Linguistic Basis of the Phenomenon of Realis / Irrealis in the English and Uzbek Languages

Normurod Rasulov

Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages
Email: *normurod5930[at]gmail.com*

Abstract: *Until now, the phenomena of "realis" and "irrealis" have been interpreted in connection with the categories of mood and modality in linguistic literature. Although these phenomena are recognized as a universal phenomenon characteristic of all languages, there are opinions that they are not fully justified from the point of view of content and meaning. The point is that the highlighted categories (mood and modal) in most cases create a false impression in terms of content and logic. Therefore, it is necessary to choose terms that correspond to the meanings of modality and inclination. A discussion of the categories of mood and modality cannot fully capture the meanings of state and situation. However, as a solution to the problem, analysis within the terms of realis/irrealis indicates the possibility of revealing the essence of the problem more fully. This paper attempts to examine the linguistic basis of the phenomenon of realis/irrealis in the English and Uzbek languages.*

Keywords: realis/irrealis, grammeme, cognitive universal, pragmatic inference

1. Introduction

The question of determining the encoding of the status of realis does not lie in terms of specific linguistic signs, but in terms of messages conveyed in speech. In this regard R. Boogaart expresses the reasoning that this condition leads to confusion between linguistic meaning and pragmatic inference [Boogart 2009:213]. G. Talmy, on the other hand, speaks of a "correlation" between past tense and realis [Talmy 1994:265]. But it can also be noted that the realis case associated with past tense morphology can be redefined using, for example, epistemic modal units (which may be the case, possibly the assumption, etc.), speech-oriented compounds (think, imagine, suppose, etc.).

If, in fact, the real state of the past tense could be overridden by other phrases in the context, then it would be acceptable to say that the semantic substance is conditionally linked to a particular language expression, "encoded". In it, the status of realis is instead a pragmatic conclusion presented in certain used contexts.

Another problem with defining "realis" as a semantic phenomenon separated from specific linguistic forms is that one can meet the view that it is more expedient to accept it than to study its cognitive universal status [Bjorn, Ferdinand de Haan 2009:511; Пироженко 2001:187]. D. Donald puts forward the idea that for the linguistic expression of realis and irrealis, meaning must be universal [Donald 2001:109]. From this case language, contextualized sentences are encouraged to be subjected to analysis. However, this opinion has not been approved by other linguists. Because, the expression realis and irrealis is defined within the immediate context in many languages, whether they are special grammatical suffixes or separate inflections.

2. Objectives of the Study

As we study the concepts related to reality in the Uzbek language, it is noticeable that it is important to distinguish between conceptual content conditionally expressed by a particular linguistic form and concepts such as the message, thought expressed through the use of a linguistic form in a particular context. Example: *Farg'onadan meni qora tortib kepti, hamshaharim bo'ladi, ishga olsang ham olasan, olmasang ham olasan, deb turib olaman* (Tukhtaboev X. – P. 33).

From a logical point of view, all negated phenomena can be considered irrealis. Because they describe situations that do not correspond to a real event. However, from a pragmatic-communicative point of view, speakers usually do not see it necessary to mention something that does not happen if there is no possibility, possibility, of an event. However, some methods of rejection may emphasize the conflict between expectation and realis more than others.

On the one hand, the complexity of the conceptual structure of the concept of irrealis, and on the other hand, the complexity of the conceptual structure of irrealis states, shed new light on the views about linguistically coding irrealis. In fact, the definition of the irrealis concept makes it possible to distinguish it from modality, among other similar categories, as well as to use it communicatively.

Assessing the complexity of the conceptual structure of irrealis determines the logical nature of the situation. Describing the situation from a realis/irrealis point of view makes it possible to identify many inconsistencies between them. The above points cause the question of the grammatical nature of irrealis.

De Haan considers in a completely different way the task of determining the meaning expressed by the "state of Realis". In his bottom-up typological search, he seeks to explore the confirmation of the existence of a prototypical semantic core to the cases analyzed as examples of realis/irrealis [de Haan 2012:107]. But, in our opinion, it is desirable that research on this subject be studied separately. To do this, it will be necessary to clarify the main ones of the means that mean realis/irrealis in each language, focusing on defining their conceptual essence. It is also required to clarify the

characteristics of each of them, confirming aspects that have an advantage over others. Thus, the core of the realis category and the sequence composition that adapts to it externally will have to be formed. That is why it is considered difficult to express an opinion on the prospect of de Haan's proposed prototypical grouping being studied.

3. Semantics of the concept of "irrealis"

R. Bugenhagen's work is particularly interesting in this context, as he explores the semantics of the concept of "irrealis" in seven Austronesian languages of New Guinea. The languages in its selection are considered genetically and geographically close to each other. Based on its database, it attempts to identify linguistic tools that can be described as a prototypical semantic kernel for the realis and irrealis categories. He believes that prototypical realis semantics is related to positive approach, non-Future Tense, completion aspect, and narrow speech acts, while irrealis semantics is related to next tense, hypothetical conditional statements, opposite conditional statements, additions to "desire", and negation target statements [Bugenhagen 1993:39]. R. Bugenhagen's prototypical use of Realis and Irrealis is shown in Table 2 below.

Table 1: Prototypical uses of realis and irrealis in Austronesian languages of New Guinea according to Bugenhagen (1993)

Realis	Irrealis
Positive polarity Non-future tense Perfective aspect Declarative speech acts	Future tense Hypothetical conditional clauses Counterfactual conditional clauses Complements of 'want' Negative purpose clauses('lest')

Table 2: Prototypical use of Realis and Irrealis in English according to R.Bugenhagen's theory.

Realis	Irrealis
Participatory ambiguity A time that has no future Finished aspect Declarative speech acts	Future tense Hypothetical conditional clauses Contradictory clauses Additions to "want". Adverbs of purpose without participles ("from")

In this table a number of concepts proposed by J. Bybee include a partial similarity to the semantic-level characteristic of (approximate) irrealis [Bybee 1998:257]. This view completed by R. Bugenhagen, it assumes that the semantic core area consists mainly of languages that correspond to each other in a wider area, as well as languages located in a separate, certain peripheral area. Depending on R.Bugenhagen's list, his de Haan [de Haan 2012:107] in contrast to the proposition, we can see the expression of several thematic classes that are related to each other. Whereas, despite the kinship and closeness of the R. Bugenhagen languages, "there are not two languages among them whose range of use of irreal forms is completely identical [Bugenhagen 1993:35]" clearly.

4. Grammatical category of realis status

J. Elliott's analysis achieved a result that was completely different from the conclusions of the noted authors. He comments on the grammatical category of realis status with realis and irrealis value. He argues that in fact it is possible to define a general, semantic component in all cases of using a Category. For J. Elliott, the general semantic core of irrealis is that "it is accepted that irreal States or situations are not in Real reality, but in alternative hypothetical or fantastic reality [Elliott 2000:55]". However, the semantic area covered by "irrealis" is extremely broad and includes potential phenomena, conditions, modality-based phenomena and commands. In addition, rejection, habits, and interrogations can also be seen as belonging to "irrealis" [Elliott 2000:90].

However, in a typological study of non-sister languages, two problems can be encountered with J.Elliott's approach. Firstly, determining whether the difference between modality on the one hand and its "realis expression" on the other is systematically consistent, and secondly, linguoculturological aspects of large inter-linguistic differences in "irrealis" semantics may exist.

In cross-linguistic comparative analysis, a number of scientific articles about this issue show the following problems: there are grammars that distinguish some part of the conceptual field to represent situations that are not realized in the composition of any studied language. If it is a generalized grammeme, it does not imply all irrealis cases. Moreover, it can express meaning only in the structure of the construct with its participation, without having a permanent meaning. Let's look at a few examples of each situation: *Qalbimizda hech tushunib bo'lmaydigan, shodlikka ham, g'ussaga ham o'xshamaydigan g'alati-g'alati hislar uyg'ongandek bo'ldi* (Tukhtaboyev X. – P. 33); *Qalandarov uyini ko'rganday ham bo'lmadi* (A.Kahhor. – P. 205); *"Ok. And that's why showed me away from the bridge as if it were dangerous?"*(S.L. Key, - P. 26); *She knew she Offset got lost in her work; her mother used to say the house would tumble down around her while she was painting, and she would never notice* (S.K. Key, - P. 21).

Irrealis in the first example can be seen as the main indicator of irrealis, the exact –the grammeme"- *dek"*in the construction "*uyg'ongandek bo'ldi*". In fact, the content of irrealis is considered relevant to the whole construction. Even in the *"ko'rganday ham bo'lmadi"* negation structure in the second example, irrealis is considered to belong to the whole structure. We agree with the idea that the further development of the "- dek, - day construction" may lead to the emergence of a specific type of actant derivation growing in Uzbek - the typologically almost unique "comparative" derivation.The English-language structures *"as if it were dangerous", "the house would tumble down", "would never notice"* have meant irrealis. As an irrealis grammeme in English, we can show the modal relational verb*"would"*. It seems that both languages have a number of grammemes that can be considered in the field of irrealis. It contains the verb *will, would,* meaning the next tense, two negations, plus desire, intention, sometimes the next tense or command, as well as *to be going to* and *probably, may be,* which represents the protasis and apodosis of opposing conditional phrasesof these indicators. J. Bybee, R. Perkins fully consistent with the universal grammeme types identified in W. Pagluica's work [Bybee, Perkins,

Volume 13 Issue 1, January 2024
Fully Refereed | Open Access | Double Blind Peer Reviewed Journal
www.ijsr.net

Paper ID: SR24117105115   DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.21275/SR24117105115   1351

Pagliuca1991:17]. It is common for the meaning of the next tense to come from the verb "*want*". In addition, such a grammeme is often used to express Will, purpose and command, as well as desire aimed at the next time. The loadings of conditional obligation signals in the main clause of the resulting subordinate clauses is another common combination of using the same grammeme. For example,"*Laura, if I meant to do you real ham, I could have done it weeks ago easily enough*" (S.H. Law, 55). The irrealis grammeme"*could have done*" in this example is a common phenomenon in English. Nevertheless, there is still no clear primary designation for the irrealis area.

In this way, in J. Martin's description, it is argued that the expression irrealis is distributed throughout different parts of the grammatical system and is not limited to speech markers. Toba and Pilaga also held that the origin of distal markers is non-speech, and that while they express the distance or invisibility of the referent, it also means that the situation associated with it has not yet been implemented or is not yet known. In English, one of the indications that is activated as an irrealis grammeme is an indefinite article. An indefinite article refers to a subject or person, whose action is not clear. For instance,"*What show would a girl have in a laundry?*" (O`. Henry, 124). In terms of content, irrealis can also be expressed using suspect pronouns. In this case, the semantic task performed by the suspect pronoun will be similar to the indefinite article. For example: *There were lights in the bunkhouse, the squeakily wail of someone practicing a faddle* (S.H. Law, 70).

It seems that irrealis is an imaginable, but unrealized during speech, action aimed at the future, defining events and events. This suggests that irrealis is inextricably linked with cognitive processes.

Considering the difference between the conceptual sphere, grammatical types and grammars with respect to modality, modality is considered a broad functional or conceptual field. The most important, known grammatical expressions in this field cover special, different grammatical units inherent in the language. However, the realistic application of this model in modality is not as clear as in the fields of tense and aspect. A number of difficulties can be encountered in the consistent description of the conceptual space of modality. In fact, modality has encompassed several partially parallel conceptual fields, and it is acceptable to consider their relationships to be more diachronic than synchronous. Another way to describe these fields is [Bybee, Perkins, Pagliuca 1991:58]is illuminated as follows:

a) Condition space for agent: defines the conditions of agent according to the completion of an agent-based (directed) modality predicate. Usually, these conditions are considered social conditions of the meanings of duty and permission, but linguistic parallel signs often represent the meanings of internal will and ability. Linguistic expression in this field is usually carried out through lexical units, auxiliary elements, prepositions, and in rare cases through inflection;

b) The functional space of speech that imposes the meanings of obligation or permission. It is a speaker-directed modality, the most common example of which

is the imperative, which indicates that the sentence is directive or evidential. Grammemes with this function are usually denotative. It is represented by the binding imperative morphology and is accordingly designated as inclined;

c) Epistemic field: epistemic modality represents the speaker's level of confidence in the realism expressed in the sentence. In this, the degree of confidence varies between uncertainty and probability. Epistemic modality is most often expressed implicitly, but it can also be peripheral or lexical;

d) Compound sentences space: Compound sentences usually connects synchronously or diachronically with the first three fields. They provide information about a structured directive or unconfirmed, especially sentences that the speaker himself does not believe in the realism of the information.

Thus, unlike the tense, aspect, or person-number categories that represent one conceptual field, modality can cover these four fields. As J. Coates points out, a grammeme may have two or more meanings to varying degrees. For example, the verb *should* may represent an obligation with epistemic probability, *(the trip should take about fourteen days),* an order *(you should repeat this ten times),* and a wish mile *(it is funny she should say that)*. Such ambiguity is generated by the fact that grammeme represents the meanings of all four diachronic fields. Modality based on agent acquires a generalizing meaning. They also tend to express meanings related to the other three fields.

5. Universal grammatical types

Despite the complexity of the subject circle, universal grammatical types can be defined in modality, as well as in tense and aspect. Certain basic meanings are found in many languages. For example, J. Bybee, D. Perkins and W. Pagluica have identified grammemes that represent the meanings of duty, permission, ability, fundamental probability, epistemological probability, epistemic possibility, imperative, and prohibitive, common in seventy-six language samples and very similar to one [Bybee, Perkins, Pagluica 1991:58]. In addition, in the example of the ambiguity of these cross-linguistic grammars, we can observe that they follow forms that clearly show universal diachronic pathways. With them, commitment becomes probabilistic in the epistemic field, and imperative in the speaker-oriented field; the meaning of opportunity changes first to the expression of fundamental probabilism and permissiveness, and then epistemic opportunity. Thus, there is no shortage of diachronic or universal forms in modality fields.

However, there is no ambiguity (puzzle) in the implementation of language-specific synchronous analysis. The only problem that arises is that a strong generalization of modality grammars, especially in the final stages of grammaticalization, can produce a distribution (partition) and ambiguity that cannot be easily unitary analyzed by decomposing into several constructions. In addition, the reason that novel grammaticalization is more common in headbands is that adverbs remain morphosyntactically conservative. In a certain sense, generalized grammemes

remain conditionally in adverbs, the identification of their semantic meaning is complex. To find a solution to this problem, it is considered important to study the role of constructions in the process of grammatization.

6. Conclusion

Linguistic devices such as *"- dek, - day, huddi, chama"* which seem to form a model of similarity in the Uzbek language, form the meaning of irrealis.Apart from this, these expressions can include auxiliaries and adverbs such as *"sababli, tufayli, mumkin, shart."*

The fact that a change in the lexical morpheme associated with grammaticalization occurred to the grammatical morpheme in the initial process in which English grammatical studies were reconstructed is argued by some scholars [Lindstedt 2000:365]. But in recent times, it is evident in the literature on the field of grammar that there are many corrections to this simplest statement. A lexical morpheme does not grammatize, but instead a lexical morpheme (or combination of grammatical units) grammatizes as part of a construct [Bybee, Perkins, Pagliuca 1991: 17]. In fact, it is a whole construction that contains certain morphemes that form a Gramm. Thus, we are far from arguing that*"have"* grammars in English as a grammarian of completion or obligation. More precisely, one can find many views that the constructions [have + Participle II] and [have + to + verb] are expressions of completion and commitment [Malchukov 2009:33]. However, the have + P II construction does not always mean completed. The scientists who put forward this idea are lexical-semantic and active (bounded/unbounded) of the verb do not focus on features. We did not find it permissible to dwell on the fact that these features were studied within the framework of aspectuality. In this way, there are views that *go* is not itself in English; rather, the construct [be going to + verb] should be considered an expression of the next tense. We believe that although this construction implies a future-oriented attitude, a purposeful action, it can be included in the structure of constructions that mean irrealis as an unrealized phenomenon.

References

[1] Boogaart R. Semantics and Pragmatics in Construction Grammar: The Case of Modal Verbs; // *Contexts and Constructions.*Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2009.

[2] Bjorn H., Ferdinand de Haan. Modal Constructions in the Languages of Europe //*Modals in the Languages of Europe: A Reference Work.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 2009. – 577 p.

[3] Bugenhagen R. D. The Semantics of Irrealis in Austronesian Languages of Papua New Guinea: A Cross-Linguistic Study; // *Topics in Descriptive Austronesian Linguistics.* Leiden: Rijks universiteit te Leiden, 1993.

[4] Bybee J.L. "Irrealis" as a Grammatical Category; *Anthropological Linguistics* 40: 1998.

[5] Bybee J.L., Perkins R.D.,Pagliuca W. Back to the Future // *Approaches to Grammaticalization,* vol. 2. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1991.

[6] Coates J. Epistemic Modality and Spoken Discourse // *Transactions of the Philological Society.* 1987. – P. 85.

[7] de Haan, Ferdinand. Irrealis: Fact or Fiction? *Language Sciences* 34: 2012.

[8] Donald D. Moods and Performances; in *Inquiries into Truth and Interpretation.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.

[9] Elliott J. R. Realis and Irrealis: Forms and Concepts of the Grammaticalization of Reality; *Linguistic Typology* 4: 2000.

[10] Lindstedt J. The Perfect: Aspectual, Temporal and Evidential // *Tense and Aspect in the Languages of Europe.* Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 2000.

[11] Martin, J. R. Beyond Exchange: APPRAISAL Systems in English; // *Evaluation in Text: Authorial Stance and the Construction of Discourse.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

[12] Talmy G. Irrealis and the Subjunctive; *Studies in Language* 18: 1994.

[13] Пироженко О.Г. Ложь как реализация цели говорящего // «Язык и культура». Научное издание. Сер. «Филология». Вып. 3. Т. 4: Язык и художественное пространство. – Киев, 2001.

[14] Shodiyev S.E. Bio-social need to the study of lexical meaning. Journal of Positive School Psychology http://journalppw.com 2022, Vol. 6, No. 9, 4771-4777

[15] To'xtaboyev X. Sariq devni minib. Toshkent: Yangi asr avlodi, 2010. – 236 b.