed here by

³⁴ A. Volodina, *Konditionale und kausale Relationen im gesprochenen Deutsch. Dissertation*, Universität Heidelberg, Heidelberg, 2007.

³⁵ W. Herrndorf, *Tschick*, Rowohlt Taschenbuch Verlag, Hamburg, 2010.

the modal word **wahrscheinlich**, which is the key word in the whole causal construction. The attitude of the speaker to the assumed result (I assume that friends possibly do not recognize Chik) is a logical conclusion resulting from the observed facts of reality and the speaker's perception (*because I know and see that Chik wears my sunglasses*).

This causal connection can be depicted as a relationship between the causal component (antecedence (Ant.)) and the effect component (consequence (Cons.)): Ant. → *caus.* → Cons.:

Consequent (*wahrscheinlich* *erkannten sie ihn wirklich nicht*) [*possibly they did not recognize hi*] ← *caus.* ← **Antecedent** (*Denn* *Tschick hatte meine Sonnenbrille auf*) [*because Chik wore sunglasses*].

Based on Pasch's view³⁶, in the present work we will define cause-effect relations as a type of connection existing between the proposed cause (**p**) and the epistemically modified consequent (**q**):

Consequent: *Epistemic mode of assumption* (*wahrscheinlich* [*possibly, perhaps*] = *I suppose that p*) + *propositional content* (*erkannten sie ihn wirklich nicht*) [*they did not recognize him*].

Antecedent: *Proposition* (*Denn* *Tschick hatte meine Sonnenbrille auf*) [*because Chik wore sunglasses*].

Consequent [*Epistemic mode of assumption + propositional content*] ← *caus.* ← **Antecedent** [*Proposition*].

The epistemic causal structure in the described example (1) is an epistemic hypothesis with the cognitive element "**suppose**" (**I suppose that p**). The modal word **wahrscheinlich** ('may be') expresses the cognitive level of the subject's consciousness and confidence in reality.

The subjectivity of consciousness is highlighted through modal expressions that show the degree and scope of knowledge. The modal expression 'may be' bears the semantics of the 'assumed truth': *I assume (it may be) that p*. The speaker is unaware of any direct cause or reason and draws conclusions and assumptions on the basis of the objective state of affairs. In (5), the fact *Tschick hatte meine Sonnenbrille auf* (*Chik wears my sunglasses*) is the reason for the speaker's conclusions *erkannten sie ihn wirklich nicht* (*they did not recognize him*). The speaker as the subject of consciousness assumes that it could be the consequence of the fact that another person has the glasses of the speaker. The assumption mode and the subjective perspective of the utterance are marked by the modal expression *wahrscheinlich* ('maybe, possibly'). The linguistic structure expresses the epistemic causal relations and the cognitive operation of the conclusion.

³⁶ R. Pasch, U. Brauße, E. Breindl, U.H. Waßner, *Handbuch der deutschen Konnektoren. Linguistische Grundlagen der Beschreibung und syntaktische Merkmale der deutschen Satzverknüpfers*, De Gruyter, Berlin, 2003.

The transformation method demonstrates the process of the cognitive operation where the mental mode becomes the core feature of the causal relationship:

I assume that they did not recognize him because he wore my sunglasses.

He wore my sunglasses, that is why I assume they did not recognize him.

Consequent[mental mode of assumption + propositional content] ← caus. ← Antecedent.

Discursive texts taken from German and Kazakh belles-lettres fiction serve in the present paper as research materials. Among the analysed works there are: W. Herrndorf's³⁷ *Tschick*, D. Kehlmann's *Die Vermessung der Welt*, *Die schwarzen Schafe* by L. H. Böll, and *Der Vorleser* by B. Schlink. The analysed Kazakh sources are: M. Auezov's³⁸ (2013) *Abai Zholy*, M. Dulatov's *Bachytsys Zhamal*, S. Zhunussov's *Zhapandagy zhalgys ui*, and A. Kekilbayev's *Chansha Dariya chikayasy*.

The selection of these works is based on the fact that the language of these authors is considered one of the most representative in German and Kazakh. The frequency is of no importance for this study as the key objective is to demonstrate the cognitive-pragmatic functions of causality. Logical conclusions have been addressed in German and Kazakh research literature in terms of the communicative-functional³⁹.

However, Sweetser's three-level theory of the epistemic level of causality and subjective perspectives of causal relationships in terms of the cognitive-pragmatic aspect has not yet been fully investigated in Kazakh research literature and in a contrastive aspect of the German and Kazakh languages, which explains our choice of these languages. Using these two languages as an

³⁷ W. Herrndorf, *Tschick*, Rowohlt Taschenbuch Verlag, Hamburg, 2010.

³⁸ M. Auezov, *Abai sholy*, Zhazushy, Almaty, 2013.

³⁹ H. Blühdorn, "Epistemische Lesarten von Satzkonnectoren – Wie siezustände kommen und wie man sie erkennt", 2006. Available at <http://www1.ids-mannheim.de/fileadmin/gra/texte/epistemisch.pdf>; E. Breindl, M. Walter, *Der Ausdruck von Kausalität im Deutschen. Eine korpusbasierte Studie zum Zusammenspiel von Konnectoren, Kontextmerkmalen und Diskursrelationen*, Institut für Deutsche Sprache, Mannheim, 2009; J. Sanders, W. Spooren, "Perspective, subjectivity, and modality from a cognitive linguistic point of view", in: W.A. Liebert, G. Redeker, L. Waugh (Eds.), *Discourse and Perspective in Cognitive Linguistics*, Benjamins, Amsterdam, 1997, p. 85-112; B. Schmidthausen, *Kausalität als linguistische Kategorie. Mittel und Möglichkeiten für Begründungen*, Niemeyer, Tübingen, 1995; S.Zh. Tazhibayeva, *Methods of expressing causal relations in the Kazakh language: A comparative aspect. PhD Thesis*, Siberian Branch of Russian Academy of Sciences, Novosibirsk, 2004; M.M. Toleup, *Functional aspects of reason for the fluctuation of Kazakh language. PhD Thesis*, Kazakh Ulytk University–Baspasy, Almaty, 2002; A. Volodina, "Sweetser's Drei-Ebenen-Theorie", in: G. Ferraresi (Hg.), *Konnectoren im Deutschen und im Sprachvergleich*, Narrverlag, Mannheim, 2011, p. 127-157; G. Zifonun, L. Hoffmann, B. Strecker, *Grammatik der deutschen Sprache*, De Gruyter, Berlin, 1997.

example, this study shows that epistemic modality expresses the subjectivity of the causal relationship: the subject of consciousness expresses his/her cognitive attitude of the causal relations, namely his/her degree of knowledge. The degree of knowledge depends on the 'quality' of the information on which the subject's claim (the epistemic modality of acceptance, doubt, and knowledge/ignorance) is based.

Results and discussion

The epistemic mode reflects the speaker's level of knowing the observed events, the degree of statement reliability, and the speaker's subjective confidence in the truthfulness of the statement. Modal words marking the effect relations help to define the speaker's deductive conclusions and speech tactics.

(1) *Tschick stand jetzt direkt vor ihnen. Sie starrten ihn an, als ob sie ihn nicht erkennen würden, und **wahrscheinlich** erkannten sie ihn wirklich nicht. **Denn** Tschick hatte meine Sonnenbrille auf (Chik stood in front of them. They stared at him as if they did not recognize him, and, **possibly**, they did not because Chik wore my sunglasses)⁴⁰.*

(2) *Kaigylly atany os oimen, os dertimen onascha kaldyru kazhet siyaky. Oitkeni onyn zhanagy sholak byiryk sosden baskatil katar zhok. Myndasar da oiy zhok Ne de bolsa bar zharasymen bir osi gana bolgysy kelgendei. (Perhaps we **should** leave the mourning grandfather alone with his thoughts and grief. **For** the only thing he had to say was a short order. He needs no one to share his grief with. Whatever awaits him, he wants to stay alone with his sorrow) (M. Auezov, *Abai zholy*).*

In the given examples we find causal relations existing between the current state of affairs (***Denn** Tschick hatte meine Sonnenbrille auf (because Chik wore my sunglasses)*) (*Oitkeni onyn zhanagy sholak byiryk sosden baskatil katar zhok. **[Because** the only thing he had to say was a short order]*) and the speaker's judgment on the possible consequence of this fact (***wahrscheinlich** erkannten sie ihn wirklich nicht (**possibly**, they did not recognize him)*) (*Kaigylly atany os oimen, os dertimen onascha kaldyru kazhet siyaky **[Perhaps** we **should** leave the mourning grandfather alone with his thoughts and grief]*). The first part of the sentence expresses the hypothesis, and the clauses with *denn* and *sebebi* express the reasons supporting the hypothesis.

Subjectivity of the given causal structures consists in the fact that the consequence component contains an assumption mode – that is non-factive information. The explicit indicators of consequence are the modal words *wahrscheinlich* (*possibly*) and *siyaky* (*should*). Clauses with *denn* (*for, because*) and *sebebi* (*because*) introduce argumentation for assumptions.

Objective cause-effect relations transpose in the person's inner world and mental sphere and acquire the functional status of an alleged consequence.

⁴⁰ W. Herrndorf, *Tschick*, Rowohlt Taschenbuch Verlag, Hamburg, 2010.

The transformation method demonstrates the epistemic level of causal relations—the connection between the mode of assumption and observed events:

(1a) *Ichnehme an (vermute, denke), dass sie ihn wirklich nicht erkannten. Denn Tschick hatte meine Sonnenbrille auf* [I assume (believe, see, think), they did not recognize Chik, for sure, as he wore my sunglasses].

(2a) **Men oilaimin** *Kaigyly atany os oimen, os dertimen onascha kaldytu kazhet siyakty. Oitkeni onyn zhanagy sholak byiryk sosden baskatil katar zhok. Myndasar da oiy zhok Ne de bolsa bar zharasymen bir osi gana bolgysy kelgendei* [I assume (believe, see, think), we **should** leave the mourning grandfather alone with his thoughts and grief. **Because** the only thing he had to say was a short order. He needs no one to share his grief with. Whatever awaits him, he wants to stay alone with his sorrow].

Consequently, the subject of speech is the author of the causal construction who knows two types of information: indirect (consequence) and reliable (reason).

In short the model of this type of causal relations can be presented in the following way:

1) {Assumption [q]} ← caus. ← {Reason denn [p]}

2) {[Epistemic mode + propositional content]} ← caus. ← {Reason denn [p]}

Let us compare:

{**Assumption** [**wahrscheinlich** erkannten sie ihn wirklich nicht]} ← caus. ← {**Reason** [**Denn** Tschick hatte meine Sonnenbrille auf]}.

The analogous model in Kazakh looks this way:

{**Assumption** [*Kaigyly atany os oimen, os dertimen onascha kaldytu kazhet siyakty* (Perhaps we **should** leave the mourning grandfather alone with his thoughts and grief)] ← caus. ← {**Reason** [*Oitkeni onyn zhanagy sholak byiryk sosden baskatil katar zhok* [**Because** the only thing he had to say was a short order]]]}.

The explicit markers of causal relations between the epistemically modified state of affairs and the actual facts of reality are the following subordinative conjunctions: German *weil* and Kazakh *sebebi*. For example:

(1b) *Tschick stand jetzt direkt vor ihnen. Sie starrten ihn an, als ob sie ihn nicht erkennen würden, und wahrscheinlich erkannten sie ihn wirklich nicht, weil Tschick meine Sonnenbrille aufhatte* (Chik stood in front of them. They stared at him as if they did not recognize him, and, **possibly**, they did not because Chik wore my sunglasses).

(2b) *Kaigyly atany os oimen, os dertimen onascha kaldytu kazhet siyakty. Sebebi onyn zhanagy sholak byiryk sosden baskatil katar zhok.* (Perhaps we **should** leave the mourning grandfather alone with his thoughts and grief. **Because** the only thing he had to say was a short order).

German conjunctions *denn*, *weil*, and Kazakh *sebebi* (because) and *oitkeni* (because) have one functional commonality—the ability to express the

recognized reason of knowledge and the confidence of the speaker in the reliability of the expressed statement.

Cf.: (1c) **Ich nehme an** (*vermute, denke*), *dass sie ihn wirklich nicht erkannten. Weil* *Tschick meine Sonnenbrille aufhatte* (I assume (believe, think), they really did not recognize Chik as he wore my sunglasses).

(2c) *Kaigly atany os oimen, os dertimen onascha kaldytu kazhet siyakty. Sebebi onyn zhanagy sholak byiryk sosden baskatil katar zhok* (I assume (believe, see, think), we **should** leave the mourning grandfather alone with his thoughts and grief. **Because** the only thing he had to say was a short order).

Yet we should also mention some semantic dissimilarities of these conjunctions. Thus, conjunctions *denn* and *oitkeni* can be used only to justify this or that assumption. They do not show any causal reasoning, it is just an evaluation in the system of mental activity, a diagnosis that may become the basis for assumption. Consequently, causal constructions of logical reasoning are evaluative means in the mental activity of the agent; principal clauses containing modal words express evaluative attitudes of the situation, in other words, there occurs a convergence of semantic meanings of assumptions and evaluation. Thus, in example (2), the speaker's evaluation urges him to leave the man alone with his thoughts (*onasha kaldyru kazhet siyakty*) because he has nothing more to say. This theory can be proved by the inability of these conjunctions to be used in preposition and the lack of semantic recursion or presupposition.

(1d) ***Denn** *Tschick hatte meine Sonnenbrille auf, erkannten sie ihn wahrscheinlich wirklich nicht* (*Because Chik as he wore my sunglasses, assume (believe, think), they really did not recognize him).

(2d) ***Oitkeni onyn zhanagy sholak byiryk sosden baskatil katar zhok. Men oilaimin kaigly atany os oimen, os dertimen onascha kaldytu kazhet** (*Because the only thing he had to say was a short order, i think we **should** leave the mourning grandfather alone with his thoughts and grief).

Therefore, we observe a causal connection between two judgements: an assumption and a statement:

Conjunctions *weilandsebebi* have rather an explanatory shade of meaning, showing the objective reason, explaining how and why this or that thing occurred. Conjunction *weil* makes possible the establishment of the reverse connection – argumentation of the relations existing between the real phenomenon:

(1e) **Weil** *Tschick meine Sonnenbrille aufhatte, erkannten sie ihn wahrscheinlich wirklich nicht*. (*As he wore my sunglasses, they really did not recognize Chik.*). Yet the coordinate conjunction **sebebi** unlike the conjunction **weil** cannot be found in preposition:

(2e) ***Sebebi onyn zhanagy sholak byiryk sosden baskatil katar zhok, kaigly atany os oimen, os dertimen onascha kaldytu kazhet** (*Because the only thing he had to say was

a short order. I think we **should** leave the mourning grandfather alone with his thoughts and grief).

German and Kazakh conjunctions *weil* and *себеби* are similar not only in their ability to give logical reasoning, but also in their ability to convey informative meaning that focuses not on an assumption, but on the objective cause-effect relations between the phenomenon.

The transformational method demonstrates synonymy of the Kazakh conjunction *себеби* (because) and the synthetic type of causal connection that is formed by means of the compound predicate suffixes –*dyktan/dikten* (**because of**) and the unit *son* (because of) used in the postposition. Let us compare:

(2f) *Kaigyly atanin zhanagy sholak byiryk sosden baskatil katar zhek bolgandyktan, oni os oimen, os dertimen onascha kaldyru kazhet siyakty* (**Because of** the only thing the mourning grandfather could say was a short order, we **should** leave him alone with his thoughts and grief).

(2g) *Kaigyly atanin zhanagy sholak byiryk sosden baskatil katar zhek bolgan son, oni os oimen, os dertimen onascha kaldyru kazhet siyakty* (**Because of** the only thing the mourning grandfather could say was a short order, we **should** leave him alone with his thoughts and grief).

In deductive conclusions one may find variants with coordinate conjunctions *da* (German) and *nege desen* (Kazakh). The conjunction *da* like conjunctions *weil* and *denn* foregrounds the known information:

(1f) *Da Tschick meine Sonnenbrille aufhatte, erkannten sie ihn wahrscheinlich wirklich nicht* (Since Chik wore my sunglasses, they **probably** did not recognize him).

Functional peculiarity of the conjunction *da* most fully manifests itself in the communicative aspect, since it is used to establish a consensus between the addressee and the addresser concerning some evident and conventional fact known to both parties. Therefore, the speaker gives an argumentation, distancing himself/herself from it and avoiding any particular emphasis. In this case sentences with *da* do not have any special accent while sentences with *weil*, on the contrary, emphasize the cause, intensifying it.

German *da* has its equivalent in the Kazakh language. It is the coordinate conjunction *неге деңең*:

(2h) *Kaigyly atany os oimen, os dertimen onascha kaldyru kazhet. Nege desen onyn zhanagy sholak byiryk sosden baskatil katar zhek. (Perhaps we should leave the mourning grandfather alone with his thoughts and grief. If you ask me why, (then I'll tell you) the only thing he could say was a short order).*

The functional value of the conjunction *неге деңең* is equal to that of the German *da* in terms of expressing the speaker's intention in a given social context whose ultimate aim is persuasion in the reliability of some assumptions or hypotheses and appealing to the interlocutor's mode. Causal clauses with *неге деңең* are found primarily in dialogues and written speech that proves its

utmost subjectivity.

The marker of argumentation can be reduced or abandoned in the language which indicates the highest degree of subjectivity of this type of causal constructions:

(2i) *Kaigylı atany os oimen, os dertimen onascha kaldyru kazbet. Onyn zhanagy sholak byiryk sosden baskatil katar zhok* (Perhaps we **should** leave the mourning grandfather alone with his thoughts and grief. The only thing he could say was a short order).

(1g) *Tschick stand jetzt direkt vor ihnen. Sie starrten ihn an, als ob sie ihn nicht erkennen würden, und wahrscheinlicherkannt sie ihn wirklich nicht. Tschick hatte meine Sonnenbrille auf* (Chik stood in front of them. They stared at him as if they did not recognize him, and, possibly, they did not because Chik wore my sunglasses.).

The analysis of German and Kazakh discourse of fiction helped to define the following means of expressing epistemic causal relations. The coordinate conjunctions *oitkenianddenn* verbalize the speaker's opinion and give argumentation to the assumption. Due to polysemy Kazakh and German equivalents *sebebi*, *-dyktan/-dikten*, *son*, and *weilcan* convey besides the speaker's opinion some additional shades of informative meaning. Coordinate conjunctions *nege desenand da* perform an appellative function, i.e. serve as a means of address to the interlocutor. A remarkable peculiarity of the Kazakh equivalent *nege desemis* the additional shade of meaning – its reference to some individual knowledge. As for the German conjunction *da*, it verbalizes not only some subjective knowledge based on factive information, but knowledge in general (common knowledge).

Conclusions

The analysis of the material also revealed some dissimilarities in the compared languages: in the German language the epistemic causal relations can be expressed explicitly by the coordinate conjunction *denn* and the subordinate conjunctions *weil* (because) and *da* (since) whereas in Kazakh causal connection between the mode of knowledge in the consequential situation and the result of this situation is expressed by the coordinate conjunctions *oitkeni* (because), *nege desen* (because) and *sebebi* (because).

The German language as the language of inflectional type uses analytical indicators (conjunctions) to express mental state, whereas Kazakh as the language of agglutinative type apart from grammatical markers uses such lexical means as postpositions that differ from conjunctions. Antecedent with the mode of knowledge in the subordinate clause is connected to the consequence-component of the principal clause by means of a past participle with the affixes *-dyktan/-dikten* or participial postposition *son*. The German language does not have such morphological means.

The position of a causal verb has a special importance for a description of the organization of causal statements in German and Kazakhs. Prepositions of causal participle and participle-postpositionals means of expression in the Kazakh language is explained by the typology of word order. It should be noted that the location of the verb–predicate in compared languages is fixed. The Kazakh language has a strict word order, SOV sentence order, when the typical position of the members of a sentence, as well as clauses of causes precede personal verb, whereas in German strictness of word order is shown by SVO sentence order: the typical of the sentence members, and also clauses of causes are placed after a personal verb.

Subjective meanings of causal relations manifest themselves in the speaker's inner mental world, his/her views and opinions, types of information, and degree of reliability. Evident signs of subjectivity include the argumentation of the hypothetical information that is based on some facts and the incomplete awareness of the subject of the factive state of affairs. The conducted linguistic analysis helped to identify two basic types of information that determine the subjective character of causal relations – reliable and indirect information. Argumentation is based on the reliable information known to the subject due to his/her personal experience or observations. On the indirect information the subject cannot pass a reliable judgment without making certain logical conclusions.

The speaker's degree of awareness and nature of knowledge, and the degree of subjective confidence in the reliability of the things said are reflected in the semantics of modal words. These modal words reflecting epistemic causal relations include Kazakh: *shygar* (*perhaps*), *balkim* (***possibly***), *balki* (***possibly***), *siyakty* (***should***) and *mumkyn* (***possibly***) German: *vermutlich* (*perhaps*), *wahrscheinlich* (***probably***), and *wohl* (*perhaps*). Non-factivity of one of the causal components is the specific feature that makes this type of relations different from the volitive ones:

Consequent (Mode of assumption) ←Caus. ←Antecedent (Fact of reality)

Thus, the analysis of the practical material helps us to conclude that the subjective meaning of the causal relations is reached in the discourse by means of deductive conclusions uniting thoughts into a row of messages and judgments. The individuality of the thinking subject most clearly manifests itself in the epistemic causal relations. By evaluating various situations and fragments of reality and by creating various causal constructions the subject of speech expresses his/her personal attitude of the observed events.

Epistemic judgments in German and Kazakh demonstrate the universal nature of the category of causality, and are a means of access to the conceptual knowledge of causal relations in the objective and subjective world, regardless of the typological structure and the genetic affiliation of the language. Organization of language content is determined by the system and the

objective nature of linguistic consciousness, which is at the same time specific to a particular national manifestation.