

THE SEMANTIC AND GRAMMATICAL DYNAMICS OF REALIS AND IRREALIS IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK

*N. Rasulov*¹

Abstract:

This thesis explores the comparative analysis of realis and irrealis categories in English and Uzbek, focusing on the grammatical structures and semantic features that distinguish these categories. Through a detailed examination of linguistic materials, the study identifies the specific grammatical indicators used in different word classes within these two languages. While the realis/irrealis indicators and their determination methods pose challenges within a single language, it is observed that similar grammeme-forming devices exist at various levels of grammar across languages. The analysis reveals how modal auxiliaries like “can” and “may” in English express overlapping yet distinct meanings, such as ability and permission, while also noting differences in usage and grammaticalization. The study also highlights the presence of realis and irrealis markers not only in verbs but also in other parts of speech, such as adverbs, conjunctions, and suffixes in Uzbek. It addresses the complex and controversial nature of the irrealis category in modern grammatical typology, referencing key studies in the field. The research further explores how the interplay between realis and irrealis categories manifests in different linguistic structures, contributing to a better understanding of these grammatical categories across languages. By considering various contexts—imperative, future tense, and negation—the study concludes that realis and irrealis indicators are not isolated, but rather interdependent, and their semantic interpretations vary significantly across different languages. Ultimately, the thesis advocates for a distinct semantic field for the irrealis category, separate from realis, suggesting that these categories are dynamic and often context-dependent, reflecting broader grammatical, lexical, and syntactic relationships. Through cross-linguistic comparisons, this work contributes to the broader understanding of how grammatical categories related to reality and unreality function in diverse languages.

Key words: Realis, irrealis, grammatical categories, modal auxiliaries, English, Uzbek, grammatical indicators, semantic fields, verb categories, morphological forms, tense, aspect, mood, negation, imperative, future tense, linguistic typology, cross-linguistic comparison, grammatical structures, semantic meaning, interdependence of categories.

By analytically approaching materials from English and Uzbek, it is possible to determine the structure of grammatical means specific to different word classes of the realis and irrealis categories through linguistic means that create a contrast of grammatical indicators. Marian Mathui points out that it is difficult to define the realis/irrealis indicators and methods for determining grammatical categories in the case of a single language [1: 367-388].

However, it is often noticeable that only grammeme-forming devices with similar meanings exist at different levels of grammar [2: 213-241].

For example, in English, can and may represent a range of mutually exclusive meanings. Thus, can represents the original ability (along with the meaning of permission) and may (more strongly grammaticalized) the original ability (along with the meaning of permission) in older, more formal, or more literary usage, and represents most epistemological possibilities. These two grammemes are included in the same basic category as modal auxiliaries, but, nevertheless, they do not create maximum contrast.

The description of realis or irrealis is not only expressed by the categories of adverb, conjunction, and verb, but sometimes also occurs depending on the suffixes of person and number. This seems to be more typical of the Uzbek language. For example, *Yolg'on bo'lsa, nega xolamning shuhrati shunchalik yoyilib ketdi* (To'xtaboyev X. *Sariq devni minib*. – B. 14).

In modern grammatical typology research, the issue of irrealis is considered complex and controversial. In the studies of V.S. Khrakovsky and R. Dixon, and A. Aikhenvald, the interaction of grammatical categories is usually understood as follows: the number of grammemes in category X varies depending on the use of the grammeme in category Y that is involved in the structure of this predication [3: 79-81; 4: 89-93; 5: 634-668].

¹ *Rasulov Normurod Atakulovich, PhD, senior teacher at Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages*

At the same time, the selection of grammemes of category X is carried out independently of the specific grammeme of category Y. In the application of grammemes, the use of a verb category in a sentence requires the use of another verb category in the same sentence.

This situation has also been widely compared to other distinctions, including common grammatical categories such as completion and incompleteness. For example, linguists engaged in cross-linguistic research, such as B. Comrie and O. Dall, have noted their scientific conclusions regarding the close similarity between the meanings of grammemes expressing completion and incompleteness in different languages [6: 255-287; 7: 309-328].

Efforts to include this category in a separate semantic field focus on semantic elements that already exist in the language.

Consequently, although there are separate indicators of the semantic levels of the highlighted categories, in some contexts their interdependence is evident. Realis/irrealis indicators are related to grammatical contexts that occur in different semantic domains and are united by common semantic aspects. This is also important in determining whether the information conveyed in a direct communication situation or in the communication process is real/unreal, and in determining the grammatical, lexical, and syntactic indicators of real or unreal realities. This indicates that the realis/irrealis indicators are widespread in the languages being compared. Compare: She, however, apparently had no such problems. She brushed beside him—if she had any idea of how near the edge he hovered, she'd never have dared to come so close—and bent to the stack of books and canvases, the rolls of paper and cases that held brushes and pots of paint. (Susan Law. *The Man Who Loved China*. 78-page); Surely it was primarily his air of mystery that kept her interested. (Susan Law. *The Shape of Her*. 35-page); Agar sadoqati samimiy bo'lsa, - dedi Navoiy ikkilanib, - xoqon hazratlari sinagan bo'lsalar, u taqdirda kamina uchun e'tirozga o'rin qolmaydi... (Oybek. *Navoiy*. 45-bet).

The only logical solution in this regard is to separate the category of irrealis into a separate semantic field from the realis. However, some linguists consider the irrealis category to be a separate linguistic level for the following reasons [8: 55-90; 9: 367-388]:

1) these grammemes are used in special contexts (imperative, present tense, future tense, negation) related to semantic meaning;

2) the set of contexts specific to each grammeme does not fully correspond to any semantic level. Perhaps it embodies elements of different semantic levels, such as mood, aspect, tense, and field.

It turns out that the grammemes of the realis category are contrasted with grammatical indicators and semantic expressions of different semantic levels, which are combined with the common semantic property of realis and irrealis indicators, precisely with the “irrealis” property. Thus, the category of realist becomes a “secondary” category, characterized as being determined by the “standard” forms (relationship to realist) of the verb category (inclination, aspect, tense, direction).

This is also reflected in the unusual morphological forms of the realis and irrealis markers in a number of languages. This is evident when irrealis indicators are used together with indicators of other grammatical categories, such as imperative, negative, and future tense. They represent hypothetical events according to their function. For instance:

“I was just...I was concerned that, if I didnt allow her to go out with him as I did the rest of you, well, forbidden fruit and all that.” (Susan Law, - P. 43); Ehtimol, kutilmagan vaqtda yoqalangan dushman tepa panasida so'nggi qat'iy jangga tayyorlanib, katta kuch bilan pisib yotgandir! (Oybek. *Navoiy*. 109-bet).

It is precisely the repetitive indicators that do not allow us to consider the indicators of the event related to the realis and irrealis as “clusters” of morphemes with special meaning (imperative, future, negative, etc.) depending on the context [10: 27]. On the contrary, the use of this irrealis indicator requires the definition of indicators with a clearer meaning. These views confirm the hypothesis that the realist category has an additional, explanatory feature in relation to verb categories. As noted, the realis/irrealis categories are based on other verb categories, and the realis and irrealis grammemes embody different semantic meanings. This ambiguity can occur in different ways across languages. As a result, the realis and irrealis grammemes never have a clear semantic meaning. On the contrary, depending on the division of verb forms into real and unreal categories, the semantic content of these grammemes differs in different languages.

References:

[1]. Mithun M. *Modality in Grammar and Discourse // On the Relativity of Irreality*. – Netherlands: John Benjamins Publishing Company. 1995. – P. 367-388.

[2]. Hopper P. J. *Aspect and Foregrounding in Discourse // Discourse and Syntax (=Syntax and Semantics, 12)*. – New York: Academic Press. 1981. – P. 213-241.

- [3]. Храковский В. С. Грамматические категории глагола (опыт теории взаимодействия) // Межкатегориальные связи в грамматике. СПб., 1996.
- [4]. Dixon R. M. W., Aikhenvald A. Yu. *Dependences between grammatical systems*. – Cambridge: Language. 1998. Vol. 74. № 1.
- [5]. Aikhenvald A. *Imperatives and Commands in Manambu*. – Honolulu: *Oceanic Linguistics* 55:2, 2016. – P. 634-668.
- [6]. Comrie B. *Plenary Session (including T. Givon: "The Speech-Act Continuum")*; in William S. Chisholm, Louis T. Milic, and John A. C. Greppin (eds.), *Interrogativity: A Colloquium on the Grammar, Typology and Pragmatics of Questions in Seven Diverse Languages*. – Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1984. – P. 255-287.
- [7]. Dahl O. *'The Grammar of Future Time Reference in European Languages*; in Osten Dahl (ed.), *Tense and Aspect in the Languages of Europe*. – Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 2000. – P. 309-328.
- [8]. Elliott J. R. *Realis and irrealis: Forms and concepts of the grammaticalization of reality* // *Linguistic Typology* 4, - Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 2000. – P. 55-90.
- [9]. Mithun M. *On the Relativity of Irreality* // J. Bybee and S. Fleischman (eds.), *Modality in Grammar and Discourse*. – Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1995. – P. 367-388.
- [10]. Урманчиева А.Ю. *Выражение реальности / ирреальности ситуации в глагольных системах языков Африки. Автореф...кан.фил.наук*. – Ташкент. 2004. – 27 с.