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ABSTRACT: This article deals with the interconnected study of language and gender. The article discusses the differences and similarities of linguistic units that verbalize the concept of “gender” in English and Uzbek languages.

The issues of gender field, in particular, classification of gender verbalizers according to linguistic hierarchy were described. While the current results indicate that there are differences in gender expression in English and Uzbek languages, they cannot answer the question of the process by which these differences arise or whether language systems play a causal role.
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INTRODUCTION

Although investigations of gender and language started in 1970s, interests to gender studies have increased dramatically in recent years. The publication of Robin Tolmach Lakoff’s groundbreaking book Language and Women’s Place by Harper&Row in 1975 has long been heralded as the beginning of the linguistic subfield of language and gender studies. Gender is a core of research in many fields, such as gender linguistics, anthropology, cultural studies, psycholinguistics, sociolinguistics etc.

English and Uzbek languages are relatively gender-neutral languages compared to many of its closest relatives. At the very least, it does not have grammatical gender, which one would imagine would remove the very possibility of many of the complications gendered language can cause modern society. But actually, both languages contain a great deal of gender-specific language use, ranging from differences on the phonetic level to differences in textual units. We are going to analyze the verbalizers of gender concept in English and Uzbek languages.

THE MAIN FINDINGS AND RESULTS

Early pre-feminist linguistic research moved between the view that women’s and men’s language signals biological differences, and the view that it symbolizes social gender roles, whereas feminist linguists have argued for the latter (Cameron, 1997). The former approach can be found as early as 1922, in the work of Danish linguist, Otto Jespersen. Jespersen made claims about certain gender differences (discussed in Cameron, 1990): women using more adverbs of intensity (e.g. ‘awfully pretty’, ‘terribly nice’) due to a tendency to hyperbole; women not finishing their sentences, due to not having thought out what they are going to say; men being linguistic innovators (e.g. coining new words) and women having a less extensive vocabulary than men. While there are various reasons for criticizing such claims – especially their reliance on ‘folk linguistics’ (widely held beliefs about language) and stereotypes rather than rigorous systematic research – it should be noted that not much else was written on the subject at the time.

Gender can then be seen as a broader, a more encompassing and complex term. As Graddol and Swann (1989) state, the many different life experiences of women and men cannot be simply explained by biological differences between the sexes. Biological differences cannot account for the fact that a person may be more or less ‘feminine’ and more or less ‘masculine’. Further, the many variations of maleness and femaleness over time/from one generation to the next, across cultures, and across contexts, show that the traits assigned to a sex by a culture are socially determined and, learned, and therefore alterable (Wodak, 1997; Talbot, 1998).

As far as terminology is concerned, gender rather than sex will be the key category under discussion. ‘Sex’ refers to a biological distinction, while ‘gender’ is the term used to describe socially constructed categories based on sex. Most societies operate in terms of two genders, masculine and feminine, and it is tempting to treat the category of gender as a simple binary opposition. Until recently, much of the research carried out on language and gender did so. But more recent theorizing challenges this binary thinking. Gender is instead conceptualized as plural, with a range of femininities and masculinities available to speakers at any point in time (Jennifer Coates, 2013).
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Gender is a complex and interdisciplin ary concept, which is studied as a main object of sociology, psychology, linguistics and other fields of science. Some scientists believe that the concept of “gender” relates to only humanity. However, we consider that the concept of gender can express not only human beings, but also animals and plants. There are special terms for each of them accordingly, humanogender, zoogender, floral gender.

Gender is a universal cognitive unit and it can be called as a category, cognitive semantics, conceptual semantics or concept. The cognitive opposition of “masculinity/femininity” is considered the cognitive-semancic core of Gender concept. The verbalizers of the concept of gender are characterized a field nature, and we aimed to study them on the scale of a “gender field”. On the basis of current research, we identified that gender concept will be verbalized by following invariant verbal and nonverbal linguistic units in any language.

1) Phonological units. Differences of tone, voice, pitch and intonation in male and female speech.


3) Lexical units. a) nouns: in English: woman, man, girl, daughter, father, mother, brother, sister, lass, lad, fellow, lady, gentleman, madam, mister, mistress, granddad, grandma, grandson, granddaughter, mother grabber, motherhouse, mother-tongue, mother-tree, mother-bee, man, woman, son, daughter, mister, mistress, boy, husband, wife, bride, groom. In Uzbek: ayol, erkak, qiz, o’g’il, erkak, urg’ochi, moda, o’g’il bula, qiz bula, chol, kampir, er, xotin, zaifa, mo’yolov, qalamqosh, sarvinoz, tannoz, go’zal, sanam, ota, ona; yigit, bola, o’spirin, erkak, kishi.

b) adjectives: in English: manly, womanly, fatherly, manly, family, manlike, womanish. In Uzbek: otalarcha, onalarcha, xotinjalal, erkaksfat, xotinsifat.


d) verbs: in English: to divorce, to get married, divorcing; married, marrying (these verbs do figure out a gender marker and they are neutral). In Uzbek: uylanmoq (for men “to get married”), turmu bozor, onang bozor.

- Pronouns: In English: he, she, him, her, his, himself, herself. But there are not these kind of pronouns in Uzbek language.

4) Syntactic units. a) phraseemes. In English: for women: motherly conduct, womanishly behavior, womanish approach, womanish thinking, mother craft nurse, mother of the family, mother of ten children, motherly care, motherly, Mothering Sunday, mother’s day, mother of states; for men: fatherly care, manly deed, father of the family. In Uzbek: for women: turmushga chiqmoq (for women “to get married”).

b) sentences. In English: If he be a motherless man, he is his wife’s head (Shakespeare W. Measure for Measure); Women on mischief are wiser than men. etc.; in Uzbek: Onang o’rgilson, ketaman dema!; Divydoring o’chkur, nima deysan; Otang bo’yinang, tez-tes kebli turgin, juda sog’intirib yuborma!; Onang girgitton, keldimgini, o’rir birpas, dam ol!; Ota rozi, xudo ali, Otang bozor, onang bozor; Qiz saqlasang, tuz saqla; Yomon xotin uyning sho’ri, limcha mulla dinnin sho’ri; Bir ota boqa olarmish o’nta bolani, o’nta bula boqalgansiz hittad otani.

5) Phraseologial units. a) nominative. In English: a man of word, mother of long standing, fatherly conduct, motherly care, Mother of Presidents, Mother of God, mother of all bombs mother of battles, Mother Nature, Mother Goose. In Uzbek: otaligga olmoq, onasini Uchqo’rg’ondan ko’rsatmoq, o’zini xotin-xalalarcha tutmoq, hezalakka o’xshamonk, exa xotindek, onasi o’pmagan qiz, birini aka deb, birini uka deb.

b) communicative. In English: The way to a man’s heart is through his stomach; The mother’s heart is the child’s schoolroom; A mother’s heart is always with her children; As the field, so the crops; as the father, so the sons; A father maintains ten children better than ten children one father; Like father, like son, Like mother, like daughter. In Uzbek: Er-xotinining urishi-doka ro’molning qurishi; Otalar so’zi-ajlining ko’zi; Ota go’ri qozixona; Ota qo’ynida, ota ku, qiz, o’g’il to’yi, xotin, izlandid, ona to’yi, sunnat to’yi.

6) Textemes. In English: “A girl without a mother is like a mountain with no paths, a girl without a father is like a mountain with no streams”; "A priest is who is called Father by everyone except his own children who are obliged to call him Uncle;" “One of life’s greatest mysteries is how the boy who wasn’t good enough to marry your daughter can be the father of the smartest grandchild in the world". In Uzbek: “Bu dunyoda ulug’ zot kim desang, doim onam derman, Hayotim ustuni munis, madadkorim-ey, onam derman! Bu umrim mash’ali o’chmas, hayoti surati ko’chmas, dilimga dili payvand, chamanxorim-ey, onam derman”, “Ona, onam deya keldi bir sado, ona, ona bebaho!”, “Sog’insam otajonim, izlayin qayerlardan? Sog’insam nur
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jahonim, izlayin qayerlardan? Qadrdon otalarga qush kabi talpinaman, Yig’lamay yashayman-u, ammoki sog’inaman, Sog’insam otajonim, izlayin qayerlardan?”, “Avvalo onangga, yana onangga va yana onangga yaxshilik qil, so’ng esa otangga yaxshilik qil”.

Taking into account all linguistic units relating to linguistic hierarchy given above, we decided to name these verbalizers as “Genderemes” and classified into these units:
1. phonogendereme (expressed by phonological language units)
2. morphogendereme (expressed by morphological language units)
3. lexogendereme (expressed by lexical language units)
4. phrasegendereme (expressed by phrasal language units)
5. sentencogenderemes (expressed by sentences)
6. phraseogendereme (expressed by phraseological language units)
7. textogendereme (expressed by textual language units)

All these genderemes above can be formed into a macro concept “Gender field”, and each linguistic constituent of the “gender field” can be found in any language.

The diagram below indicates the “gender field”.

According to the proportion of genderemes in the language use, they are divided into nucleus (phrasegenderemes and sentencogenderemes), dominant (lexogendereme) and periphery (textogendereme, morphogendereme and phraseogendereme) branches and relative subgroups. All above mentioned genderemes could be found in all languages, though they can be semantically, structurally or culturally different. Interdisciplinary aspects of a language study can be a casual factor of it.

CONCLUSION
The examples given confirm that the concept of gender is not only complex, but also requires to consider about a syntagmatic and interdisciplinary relationship with other aspects of science as discourse, culture, society, psychology and history. So, given the scope of the study, we have limited ourselves above to considering only the semantic and structural aspects of verbalizers of gender concept in English and Uzbek languages. We found it convenient to present our comprehensive specific observations in this regard in a monographic study.
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