

LINGVOGENDER FEATURES OF COMPLEX SENTENCES WITH A
PARENTHEZIZED INSERTIONAL COMPONENT AS A LINGVOGENDER
ELEMENT IN ENGLISH, UZBEK AND RUSSIAN LANGUAGES

M.G. Khoshimov

Ph.D. Associate Professor of ASIFL

Annotation

The article addresses one of the lesser-explored issues in the theory of complex sentences with a parenthetical inserted clause (CSPIC), specifically their linguo-genderological features in modern English, Uzbek, and Russian. In particular, it identifies and explores the genderological properties of CSPIC as linguo-genderemes in the speech of representatives of the masculine and feminine genders. As a result, a new taxonomy of the complex sentences under investigation is developed, revealing their isomorphic and allomorphic characteristics, as well as the factors that influence these differences.

Key words: linguogenderology, linguogendereme, composite sentences with a parenthetical inserted clause, taxonomy.

One of the little-studied aspects of the systematic study of complex sentences, specifically complex sentences with parenthesized insertions (CSPI), is the linguogenderological approach to their analysis. Within this approach, it is important to consider how gender is manifested in language, what characteristics and evaluations are attributed to men and women, and in which semantic domains these differences are most pronounced.

Being a relatively young and rapidly developing field of linguistic science, gender linguistics is associated with the fact that the subjective factor (masculine or feminine) is increasingly becoming the center of their modern linguistic research.¹ Linguists are interested not only in the author's narrative manifestations in the text, but also in the methods and motives for the selection of linguistic means by men and women. Therefore, modern linguistic research increasingly employs a genderological approach, according to which what matters is not the biological and physical differences between men and women, but the cultural and social meaning society attaches to these differences², although "they (biological and physical differences) are also of considerable interest, especially in the translation process".³

¹ Горощко Е. И. Языковое сознание: гендерная парадигма. — М., 2003; Гриценко Е. С. Язык. Дискурс. Гендер. — Н.Новг., 2005; Земская Е.А., Китайгородская М.А., Розанова Н.Н. Особенности мужской и женской речи // Русский язык в его функционировании. Под Ред. Е. А. Земской и Д. Н. Шмелева. — М., 1993. — С. 90—136; Кирилина А. В. Гендер: лингвистические аспекты. — М., 1999; Крейдлин Г. Е. Мужчины и женщины в невербальной коммуникации, М., 2005; Кучмезова Л.О. Вставные конструкции в аспекте гендерной лингвистики // Вестник Костромского государственного университета. Языкознание и литературоведение. Кострома, 2011. С.66-69; Панина, Н. В. (2023). Гендерные особенности функционирования английских междометий в современной американской лингвокультуре. Вестник МГПУ. Серия «Филология. Теория языка. Языковое образование», 1(49), 67-86; Тухтасинов И.М. Лингвокультурологические и гендерные особенности сложных слов в художественном тексте (на материале английского и узбекского языков). Автореф. дисс. ... канд. филол. наук, Ташкент, 2011; Эргашева Г.И. Турли тизимдаги тилларда гендерга оид терминологиянинг шаклланишида лингвистик ва экстралингвистик омилилар. Филол. Фан. докт. дисс... (DSc) автореферати, Тошкент, 2018; Coats J. Women, men and language. A sociolinguistic account of sex differences in language. — New York, 1986. — 389 p.; Lakoff R.T. Language and women's Place // Language in Society. — 1973. — N 2. — P. 45-79; Malts D.N. & Broker R.A. (1982). A cultural approach to male and female miscommunication. In J.J. Gumperz (Ed.), Language and social identity (p. 196—216). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; Spender M. Man made language. Routledge and Kegan Paul. London, 1985. D. Tannen. You just don't understand. New York: Ballantine, 1990; Tannen D. You just don't understand: Women and men in conversation. — New York, 1990; The Handbook of Language and Gender. Ed. by J. Holmes and M. Meyerhoff. Blackwell Publishing, 2003; West C., Zimmerman D.H. (1985). Gender. language and discourse/handbook of discourse analysis. Vol. 4. P. 103—124.

² Кучмезова Л.О. Вставные конструкции в аспекте гендерной лингвистики // Вестник Костромского государственного университета. Языкознание и литературоведение. Кострома, 2011. С.66-69

³ Эргашева Г.И. Турли тизимдаги тилларда гендерга оид терминологиянинг шаклланишида лингвистик ва



Thus, the main object of research in genderology is the relationship between language and gender, that is, the question of how exactly gender (sex) is manifested in language, at what levels of the linguistic hierarchy and by what means and units of language gender is expressed, while the main goal of genderological research is to reveal, describe and explain how gender is represented in language, what characteristic gender features of certain verbal means are observed in the speech of men and women in everyday communication and what linguistic and extralinguistic factors determine the use of certain gender-relevant linguistic units, in particular, CSPI, which turn out to be no less gender-relevant types of syntaxemes.

Thus, a systematic analysis of the gender-relevant properties of CSPI as one of the invariant types of complex sentences in languages contributed to the discovery of three main factors that determine the conscious and intelligible use of CSPI in speech:

1. CSPI used by members of the masculine gender;
2. CSPI used by members of the feminine gender;
3. CSPI used by members of both the masculine and feminine genders.

Next, we will try to illustrate each type separately:

1) CSPI, predominantly used by representatives of the masculine gender, for example, in English: "How wonderful it would be (*I don't even dare to think about this*) to go through life together, dreaming." (Pierre Curie); in uzb.: «Hayotni birga boshdan kechirish, orzu qilish qanchalik ajoyib bo'lar edi (men bu haqda o'ylashga jur'at etmayman)» (Piyer Kyuri); in russ.: «Как было бы прекрасно (*об этом я не смею даже думать*) вместе пройти по жизни, мечтая». (Пьер Кюри);

2) CSPI, used by representatives of the feminine sex, for example, in English: «Oh, How much I love you, *my sunshine, you, my hero, the elixir of my life*, and I'm ready to repeat this all my life! (The Times); in uzb.: «Oo, men seni qanchalik yaxshi ko'raman-a, *sen mening quyoshimsan, mening qahramonimsan, sen hayotimning manbayisan*, men esa buni butun umrim davomida takrorlashga tayyorman!»; in russ.: «Дорогой мой, как сильно я люблю тебя, *ты моё солнышко, мой герой, эликсир моей жизни*, и я готова повторять это всю свою жизнь!»;

3) CSPI, used by both masculine and feminine genders, for example, in engl.: «The people are suffering there (*they are short of staples and medicine*)» (Cronin); in uzb.: Ўғлим, отангизни ранжитманг (*"Ота рози –худо рози" дейдилар.*) (Т.Ашуров); in russ.: Вы, молодцы. парни, все сделали ради народа (*да храни вас Бог!*).

As our analysis of the use of CSPI shows, in male prose, inserted constructions that are sentence- or text-like in structure dominate, for example: in russ.: «Опять берусь за перо, чтобы сказать вам, что я у ног ваших: *что я все вас люблю, что я целую ваши прелестные ручки, что снова перецеловываю их в ожидании еще лучшего, что больше сил моих нет, что вы божественны*» (Тургенев).

As for women's prose, here inserted constructions predominate, equal in their structure to a word, phrase or sentence, for example, in russ.: «Я встаю в восемь часов, делаю (*не делаю*) зарядку и принимаю душ. Потом пью чай (*кофе*). Вечером ко мне приходят друзья, и мы слушаем радио (*смотрим телевизор*)» (Т.Н. Толстая. Двое).

Often there are cases of using one or another type of CSPI, in which various exclamations and exclamations are used, characteristic of the oral or written speech of one or another gender, for example:



1) masculine, in engl.: «*Ooh*, it's pretty dark (*he starts feeling around him*) (Friends); in uzb.: «*Oo*, juda qorong'i-ku (*u hona atrofida paipaslan boshlaidi*) (Do'stlar); in russ.: *Hy*, темновата. (*он начинает идти на ощупь в комнате*)» («Друзья»);

2) feminine gender, in engl.: «Monica: You're just jealous because your hair can't do this... (and she shakes her head more violently), *ouch!*»; in uzb.: «Monika: Siz shunchaki hasad qilyapsiz, chunki sochlaringiz buni qila olmaydi ... (va u boshini yanada qattiqroq chayqadi), voy!»; in russ.: «Моника: Ты просто завидуешь, потому что твои волосы не могут этого сделать... (и она еще сильнее трясет головой), ой!».

In addition, individual interjections expressing negative emotions have been recorded, incorporated into the structure of parenthetical constructions characteristic only of women's speech (Good God, Oh Gosh, Ooy, Geez, Oh my, Shoot, Whoopsie, Ugh, Eww) or only of men's speech (Argh, Gee, Hell, Duh, Gosh, Whoa, Boy, Man). For example, women of one South American Indian people say "Hije!" when surprised, while men say "Howa!" In another South American language, the interjection "Abo!" conveys the impression made on a person by something large (similar to the Russian "ogo"), while "Abi" is a reaction to something, conversely, very small.

As can be seen from the illustrations, CSPI function as linguogenders in the speech of men and women, and in the compared languages there are three main types:

- 1) CSPI used by representatives of the masculine sex;
- 2) CSPI used by representatives of the feminine sex;
- 3) CSPI used by representatives of both the masculine and feminine sexes, which indicates their isomorphic properties, while their allomorphic features are mostly revealed in their ethnolinguocultural characteristics associated with the original socio-spiritual foundations of the speakers of a particular language and culture.

Based on the above, it can be concluded that the study of gender-relevant characteristics of CSPI in different languages contributes to their conscious use in speech and more accurate translation between languages. At the same time, the conscious choice and careful application of gender-related CSPI types in each language, in addition to their linguostylistic features, is closely linked to ethnolinguocultural, socio-political, and spiritual-educational aspects, which, in turn, should become the subject of further specialized research.

References:

1. Горошко Е. И. Языковое сознание: гендерная парадигма. — М., 2003.
2. Гриценко Е. С. Язык. Дискурс. Гендер. — Н.Новг., 2005.
3. Земская Е.А., Китайгородская М.А., Розанова Н.Н. Особенности мужской и женской речи // Русский язык в его функционировании. Под Ред. Е. А. Земской и Д. Н. Шмелева. — М., 1993. — С. 90—136.
4. Кирилина А. В. Гендер: лингвистические аспекты. — М., 1999.
5. Крейдлин Г. Е. Мужчины и женщины в невербальной коммуникации, М., 2005
6. Тухташинов И.М. Лингвокультурологические и гендерные особенности сложных слов в художественном тексте (на материале английского и узбекского языков). Автореф. дисс. ... канд. филол. наук, Ташкент, 2011.
7. Эргашева Г.И. Турли тизимдаги тилларда гендерга оид терминологиянинг шаклланишида лингвистик ва экстралингвистик омиллар. Филол. Фан. докт.дисс...(DSc) автореферати, Тошкент, 2018.
8. Coats J. Women, men and language. A sociolinguistic account of sex differences in language. — New York, 1986. — 389 p.
9. Lakoff R.T. Language and women's Place // Language in Society. — 1973. — N 2. — P. 45-79.



10. Malts D.N. & Broker R.A. (1982). A cultural approach to male and female miscommunication. In J.J. Gumperz (Ed.), *Language and social identity* (p. 196—216). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
11. Spender M. *Man made language*. Routledge and Kegan Paul. London, 1985. D. Tannen. *You just don't understand*. New York: Ballantine, 1990.
12. Tannen D. *You just don't understand: Women and men in conversation*. — New York, 1990.
13. *The Handbook of Language and Gender*. Ed. by J.Holmes and M. Meyerhoff. Blackwell Publishing, 2003.
14. West C., Zimmerman D.H. (1985). Gender. language and discourse/handbook of discourse analysis. Vol. 4. P. 103—124.

