



THE STUDY OF GENDER BY COMPATIBILITY IN MULTI-SYSTEM LANGUAGES

Submission Date: November 30, 2022, **Accepted Date:** December 05, 2022,

Published Date: December 08, 2022

Crossref doi: <https://doi.org/10.37547/philological-crjps-03-12-07>

Journal Website:
<https://masterjournals.com/index.php/crjps>

Copyright: Original content from this work may be used under the terms of the creative commons attributes 4.0 licence.

Gulzira S. Babaeva

Lecturer Karakalpak State University, Uzbekistan

ABSTRACT

This article is devoted to the study of gender by compatibility in generic and non-generic languages, to the generic classification of nouns, articles, pronouns, to the role of coordination in gender expression in multi-system languages.

KEYWORDS

Syntagmatic, functional, semantic, tendency, classification, differentiation, ability, context, denotation, expression.

INTRODUCTION

The expression of gender in a number of languages (for example, English, Karakalpak, Russian, etc.) is increasingly established based on the syntagmatic properties of words [9, 17-18] and highlighting the following properties in them: 1) functional, related to the component role of

words in a sentence, i.e. the ability of words to be a carrier of a certain syntactic function, 2) semantic, related to the deep structure of the sentence (in this case, in particular, cases are possible when words that are functionally identical at the surface level differ at the deep level), 3) syntagmatic, related to the behavior of



the word in the syntagmatic chain, where the valence properties of the word are important [10, 10-11].

THE MAIN RESULTS AND FINDINGS

In modern linguistics, there is a tendency to absolutize the importance of gender agreement as the only means of expressing this category [4, 25]. This trend manifests itself in two directions: 1) narrowing the concept of "gender expression plan" to the framework of agreement in the genus and 2) expanding the concept of "agreement in the genus" by connecting to it those means of gender expression that have nothing to do with agreement in the genus.

The first direction has found expression in many definitions of the concept of "genus". Representatives of this trend proceed from the fact that the gender of the noun is expressed in its differentiated selective ability to combine with the word forms of the modified elements of the sentence (cf., for example, a good house, * a good house, * a good room, * a good room, * a good room, etc. Such an interpretation of gender is valid, however, only for those languages in which the generic classification of nouns is expressed exclusively by word forms of the modified elements of the sentence. Indeed, in many languages, the generic classification of nouns is expressed in their selective ability to combine with any sentence elements that differ in gender. These may include articles, pronouns-nouns, pronominal articloids, isaphetic indicators,

relational particles and other means of expressing generic classifications of nouns in various generic languages of the world.

Before considering specifically the role of compatibility in gender expression, it is necessary to reconsider the opinions common in modern linguistics about the role of coordination in the system of grammatical gender. So, it is impossible to agree with the opinion of J.Vandries, which the Indo-European genus reduces exclusively to agreement [2, 85]. It is also impossible to accept L.Elmslev's statement that gender serves "simple purposes of coordination" [3, 115], since in many modern Indo-European generic languages, coordination is clearly on the wane, and in some of them it simply does not exist, being displaced by other means of gender expression.

Let us turn to the role of coordination in gender expression in the English language, the discussion about the presence or absence of a gender in which continues throughout the history of the description of its grammatical structure. The diagnostic contexts given below clearly indicate that the nouns of modern English have a differentiated ability to combine with sentence elements that differ in kind (personal, possessive and reflexive pronouns of the 3rd person units);

- 1) Tell the boy that he (*she, *it) must do his (*her, *its) home-work himself (*herself, *itself) ("Tell the boy that he must do his own homework");
- 2) Tell the girl that she (*he, *it) must do her (*his, *its) home-work herself (*himself, *itself) ("Tell



the girl that she should do her homework herself").

In these sentences, the nouns boy ("boy") and girl ("girl") differentially relate to the choice of pronouns from the general set of English pronouns that differ in gender: boy is combined in the sentence only with masculine pronouns, and girl - only with feminine pronouns.

3) Where is your house? It is far from here ("Where is your home? He is far from here") (It is impossible to say: *He is far from here; *She is far from here); The war came to its end ("The war has come to its end") (Impossible: The war came to *his end; The war came to *her end); The quarrel stopped by itself (the quarrel stopped by itself) (impossible: The quarrel stopped by *himself; The quarrel stopped by *herself). In these sentences, the nouns house ("house"), war ("war") and quarrel ("quarrel") showed the ability to combine only with neuter pronouns.

The differentiated ability to combine with pronouns that differ in gender is based on the generic classification of English nouns, according to which the noun boy ("boy") refers to the masculine, the noun girl ("girl")- to the feminine, and the nouns house ("house"), war ("war") and quarrel ("quarrel") to the middle generic classes. The differentiated ability of Russian and English nouns to combine with certain elements differing in gender is based on a single three-gendered classification. In each of these languages there is a means to express this unified classification. The

difference lies only in the discrepancy of these means (agreement in the genus in Russian and pronominal correlation in English). However, this difference is not essential: what is important is that both tools perform a single grammatical function with the same accuracy and rigor.

Another manifestation of this trend is the broad interpretation of the concept of "agreement in kind". Some linguists include here both the pronominal correlation, and the article, and a number of other means of expressing the category of gender that are not related to agreement. The authors of the "Grammar of Modern English" wrote: "Personal nouns of the 3rd person agree with their antecedents, both in number and in gender (in the case of pronouns of the 3rd person singular he ("he"), she ("she") and it ("it")) [11, 369]. It follows from this that they proceed from the presence of the category of gender expressed by pronouns, but this way of expressing gender refers to their agreement. It is difficult to agree with this, since gender agreement is based on differences in word forms, and pronominal correlation is based on words that differ in gender; pronouns he ("he"), she ("she") and it ("it")- different pronouns are nouns, not word forms of one word.

It is noteworthy that from the above contexts, new studies [5, 103-104] establish the presence of two planes in the grammatical characteristics of personal pronouns that are actualized when expressing gender-gender semantic relations.

The first of them is directly focused on the description of the denotations of personal



pronouns and, in particular, on their division in terms of the role in the communication process (division by persons), quantitative and qualitative characteristics (the latter characteristic reflects the differences between persons and objects, and for persons also differences based on gender).

The second plan includes grammatical categories related to the functioning of personal pronouns as syntactic equivalents of names in sentences and phrases. These are general categories of gender, number and case.

While differences in the first plan are differences between individual words in the system of personal pronouns, differences in the second plan are differences in the forms of the same thing. The category of the person always belongs to the first plan, and the category of the case belongs to the second plan. As for number and gender, in the history of the English language there was a transition of these categories from one plane to another [6, 88-89]. The Old English system of personal pronouns was characterized by the isolated existence of a subsystem of communicative personal pronouns (pronouns of the 1st and 2nd person) and non-communicative personal pronouns (pronouns of the 3rd person). In the first of these subsystems, the number belonged to the first grammatical plan (this is evidenced by the presence of a dual number, which was not found outside the system of personal pronouns in Old English), and the gender category was absent.

In non-communicative personal pronouns, the categories of gender and number reflected the

morphological characteristics of the replaced nouns, and therefore belonged to the second plan [7, 205].

CONCLUSION

In the Middle English period, there was a loss of the dual number of communicative personal pronouns, and the use of the plural to denote a single passive communicant with polite treatment (in the 2nd person) also began. The subsystem of non-communicative personal pronouns, in turn, underwent a restructuring associated with the loss of the gender category in Middle English nouns. As a result of this loss, generic forms of non-communicative personal pronouns lost their support in the grammatical gender of the noun and, thus, moved from the second to the first grammatical plan. As a result, instead of four forms of a single pronoun of the 3rd person, four special pronouns appeared, which weakened the contrast between the two subsystems of personal pronouns and caused a number of changes aimed at strengthening the internal unity of the system of personal pronouns, at separating it from other nominal classes of words in morphological terms [8, 60-61].

REFERENCES

1. Блумфилд Л. Язык.- М.: Прогресс, 1968.- С. 204.
2. Вандриес Ж. Язык: Лингвистическое введение в историю.- М.: Соцэкгиз, 1937.-С. 85.



3. Ельмслев Л. О категориях личности-неличности и одушевленности-неодушевленности // Принципы типологического анализа языков различного строя.- М., 1972.- С. 115.
4. Зализняк А.А. К вопросу о грамматической категории рода и одушевленности в русском языке // Вопросы языкознания.- М., 1964.- №4.- С. 25.
5. A practical English grammar.- New York: Harcourt, 1998.- P. 103-104
6. Binrert P.J. Generative grammar without transformations.- Berlin etc.: Mouton, 2004.- P. 88-89
7. Campbell A. Old English grammar.- Oxford: University Press, 1999.- P. 205.
8. Langacker R.W. Language and its structure.- New York: Harcourt, 2004.- P. 60-61.
9. Langendoes D.T. Essentials of English grammar.-New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 2000.- P. 17-18.
10. Muir J. A modern approach to English grammar. An introduction to systemic grammar.- London: B.T.Batsford LTD., 2002.-P. 10-11.