

Oksana Kovtun
Vasyl' Stus Donetsk National University

**The Category of Gender
in Aspects of Comparative Grammar of Evaluation,
Grammar of Creativity and Gender Linguistics:
Review of the Problem
(on the Material of Ukrainian and Russian Linguistic Cultures)**

Unrestrained changes in the life of society are a kind of „challenge to the language system, leading to transformations at all its levels since the language lives, and to live means not to remain in the same state”¹. We observe the creative modification of lexical units, the formation of new contextual conditions, new compatibility, and the actualization of not only new semantic but also pragmatic values and meanings. As a result of such transformations, there is a violation of existing norms and the formation of new norms, motivated by the manifestation of speech creation, revealing the full potential of linguistic signs, since the language, like any other living organism, is enriched, improved, modified in one way or another, due to the linguo-creative activity of its speakers².

The manifestation of creative potential, of course, is also observed in the process of using grammatical forms in the communicative space of each linguistic culture. The study of this process makes it possible to assert the presence of relative linguistic stability and, at the same time, the linguistic dynamics occurring at the level of the grammatical system³.

¹ KOSMEDA T., *The rhetoric of Ukrainians: norm violation as a language game*, Studia Ukrainica Posnaniensia, 2013, No. 1, pp. 86–87.

² KOSMEDA T. et al., *Gender linguistics in Ukraine: history, theoretical foundations, discursive practice*, Kharkiv, KhNPU named after H. S. Skovorody, Drohobych, Kolo, 2014, p. 44.

³ KHALIMAN O., *Metaphorization of the grammatical meaning of the gender of anthroponyms as a means of expressing evaluation (on the example of the models “someone [noun of the male gender] in a skirt / in stockings / in a dress”, “someone[noun of the female gender] in pants”)*, Acta onomastica, 2019, No. LX/2, p. 221.

Quite a large number of scientific investigations are projected on the study of transformational grammar. In the field of comparative grammatical studies, there is a differentiation of various scientific areas, one of which is a comparative study of the grammar of evaluation⁴, isolated from the bosom of linguistic axiology and partially described by Oksana Khaliman⁵ using Ukrainian language material. The study of the named scientist is a detailed description of the entire system of nominal and verbal grammatical categories through the prism of the grammar of evaluation, as well as an analysis of the multidimensional functional load of stylistic means that create grammatical connotation and play a key role in the process of modelling the corresponding speech genres common in the Ukrainian linguistic space⁶.

The study of the creative potential of grammar involves the description of ways to update grammatical meanings. Research in this area shows that different elements of the grammatical system of any morphological category can be updated under the conditions of text creation⁷. In the process of creative modelling of grammatical units, as a result of the interaction of actualized meanings, grammatical games arise – units that are formed based on purposeful violations of grammatical norms and restrictions to create certain communicative-pragmatic effects⁸.

The *purpose* of this research is to identify and describe the features of the actualization of the grammatical category of gender in the reception of Ukrainian and Russian linguistic cultures in the aspects of the comparative grammar of evaluation, creative grammar and gender linguistics. *The research material* includes factual data representing literary and journalistic texts, as well as recordings of fragments of colloquial speech. The *novelty* of this article is motivated by the fact that for the first time, an attempt is made to project the postulates of pragmatic grammar, the grammar of evaluation onto the theory of comparative linguistics, taking into account the methodological principles of creative grammar and gender linguistics, since the grammatical category of gender is directly related to the theory of linguo-genderology.

The term *linguistic culture* is interpreted as a phenomenon that reflects the connection of linguistic and cultural phenomena due to the type of human cognition associated with the perception of reality, human logic, attention, memory, etc. as

⁴ KOVTUN O., *Problems of linguoaxiology in the Western research tradition: an aspectual review*, Challenges and achievements of European countries in the area of philological research, 2020, Vol. 1, Riga, Latvia, Baltija Publishing, pp. 274–297.

⁵ KHALIMAN O., *Grammar of Evaluation: morphological categories of the Ukrainian language*, Kharkiv, Maidan, 2019.

⁶ Ibid.

⁷ CHEPURINA I., *Grammatical innovations in colloquial discourse*, Bulletin of VSU, Series: Linguistics and Intercultural Communication, 2018, No. 3, p. 72.

⁸ KOSMEDA T. & KHALIMAN O., *Language game in the paradigm of interpretive linguistics. Grammar of evaluation. Grammatical game (theoretical understanding of the discursive practice)*, Drohobych, Kolo, 2013, p. 116.

characteristic structures⁹. We understand the *grammar of creativity* as an important component of the linguistics of creativity, the basis of which, of course, is the human psyche, manifested in the desire of a linguistic personality to model wit, jokes, irony, speech play, and speech experiment¹⁰. The grammar of creativity studies the process of creative modelling of grammatical units to express evaluative meanings¹¹, the creative use of grammatical units, transpositional use, and their involvement in a language game¹².

In the process of this research, we use the following methods: *traditional descriptive method* using *the method of classifying theoretical material*, *analysis and synthesis* operations to represent the author's intentions regarding the actualized issues, *the method of induction* for obtaining general conclusions based on the principles underlying the proposed approaches for describing the theory, as well as *the method of the deduction* for choosing important theoretical postulates and their comprehension for the purpose of a comprehensive review of the theory, using *the interpretive method*, we formulate the author's generalizations, also based on the use of *a comparative analysis* of linguistic and speech facts.

There is a noticeable dynamic in the lexical-semantic space of the language, concerning changes in the degree of coverage of layers of the vocabulary of nouns by grammemes of the gender¹³. The changes that are found at the level of the grammatical category of gender are due to societal shifts in the perception of gender traditional opposition, which occurs in systems of related and unrelated languages^{14 15}. And this phenomenon requires a certain interpretation, a comparison of linguistic facts to comprehend existing trends. It seems that it is necessary to pay special attention to the uniqueness of language systems, the variety of forms and conditions of communication, what means the language has at its disposal for constructing gender identity, in what communicative situations, types of discourse and with what intensity it is constructed, what extra- and intralinguistic factors influence this process¹⁶. At the same time, it is important to take into account the axiological factor.

⁹ POPOV S., *Linguoculturology: from statements to explanatory*, Traektoriâ Nauki = Path of Science, 2018, No. 4, pp. 1001–1002.

¹⁰ KOSMEDA T., *Linguistics of creativity: the originality of the modeling of created units in modern Ukrainian discourse*, [In:] *Przekraczanie granic. Rosyjska, ukraińska i białoruska przestrzeń literacka, kulturowa i językowa z perspektywy XXI wieku*, red. Magdalena Kawecka, Maria Mocarz-Kliendienst i in., Lublin, Wydawnictwo KUL, 2020, pp. 133–144.

¹¹ KHALIMAN O., *Grammar of Evaluation ...*, p. 33.

¹² *Ibid.*, p. 70.

¹³ VYKHOVANETS I. & GORODENSKA K., *Theoretical morphology of Ukrainian language*. Academic grammar of the Ukrainian language, Kyiv, Pul'sary, 2024, pp. 85–86.

¹⁴ HALL K. et al., *Gender articulated: Language and the Socially Constructed Self*, Routledge, 1995.

¹⁵ SINGH J., *Language, gender and sexuality in 2020: forward Global South*, *Gender and Language*, 2021, No. 15(2), pp. 207–230.

¹⁶ MILOVANOVA M. & MAKSIMOVA V., *Gender stereotypes and means of their expression in the speech of young people*, *Bulletin of the Volgograd State University, Series 2, Linguistics*, 2011, No. 2 (14), p. 175.

The morphological category of gender is not always predictable and sometimes has illogical manifestations¹⁷. It actualizes powerful expressive possibilities in comparison with other nominal grammatical categories, which generate the corresponding semantic shades, motivated by a certain system of gender grammemes.

Each linguistic culture ascribes several stereotypical rules that regulate gender behaviour to a particular sex¹⁸. This is reflected in the language, in particular, in stable axiological formulas: *a man is the head of the family, clan, the protector*, embodies masculinity; *a woman is the keeper of the family hearth*, embodies weakness, femininity. Although these stereotypes are changing. In the conditions of the Russian-Ukrainian war (since the beginning of 2022 till the current moment), when women perform the duties of soldiers, the President of Ukraine Volodymyr Zelensky, addressing the Ukrainian armed forces, each time updates the appeal – *захисники* (male defenders) and *захисниці* (female defenders), i.e. a woman is no longer only the keeper of the hearth.

Violations of the correlation of the grammatical gender of the word with the gender of the designated person, as is known, lead to the formation of secondary shades of the meaning of generic forms, in particular evaluative ones. We should consistently take into account the role of extralinguistic factors: psychological, social, gender, cultural, etc. When modelling pragmatic meanings, it is important to take into account the ethnolinguistic consciousness of the speakers and the ideological and semantic orientation of the context, the nature of the communicative process. The fact that *the generic characteristics of people and animals serve as the basis for distinguishing them by gender*, as noted, becomes *the basis for grammatical metaphorization and modelling of several axiological meanings*.

At the heart of the generation of metaphorical grammatical meanings for expressing evaluative semantics is the contradiction between the grammatical meaning of gender and the gender of the called person, which leads to the emergence of secondary evaluative semantics. The actualization of the interchange of generic forms transforms them into means of artistic expression, in particular, such as irony, satire, and sarcasm. They are constructed based on the actualization of negative evaluative meanings, meanings implied by the corresponding grammatical games. The communicative tonalities of sympathy, respect, honour, sympathy, diminutive attitude, etc. are also modelled: they are formed by verbalizing positive evaluative meanings.

Although the lexical and grammatical category of gender differs in Ukrainian and Russian languages mainly in the focus of the distribution of lexemes within the lexical and grammatical categories of the noun, however, being realized in the speech by certain means of the language, the named category undergoes certain changes. It demonstrates the most numerous and vivid examples of the conflict between the norm and extralinguistic reality, which allows us to detect the implementation of creativity in a high degree of its manifestation.

¹⁷ MEILLET A., *Linguistique historique et linguistique generate*, Paris, Champion, 1921.

¹⁸ COATES J., *Language and Gender: A Reader*, Oxford, Blackwell, 2018.

In Ukrainian linguistic culture, we observe an active expansion of the vocabulary of feminitives and an increase in the frequency of their use, which reflects the cultural tradition and is recorded in the historical (diachronic) dictionary of women's names compiled by Maria Brus. There are about 8000 feminitives¹⁹. In the tradition of Ukrainian linguistic culture, women were considered guardians of the clan, culture, and strong personalities that influence the behaviour of men who have power in everyday life²⁰. In Soviet times, the process of feminization of the Ukrainian language was somewhat weakened. Obviously, under the influence of the Russian language, Russian cultural tradition, in which a woman was completely subordinate to the power of men (compare: *Домострой* – *Domostroy*). Today we are witnessing a pronounced trend towards the feminization of the Ukrainian language, which, however, is perceived differently by the Ukrainian society – is it approved or not approved, which affects the vector of evaluative perception of such nominations.

Today, almost all over the world, women perform functions that were not previously characteristic of them, they occupy high positions, positions, take part in the management of the state, and its protection. With the entry of women into the comprehensive social world, the number of feminitives, in particular in the Ukrainian language, has increased markedly, since linguistic reality certainly reflects social reality²¹. This fact became a signal for the appearance of the corresponding nominations – the names of women according to their occupation, profession, position, etc. Thus, today we are tracing the appearance of a fairly large number of nouns that serve to name women. Some of them are moving into the category of active vocabulary, but many still belong to neologisms and only enter into active language usage²². In the dictionary of new words of the Ukrainian language²³, we trace the fixation of such lexemes as *авіатореса* ('female aviator'), *агностичка* ('agnostic woman'), *антивакцинаторка* ('anti-vaccinator woman'), *антикорупційниця* ('anti-corruption woman'), *босичка* ('boss woman'), *гуриня* ('female guru'), *єврооптимстка* ('European optimist woman') and other ones. Here are some contextual examples: *Нещодавно українську парамедициню та волонтерку з позовним "Тайра" справжнє ім'я Юлія Паєвська було обміняно з ворожого полону* (<https://cutt.ly/w2s4MBT>); *«Підприємниця», «міністерка», «стюсарка» – фемінітиви відтепер офіційні* (<https://cutt.ly/h2s406O>).

M. Brus notes that the names of women by the nature of their actions, behaviour, inner qualities, character traits, type of temperament, appearance and internal state, abilities, inclinations, and knowledge had an evaluative connotation – they characterized women from the positive and negative sides. At the same time, a negative

¹⁹ BRUS M.P., *Feminitivi in Ukrainian language: genesis, evolution, functioning. Glossary*, Part 2, Ivano-Frankivsk, 2019, p. 640.

²⁰ Ibid., pp. 175–176.

²¹ MARKEŽIČ T., *(Ne)omejenost tvorbe feminativov v slovenščini*, *Slavia Centralis*, 2020, 11(1), p. 76.

²² MARKEŽIČ T., op. cit.

²³ *Lexical and verbal innovations. 2017–2021. Glossary*, Compilers A. NELYUBA, E. REDKO; general editor A. Nelyuba, Kharkiv, Kharkiv Historical and Philological Society, 2022, p. 124.

evaluation was most expressed among the names of women precisely in terms of her actions, the nature of her behaviour (Ukrainian *аферистка*, *бандитка*, *бунтівниця*, *виниженочка*, *гримасниця*, *комедіантка*, etc.), internal qualities, character traits, temperament (Ukrainian *авантюристка*, *гордівниця*, *задавачка*, *мерзотниця*, *ненависниця*, *плаксивиця*, etc.)²⁴. Here are some contextual examples: *Державна зрадниця* Галина Данильченко, яка називає себе мером окупованого Мелітополя, заявила, що готується масштабно святкувати 9 травня цього року (<https://cutt.ly/N2s7RwJ>); *Самопроголошений президент Білорусі* Олександр Лукашенко назвав лідера білоруської опозиції “дурою і *мерзотницею*” (<https://cutt.ly/B2s7Vz2>).

However, among Ukrainian linguists, there are discussions regarding active feminization in the field of nominations of women by profession and occupation – we observe the acceptance and rejection of neologisms-feminitives. Sometimes they are ridiculed and even intolerance is expressed towards them, but the process of feminization of the Ukrainian language cannot be stopped by this. Therefore, the meanings of many feminitives are currently ambivalent, which depends on the worldview of native speakers, their linguistic taste, etc. However, researchers of feminitives emphasize that individual feminitives will continue to form along with the corresponding male neologisms or new meanings, where possible, and eventually also settle in the language²⁵. And you can't help but agree.

In the Russian language, lexico-grammatical neologisms of the feminine correlate of nouns are also found to designate persons by profession and occupation. However, these correlates almost always have a certain expressive-emotional colouring, a pronounced negative estimated value, which is recorded in dictionaries. They determine the pragmatic orientation of the statement²⁶, let's compare: (1) *рус. – Ну и где же ваша докторесса?! (from the conversation); (2) Тоже мне, Рокфеллерша! Самой есть нечего, а еще пытается заниматься благотворительностью!.. (N. Levitina)*. In example (1), the substantive generic correlate expresses a feeling of dissatisfaction, and emotions of indignation are verbalized as a reaction to the fact that a female doctor is absent from work; in example (2), the emotional reaction and negative evaluation of the addressee is verbalized due to the fact of excessive expenses, unnecessary waste of money. However, we also note the fact of the presence of stylistically and axiologically neutral new feminitives in the Russian language, for example: *Когда докторесса поднялась после «вашей» трахеотомии в реанимационный зал, то ее мужа уже не было в живых. (С. Ямпольский); Соответствующее заявление от лица Кужель зачитала с трибуны Верховной Рады другая парламентарша Елена Шкрум (https://cutt.ly/S2s5LX2); В свои семьдесят Йоко Оно – заслуженная деятельница авангардного движения и в некотором смысле его идеальный портрет... (O. Karminsky)*.

²⁴ BRUS M. P., op. cit., p. 191.

²⁵ MARKEŽIĆ T., op. cit., p. 76.

²⁶ СЕРПУРИНА I., op. cit., p. 72.

Analyzing the problem related to the implementation of gender issues in the Russian linguistic culture, Alla Kirilina notes that in the Russian linguistic consciousness, the image of a woman has a more positive evaluation than the image of a man, compare:

Femininity is not associated with weakness, but with strength, determination, endurance, patience, love, intelligence and beauty. (...) Considering the frequency of the catchphrase “*Коня на скаку остановит...* (She will stop the horse at full gallop...)”, we can conclude that the image of a Russian woman combines strength and external attractiveness, which are not mutually exclusive²⁷.

Negative evaluation, projected onto the image of men, is associated mainly with their inherent alcoholism, and drunkenness, and partially with adultery. Traditionally, the male stereotype, in the opinion of this researcher, is not expressed in Russian linguistic culture, except for associations of *strength / strong*. On the other hand, according to this scientist, there is a certain dynamics of gender stereotypes associated with historical and social changes²⁸.

In comparison with the vocabulary material, the positive features attributed to women have intensified. Psycholinguistic experiments do not allow us to state that intellectual insufficiency and talkativeness are among the stereotypical female traits. To a lesser extent, grumpiness is represented, although lexemes expressing it are still found. The appearance of a woman is of great importance, but the appearance of a man also matters²⁹. Thus, the cultural representation of gender succumbs to manipulation in the form of accentuation of certain gender stereotypes in everyday discourse.

Both in Ukrainian and Russian, words with formal masculine features are activated for the nomination of feminine persons, and, conversely, names with formal feminine features acquire the meaning of ‘male person’³⁰. Such a technique is called “switching the gender” (Viktor Vynogradov’s term). It is used to model expression, a specific evaluative value. Although V. Vynogradov wrote about it referring to the speech practice of representatives of Russian linguistic culture³¹, Ukrainian researchers T. Kosmeda^{32 33 34 35}, O. Taranenko³⁶, O. Kha-

²⁷ KIRILINA A., *Gender: linguistic aspects*, Moscow, Institute of Sociology RAS, 1999, pp. 121–122.

²⁸ KIRILINA A., op. cit., p. 122.

²⁹ Ibid.

³⁰ KOSMEDA T., *Axiological aspects of pragmalinguistics: formation and development of the category of evaluation*, Lviv, LNU named after Ivan Franko, 2000, pp. 251–252.

³¹ VYNOHRADOV V., *Russian language: Grammatical doctrine of the word*, Moscow, 1972.

³² KOSMEDA T., *Axiological aspects of pragmalinguistics...*

³³ KOSMEDA T., *The rhetoric of Ukrainians...*, pp. 81–90.

³⁴ KOSMEDA T., *Linguistics of creativity...*, pp. 133–144.

³⁵ KOSMEDA T., *Feminine metaphor in the language of modern Russian- and Ukrainian-language newspapers (on the example of Yulia Tymoshenko’s media image modelling)*, *Przegląd Rusycystyczny*, 2021, No. 4 (176), pp. 1–24.

³⁶ TARANENKO O., *Androcentrism in the language coordinate system and the modern gender movement*, Kyiv, Dmytro Burago Publishing House, 2021.

liman^{37 38} showed that this trend is also typical for Ukrainian linguistic culture. According to O. Khaliman, the basis of the generation of this grammatical game is the contradiction between the grammatical meaning of the corresponding gender and the opposite sex of the designated person, which causes a change in the lexical meaning (secondary, in particular, evaluative shades of meaning appear), that is, the grammatical meaning, metaphorizing, becomes a means modelling the appropriate evaluation and pragmatic meanings³⁹.

The use of feminine forms for the nomination of males by equating a man to a woman causes the modelling of a negative evaluation; the use of masculine forms for the nomination of females serves both for positive and negative evaluations: a positive evaluation arises as a result of comparing a woman with a man as a strong personality, a negative evaluation arises as a rude personality with features that contradict femininity⁴⁰. Exploring constructions common in the modern Ukrainian language, such as *юда у спідниці*, *Дон Кіхот у панчохах*, *Шерлок Холмс у спідниці* to designate females with the actualization of both negative and positive evaluative meanings, as well as *Юля у штанах* to designate males with a negative evaluative value (the last of the presented models is rarely observed), O. Khaliman notes that metaphorized evaluative generic forms represent several functional options that contribute to the emergence of a system of connotative meanings. The analyzed language forms are active in modern Ukrainian- and Russian-speaking discourses, which is explained by the influence of sociolinguistic factors such as the emergence of active leaders, for the characteristics of which, according to the speakers, such a speech model is appropriate, which might not have been possible under other extralinguistic conditions⁴¹. T. Kosmeda highlights that nowadays we are witnessing a high level of actualization of femininity, that is, the normative perception of somatic, mental and behavioural characteristics characteristic of women. Femininity develops as a result of the spread of feminism as a social phenomenon associated with an increase in the status of women in society. It, of course, is fixed in linguistic forms and formulas, the linguistic picture of the world, and secondary, figurative names⁴². Thus, new trends in the use of feminines are a consequence of the increase in the status of women in society and the establishment of gender-linguistic social equality.

The metaphorical use of feminine forms to refer to males characterizes them as unreasonable, weak-willed, with weak nerves, cowardly, shy, talkative, mannered, de-

³⁷ KHALIMAN O., *Grammar of Evaluation...*

³⁸ KHALIMAN O., *Metaphorization of the grammatical meaning of the gender of anthroponyms as a means of expressing evaluation (on the example of the models "someone [noun of the male gender] in a skirt / in stockings / in a dress", "someone [noun of the female gender] in pants")*, *Acta onomastica*, 2019, No. LX/2, pp. 221–232.

³⁹ KHALIMAN O., *Metaphorization of the grammatical meaning...*, p. 223.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*

⁴¹ KHALIMAN O., *Metaphorization of the grammatical meaning...*, pp. 228–229.

⁴² KOSMEDA T., *Feminine metaphor...*, pp. 6–7.

serving of humiliation if they are equated with a woman^{43 44}, e.g. Ukrainian: *Скажи йому, що він «баба»* (М. Kotsiubinsky); *Ну-ну, не будь бабою! Вартуй, коли наказано* (Ya. Mamontov). Similar examples are also typical for the Russian language, compare: *Этот начальник – баба* (from colloquial speech); *звездюлька, звезденка, звездунья* – ‘about a popular pop singer, actor’ (colloquial, derogatory, or ironic). We also note single neologisms with the actualization of positive evaluation, for example: Russian *усатый нянь* (movie hero); укр. *Нянь для молодих облич* (Ukrayina moloda: 28–29.02.2020).

Metaphorization of gender grammes leads to a rethinking of the axiological stereotypes of *a man – masculinity*, and *a woman – femininity*⁴⁵. This is how negative evaluation is modelled for the representation of the characters of a literary text, the effect of comicality, irony and sarcasm is created mainly in journalistic and literart discourses.

The use of the metaphorical form of the masculine gender to designate females is realized in a wide system of pragmatic meanings: (1) a positive evaluative characteristic of a strong woman with a masculine character, for example: Ukr. *Не дівка, а козак!*^{46 47}; Rus. *Не девушка, а настоящий солдат* (from colloquial speech); (2) a negative evaluation characteristic, sometimes of an ironic nature, for example: Ukr. *Що я тут? – наймичка, попихач. А там – сама хазяйкою буду* (Panas Myrnyj); Rus. *Едва достали через отверстие в мусоре: в Запорожье женщина-плюшкин устроила пожар в квартире и не могла выбраться* (<https://tsn.ua/>)⁴⁸; (3) an evaluative-neutral name for females, indicating their occupation and social status⁴⁹, for example: Ukr. *Ліна Костенко, почесний професор НПУ імені М. П. Драгоманова*; Rus. *После переезда в Израиль в течение многих лет, доктор Мерензон работала в государственной психиатрической больнице* (<https://dr-merenzon.net>).

As you can see, in the Ukrainian language there is opposition to the nomination of females, compare: Ukr. *професор* (in relation to a woman) and *професорка*. The second member of this opposition in the Ukrainian language can still be used with a reduced tone, however, the number of feminitives opposed to masculine nominations increases and is characterized by a neutral evaluation. In the Russian language, the process of feminitive formation is somewhat slower and such units are not considered neutral in the evaluative sense, which is also recorded in the explanatory dictionaries of the modern Russian language, but with obligatory marks – *ironic, negative, joking* etc., compare: *авторица, бизнес-вуменша, бизнесменка*,

⁴³ TARANENKO O., op. cit., p. 44.

⁴⁴ KHALIMAN O., *Grammar of Evaluation...*, p. 121.

⁴⁵ TARANENKO O., op. cit., pp. 35–36.

⁴⁶ Ibid., p. 44.

⁴⁷ KHALIMAN O., *Grammar of Evaluation...*, p. 123.

⁴⁸ TARANENKO O., op. cit., p. 44.

⁴⁹ Ibid., p. 6.

бизнесменша, демократесса, политесса, политикесса etc.⁵⁰. Contextual examples: Российская **бизнесменша**, генеральный директор Wildberries. Ее состояние оценивается в \$13 миллиардов (<https://cutt.ly/k2dyqAW>); Поколение поэтически высококлассных традиционщиков, поэтов и поэтесс – и одновременно авторов и **авториц** именных и под псевдонимами бульварных романов (<https://cutt.ly/62dyrbR>); И хорошо, что так, иначе, как знать, вдруг странная **политесса** довела бы свое дикое предложение до уровня закона? (<https://www.kp.ru/daily/25699/901717/>).

The sexual revolution observed in modern society has many consequences, among them the cult of the body; declining birth rates in Europe and the US; 40 million abortions per year worldwide; the commercialization of sex, whereby pornography and sexual slavery have become modern global problems; popularization of social sex – gender; same-sex marriage, the growing influence of the LGBT community on culture and language, etc. As with any revolution that establishes new relations in the social system, ideologically coloured words and expressions are actively introduced into the public vocabulary, for example, *discrimination*, *homophobia*, *sexism*, *hate speech*, etc., as a tool to suppress freedom of speech and public harassment of those who disagree with the dominant ideology. As a result, a phenomenon arose in the linguistic sphere, which is called *slut-shaming*⁵¹ (a neologism consisting of the English words “slut” and “shame”) which means criticism, stigmatization, accusation, discrediting of any woman whose personal attitude, behaviour or appearance are considered provocative, too sexual or immoral. Slutshaming can be physical or mental attacks and promotes the idea that sex is dirty and humiliating for a woman. As a result of slut-shaming, new evaluative lexemes arise to designate masculine and feminine persons in connection with the manifestations of their sexuality. A stereotype has arisen: a man who has many sexual partners is *мачо*⁵² (a macho – ‘a man who demonstrates physical strength, masculinity, sexuality, deliberate rudeness, his superiority over a woman’ – is a positive connotation), and a woman is *давалка*⁵³ (Russian ‘a woman who does not refuse men in sexual intimacy due to their spinelessness, heightened sexuality’ – a negative connotation, reduced contemptuous semantics).

⁵⁰ *New words and meanings* (2), Dictionary-reference book on materials of the press and literature in 3 volumes, T. N. BUTSEVA (ed.), Compiled by: T. N. Butseva, E. A. Levashov, Yu. F. Denisenko, N. G. Stulova, N. A. Kozulina, S. L. Gonoboleva, Institute of Linguistic Studies RAS., St. Petersburg, publishing house Dmitry Bulanin, 2009–2010, Vol. 1.

⁵¹ *Dictionary of gender terms.*, Z. V. SHEVCHENKO (Compiler), Cherkasy: Yu. Chabanenko publisher, 2016, URL: <http://a-z-gender.net/slatshejming.html>.

⁵² *New words and meanings* (3), Dictionary-reference book on materials of the press and literature in 3 volumes, T. N. BUTSEVA (ed.), Compiled by: T. N. Butseva, E. A. Levashov, Yu. F. Denisenko, N. G. Stulova, N. A. Kozulina, S. L. Gonoboleva, Institute of Linguistic Studies RAS, St. Petersburg, publishing house Dmitry Bulanin, 2009–2010, Vol. 2, p. 670.

⁵³ *New words and meanings* (1), Dictionary-reference book on the materials of the press and literature of the 90s of the twentieth century: In 2 volumes, Comp. T. N. BUTSEVA, E. A. Levashov, Yu. F. Denisenko, N. G. Stulova, N. A. Kazulina, S. L. Gonoboleva; Rep. ed. T. N. Butseva, Institute of Linguistic Studies RAS, St. Petersburg, DMITRY BULANIN, 2009, Vol. 1, p. 452.

An analysis of the dictionaries of new words and meanings of the Russian language, the so-called newspeak, shows that as a result of slut-shaming in the Russian language, many words and meanings have arisen that characterize the sexuality of males and females, with a negative evaluative connotation, compare: *активист* ('active homosexual')⁵⁴, *натурал* ('a man who has a heterosexual relationship')⁵⁵, *гей* and *зэй* ('a man who is sexually oriented towards members of the same sex; homosexual, gay')⁵⁶, *голубой* ('homosexual')⁵⁷, *голубо-розовый* ('pertaining to homosexuality, homosexuals and lesbianism, lesbians; consisting of these sexual minorities')⁵⁸, *девочка* ('a prostitute')⁵⁹, *девушка* ('a prostitute')⁶⁰, *жигало* ('a man who keeps a woman company for a fee, entertains her, sometimes has sexual relations with her')⁶¹, *колл-гёрл*, *кол-гёрл* and *колгёрл* ('call prostitute')⁶², *мутантка* ('about a girl, a woman who has a value system that differs from the generally accepted one, characterized by atypical behavior, way of thinking, morality' / disapproving/)⁶³, *плечевая* и *плечовка* ('same as a prostitute')⁶⁴, *секс-дива* ('woman working in virtual sex service, phone sex')⁶⁵ etc. Contextual examples: *Чтобы в дороге не было скучно, с собой брали даму. Она и получила название «плечевая» – дама на одно плечо, на один перегон* (<https://cutt.ly/q2fSP2a>); *«Юноша по вызову» убил своего клиента* (<https://cutt.ly/c2fSD7U>); *Появляются роскошные мутантки с перевернутой, но жесткой системой ценностей: бизнесмении, девочки, мечтающие о карьере валютной проститутки* (*Krasnyj Sever (Vologda)* 30.10.1997); *Можно заказать и двух, и трех, и больше девиц. Причем в стоимость входят и расходы по проезду «колгёрл» до офиса или квартиры заказчика* (*Novye slova i znachenija*); *Недавний скандал, разразившийся в Америке из-за раскрывшейся связи президентского советника... с «девушкой по вызову»...*, *заставляет лишний раз задуматься о влиянии интимных факторов на судьбу политика* (*AiF*, 1996, 11); – *Ты не слыхал, что такое интердевушка? Ну а что такое валютная проститутка – сечешь? Во чумак! А что такое потаскушка, давалка... ну просто блядь, говоря по-русски?* (*I. Vinogradov «Noneshnjaja skazka pro Ivana-duraka»*).

⁵⁴ Ibid., p. 46.

⁵⁵ *New words and meanings* (3)..., p. 1030.

⁵⁶ *New words and meanings* (1)..., p. 373.

⁵⁷ Ibid., p. 405.

⁵⁸ Ibid., p. 405.

⁵⁹ Ibid., p. 468.

⁶⁰ Ibid., p. 468.

⁶¹ Ibid., p. 580.

⁶² *New words and meanings* (3), ..., p. 107.

⁶³ Ibid., p. 892.

⁶⁴ *New words and meanings* (4), Dictionary-reference book on materials of the press and literature in 3 volumes, T. N. BUTSEVA (ed.), Compiled by: T. N. Butseva, E. A. Levashov, Yu. F. Denisenko, N. G. Stulova, N. A. Kozulina, S. L. Gonobobleva, Institute of Linguistic Studies RAS, St. Petersburg, publishing house Dmitry Bulanin, 2009–2010, Vol. 3, p. 187–188.

⁶⁵ Ibid., p. 722.

Similar lexemes related to sex and sexuality, the meanings of which are based on specific compatibility, sometimes form generic pairs, for example: *девушка по вызову – юноша по вызову* (call girl – call boy), suppletive forms are formed *гей – лесбиянка* (gay – lesbian), *жигало – ескортниця* (gigolo – escort girl), *голубой* (blue) /substantiation/ – *розовая* (pink) /substantiation/, etc., but in most cases, such opposition is not observed.

A characteristic feature of the Ukrainian language is the active use of neuter forms to verbalize positive evaluative meanings, which is not inherent in the Russian language. Meanings with positive semantics are modelled with the help of a metaphorical transfer, the creation of a positive modality, typical for the dialogues of an adult with a child, compare: Ukr. *До речі, сьогодні вона зайде, щоб лишити тобі ще й голубці. А потім лагідно потрїпає за щічку і скаже щось у дусі «Яке ж ти худеньке!»* (<https://vsviti.com.ua/ukraine/65458>); *Ти страшний, жадливий, кровожерний, чи не так? Ой, ти моє маленьке любе дивовижне створіннячко!* (Т. Yansson). This fact is considered the national specificity of the grammar of the Ukrainian language. In Russian, this function is performed by the masculine forms of nouns with suffixes *-енок (-онок), -ец, -ыш* (*ребенок, зайчонок, младенец, птенец, малыш*). The use of the transposition technique in this case in the Russian language is expressively realized only concerning females. Negative meanings are formed with the help of purposeful opposition of the masculine or feminine gender to the average in one sentence or a specific speech situation. This is how a grammatical game with negative evaluation is modelled in the Ukrainian and Russian languages⁶⁶, compare: Ukr. *Люди живуть тисячоліттями там, а воно приперлося з лісу і все йому не те...* (<https://cutt.ly/Y2fFSX1>); *Знаю його батьків – милі, інтелігентні люди... А воно вдалося якесь таке... плохеньке* (<https://ua-mova.livejournal.com/1140716.html>); Rus. *Оно* (about the groom) *снова приходило* (from colloquial speech); *“Она была настоящим чудовищем!” – повторил он, может быть бессознательно создавая себе оправдание, и погрузил свою кирку в ее могилу до самой рукоятки* (В. Ambroz). In both compared languages, neuter nouns can be metaphorically (often in the function of a predicate) used concerning male or female living beings^{67 68} to express negative evaluative meanings, compare: Ukr. *чудовисько, страхіття, нещастя*, Rus. *чудище, чудовище, страшилище*.

The reflection of events occurring, in reality, is realized in the language through the prism of the category of evaluation, traditionally interpreted as a consequence of the linguistic expression of logical and philosophical value judgments. Grammatical means take part in the formation of axiological meanings in different types of discourse in parallel, together with lexico-semantic means. The analysis of linguistic facts illustrates the originality of the actualization of the gender category, as a result of which vocabulary and grammar can come into conflict. The purposefulness of this

⁶⁶ KHALIMAN O., *Grammar of Evaluation...*, pp. 143–145.

⁶⁷ CORBETT G., *Canonical gender*, *Journal of Linguistics*, 2015, 52(03), pp. 495–531.

⁶⁸ VYNOHRADOV V., op. cit.

conflict on the part of the addresser, its “grammatical boldness” expand the range of individual expressive means that serve to verbalize the category of evaluation, create new semantic shades of meaning, and also demonstrate the linguistic intelligence and taste of the speaker as a linguistic personality.

The study of the specifics of the functioning of language units has shown that the creative potential of the grammatical category of gender is manifested in (a) the creation of a generic correlate for nouns, names of persons, which is absent in the language; (b) changes in the gender of substantives with the meaning of a person to express an evaluative attitude towards a person of the opposite sex.

An analysis of the scientific literature on the problem under consideration, as well as a demonstration of illustrative material, allows us to assert that numerous cases of violation of grammatical gender relationships in words indicating the corresponding gender of a person lead to the emergence of secondary semantic shades, in particular evaluative ones. The frequency and nature of use, the actualization of the emotional and expressive evaluation of transposed grammes of the gender continue to be influenced by extralinguistic reality, in particular, concerning both psychological and gender factors, the national consciousness of the speakers, the ideological and semantic orientation of the context, and cultural and historical traditions. The study of grammar in the focus of linguoaxiology allows (1) to see the dynamics of the grammatical system, (2) forms a new look at the traditional problem and, accordingly, (3) contributes to the development of grammatical science itself, including grammatical pragmatics, axiological pragmalinguistics, grammar estimates.

In the Ukrainian linguistic culture, we trace active and contradictory feminine-educational processes with the actualization of ambivalent evaluation, contributing to the restoration of gender-linguistic equality. In the Russian language space, we track less activity in the formation of correlative generic derivatives-feminitives, they usually have a vernacular marker and represent a negative evaluative value.

Stable gender associations formed in ancient times make it possible to use feminine grammatical forms to nominate males, which leads to the modelling of predominantly negative evaluative meanings in both compared languages. The use of masculine forms for the names of female persons contributes to the modelling of several meanings for the verbalization of both positive and negative types of connotation.

By filling the discourse with grammatical games, the speaker can change the axiological orientation of the statement. However, the actualization of such means to model positive and negative estimated values can lead to misunderstandings (communicative deviations) if they are incorrectly interpreted in the communication process, saturated with axiological markings.

We also note the reorientation of axiological vectors due to the change in gender stereotypes, which leads to a decrease in the frequency of using metaphorical grammatical structures based on the interchange of generic forms.

References

- BRUS M. P., *Feminitives in the Ukrainian language: genesis, evolution, functioning*: Monograph, Part 1, Ivano-Frankiv'sk, 2019.
- CHEPURINA I., *Grammatical innovations in colloquial discourse*, [in:] Bulletin of VSU, Series: Linguistics and Intercultural Communication, 2018, No. 3, pp. 70–75.
- COATES J., *Language and Gender: A Reader*, Oxford, Blackwell, 2018.
- CORBETT G., *Canonical gender*, [in:] Journal of Linguistics, 2015, 52(03), pp. 495–531.
- Dictionary of gender terms.*, Z. V. SHEVCHENKO (Compiler), Cherkasy: Yu. Chabanenko publisher, 2016.
- HALL K. et al., *Gender articulated: Language and the Socially Constructed Self*, Routledge, 1995.
- KHALIMAN O., *Grammar of Evaluation: morphological categories of the Ukrainian language*, Kharkiv, Maidan, 2019.
- KHALIMAN O., *Metaphorization of the grammatical meaning of the gender of anthroponyms as a means of expressing evaluation (on the example of the models "someone [noun of the male gender] in a skirt / in stockings / in a dress", "someone [noun of the female gender] in pants")*, [in:] Acta onomastica, 2019, No. LX/2, pp. 221–232.
- KIRILINA A., *Gender: linguistic aspects*, Moscow, Institute of Sociology RAS, 1999.
- KOSMEDA T., *Axiological aspects of pragmalinguistics: formation and development of the category of evaluation*, Lviv, LNU named after Ivan Franko, 2000.
- KOSMEDA T., *The rhetoric of Ukrainians: norm violation as a language game*, [in:] Studia Ukrainica Posnaniensia, 2013, No. 1, pp. 81–90.
- KOSMEDA T., *Linguistics of creativity: the originality of the modeling of crealized units in modern Ukrainian discourse*, [in:] *Przekraczanie granic. Rosyjska, ukraińska i białoruska przestrzeń literacka, kulturowa i językowa z perspektywy XXI wieku*, red. Magdalena Kaweczka, Maria Mocarz-Kliendienst i in., Lublin, Wyd-wo KUL, 2020, pp. 133–144.
- KOSMEDA T., *Feminine metaphor in the language of modern Russian- and Ukrainian-language newspapers (on the example of Yulia Tymoshenko's media image modelling)*, [in:] *Przegląd Rusycystyczny*, 2021, No. 4 (176), pp. 1–24.
- KOSMEDA T. et al., *Gender linguistics in Ukraine: history, theoretical foundations, discursive practice*, Kharkiv, KhNPU named after H. S. Skovorody, Drohobych, Kolo, 2014.
- KOSMEDA T. & KHALIMAN O., *Language game in the paradigm of interpretive linguistics. Grammar of evaluation. Grammatical game (theoretical understanding of the discursive practice)*, Drohobych, Kolo, 2013.
- KOVTUN O., *Problems of linguoaxiology in the Western research tradition: an aspectual review*, [in:] *Challenges and achievements of European countries in the area of philological research*, 2020, Vol. 1, Riga, Latvia, Baltija Publishing, pp. 274–297.
- Lexical and verbal innovations. 2017–2021*. Glossary, Compilers A. Nelyuba, E. Redko; general editor A. Nelyuba, Kharkiv, Kharkiv Historical and Philological Society, 2022, 124 p.
- MARKEŽIČ T., *(Ne)omejenost tvorbe feminativov v slovenščini*, [in:] *Slavia Centralis*, 2020, 11(1), pp. 61–78.
- MEILLET A., *Linguistique historique et linguistique generate*, Paris, Champion, 1921.
- MILOVANOVA M. & MAKSIMOVA V., *Gender stereotypes and means of their expression in the speech of young people*, [in:] Bulletin of the Volgograd State University, Series 2, Linguistics, 2011, No. 2 (14), pp. 174–178.

- New words and meanings* (1), Dictionary-reference book on the materials of the press and literature of the 90s of the twentieth century: In 2 volumes, Comp. T. N. Butseva, E. A. Levashov, Yu. F. Denisenko, N. G. Stulova, N. A. Kazulina, S. L. Gonobobleva; Rep. ed. T. N. Butseva, Institute of Linguistic Studies RAS, St. Petersburg, DMITRY BULANIN, 2009, Vol. 1.
- New words and meanings* (2), Dictionary-reference book on materials of the press and literature in 3 volumes, T. N. Butseva (ed.), Compiled by: T. N. Butseva, E. A. Levashov, Yu. F. Denisenko, N. G. Stulova, N. A. Kozulina, S. L. Gonobobleva, Institute of Linguistic Studies RAS., St. Petersburg, publishing house Dmitry Bulanin, 2009–2010, Vol. 1.
- New words and meanings* (3), Dictionary-reference book on materials of the press and literature in 3 volumes, T. N. Butseva (ed.), Compiled by: T. N. Butseva, E. A. Levashov, Yu. F. Denisenko, N. G. Stulova, N. A. Kozulina, S. L. Gonobobleva, Institute of Linguistic Studies RAS, St. Petersburg, publishing house Dmitry Bulanin, 2009–2010, Vol. 2.
- New words and meanings* (4), Dictionary-reference book on materials of the press and literature in 3 volumes, T. N. Butseva (ed.), Compiled by: T. N. Butseva, E. A. Levashov, Yu. F. Denisenko, N. G. Stulova, N. A. Kozulina, S. L. Gonobobleva, Institute of Linguistic Studies RAS, St. Petersburg, publishing house Dmitry Bulanin, 2009–2010, Vol. 3.
- POPOV S., *Linguoculturology: from statements to explanatory*, [in:] *Traektoriâ Nauki = Path of Science*, 2018, No. 4, pp. 1001–1011.
- SINGH J., *Language, gender and sexuality in 2020: forward Global South*, [in:] *Gender and Language*, 2021, No. 15(2), pp. 207–230.
- TARANENKO O., *Androcentrism in the language coordinate system and the modern gender movement*, Kyiv, Dmytro Burago Publishing House, 2021.
- VYKHOVANETS I. & GORODENSKA K. *Theoretical morphology of Ukrainian language. Academic grammar of the Ukrainian language*, Kyiv, Pul'sary, 2024.
- VYNOHRADOV V., *Russian language: Grammatical doctrine of the word*, Moscow, 1972.

The Category of Gender in Aspects of Comparative Grammar of Evaluation, Grammar of Creativity and Gender Linguistics: Review of the Problem (on the Material of Ukrainian and Russian Linguistic Cultures)

Abstract: The reflection of the events of the reality around us is carried out in speech through the prism of the category of evaluation, which is traditionally interpreted as a consequence of the linguistic expression of logical and philosophical evaluative judgments. The article discusses the features of using the grammatical category of gender as a tool for representing axiological meanings, shades of meanings, and meanings in Ukrainian and Russian linguistic cultures, which is the subject of a comparative grammar of evaluation. The mechanisms for modelling the corresponding grammatical meanings of a semantic and pragmatic nature are described. An analysis of the factual material allows us to state numerous cases of violations of the correlation of the grammatical gender of words denoting male and female persons, which leads to the emergence of secondary semantic shades of generic forms, in particular, evaluative ones due to the linguistic creativity of native speakers. The study of grammar with a focus on axiologicalness allows us to see the dynamics in the grammatical system,

forms a new look at traditional problems and, accordingly, contributes to the development of grammatical science. By filling the discourse with grammatical games, the speaker can change the axiological orientation of the statement.

Keywords: gender stereotype, grammatical meaning, linguistic creativity, category of gender, masculine and feminine, category of evaluation, the comparative grammar of evaluation

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.34864/heteroglossia.issn.2084-1302.nr16.art4>