4. Мукумов, М. Х. (2021). Interpretation of the terms world model, worldview, image of the world in cognitive linguistics. Международный журнал Искусство слова, 4(2).

5. Разинкина Н.М. Функциональная стилистика английского и русского языков. – М.: Высшая школа, 2004.

6. Makhmud, Mukumov. Using the Moodle Distance Learning System in the Educational Process. *JournalNX*, vol. 6, no. 11, 2020, pp. 156-159.

7. Реформатский А.А. Термин как член лексической системы языка. – В сб.: Конференция по применению структурных и стилистических методов исследования словарного состава языка. М., 1961.

8. Bahromovna, Y. S. (2021). Thematic Division of Clothing Names in English and Uzbek. European journal of innovation in nonformal education, 1(2), 61–62. Retrieved from https://inovatus.es/index.php/ejine/article/view/41

9. Yadigarova Sitora Bahramovna. (2023). Analysis of Clothing Component Proverbs in English and Uzbek. American Journal of Language, Literacy and Learning in STEM Education (2993-2769), 1(10), 353–356. Retrieved from https://grnjournal.us/index.php/STEM/article/view/2017

EXPRESSING A PROPOSITIONAL MEANING
IN THE CATEGORY OF REALIS/IRREALIS
(in the example of the English and Uzbek languages)

Normurod RASULOV
Researcher, senior teacher at
Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages

Abstract. *The article discusses typological application of the concept of "realis/irrealis", serious approach to functional universals and the definition of grammatical typology. Moreover, the importance of existing the same indicator of negative grammatical form of the realis or irrealis event as the affirmative has been analysed.*

J. Bybee and supporters of his views try to express it against the universality of the irrealis concept related to grammar and typology. According to them, only cognitive-communicative categories that are adequately defined in individual languages or grouped in common in most languages should be considered logically realist. This is a serious approach to functional universals and the definition of grammatical typology. Complex

functional categories with a full range of semantic and pragmatic features are rarely the reason why complex grammatical categories are not grouped in the same way in all languages[104].

Thus, in addition to characterizing the habitual nature of the past tense, T. Givon's[105] response to J. Bybee's argument primarily addresses the theoretical nature of the issue[106].

However, it becomes clear that these observations of J. Bybee are not arguments against the typological application of the concept of "irrealis", but they can be considered as a feature of the realist category, depriving them of the "evaluation part". In fact, if the category of realis is made on the basis of the system of verb conjugation, it is possible to predict the features of the distribution of the meanings of different semantic fields between groups of realis and irrealis. From this approach, it becomes clear that this theoretical debate is actually about purely practical evidence. First, the same grammatical contexts can be designated realis in some languages and irrealis in others. Second, some "normally realistic" contexts are likely to be represented as unrealistic. In the process of discussing these issues, one can come across a number of similar misleading arguments. However, we have not found a theory that offers a clear solution to the problem common to all languages.

It seems that in every language, contexts describe a concrete reality. It is effective to refer to typical contexts for the use of realis and irrealis markers. That is why, when the realization of realis/irrealis is analyzed typologically, it becomes clear that the logical approach is the same for different systems.

In a number of languages, the category of realis is considered to be unrelated to the contrast between participle and non-participle forms. In these languages, the opposition

---

[104] Cormack A., Neil S. Modal and Negation in English // Modality and its Interaction with the Verbal System. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2002. – P. 133-163; Cristofaro S. 'Descriptive Notions vs. Grammatical Categories: Unrealized States of Affairs and "Irrealis"?' Language Sciences 34: 2012. – P. 131-146.

[105] Givón T. Irrealis and the Subjunctive. Studies in Language 18. 1994. – P. 265-337.

[106] Bybee J.L. 'Mechanisms of Change in Grammaticization: The Role of Frequency; in B. D. Joseph and R. D. Janda (eds.), The Handbook of Historical Linguistics (Reference Online edition). Oxford: Blackwell, 2004. – P. 602-623; Bybee J. L., Suzanne F. Modality in Grammar and Discourse: An Introductory Essay; in Joan L. Bybee and Suzanne Fleischman (eds.), Modality in Grammar and Discourse. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1995. – P. 1-14.

of real and unreal forms in the negative form exactly repeats the signs of reality and unreality in the affirmative form.

In comparative languages, the border between realis and irrealis runs along the line that separates the past and present from the future, and separates the past and present from the future. It is emphasized that the events that are happening now or happened in the past belong to the realm of realis, and the events that will happen in the future belong to the realm of irrealis. We pay attention to the fact that the negative grammatical form of the realis or irrealis event has the same indicator as the affirmative. At the same time, it is realized that any undivided predication is connected with an event that has no place in real reality.

For example, both past and present negation and affirmation in English and Uzbek can mean realist realization. If a sentence expressing a propositional meaning in these languages should be included in the realis or irrealis category, it is not the reality of the event, but the real reality in the context of reasoning that is evaluated. It is determined, first of all, by the temporal reference of the event, and the boundary between the realis/irrealis world separates the past from the present. They represent the present reality as opposed to an imagined future. For instance: *And things had taken such strange turns lately that a country would probably bargain, would want concessions or some sort of exchange before releasing a foreign national* (Ruth Rendell. Shake hands for ever. 190-page); *Uch-to'rt so'm ishlab, Orifga bersam zoraki ko'ngli ko'tarilsa, kutubxonasiga kitob olib xursand bo'lsa degan niyatda darhol yeng shimarib ishga kirishib ketdim* (To'xtaboyev X. Sariq devni minib. 157-bet).

In ungrammatical languages, the realist category is determined by the relation of the sentence to the tense. The approach to the division of real and unreal realities is evaluated logically. Therefore, since the realist category in the compared languages does not depend on the opposition of participle and non-participle forms, it is not important to determine whether the situation happened or not, the real status of the sentence. In this sense, it seems appropriate to support the idea of a logical understanding of the realist, connecting the real reality of the event with real events. Let's focus on the following

examples: *He had been in the kitchen for about half an hour, and perhaps <u>Hathall believed</u> he had already left the house, for he had made a very rapid recovery from his abandonment to grief, and was standing by the window peering closely at something on the front page of the morning paper* (Ruth Rendell. Shake hands for ever. 19-page); *Yo bir-birlari bilan kim ko'p ishlashga musobaqa o'ynashgan yoki o'zlari shunaqangi chaqqon ishlashga o'rganib qolishgan <u>bo'lsa kerak</u> deb o'yladim* (To'xtaboyev X. Sariq devni minib. 23-bet).

However, the realist can be analyzed as an expression of both actual and non-actual reality that constitutes certain characters during speech. In this case, the existence of a realist is a reality with a high degree of probability. However, both the past tense and the present tense express the meaning of the specific tense during speech. Separating the real from the irrealis based on the line separating the situation from the past and the present to the future is explained by a pragmatic interpretation.

Thus, the consideration of examples that can be considered as cases of inconsistent use of indicators realis and irrealis is the basis for reaching the following conclusions. Due to the fact that the realis category is strongly influenced by the opposition of the grammars of other verb categories and different verb categories are not mutually exclusive and their grammar can be combined in one way or another, controversial situations may arise in some cases. An example of this is when one gramme (for example, past tense) requires a realis indicator, and another (for example, a negation) requires an irrealis indicator.

References

1. Bybee J.L. 'Mechanisms of Change in Grammaticization: The Role of Frequency; in B. D. Joseph and R. D. Janda (eds.), The Handbook of Historical Linguistics (Reference Online edition). Oxford: Blackwell, 2004. – P. 602-623.

2. Bybee J. L., Suzanne F. Modality in Grammar and Discourse: An Introductory Essay; in Joan L. Bybee and Suzanne Fleischman (eds.), Modality in Grammar and Discourse. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1995. – P. 1-14.

3. Cormack A., Neil S. Modal and Negation in English // Modality and its Interaction with the Verbal System. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2002.

– P. 133-163; Cristofaro S. 'Descriptive Notions vs. Grammatical Categories: Unrealized States of Affairs and "Irrealis"?' Language Sciences 34: 2012. – P. 131-146.

4. Givón T. Irrealis and the Subjunctive. Studies in Language 18. 1994. – P. 265-337.

O'ZBEK TILIDA TANA HARAKATINI IFODALOVChI FE'L LEKSEMALARINING INGLIZ TILIDAGI EKVIVALENTLARINI O'RGANISh JARAYONIDAGI MUAMMOLAR VA ULARNING   YEChIMLARI

Nigora AVEZOVA
O'zbekiston davlat jahon tillari universiteti katta o'qituvchisi

Annotatsiya: *So'z shakli, o'zaro bog'langan so'zlarning semantik tuzilishi va ularning nutqda ishlatilishi turli xil tillarda turlichadir. O'zbek va ingliz tillaridagi tana harakati a'zolarini ifodalovchi fe'llar o'zaro qiyoslanganda, har ikki tilda ham bunday fe'llarning ifodalanishida o'xshash va farqli jihatlar mavjud ekanligi aniqlandi.*

Hozirgi kunda dunyodagi globallashuv jarayonlari bois, har bir fanda qator yangicha yondashuvlar vujudga kelmoqda. Shu bilan bir qatorda xorijiy tillarni yaxshi o'zlashtirib, ikkala tilda ham birdek tarjima jarayonlarini amalga oshiradigan kadrlarga ehtiyoj oshib bormoqda. Bu jarayonda matnlarni, frazeologik birliklarni o'zbek tilidan ingliz tiliga yoki aksincha, ingliz tilidan o'zbek tiliga tarjima qilishda, yekvivalentlikni aniqlashda qator qiyinchiliklar yuzaga kelmoqdaki, bularni yechimini topish dolzarb masalalardan sanaladi. U yoki bu birikmalarni o'zbek tilidan chet tiliga tarjima qilishda tarjimon albatta, chet tilining leksik, grammatik va stilistik xususiyatlari bilan bog'liq qiyinchiliklarni hal qilish uchun tarjima usullarini tanlash va ulardan to'g'ri foydalanish qobiliyatiga ega bo'lishi darkor. Tarjima jarayonida qiyosiy tilshunoslikdagi juda ko'p jihatlarga e'tibor qaratish zarur. Ingliz tilidagi so'zlar bilan o'zbek tilidagi so'zlarning turli xil xususiyatlarini qiyosiy o'rganish ingliz va o'zbek tilidagi so'zlarni turli xil xususiyatlari bilan farqlanishini ko'rsatadi.

So'z shakli, o'zaro bog'langan so'zlarning semantik tuzilishi va ularning nutqda ishlatilishi turli xil tillarda turlichadir. Har bir tilning o'zining leksik tuzilishi mavjud,