

THE RELATIONSHIP OF THE REALIS/IRREALIS PHENOMENON WITH OTHER CATEGORIES

N. Rasulov¹, X. Аюбов²

Abstract:

The article outlines the relationship of the realis/irrealis phenomenon with other categories, including the tense and modal verb. Signs of future tense are observed mixed with irrealis adjectives. That is, it is argued that adjectives of irrealis are used to express “future events”. Future events presented in a clear, realistic way represent a sign of what will happen in the future.

Key words: Realis Status, realis/irrealis, canonical typology, semantic parameters, specific linguistic reality, conditional clause, epistemic modality, morphologization, actant derivation, habitualis.

doi: <https://doi.org/10.2024/66pd4373>

In different languages, the irrealis category is used in different semantic interpretations. These include the tense and modal verb. Therefore, a phenomenon defined as irrealis in one language can be expressed as realis in another language. It is not recommended to represent Irrealis in the way you encounter. L. Michael proved that there are languages with obligatory Realis Status in every morphosyntactic environment of verbal intonation³. He suggests that languages carry over from the canonical typology to capture differences in computation⁴. Canonical typology is an improvement of the prototyping method⁵. The main aspect of each category is that less attention is paid to the general reality than to the specific linguistic reality of languages. For a given category to exist, it does not have to be expressed in the same way in all languages. However, a canonical category can exist in any language. L. Michael points out several semantic parameters that are important for a predicate⁶.

While in some languages the simple past tense may be marked with irrealis, in Nanti the usual triggers are marked with realis markers⁷. It is argued that they can encode a difference in temporal precision.

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

² *Аюбов Хаётулло Мутеъуллоевич, старший преподаватель общеуниверситетской кафедры философии Государственного образовательного учреждения "Худжандского государственного университета имени академика Бабаджана Гафурова"*

³ Michael L. The Nanti reality status system: Implications for the typological validity of the realis/irrealis contrast // *Linguistic Typology*, 18 (2), 2014. – P. 251–288.

⁴ Used reference. – P. 258.

⁵ Martin L. Irrealis constructions in Mocho (Mayan). *Anthropological Linguistics*, 40 (2), 1998. – P. 198–213.

⁶ Michael L. The Nanti reality status system: Implications for the typological validity of the realis/irrealis contrast. *Linguistic Typology*, 18 (2), 2014. – P. 268.

⁷ Used reference. – P. 255.

If Irrealis is referred to by the term “presumed” in the context of the past tense, it is evaluated as a phenomenon that also applies to the future tense.

However, irrealis can only be used in the future tense if it occurs in conjunction constructions with a subordinate clause. More research is needed in this regard. The future tense irrealis prefix can only be used to express negative constructions. Here, we can note that the definition of irrealis is related to an abstract situation. In Uzbek, the future tense sign is added to the verb realis for “certain statements that will happen in the future”, and irrealis itself means “thoughts that a certain action may occur, as well as vague predictions about its occurrence” is also used for. In this case, irrealis signs can be associated with a sign of uncertainty (epistemic modality) and not with temporally calculated corresponding signs. It can also be found in verbs marked with the future tense irrealis. If the speaker is not sure that an event will happen, but “needs to refer to the future”, then no concrete reality is implied. The Uzbek language actually has a future tense, which can refer to a future action in the past. For example: *Aftidan, Jo'ra Jumon bugun savol berish uchun ataylab tayyorgarlik ko'rib kelganga o'xshaydi* (To'xtaboyev X. 48-bet); *Kechagi gaplardan keyin darrov javob bera qolmas. Ehtimol, Zokirning o'zi u yoq-bu yoqqa o'tib qolar, unda javob olish juda osonlashib ketardi-ya* (To'xtaboyev X. 109-bet).

In the first example given, the verb “*ko'rib kelganga o'xshaydi*” is not marked as irrealis or future tense. Even so, the reference is past-tense, but relevant to the present. Information about the temporal marking of a sentence is conveyed by the Realis Status or future tense marker, along with the general context in which the sentence occurs. In addition to the future tense, there are also adverbs in Uzbek, such as “*ehtimol, ravshanki, aniq*”, which express a close aspect. This add-on is only compatible with Realis/Irrealis Status².

Constructions involving the verb “*xohlamoq*” in the compared languages seem to be marked by the irrealis category for the object verb. In this regard, we compare the following examples in English and Uzbek languages: *She shivered, then cursed herself. Allowing her discomfort to show would draw the very attention she wanted to avoid* (Lane A., 4); *And there are some graves in the cemetery of the church that you might want to see ... but do not go there after dark. - Why not?* (Kehler, 53-page); *Zulfiqorov ijozat so'rab raisga murojaat qilishni esidan chiqardi shekilli, nimadir demoqchi bo'ldi* (Abdulla Qahhor, 97-bet); *Axir bir kunmas-bir kun Mullahoshimboyni ko'rgingiz kelib qolsa yoki xat orqali ko'nglini so'ramoqchi bo'lsangiz, loaqal, adresimni bilmaysiz-ku!* (To'xtaboyev X. 90-bet). In the Uzbek language, additional means can be noted when referring to the future tense. For instance: *Turkona so'z bilan tarannum etaylikki, elning yuragi mavjga kelsin* (Oybek. 157-bet). In this example, the level of accuracy in the speaker's speech caused an unknown phenomenon. In this case, the probability of the occurrence of the event is represented by the units of “*etaylikki, mavjga kelsin*” the irrealis symbol.

In the same way, it is not based on clear evidence to conclude that the following conditional clause in English, which represents the verb realis, is grammatically correct or incorrect. For instance: *I dont think so. I believe that whoever came to your house wiped the place clean of a considerable number of fingerprints* (Rundell R. 44-page). *I dont think so. I believe* is used to express irrealis in this context for the future tense meaning. It indicates an uncertain result of the expected reality, that is, these sentences can be taken as an irrealis phenomenon.

¹ Butler J. A Minimalist Treatment of Modality. *Lingua* 113. 2003. – P. 867-996.

² Butler J. A Minimalist Treatment of Modality. *Lingua* 113. 2003. – P. 867-996; Chafe W. The Realis-Irrealis- Distinction in Caddo, the Northern Iroquoian Languages, and English; in Joan L. Bybee and Suzanne Fleischman (eds.). *Modality in Grammar and Discourse*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1995. – P. 349-365.

It can be observed that in conditional clauses, connecting devices serve to illuminate the irrealis expressed by the verb. For example: *But he had been a good man, and she had never regretted wedding him. Perhaps if she could have loved him, she would have felt better. But despite a comfortable friendship, her heart had never been his* (Allison Lane. – P. 5); **Garchi** *Shahobiddin o‘z gunohlarini e‘tirof qilmasa-da, har holda, o‘z yomonligini jilovlashga qaror qilganligiga, uning qora ruhida insofdan bironta uchqun qolganligiga shubha qilmadi.* (Oybek. 350-bet). Here the indefinite *perhaps, if, garchi*, and prepositions are used to indicate an unknown future state. The verb constructions in the above sentences are the main means of clarifying the signs of irrealis.

In constructions expressing desire, we often find irrealis as an auxiliary verb. However, the characteristic of the past tense of desire, in some cases, comes in the realist form. This is a characteristic of the Uzbek language. For example: *Ular, agar Alisher Navoiyning qo‘li bo‘lmasa, bunday ishga Darveshalining o‘zi jasorat ko‘rsata olmas edi, deganlar.* (Oybek. 418-bet). In the Uzbek language, in controlling the occurrence of an event, the expression of the event may be related to the realis. It can also be a cultural symbol of the Uzbek language. For example: *Joningizdan qilcha umidingiz bo‘lsa, endi tilingizni kesing, tamom gung bo‘ling!* (Oybek. 393-bet). It was found that there are no big differences in the semantic realization of the realis/irrealis category in the Uzbek language. In particular, adverbs that mean that reality is incomplete due to some obstacle or external influence have a special place. Surely, it can be observed that this is done in Uzbek through the suffix - *yozdi*. For instance: *Lekin sariq jinlarning jarang-jurung qilib o‘yinga tushayotgani, childirma chalayotgani eshitilib, qo‘rqqanimdan dodlab yuborayozdim.* (To‘xtaboyev X. 15-bet).

It is not possible to determine the main meaning of this example linguistically, logically it means that the situation is controlled, that is, the action is not fully implemented. In our opinion, although such means of expression exist in other languages, they may not have a clear linguistic code. The definition of realis and irrealis also depends on the objective indicators of the expressed reality. For example, in English, the construction “*be going to*” forms a construction with future tense, more precisely, prospective content. This structure in the English language “*(he) is going to do*” or the Uzbek verb “- *moqchi*” becomes autonomous.

In this and many similar cases, a semantic shift occurs first, leading to a grammatical meaning. This makes it possible to compare structures that do not have morphologization, to identify separate structures of realis or irrealis phenomena. However, comparing certain structures, in general, confirms again that morphologization and grammaticalization are independent phenomena.

The purpose of such an interpretation raises the question of whether it is possible to consider this construction as a separate structure in English. This construction does not contradict the existing grammatical indicators, on the contrary, it can combine with all of them. More precisely, we believe that the further development of the “- *dek konstruksiyasi*” may lead to the emergence of a specific type of actant derivation growing in Uzbek - the typologically almost unique “comparative” derivation. For instance: *Juma namozidan keyin Gavharshodbegim madrasasi suv quygandek jimjit bo‘lib qoldi.* (Oybek. 139-bet).

Another observation about the term irrealis and its usage is that it tends to misunderstand the semantic domain of modality. Because this grammatical category allows to express the “reality” or “irreality” of events. For example: *‘It may not be bad, I wouldn’t know. But the chief constables been in here after you, and he wants to see you at three sharp tomorrow afternoon.* (Rundell R. – P. 87).

These modal relations do not correspond to different interpretations of realism. Their main meaning is whether the proposition is confirmed or not. If it is approved, it means to what extent it is approved¹.

In the studies of J. Bybee, we can find conflicting opinions and opinions about the existence of realis and irrealis categories in English. In particular, the author expresses his views on what foundations this category can have. Namely, J. Bybee believes that it is easier to classify “realis” than “irrealis” statements are considered “realis” if the speaker affirms their truth. Statements are considered “realis” if the speaker affirms their truth².

W. Chafe says that the functional basis of the opposition between realis and irrealis is the judgment of people about how their thoughts and ideas are related to what they consider to be objective realis³. W. Chafe states that the ideas expressed in words are compared to the “objective realis” and the presented information is classified as realis or irrealis. At the same time, it points out that there are reasons to believe that the functions of modal categories are more discourse-oriented. Moods are used for other discursive or illocutionary functions. Imperatives and prohibitives imply a hint rather than an affirmation, while epistemic inflections soften the strong affirmative meaning of a sentence. Subordinating moods indicate the background character of the sentence, so it is not confirmed even if it is consistent with the sentence. From the example of “*She doesn't feel well. Its strange, he is late*”, it can be clearly understood that it is not the realis or irrealis phenomena of reality, but how the speaker's opinion expresses the attitude in the speech that is important.

Thus, both J. Bybee and T. Givon criticize the traditional definition of irrealis for not having a functional basis, relying on a logical understanding of the reality of the situation⁴.

Nevertheless, in subsequent works, the scope of linguistic analysis is expanding rather than the philosophical and logical approaches of analyzing the contrast between the events occurring in real life and the events that belong to the human fantasy world, desires, plans, etc. Accordingly, attention is paid to the importance of taking psychological and cognitive factors into account when defining the realist category. In general, in order to define the realis/irrealis categories, or to create a precise definition, it is necessary to carry out comparative typological work within a number of languages.

Thus, the various definitions of the realist category attract our attention. They express chronologically, the most common and “permanent” aspects based on the logical tradition, while some definitions describe realist phenomenon in the form of a communication-based category. One of them was written by T. Givon, and the other was proposed by J. Bybee as a “hypothetical definition”:

1. Realis describes events related to real reality, irrealis describes events related to imaginary reality⁵;
2. Realis corresponds to a proposition that can be asserted as true. Irrealis corresponds to an affirmative proposition as an unknown, uncertain phenomenon⁶;

¹ Bybee J. “Irrealis” as a grammatical category. *Anthropological Linguistics* 40. 1998. – P. 267-268.

² Bybee J. “Irrealis” as a grammatical category. *Anthropological Linguistics* 40. 1998. – P. 267-268.

³ Chafe W. The Realis-Irrealis- Distinction in Caddo, the Northern Iroquoian Languages, and English; in Joan L. Bybee and Suzanne Fleischman (eds.). *Modality in Grammar and Discourse*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1995. – P. 364.

⁴ Bybee J. “Irrealis” as a grammatical category. *Anthropological Linguistics* 40. 1998. – P. 257-271.; Givon T. Irrealis and the Subjunctive; *Studies in Language* 18. 1994. – P. 265-337.

⁵ Foley W., Robert V. V. *Functional syntax and universal grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984. – 432 p.; Roberts J. R. *Modality in Amele and other Papuan Languages // Journal of Linguistics*. V. 26. N 2. 1990. – P. 363-401; Mithun M. *Modality in Grammar and Discourse // On the Relativity of Irreality*. Benjamins. 1995. – P. 21-66; Chafe W. *The realis-irrealis distinction in Caddo, the Northern Iroquoian languages and English*. In: Bybee & Fleischman, 1995. – P. 135-165; Mithun M. *The languages of Native North America*. New York: Cambridge University Press. 1999; Elliott J. R. *Realis and irrealis: Forms and concepts of the grammaticalization of reality // Linguistic Typology* 4, 2000. – P. 55-90.

⁶ Givon T. Irrealis and the Subjunctive. *Studies in Language* 18. 1994. – P. 265-337.

3. Realis affirmative propositions are associated with sentences that are not affirmative or weakly affirmative in their opposite sense¹.

Undoubtedly, it is important to describe the semantics of a certain grammatical category from a communicative-pragmatic point of view. However, in the practical use of the concepts of “realis” and “irrealis”, it seems effective to refer to “logical” and “pragmatic” approaches.

Although the definitions of realis and irrealis differ, all of them do not deny the opposition between “realis – irrealis”. These definitions differ, first of all, according to the degree of completeness of reality. Linguists who use the logical definition talk about the proposition’s direct relation to reality. In particular, T. Givón considers that it is wrong to give a firm conclusion about the speaker’s information. In fact, they are not opposites. It is important to determine which of the logical or communicative-cognitive components prevails in the semantics of the Realis category².

It is known that in many languages, the past tense is evaluated as a habitualis event. Habitualis is a type of irrealis that does not have a basic grammatical form. However, habitualis is a mixture that combines some of the typical features of realis, including the high degree of assertion of belief, and the typical features of irrealis, such as the absence of a definite tense, the absence of specific representations of the situation, and the absence of the features of habitualis noun phrases. is a modality. Thus, it is not surprising that some languages attempt to combine habitualis with other irrealis meanings³.

References:

- [1]. Butler J. *A Minimalist Treatment of Modality*. *Lingua* 113. 2003.
- [2]. Bybee J. “Irrealis” as a grammatical category. *Anthropological Linguistics* 40. 1998.
- [3]. Chafe W. *The Realis-Irrealis- Distinction in Caddo, the Northern Iroquoian Languages, and English*; in Joan L. Bybee and Suzanne Fleischman (eds.). *Modality in Grammar and Discourse*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1995.
- [4]. Elliott J. R. *Realis and irrealis: Forms and concepts of the grammaticalization of reality* // *Linguistic Typology* 4, 2000.
- [5]. Foley W., Robert V. V. *Functional syntax and universal grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984.
- [6]. Givón T. *Irrealis and the Subjunctive*. *Studies in Language* 18. 1994.
- [7]. Givón T. *Tense-aspect-modality: The creole prototype and beyond*. // *Tense-aspect: Between semantics and pragmatics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 1982.
- [8]. <https://doi.org/10.1997/463mfn89>
- [9]. Martin L. *Irrealis constructions in Mocho (Mayan)*. *Anthropological Linguistics*, 40 (2), 1998.
- [10]. Michael L. *The Nanti reality status system: Implications for the typological validity of the realis/irrealis contrast* // *Linguistic Typology*, 18 (2), 2014.
- [11]. Mithun M. *Modality in Grammar and Discourse* // *On the Relativity of Irreality*. Benjamins. 1995.
- [12]. Mithun M. *The languages of Native North America*. New York: Cambridge University Press. 1999.

¹ Bybee J. “Irrealis” as a grammatical category. *Anthropological Linguistics* 40. 1998. – P. 257.

² Givón T. *Tense-aspect-modality: The creole prototype and beyond*. // *Tense-aspect: Between semantics and pragmatics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 1982. – P. 115–163.

³ Givón T. *Irrealis and the Subjunctive*; *Studies in Language* 18. 1994. – P. 322.

International Conference

ADVANCED METHODS OF ENSURING QUALITY OF EDUCATION: PROBLEMS AND SOLUTIONS

- [13]. Roberts J. R. *Modality in Amele and other Papuan Languages // Journal of Linguistics*. V. 26. N 2. 1990.
- [14]. To'xtaboyev X. *Sariq devni minib. – T.: Yangi asr avlodi*. 2010.