



## GENDER RELATED TERMS THROUGH COGNITIVE SEMANTICS LENS: FRAME ANALYSIS.

*Ergasheva Guli Ismoil qizi,*

*Doctoral student of Uzbekistan state university of world languages*

**Key words:** *gender discourse, language and gender, applied linguistics, socio-cognitive terminology, cognitive categories, frame analysis, the term discrimination.*

The conception I deal with expresses how language functions for me as a linguist, explores the power of words, words which can do more than just stand for things, words affecting our understanding the world, words which can make us “move” forward, reveal a language power in enhancing the social-cultural life of society. Since, we attempt to explore some of the consequences of bringing the *power of words to move* to the discipline of Gender discourse<sup>17</sup>.

Modern researches dealing with the topic “language and gender” work from the premise that we should not take the language of gender for granted. Since the very topic in the form of linguistic forms in the special language has intricate, interesting, and sometimes debatable histories to study, as “Debates about language are really about issues of race, gender, class, or culture” [6,5].

In recent decades the interconnection between gender issues and applied linguistics has become one of the most researched subjects among scholars. The very interconnection, in particular in the aspect of terminology and translation, is the main concern of the present study.

The following work challenges the principles of traditional Terminology testing the perspective relevance of some of the insights and methodologies of cognitive semantics for descriptive Terminology. Since a very pressing issue on the agenda of the Uzbek linguistics is the introduction of new approaches towards terminology studies.

We claim that modern national researches in the scope of terminology, dealing with the vocabulary of specialized

subjects, are cut from the natural functionality of language; the study how social gender discourse terminology, in international and national contexts and language in general, is determined by the conscious and unconscious way we categorize and conceptualize the world.

Thus, traditional Terminology has been integrated into a totally different space in the 1990s; the approach from communicative [1], and sociocognitive terminology [7] viewpoint.

Scientific terminology as it occurs in gender discourse is not given any attention from a perspective of ‘understanding’, since terminology is condemned to be studied as a meta-language only, almost on a par with nomenclature.

The present study is made on the main thesis of Lakoff “that we organize our knowledge by means of structures called *idealized cognitive models*, or ICMs, and that category structures and prototype effects are the by-products of that organization” [4]. Each ICM is a complex structured whole which uses four kinds of structuring principles: propositional structures (as in Fillmore’s frames), image schematic structures (as in Langacker’s cognitive grammar, 1987), metaphoric and metonymic mappings (as described by Lakoff and Johnson, 1980).

Aiming at making categories understood by frame analysis method we will consider how categories get defined in human rights texts, hence to understand a category is part of understanding the frames or idealized cognitive models of the category inherent to different cultures.

It is worth noting that that the ICMs of the category “discrimination” have been studied within the scope of the article published in the

<sup>17</sup> The scope of our research covers the interpretation of *gender* as the social cultural construction of both sexes.



*East Journal of Translation. CIUTI (China)* [3]. The process of compiling a glossary of Gender terms urged us to deal with human rights texts such as the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women – CEDAW. The term *discrimination* has been analysed as a means to shed light on related concepts, since it is considered to be the basic term around which gender issues at a national and international level are being discussed and introduced. To justify our claim that using a metaphor theory approach (Lakoff and Johnson) gives the translator and terminologist a substantial evidence of the text producer's language and world, which will undoubtedly be a helpful tool in the process of translation of gender terms, the denotative descriptors of the term *discrimination* have been constructed on the basis of data provided by British National Corpora: DISCRIMINATION IS THE ENEMY; DISCRIMINATION IS A THREAT; DISCRIMINATION IS UNDER THE LAW; LAW IS UP, DISCRIMINATION IS DOWN; EQUALITY IS UP, DISCRIMINATION IS DOWN; LAW IS AN ENTITY; DISCRIMINATION ACT IS AN ENTITY; LAW (DISCRIMINATION ACT) IS CONSUMING; LAW IS A POWER, LAW IS A SUBSTANCE, LAW IS A CONTAINER, LAW IS A PERSON (more in the mentioned article).

The support for proposition that the frame structure of knowledge is viable for understanding the category *discrimination* in human rights texts will be studied in the following analysis.

Framing is one of the most well-known cognitive categories. According to M.Minsky, framing is a declarative way of representing knowledge, formulated in terms of descriptions. The essence of M.Minsky's conception, as one of the first scientists who developed the theory of frames, is the following: facing a new situation, a person extracts from his memory a certain model (frame) that, if necessary, changes it according to reality. Thus, frame is understood as the structure of knowledge about a typified object or stereotyped situation [10,155].

Modern cognitive theory claims that categorisation is based on similarity in terms of a holistic gestalt, which can imply perceptual, interactional and functional attributes. Yet, because *frames* provide the possibility of understanding, the gestalt structure of frames is directed towards more detailed extension of the knowledge about particular concept.

V.Krasnih considers frame-structures of knowledge as components of the of native speakers cognition – "a certain structured set of basic-necessary knowledge and minimized ideas of the given national lingua-cultural community" [9,54].

Dealing with terminology from cognitive viewpoint P.Faber notes that "Frames also fall within cognitive linguistic approaches, and are a type of cognitive structuring device based on experience that provide the background knowledge and motivation for the existence of words in a language as well as the way those words are used in discourse < ... > a description of conceptual relations as well as a term's combinatorial potential [5,123]".

It is worth noting that frames are not considered as arbitrarily allocated "pieces" of knowledge. According to Teun Van Dijk, in contrast to a simple set of associations, these units contain the basic, typical and potentially possible information that is associated with a particular concept. ... It is possible that frames are more or less conventional by nature and therefore can define and describe what is typical for a given society [8,35].

On the ground of the above mentioned views a metaphorically constructed hypothesis in terms of the window may be formulated, i.e. "*frames* are rigidly constructed elements of the gestalt *window*", since the unity of separate frames presents an image (knowledge) of the window".

The analysis below demonstrates a schematic representation, i.e. a combinatorial potential (Faber, 2009) of the term *discrimination*; how the language gestalt provides a didactic frame model for *discrimination*.

*General forms* of the category *discrimination*: age, caste, class, color,



disability, genotype, height, language, looks, mental type, race /ethnicity / nationality, rank, religion, sex / gender, sexuality.

*Types of Discrimination:* direct discrimination, indirect discrimination, multiple discrimination harassment, victimization.

*Specific forms* of the category are implied in the social forms, in the forms of manifestations, countermeasures, etc.:

*Social forms:* AIDS stigma, Adulthood, Anti-albinism, Anti-autism, Anti-homelessness, Anti-intellectualism, Anti-left handedness, Genderism, Handicapism, Heteronormativity, Heterosexism, Homophobia, Intersex discrimination, Lesbophobia, Misogyny.

*Manifestations:* Class conflict, Democide, Employment, LGBT hate crime, Gay bashing, Gendercide, Sex-selective abortion, Slavery, Wife selling, White flight, Supremacism.

*Countermeasures:* Anti-discrimination law, Affirmative action, Cultural assimilation, Desegregation, Diversity training, Empowerment, Ethnopluralism, Human rights, Intersex rights, Masculism, Multiculturalism, Racial integration, Self-determination, Social integration, Toleration.

CEDAW formally prohibits *discrimination* on basis of the following frames:

stereotyped roles for men and women (article 5a)

responsibility of men and women in the upbringing the children (5b)

traffic in women and exploitation of prostitution (article 6)

political and public life of the country (article 7)

represent the Governments at the international level (article 8)

nationality (article 9)

education (article 10)

employment (article 11)

health care (article 12)

economic and social life (article 13)

rural women (article 14)

civil matters (article 15)

marriage and family relations (article 16)

To understand how discrimination is conceptualized and categorized in international context, in particular *in the context of the UK*, the frame structure of *discrimination* has been studied in the category *employment (CEDAW article 11)*, in which discrimination was formally prohibited on grounds of:

race (1965)

gender (1975)

disability (1995)

sexual orientation (2003)

religion (2003)

age (2006)

The adoption of the *EQUALITY ACT 2010* in the UK demonstrates that frames have been renewed and multiplied:

Age Discrimination

Disability Discrimination

Race Discrimination

Discrimination by Religion/Beliefs

Marriage/Civil Partnership

Discrimination

Sex Discrimination

Sexual Orientation Discrimination

Gender Reassignment Discrimination

[Pregnancy/Maternity Discrimination](#)

The frame analysis due to “understanding” of the term, from hermeneutic approach, will undoubtedly contribute to any process of inter-linguistic mediation, such as translation. In this sense, cognitive linguistics approaches have the virtue of regarding conceptual structure as a fundamental part of language. As Cliff Goddard and Anna Wierzbicka consider the cognitive linguistics is to be seen as “a movement or a coalition” [2,124], rather than a single approach and the subject we deal with can rightly be seen as one of the research programs within this broad movement or coalition.

The flexibility of frame organised lexical items is to a large extent the result of a mechanism of polysemisation. The category *discrimination* has exploited its polysemic potential several times in the course of its history. This is an issue that will be dealt with in the following studies.



---

---

The list of used of literature

1. Cabre Teresa. Terminology. Theory, methods and applications. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1999. Web. 27.04.16.
2. Cliff Goddard, Anna Wierzbicka. Men, women and children: the conceptual semantics of basic social categories // Goddard Cliff C., Wierzbicka Anna A. Words and Meanings: Lexical Semantics Across Domains, Languages, and Cultures. Oxford University Press. 2014. - 352 p.
3. Ergasheva G.I. "Translation and cognitive linguistics: metaphorical models of the concept discrimination". *East Journal of Translation. CIUTI*, - pp.39-48.
4. LAKOFF GEORGE. WOMEN, FIRE AND DANGEROUS THINGS, CHICAGO: UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS. 1987. - P.68. WEB. 04.11.10.
5. Pamela Faber Benítez. The cognitive shift in terminology and specialized translation. University of Granada. 2009. <https://www.researchgate.net/> - p.123.
6. Romaine Suzanne. *Sociohistorical Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1982. [www.ejtrans.com](http://www.ejtrans.com)
7. Temmerman Rita. Towards New Ways Of Terminology Description. The sociocognitive-approach. – John Benjamins B.V. 2000.
8. Ван Дейк Т.А. Контекст и познание. Фреймы знаний и понимание речевых актов // Язык. Познание. Коммуникация. – М.: Прогресс, 1989. – С. 12-41.
9. Красных В.В. Строение языкового сознания: фрейм-структуры. Когнитивная семантика. Часть 1. – Тамбов, 2000. – С. 53-55.
10. Минский М. Остроумие и логика когнитивного бессознательного // Новое в зарубежной лингвистике. – Вып. 23. – М.: Прогресс, 1988. – С. 281-308.

**Эргашева Г. Гендерга оид терминлар когнитив семантика нуқтаи назаридан: фрейм таҳлил.** Мақолада жинслар тенглигига комплекс ёндашув дискурсининг асосий тушунчаларидан дискриминация – камситилиши терминининг фрейм таҳлили ўтказилади. Зеро, ушбу таҳлил терминолог ва таржимоннинг гендер тадқиқотларида оид ишлари жараёнида тўғри стратегияни танлашида муҳим аҳамиятга эга.

**Эргашева Г. Гендерные термины сквозь призму когнитивной семантики: фреймовый анализ.** В статье проводится фрейм анализ одного из ключевых терминов дискриминация в рамках дискурса комплексного подхода к проблеме равенства женщин и мужчин. Анализ послужит инструментом для терминолога и переводчика в выборе правильной стратегии в работе с гендерной проблематикой.

---

---