

How to Cite:

Tolibovna, H. G. (2022). Semantic-pragmatic analysis of female and male ways of communication. *International Journal of Health Sciences*, 6(S1), 12529–12538.
<https://doi.org/10.53730/ijhs.v6nS1.8126>

Semantic-pragmatic analysis of female and male ways of communication

Haqberdiyeva Gulrux Tolibovna

Lecturer of the Samarkand State Institute of foreign languages

Abstract---This article provides a semantic-pragmatic analysis of female and male ways of communication. The object of the study is gender-sensitive statements that reflect modern ideas about the masculine and feminine principles. In fact, the linguistic mechanisms of constructing the masculine and feminine principles, namely, lexical-grammatical and semantic-syntactic means, are being studied.

Keywords---semantics, paradigm, female, male, cultural studies, cognitive function, “femininity”, “masculinity”, gender, gender marking.

Introduction

According to scientists, in the second half of the 20th century, under the influence of cultural and social processes, there was a gradual change in cognitive paradigms in the humanities. The concept of "paradigm" (from the Greek *paradeigma* -example, sample) existed in ancient and medieval philosophy, where it characterized the sphere of eternal ideas as a prototype, a model, in accordance with which the god-demiurge creates the world of existence.

The term "paradigm" in the philosophy of science was first introduced by the positivist G. Bergman at the turn of the XIX-XX centuries, but the real priority in the use and the spread of this concept belongs to the American methodologist of science T. Kuhn. In *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, published in 1962, he explained the development of science by an epistemological paradigm shift – scientific revolution [Kun 1977, p. 29]. In modern science, a paradigm is called a system of theoretical, methodological and axiological attitudes, accepted as a model for solving scientific problems and shared by all members of the scientific community. In the process of evolutionary development in three scientific paradigms have taken shape in humanitarian knowledge: comparative-historical, system-structural, anthropocentric.

The cognitive concept of metaphor gained general ground in the 1970s. In the works of J. Lakoff. The scientist comes to the conclusion that "conceptual

system in which man thinks and acts is metaphorical in nature." [Lakoff 1990, p. 387] and "linguistic expressions are possible because metaphors are present in the very conceptual system of man" [ibid., p. 390]. In conceptual metaphor, two projections are combined - one is associated with concrete images, the other with abstract concepts and sensations, in other words, metaphorical transfer occurs when comprehending abstract phenomena and entities through the known and the ordinary. T.G. Popova emphasizes that "the cognitive function of metaphor is to master abstract through the concrete, unobservable through accessible to the sensible perception" [Popova 2011, p. 35]

A cultural metaphor activates in the mind two objects that are compared on the basis of a certain common feature, and acts "as the intersection of two conceptual systems in order to apply to the main subject of the metaphor properties and associative implications associated with its auxiliary subject" [Ryabov 1997, p. 297].

An example of a cultural metaphor is generalized categories "masculinity" and "femininity", the basis of which was the presence of two types of people - real men and women, who made up the tertium comparationis (base of comparison) "bodily" metaphor. The figurativeness of metaphor allows to transfer the properties of masculinity and femininity to other objects and conditional concepts (manly look, feminine demeanor). In works of famous linguists in terms of metaphorical opposition "femininity / masculinity" reflects the historical and philosophical tradition definitions of national character [Ryabov 1996, p. 32–33; Kirilina 1998, p. 22–23], characterological features of languages are interpreted [Vezhbitskaya 1996, p. 33–34.]

The emergence of gender theory was preceded by unsystematized attempts at philosophical understanding of the role of masculine and feminine principles in history and humanity. The metaphorical nature of concepts was discussed above. Masculinity and femininity, which has mythological roots. Understanding "male" and "female" as the eternal conflict of the earthly universe in mythological pictures of the world is reflected in stable binary oppositions, where the left term implies masculinity, and the right term implies femininity: light - dark, right - left, top - bottom, etc. A number of polar categories, which refers to the masculine and feminine principles, present in most philosophical systems: nature - culture, spirit - matter, activity - passivity, logic - emotions, power - submission, content is form. Understanding masculinity and femininity as philosophical categories O.V. Ryabov connects with antiquity, in which "the masculine principle was interpreted as the apollonian principle of form, idea, initiative, activity, power, responsibility, Logos, culture, personality, mind, abstract conceptual thinking, consciousness, justice. The feminine principle is like the dionysian principle matter, passivity, submission, nature, kind, feeling, instinctiveness, unconscious, concrete thinking, mercy" [Ryabov 1997, p. 29–30].

Analysis of the ontological interpretation of the concepts of "male" and "female" allows you to trace the most significant changes in the public consciousness, which reflect the attitude towards men and women at a particular cultural and historical stage of the development of society. Only with development in recent decades of the twentieth century of gender theory in the wake of the

struggle against patriarchal traditions and male dominance in all spheres of public life. Categories of "masculinity" and "femininity" received a theoretical substantiation in philosophy, psychology, sociology, gender studies and other areas of the humanities.

Gender linguistics (E.I. Goroshko), or linguistic gender studies (A.V. Kirilina) was preceded by feminist criticism of language, which received development in the 1960s–70s as a result of the "New Women's Movement" in the United States and Europe and with the advent of new trends in linguistics itself (psycholinguistics, sociolinguistics, pragmatics, communication theory). R. Lakoff "Language and the place of a woman", in which numerous examples prove the androcentric nature of the English language and the related female secondary in JCM [Lakoff 1975, pp. 40–43], were later published in a book by American feminist M.R. Kay's *Male/Female Language* [Key 1975] and monographs by German authors L. Pushch "German is the language of men" [Pusch 1984] and S. Trömel-Plötz "Women's language is the language of change" [Trömel-Plötz 1986].

By sharply criticizing the patriarchal system of language, in which a woman is characterized from the standpoint of opposition to a man (according to the principle "male as norm" [Frye 1996]), feminist linguistics refutes the myth of female inferiority, subordination and secondariness [Bart 1989; Stetsenko 1997], explaining the diversity of manifestations of femininity and masculinity does not congenital traits, but the influence of society and culture.

R. Bailey and R. Maggio believe that certain changes in the vocabulary composition and modification of some grammatical rules of English language can influence the attitude towards women in society. As a gender marker, it was proposed to add the lexeme woman (female) in the form phrases (female doctor) or compound nouns (businesswoman) [Stanley 1977, p. 67], other language innovations were also developed.

In revisiting the use of gender-tagged units in English language in the spirit of feminist ideas there is a certain contradiction. From on the one hand, due to the growth of professional and social female activity, the development by women of traditionally male professions, there is a development of the word-formation activity of the woman component and its derivatives in speech, for example:

- traditional lexemes *businessman*, *spokesman*, *policeman* are replaced with similar derivatives with the woman component: *businesswoman*, *spokeswoman*, *policewoman*;
- numerous neologisms appear, in which the basis of *woman* becomes an active word-building element by analogy with lexemes with the stem *man* (*to woman* (*v*) – *to man*, *womanagement* – *management*, *womanhour* – *man-hour*, *woman-year* – *man-year*).

On the other hand, under the influence of feminist linguistic transformations there is a desire to avoid the use of gender-marked words. Status *Sexist Words* (sexist terms) received the following examples:

- the noun *man*, used in their once-traditional meanings "a person of either sex";
- composites based on *man*: *mankind*, *man-made*, *manhunt* etc;

- derivatives with a gender-marked word-forming suffix:
- *waiter* - *waitress*, *hero* - *heroine*;
- masculine third person personal and possessive pronouns: *he*, *him*, *his* when used in relation to men and women, etc.

There is a set of recommendations that prescribes the use of language units that express the necessary meaning, but are gender neutral ([Maggio 1997], [Howard 1997]). Many scientists cite examples of how in English they began to “eliminate” morphemes from speech, such as *-ess*, *-man*, indicating the gender of the referent. *Waitress* is replaced with *waitron*, and *chairman* - on *chairperson* [Belova 2007 and others].

Within the framework of the first direction, the emphasis is on the social nature of the language of women and men. Characteristic features of “male” and “female” languages are attributed to social dominance. Breadth of tasks and interdisciplinary nature of research closely links linguistic genderology with psycholinguistics, sociolinguistics, cultural linguistics and cognitive linguistics. In within the framework of gender issues, socio- and psycholinguistic studies of gender reflection in speech and communicative behavior of men and women. Their purpose is to describe by what means and to what extent contexts, gender is constructed, as well as how this process is influenced by social factors and communicative environment.

Gender-specific lifestyle magazines are an independent type of media discourse addressed to a wide range of readers, covering all areas of life: health, work, relationships, fashion, sports, hobbies. The purpose of these publications is to form in readers a certain lifestyle and striving for success in various aspects of activities in modern urban reality, and the emphasis is on beauty and gender relations. From the point of view of the structural approach, I.V. Zykova highlights in the composition there are four main groups of gender-marked units, with the first three groups have a clear dichotomous division into pairs of nouns with gender contrast:

- 1) anthropometric lexemes, in which the sign of gender has defining meaning: in English - man - woman, boy - girl, maid / maiden - fellow / guy / lad, Mr - Mrs - Miss, male - female, gentleman - lady, lord, master - mistress, knight / chevalier - dame, king - queen; in Russian - man - woman, guy - girl, man - woman, gentleman - lady, gentleman - lady;
- 2) terms of kinship: in English - mother - father, daughter - son, sister - brother, aunt - uncle, wife - husband, grandmother - grandfather, widow - widower, fiancé - a fiancée; in Uzbek - husband - wife, spouse - spouse, father - mother, brother - sister, uncle - aunt, father-in-law - mother-in-law, father-in-law - mother-in-law, son-in-law - daughter-in-law, grandmother - granddad;
- 3) anthroponymic lexemes (proper names);
- 4) agentive nouns.

With regard to agentive lexemes, this paper uses classification S.V. Silinsky [Silinsky 1995, p. 96] and I.V. Zykova, who divide agentive nouns into two groups: the first group includes gender-marked nominations of people on a professional basis (*doctor*, *priest*, *philosopher*, *nurse*, *maid*, *editor*, *athlete*); second group combines the names of a person in the category “actor” with the

actual, result value and state value based on presence in their structure of the general semantic component "unprofessional activity" (*burglar, objector, mourner, gossamer, strategist, partner, representative, resident, interlocutor*) [Zykova 2002, p. 166].

In some English-language utterances, only gender the journal's addressing allows you to determine the correlation of the semantic nominations with a man or a woman: It doesn't mean **you're a people pleaser** who's so consumed with being liked that **you** never achieve greatness (Glamour, April 2016); So don't be a **tightwad**, but do point out your smart-money ways (MH, June 2015).

English lexical units with semantic marking are often have an expressive-evaluative connotation, which can be enhanced in context: When you're **an ancient old fart**, that's the reason they'll be bringing the grandkids and great-grandkids around to visit: because being part of your clan actually means something to them (MH, November 2015); Shunning the shy monkey or dancing twins does not make you a **brave crusader** for 'proper' communication (GQ, February 2016).

In English and Uzbek, adjectives can take sentence attributive and predicative syntactic positions. An attributive definition with a noun denotes a constant feature that does not exist separately from the defined object (*whitehouse, chiroyliqiz*). A more pronounced communicative meaning is an adjective in the predicate position as part of a nominal verbal predicate, when it expresses a temporary sign of an object or phenomenon (*she was beautiful, qizchiroyliedi*). The versatility of adjectives provides a blurred scope of their values, often combining the value of the attribute of the subject and the value of the author's assessment of this subject, which is realized in the context of the statement and can change the evaluative connotation [Manzullina 2005, p. 138–139].

In the discourse of the English-speaking, adjectives simple structures (*slim, good, smart*), adjectives of a derivative structure that have derivational suffixes *-al, -ic, -ful, -ive, -ly* (*fatal, motherly*) and adjectives formed from participles (*exciting, lasting, bereaved, tired*). All of them receive partial gender marking if used with a noun denoting a man/woman, or in the context statements. In English adjectival vocabulary, adjectives should be noted, which characterize only men: *effeminate* - effeminate, pampered, *dapper* - neat, dapper, *spruce* - elegant, smart. In a number of adjectives reflect exclusively female characteristics (appearance, character, demeanor): *svelte* - slender, *petite* - graceful, miniature, *willowy* - tall, slender, *buxom* - plump, strong, *dowdy* - sloppily dressed [Popova 2004, p. 209].

Qualitative adjectives in English contain qualitative a sign that, when objectifying, is conveyed by nouns, having an adjectival basis: red - redness, difficult - difficulty, important - importance. Relative adjectives express a sign through relation to subject, usually such an adjective is derived from a noun: *American* (*girl* - a girl from America), *wooden* (*box* - a box made of wood). The opposition qualitative/relative adjectives is relevant in when these adjectives change in degrees of comparison (qualitative adjectives have degrees of comparison (*powerful* - more powerful; *big* - bigger - the biggest) or can be defined by adverbs (*very strong*; *rather brave, too slow, etc.*), relative - no).

There are three degrees of comparison in English and Uzbek adjectives: positive, denoting the quality of the item beyond comparison with some other subject; comparative, denoting a greater degree of a certain quality in one object in comparison with another object; excellent, denoting the highest degree of quality in one item among all other similar items of the same quality. Degrees of comparisons of quality adjectives in English can be expressed both synthetic forms (*easier*, *shorter*) and analytical (*more interesting/important*)

In men's magazines with feminine pronouns *she*, *her* and *she*, *her woman* fits into the masculine picture of life, and in women's magazines the pronouns *he*, *his* and *he*, *his position* a man as an integral part of the female world: *Remember that 'after you' gallantry isn't always appropriate – sometimes it is more chivalrous to go first: when ascending an escalator (so you're not staring at **her**); when getting into the back of a car (so **she** doesn't have to scoot across the seat)* (GQ, February 2016);

Personal pronouns of the 1st person singular: *I*, *my*, *mine* are actively used in male and female self-referential utterances reflecting their own representation of gender identity: ***I** couldn't help noticing that **my** personal experience is much more important than what others think* (WF, June 2017);

As the author's address to the conditional addressee of the male and female gender in advice and instructions, pronouns of the 2nd person singular are in demand. *you*, *your*, performing appellative statements in incentive statements function: ***You** just have to work hard if **you** want to achieve any kind of success* (MC, May 2014).

Pronouns 1st and 2nd person plural *we*, *you*, *we*, *you* in combination with formal gender nominations (man - woman, boy - girl, *erkak/ayol*, *yigit/qiz*) can also act as markers of opposite gender groups: As **women we** always tell ourselves that **we** have to appear tough and strong. But sometimes, we need to ask for help (Cosmo, September 2015);

Use of personal and possessive pronouns in discourse plural (*we*, *our*, *they*, *we*, *ours*, *yours*, etc.) combined with the nouns *man*, *woman* imply the gender group as a whole. Gender marking of uncertain, negative, mutual, quantitative, generalizing pronouns (*somebody*, *neither of us*, *one of us*, *each other*, *everybody*, *someone*, *none of us*, *everyone*) appears in the general context of the statement: *If **a man** and **a woman** can understand **each other**, it's the first step to successful relationships* (HB, September 2013);

In modern English, the lexeme *man* is not considered universal and has practically lost its hyperonymic meaning, therefore, there is limitation in the use of words containing this lexeme when references to female representatives. As E.V. Shlyakhtin, who were previously considered gender neutral compound nouns containing the morpheme *man* and used to refer to members of both sexes, now not as such are. For this reason, the following expressions are preferred: *person/people*, *individual(s)*, *human(s)*, *human being(s)*, the use of which most adequately and neutrally towards both sexes [Shlyakhtina 2009, from 123]. As part of gender correctness, it is also proposed to replace expressions

manpower, workforce on personnel, *the staff, the workers*; *man hours* on working time; *the verb to man something* on to staff, operate, run, etc.

To gender-neutral names of a person used in masculine and women's magazines, we can include the lexemes parents, grandparents, *kids, children, grandchildren, grown-ups, adults*: **Kids** with strong father relationships are better problem solvers and perform better in school (MH, June 2015); **Kids** are always on their phones these days – make sure they know how to have a conversation face-to-face. When you're an ancient old fart, that's the reason they'll be bringing the **grandkids** and **great-grandkids** around to visit: Because being part of your clan actually means something to them (MH, November 2015).

Trends towards gender neutralization in the designation of professions and social status corresponds to the priority use in discourse in the meaning of "professional activity" and names of a person united by a common semantic component "unprofessional activity". Use in named groups nouns of gender-neutral lexemes formed with the help of agentive suffixes *-er (-ier), -or, -ee, -ist, -ite, -ant (-ent), -an, -arian, -ary, -ate, -logue (-log), -ling, -ician, -ster, -hood*, allows you to emphasize features and qualities of referents rather than their gender.

In the proposed I.V. Language classification of English agentive nouns as the name of a person, a category boundary "non-professional activity", including lexemes with actual value, state value and result value, it is enough blurred. The following nominations can be conditionally included in this category:

- gender-neutral lexemes can be relevant, reflecting the relationship of referents, friend, lover, classmate, etc.
- the lexemes author, columnist, delegate, partner, master
- the meaning of the state is characteristic of the names of persons by nationality, at the place of residence, etc.

In the absence of gender marking in the name of a person, gender the referent to which this nomination refers can be perceived in the context of the utterance or correlation with gender is carried out using pronouns *he* and *she*.

The main gender-marked anthropometric lexemes are the words *man, young man, woman, girl, boy, wife, male* and their derivatives nouns: *That was the time when **girls** turn into **young women**.*

In men's and women's publications, there are also other gender-marked anthropometric lexemes: *fellow, guy, lad, male, gentleman, king, female, lady, queen, etc.*

Gender-marked lexemes with an indefinite article perform generalizing function, for example, a statement containing man tokens, woman, etc. with the indefinite article *a*, contains a generalization – a description not with a separate subject, but with the whole group, but this means any representative of the gender group.

In both women's and men's magazines, the following are common: gender-specific kinship terms: *a father, a mother, a sister, a brother, and etc.*

The discourse uses both types characteristic of the English language gender markers: morphological and syntactic. In the nominations of the person in suffixes may be present as morphological markers morphemes *-ess, -trix, -euse, -ette, -ine, -enne, -ene, -en, -e, -a*, which form feminine derivatives from generic nominations, for example: *actor - actress, waiter - waitress, poet - poetess, hero - heroine*.

Syntactic markers of person nominations include the lexemes masculine and female attribution: male, man(men)/female, woman(women), lady, boy/girl, which form phrases of different levels of resistance, for example, free (lady doctor) or phraseological (family man).

"Female" markers form nominations that denote prestigious, or so-called "male" areas of activity, where quantitatively dominated by men, for example: *woman astronaut, woman priest, female lawyer, female police constable*.

The imitation of spontaneous oral speech, associated with the communicative nature of the discourse, is realized with the help of various introductory words and constructions (parenthesis). The author's attitude to the referent or the assessment of the described situation is expressed, for example, by modal words with the meaning of the degree of reliability of the reported (confidence, assumption, doubt, uncertainty, etc.): *obviously, certainly, surely, admittedly, indeed, naturally*.

In the discourse of male and female, various gender nominations are widespread on a semantic basis, reflecting a certain state, role, attribute, quality, function of a man or woman (*boyfriend - girlfriend*), as well as general nominations of the gender group (*strong / weaker sex, beautiful half of humanity*).

The gender marking of generalized negative or quantitative pronouns none of us, one of us is also manifested in the general context of the statement.

In the invocative sense, the connective existential verb is most in demand. More often it has an imperative form and forms a nominal verbal predicate with a predicate in the form of a gender marked noun or a short adjective: Be beautiful, because men love with their eyes!

The volutative function is also performed by compound verbal predicates, consisting of an imperative form, an infinitive of the linking verb to be, and a nominal predicative denoting the quality of the described object: Girls are taught to be feminine.

The function of a predicate in discourse is often performed by short participles, consistent with gender-marked nominations and practically not correlated with verbs. These predicative units are a means of expressing various modal meanings:

- obligation (should, must,)
- confidence (ready, sure)
- rejection (not ready)
- compliance

In instructive-explanatory (expository) types of presentation (explanations, recommendations), the validity of advice is enhanced by connective formations such as this, etc., which perform a connecting function and enrich the statement with instructive intonations and shades of colloquial speech. Such functional connective formations are expressions with the meaning of interpretation (this means, this is called); pointing (that's it, that's it, that's it), identifications (this is it, the same thing as, nothing but, no one else like); mappings (like, it's like how).

The persuasive function of the language is provided by causative verbs that denote the impact on a person or object to achieve the desired result (to force, force, entreat, induce) and subjugate a complex addition - a secondary predicative

structure consisting of the name of a person and his action, expressed in an impersonal form of the verb, by other means.

Intentional verbs expressing intention (plan, gather, intend, to plan, to be going to, to intend, to mean) are marked with a modal meaning.

In the construction of masculinity/femininity, complex sentences are involved in the discourse, in which the presence of connecting, adversative and divisive links between simple sentences is dictated by the meaning of the statement, and complex sentences that are more consistent with the explanatory nature of the discourse.

The use of a comparative relationship between clauses in complex sentences is often associated with an implicit comparison of gender groups.

The syntax of the original texts of domestic publications is distinguished by a variety of emotionally expressive syntactic figures with a rhetorical load, including anaphora, epiphora, polyunion, multi-preposition, verbal repetitions (accumulation of synonyms, gradation, parallelism), antithesis. This also includes a change in the neutral form of syntactic constructions: packaged, conveying the intonations of colloquial speech; truncated, reflecting the emotional state; plug-in constructions or parenthesis used as an additional comment. In statements with a gender-sensitive theme, phraseological units and set expressions are often used for cognitive assimilation of information. Rhetorical devices, such as hyperbole, are used to enhance the influencing effect of gender characteristics. Expressive-evaluative connotation of the characteristics of men and women is given by the following techniques:

- comparisons (non-common, common, complicated by participial, adverbial constructions or subordinate clauses)
- zoomorphisms
- personification (transferring the properties of animate objects to inanimate ones).

An analysis of the theoretical material proves that any kind of discourse (oral and written) contains a gender component. To study the gender aspect, it is necessary to use the methods of linguistic analysis of the media text, considering both linguistic means and extralinguistic factors.

Under the influence of cultural, social and economic factors, the content of the concepts of masculinity and femininity, which have accompanied humanity throughout centuries of history, is changing. In the discourse of which, in addition to reflecting modern gender norms and roles, certain models of gender behavior are actively constructed and broadcast.

A high percentage of the use of gender-neutral lexical units (person, individual, human, human being) was found in the discourse, which meets the requirements of gender correctness and corresponds to the egalitarian gender model common in western society.

In gender-oriented magazines, the names of a person are common according to a semantic feature that reflects the state, role, attribute, quality, function of a man (a fellow, a buddy, a son of a gun, boyfriend, friend, buddy, boyfriend, beloved,

groom, admirer, lover) or women (a beauty, a ladylove, a best girl, sweetheart, girlfriend, mistress, chosen one, acquaintance, bride, young lady, ex-girlfriend).

To describe men and women, adjective vocabulary is widely used and, above all, relative adjectives male/female, male/female as markers of gender attribution when characterizing appearance, character, behavior, attributes, often marking abstract concepts, these adjectives endow them with gender characteristics that carry a hidden assessment. A general marker of a gender group can be quantitative adjectives in combination with a male or female nomination (many women, many men, many girls, many guys). When designating gender categories, various types of gender-relevant pronouns (he / she), as well as generalized markers of gender groups (we, men, we, women; we are men, we are women) acquire functional significance.

A comparative analysis of the discourse made it possible to identify the use of gender-relevant language means in the context of social communication, to identify pan-European trends in understanding modern gender concepts and to note the national features of their content. The conducted research considers the possibilities of language means in the implementation of the gender component in discourse and gender, which can be applied to all types of discourse.

References

1. Belova, T.M. Gender metaphor as a reflection of the cultural concept of "masculinity" in French: dis. ... cand. philol. Sciences: 10.02.19 / Belova Tatyana Muhoramovna. - Kemerovo, 2007. - 270 p.
2. Kun, T. The structure of scientific revolutions / T. Kun. - M.: Progress, 1977. - 300 p. 145..
3. Lakoff, J. Metaphors we live by / J. Lakoff, M. Johnson // Theory of Metaphor. - M., 1990. - S. 387-415
4. Popova, T.G. National-cultural semantics of the language and cognitive-sociocommunicative aspects (on the material of English, German and Russian languages): dis. ... Dr. Philol. Sciences: 10.02.19 / Popova Tatyana Georgievna. - M., 2004. - 288 p.
5. Popova, T.G. The role of the cognitive function of metaphor in creating a picture of the world / T.G. Popova // Foreign languages in higher education. - Ryazan: Ryazan State University. S.A. Yesenin. - 2011. - No. 2. - P. 34-36.
6. Ryabov, O.V. Woman and Femininity in the Philosophy of the Silver Age / O.V. Ryabov. - Ivanovo: Ivanovo State University, 1997. - 160 p.
7. Safarov Sh. The cognitive principles of ytranslation studies. Tashkent, Publishing House "Navruz", 2019.
8. Stanley, J.P. Gender-marking in American English: Usage and reference / J.P. Stanley // Sexism and language. - Urbana: National Council of Teachers of English, 1977. - P. 44-76.
9. Vezhbitskaya, A. Language. Culture. Cognition / A. Vezhbitskaya // transl. from English, resp. ed. M.A. Krongauz, entry. Art. E.V. Paducheva. - M.: Russian Dictionaries, 1996. - 416 p.
10. Zykova, I.V. Gender Component in the Structure and Semantics of Phraseological Units in Modern English: Ph.D. ... cand. philol. Sciences: 10.02.04 / Zykova Irina Vladimirovna. - Moscow, 2002. - 219 p.