THE CONCEPTUAL ESSENCE OF THE COMPOSITION OF IRREALIS

Ochilova N.F.[1],

Abstract:

This article shows the differences between realis and irrealis constructions and one functionally, which have been used in linguistics. It has been mentioned that when Realis and irrealis compare categories as linguistically as any modal category, they can make sure that the discrepancies on which they are based are indeed comparable. The article mentions typological analysis of irrealis composed units and changes in it in the sentence.

Key words: realis, linguistic coding, lexical means, grammatical constructions, conceptual side.

By analyzing the specific system of existing form-meaning compositions in each language, we can appreciate the universal significance of the human communication system and the richness of its distinctive features. G.Risink argues that the importance of the heuristic type that Pike distinguishes is that in our minds it always dominates the structure of our native language and negatively affects the linguistic analysis of other languages.

Although G.Risink's paper is not dedicated to making the distinction between realis and irrealis a course, it is relevant to the discussion of this issue because it allows us to consider "realis" and "irrealis" as descriptive characters referring to the linguistic coding of reality. It does this through deictic modal categories - that is, the characters themselves imply language-specific meanings or functions of realis and irrealis constructions. To study the specific meanings and functions that exist in the language, it is necessary to analyze from the speech units used in the field work process to the speech units used in the documentation. It can finally be understood through analysis that leads to a reliable representation of annotated information from (ideal) texts.

Another part of the G. Risink argument is related to the cross-linguistic comparison problem. He argues that it is only after we have considered and understood the meanings of constructions from an empirical point of view that we have a solid basis for cross-linguistic comparison. The same view is supported by Contini-Morava. Obviously, it is very important to make sure that the categories of xosrealis and irrealis are really comparable to the language to be compared. The reason is that in some of them the alternative task constant is also mucin. But, so far, there is a lot of evidence for significant similarities and differences.

If the realis and irrealis terminology was not used, then the cross-linguistic similarities in the semantic nature of the difference and the contradictions in its application could be ignored. Of course, when comparing these categories linguistically, like any modal category, it is necessary to pay special attention to make sure that the differences on which they are based can really be compared.

Regarding comparison, the basic concept here is seen as a grammatical difference to the irrealis category. In the description of the English language, "irrealis" is a modal category meaning event. We will focus on the analysis of this reality between English and Uzbek language of the realis/irrealis distinction. Irrealis in this cross section of languages does not count as secondary, in these languages it is observed that constructions denoting Irrealis have grammatical forms, separate lexical means.

For example, we do not find cases where the term "irrealis" is used in the description of the Uzbek language, but we do meet morphemes (- sa,- ar) that occur in opposite condition clauses that mean.

More specifically, it does not matter whether or not linguists use the term "irrealis" as a descriptive designation. Descriptive signs are always approximate, ideally consistent, so that as long as they have logic and clear meaning, their use cannot be challenged at all. It will be more

---

[1] *Ochilova N.F., Samarakand State Institute of Foreign Languages*

effective to focus on the question of proving the existence of a clear distinction between realis and irrealis, which is considered central in the cross section of certain languages. This principle is equivalent to denying the existence of the distinction between realis and irrealis, which is treated as a terminologically identical but grammatically distinct phenomenon, assuming the rejection of one of the two.

The use of the descriptive characters of " Realis "and "irrealis" (i.e., for the exact modal distinction important to grammar) in this way can be found in the following continuously growing linguistic descriptions and journal articles. For the genealogically diverse Papuan languages of America; South America; Australia; Austronesia, as well as New Guinea and eastern Indonesia. Although this is not a complete list, it shows that the distinction between realis and irrealis is a common phenomenon and deserves to be studied from a cross-linguistic point of view.

Understanding and understanding the existence of a distinction between realis and irrealis is considered extremely important in linguistics. But the presence of this difference in very few languages in the world is explained, as noted in several points of grammar. Such languages include: also on the Oregon coast, the Southern Aravakan languages, and the northeastern New Belt languages of Guinea. Kiny is the only language with sufficient data to study how the realis and irrealis differences in verb morphology and sentence link morphology are related.

Learning from a conceptual point of view of realis and irrealis allows many problematic-looking issues of cross-language comparison to be viewed from a new point of view. That is, the functional properties of any given realis and irrealis distinction are not only language-dependent, or reflect the attitude towards events in the thinking of the speaker and the listener, rather than grammatical markers. Thus, the irrealis distinction recorded in the –sa,- day,- Dec forms of verbs in Uzbek (e.g.) is not functionally nor conceptually compatible with the morphological forms in English. More precisely, what we expect from two systems only serves to be the basis for dividing some part of the conceptual space in modality into two opposite categories.

References:

1.   *Danielsen and Terhart 2015 for Terena; Michael 2014 for Nanti; Mihas 2015 for Alto Perené.*

2.   *M. Mithun On the Relativity of Irreality. In Bybee J. and S. Fleischman //Modality in Grammar and Discourse. Benjamins, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 1995. -P 367-388*

3.   *N.F.Ochilova "Irrealis konseptuallashuvining asosiy belgilari" "So'z san'ati" xalqaro jurnali 6 jild 4 son, Toshkent 2023*

4.   *Karshieva, Y. ., & Abbosova , M. . (2023). Using Different Methods for Teaching Foreign Languages. Journal of Language Pedagogy and Innovative Applied Linguistics, 1(4), 44-48. https://doi.org/10.1997/zj1zpx70*

5.   *Iskandarovich, A. S. (2021). Toponyms, their classification and types. Евразийский научный журнал, (3), 27-28.*

6.   *Бегматов, Қ. (2022). Олий таълим муассасаларида немис тилини иккинчи чет тили сифатида ўқитиш. Zamonaviy lingvistik tadqiqotlar: xorijiy tajribalar, istiqbolli izlanishlar va tillarni o 'qitishning innovatsion usullari, (1), 265-266.*