



Research Article

THEORETICAL BASIS OF THE GRAMMATICAL CATEGORY REALIS / IRREALIS

Journal Website:
<https://frontlinejournal.s.org/journals/index.php/fsshj>

Copyright: Original content from this work may be used under the terms of the creative commons attributes 4.0 licence.

Submission Date: May 10, 2022, Accepted Date: May 20, 2022,

Published Date: May 30, 2022

Crossref doi: <https://doi.org/10.37547/social-fsshj-02-05-06>

Rasulov Normurod Atakulovich

Senior teacher of Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages, Uzbekistan

ABSTRACT

This article outlines the theoretical basis of the grammatical phenomenon realis / irrealis, in which the lexical and grammatical features of the highlighted events in linguistics.

KEYWORDS

The concepts realis / irrealis, pragmatic levels of linguistics, modality typology, European languages, indicative - direct inclination, desired, approximate, impossible, optical, conjunctive, conditional.

INTRODUCTION

The problem between modality and inclination, in turn, can be explained by the fact that many fundamental concepts in the realm of modality have not yet to be clearly resolved. This is due not only to how broadly the scope of modality is

understood, but also to the definitions of the concept of inclination, as well as the empirical references to the meanings indicated by modal verbs in European languages, as is customary. One theory devoted to these categories considers

the tendency as a result of modal grammar and does not divide the modal and the tendency into two concepts. [Palmer, 1986; Bybee, Ö. Dahl, 1989].

The speaker's attitude toward the circumstance falls under the inclination category. The occurrence of the content of this category is indirect to the realis (indicative - direct inclination) or irrealis (desired, approximate, impossible, optical, conjunctive, conditional, irrealis) or realis conjecture (imperative) of the verb preposition [Fleischman, 1982: 111, Melchuk, 1998: 153]. Compared to the other categories under consideration, as it encompasses the entire predicate of meaning, which is the sentence's core.

The interaction of the expression irrealis with tense forms occurs in a slightly different pattern by neutralizing the temporal expressive connotations of irrealis. Such neutralization can be explained by an expression defined within the inclined category of the irrealis grammar (conjunctive) or by adding it in the "relevance" factor. The signs of time are less important in describing events that do not occur [Melchuk, 1998]. It is also explained by the fact that the meanings expressed in negative sentences are not

always related to negative resistance [Aikhenwald, 1998].

Only two of the 36 European languages have all indicative tenses articulated in the conjunctiva, according to the majority of publications devoted to the categories of inclinations in European languages. In addition, the distinction of time categories is frequently observed in opposing contexts. It is therefore reinterpreted by generalizing the meanings they convey, focusing on the study as they are divided into realis / irrealis types.

Although the use of past tense forms as indications of irrealis indicators in European languages is more well-known than the use of approximate case indicators (If I were you, I would never do it), they are also documented in other languages [Khrakovsky, 2005]. In fact, it has been observed in many languages that the inconsistency of the category of time with non-indicative (irreal) tendencies also has led to the hypothesis that time and inclination should be included in the same category.

The inclusion of the concepts realis / irrealis into linguistics can play an important role in clarifying the syntagmatic relationship between inclination

and modality, as well as in defining the content expressed in the text, the pragmatic levels of linguistic units in the text. The relevance of the realis / irrealis tense categories to the context is also significant, as is the ability to define additional functions of tense forms.

It is emphasized that the category realis / irrealis is especially valuable in resolving the contradictions between the expression of the future tense, which is sufficiently discussed in European languages, and the presence of a link between hypothetical modal meanings. However, researchers who advocate studying European languages in terms of modal content rather than the tendency category of the future tense suggest that realis / irrealis can be compared across languages [Eliot, 2000]. In the context of modal relations, grammatical tools are investigated.

It should be emphasized that the future tense will not be associated with modality in all languages with realis / irrealis characters. In some languages, the contradiction between the expression of the meanings of realis and irrealis is defined not by time, but by the form with or without division. In other languages only certain types of activities in the future tense can belong to the realis, while in others the definite future

tenses are included in the realis and the indefinite ones in the unreal. In general, the semantic connection between the future tense and the irrealis, depending on the nature of the events in the future tense, they are naturally incorporated into the irrealis.

Other tense forms' modality and realis / irrealis relationship is far more complicated. Another radical approach holds that the forms of time are essentially modal in nature [Fleischman 1982]. Time is one of the categories that make up a unique database, according to the author. When a person expresses an opinion regarding a specific time period, this results in a modal relationship. According to Tierof, the past tense, as well as the future tense, performs a modal function in English since its signs are used in circumstances particular to irrealis (e.g., non-reality-related presence indicators).

This viewpoint is shared by a number of other linguists. They define "dissociation from reality" as the employment of past tense indications to signify unrealism [Bybee, 1995]. It should be noted, however, that such modalization of past tense forms can only occur under limited circumstances (e.g., when modal verbs are used). These cases may lead to the desired conclusion

that the realis / irrealis indicators we offer are specific to all tense forms and classify them inside separate grammatical indicators, based on which the predicates belong to the realis or irrealis types.

Indeed, the analysis of German and Roman languages differs analytically in the relationship of the events we are considering, but it is necessary to focus on linguistic connections associated with the occurrence of past and future tense grammemes in certain combinations to analyze the use of past tense indicators in modal senses. The grammar of the past tense differs from the grammar of the future tense in that the future tense has its own field of impact. For example, He knew that she would come. She will have had dinner by now.

R. Langaker argues that the presentation of the grammatical scheme is related to the use of special constructions in a specific and specific context. [Langacher 1987; 47]. In this case, the schemes are considered to be of a private nature. Grammatical schemes can also be organized from abstract and general schemes. However, it will be more difficult to find generalizing evidence at higher levels of abstraction. We do not know whether abstract language forms grammatical

units for users in different situations or manipulates specific constructions with more precise meaning and usage conditions. The results of many studies show that the evidence for very complex areas of modality confirms the second conclusion [Langacher 1987; 137-141].

In many languages, the irrealis category implies general semantic components of situations, constructive aggregation of different levels of linguistic units at different levels. In most cases, the meaning of irrealis also applies to units of language that represent events of different levels that do not belong to real reality. Also, the diversity of linguistic units representing the meaning of irrealis has led to the need to define the status of sectarian phenomena, as well as the use of different terms to them.

In English, the verbs “would”, “should” and “will” are means with only modal meanings, while expressing the various meaningful dyes of the speaker, in some cases noreal reality. In English, believe, like be sure, serve to represent reality. Conversely, verbs such as “to seem”, “to think”, “to consider” can mean irrealis reality. For example, Hathall believed he had already left the house [Rundell, 19]; But I think that’s what they are doing [Rundell, 110]. Although there are a



number of language units that can be equivalent in Uzbek, these units are not always equivalent in terms of functionality. However, in Uzbek, the meaning of irrealis is not specific to any lexical unit, but is manifested in certain morphological additions, context, and discourse. For example, due to the fact that it is possible, conditionally, auxiliary and rative, English-language modal units and because, due to, probably, completions play an important role in expressing such as the ability, necessity, probability, ability, need to perform action by verbs that have a meaning that is meaningfully independent in meaning. For instance, She was totally and completely lost and the grayness in the sky was not wholly due to the appalling conditions [Mithun 1995; 371].

Thus, expressing the contradictory use of the category realis / irrealis in some languages using a divisible or indivisible form without presuming that it is time-dependent may show the essence of the situation. While only some types of future tense actions are regarded as belonging to the realis in some languages, the definite future tense forms are considered realis in other languages, while the indefinite ones are classified as irrealis.

REFERENCES

1. Aikhenvald A., Dixon R. M. Differences between grammatical systems. Language № 74. 1998. – P. 56-80.
2. Bybee J., Dahl Ö. The creation of tense and aspect systems in the languages of the world. Studies in Language. №13. 1981. – P. 51-103.
3. Bybee J. Morphology. Amsterdam. John Benjamin. 1985. -266 p.
4. Fleischman S. The Future in thought and Language // Diachronic Evidence from Romance. Cambridge. 1982. – P. 61-97.
5. Langacker R. Foundations of Cognitive Grammar. // Theoretical Prerequisites. – Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1987. – 248 p.
6. Palmer F. R. Mood and Modality. Cambridge. 1986. – 361 p.
7. Мельчук И. А. Курс общей морфологии: монография. Том 2. Морфологические значения - Москва

- Вена: Языки русской культуры,
1998.

8. Храковский В.С. О соотношении
эвиденциальности и эпистимической
модальности // А. П. Выдрин и др.
(ред.). Вторая конференция по
типологии и грамматике для
молодых исследователей. Материалы
докладов (Санкт-Петербург, 3-5
ноября 2005 г.). СПб.: Наука, 2005. С.
163-183.

