GENDER ACROSS LANGUAGES

VOLUME 3

EDITED BY

Marlis Hellinger
Hadumod Bußmann

Gender Across Languages

Impact: Studies in language and society

IMPACT publishes monographs, collective volumes, and text books on topics in sociolinguistics. The scope of the series is broad, with special emphasis on areas such as language planning and language policies; language conflict and language death; language standards and language change; dialectology; diglossia; discourse studies; language and social identity (gender, ethnicity, class, ideology); and history and methods of sociolinguistics.

General editor

Annick De Houwer
University of Antwerp

Advisory board

Volume 11

Gender Across Languages: The linguistic representation of women and men
Volume III
Edited by Marlis Hellinger and Hadumod Bußmann

Gender Across Languages

The linguistic representation of women and men

VOLUME 3

Edited by

Marlis Hellinger
University of Frankfurt am Main

Hadumod Bußmann
University of Munich

Table of contents

Languages of Volume I

Arabic
Atiqa Hachimi

Belizean Creole
Geneviève Escure

Eastern Maroon Creole
Bettina Migge

English
Marlis Hellinger
Janet Holmes
Anne Pauwels
Suzanne Romaine

Hebrew
Yishai Tobin

Indonesian
Esther Kuntjara

Romanian
Florence Maurice

Russian
Ursula Doleschal and Sonja Schmid

Turkish
Friederike Braun

Languages of Volume II

Chinese
Charles Ettner
Marjorie K. M. Chan
Hong Zhang

Dutch
Marinel Gerritsen

Finnish
Mila Engelberg

Hindi
Kira Hall

Icelandic
Anna Gunnarsdotter Grönberg

Italian
Gianna Marcato and Eva-Maria Thüne

Norwegian
Tove Bull and Toril Swan

Spanish
Uwe Kjær Nissen

Vietnamese
Hoa Pham

Welsh
Gwenllian Awbery and Kathryn Jones and Delyth Morris

Preface

The series *Gender across languages* is an ongoing project with potential follow-up publications. Our main goal has been to provide a comprehensive collection of in-depth descriptions of gender-related issues in languages with very diverse structural foundations and socio-cultural backgrounds. The project is designed to have an explicit contrastive orientation in that basically the same issues are discussed for each language within the same terminological and methodological framework. This framework, whose central notion is, of course, the multidimensional concept of "gender", is discussed in the introductory chapter of "Gender across languages – The linguistic representation of women and men". Care has been taken not to impose a narrow western perspective on other languages.

This is the third of three volumes which comprise a total of thirty languages: (Moroccan) Arabic, Belizean Creole, Chinese, Czech, Danish, Dutch, Eastern Maroon Creole, English, Finnish, French, German, Greek, Hebrew, Hindi, Icelandic, Indonesian, Italian, Japanese, Norwegian, Oriya, Polish, Romanian, Russian, Serbian, Spanish, Swahili, Swedish, Turkish, Vietnamese, and Welsh. All contributions were specifically written for this project, in close collaboration with the editors over a period of four years. Unfortunately, a few languages (Bulgarian, Hungarian, Korean, Portuguese, and one Native American language) dropped out of the project for various reasons. These languages should be included in a potential future volume.

The basis on which particular languages should be brought together in one volume has been a problematic one to define. Rather than categorizing languages according to language family (areal, typological or historical), or according to whether the language has or does not have grammatical gender, or using an overall alphabetical ordering, we decided – in agreement with the publisher – that each volume should contain a balanced selection of languages, so that each volume will provide readers with sufficient material to illustrate the diversity and complexity of linguistic representations of gender across languages. Thus, each volume will contain both, languages with grammatical gender as well as "genderless" languages, and languages with different areal, typological and historical affiliations.

"Gender across languages" is, of course, a selection, and no claims can be made that the three volumes will cover all language groups adequately. Critics will find it easy to identify those language areas or families that are under-represented in the project. In particular, future work should consider the immense number of African, Asian and Austronesian languages which have so far received little or no attention from a gender perspective.

Though we are aware of the fact that most languages of the project have developed a number of regional and social varieties, with different implications for the representation and communication of "gender", we supported authors in their unanimous decision to concentrate on standard varieties (where these exist). This decision is particularly well-founded for those languages for which gender-related issues are being described here for the very first time. Only in the case of English, which has developed major regional standards with considerable differences in usage, did we decide to make explicit reference to four different varieties (British English, American English, New Zealand English and Australian English). Of course, important varieties of languages such as Chinese, French and Spanish would require individual attention in the future.

We took care that each chapter did address most of the questions we had formulated as original guidelines which, however, were not intended (nor interpreted by authors) to impose our own expectations of how "gender" is represented in a particular culture. Thus, chapters basically have the same overall structure, with variation due to language-specific properties as well as to the state of research on language and gender in the respective country. In some cases, we encouraged authors to include some of their own empirical research where this has implications for the analysis of "gender" in the respective language.

Marlis Hellinger
Hadumod Bußmann

Acknowledgments

demanding and encouraging editors, and from whose sympathetic enthusiasm and efficient expertise the final processing of the text has profited tremendously.

List of abbreviations

ABL	ablative		INF	infinitive
ACC	accusative		INSTR	instrumental
ADJ	adjective		IPF	imperfective
ADV	adverb		LOC	locative
AGR	agreement		MASC/m	masculine
ALLAT	allative		N	noun
ANIM	animate		NEG	negation
ANT	anterior		NEUT/n	neuter
AOR	aorist		NOM	nominative
ASP	aspect		NP	noun phrase
ATT	attributive		OBJ	object
AUX	auxiliary		OBL	oblique
CAUS	causative		PART	participle
CL	classifier		PARTT	partitive
COM	comitative		PASS	passive
COMP	comparative		PAST	past
COND	conditional		PERS	personal pronoun
CONJ	conjunction		PF	perfective
COP	copula		PL/pl	plural
DAT	dative		POL	polite
DEF	definite		POSS	possessive
DEM	demonstrative		PREP	preposition
DER	derivational affix		PRES	present
DET	determiner		PROG	progressive
DUR	durative		PRON	pronoun
ELAT	elative		PRT	particle
ERG	ergative		REF	referent
ESS	essive		REFL	reflexive
EVID	evidential		REL	relative pronoun/affix
EXPL	expletive		SFP	sentence final particle
FEM/f	feminine		SG/sg	singular
FUT	future		SUBJ	subject
GEN	genitive		TOP	topic
GER	gerund		TRANS	transitive
HAB	habitual		TRNS	translative
ILLAT	illative		VERB	verb
IMP	imperative		VOC	vocative
INAN	inanimate		1	first person
INDEF	indefinite		2	second person
INESS	inessive		3	third person

Gender across languages

The linguistic representation of women and men[*]

Marlis Hellinger
University of Frankfurt am Main, Germany

Hadumod Bußmann
University of Munich, Germany

1.   Aims and scope of "Gender across languages"

"Gender across languages" systematically investigates the linguistic representation of women and men in 30 languages of very different structural and socio-cultural backgrounds. Fundamental to the project is the hypothesis that the formal and functional manifestations of gender in the area of human reference follow general, and perhaps universal principles in the world's languages. We will outline these principles and specify the theoretical and empirical foundations on which statements about gendered structures in languages can be made.

A major concern of "Gender across languages" is with the structural properties of the individual language:

–   Does the language have grammatical gender, and – if so – what are the consequences for agreement, coordination, pronominalization and word-formation, and more specifically, for the linguistic representation of women and men?
–   In the absence of grammatical gender, what are possible ways of expressing female-specific, male-specific or gender-indefinite personal reference?
–   Can asymmetries be identified in the area of human reference which may be interpreted as the result of the choice of the masculine/male as the default gender?
–   What is the empirical evidence for the claim that in neutral contexts masculine/male expressions are perceived as generic and bias-free?
–   Does the language contain idiomatic expressions, metaphors, proverbs and the like which are indicative of gender-related socio-cultural hierarchies or stereotypes?

In addition, the project will outline gender-related tendencies of variation and change, and – where applicable – language reform, seeking to identify the ways in which the structural/linguistic prerequisites interact with the respective social, cultural and political conditions that determine the relationships between women and men in a community.

"Gender across languages" will focus on personal nouns and pronouns, which have emerged as a central issue in debates about language and gender. In any language, personal nouns constitute a basic and culturally significant lexical field. They are needed to communicate about the self and others, they are used to identify people as individuals or members of various groups, and they may transmit positive or negative attitudes. In addition, they contain schemata of, e.g., occupational activities and (proto- or stereotypical) performers of such

activities. On a psychological level, an appropriate use of personal nouns may contribute towards the maintenance of an individual's identity, while inappropriate use, for example identifying someone repeatedly (either by mistake or by intention) by a false name, by using derogatory or discriminatory language, or by not addressing someone at all, may cause irritation, anger or feelings of inferiority. And since an individual's sense of self includes an awareness of being female or male, it is important to develop an understanding of the ways in which gender is negotiated in a language. This understanding must, of course, be based on adequate descriptions of the relevant structural and functional properties of the respective language.

In communication, parameters like ethnicity, culture, social status, setting, and discourse functions may in fact be as important as extra-linguistic gender, and none of these parameters is represented in a language in any direct or unambiguous way (cf. Bing & Bergvall 1996:5). Only a multidimensional theory of communication will be able to spell out the ways in which these parameters interact with linguistic expressions. By interpreting linguistic manifestations of gender as the discursive result of "doing gender" in specific socio-cultural contexts, the analysis of gender across languages can contribute to such a theory.

Structure-oriented gender research has focused primarily on formal, semantic and historical issues. On a formal level, systems of gender and nominal classification were analyzed, with an emphasis on the phonological and morphological conditions of gender assignment and agreement (cf. Section 4.2).[1]

From a semantic perspective, a major issue was the question as to whether the classification of nouns in a language follows semantic principles rather than being arbitrary.[2] While gender assignment in the field of personal nouns is at least partially non-arbitrary, the classification of inanimate nouns, e.g., words denoting celestial bodies, varies across languages. Thus, the word for 'sun' is grammatically feminine in German and Lithuanian, but masculine in Greek, Latin and the Romance languages, and neuter gender in Old Indic, Old Iranic and Russian. Correspondingly, metaphorical conceptualizations of the sun and the moon as female or male deities, or as the stereotypical human couple, will also show variation.

Nominal class membership may be determined by conceptual principles according to which speakers categorize the objects of their universe. The underlying principles may not be immediately comprehensible to outsiders to a particular culture. For example, the words for female humans, water, fire and

fighting are all in one nominal category in Dyirbal, an Australian language (cf. Dixon 1972). The assignment of, say, some birds' names to the same category can only be explained by recourse to mythological association.[3] Finally, historical issues in the study of linguistic gender concerned the origin, change and loss of gender categories.[4]

Corbett's account of over 200 languages is a major source for any discussion of gender as a formal category. However, since Corbett analyzes entire noun class systems, while we concentrate on personal nouns and pronouns, "sexism in language" (Corbett 1991:3) is not one of his concerns. But Corbett does in fact contribute to that debate in various ways, in particular, by introducing richness and diversity to a field which has been dominated by the study of a few Western languages.

2.   Gender classes as a special case of noun classes

Considering the lack of terminological precision and consistency in the debate about language and gender, the terms "gender class" and "gender language" need to be defined more precisely and with a more explicit reference to the wider framework of nominal classification. Of course, it must be noted that not all languages possess a system of nominal classification. In the project, Belizean Creole, Eastern Maroon Creole, English, Finnish and Turkish[5] represent this group of languages. Other languages may divide their nominal lexicon into groups or classes according to various criteria. Among the languages which exhibit such nominal classification, classifier languages and noun class languages (including languages with grammatical gender) constitute the two major types.[6]

2.1 Classifier languages

A prototypical case of classifier systems are numeral classifiers. In languages with such a system, a numeral (e.g. 'three') cannot be combined with a noun (e.g. 'book') directly, but requires the additional use of a classifier. Classifiers are separate words which often indicate the shape of the quantified object(s). The resulting phrase of numeral, classifier, and noun could, for example, be translated as 'three flat-object book' (cf. Greenberg 1972:5). Numeral classifiers are thus independent functional elements which specify the noun's class membership in certain contexts. In addition, the use of classifiers may be indicative of stylistic variation.

In languages with (numeral) classifiers, nouns do not show agreement with other word classes, although classifiers may perform discourse functions such as reference-tracking, which in gender languages are achieved by agreement. On average, classifier languages have from 50 to 100 classifiers (cf. Dixon 1982:215).[7] Classifier systems are rather frequent in East Asian languages, and in "Gender across languages" are represented by Chinese, Indonesian, Japanese, Oriya and Vietnamese.

2.2 Noun class languages

While in numeral classifier systems the class membership of nouns is marked only in restricted syntactic contexts (mainly in the area of quantification), class membership in noun class languages triggers agreement on a range of elements inside and outside the noun phrase. Noun class languages have a comparatively small number of classes (hardly more than 20). These classes consistently structure the entire nominal lexicon, i.e. each noun belongs to one of these classes (there are exceptional cases of double or multiple class membership). French, German, Swahili and many others are noun class languages, but we find these languages also referred to as "gender languages".[8] In accordance with Craig (1994), we will not use the terms "gender language" and "noun class language" synonymously, but will define them as two different types of noun class languages based on grammatical and semantic considerations. This distinction is also motivated by our interest in the linguistic representation of the categories "female" and "male".

"Gender languages"

This type is illustrated by many Indo-European languages, but also Semitic languages. These languages have only a very small number of "gender classes", typically two or three. Nouns do not necessarily carry markers of class member-ship, but, of course, there is (obligatory) agreement with other word classes, both inside and outside the noun phrase. Most importantly – for our distinc-tion – class membership is anything but arbitrary in the field of animate/personal reference.

For a large number of personal nouns there is a correspondence between the "feminine" and the "masculine" gender class and the lexical specification of a noun as female-specific or male-specific. Languages of this type will be called "gender languages" or "languages with grammatical gender".[9] The majority of languages included in the project belong to this group: Arabic, Czech, Danish,

Dutch, French, German, Greek, Hebrew, Hindi, Icelandic, Italian, Norwegian, Polish, Romanian, Russian, Serbian, Spanish, Swedish, and Welsh. As the examples of Oriya and English show, a gender system of this type can erode (Oriya) and eventually be lost (English); cf. also Section 3.1.

"Noun class languages"

This type displays no obvious correspondence between class membership and a noun's specification as female-specific or male-specific in the field of personal nouns. These languages, represented in the project by Swahili,[10] have a larger number of classes than gender languages. Often class membership is explicitly marked on the noun itself (cf. the class prefixes in Bantu languages), and there is extensive agreement on other word classes.

To summarize, we will speak of a "gender language" when there are just two or three gender classes, with considerable correspondence between the class membership and lexical/referential gender in the field of animate/personal nouns. Languages with grammatical gender represent only one type of nominal classification requiring the interaction of at least two elements, i.e. of the noun itself and some satellite element that expresses the class to which the noun belongs.

   The lack of grammatical gender in a language does not mean that "gender" in the broader sense cannot be communicated. There are various other categories of gender, e.g., "lexical" and "social" gender, which may be employed to transmit gendered messages. Thus, "gender languages", languages with classifiers or noun classes, as well as those languages that lack noun classification completely (English, Finnish, Turkish), can resort to a variety of linguistic means to construct gender-related messages.

3.   Categories of gender

Having established the difference between the more comprehensive concept of "noun class language" and the concept of "gender language", it is necessary to introduce a number of terminological distinctions beyond the typological level which will focus more directly on the representation of women and men in a language: *grammatical gender*, *lexical gender, referential gender* and *social gender*.

3.1 Grammatical gender

A central issue in any cross-linguistic analysis of gender is, of course, the category of grammatical gender. Typically, gender languages as defined in Section 2.2 have two or three gender classes – among them frequently "feminine" and "masculine". Sometimes the emergence of new subclasses presents problems of analysis, examples being Serbian and Russian (cf. Corbett 1991: 161–168). By contrast, a language may reduce the number of its grammatical gender classes, as in the case of some Germanic, Romance, and most Iranian languages, or lose its original gender system completely, as happened in English and Persian.[11]

Unlike case or number, grammatical gender is an inherent property of the noun which controls agreement between the noun (the controller) and some (gender-variable) satellite element (the target) which may be an article, adjective, pronoun, verb, numeral or preposition. Nominal gender typically has only one value, which is determined by an interaction of formal and semantic assignment rules.

3.2 Lexical gender

In debates on language and gender, the term "gender" usually relates to the property of extra-linguistic (i.e. "natural" or "biological") femaleness or maleness. Thus, in English, personal nouns such as *mother, sister, son* and *boy* are lexically specified as carrying the semantic property [female] or [male] respectively, which may in turn relate to the extra-linguistic category of referential gender (or "sex of referent"). Such nouns may be described as "gender-specific" (female-specific or male-specific), in contrast to nouns such as *citizen, patient* or *individual*, which are considered to be "gender-indefinite" or "gender-neutral". Typically, gender-specific terms require the choice of semantically corresponding satellite forms, e.g., the English anaphoric pronouns *she* or *he*, while in the case of gender-indefinite nouns, pronominal choice may be determined by reference (e.g., to a known individual), tradition (choice of "false generics"; cf. Section 3.4) or speaker attitude (as evident, e.g., from a positive evaluation of "gender-fair" language). In languages with grammatical gender, a considerable correspondence can be observed between a noun's grammatical gender class and its lexical specification, most consistently in the field of kinship terms: Germ. *Tante* (f) 'aunt' and *Onkel* (m) 'uncle' have a lexical specification as [female] and [male], respectively. Such nouns require the

use of the corresponding pronouns *sie* (f) and *er* (m). For terms without lexical gender, i.e. gender-indefinite nouns such as *Individuum* (n) 'indivdual' or *Person* (f) 'person', pronominal choice is usually, but not always, determined by the grammatical gender of the antecedent (see Bußmann & Hellinger, this vol.).

We do not wish to imply that the terms "female-specific" and "male-specific" correspond to a binary objectivist view that categorizes people neatly into females and males. For example, anthropologists have discussed the Hindi-speaking *hijras* as a "third gender": "[…] most *hijras* were raised as boys before taking up residence in one of India's many hijra communities and adopting the feminine dress, speech, and mannerisms associated with member-ship" (Hall, vol. II).[12] Although the terms "female" and "male" contribute to the construction of people's everyday experience, they might perhaps be more adequately placed on a continuum, which allows for variation, fuzzy category boundaries, and prototype effects (cf. Lakoff 1987). In spite of this insight, we will continue to use the terms "female" and "male" as valuable descriptive tools.

In any language, lexical gender is an important parameter in the structure of kinship terminologies, address terms, and a number of basic, i.e. frequently used personal nouns. Lexical gender may or may not be marked morphological-ly. In English, most human nouns are not formally marked for lexical gender, with exceptions such as *widow–widower* or *steward–stewardess*, which show overt gender marking by suffixation. Only in principle is such markedness independent of grammatical gender. Languages with grammatical gender generally possess a much larger number of devices of overt gender marking. Thus, in the highly inflected Slavic languages, overt lexical gender marking (as a result of the correspondence with grammatical gender) is much more visible than in most Germanic languages, simply because satellite elements have more gender-variable forms.

3.3 Referential gender

"Referential gender" relates linguistic expressions to the non-linguistic reality; more specifically, referential gender identifies a referent as "female", "male" or "gender-indefinite". For example, a personal noun like Germ. *Mädchen* 'girl' is grammatically neuter, has a lexical-semantic specification as [female], and is generally used to refer to females. However, an idiomatic expression like *Mädchen für alles* lit. 'girl for everything'; 'maid of all work', may be used to refer to males also. In this example, while the metaphor seems to neutralize the lexical specificity of *Mädchen*, a gendered message is nevertheless transmitted: the expression has explicitly derogatory connotations.

In gender languages, a complex relationship between grammatical gender and referential gender obtains for the majority of personal nouns, with typical gender-related asymmetries in pronominalization and coordination (cf. Sections 4.3 and 4.4 below). For example, when reference is made to a particular known individual, the choice of anaphoric pronouns may be referentially motivated and may thus override the noun's grammatical gender, as in Germ. *Tennisstar* (m) … *sie* (f) (cf. Oelkers 1996).

3.4 "False generics": Generic masculines and male generics

All the gender languages of the project illustrate the traditional (and often prescriptive) practice which requires the use of so-called "generic masculines" to refer to males as well as females.[13] With reference to languages with grammatical gender we will talk about "generic masculines" (where "masculine" denotes grammatical gender), while for languages without grammatical gender, such as English or Japanese, the term "male generics" (with "male" denoting a lexical-semantic property) is more appropriate. This terminological distinction reflects on the different typological affiliations of the respective languages as explained in Section 2.

Grammatically feminine personal nouns tend to be female-specific (with only few exceptions), while grammatically masculine nouns have a wider lexical and referential potential. For example, masculine nouns such as Russ. *vrač* (m) 'physician', Fr. *ministre* (m) 'minister', or Arab. *muħami* (m) 'lawyer' may be used to refer to males, groups of people whose gender is unknown or unimportant in the context, or even female referents, illustrating the function of the so-called "generic masculine" usage. The reverse, i.e. the use of feminine nouns with gender-indefinite reference, is the rare exception. For example, in Seneca, an Iroquoian language, the feminine has been attested for indefinite reference to people in general (cf. Chafe 1967). In Oneida, also an Iroquoian language, gender-indefinite reference may be achieved by feminine pronouns. But then, speakers may make other choices (including the masculine gender) which are determined by highly complex semantic and pragmatic constraints (cf. Abbott 1984: 126). In a number of Australian Aboriginal languages, the feminine is used as the unmarked gender – in restricted contexts –, while other languages from the same family exhibit the opposite configuration (Alpher 1987: 175). Clearly, further research is necessary which must bring together the anthropological and linguistic evidence. Of primary importance will be the question in which way a relationship can be identified between the existence of feminine/female generics and underlying matriarchal structures.

In languages without grammatical gender, but with some gender-variable pronouns, male generic usage is the traditional androcentric practice in cases of gender-indefinite reference. E.g., in English, where gendered third person singular pronominal distinctions remain of an original grammatical gender system, "generic *he*" – including *him(self)* – is the prescriptive choice in such cases as *an American drinks his coffee black*. Since the use of male-biased pronouns may create referential ambiguities and misunderstandings, alternative formulations have been suggested to replace male generic expressions, e.g., *Americans drink their coffee black* (cf. Section 6). In languages without pronominal gender distinctions, male generic usage is found with the nouns themselves. In Finnish, for example, occupational terms ending in -*mies* 'man' are used for men as well as women (e.g., *lakimies* lit. 'law-man'; 'lawyer') and are officially claimed to be gender-neutral. Empirical findings reported by Engelberg (vol. II), however, show that this claim is more than doubtful.

The prescription of "generic masculines" or "male generics" has long been the center of debates about linguistic sexism in English and other languages. The asymmetries involved here, i.e. the choice of masculine/male expressions as the normal or "unmarked" case with the resulting invisibility of feminine/female expressions are reflections of an underlying gender belief system, which in turn creates expectations about appropriate female and male behavior. Such expectations will prevent a genuinely generic interpretation of gender-indefinite personal nouns, and can also be related to the fact that masculine/male pronouns occur three times as frequently as the corresponding feminine/female pronouns in some languages, e.g., in English and Russian.[14] There is empirical evidence for English, but also for Turkish, Finnish, and German, that most human nouns are in fact not neutral, which supports the assumption that gender-related socio-cultural parameters are a powerful force in shaping the semantics of personal reference.[15]

3.5 Social gender

"Social gender" is a category that refers "to the socially imposed dichotomy of masculine and feminine roles and character traits" (Kramarae & Treichler 1985: 173). Personal nouns are specified for social gender if the behavior of associated words can neither be explained by grammatical nor by lexical gender. An illustration of social gender in English is the fact that many higher-status occupational terms such as *lawyer*, *surgeon*, or *scientist* will frequently be pronominalized by the male-specific pronoun *he* in contexts where referential

gender is either not known or irrelevant. On the other hand, low-status occupational titles such as *secretary*, *nurse*, or *schoolteacher* will often be followed by anaphoric *she*. But even for general human nouns such as *pedestrian*, *consumer* or *patient*, traditional practice prescribes the choice of *he* in neutral contexts.

Social gender has to do with stereotypical assumptions about what are appropriate social roles for women and men, including expectations about who will be a typical member of the class of, say, *surgeon* or *nurse*. Deviations from such assumptions will often require overt formal markings, as in Engl. *female surgeon* or *male nurse*. However, since the majority of general personal nouns can be assumed to have a male bias, it seems plausible to suggest that – irrespective of whether the language does or does not have grammatical gender – underlying is the principle "male as norm".

Social gender is a particularly salient category in a language like Turkish which lacks even gender-variable pronouns. Frequently, gender-related associations remain hidden on a deeper semantic level. E.g., the Turkish occupational term *kuyumcu* 'goldseller' is lexically gender-indefinite, but is invariably associated with male referents, although theoretically, a female goldseller could also be referred to as *kuyumcu*. The word can be said to have a covert male bias which derives from sociocultural assumptions and expectations about the relationships between women and men (cf. Braun, vol. I, Section 3.1).

4.   Gender-related structures

4.1 Word-formation

Word-formation is a particularly sensitive area in which gender may be communicated. In languages with or without grammatical gender, processes of derivation and compounding have an important function in the formation of gendered personal nouns, particularly in the use of existing and the creation of new feminine/female terms, e.g., in the area of occupational terms, cf. (1) and (2):

(1)   **Derivation**

	Masculine/male	Feminine/female	
Norw.	*forfatter*	*forfatter-inne*	'author'
Arab.	*katib*	*katib-a*	'secretary'
Rom.	*pictor*	*pictor-iță*	'painter'
Engl.	*steward*	*steward-ess*	

(2) **Compounding**

	Masculine/male	Feminine/female	
Germ.	*Geschäfts-mann*	*Geschäfts-frau*	'business man/woman'
Norw.	*politi-mann*	*politi-kvinne*	'police officer'
	lit. 'police man'	lit. 'police woman'	
EMC	*seli-man*	*seli-uman*	'trader'
	lit. 'sell-man'	lit. 'sell-woman'	
Indon.	*dokter*	*dokter perempuan*	'doctor'
	lit. 'doctor'	lit. 'doctor woman'	

Typically, female gender-specification occurs with reference to a particular individual (*Congresswoman Maxine Waters*) or in contexts of contrastive emphasis (*male and female delegates*). Female linguistic visibility is often a marked and loaded concept, and we find considerable variation concerning the status and productivity of feminine/female word-formation processes across languages. Thus, German has a well-established and extremely productive process for the formation of personal feminines ending in -*in*: *Punkerin* 'female punk', *Bundeskanzlerin* 'female chancellor', *Bischöfin* 'female bishop', etc. By contrast, Welsh, also a gender language, has no such instrument for morphological gender-specification. Very few derived feminines exist, i.e. most occupational and other personal nouns in Welsh are grammatically masculine and have no feminine counterparts.

In English, the few derivational patterns that exist for the formation of female-specific terms have low productivity, and more often than not produce semantically asymmetric pairs in which the female represents the lesser category, illustrating what Schulz (1975) has called "semantic derogation". Notorious examples are Engl. *governor/governess*, *major/majorette*. Of course, such asymmetric pairs also occur in languages with grammatical gender, cf. (3):

(3) Fr.   *couturier* (m)   'fashion designer'
             couturière (f)   'seamstress, female tailor'

      Germ. *Sekretär* (m)   'secretary of an administration, trade union
                              or the like'

             Sekretärin (f)   'secretary in an office'

Feminine/female terms are not consistently derived nor used in case of female reference; their use may be stylistically marked and in many languages carries negative connotations, which makes them unacceptable in neutral contexts. Thus, in Russian or Polish, where masculinity is highly valued, feminine/female

counterparts of terms denoting prestigious occupations are avoided. By contrast, masculine/male terms are either neutral or carry positive connotations.

4.2 Agreement

In agreement, concern is with overt representations of gender. On a formal level, agreement establishes a syntactic relationship between a noun's satellite element, e.g., an article, adjective, pronominal or verbal form, and the noun's gender class. Satellite elements must be gender-variable, i.e. they must allow for a choice between at least two values (e.g., feminine and masculine, as in French and Italian, or feminine, masculine and neuter, as in Russian and German). In some languages, e.g., in Russian, discourse categories such as the gender of speaker, addressee or person talked about may all be marked morphologically on some verbal forms (cf. Doleschal & Schmid, vol. I, Section 2.2):

> (4) *Prišl-a   moj-a   byvš-aja   studentka,*
> came-FEM my-FEM former-FEM student.FEM
> *kotor-aja očen' umn-aja.   On-a   mogl-a   by   pomoč'.*
> who-FEM very intelligent-FEM she-FEM might-FEM COND help
> 'A former student of mine, who is very intelligent, has come. She might help.'

In traditional grammars, agreement is described as a primarily formal and predictable phenomenon, one of whose major functions is reference-tracking. Contrary to this view, we believe that agreement may add semantic and social information to the discourse, thus taking on symbolic functions. This claim is based on the observation that agreement tends to affect masculine and feminine nouns in different ways, mainly due to the principle "male as norm": Agreement will favor the masculine in coordination (cf. Section 4.4), and, generally, masculine agreement predominates; feminine agreement is female-specific and, in many contexts, non-obligatory and irregular, depending on extralinguistic factors such as tradition, prescription or speaker attitude.

4.3 Pronominalization

Gendered pronouns are overt representations of gender both in languages with and without grammatical gender. Anaphoric gendered pronouns reveal the semantic specification of nouns with lexical gender, they may express referential gender in contradiction to grammatical gender, they may function as a means

to either specify or abstract from (intended) referential gender, and they may emphasize traditional or reformed practices, as when a speaker chooses between a "false generic" (e.g., Engl. *he*) or a more gender-neutral alternative (such as Engl. "singular *they*"). Generally, pronominalization is a powerful strategy of communicating gender.

The interpretation of pronominalization as one type of agreement remains controversial. English exemplifies a type of relation between noun and pronoun which is not syntactically motivated. Only reflexes of the original grammatical gender system remain in third person singular pronouns (*he–she–it*), and the choice of anaphoric pronouns is controlled by lexical-semantic properties of the antecedent, by referential gender (including intended reference), or social gender. Corbett (1991:169) concludes that pronouns "may be the means by which particular languages divide nouns into different agreement classes". However, this classification is semantically based, and English is, of course, not a "gender language" as defined in Section 2.2.

4.4 Coordination

When a noun phrase conjoins a masculine and a feminine noun, the choice of a related target form may create a conflict between two competing genders. An example from Romanian (cf. Maurice, vol. I, Section 2.3) illustrates the strategy of what Corbett (1991:279) calls "syntactic gender resolution", where agreement occurs with one conjunct only, namely the masculine, albeit in the plural:[16]

(5) *un vizitator   și   o turistă   mult interesați*
     a   visitor.MASC and a tourist.FEM very interested.MASC.PL
     'a very interested (male) visitor and a very interested (female) tourist'

Corbett claims that the choice of masculine agreement forms in such cases is "evidently of the syntactic type" (Corbett 1991:ibid.), since what determines agreement is independent of the meaning of the nouns involved. In our view, however, the example illustrates the prescriptive practice that if at least one conjunct is headed by a masculine noun, masculine agreement forms are used. Another illustration of this practice involving inanimate nouns is the Hebrew example (6), cf. Tobin (vol. I, Section 2.3):

(6) *Ha-sefer   ve-ha-maxberet   nimtsaim   kan.*
     the-book.MASC.SG and-the-notebook.FEM.SG are.found.MASC.PL here
     'The book and the notebook are here.'

There are a number of exceptions to this regularity. For example, in some languages with three grammatical genders, the neuter gender may be employed to resolve the gender conflict in coordination, as in this example from Icelandic (cf. Grönberg, vol. II, Section 2.3):

(7) *Óli   og Elsa   eru ung.*
     Óli.MASC and Elsa.FEM are young.NEUT.PL
     'Óli and Elsa are young.'

In some cases the choice of the masculine target gender may be motivated by the vicinity of the nearest controller noun when this is also masculine (cf. Corbett 1991:265). However, "Gender across languages" provides numerous counter-examples. For example, in Arabic, if word order in a conjoined noun phrase is reversed to masculine first and feminine second, the choice of the feminine, as a response to the nearest controller gender, is ungrammatical; the masculine must still be chosen (cf. Hachimi, vol. I, Section 4.3):

(8) *Lab   u bnat-u   yan-in.*
     father.MASC.SG and daughter.FEM.PL-his tired.MASC-PL
     'The father and his daughters are tired.'

Underlying such syntactic conventions may be a gender hierarchy which defines the masculine as the "most worthy gender" (Baron 1986:97).[17] As a result, masculine nouns are highly visible in gender languages and carry considerably more weight and emphasis than feminine nouns.

5.   Gender-related messages

The communication of gender-related messages may be performed by many other devices in addition to the ones discussed so far. Of primary importance in the context of "Gender across languages" are address forms, idiomatic and metaphorical expressions, proverbs, and, of course, female/male discourse.

5.1 Address terms

Languages differ considerably in the type of obligatory and optional information they encode in their address systems. English can be characterized as a language with only moderate distinctions, lacking even the *tu/vous*-distinction that is characteristic, e.g., for German, French or Russian, while languages such as Vietnamese, Japanese or Javanese have extremely complex address systems.[18]

For example, on the basis of the underlying, all-pervasive concept of *hormat* 'respect', Indonesian as spoken in Java has lexicalized numerous socio-cultural and interactional dimensions such as age, gender, social status, participant relationship, and formality of the situation, which will determine a speaker's selection of an item from one of several speech styles and terms (cf. Kuntjara, vol. I, Section 3). Gender will be performed in asymmetric and non-reciprocal practices. Thus, the traditional Javanese husband will address his wife by her first name or by the kinship term *dik* 'younger sister', but will receive the term *mas* 'older brother', irrespective of his age. Lexical choices generally are less constrained for males, while women are expected to use a higher, more deferential style.

Changes in address practices may be indicative of underlying changes in the social relationships between women and men. In language planning such changes will be supported as contributing to more symmetry in address systems. An example is the legislation establishing Germ. *Frau* as the only acceptable official term of address for adult women to abolish the traditional distinction between *Frau* 'Mrs' and *Fräulein* 'Miss' (cf. Bußmann & Hellinger, this vol.).[19] Similarly, in English the address term *Ms* was introduced to abolish the distinction between *Mrs* and *Miss*. However, such a term may also be appropriated by mainstream usage to transmit (originally) unintended messages, as in the case of Australian English *Ms* 'divorced' or 'feminist' (cf. Pauwels, vol. I, Section 2.1).

5.2   Idiomatic expressions and proverbs

Another area of the implicit discursive negotiation of gender, irrespective of whether the language does or does not have grammatical gender, are frozen expressions such as idioms, metaphors, and proverbs.[20] Descriptions of or terms for women – when these are part of such expressions – tend to have negative, and frequently sexual and moral implications which are not found for corresponding male terms (where these exist).

For example, Moroccan Arabic provides a number of honorific terms, phrases, and proverbs which are indicative of the glorification of the mother-concept in Moroccan culture, as in 'the mother is the light of the house' or 'paradise lies under mothers' feet'. At the same time, mothers of daughters are evaluated negatively, reflecting on the unequal status of girls and boys (cf. Hachimi, vol. I, Section 7). Representative of the genre of proverbs is the following Turkish example (cf. Braun, vol. I, Section 6):

(9)   *Oglan doguran övünsün, kiz doguran dövünsün.*
      'Let the one who bears a son be proud, let the one who bears a daughter
      beat herself.'

This is the message of numerous idiomatic expressions and proverbs from many languages of "Gender across languages": Arabic, Chinese, Danish, Finnish, Italian, Norwegian, Russian, and Turkish.

In Russian, the woman-as-mother concept is practically the only positive female image in proverbs (cf. Doleschal & Schmid, vol. I, Section 6.1). The extreme opposite is obscene language with expressions of "mother-fucking", a misogynist practice which has also been attested for many languages, with Russian, Chinese, Turkish, and Danish representing examples in "Gender across languages". Such frozen expressions embody fundamental collective beliefs and stereotypes which are available for continued practices of communicating gender.

5.3   Female and male discourse

A major concern of studies on language and gender in the 1990s has been the search for an empirical foundation on which statements could be made on discourse practices in diverse types of interaction (cf. Wodak & Benke 1997).

On a theoretical level the inadequacy of binary categories (*women* vs. *men*, *female* vs. *male*) has been criticized. These categories show internal diversification and must be described to a considerable extent as social constructs. Also statements about female and male verbal behavior have been criticized for making inappropriate generalizations. Explanatory theories (cf. the deficit, dominance, difference, and diversity models) developed with reference to English cannot be applied to other languages without taking into account dimensions of sociocultural difference (cf. also Pauwels 1998, Bergvall 1999).

Investigations of gender and discourse have primarily focussed on the identification of differences between female and male speech.[21] For a number of languages, among them English, Chinese and Japanese, some differences were indeed found, but quantitative evidence remains controversial. For example, higher frequencies of "uncertainty phenomena" were found in some types of discourse (typically in experimental or more formal situations), but not in others. More importantly, the occurrence of *tag*-questions (e.g. in English) or sentence-final particles (e.g. in Chinese) may have various communicative functions in actual discourse, so that an explanation in terms of uncertainty or

tentativeness is only one among several possibilities (cf. Holmes 1995). This is also true for categories of turn-taking, where a higher frequency of interruptions and overlaps as performed by male speakers is widely interpreted as indicative of conversational dominance (cf. West & Zimmerman 1983). However, Bergvall (1999) has repeatedly warned against immediately approaching discourse in terms of gender differences, suggesting that rather than categorizing people and their verbal behavior into seemingly dichotomous and opposed groups, it would be more appropriate to interpret the data in terms of a linguistic and behavioral continuum.

In "Gender across languages", discourse analysis features more prominently for those languages where – in the absence of substantial structural representations of gender – discourse emerges as a central field in which gender is negotiated, e.g., in Chinese, Japanese, English, and Belizean Creole.

6.   Language change and language reform

In all the languages represented in "Gender across languages", tendencies of variation and change in the area of personal reference can be observed. In some languages (e.g., English, German, French, Dutch and Spanish) such tendencies have been supported by language planning measures, including the publication of recommendations and guidelines, while for other languages an awareness of gendered asymmetries is only beginning to develop in both academia and the media (e.g., in Czech or Polish). To a large extent, the emergence of public discourse on language and gender depends on the socio-political background, in particular the state of the women's movement in the respective country.

Language as a tool of social practice may serve referential functions (e.g., the exchange of information); it has social-psychological functions in that it reflects social hierarchies and mechanisms of identification, and it contributes to the construction and communication of gender. More specifically, language is assumed to codify an androcentric worldview. Recommendations and guidelines for non-discriminatory language identify areas of conventional language use as sexist and offer alternatives aiming at a gender-fair (and symmetric) representation of women and men. As an instrument of language planning they reinforce tendencies of linguistic change by means of explicit directions (cf. Frank 1989: 197; Pauwels 1998, 1999; Hellinger 1995).

Gender-related language reform is a reaction to changes in the relationships between women and men, which have caused overt conflicts on the level of

language comprehension and production. Reformed usage symbolizes the dissonance between traditional prescriptions such as the use of masculine/male generics and innovative alternatives. In most cases it explicitly articulates its political foundation by emphasizing that equal treatment of women and men must also be realized on the level of communication.

Guidelines are based on the assumption that a change in behavior, i.e., using more instances of non-sexist language, will be attended by a change in attitude so that positive attitudes towards non-sexist alternatives will develop (cf. Smith 1973:97). Conversely, positive attitudes will motivate speakers to use more non-sexist language. This is not necessarily what happens in actual cases of language reform. Reformed usage has sometimes been appropriated by speakers who will use alternatives in ways that were not intended, thereby redefining and depoliticizing feminist meanings (cf. Ehrlich & King 1994).

7.   Conclusion

The central function of linguistic gender in the domain of human reference is the communication of gendered messages of various types. The linguistic representation of gender is one of the dimensions on which languages can be compared, irrespective of individual structural properties and sociolinguistic diversities. However, even apparently straightforward categories such as grammatical or referential gender cannot be fully described in terms that abstract from the cultural and sociopolitical specifics of individual languages. And once the study of gender is taken beyond the level of formal manifestation to include discourse practices, the concept of gender becomes increasingly complex and multi-dimensional.

The general tendencies we have identified all center around one fundamental principle: masculine/male expressions (and practices) are the default choice for human reference in almost any context. The assumption may be plausible that gender languages offer the larger potential for the avoidance of male-biased language – simply because female visibility is more easily achieved on the level of expression. At the same time, advocating an increase in female visibility may create problematic and potentially adverse effects in languages like Russian or Hebrew, where masculine/male terms for female reference are evaluated positively even by women. In addition, consistent splitting, i.e. the explicit use of both feminine and masculine expressions when reference is made to both women and men, is considered to be stylistically cumbersome by many speakers, esp. in

languages with case. Thus, a comparative view would have to investigate the ways in which structural prerequisites interact with sociolinguistic tendencies of change.

By contrast, "genderless" languages seem to provide more possibilities for egalitarian and gender-neutral expressions, by avoiding the dominant visibility of masculine terms, and stereotypical associations of feminine terms with secondary or exceptional status. However, in genderless languages it may be even more difficult to challenge the covert male bias and the exclusion of female imagery in many personal nouns.

In the study of language and gender, there is an urgent need for comparative analyses based on adequate descriptions of a large number of languages of diverse structural and sociocultural backgrounds. This includes an awareness of the fact that *white middle class North American English* cannot be regarded as representative for other languages also. "Gender across languages" contributes towards the goal of a more global view of gender by presenting a wealth of data and language-specific analyses that will allow for cross-linguistic statements on manifestations of gender. In addition, the material presented in "Gender across languages" can be expected to enrich the debate of a number of interdisciplinary issues:

From a sociolinguistic perspective, the tremendous variation found in the exchange of gendered messages must be placed more explicitly in a wider framework of communities of practice (CofP), considering the interaction between "gender" and age, ethnic membership, social status and religion.[22]

From a text-linguistic perspective, comparative investigations of gender-related structures will identify the stylistic and rhetorical potentials of grammatical gender in a given language, in particular for the construction of cohesion and textuality by a less constrained word order and for disambiguation (reference tracking).

From a historical perspective, the analysis of ongoing structural changes may shed light on the question of why manifestations of gender in historically or typologically related languages have developed in very different directions, as in the case of Germanic languages which may have two or three categories of grammatical gender – or none at all.

From a psycholinguistic perspective, further empirical evidence is needed from more languages that might contribute towards an understanding of how gendered messages are interpreted, and more generally, in which ways the perception and construction of the universe is influenced by linguistic, social and cultural parameters.

Notes

* In accordance with the publisher's policy of publishing "Gender across languages" as three separate and independent volumes, this chapter is a reprint from volume I. Of course, references to chapters in the other volumes have been adjusted.

1. Cf. Corbett (1991). Lehmann (1993) provides an informative overview of types of congruence/agreement. Rich data from various languages can be found in Barlow & Ferguson (1988).

2. Cf. Zubin & Köpcke (1984, 1986).

3. Cf. also Lakoff (1987: ch. 6), Corbett (1991: 15–18). For further examples see Grimm (1831: 349f), Royen (1929: 341–347), Strunk (1994: 151f).

4. On the origin of gender cf. Claudi (1985), Fodor (1959), Ibrahim (1973), Royen (1929), Leiss (1994); on the decay and loss of gender (systems) cf. Corbett (1995), Claudi (1985).

5. This ignores the very rudimentary numeral classification found in Turkish.

6. Cf. Unterbeck (2000) for an overview of different types of noun classification. Material from a larger number of languages can be found in Craig (1986, 1994). Royen (1929) is still an impressive study of gender and nominal classification.

7. Thus, for Vietnamese over 200 such classifiers have been identified, cf. Pham (vol. II, Section 2); on classifier languages cf. also Craig (1994).

8. For example, Corbett (1991: ch. 3.1) discusses morphological *gender assignment* jointly for Russian, Swahili and other Bantu languages; cf. also Hurskainen (2000).

9. This is the approach taken by Dixon (1982: 160); cf. also Braun (2000: 32).

10. Swahili (cf. Beck, this vol.) is one of perhaps 600 African languages with noun classes (cf. Heine 1982: 190); on noun classes in African languages cf. Hurskainen (2000). Large numbers of noun class languages are also found among Dravidian and New Guinean languages.

11. In contrast to English, Persian even lost pronominal gender distinctions. The loss of grammatical gender in English is described in Jones (1988), and more recently, Kastovsky (2000); for a diachronic perspective on gender in the Scandinavian languages cf. Braunmüller (2000), in French cf. Härmä (2000), and in the Iranian languages Corbett (1991: 315–318).

12. Practices of gender-crossing in Native American communities, e.g., the Navajo, are described in Whitehead (1991). So-called "abnormal" developments are discussed in Wodak & Benke (1997: ch. 1.2).

13. The term "false generics" was used by Kramarae & Treichler (1985: 150, 175) to refer to "generic masculines". Romaine (vol. I, Section 3.2) uses the term "androcentric generics".

14. There are statistical data for English (Graham 1975) and Russian (Francis & Kučera 1967).

15. Empirical evidence for English can be found in MacKay & Fulkerson (1979), for Turkish in Braun (2000), for Finnish in Engelberg (vol. II, Section 5), for German in Scheele & Gauler (1993) and Irmen & Köhncke (1996). For cross-linguistic evidence cf. Batliner (1984).

16. Coordination is no problem in German which has no corresponding gender-variable satellite forms in the plural (cf. Bußmann & Hellinger, this vol.).

17. Cf. also Curzan (2000); for German, cf. Bußmann (1995).

18. On address systems, cf. Braun (1988); on the T/V distinction Brown & Gilman (1960). For Vietnamese, cf. Pham, vol. II.

19. On French legislation, cf. Burr, this vol.

20. For German, cf. Daniels (1985), for Moroccan cf. Webster (1982), for Chinese, cf. Zhang (vol. II). For a comparison of Finnish and German proverbs, cf. Majapuro (1997).

21. For recent overviews of gendered discourse, cf. Talbot (1998) and Romaine (1999: chs. 6, 7).

22. On the concept of CofP, cf. the special issue of *Language in Society* 28/2 (1999).

References

Abbott, Clifford. 1984. "Two feminine genders in Oneida." *Anthropological Linguistics* 26: 125–137.

Alpher, Barry. 1987. "Feminine as the unmarked grammatical gender: Buffalo girls are no fools." *Australian Journal of Linguistics* 7: 169–187.

Barlow, Michael & Charles A. Ferguson, eds. 1988. *Agreement in natural language. Approaches, theories, descriptions.* Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Baron, Dennis. 1986. *Grammar and gender.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Batliner, Anton. 1984. "The comprehension of grammatical and natural gender: A cross-linguistic experiment." *Linguistics* 22: 831–856.

Bergvall, Victoria L. 1999. "An agenda for language and gender research for the start of the new millennium." *Linguistik Online.* http://viadrina.euv-frankfurt-o.de/~wjournal/1_99/bergvall.htm

Bergvall, Victoria L. & Janet M. Bing & Alice F. Freed, eds. 1996. *Rethinking language and gender research: Theory and practice.* London: Longman.

Bing, Janet M. & Victoria L. Bergvall. 1996. "The question of questions: Beyond binary thinking." In *Rethinking language and gender research: Theory and practice*, eds. Victoria L. Bergvall & Janet M. Bing & Alice F. Freed. London: Longman, 1–30.

Bittner, Dagmar. 2000. "Gender classification and the inflectional system of German." In *Gender in grammar and cognition*, eds. Barbara Unterbeck et al. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1–23.

Braun, Friederike 1988. *Terms of address. Problems of patterns and usage in various languages and cultures.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Braun, Friederike. 2000. *Geschlecht im Türkischen. Untersuchungen zum sprachlichen Umgang mit einer sozialen Kategorie.* Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Braunmüller, Kurt. 2000. "Gender in North Germanic: A diasystematic and functional approach." In *Gender in grammar and cognition*, eds. Barbara Unterbeck et al. Berlin: de Gruyter, 25–54.

Brown, Roger & Albert Gilman. 1960. "The pronouns of power and solidarity." In *Style in language*, ed. Thomas A. Sebeok. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 253–276.

Bußmann, Hadumod. 1995. "Das Genus, die Grammatik und – der Mensch: Geschlechterdifferenz in der Sprachwissenschaft." In *Genus: Zur Geschlechterdifferenz in den Kulturwissenschaften*, eds. Hadumod Bußmann & Renate Hof. Stuttgart: Kröner, 114–160.

Chafe, Wallace L. 1967. *Seneca morphology and dictionary.* Washington: Smithsonian Press.

Claudi, Ulrike. 1985. *Zur Entstehung von Genussystemen: Überlegungen zu einigen theoretischen Aspekten, verbunden mit einer Fallstudie des Zande.* Hamburg: Buske.

Corbett, Greville G. 1991. *Gender.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Corbett, Greville G. 1995. "Agreement." In *Syntax. Ein internationales Handbuch zeitgenössischer Forschung,* Vol. 2, eds. Joachim Jacobs & Arnim von Stechow & Wolfgang Sternefeld & Theo Vennemann. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1235–1244.

Corbett, Greville G. & Norman M. Fraser. 2000. "Default genders." In *Gender in grammar and cognition,* eds. Barbara Unterbeck et al. Berlin: de Gruyter, 55–97.

Craig, Colette G. 1986. *Noun classes and categorization.* Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Craig, Colette G. 1994. "Classifier languages." In *The encyclopedia of language and linguistics,* Vol. 2, ed. Ronald E. Asher. Oxford: Pergamon, 565–569.

Curzan, Anne. 2000. "Gender categories in early English grammars: Their message to the modern grammarian." In *Gender in grammar and cognition,* eds. Barbara Unterbeck et al. Berlin: de Gruyter, 561–576.

Daniels, Karlheinz. 1985. "Geschlechtsspezifische Stereotypen im Sprichwort." *Sprache und Literatur* 56: 18–35.

Dixon, Robert M. W. 1972. *The Dyirbal language of North Queensland.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dixon, Robert M.W. 1982. *Where have all the adjectives gone? And other essays in semantics and syntax.* Berlin: Mouton.

Ehrlich, Susan & Ruth King. 1994. "Feminist meanings and the (de)politicization of the lexicon". *Language in Society* 23: 59–76.

Fodor, Istvan. 1959. "The origin of grammatical gender." *Lingua* 8: 1–41, 186–214.

Francis, Nelson & Henry Kučera. 1967. *Computational analysis of present-day American English.* Providence, RI: Brown University Press.

Frank, Francine W. 1989. "Language planning, language reform, and language change: A review of guidelines for nonsexist usage." In *Language, gender, and professional writing: Theoretical approaches and guidelines for nonsexist usage,* eds. Francine W. Frank & Paula A. Treichler. New York: MLA, 105–137.

Graham, Alma. 1975. "The making of a nonsexist dictionary." In *Language and sex: Difference and dominance,* eds. Barrie Thorne & Nancy Henley. Rowley, MA: Newbury House, 57–63.

Greenberg, Joseph H. 1972. "Numeral classifiers and substantival number: Problems in the genesis of a linguistic type." *Working Papers on Language Universals* 9: 1–39.

Greenberg, Joseph H. 1978. "How does a language acquire gender markers?" In *Universals of human language,* Vol. 3, ed. Joseph H. Greenberg. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 47–82.

Grimm, Jacob. 1831. *Deutsche Grammatik* III. 3. Theil, 3. Buch: *Von der Wortbildung.* Göttingen: Dietrich.

Härmä, Juhani. 2000. "Gender in French: A diachronic perspective." In *Gender in grammar and cognition,* eds. Barbara Unterbeck et al. Berlin: de Gruyter, 609–619.

Hall, Kira & Mary Bucholtz, eds. 1995. *Gender articulated: Language and the socially constructed self.* New York: Routledge.

Heine, Bernd. 1982. "African noun class systems." In *Apprehension: Das sprachliche Erfassen von Gegenständen.* Teil I: *Bereich und Ordnung der Phänomene*, eds. Hansjakob Seiler & Christian Lehmann. Tübingen: Narr, 189–216.

Hellinger, Marlis. 1995. "Language and gender." In *The German language in the real world*, ed. Patrick Stevenson. Oxford: Clarendon, 280–314.

Hockett, Charles F. 1958. *A course in modern linguistics.* New York: Macmillan.

Holmes, Janet. 1995. *Women, men and politeness.* London: Longman.

Hurskainen, Arvi. 2000. "Noun classification in African languages." In *Gender in grammar and cognition*, eds. Barbara Unterbeck et al. Berlin: de Gruyter, 665–688.

Ibrahim, H. Muhammad. 1973. *Grammatical gender. Its origin and development.* The Hague: Mouton.

Irmen, Lisa & Astrid Köhncke. 1996. "Zur Psychologie des "generischen" Maskulinums." *Sprache & Kognition* 15: 152–166.

Jones, Charles. 1988. *Grammatical gender in English: 950–1250.* London: Croom Helm.

Kastovsky, Dieter. 2000. "Inflectional classes, morphological restructuring, and the dissolution of Old English grammatical gender." In *Gender in grammar and cognition*, eds. Barbara Unterbeck et al. Berlin: de Gruyter, 709–727.

Kramarae, Cheris & Paula A. Treichler. 1985. *A feminist dictionary.* Boston: Pandora.

Lakoff, George. 1987. *Women, fire, and dangerous things: What categories reveal about the mind.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lehmann, Christian. 1993. "Kongruenz." In *Syntax. Ein internationales Handbuch zeitgenössischer Forschung,* Vol. 1, eds. Joachim Jacobs & Arnim von Stechow & Wolfgang Sternefeld & Theo Vennemann. Berlin: de Gruyter: 722–729.

Leiss, Elisabeth. 1994. "Genus und Sexus. Kritische Anmerkungen zur Sexualisierung von Grammatik." *Linguistische Berichte* 152: 281–300.

MacKay, Donald & David Fulkerson. 1979. "On the comprehension and production of pronouns." *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior* 18: 661–673.

Majapuro, Anne. 1997. "Weinende Braut, lachende Frau. Geschlechtsspezifische Merkmale des Lachens und Weinens in deutschen und finnischen Sprichwörtern." In *Laughter down the centuries*, eds. Siegfried Jäckel & Asko Timonen. Turku: University of Turku, 233–248.

Oelkers, Susanne. 1996. " 'Der Sprintstar und ihre Freundinnen'. Ein empirischer Beitrag zur Diskussion um das generische Maskulinum." *Muttersprache* 106: 1–15.

Pauwels, Anne. 1998. *Women changing language.* London: Longman.

Pauwels, Anne. 1999. "Feminist language planning: Has it been worthwhile?" *Linguistik Online.* http://www.viadrina.euv-frankfurt-o.de/~wjournal/1_99/pauwels.htm

Romaine, Suzanne. 1999. *Communicating gender.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Royen, Gerlach. 1929. *Die nominalen Klassifikations-Systeme in den Sprachen der Erde. Historisch-kritische Studie, mit besonderer Berücksichtigung des Indo-Germanischen.* Mödling: Anthropos.

Scheele, Brigitte & Eva Gauler. 1993. "Wählen Wissenschaftler ihre Probleme anders aus als Wissenschaftler*I*nnen? Das Genus-Sexus-Problem als paradigmatischer Fall der linguistischen Relativitätsthese." *Sprache & Kognition* 12: 59–72.

Schulz, Muriel R. 1975. "The semantic derogation of woman." In *Language and sex: Difference and dominance*, eds. Barrie Thorne & Nancy Henley. Rowley, MA: Newbury House, 64–75.

Smith, David M. 1973. "Language, speech and ideology: A conceptual framework." In *Language attitudes: Current trends and prospects*, eds. Roger W. Shuy & Ralph W. Fasold. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 97–112.

Strunk, Klaus. 1994. "Grammatisches und natürliches Geschlecht in sprachwissenschaftlicher Sicht." In *Frau und Mann. Geschlechterdifferenzierung in Natur und Menschenwelt*, ed. Venanz Schubert. St. Ottilien: EOS Verlag, 141–164.

Talbot, Mary M. 1998. *Language and gender: An introduction.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Unterbeck, Barbara. 2000. "Gender: New light on an old category. An introduction." In *Gender in grammar and cognition*, eds. Barbara Unterbeck et al. Berlin: de Gruyter, xv-xliv.

Webster, Sheila K. 1982. "Women, sex, and marriage in Moroccan proverbs." *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 14: 173–184.

West, Candace & Don H. Zimmerman. 1983. "Small insults: A study of interruptions in cross-sex conversations between unacquainted persons." In *Language, gender and society*, eds. Barrie Thorne & Cheris Kramarae & Nancy Henley. Rowley, MA: Newbury House, 113–118.

Whitehead, Harriet. 1991 [[1]1981]. "The bow and the burden strap: A new look at institutionalized homosexuality in Native North America." In *Sexual meanings. The cultural construction of gender and sexuality*, eds. Sherry B. Ortner & Harriet Whitehead. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 80–115.

Wodak, Ruth & Gertraud Benke. 1997. "Gender as a sociolinguistic variable: New perspectives on variation studies." In *The handbook of sociolinguistics*, ed. Florian Coulmas. Oxford: Blackwell, 127–150.

Zubin, David & Klaus-Michael Köpcke. 1984. "Affect classification in the German gender system." *Lingua* 63: 41–96.

Zubin, David & Klaus-Michael Köpcke. 1986. "Gender and folk taxonomy: The indexical relation between grammatical and lexical classification." In *Noun classes and categorization,* ed. Colette G. Craig. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 139–181.

Communicating gender in Czech

Světla Čmejrková

The Czech Language Institute, Prague, Czech Republic

1. Introduction

Czech (*český jazyk, čeština*) is the mother tongue of about 10 million inhabitants of the Czech Republic. Czech belongs to the Slavic group of the Indo-European languages, specifically to the subgroup of the West Slavic languages, along with

Slovak, Polish and Sorbian. The Slovak language, spoken in Slovakia, the second area of the former Czechoslovak Federation, is closely related to Czech and both languages are mutually intelligible (cf. Short 1987).

The Czech Literary Standard (*spisovný jazyk* 'literary language') originated in the early Middle Ages, reaching its peak in the period of the Hussite movement and Humanism (the epoch of Renaissance). The modern Literary Standard was elaborated at the beginning of the 19th century, in the process of the National Revival, on the basis of the earlier standard of the humanistic period. It contained a number of archaic features and became estranged from the colloquial speech. The entire history of the modern Standard until the present day has been marked by the tendency to overcome this gap. The present situation of Czech is characterised by the fact that whereas in the provinces of Moravia and Silesia the dialectal diversification in essence survives, in the province of Bohemia the local dialects have nearly disappeared and a regional interdialect (koiné), based on the speech of Prague and Central Bohemia, has emerged. This so-called Common Czech (*obecná čeština*) is marked, above all, by simplified inflectional paradigms. Being the speech of the cultural centre of Prague, Common Czech has also expanded to other regions.

Typologically, Czech is a highly inflected language. Its consistent inflectional nature is more evident than in other Slavic languages, e.g. Russian or Polish (see Doleschal & Schmid, vol. I; Koniuszaniec & Błaszkowska, this vol.). It has a rich system of declensional and conjugational paradigms as well as a rich and productive system of word-formation. The inflectional categories of the noun – including adjectives, pronouns and some numerals – comprise case (nominative, genitive, dative, accusative, vocative, locative, instrumental), number (singular and plural, with vestiges of the dual), gender (masculine, feminine, neuter) and animacy (opposition of animate/inanimate within the masculine gender).

The verb is inflected for tense (past, present, future), person (first, second, third), number (singular, plural), mood (indicative, imperative, subjunctive), voice (active, passive), aspect (imperfective, perfective) and gender (in the past tense and in the subjunctive, both in the singular and plural, and also in the passive voice of all the three tenses and moods in the singular and plural, the verb has different forms for all three genders).[1]

2.   Gender in Czech

Czech belongs to the group of *noun class languages*, and more specifically, to the subgroup of *gender languages* (cf. Hellinger & Bußmann, this vol.). Although

grammatical gender may be conceived of as independent of a direct semantic correlation between the gender of a noun and the physical properties of the persons or objects denoted by that noun, there is a "natural" basis for the classification, evident in the group of nouns denoting persons. In most cases, nouns denoting male human beings are masculine, nouns denoting female human beings are feminine, while nouns denoting immature beings and young animals, such as *dítě* 'child', *mládě* 'young', or *kotě* 'kitten' are often neuter gender in Czech.

The category of animacy/inanimacy operates only within the masculine gender, classifying nouns into two types, one for animate masculines denoting human beings and animals (e.g. *pán* 'master'), the other for inanimate masculines (e.g. *hrad* 'castle'). The animate masculine is characterised by identical forms in the genitive (*pán-a*) and accusative case (*pán-a*), while the inanimate masculine has identical forms in the nominative (*hrad-Ø*) and accusative case (*hrad-Ø*). The distinction of animacy/inanimacy is also marked in orthography, determining the spelling of the nominal endings (*-i/-y*) in nominative plural forms: *pán-i* vs. *hrad-y*.[2]

Feminine and neuter nouns are not classified with respect to the feature of animacy, i.e. personal nouns such as *žena* (f) 'woman' or *děcko* (n) 'child' belong to the same declensional type as morphologically corresponding nouns denoting inanimate objects.

2.1 Grammatical gender

Grammatical gender is an inherent morphosyntactic property of the noun, which (together with the category of animacy) has both paradigmatic and syntagmatic features in Czech:

a. Nouns are classified into three gender classes corresponding to their declensional paradigms. Productive processes of word-formation, and in particular the derivation of feminine personal nouns give rise to numerous feminine counterparts to masculine terms.

b. Gender controls grammatical agreement between the noun (the controller) and the verb, as well as between the noun and its gender-variable satellite elements, such as adjectives, pronouns, and numerals in both attributive and predicative positions. The category of gender (together with that of animacy within the masculine gender) also controls the inflectional orthography of dependent verbs and nouns (e.g., the endings *-i/-y*):

(1) *Jeden   mladý   muž   potkal   svého*
one.MASC young.MASC man.MASC met.MASC his.MASC
přítele   a   vzal   ho   do kina.
friend.MASC and took.MASC him.MASC to cinema.NEUT
'A young man met his friend and took him to the cinema.'

(2) *Oba   mladí   muži   šli   spolu*
two.MASC young.MASC men.MASC went.MASC together
do kina.
to cinema.NEUT
'The two young men went together to the cinema.'

(3) *Jedna   mladá   žena   potkala svou   přítelkyni*
one.FEM young.FEM woman.FEM met.FEM her.FEM friend.FEM
a   vzala   ji   do kina.
and took.FEM her.FEM to cinema.NEUT
'A young woman met her friend and took her to the cinema.'

(4) *Obě   mladé   ženy   šly   spolu*
two.FEM young.FEM women.FEM went.FEM together
do kina.
to cinema.NEUT
'The two young women went together to the cinema.'

(5) *Jedno   malé   dítě   našlo   štěně*
one.NEUT little.NEUT child.NEUT found.NEUT puppy.NEUT
a   doneslo si   je   domů.
and brought.NEUT it.NEUT home
'A little child found a puppy and brought it home.'

Unlike in English, gender distinctions are communicated in Czech through various lexical, morphological, and syntactic means. Consequently, the category of gender and the relationship between grammatical gender and referential or "natural" gender has been analysed in detail by many Czech linguists: (a) in its diachronic perspective, tracing the history of the category of gender in Indo-European languages (cf. particularly Oberpfalcer 1933), and also (b) in its synchronic perspective (cf. Trávníček 1940, 1949; Šmilauer 1966, 1971; Jedlička 1955, Dokulil 1967; cf. also note 1). The analysis included word-formation, the adaptation of international lexemes to Czech morphology, and especially, the status of newly formed personal feminines. The Czech linguists have repeatedly debated systemic and functional features of the newly formed feminine terms, taking into account their opposition to, and competition with, masculine terms.

The linguistic interpretation of these opposite gender pairs was informed by the general background of the structuralist treatment of linguistic meanings and functions, and by markedness theory as formulated by Jakobson (1932); cf. also Daneš (1997).

Any interpretation of gender in Czech and, more specifically, the linguistic representation of women and men, must take into account the conspicuous nature of Czech gender distinctions. Languages differ not only in what they can express, but also in what they must express. Czech can (and in many cases must) communicate not only the gender of the person referred to, but also the gender of the speaker and that of the addressee. The Czech essayist Pavel Eisner (1946: 377–382) called Czech a thoroughly "sexist" language long before this topic was ever subjected to linguistic investigation. He established a scale of languages, based on the degree of linguistic sexism – where "sexism" relates to linguistic manifestations of gender and has nothing to do with the discrimination of women (or men):

> With regard to the structure of morphological endings and consequently word forms controlled by sex we can distinguish absolutely sexless languages like English, then languages with a small degree of sexism like German, languages with a larger degree – these are Romance languages – and in the end thoroughly sexist languages, and in Europe these are the Slavic languages, including Czech. (Eisner 1946: 378, my translation)

Although femaleness has many manifestations in Czech, some of the formal and functional manifestations of gender in the area of human reference can be interpreted as relics of the so-called "patriarchal language paradigm" (a term introduced by Eisner 1946: 366n), which may be universal. In Czech this also applies to orthography. The orthographic feature that is often mentioned in this connection is the choice of *-i* or *-y* in verb plural agreement, cf. the masculine vs. feminine verbal agreement in (2) vs. (4). In case of coordination of a masculine and a feminine noun it is the masculine expression which determines agreement: If at least one male person is present in the group referred to by the subject, only masculine agreement *-i* is permitted, as in (6):

(6) *Jeden   muž   a   tři   ženy   šli   do kina.*
      one.MASC man.MASC and three women.FEM went.MASC to cinema
      'One man and three women went to the cinema.'

2.2 Lexical gender

The correspondence between grammatical gender (masculine/feminine) and lexical gender (male/female) in Czech can best be illustrated by (general) personal nouns (Table 1a) and kinship terms (Table 1b). They are often paired by gender, but are not derived from each other. Typically, the nouns in this group display symmetry in that they stand in equipollent opposition, i.e. both terms are gender-specific and cannot substitute one another. However, this group of paired lexical gender nouns is now closed and unproductive in Czech.

Table 1c displays the marginal position of derived kinship terms such as the masculine/male term *tchán* 'father-in-law', which is historically derived from the feminine/female *tchyně* 'mother-in-law', and *švagr-ová* 'sister-in-law' which is derived from *švagr* 'brother-in-law'. Though these nouns form equipollent oppositions and are gender-specific, in metaphorical contexts female referents may be included in the group of referents denoted, e.g., by the masculine *vnuk* 'grandson', cf. (7).

Table 1a. General personal nouns

Masculine		Feminine	
muž	'man'	*žena*	'woman'
chlapec/hoch	'boy'	*dívka*	'girl'
kluk	'boy'	*holka*	'girl'
ženich	'bridegroom'	*nevěsta*	'bride'

Table 1b. Kinship terms

otec	'father'	*matka*	'mother'
otčím	'stepfather'	*macecha*	'stepmother'
bratr	'brother'	*sestra*	'sister'
syn	'son'	*dcera*	'daughter'
synovec	'nephew'	*neteř*	'niece'
bratranec	'cousin'	*sestřenice*	'cousin'
strýc	'uncle'	*teta*	'aunt'
zeť	'son-in-law'	*snacha*	'daughter-in-law'

Table 1c. Derived kinship terms

tchán	'father-in-law'	*tchyně*	'mother-in-law'
švagr	'brother-in-law'	*švagrová*	'sister-in-law'
vdovec	'widower'	*vdova*	'widow'
vnuk	'grandson'	*vnučka*	'granddaughter'

(7)   *Mysleme na naše vnuky.*
       think   of our grandsons.MASC
       'Think of our grandsons (i.e. of the next generations).'

This type of female invisibility also occurs in expressions such as *generace našich otců* 'generation of our fathers' and *generace našich dědů* 'generation of our grandfathers'.

To avoid the gender-specific reference of kinship terms, Czech can use nouns with gender-indefinite or gender-neutral reference, such as *rodič*, pl. *rodiče* 'parents', which are grammatical masculines:

(8)   *Rodič* (male or female person) *pomůže dítěti.*
       'A parent will help a child.'

(9)   *Rodiče* (male and/or female) *pomohou dětem.*
       'The parents will help the children.'

Other nouns with gender-indefinite or gender-neutral reference for family members include the following masculines: *manžel*, pl. *manželé* 'couple', *partner*, pl. *partneři* 'partners', *prarodič*, pl. *prarodiče* 'grandparents', *sourozenec*, pl. *sourozenci* 'siblings' (children of both genders are denoted by grammatically neuter nouns: *dítě*, *děcko*, pl. *děti*, *děcka* 'children', *vnouče*, pl. *vnoučata* 'grandchildren').

The gender-indefinite or gender-neutral function can be expressed not only by generic masculines, such as *partner*, *rodinný příslušník*, or *člen rodiny* 'family member', but also by masculine, feminine and neuter epicenes (in Czech *jména vespolná*) (see Section 2.3), as well as by the so-called double gender nouns (in Czech *jména obourodá*), cf. Section 2.4.

2.3 Epicene nouns

Epicenes (*vespolná jména*) denote both female and male persons without a change of grammatical gender. These nouns belong to one of the grammatical genders and require the corresponding grammatical agreement.

2.3.1 *Masculine epicenes*

The central term in the category of masculine epicenes is undoubtedly *člověk* 'man, person' (plural *lidé* 'people') which can be described as gender-indefinite. The feminine counterpart *člověčice* 'female person' is very rare and stylistically marked, created occasionally to foreground the gender opposition as part of poetic licence (the corresponding feminine epicene *osoba* will be discussed in

Section 2.3.2). The term *člověk* applies to women as well, as in the following example from an interview between two young women:

(10)   *Považujete se   za   cílevědomého   člověka?*
       consider   you yourself ambitious.MASC person.MASC
       'Do you consider yourself an ambitious person?'

Eisner (1946: 366) stated that Czech differentiates between the general personal noun *člověk* and the personal noun with male-specific reference *muž* 'man', and in this sense, he states, the Czech language is more friendly and welcoming to women than other languages in which the general noun denoting a person is derived from the noun "man" or associated with maleness. This semantic association can arise in Czech, too, particularly in contexts referring to an individual as in (11):

(11)   *Byl   tam jen jeden   člověk.*
       was.MASC there only one.MASC person.MASC
       'There was only one person/one man there.'

The noun *člověk* is mostly used in colloquial contexts, its indefinite meaning being sometimes close to that of the pronoun *somebody*, *anybody*, *one* (analogous to German *man*):

(12)   *Člověk   stráví   ve škole   spoustu času.*
       man.MASC spends at school much   time.
       'One spends a lot of time at school.'

Other nouns in this group are the above-mentioned masculines *rodič* 'parent', *kojenec* 'nursing infant', *sourozenec* 'sibling', and also *jedinec* 'individual', *jednotlivec* 'individual', *host* 'guest' and *sirotek* 'orphan':

(13)   *Máš   nějakého sourozence?*
       have.you any.MASC sibling.MASC
       'Do you have a brother or sister?'

Most of the nouns in this group can transmit both positive and negative evaluations. Whereas the nouns *idol* 'idol', *genius* 'genius', *drahoušek* 'darling', *miláček* 'sweetheart' and others express positive evaluations, the nouns *snob* 'cultural snob' or *anonym* 'anonymous person' are usually connected with negative associations. The group of masculine epicenes is quite numerous, as many nouns derived from adjectives lack feminine counterparts: *chytrák* 'clever', *hlupák* 'blockhead', *blbec* 'fool', *blázen* 'lunatic', *opilec* 'drunkard',

lenoch 'idler', *zuřivec* 'maniac', *zbabělec* 'coward', *pokrytec* 'hypocrite', *lakomec* 'miser', *povýšenec* 'arrogant person', *snaživec* 'eager person', *blouznivec* 'visionary', and *zločinec* 'criminal'.

A woman may use the gender-indefinite masculine noun *blázen* when referring to another woman, when addressing a female addressee, or when referring to herself, cf. (14):

(14)   *To jsem blázen.*
        it   I.am fool.MASC
        'I must be crazy.'

Nevertheless, some of the masculine epicenes have rare and expressive feminine counterparts. This results from a strong tendency in Czech to create feminine counterparts to all grammatical masculines, e.g. *bláznivka* 'female lunatic', *lenoška* 'female idler', *chytračka* 'clever woman', *hlupačka* 'female blockhead', *zuřivka* 'female maniac', *lakomnice* 'female miser'. In dialects and occasionally also in literary language additional feminines may appear, such as *hostka* 'female guest', *génijka* 'female genius', *idolka* 'female idol', *milka* 'female darling', *drahuška* 'female darling', *anonymka* 'anonymous woman', *blbka* 'female fool', *opilka* 'female drunkard' or *povýšenkyně* 'arrogant woman'.

2.3.2   *Feminine epicenes*

There are also a number of feminine epicenes, the most neutral undoubtedly being *osoba* 'person'. This noun is frequently used in law (*osoby činné v trestním řízení* 'persons active in criminal proceedings'), psychology (*závislá osoba* 'dependent individual'), the workplace (*soukromá osoba* 'private person'), administration (*úřední osoba* 'official') and social life (*doprovázející osoba* 'accompanying person, escort').

Whereas in written texts the noun *osoba* 'person' is stylistically neutral and gender-indefinite, in colloquial speech, fairy tales and story-telling it may raise associations with a female person (the analogy with *člověk* 'man' being obvious).

There is another noun belonging to the category of feminine epicenes, i.e. *osobnost* 'person, personality', which – unlike the stylistically neutral noun *osoba* – transmits a positive evaluation 'a remarkable person' in various respects, particularly in the world of science, culture, social and political life, and in the sense of 'a type of personality'. It can also be applied in more neutral contexts, particularly to denote representatives of various occupations, backgrounds, settings or political opinions, as in (15):

(15) *Osobnosti* (f) *z prostředí Brandýského fóra sdělily* (f) *svůj postoj v dopise,*
který odeslaly (f) *v pátek předsedkyni* (f) *US-DEU a předsedovi* (m)
KDU-ČSL Cyrilu Svobodovi.
(*Literární noviny*, 13 February 2002:2)
'Personalities (f) from the Brandýs Forum expressed (f) their position in
a letter they sent (f) on Friday to the chairwoman (f) of US-DEU and the
chairman (m) of KDU-ČSL Cyril Svoboda.'

Another personal feminine is *bytost* 'being, creature', which is used predominantly in philosophical, psychological and literary contexts. It can be found in neutral and positive evaluative contexts, mostly in predicative positions:

(16) *Byla   to   křehká   bytost.*
was.FEM it.NEUT tender.FEM being.FEM
'He/she was a tender being.'

The feminine noun *existence* 'existence', when applied to a person, tends to appear in deprecating contexts, where it refers to a person's peculiar characteristics (e.g., *podivná existence* 'a fellow of dubious background'), and in this sense it is close to the negative meaning of the more expressive noun *kreatura* 'creature'.

Several additional personal nouns are used without regard to referential gender, e.g. *postava*, *figura* 'figure'. These nouns appear in evaluative contexts (e.g., *velká postava české literatury* 'a major figure in Czech literature', *pochybná postava českých dějin* 'a dubious figure in Czech history') and can be applied to both males and females. The noun is often found in literary discourse (*literární postava* 'literary character'), and appears mostly in descriptive, visual contexts, where it may introduce a new character on the scene whose gender may be unknown or unimportant.

The group of feminine epicenes also includes nouns with positive connotations used to characterise persons or rather personalities, such as *autorita* 'authority', used mostly in politics, science and family life; *kapacita* 'authority', used mostly in science; *celebrita* 'celebrity', widespread in social life; and the metaphorical noun *hvězda* 'star', used in culture, particularly in the areas of theatre, film, music and sports, as in *tenisová herecká*, *filmová hvězda*, *hvězda pop-music* 'tennis-, theatre-, film-, pop-star'. As grammatical feminines these nouns require feminine agreement, within a sentence or across sentence boundaries. This group of nouns also includes metaphorical nominations of human qualities both positive, as in *pilná včelka*, *včelička* 'diligent little bee', and negative, as in *obluda* 'monster', *příšera* 'fright', *baba* 'coward', *bačkora* 'push-

over', *bábovka* 'sissy'; on the border between positive and negative evaluation are, e.g., *(velká) ryba* 'fish', *štika* 'pike, cunning person', and *liška* 'fox'.

Historical contexts testify to a wide use of such abstract nouns as *Excelence* 'Excellence', *Magnificence* 'Magnificence', *Výsost* 'Highness', *Milost* 'Majesty, Grace', or *Svatost* 'Holiness', which are grammatical feminines denoting both male and female beings. Referential gender is expressed by the possessive pronouns *jeho* 'his' or *její* 'her'; however, these nouns require feminine agreement:

(17) a. *Jeho Královská milost   přišla.*
          his   royal.FEM majesty.FEM came.FEM
          'His Majesty the King arrived.'
      b. *Její Královská milost   přišla.*
          her royal.FEM majesty.FEM came.FEM
          'Her Majesty the Queen arrived.'

2.3.3   *Neuter epicenes*

Besides nouns for immature persons, e.g., *dítě* 'child', *vnouče* 'grandchild', *batole* 'toddler', *nemluvně* 'infant', or *lidské mládě* 'child, greenhorn' there is the neutral noun *individuum* 'individual', which is partially synonymous with the stylistically neutral masculine *jedinec, jednotlivec* 'individual', but often transmits negative connotations, especially when preceded by the adjective 'strange', as in *podivné individuum* 'peculiar, strange, odd creature'. Some other evaluative nouns focus on insufficient size (*mrně, prtě, škvrně* 'tiny tot') or negative or insufficient outer or inner features, e.g., *strašidlo* 'fright', *trdlo* 'klutz, twit', *motovidlo* 'oaf', *třeštidlo* 'madcap', or *slonbidlo* 'spindleshanks'.

In historical contexts, honorary nominations and titles are widely used, such as *blahorodí* 'Honour' or *veličenstvo* 'Majesty', which are grammatically neuter denoting both male and female persons. Referential gender is communicated by the pronouns *jeho* 'his' or *její* 'her', but syntactically these nouns require neuter agreement:

(18) *Jeho Císařské   veličenstvo   přišlo.*
      his   imperial.NEUT majesty.NEUT came.NEUT
      'His Honour the Emperor came.'

2.4 Double gender nouns

In Czech, there is a group of nouns that have one form in the nominative singular, but two grammatical genders, i.e. they belong to two grammatical

Table 2. Double gender nouns

Masculine		Feminine	
choť	'partner, husband'	*choť*	'partner, wife'
mluvčí	'spokesman'	*mluvčí*	'spokeswoman'
průvodčí	'male conductor'	*průvodčí*	'female conductor'
sirota	'male orphan'	*sirota*	'female orphan'
popleta	'male muddler'	*popleta*	'female muddler'

gender paradigms as manifested both paradigmatically (on the level of morphological forms) and syntagmatically (on the level of agreement), cf. Table 2.

The obsolete noun *choť* denotes either a husband or a wife. A semantic analogy with English *spouse* is obvious. In Czech, however, the word belongs to two gender paradigms and accordingly takes two types of agreement:

(19) a. *Přišel   se   svou   chotí.*
          came.MASC with his.FEM partner.FEM
          'He came with his wife.'

      b. *Přišla   se   svým   chotěm.*
          came.FEM with her.MASC partner.MASC
          'She came with her husband.'

(20) a. *Můj   choť   přišel.*
          my.MASC partner.MASC came.MASC
          'My husband came.'

      b. *Moje   choť   přišla.*
          my.FEM partner.FEM came.FEM
          'My wife came.'

The group of double gender nouns includes some personal nouns derived from verbs, such as *mluvit* 'speak', *provádět* 'conduct', *vypravit* 'dispatch': *mluvčí* 'spokesman/spokeswoman', *průvodčí* (m/f) 'conductor', *výpravčí* (m/f) 'train dispatcher', also *rukojmí* (n, recently also m/f) 'hostage', cf. (21–24). It is not easy to decide whether we have one lexeme with two grammatical genders (cf. the term *double gender*) or two separate lexemes with partially homonymous forms.

(21) *Prezident* (m) *představil* (m) *svého* (m) *nového* (m) *mluvčího* (m) *Pavla Nováka.*
      'The President introduced his new spokesman Pavel Novák.'

(22) *Prezident* (m) *představil* (m) *svou* (f) *novou* (f) *mluvčí* (f) *Annu Novákovou.*
      'The President introduced his new spokeswoman Anna Nováková.'

(23)   *Nový* (m)   *mluvčí* (m)   *Pavel Novák se omluvil* (m).
        'The new spokesman Pavel Novák apologised.'

(24)   *Nová* (f)   *mluvčí* (f)   *Anna Nováková se omluvila* (f).
        'The new spokeswoman Anna Nováková apologised.'

In addition, there is a group of expressive double gender nouns belonging to the *a*-declension, usually associated with feminine gender. These expressive nouns are used mainly in the singular; nevertheless, their plural paradigms are also gender-sensitive. The obsolete noun *sirota* 'orphan' denotes either an orphaned boy or an orphaned girl, and takes either masculine or feminine agreement. The same applies to such colloquial expressive nouns as *popleta* 'muddler', *nešika* 'butter-finger', *naivka* 'naive person', and some other evaluative nouns belonging to the *a*-declension.

2.5 Nominalised adjectives

There is an even larger class of gender-symmetrical nouns (i.e. partially homonymous pairs of nouns), both masculines and feminines. These are conversions of adjectives (participles), cf. Table 3.

Table 3. Nominalised adjectives and participles

Masculine	Feminine	
dospívající	*dospívající*	'adolescent'
cestující	*cestující*	'traveller'
vedoucí	*vedoucí*	'head, leader'
dospělý	*dospělá*	'adult'
milý	*milá*	'beloved'

2.5.1   *Nominalised adjectives of the type* **dospívající** *(m/f) 'adolescent'*
In the nominative singular, e.g., *dospívající (muž)* 'adolescent (man)' – *dospívající (žena)* 'adolescent (woman)', and in all plural forms, e.g., *dospívající (muži) – dospívající (ženy)*, masculine and feminine forms merge, but are differentiated by gender in singular oblique cases, as in the genitive form: *dospívajícího (muže) – dospívající (ženy)*. These nouns denote persons on the basis of different features, relations, professions and functions: *neslyšící* (m/f) 'deaf person', *tonoucí* (m/f) 'drowning person', *předsedající* (m/f) 'acting chairperson', *soutěžící* (m/f) 'competitor', *vedoucí* (m/f) 'chief', *domácí* (m/f) 'landlord/landlady', *spolubydlící* (m/f) 'roommate', *kolemjdoucí* (m/f) 'passer-by', *pracující* (m/f) 'worker', *vyšetřující*

(m/f) 'investigator', *cestující* (m/f) 'passenger', *pěší* (m/f) 'pedestrian', *pokladní* (m/f) 'cashier', *radní* (m/f) 'counsillor', cf. (25):

(25)   a.   *Nový   vedoucí   odešel.*
            new.MASC chief.MASC left.MASC
            'The new chief left.'

       b.   *Nová   vedoucí   odešla.*
            new.FEM chief.FEM left.FEM
            'The new chief left.'

2.5.2   *Nominalised adjectives of the type* dospělý/dospělá *(m/f) 'adult'*
Gender-symmetry also marks the group of masculine and feminine nouns converted from adjectives (participles) whose gender opposition is also manifested in the nominative singular: *dospělý (muž)* 'adult (man)' – *dospělá (žena)* 'adult (woman)', and, of course, in oblique cases, cf. the genitive forms *dospělého (muže)* – *dospělé (ženy)*. These nouns, too, denote persons on the basis of different features, relations, professions and functions: *známý/-á* (m/f) 'acquaintance', *milý/-á* (m/f) 'beloved', *vyvolený/-á* (m/f) 'sweetheart', *handicapovaný/-á*, *postižený/-á* (m/f) 'handicapped', *nemocný/-á* (m/f) 'ill', *raněný/-á* (m/f) 'wounded', *bytná/-ý* (m/f) 'landlord/landlady', *vrátný/-á* (m/f) 'porter', *odsouzený/-á* (m/f) 'convicted', *pohřešovaný/-á* (m/f) 'missing', *podezřelý/-á* (m/f) 'suspect', *hledaný/-á* (m/f) 'wanted', *trestně stíhaný/-á* (m/f) 'criminally prosecuted', *nezaměstnaný/-á* (m/f) 'unemployed', etc.

These nominalised adjectives and participles are converted directly from collocations with the word *muž* 'man' or *žena* 'woman'. They refer to women and men symmetrically, particularly in the case of a singular referent in a referential context:

(26)   *Tento   nemocný byl   převezen   do nemocnice.*
        this.MASC ill.MASC was.MASC carried.MASC to hospital
        'This ill man was taken to hospital.'

(27)   *Tato   nemocná byla   převezena   do nemocnice.*
        this.FEM ill.FEM   was.FEM carried.FEM to hospital
        'This ill woman was taken to hospital.'

The personal nouns introduced in 2.4 and in 2.5 are formed symmetrically, but do not form an equipollent opposition, as their textual usage shows: their opposition is privative, i.e. a masculine term, being an unmarked form, may include a female referent (cf. Section 4).

2.6 Word-formation

2.6.1 *The derivation of feminine personal nouns*

The tendency toward separate terms for males and females in Czech is reflected in widely applied processes of "motion", i.e. the derivation of feminine counterparts from masculine nouns. In comparison with other Slavic languages, this type of word-formation is more productive in Czech (particularly in the area of occupational terms), cf. Table 4.

Table 4. The derivation of personal feminines

Masculine	Feminine	
učitel	*učitelka*	'teacher'
divák	*divačka*	'viewer'
ministr	*ministryně*	'minister'
poslanec	*poslankyně*	'deputy'

A feminine counterpart may be formed practically from any masculine form – if the meaning of the masculine permits female reference. E.g., the term *horník* 'miner' has a potential feminine parallel *hornice*, but this is not used because there are no women working as miners (cf. Section 3). Because they are formally marked by suffixes, the feminine terms may be perceived as secondary. However, they are widely used, and most of them are stylistically neutral, although some are rare in comparison with their masculine counterparts, depending on the type of lexeme, the suffix and the frequency of the given noun. For instance, as *psychiatr* 'psychiatrist' allows both the feminine terms *psychiatrička* and *psychiatryně*, and *chirurg* 'surgeon' both *chiruržka* and *chirurgyně*, they are used more reluctantly than stable derivations. Czech speakers have completely accepted such feminine nouns as *doktorka* 'female doctor', *starostka* 'female mayor', *ministryně* 'female minister', *poslankyně* 'female deputy', *psycholožka* 'female psychologist', and *filoložka* 'female philologist', all of which were hardly used a few decades ago.

Linguistic debates about derived feminines and their relation to masculines formerly addressed systemic processes of formation, social legitimacy and norms of usage (cf. Trávníček 1949: 426). For example, two competing variants of a feminine for *doktor* were discussed by Trávníček at that time:

(28) a. *Paní doktor   mi poradila.*
          Mrs doctor.MASC me advised.FEM
      b. *Paní doktorka   mi poradila.*
          Mrs doctor.FEM me advised.FEM

In present-day Czech, *doktorka* has become generally accepted, whereas *doktor* for a female doctor is used rarely and exclusively by elderly people. Both forms have been frequently discussed by Czech linguists. E.g., Trávníček (1940:148) maintained that it was not the form of the title (*doktor/doktorka*) that would guarantee equal positions for men and women, but the law, public opinions, social attitudes, and life itself.

The same opinion was voiced by bohemicists in the 1950s and 1960s. It has repeatedly been noticed that equal rights have brought women to new professions and that "the language has to reflect these facts systematically and organically. The tendency to denote women in various occupations, functions and positions by separate terms derived from masculines is salient in Czech" (Jedlička 1955:79). The effort not to exclude women from traditionally male positions has given rise to feminine counterparts of masculines even in the sphere of military service, cf. *vojákyně* 'female soldier', *vojínka* 'female private', *poručice* 'female lieutenant', *plukovnice* 'female colonel', *generálka* 'female general'.

The derived feminine terms belong to the so-called nomina agentis (*učitelka* 'female teacher', *ředitelka* 'female director', *hlasatelka* 'female announcer'), nomina actoris (*novinářka* 'female journalist', *oštěpařka* 'female javelin thrower'), nomina attributiva (*cizinka* 'female foreigner', *demokratka* 'female democrat', *chudinka* 'poor woman'), and to the nouns denoting persons according to their place of origin (*Češka* 'Czech woman', *Angličanka* 'Englishwoman', *Moravanka* 'Moravian woman', *Pražačka* 'woman from Prague'). Most of the derived feminines belong to the first two categories, the most productive derivational suffix being -*ka*. A monograph on word-formation in Czech (Dokulil 1967:125) lists more than 1000 feminines derived by this suffix. Since that time, however, their number has increased even more. The dictionary of Czech neologisms (*Slovník neologismů* 1998) includes such words as *moderátorka* 'female moderator', *vizážistka* 'female visagiste', *workoholička* 'female workaholic' and many others.

Another productive derivational suffix in Czech is -*ice*, as in *pracovnice* 'female worker', *kadeřnice* 'female hairdresser', *současnice* 'female contemporary', *krasavice* 'female beauty', *výtvarnice* 'female artist', or *uprchlice* 'female refugee'. Dokulil (1967) mentions about 230 feminines derived by this suffix.

The next suffix on the frequency scale is *-(k)yně*, as in *poslankyně* 'female deputy', *ministryně* 'female minister', *umělkyně* 'female artist', *běžkyně* 'female runner', etc. The suffix *-ová* is restricted to the derivation of female surnames from both Czech and foreign male names, e.g., *Nováková, Krejčová, Lagerlöfová*. Other suffixes are specialised: *-na* is restricted to historical terms, cf. *kněžna* 'Duchess' or *královna* 'Queen', and *-anda* is a derivational element used to derive expressive and often derogatory feminines, e.g. *vojanda* 'woman soldier'.

Feminine counterparts to masculine nouns can be found in dictionaries, though inconsistently. The *Dictionary of the literary Czech language* (SSJČ) introduces them in brackets following the masculine term, whereas the more recent *Dictionary of contemporary Czech* (SSČ) introduces both forms (m is followed by f, often in a shortened form; for a profound analysis of SSČ from the point of view of gender linguistics see Dickins 2001). The *Dictionary of neologisms* (*Slovník neologismů* 1998) treats both parallels separately in two lexical entries.

2.6.2 *Compounding*

Compounding is not used as a means of gender specification in Czech. Compounding of the word *muž* 'man' or *žena* 'woman' with another noun (typical of English and German) does not occur in Czech; juxtaposition of the word *žena* with a masculine noun (typical of Russian, e.g. *ženščina-vrač* 'woman doctor') is not used either. Such masculine nouns as *gentleman* (more often *džentlmen*), *businessman* (*byznysmen*), *sportsman, superman, batman*, etc. are more or less lexicalised loans from English. Instead of compounding, Czech uses double gender nouns (29a) or derivation (29b) to create feminine counterparts:

(29) a.   'spokesperson'   *mluvčí* (m/f)
           'chairperson'   *předsedající* (m/f)
      b.   'businessman/woman' *obchodník* (m), *obchodnice* (f)
           'salesman/woman'   *prodavač* (m), *prodavačka* (f)
           'sportsman/woman'   *sportovec* (m), *sportovkyně* (f)

3.   Asymmetries and lexical gaps

Due to extralinguistic restrictions some male-specific masculines lack feminine counterparts and vice versa. Such asymmetries may have different origins, and may derive from:

a. biologically and socially determined roles in family life; for this reason *rodička* 'mother-parent', *kojná* 'wet-nurse' or *chůva* 'nanny' are feminines and have no semantically parallel masculines;

b. the distribution of roles in social, professional and occupational settings; for this reason, *bytná* 'landlady' and *servírka* 'waitress' are feminine, whereas *pikolík* 'page boy, bus boy' is a masculine term and *příručí* 'shop assistant' tends to have male reference;

c. the distribution of roles in religious life; while e.g. the masculine *kněz* 'priest' includes both non-Christian and Christian connotations, the feminine *kněžka* 'priestess' is associated rather with non-Christian contexts; the feminine *vědma* 'prophetess' has no masculine counterpart in Czech, but can be roughly paralleled to masculine *jasnovidec* 'clairvoyant'.

d. various aspects of evaluation of male and female characteristics and appearance; this is responsible for the male interpretation of such masculines as *vousáč* 'bearded', *holobrádek* 'beardless', *plešatec* 'bald' and the female associations conveyed by feminines such as *kráska* 'beauty', *plavovláska* 'blonde', or *modroočka* 'blue-eyed'. Such asymmetries may have linguistic as well as cultural motivations: cf., e.g., the different denotative and connotative features of such lexemes as *duch* 'spirit' and *duše* 'soul':

(30) a.   *Byl   to velký   duch.*
          was.MASC it great.MASC spirit.MASC
          'He/she was a great spirit.'
      b.   *Byla   to křehká   duše.*
          was.FEM it tender.FEM soul.FEM
          'He/she was a tender soul.'

Each lexeme has a significant amount of cultural history inscribed in its semantics and transports rich intertextual and inter-discursive overtones. Over time, some types of gender-aligned messages have remained constant, while others have changed. Some nominations have disappeared or become archaic; and many new terms have appeared which demonstrate the process of neutralising gender oppositions and contribute to the mixing of gender roles. Thus, in present-day Czech we can observe not only feminine counterparts to originally masculine nouns as in *golfista – golfistka* or *surfař – surfařka*, but also the opposite, i.e. masculine counterparts to originally feminine nouns: *striptérka – striptér, prostitutka – prostitut, modelka – model, hosteska – hostes, feministka – feminista*, etc. Whereas in such examples the process of reverse derivation

causes no problems (the feminine ending is simply removed), in other cases it may be more difficult to find a corresponding expression (*sestřička* lit. 'diminutive sister' means 'nurse' in Czech).

The pairs of gender nouns and their meanings are subject to diachronic change. This concerns not only their occurrence in language and their frequency in texts, but also the interpretation of their semantic and stylistic features, as given in dictionaries. The paired lexemes may or may not be listed in dictionaries as independent entries and the meaning of the feminine form can be described as dependent on or independent of the respective masculine term. In any case, dictionaries deal with the fact that some of the interrelated gender pairs are only partially synonymous, i.e. they share only a part of their semantic core. For example, a feminine term may lack some of the meanings of its male counterpart: whereas *mistr* may denote 'master, specialist, artist, head of a workshop', and may generally be used as the title of an outstanding artist or athlete, *mistryně* can be used only as the title of an outstanding female athlete, while *mistrová* denotes a female head of a workshop. Masculines may have developed different semantic features than their feminine counterparts due to transposition processes in metaphorical contexts, cf. the nouns *otcové* 'fathers', *dědové* 'grandfathers', *vnuci* 'grandsons' denoting 'generations'. Fathers can also be associated with founders (*otcové zakladatelé* 'founding fathers'), whereas mothers are associated with wisdom (*matka moudrosti* 'mother of wisdom').

Long lists of both male-specific and female-specific nouns, not only from the literary language but also from various dialects, can be found in Eisner (1946: 368–377). He also analyses numerous examples of cross-gender reference, i.e. denoting a male person with a feminine noun (such as *klepna* 'gossip', *fňukna* 'whimperer', *bábovka* 'softie', *bačkora* 'sneak') and vice versa. Linguists have made two salient observations about the phenomenon of crossing gender lines (see Yokoyama 1999: 422f, who analysed the situation in Russian): The use of masculine nouns to refer to women (a) can be accounted for by Jakobson's thesis about the more inclusive, unmarked nature of the masculine gender in Russian, (b) carries affectionate connotations and generally produces positive effects, while crossing the gender line in the direction of feminine nouns, with reference to men, produces negative connotations (cf. Tobin, vol. I). According to Yokoyama, this is evidence of the fact that maleness is more positively evaluated than femaleness (for the situation in Russian see also Doleschal & Schmid, vol. I). In Czech, the effects of cross-gender reference do not seem to be as conspicuous as in Russian, and both neutral and connotatively charged (ameliorative and pejorative) transgressions can be found in either direction.

4. Masculine generics

Although the productivity of feminine derivation from originally masculine forms is almost unlimited in Czech (with the exceptions mentioned above) and constantly supply the repertoire of feminine nouns with new items (e.g. professional titles), the frequency of derived feminines in texts is lower than we would expect, due to the fact that in gender-indefinite contexts masculine forms are considered to be the norm.[3]

According to structuralist theory it is the unmarkedness of masculine terms that is responsible for the fact that the referential range of masculine terms is wider than that of corresponding feminine terms (Jakobson 1932, 1971). While in the area of terms for human referents feminines are always female-specific, masculine terms have both male-specific and gender-neutral reference.

The concept of privative, i.e. asymmetrical, gender opposition has been questioned repeatedly (cf. Dokulil 1958). Examples show that the relationship between the two members of a gender pair is sometimes equipollent, i.e. symmetrical:

(31)   *Porady   se.zúčastnilo   pět učitelek*
       in.meeting participated.NEUT five teachers.FEM
       a   tři   učitelé.
       and three teachers.MASC
       'Five teachers (f) and three teachers (m) participated (n) in the meeting.'

Jakobson (1932:74) acknowledged this fact when he stated that the unmarked category can under certain conditions express the non-existence, or absence of the feature – in our case femaleness – and may express the opposite feature, i.e. maleness. Jakobson adds that this is even the most frequent function of the unmarked term. However, he points out that such a contextually bound meaning does not contradict the general and basic meaning of an unmarked category.

The contextually bound gender-specific meaning of the unmarked category appears in situations of foregrounding, i.e. in situations where maleness stands in contrast to femaleness, as in example (31). When gender is not foregrounded, the opposition remains hidden and the female reference is only implicit. This holds for singular as well as plural expressions in Czech:

(32)   *Tato televize se snaží oslovit diváka* (m), *dát mu* (m) *možnost, aby
       vyjádřil* (m) *svůj* (m) *názor.*
       'This TV tries to address the viewer (m), giving him (m) a chance to
       express (m) his (m) opinion.'

(33)   *Ráda* (f) *čtu rozhovory s herci* (m), *ale nedivím se některým svým*
        kolegům (m), *že nechtějí s novináři* (m) *mluvit.*
        'I like (f) to read interviews with actors (m), however, I do not find it
        strange that some of my colleagues (m) do not wish to talk to
        journalists (m).'

One must admit that in some contexts the usage of masculine forms may create
the impression that it is predominantly or only men who are being referred to.
It is not easy to say which contexts suggest a more gender-specific or more
gender-indefinite reading of a noun. First of all, it would be necessary to
distinguish between several types of referential situations, from those in which
the referent is an individual who may, however, be unknown (*hledaný vrah* 'the
wanted murderer'), to those of generic reference, with a large number of
possible referential situations between the two poles.

    Whether we interpret masculine terms as in (34) in their generic or gender-
specific meaning, depends on many factors, including the meaning of a lexeme,
the situation referred to, the author's as well as the reader's perspective, etc.

(34)   *Procesy se zločinci* (m) *minulého režimu, ať už máme na mysli*
        zločince (m) *ve smyslu mravním, nebo i zákonném, vnucují ještě jednu*
        užaslou otázku. Jak to, že ani jeden (m) *z nich není schopen* (m) *podívat se*
        na vlastní minulost…?
        (*Literární noviny*, 13 February 2002:4; (m) added)
        'The legal proceedings with the criminals (m) of the past regime, be it
        criminals (m) in a moral or a legal sense, prompt one further astounding
        question: How is it possible that not a single one (m) of them was able to
        look into his (m) own past…?'

There are several principles that seem to underlie the usage of masculine/
feminine forms:

Reference to third person
In referential contexts femaleness is often contrasted to maleness – when a
singular female referent or more referents whose gender is known are meant:

(35)   *Naše   učitelka   je nemocná.*
        our.FEM teacher.FEM is ill.FEM
        'Our teacher is ill.'

In predicative positions feminines may be used to characterise a female referent
(36a), but this is not necessarily common practice (36b):

(36)   a.   *Ona je vědecká.pracovnice.*
             she is scholar.FEM
             'She is a scholar.'
       b.   *Ona je vědecký.pracovník.*
             she is scholar.MASC
             'She is a scholar.'

Speaker reference

Not only when women are referred to by other speakers, but also when women talk about themselves, they often use masculine nouns to express their profession:

(37)   *Já jako lingvista* (m), *filosof* (m), *právník* (m) *si myslím …*
       'I as a linguist (m), philosopher (m), lawyer (m) think …'

What is stressed in these utterances is professional status and membership in a professional group. Group membership is often more important than gender differentiation. However, feminine counterparts can be used in such contexts and it may be only a question of time until they prevail over masculine expressions.

Reference to addressee

As a rule, the gender of the addressee is explicitly identified, at least as far as nominal address forms are concerned. In situations of social contact, women and men are both addressed, with the women being addressed before the men as a form of "politeness":

(38)   *Vážené dámy a pánové*
       'Dear ladies and gentlemen'

In written texts, the norms differ in accordance with the type of discourse. Magazines and other texts designed explicitly for girls and women address their readership with feminine nouns *Milé čtenářky*, *Vážené čtenářky* (f.pl) 'Dear readers ', or recently also *Milá čtenářko* (f.sg) 'Dear reader', or *Milá dívko* (f.sg) 'Dear girl' (cf. Čmejrková 1996, 1997, 1998). However, in texts addressed to a mixed readership masculine forms prevail *Milý čtenáři* (m.sg) 'Dear reader', *Milí čtenáři* (m.pl) 'Dear readers', though we also encounter more gender-specific address forms such as *Milá čtenářko* (f.sg), *milý čtenáři* (m.sg) 'Dear reader', especially in those types of texts which are based on the so-called "synthetic personalisation" (Fairclough 1989). Such a form of addressing a potential reader is typical of media discourse, particularly of advertising and generally of those situations when authors do not know their audience and

therefore use synthetic personalisation (or splitting) as "a compensatory tendency to give the impression of treating each of the people 'handled' en masse as an individual" (Fairclough 1989: 62). The application of this principle in advertising is self-evident (cf. Čmejrková 1998, 2001).

5.   Achieving female visibility in Czech

A symmetrical form of reference with both masculine and feminine terms (splitting) seems to be in progress. If the text is designed to reach both a male and a female audience and tries to treat both genders symmetrically, the consequences of its dual orientation vary depending on the nature of the text. Short official texts, circulars, and questionnaires sometimes employ splitting of items such as: *žadatel* (m), *žadatelka* (f) 'applicant', *narozen* (m), *narozena* (f) 'born', etc., usually in the form *žadatel(ka)*, *narozen(a)*. This usage also appears in job advertisements, albeit unsystematically. The format of job advertisements has been undergoing a change in Czech professional settings, and splitting in job offers seems to be getting the norm.

Splitting may also be introduced into those types of texts which have the character of a short list of items addressed to a mass audience, or into newspaper headlines (cf. Valdrová 2001).

Apart from usage in such simple text types, the strategy of splitting or any other kind of gender-fair usage is problematic in Czech, as the category of gender has distinctive manifestations on several linguistic levels (cf. Section 2.1). For personal reference, Czech has a set of morphological endings not only in adjectives, pronouns, and some numerals, but also in verb forms. Although differentiation in the active voice affects only preterit forms of the indicative and subjunctive, in the passive voice grammatical gender is marked in all three tenses and moods. This is also the reason why Czech linguists are very cautious to recommend any language policy in this respect.

Thus, a consistent gender-oriented translation of the English sentence (39) into Czech would result in a problematic case of gender splitting:

(39)   The reader is invited to reveal for himself/herself the consequences of revising language paradigms for the text.
Čtenář/ka (m/f) *je vyzýván/a* (m/f), *aby sám/sama* (m/f) *odhalil/a* (m/f) *důsledky revidování jazykového paradigmatu pro text.*

Attempts at avoiding a male bias in a cohesive text would result in the stylistically objectionable proliferation of masculine and feminine word pairs. We are reminded of Pavel Eisner's statement about the erotic spell in the Czech language as rendered by the system of feminine endings. This characteristic feature of Czech (and to a certain extent of all Slavic languages) would overload many Czech gender-oriented texts with cumbersome formulations.

In other languages one of the solutions to avoid problems of splitting is the use of personal nouns in the plural. However, in Czech, plural forms are no option because they would result in equally clumsy utterances:

(40)   *Čtenář/i/ky* (m/f) *jsou vyzýván/i/y* (m/f), *aby sam/i/y* (m/f) *odhalil/i/y* (m/f) *důsledky revidování jazykového paradigmatu pro text.*
'Readers are invited to …'

In most cases, the plural endings of verbs, adjectives, pronouns and some numerals entering into grammatical agreement also differ orthographically, the minimal distinction being *-i* in verb agreement with masculines, and *-y* with feminines (e.g. *muži přišli* 'men came' and *ženy přišly* 'women came'). This is why female visibility can only be achieved in very simple cases:

(41)   *Olympijské hry jsou opravdovým svátkem pro sportovce* (m) *a sportovkyně* (f).
'Olympic games are a real festival for male and female athletes.'

In written language, the strategy of splitting appears only rarely. It tends to occur more often in linguistic texts rather than anywhere else. The following, very rare example is taken from a short notice addressed to students of Czech:

(42)   *Kolegové* (m) *a kolegyně* (f),
Kteří/které (m/f) *jste nepsali/nepsaly* (m/f) *testy z historické mluvnice a absolvovali* (m) *kurz už dříve, pozor! Změnila se struktura testů. Informujte se u spolužáků* (m) *nebo učitelů* (m).
'Colleagues (m) and colleagues (f),
those of you who (m/f) have not written (m/f) tests on historical grammar and had finished (m) the course earlier, mind that the structure of tests has changed. Ask your schoolmates (m) or teachers (m) for information.'

In spite of such restrictions there can be no doubt that the expression of gender has been undergoing a change in Czech.

6.   Variability, language critique and language politics

It remains to be seen how Czech and other Slavic languages will react to the efforts observable in other languages to develop a more gender-fair language. Language politics has to take into account the fact that, although masculine terms are widely used in a non-masculine referential meaning, they share that function with other terms that have gender-indefinite or gender-neutral functions. The textual distribution of generic masculines in Czech should be considered in relation to other strategies of referring in the given text. I have shown above that, among the expressions used in Czech to denote human beings, there are:

Symmetric kinship terms and asymmetric pairs of basic masculines and derived feminines; double gender nouns; masculine epicenes (of the type *člověk* 'man, person'), and feminine epicenes (of the type *osoba* 'person'). In a cohesive text, various designations (masculine and feminine) may co-occur, controlling agreement with either masculine or with feminine forms. While the use of masculine nouns seems to be the norm for various types of texts that express generic reference, there are some genres, e.g. law documents, that use the feminine noun *osoba* 'person' as a generic.

In the following example the masculine *účastník občanskoprávních vztahů* 'participant in civil rights relations' has the same generic reference as the masculine pronoun *každý* 'everybody' or the feminine epicene *osoba* 'person'; cf. the Czech National Corpus (Český národni Korpus 2000):

(43)   *Tato ustanovení mají povahu jednoho ze základních principů občanského*
       práva. Jako takové se vztahuje na všechny (i možné) účastníky (m) *občan-*
       skoprávních vztahů, což je vyjádřeno použitým termínem "každý" (m), *a*
       osoba (f) *fyzická* (f) *nebo právnická* (f).
       'These statutes have a character of one of the fundamental principles of
       civil rights. As such, they refer to all (including potential)
       participants (m) in civil rights relations, as expressed by the use of the
       term "everybody" (m), and a physical (f) or a legal (f) person (f).'

The following example shows that the same persons can be denoted either by the feminine noun *osobnosti* 'personalities' or by the masculine noun *signatáři dopisu* 'signatories of the letter' and that both control plural agreement, either masculine or feminine. The gender of the persons who are called 'personalities' and who 'signed the letter' is obvious as their names (both female and male) follow at the end of the text, and, of course, the form of a Czech surname signals the bearer's gender.

(44) *Osobnosti* (f) *z prostředí Brandýského fóra sdělily* (f) *svůj postoj v dopise,
      který odeslaly* (f) *v pátek předsedkyni* (f) *US-DEU a předsedovi* (m)
      KDU-ČSL Cyrilu Svobodovi. Signatáři (m) *dopisu záměr přivítali* (m),
      vyjádřili (m) *však přesvědčení, že nezávislé osobnosti* (f) *nemají na kandi-
      dátky vstupovat jen pro ozdobu, ale jako respektovaný partner* (m), *který
      (m) *bude mít vliv na obsah společných programových zásad i na postavení
      na kandidátkách…. Dopis podepsali* (m) *například: … šéfredaktor* (m),
      nezávislý senátor (m), *ředitel* (m), *spisovatelka* (f), *katolický duchovní* (m),
      spisovatel (m), *hlavní dramaturgyně* (f), *nezávislá senátorka* (f), *vysokoš-
      kolský pedagog* (m), *politolog* (m), *předsedkyně* (f) … *V dovětku dopisu
      “všichni* (m) *signatáři* (m) *podporují toto řešení, jakkoli některé z níže
      podepsaných osobností* (f) *nehodlají do Poslanecké sněmovny kandidovat za
      žádných okolností”.*
      (*Literární noviny*, 13 February 2002: 2; (f) and (m) added)
      'Personalities (f) from the Brandýs Forum communicated (f) their stance
      in a letter sent on Friday to the president (f) of US-DEU and the presi-
      dent (m) of KDU ČSL Cyril Svoboda. The signatories (m) of the letter
      welcomed (m) the intention, nevertheless, they expressed (m) their
      conviction that independent personalities (f) should not appear on the
      list of candidates for decoration only, but as respected partners (m) who
      would influence the content of the principles of the political platform, as
      well as the position on the list… The letter was signed (m), for instance,
      by … an editor-in-chief (m), independent senator (m), director (m),
      writer (f), catholic priest (m), writer (m), chief theatre manager (f),
      independent senator (f), university teacher (m), political scientist (m),
      chairwoman (f)… In the postscript to the letter, "all the signatories (m)
      of the letter support this solution, even though some of the under-signed
      do not intend (f) under any circumstances to stand as candidates".'

This feature of Czech texts, i.e. the constant shifts in the grammatical gender of personal nouns has never attracted the attention of either readers or linguists. Gender, however, has often been discussed in translation studies commenting on cross-linguistic differences in the grammatical gender of nouns referring to the same non-linguistic entity (life, death, sun, moon, etc.). Whereas it was widely recognised that in poetic contexts gender may sometimes play a decisive role when foregrounded (Daneš 2001), in everyday speech grammatical gender was taken rather as a conventional attribute of a noun.

The semantics of gender is not generally recognised as a serious problem in Czech linguistics; nevertheless, in recent years, the topic has often been raised,

particularly in linguistic literature reporting on the situation in Western languages.[4] Thus, the semantics of gender is recognised rather as a problem of "other", i.e. Western languages. As to Czech, no serious guidelines for the equal linguistic treatment of women and men have been created, and no measures to reform the Czech language have been accepted. Initial attempts at a feminist critique of language and literature can be found in the proceedings of the conference "Woman – language – literature" (Moldanová 1996). And occasionally, the topic has been raised in public discourse and in the general press.[5]

7. Conclusion

The linguistic representation of women and men is one of the basic and universal issues of language structure and language use. Languages differ not only in what they can express, but also in what they must express. In this respect, Czech data deserve a systematic study: Czech must express not only the gender of the referent – and does so more systematically than other languages – but also the gender of speaker and addressee. This is why Czech gender linguistics must always be directly related to genre analysis.

Czech communicates "natural" gender both by the first name (if it is a Czech name) and last name (in most cases, even if it is a foreign name), and common personal nouns are regularly gendered, forming either equipollent or privative counterparts of masculine and feminine forms. In this way, these nouns manifest the strong tendency of the Czech language to create separate symmetrical terms for women and men. The conclusions of linguistic gender research will undoubtedly force Czech linguists into reconsidering the interpretation of unmarkedness of masculine terms and the proportion of "marked" (male-specific) and unmarked (generic) readings of masculines in various types of texts. I have tried to give a tentative outline of the scope of sensitive contexts (referential vs. predicative positions, contrasting male vs. female reference, etc.). However, much analytical work still remains to be done. New discourse practices may have shifted the interpretation of some masculines from gender-indefinite to gender-specific, i.e., in some contexts, masculine terms appear to be more male-specific than their presumed unmarked, "inclusive" meaning would predict (cf. also Lehečková 2002). In this respect, the potential changes in the linguistic awareness of speakers of Czech are worth linguistic attention.

Notes

1. Standard grammatical descriptions of Czech are Trávníček (1949), Šmilauer (1966), Havránek & Jedlička (1988), Kavka (1988), *Mluvnice češtiny* (1986-1987), *Příruční mluvnice češtiny* (1995).

2. Some inanimate masculines inflectionally behave like animate masculines. Not only the category of animacy, but the whole category of gender has different manifestations in the Literary Standard Language and in Common Czech.

3. For example, in the Czech National Corpus (SYN 2000) the noun *poslanec* (m) 'deputy' has 4500 occurrences, *poslankyně* (both sg and pl.f) 'deputy' 686 occurrences and *poslanci* (m) 'deputies' 6535 occurrences. Statistical data require a profound analysis from the point of view of linguistic as well as extralinguistic features.

4. Cf., e.g., Čmejrková (1995, 1996, 1997, 1998), Daneš (1997, 2001), Flegl (1999), Hoffmannová (1995, 1997), Ježková (1998–1999), Maroušková (1996), Nebeská (1996, 1997), Podhajská (1995–1996), Schwarzová (1999a,b), Valdrová (1996, 1997, 1999b, 2001), Věšínová (1998), Zimová (1996–1997).

5. Cf. Lipold (2000), Loucká (1995), Machovec (2000), Stránský (1995), Vaculín (2000), Valdrová (1999a).

References

Český národní Korpus – SYN. 2000. Ústav Českého národního korpusu. Praha: FF UK. Also: www: ⟨htpp://ucnk.ff.cuni.cz⟩

Čmejrková, Světla. 1995. "Žena v jazyce" [Woman in language]. *Slovo a slovesnost* 56: 43–55.

Čmejrková, Světla. 1996. "Kdo je Ty? Jazyk pro dívčí časopis aneb syntetizovaná čtenářka" [Who is You? Language for a girls' magazine or a synthetised reader]. In *Jazyk a jeho užívání* [Language and its use], eds. Iva Nebeská & Alena Macurová. Praha: FF UK, 265–274.

Čmejrková, Světla. 1997. "Jazyk pro druhé pohlaví" [Language for the second sex]. In František Daneš & Kevin Hannan. *Český jazyk na přelomu tisíciletí* [Czech at the turn of the millennium]. Praha: Academia, 146–158.

Čmejrková, Světla. 1998. "Is this my position? Teenagers' response to mass media discourse." In *Dialoganalyse* VI, eds. Světla Čmejrková & Jana Hoffmannová & Olga Müllerová & Jindra Světlá. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 281–289.

Čmejrková, Světla. 2001. *Reklama v češtině, čeština v reklamě* [Advertising in Czech, Czech in advertising]. Praha: Leda.

Daneš, František. 1997. "Ještě jednou 'feministická lingvistika'" [Once again on 'feminist linguistics']. *Naše řeč* 80: 256–259.

Daneš, František. 2001. "Univerzália a specifika češtiny v období globalizačních proměn" [Universals and specifics of Czech in the period of globalization changes]. In *Čeština – univerzália a specifika* [Czech – universals and specifics], eds. Zdeňka Hladká & Petr Karlík. Praha: Lidové noviny, 42–45.

Dickins, Tom. 2001. "Gender differentiation and the asymmetrical use of animate nouns in contemporary Czech." *The Slavonic and East European Review* 79: 212–247.

Dokulil, Miloš. 1958. "K otázce morfologických protikladů" [On the question of morphological oppositions]. *Slovo a slovesnost* 19: 81–103.

Dokulil, Miloš. 1967. *Tvoření slov v češtině* [Word-formation in Czech] vol. 2. Praha: Academia.

Eisner, Pavel. 1946. *Chrám i tvrz. Kniha o češtině* [Temple and citadel. The book on Czech]. Praha: Jaroslav Podroužek.

Fairclough, Norman. 1989. *Language and power.* London: Longman.

Flegl, Pavel. 1999. "Meinen Frauen und Männer immer dasselbe? Zu semantischen Differenzen der Sprache von Frauen und Männern." *Germanoslavica* 6: 81–95.

Havránek, Bohuslav & Alois Jedlička. 1988. *Česká mluvnice* [Czech grammar]. 6th ed. Praha: SPN.

Hoffmannová, Jana. 1995. "Feministická lingvistika?" [Feminist linguistics]. *Naše řeč* 78: 80–91.

Hoffmannová, Jana. 1997. *Stylistika a …* [Stylistics and …]. Praha: Trizonia.

Hoffmannová, Jana & Olga Müllerová & Jiří Zeman. 1999. *Konverzace v češtině* [Conversation in Czech]. Praha: Trizónia.

Jakobson, Roman. 1932. "Zur Struktur des russischen Verbums." In *Charisteria Gvilelmo Mathesio qvinqvagenario a discipulis et Circuli lingvistici Pragensis sodalibus oblata.* Pragae: PLK, 74–84.

Jakobson, Roman. 1971. "The gender pattern of Russian." In *Selected writings* II: *Word and language.* The Hague: Mouton, 184–186. (Originally published in 1960).

Jedlička, Alois. 1955. *Jazykový koutek Československého rozhlasu* [Language column of the Czechoslovak radio]. Praha: SPN.

Ježková, Slavomíra. 1998–1999. "Mimojazykové faktory a tvoření feminin ve francouzštině" [Extralinguistic factors and word-formation in French]. *Cizí jazyky* 42: 45–46.

Kavka, Stanislav. 1988. *An outline of Modern Czech grammar.* Uppsala: Uppsala University.

Kraus, Jiří. 1995. "Přechylování není harašení" [Motio is no harassment]. *Lidové noviny (Praha)*, August 28, 1995: 10.

Lehečková, Helena. 2002. "Gramatická kategorie rodu v typologicky různých jazycích" [The grammatical category of gender in typologically different languages]. In *Setkání s češtinou* [Encounter with Czech], eds. Alena Krausová & Markéta Slezáková. Praha: ÚJČ AV ČR, 50–56.

Linková, Marcela & Alena Kŕížková. 2000. "Gender(ový) diskurz" [Gender discourse]. *Akademický bulletin* 11: 16–18.

Lipold, Jan. 2000. "Ženský rod se (v češtině) také hlásí o slovo" [The feminine gender (in Czech) calling for attention]. *Mladá fronta Dnes (Praha)*, February 2, 2000.

Loucká, Pavla. 1995. "Jsou ženy diskriminovány jazykově?" [Are women discriminated against in language?]. *Vesmír* 74: 708.

Machovec, Milan. 2000. "Feminismus nebyl a není problém jazykový" [Feminism was not and is not a language problem]. *Mladá fronta Dnes (Praha)*, March 17, 2000.

Maroušková, Marie. 1996. "Jazykové předpoklady rozvoje Frauenlinguistik v Německu" [Linguistic background of the development of feminist linguistics in Germany]. In *Žena – Jazyk – literatura* [Woman – language – literature], ed. Dobrava Moldanová. Ústí n. Labem: PF Univerzity J. E. Purkyně, 292–296.

Mluvnice češtiny I–III [Grammar of Czech I–III]. 1986–1987. Praha: Academia.

Moldanová, Dobrava. 1996. *Žena – jazyk – literatura* [Woman – language – literature]. Ústi n. Labem: PF Univerzity J. E. Purkyně.

Nebeská, Iva. 1996. "K prostředkům výstavby feministického textu" [On the means of constructing a feminist text]. In *Žena – jazyk – literatura* [Woman – language – literature], ed. Dobrava Moldanová. Ústí n. Labem: PF Univerzity J. E. Purkyně, 303–305.

Nebeská, Iva. 1997. "Jak píší české feministky. Kontrasty ve stavbě feministického textu" [How Czech feminists write. Contrasts in the composition of the feminist text]. *Naše řeč* 80: 19–25.

Oberpfalcer, František. 1933. *Rod jmen v češtině* [Gender of nouns in Czech]. Praha: FF UK.

Podhajská, Eva. 1995–1996. *Vliv feministického hnutí v SRN na německý jazyk* [The influence of the feminist movement in Germany on the German language]. *Cizí jazyky* 39:97.

Příruční mluvnice češtiny [Handbook of Czech grammar]. 1995. Praha: Nakladatelství Lidové noviny.

Schwarzová, Jana. 1999a. *Die Kategorie der Weiblichkeit im Tschechischen: Die Verwendung femininer und maskuliner Personenbenennungen für Frauen im Vergleich zum Deutschen.* Praha: FF UK.

Schwarzová, Jana. 1999b. "Kategorie ženskosti v češtině: Pojmenování žen v češtině" [The category of femaleness in Czech: The naming of women in Czech]. In *Heterogennost v komunikaci, v textu a v jazyce* [Heterogeneity in communication, text and language], ed. Alena Macurová. Praha: FF UK, 61–85.

Short, David. 1987. "Czech and Slovak." In *The world's major languages*, ed. Bernard Comrie. London: Croom Helm, 367–390.

Slovník neologismů. (= *Nová slova v češtině*) [The dictionary of neologisms. (= New words in Czech)]. 1998. Praha: Academia.

SSJČ (= *Slovník spisovného jazyka českého*) [The dictionary of the literary Czech language]. 1960–1971. Praha: Academia.

SSČ (= *Slovník současné češtiny*) [The dictionary of contemporary Czech]. 1994. Praha: Academia.

Stránský, Jiří. 1995. "Harašení" [Harrassment]. *Lidové noviny (Praha)*. (August 19, 1995).

Šmilauer, Vladimír. 1966. *Novočeská skladba* [Modern Czech syntax]. Praha: SPN.

Šmilauer, Vladimír. 1971. *Novočeské tvoření slov* [Modern Czech word-formation]. Praha: SPN.

Trávníček, František. 1940. *Nástroj myšlení a dorozumění* [The instrument of thought and communication]. Praha: F. Borový.

Trávníček, František. 1949. *Mluvnice spisovné češtiny* [Grammar of literary Czech]. Praha: Melantrich.

Vaculín, Ivo. 2000. "Slova. Otázky feminismu" [Words. Questions of feminism]. *Hospodářské noviny (Praha)*, February 25, 2000.

Valdrová, Jana. 1996. "Sexismus v německém jazyce a situace u nás" [Sexism in the German language and the situation in our society]. In *Žena – Jazyk – Literatura* [Woman – language – literature], ed. Dobrava Moldanová. Ústí n. Labem: PF Univerzity J. E. Purkyně, 288–291.

Valdrová, Jana. 1997. "K české genderové lingvistice" [On Czech gender linguistics]. *Naše řeč* 80: 87–91.

Valdrová, Jana. 1999a. "Jak si stojí ženská otázka v češtině aneb Mužské tvary zahltily náš jazyk" [On the female question in Czech, or masculine terms have taken over our language]. *Slovo (Praha)*, January 11, 1999.

Valdrová, Jana. 1999b. "Ženský obsah v mužské formě – některá úskalí generického maskulina" [Female content in masculine form – some stumbling blocks of the generic masculine]. In *Jinakost, cizost v jazyce a literatuře* [Otherness, foreignness in language and literature], eds. Marie Čechová & Dobrava Moldanová. Ústí n. Labem: PF Univerzity J. E. Purkyně, 105–107.

Valdrová, Jana. 2001. "Novinové titulky z hlediska genderu" [News headlines from the point of view of gender]. *Naše řeč* 84: 90–96.

Věšínová, Eva. 1998. "Úvaha na téma 'Čeština a žena'" [Contemplation on the topic 'Czech and woman']. *Naše řeč* 81: 21–28.

Yokoyama, Olga T. 1999. "Russian genderlects and referential expressions." *Language in Society* 28: 401–429.

Zimová, Ludmila. 1996–1997. "Dívka a žena v učebnicích českého jazyka" [Girl and woman in Czech language textbooks]. *Český jazyk a literatura* 47: 161–166.

Equal before the law – unequal in language

Kirsten Gomard
University of Aarhus, Denmark

Mette Kunøe
University of Aarhus, Denmark

1. Introduction

Danish (*dansk*) is a Scandinavian (North Germanic) language which is spoken by about 5.3 million people, primarily in Denmark. Of the appr. 15,000 pro-German Danish citizens in Southern Jutland, about two thirds speak a Danish dialect at home, while German has minority status. Of the appr. 50,000 pro-Danish German citizens in Schleswig-Holstein (Germany), about 5,000 speak Danish at home, and ca. 35,000 know some Danish (Pedersen 2000). Danish has equal status with Faroese and Greenlandic in the Faroe Islands and Greenland respectively, and is a compulsory school subject there, as it is in Iceland.[1]

The majority of Danes speak either Standard Danish or, more often, a regional and/or social variety. The spoken language is experiencing constant and rapid changes in pronunciation, which tend to have their origin in the capital Copenhagen (cf. Brink 1988:30). The regional varieties are based on former dialects from three major dialect groups: the dialects of Jutland, the islands Funen, Seeland, etc., and Eastern Denmark – the latter now only comprising the island of Bornholm, but until 1660 it also included Southern Sweden. The orthography is conservative and only partly corresponds to present-day pronunciation.

Historically speaking, Danish is a dialect of a common Scandinavian language, which is documented in Runic inscriptions from 200 AD onwards. In the 9th century, the common language slowly divided into a western part which developed into Norwegian, Faroese, and Icelandic, and an eastern part which in the 12th century developed into Swedish and Danish. Over the centuries, Danish has adopted thousands of loanwords from Latin and Greek, and, especially between 1300 and 1500, from Low German. Many loanwords have entered the language from High German since the Reformation (1536), from French since the 17th century, and from English in the 20th century.

Modern Danish has two grammatical genders, common gender and neuter gender, but until the 15th century it had three: masculine, feminine, and neuter. The former two then merged into the common gender, a development which is also found in Norwegian *bokmål* (cf. Bull & Swan, vol. II). The three genders are preserved in the dialects of Vendsyssel and Djursland in Jutland, as well as in the dialects of the islands and of Eastern Denmark. Nouns have two cases, nominative and genitive, e.g. *kvinde, kvindes* 'woman, woman's'; some pronouns have a third case for objects, e.g. *hun, hendes, hende* 'she, hers, her'.

A feature peculiar to Scandinavian is the fact that the definite article may be enclitic: *-(e)n* in the singular of common gender nouns, e.g. *kvinde-n* 'the woman', and *-(e)t* in the singular of nouns which are of neuter gender, e.g.

barn-et 'the child'. In the plural, there is no distinction between the two genders: *-(e)ne*, e.g. *kvinder-ne* 'the women', *børn-ene* 'the children'. A characteristic feature is also the passive form of the verb, e.g. *elsk-es* 'is/are loved', *elsk-ed-es*, 'was/were loved'. With the simplification of the case-system (1200–1400), word order became fixed, indicating syntactic relations. Main clauses and subordinate clauses have different word orders.[2]

2.   Structural properties of Danish

2.1 Grammatical gender and agreement

The common gender, comprising the former masculine and feminine gender, accounts for approximately 75% of all nouns (cf. Hansen 1967: 29). The rest are neuter. Both common gender and neuter gender contain animate and inanimate nouns, and human nouns may belong to either of the two genders.

Most personal nouns are common gender, i.e. more than 90% (cf. Hansen 1967: 42, 79 f), but among the exceptions, which are neuter gender, are some frequently used words, such as *menneske* 'human being', *individ* 'individual', *geni* 'genius', *bud* 'messenger', *medlem* 'member', and *barn* 'child'. Many derogatory expressions are neuter, such as: *afskum* 'rascal, scum', *bøllefrø* 'young hooligan', *drog* 'nitwit', *drys* 'dawdler', *fjog* 'fool', *fjols* 'fool', *fæ* 'fool', *pjok* 'sissy', *skarn* 'beast', *skravl* 'weakling', *skrog*, 'crock', *skvat* 'twirp', *snakkehoved* 'windbag', *snøvl* 'dawdler', *utyske* 'monster', and *vrøvl* 'fool' (cf. Hansen 1967: 43).

While verbs show no gender-related variation, adjectives or pronouns which are syntactically related to a noun, are inflected in agreement with the noun for number (singular and plural) and – in the singular – also for common gender vs. neuter gender, cf. the following examples:

			Common Gender	**Neuter Gender**
(1)				
	Singular			
	a.	Indefinite	*en klog kvinde*	*et klogt barn*
		(+ADJ)	'a wise woman'	'a wise child'
		(+PRO)	*en anden kvinde*	*et andet barn*
			'a different woman'	'a different child'
	b.	Definite	*den kloge kvinde*	*det kloge barn*
		(+ADJ)	'the wise woman'	'the wise child'
		(+PRO)	*den anden kvinde*	*det andet barn*
			'the other woman'	'the other child'

Plural

a.	Indefinite	*kloge kvinder*	*kloge børn*
	(+ADJ)	'wise women'	'wise children'
	(+PRO)	*andre kvinder*	*andre børn*
		'other women'	'other children'
b.	Definite	*de kloge kvinder*	*de kloge børn*
	(+ADJ)	'the wise women'	'the wise children'
	(+PRO)	*de andre kvinder*	*de andre børn*
		'the other women'	'the other children'

In the plural, articles and adjectives have no gender-variable forms.

2.2 Pronouns

Singular nouns of common gender are referred to with the pronouns *han, hun, den* (for their distribution cf. below). All nouns of neuter gender are referred to with the pronoun *det* in the singular. This is another manifestation of grammatical agreement. But especially in the spoken language a personal noun of neuter gender may be referred to with *han* or *hun*, e.g. *Det pjok! Han er et bløddyr!* 'That wimp! He is a softie!' In this case, semantic agreement overrides grammatical requirements.

In the system of 3rd person singular personal pronouns, there is a semantic distinction between male *han* 'he', which refers to male humans and larger male animals, and the female *hun* 'she', which refers to female humans, larger female animals – and ships. Common gender *den* 'it' refers to all other nouns that have common gender, both animate and inanimate. In the plural pronoun *de* 'they', there is no distinction between genders or between animate and inanimate. The use of the pronouns *hun* 'she', *han* 'he', *de* 'they' is thus very similar to the English system.

Third person singular *han* 'he' is still used quite frequently as a generic form, e.g. in legal texts. Paragraph 24 of the Danish Marriage Act presents the conditions under which *han* 'he' can have the marriage cancelled. *Hun* 'she' is not mentioned.

A special feature of the Scandinavian languages is the existence of a gender-neutral 3rd person singular possessive pronoun *sin*, which is reflexive, i.e. it is used attributively to the object of a sentence if the possessor is the human subject of the same sentence. If there is no possessive relation to the subject of the sentence, the genitive is used, i.e. *hendes, hans.* This allows for the disambiguation of the following Standard Danish expressions:

(2) a. *pigen henter sin bog*   'the girl fetches her book'
                                     (*sin* = her own book)
     b. *drengen henter sin bog*   'the boy fetches his book'
                                     (*sin* = his own book)
     c. *pigen henter hendes bog* 'the girl fetches her book'
                                     (*hendes* = another female person's book)
     d. *drengen henter hans bog* 'the boy fetches his book'
                                     (*hans* = another male person's book)

This particular use of the possessive pronoun *sin* makes the following sentences gender-indefinite:

(3) a. *Hvem har glemt sin bog?*
         'Who has forgotten her/his book?'
     b. *Enhver tager sin egen baggage med.*
         'Everybody takes her/his own luggage.'

The reflexive pronoun *sig* 'himself, herself, itself, themselves' is also gender-neutral, cf. (4):

(4) a. *Hun havde ingen penge på sig.*
         'She had no money on her.'
     b. *Han havde ingen penge på sig.*
         'He had no money on him.'
     c. *De havde ingen penge på sig.*
         'They had no money on them.'

The indefinite pronouns *nogen* 'somebody/anybody', *ingen* 'nobody' etc. are gender-neutral, too. Anaphorically they are referred to by the plural: *ingen så hende komme, for de var alle inde i huset* 'nobody saw her coming, because they were all in the house'. However, the indefinite pronoun *enhver* 'everybody' can only be referred to anaphorically by the masculine singular *han* 'he', as in (5):

(5) a. *Enhver synes, at han selv er den bedste.*
         'Everybody thinks he himself is the best.'
     b. *Her er enhver velkommen, enten han er millionær eller tigger.*
         'Everybody is welcome here, be he a millionaire or a beggar.'
         (cf. Hansen 1967:74)

More recently, pronominal splitting *han/hun* 'he/she' is sometimes used in such cases (cf. Section 5.3).

2.3 The morphology of human nouns

In the following sections, examples are taken only from the large group of human nouns which are of common gender. A pioneer in the research on human nouns with a special view to gender was the Danish linguist Lis Jacobsen who in 1912 published her work on Old Icelandic terms for women and men. However, most of the research in this area – in part from a feminist angle criticizing sexism in language – was carried out in the 1970s and 1980s (e.g. Dansk Sprognævn 1981; Gomard 1985; Hansen & Rajnik 1982; Kunøe 1979, 1981, 1992; Pedersen 1992, 1998; Petersen 1975, 1978).

In the Middle Ages, women were usually referred to according to the way they were related to men, their position in the family as a man's *hustru* 'wife', *enke* 'widow', *datter* 'daughter', or *søster* 'sister'. Men, however, were referred to according to their position in society, i.e. as *bonde* 'peasant', *smed* 'blacksmith', *konge* 'king' (cf. Jacobsen 1912). But in the course of history it has become increasingly necessary to create occupational titles and designations for women's functions outside the family.

In modern Danish, there are two different strategies for achieving this: (a) by morphological means, i.e. derivation and compounding, or (b) by semantic extension, i.e. originally 'male' terms such as *læge, præst, professor, formand* lose their male-specific quality and become gender-indefinite: *hun er læge, præst, professor, formand* 'she is a doctor, vicar, professor, chair(person)'.

2.3.1   *Derivation*

Derivation with the suffixes *-inde* and *-ske* is the most frequent morphological means of marking female reference. Other suffixes used are *-trice and -øse*, mostly borrowed with French loanwords, but for a while also productive to a lesser extent, e.g. *servitrice* 'waitress', *massøse* 'masseuse'. Apart from a small group of words these suffixes are now obsolete. The suffix *-ine* is still used in *piccoline* 'messenger girl', derived from *piccolo* 'messenger boy'; *-ine* was (and in rare cases still is) also used to create female proper names from male names, e.g. *Jensine* from *Jens*.

The suffixes *-inde* and *-ske* are historically of Low German origin, but they are not considered to be foreign, as they have been in use in Danish since around 1400 (cf. Hansen & Rajnik 1982).

The suffix *-ske* was only attached to words ending in *-er*, e.g. *arbejder-ske* 'female worker', *sygeplejer-ske* 'female nurse'. The suffix *-inde* has no such limitations: *lærer-inde* 'female teacher', *skuespiller-inde* 'female actor', *damefrisør-inde*

'female ladies' hairdresser'. But when the derivative *-inde* was attached to a word ending in *-er*, it indicated a socially higher position than *-ske*. Morphologically, it would have been possible to use the form **lærerske* instead of *lærerinde*. The word *lærerinde* was a social signal that indicated that a female teacher had a higher social standing than a *syerske* 'female dress maker', *arbejderske* 'female worker', or *sygeplejerske* 'female nurse'.

Nowadays such suffixes are on the wane in Danish and thus share the fate of their Norwegian counterparts (cf. Bull & Swan, vol. II). The question is why the suffixes did not become fully productive, and why in analogy to existing pairs like *lærer/lærerinde* 'teacher', similar pairs were not constructed, e.g., *sagfører/*sagførerinde* 'lawyer' or *læge/*lægeinde* 'doctor'.

One explanation is of a social nature: the female jobs designated by *-inde* and *-ske* did not have the same status nor the same wages as the corresponding male jobs. In the interest of equal status it became important to stress that what counted was qualification and not gender, and consequently gender-specific linguistic forms had to be discarded. Even elderly people who have grown up with words like *lærerinde*, *arbejderske*, and *syerske*, are today realizing that such words are old-fashioned and are adjusting more or less happily to the language use of modern times (cf. Gomard 1985).

The fact that it has, on the whole, been fairly easy to accept underived words like *lærer* 'teacher' and *arbejder* 'worker' for both women and men, is probably due to the fact that they give no linguistic clue to the gender of the person referred to. They are seen as gender-indefinite in modern Danish, this view being facilitated by the common gender. Besides, the suffixes *-inde* and *-ske* have never been used consistently. When people in Denmark were still using *lærerinde* and *arbejderske*, female professors, doctors and clergy were already referred to as *professor* 'professor', *læge* 'doctor' and *præst* 'vicar'. In some cases this tendency towards neutralization was supported by the fact that derivatives in *-inde* already existed with a different meaning; thus, the meaning of *præstinde* was 'priestess', a word that was already in use for women with religious functions in archaic or exotic religions and had certain sexual connotations that were completely out of place in the Danish Church. *Professorinde* did not refer to a woman with academic qualifications, but to the wife of a professor.

This use of the suffix *-inde* for wives of high officials is nearly extinct now, but it has survived at the Danish Court where such words are still used in guest lists, e.g. *Stiftamtmand* 'lord lieutenant' *Leif Groth og stiftamtmandinde Groth, Biskop* 'bishop' *Kjeld Holm og bispinde Holm, Professor Christian Thodberg og professorinde Thodberg* (*Århus Stiftstidende*, August 1, 1998).

In modern Danish, derivatives in -*ske* or -*inde* are hardly in use any more as occupational terms, and new ones are not coined. But some derivatives in -*inde* are still alive in more private areas where the information about the referential gender is relevant: *elskerinde* 'female lover' refers to a woman, *elsker* 'male lover' can only refer to a man.

2.3.2   *Compounding*

In Danish, there are some compounds which are marked for female gender, i.e. compounds with the lexical gender elements -*kone* '-wife', -*dame* '-lady', -*kvinde* '-woman', -*pige* '-girl'.

Words with -*kone*, such as *vaskekone* lit. 'wash-wife, wash-woman' and *rengøringskone* lit. 'cleaning wife, cleaning woman' have always designated low-status jobs for women. The element -*kone* usually indicates that the woman in question is (or has been) married. Other job titles ending in -*dame* indicate a higher social position (without revealing marital status), e.g. *kontordame* lit. 'office-lady' for a woman doing clerical work. Sometimes Danish speakers convert *rengøringskone* into *rengøringsdame* lit. 'cleaning lady' to achieve a social upgrading without there being a change in the work itself (or the wages!).

Compounds with -*kvinde* '-woman' designating functions or jobs in analogy to compounds with -*mand* '-man' became popular in the 1970's and 1980's, but a few of them are older: *tillidskvinde* lit. 'confidence-woman = female shop steward' as a counterpart to *tillidsmand* lit. 'confidence-man = male shop steward' is a hundred years old and was taken up by the first female workers' unions. *Videnskabskvinde* lit. 'research-woman = female scholar' as a counterpart to *videnskabsmand* lit. 'research-man = male scholar' and *sportskvinde* 'sportswoman' as a parallel to *sportsmand* 'sportsman' both date back to the 1930's (*ODS* 1919–1956). Such words do not indicate marital status.

Job designations in -*pige* originally indicated work for little girls (*gåsepige* lit. 'goose-girl', *budpige* lit. 'errand-girl') or for unmarried women (*stuepige* lit. 'parlour-maid', *kokkepige* lit. 'cook-maid'). But in the course of the 1960's a lot of women entered the labor market, and this led to the formation of compounds such as *butikspige* lit. 'shop-girl', *kontorpige* lit. 'office-girl', *datapige* lit. 'data-girl', *kennelpige* lit. 'kennel-girl' (cf. Petersen 1975). These words do not refer to children or young unmarried women doing certain jobs, but can be used even for mature women as an indication that there is an informal atmosphere in the workplace. Such words have later become obsolete in formal use (see Section 5.1). But even today, many middle-aged women refer to themselves and other women as *piger* 'girls', for instance inviting their female friends to

pigefrokost 'a girls' luncheon' on their 50th birthday. However, there are no parallel forms for the *-pige-*compounds ending in *-dreng* '-boy', as in the workplace men do not in earnest refer to themselves as *drenge* 'boys'. Again, on a more intimate level, they may well have a beer with *drengene* 'the boys' or *gutterne* 'the guys'. In the 1970's, feminists very strongly opposed this asymmetrical use of the word *pige*, which places grown-up women on the same level as children.

Derivatives in *-inde* and *-ske* and compounds with *-kone, -dame, -pige* are gender-specific. They can only refer to females. If men have the same kind of jobs they are referred to without gender marking, like *rengøringsassistent* lit. 'cleaning-assistant', *kontormedhjælper* lit. 'office-help', *kennelmedhjælp* lit. 'kennel-help'. Such words are also increasingly used for women in more formal language (see Section 5.1). Danish *sygeplejerske* 'nurse' or *jordemor* lit. 'earth-mother = midwife' are examples of the extremely few words with explicit female marking that are also used for men.

One group of Danish compounds (those with the element *mand* 'man') has a clear gender-specific marking: *sømand* lit. 'sea-man = sailor', *vognmand* lit. 'carriage-man = lorry driver', *bedemand* lit. 'bidding-man = undertaker' – or so it seems. For they can also be used to refer to women. The University of Aarhus until recently had a form for its faculty to apply for traveling money which was called *videnskabsmænds rejser* lit. 'research-men's travels'. Aarhus has a mayor and five subordinate mayors, one of whom is a woman. Both female and male subordinate mayors are called *rådmænd* 'aldermen'. A woman chairing an association is usually called *formand* 'chairman', just like her male colleague. At the beginning of the 20th century the derivative *formandinde* was coined for a woman in this function, but this was short-lived.

Generally, the structural properties of the Danish language – similar to English – present only minor problems for those who wish to adopt a gender-fair language. Current problems are mostly due to historical and cultural causes and are mainly situated in the lexical-semantic area.

3.   The semantics of human nouns

3.1 'Woman' and 'man'

Modern Danish has few words covering the meaning 'man' and many covering 'woman'. Thus we have the pair *mand/kvinde* 'man/woman' used – mostly in the plural – in statistics, in general statements, and for man and woman as

differentiated on the biological level. Then we have the pair *mand/kone* 'husband/wife' which denotes spouses; the pair *mand/hustru* refers to spouses in higher social strata or in more formal language. In poetic language *mand/viv* occurs. In addition, *mand/dame* 'man/lady' are used for strangers, especially by children; *mand/pige* 'man/girl' are used for a younger couple. The noun *dame* 'lady' can be coupled with *herre* 'gentleman' in formal speech as in *Mine damer og herrer!* 'Ladies and gentlemen!', and on the doors of public lavatories, and the word *pige* 'girl' can be coupled with *fyr* 'guy' in the speech of younger people when talking about their peers. In reports on the sports results in newspapers and on television, the usual terms are *mænd* 'men' and *kvinder* 'women', except in tennis and badminton, where the older words *herrer* 'gentlemen' and *damer* 'ladies' are used: *herresingle, damedouble*.

It appears, then, that the word *mand* has a considerably wider semantic range, while the words for the human female are lexically differentiated according to social hierarchies and attitudes.

In many connections, the word *mand* is used to mean both 'man', 'woman', and 'human being', in spite of the fact that the neuter word *menneske* for 'human being regardless of gender' was introduced with Christianity, as early as the 10th century:

(6) a. *Mon en mand kan gavne Gud?*
       'Can a man be profitable to God?' (Job 22:2)
    b. *Gud og hver mand*
       'God and everyman' = 'all and sundry'
    c. *gå ned med mand og mus*
       (about ships) lit. 'go down with man and mouse' = 'be lost with all hands'
    d. *den almindelige mand*
       'the common man'
    e. *mand tænker, Gud skænker*
       'man thinks, God gives'
    f. *manddrab*
       'manslaughter'

The word *kvinde* 'woman' is etymologically related to the Danish word *kone* 'wife' as well as to the English word *queen*. Between the 17th century and the 19th century it was slowly ousted by *fruentimmer*, borrowed from Low German, a word that gradually acquired negative connotations, and around 1850 meant 'prostitute'. The word *kvinde* was then taken up again from the language of the

Danish Bible by the Romantic movement from 1800, which tried to revive it as "poetic". The Women's Movement took it as their word from 1850 on, and John Stuart Mill's book *The Liberation of Women* was translated and edited by Georg Brandes in 1869 under the title *Kvindernes Frigjørelse*. The word *kvinde*, though, did not escape its destiny, but also glided down the road to sexual slur; one of its meanings from about 1900 onwards was 'mistress'.

Compounds with *-kvinde* '-woman' or *-pige* '-girl' for adult women, which are morphologically parallel to compounds with *-mand* '-man', may not be symmetrical semantically: *tjenestemand* means 'civil servant', while *tjeneste-kvinde* or *tjenestepige* (now obsolete, but used in historical accounts) refer to a female servant in a household. Therefore, female civil servants today cannot be referred to as **tjenestekvinder*, but are called *kvindelige tjenestemænd* lit. 'female civil servant-men'.

In the new Women's Movement the Danish Redstockings[3] made a point of presenting themselves as *kvinder* 'women' in *kvindebevægelsen* 'women's movement' who were engaged in *kvindekamp* 'women's struggle'.

Informal surveys conducted by Mette Kunøe seem to indicate that both male and female students (born around 1980) are reluctant to use the word *kvinde*. It is too serious for them, too burdened with gender implications. They use *pige* 'girl' to refer to female students. Is this perhaps a reaction to their mothers' fighting for or against the Women's Movement? This is an area for further investigation.

3.2 Occupational titles

The vast majority of Danish designations for jobs and functions are grammatically of common gender and semantically gender-indefinite. They do not contain any linguistic clues to referential gender. However, it is still legitimate to ask whether presumably gender-neutral words like *kontorassistent* 'clerk', *bibliotekar* 'librarian', *tekstilarbejder* 'textile-worker', *maskinarbejder* lit. 'machine-worker = mechanic', *skorstensfejer* 'chimney-sweep', *præst* 'vicar', *læge* 'doctor', *professor* 'professor', *lærer* 'teacher', *annoncemedarbejder* lit. 'advertisement-staff' are, in fact, perceived as gender-neutral (cf. Petersen 1975). There is indeed a need for empirical studies that would test the hypothesis that the choice of personal pronouns with reference to occupational titles of different social status is determined by stereotypical assumptions about the most typical – male or female – representatives. In current usage, the pronoun *han* 'he' relates to words like *skorstensfejer* and *præst*, and *hun* 'she' to words like

kontorassistent or *tekstilarbejder* when they are used generically. People find it necessary to say *kvindelig præst* 'female vicar' or *mandlig kontorassistent* 'male clerk', but *mandlig præst 'male vicar' or **kvindelig kontorassistent* 'female clerk' are hardly ever heard. However, in the course of time, the social gender of a word may change. We now have more women than men as medical students and students of theology, so in a couple of generations the social gender of words like *læge* 'doctor' and *præst* 'vicar' may become neutral – or even female, so that it will rather be necessary to emphasize that someone is a *mandlig læge 'male doctor' or *mandlig præst 'male vicar'.

3.3 Address forms

In Danish, men are addressed formally by placing *herr* or *hr.* 'Mr' in front of the family name: *hr. Hansen*. Likewise, women are addressed formally by adding *fru* 'Mrs': *fru Hansen*. Originally, *fru* is the address term for a married woman. Today, the address term *frøken* 'Miss' for an unmarried woman is hardly ever used. In the 1970s feminists introduced *fr.* as the common abbreviation for *fru* and *frøken*. Today this abbreviation belongs to Standard Danish and is some-times used in written language, e.g. in addresses on letters. The titles *hr.* and *fru* have become very rare both in oral and written language, as Danes have become increasingly informal during the past 30 years. Like *fr.*, these titles mostly survive in addresses on letters.

Like German, Danish has several pronouns for addressing people, namely second person singular and plural for informal address: *du/I* (compare German *du/ihr*), and third person plural, written with a capital D for the polite address of one or several people: *De* (cf. German *Sie*). Since the 1970s Danes have nearly ceased to address other people with *De*, with the Royal Family as the obligatory exception. The most frequent term of address for both women and men is *du/I*, and women and men are treated symmetrically in this respect. However, *De* as a polite form of address seems to be slightly gaining ground again, perhaps following a general tendency towards more formality.

In informal use of first names and family names for women and men there is a certain asymmetry between women and men. A man can be addressed by the family name alone: *Brun*, *Hansen*, or, more formally – or if there is more than one *Hansen* or *Brun* – by first name + family name: *Jens Hansen*, *Ole Brun*. The address by first name alone, *Jens*, *Ole*, for adult men is mostly used among friends and family and is – at least by some – considered unduly intimate in other contexts (cf. Hagemann 1988).

Family names in Denmark have the same form for women and men, so the family name in itself does not give any explicit clue regarding to gender, but implicitly it is assumed that a family name refers to a man if it is used alone. In order that it may refer to a woman there must be a title like *fru* 'Mrs' in front of it, and then it is not informal any more. The most widespread informal address for women is by first name only, e.g. *Eva.* This puts them into a category with children, where address by first name only is the rule, and many adult women perceive this to be unduly intimate if used by strangers. In more educated circles, people use first name + family name *Eva Hansen* for women as an equivalent of *Brun* or *Jens Hansen* for men.

Young men address each other informally either by family name alone or by first name alone, depending on the type of name. Some of them also use nicknames for each other. They address young women by first name only. Young women usually address both each other and young men by first name only, and nicknames are not used very much. We believe that this asymmetry where family names are mostly used by men addressing men can be explained by the fact that young people are in a period of transition of their lives between school, where both girls and boys mostly address each other by first names (or possibly a nickname), and adult life. In this area empirical research on actual language use is much needed.

3.4 Terms of abuse and slang words

The spoken language has numerous invectives about women. As an example, we will draw upon a dialect collection of more than 100 words from Vendsyssel in North Jutland (*Jysk Ordbog*). There are particularly many invectives about sloppy women: *fjossel, sjuske, slaske, sluske, vråssel* all meaning 'careless, slovenly woman'. Or about talkative women: *bladderlik* lit. 'one who licks up mud', *hjabber, hjaddergås* lit. 'chattergoose', *klæbber, knævver, tjallerhøne* lit. 'chatterhen', all meaning 'chatterbox, ceaseless talker'. Or about fat women: *barduse, blase, blære, bommerut, kovsel* 'fat woman'. Or sexually loose women: *dåse, fjolter, knokkel, smejs, vildster* 'sexually loose woman'. Some of these words, like *sjuske, slaske, dåse*, are also known outside of this particular area.

Several of these invectives contain the pejorative element *-j-*. When this sound appears after a word-initial consonant, the word acquires a derogatory meaning. In Danish, as in Swedish and Norwegian, many such words (nouns, adjectives, verbs) start with *fj-, hj-, pj-* or *sj-* (Skautrup 1944–1979, Vol. 3: 361 f).

It is also interesting to note that many invectives are taken from the animal

kingdom by way of metaphorization (cf. Anker-Møller & Jørgensen 1997): *brummer* 'barren cow = woman who cannot have children', also: 'randy woman', *edderkop* 'spider', *gås* 'goose', *hjemmegrib* lit. 'home-vulture', *hyæne* 'hyena', *høne* 'hen', *ko* 'cow', *tæve* 'bitch'.

The Danish craftsman's language contains a lot of sexual slang. An electric plug is termed *hanstik* 'he-', and the socket is called *hunstik* 'she-' (cf. Anker-Møller & Jørgensen 1997). This gives a special twist to the meaning of the slogan for a local electrician in Aarhus: *Skal stikket ind, så ring til Finn* 'If the plug must (go) in, then please phone Finn'. Screw and nut may be termed *hanskrue* 'male screw' and *hunskrue* 'female screw' (*ODS* 1919–1956). *Møtrik*, the Danish standard word for 'nut' is derived from older slang and means 'small womb, uterus' (cf. also German *(Schrauben)mutter*, French *matrice* (*ODS* 1919–1956).

Male slang for a female worker is, e.g., *den langhårede* lit. 'the long-haired one', or *den pikløse* lit. 'the cockless one'. In offensive usage, a waitress may be called *pikløs opvarter* lit. 'cockless waiter', and a woman working in a traditional male trade may be marked with the same attributive, e.g. *pikløs murer* 'cockless bricklayer'. A job that is easily done is termed *går som pik i Grete*, lit. 'goes like cock in Grete', the female first name *Grete* also being a slang word for 'vagina'. Material that fits nicely may be said to *passe på et kussehår* 'fit to a cunt's hair' (cf. Anker-Møller & Jørgensen 1997).

3.5 Idiomatic expressions

A number of abusive idioms are compounds with the word *kvinde-* 'woman': *Kvindesiden* lit. 'woman's side' is the wrong, the bad side, cf. *kællingeknude* lit. 'granny knot', knotted to the wrong side. *Kvindesind* 'woman's mind' is used about irresolute persons. *Kvinderæd* means 'scared like a woman' or 'scared of women'. *Kvindagtig* means 'womanish, soft', and is used as a strongly derogatory term for men. *Kvindedreng, kvindekarl, kvindemand* 'womanly man' was used early in the 20th century about a cowardly man; now the equivalents are *pigedreng, tøsedreng* 'girlish boy'. *Kvindelogik* means 'thinking or reasoning that lacks logic'. And last, but not least, *kvindehjerte* 'woman's heart' means 'a cowardly mind'. Therefore, we have the pair *mod og mandshjerte* 'courage and man's heart', but *kvindehjerte er harehjerte* 'a woman's heart is a hare's heart'.

Using terms originally referring to men and boys for women and girls is not necessarily derogatory in the same way. *Drengepige* lit. 'boyish girl = tomboy' used about a girl has negative connotations, but may also express admiration.

The female former Minister of Education, Ritt Bjerregaard, was called *et mandfolk* 'a real man' in a letter to the editor in the newspaper *Politiken*, and that was meant – and understood to be – a term of praise (Kunøe 1992: 335). On the front page of the tabloid *Ekstra-Bladet*, the female former Minister of the Interior, Britta Schall Holberg, was addressed with a large headline "Du har hår på brystet, Britta" 'You've got hair on your chest, Britta' – and in the article inside the newspaper this compliment was referred to as 'the most beautiful roses of the day for her' (Kunøe 1992: 335). In a personal advertisement in a local newspaper (*Aarhus Onsdag* July 3, 1996), a man described the woman of his dreams as someone with *nosser i en feminin indpakning* 'balls in a feminine wrapping'.

4. Proverbs

Danish proverbs date from the Middle Ages to recent days. They were collected by men, probably from male informants and regarded as men's property (Kjær & Holbek 1969: 10). They are outspoken evidence that men's estimation of women is rather low. Proverbs are usually short, have alliteration or rhyme, and use metaphors and other images to make their point. Thus they are easy to remember, and some of them are therefore often repeated, today most often slightly tongue-in-cheek. But even so it is interesting to see which stereotypes they convey about women. Take a proverb such as statement (7):

(7) *Kvindfolk har ingen skæg på grund af, at de ikke kan tie mens de bliver raget.*
     'Women have no beards, because they cannot stop talking while being shaved.'

This example is part of a vast bulk of proverbs about women being talkative and chatty. As compared to men, that is. Quite to the contrary, a consistent finding in empirical research is that men speak more than women, at least in public (Pedersen 1992). We would therefore suggest that proverbs are not statements, but a means of socialization. The "truths" about themselves that women have been told through the proverbs in the course of times are likely to have left their stamp on women's self-esteem.

    In the following selection of proverbs, the date of first documentation is given wherever it is known (cf. Kunøe 1979). Proverbs (8) and (9) tell us that women are ungovernable and ought to be subdued by men:

(8) *Styr hest med bidsel og kone med kæp.*
     'Govern horse with bit and bridle, woman with stick.' (before 1400)

(9)   *Gal hest og kvinde bør køres i stramme tøjler.*
'A tight reign must be kept on crazy horse and woman.'

Women are chatty:

(10)   *Alle kvinder er gode lutherske, de prædiker hellere end høre messe.*
'All women are good Lutherans, they preach rather than listen to mass.'
(17th cent.)

(11)   *Der går ikke meget ukaglet fra hønerøv.*
lit. 'Not much goes uncackled from a hen's arse = A hen cackles whenever it lays an egg.'

It is bad if women are in power:

(12)   *Vil du leve til ende, giv ej kvinden magt i hænde.*
'If you want to live to the end don't give women power in their hands.'
(17th cent.)

(13)   *Koldt er kvinders råd.*
'Cold is women's counsel.' (before 1400)

Women are changeable like the weather:

(14)   *Unge piger og aprilsvejr ligner hinanden, de er begge ustadige.*
'Young women and April weather resemble each other – they are both changeable.'

(15)   *Kvindevrede og hvirvelvinde lægger sig gerne med vådt.*
'Womens' anger and whirlwinds will calm down with water.'

Women are unfaithful and not to be trusted:

(16)   *Snart (let) er kvinder lokkede.*
'Easily are women tempted.' (before 1400)

(17)   *Hvo som tager en for skønhed alene, får gode nætter og onde dage.*
'He who takes a woman for her beauty alone, gets good nights and bad days.' (17th cent.)

Women are dangerous, especially as regards sexuality:

(18)   *Aldrig bor lammet trygt hos ulven, eller drengen hos pigen.*
'The lamb never lives safely with the wolf, nor the boy with the girl.' (1611)

(19)   *Mandvoksen mø er ond (vanskelig) at vogte.*
'A maid of marriable age is hard to look after.' (17th cent.)

The outward apperance of women is treacherous:

(20) *De er ej alle møer, der har fagert hår.*
      'Not all with fair hair are maidens.' (17th cent.)

(21) *Den der køber leer efter klangen og piger efter sangen, den bliver narret.*
      'He is a fool who buys scythes because of their sound and girls because of their singing.'

Women are extravagant:

(22) *Det er ondt (svært) at trække vand op med en utæt spand og holde hus med en ødsel kvinde.*
      'It is hard to draw up water with a leaky bucket and keep house with a wasteful woman.'

(23) *En so kan vrøde lige så meget ud, som fire galte kan vrøde ind.*
      'A sow can take out as much as four hogs can take in.'

Women are quarrelsome:

(24) *Kvindeskind er godt til trommeskind: når en slår på det på en mandag morgen, så brummer det til søndag aften.*
      'Woman's skin is good for a drum: if you hit it on a Monday morning it will go on humming on Sunday evening.'

Women are despicable:

(25) *Kvindfolk og lus tåler ikke gode dage.*
      'Women and lice cannot stand good days.'

(26) *Den der mister en kvinde eller en halvskilling mister en bagatel.*
      'He who loses a woman or a penny, loses a trifle.'

Women ought to know their place, and ought to be industrious and hard-working, for instance preparing food:

(27) *Kagen er konen lig.*
      'The cake is like the woman.' (16th cent.)

(28) *Man skal skue en pige i et trug dej og ej i en springdans.*
      'You must watch a girl in a trough of dough and not in a leaping dance.' (17th cent.)

Women are inferior to men:

(29) *Der er jo aldrig bedre pige, end der jo er lige så god en karl.*
      'No matter how good a girl, there is always a boy just as good.'

(30)   *En mand er en mand i sit hus, var han ikke større end en mus.*
        'A man is master of his house even if he is only as big as a mouse.'
        (16th cent.)

(31)   *Hønefløjet (høneflugten) er stakket (kort), uden hanen flyver med.*
        'A hen's flight is short without the cock flying along.' (1611)

Proverbs will not sound any different, until women themselves begin to coin them:

(32)   *En kvinde uden en mand er som en fisk uden en cykel.*
        'A woman without a man is like a fish without a bicycle.'
        (The proverb was first used in the 1970s)

Today most proverbs have only survived in older texts and are not part of modern every day language. It is thus possible to avoid negative proverbs and terms of abuse about women. That is a question of attitudes. If they are not used, they will simply become extinct, and there is no social necessity to create new ones.

5.   Language politics

In Denmark there is no long tradition of language politics. *Dansk Sprognævn* (The Danish Language Board), established in 1955, is a committee under the Ministry of Culture. It is responsible for monitoring the development of the Danish language, answering linguistic questions from the public, and first and foremost deciding about rules for spelling and punctuation, and publishing the official Danish Dictionary of Spelling. The committee does not in any way attempt to influence language use.

Ligestillingsrådet, The Equal Status Council, under the Danish Prime Minister's office, was the primary agency for the institutionalization of gender equality in society between 1975 and 2000 (Borchorst 1994). The Council occasionally also monitored the language of laws and job advertisements in newspapers to see if these were in compliance with the Act of Equal Treatment of 1978, which states that job advertisements must address both women and men. The Equal Status Council has not issued any guidelines as in English- and German-speaking countries, but they occasionally published minor articles about equal treatment in language (e.g. Brinch 1997). Today (2002), the Equal Status Council has been replaced by an Equal Status Board under the Minister for Equal Status. Neither of those have, so far, dealt with issues of language.

5.1 Alternatives to male-biased personal nouns

The use of male-biased words like *formand* 'chairman', *styrmand* lit. 'steering man = navigator', *rådmand* 'alderman' for women became a source of irritation for feminists, who, in the 1970s, started a strategy of so-called splitting, i.e. naming both women and men (cf. Gomard 1985). They created new words like *forkvinde* 'chairwoman', *styrkvinde* lit. 'steering woman', *rådkvinde* 'alderwoman' to enhance female visibility. The reason for using the word *kvinde* 'woman' as the second part of the compounds was probably both that it was the word for an adult female person and did not indicate marital or social status, and also the positive connotations that *Kvindebevægelsen* 'the women's movement' gave to this word.

In the beginning, compounds with *-kvinde* were considered ridiculous and outrageous, but by and by they became partially accepted both in the media and in everyday use. But compounds with *-mand* are still used in gender-specific as well as in generic function. These compounds are also still in widespread use even when referring to women only.

In consequence of the Act of Equal Treatment in 1978, the Organisation of Danish Newspapers set up a committee of journalists to work out designations for jobs and functions that were in accordance with the law. They recommended neutralizing expressions wherever possible, and established a list of job designations with common gender, many of them consisting of compounds ending in *-assistent* '-assistant', *-medarbejder* '-staff', *-medhjælp* '-help', and such words have been fairly successful. A new gender-neutral word, *tillidsrepræsentant* lit. 'confidence-representative = shop-steward', can today be used as an alternative to *tillidsmand* lit. 'confidence-man = male shop-steward' or *tillidskvinde* lit. 'confidence-woman = female shop-steward' without, however, having replaced the latter two completely. For inherently gendered designations that were not so easy to replace, like *styrmand* lit. 'steering-man = navigator', *vognmand* lit. 'carriage-man = lorry driver', *sygeplejerske* 'nurse', a kind of splitting by adding *m/k* (male/female) to signal that both women and men can apply for the job was recommended for a transitory period. After this transitory period the designations without *m/k* were to be used generically for both women and men (cf. Petersen 1978).

The *m/k* solution is not very elegant, and it never became popular. People have made great fun of it, and some did not understand the linguistic mechanisms and started adding *m/k* to all kinds of gender-indefinite job designations, e.g. *lærer m/k* 'teacher m/f', *frisør m/k* 'hairdresser m/f', where it was not necessary.

Today gender-neutral language is recommended, or, in cases where parallel terms exist, splitting by mentioning both the masculine and the feminine word is required: *piccolo/piccoline* 'messenger/messenger girl'. Splitting with *m/k* is no longer accepted, and a job designation such as *ung pige i huset m/k* lit. 'young girl in the house m/f = housemaid m/f' is considered to be downright illegal, as it is easily possible to rephrase it in more neutral terms, such as *ung i huset* lit. 'young [person] in the house'.

Originally female-specific designations for particular jobs, such as *sygeplejerske* 'nurse' and *jordemor* 'midwife' are today accepted as being gender-indefinite without *m/k*. Logically, one might expect the same to apply to originally male-specific words designating jobs like *bedemand* lit. 'bidding-man = undertaker' or *vognmand* lit. 'carriage-man = lorry driver'. According to an employee of the Equal Status Council, the Council has so far not dealt explicitly with such words. Personally she considers this to be a grey area (Elizabeth Brinch, personal communication).

State and municipal institutions issuing job adverts in newspapers adhere to the rules today. So do most of the private companies, but every now and then adverts can be seen with clearly male- or female-specific language. Families looking for domestic help nearly always use female-marked language.

Even adverts employing gender-indefinite language in the headlines sometimes more or less subtly hint at the preferred gender, e.g. by using *han* 'he' in the text, which can be interpreted as being generic or male-specific.

In the summer of 1997, the Equal Status Council discovered illegal advertising in several cases. They wrote letters to a number of newspapers to the effect that it was the editor's responsibility that the language use in adverts be in accordance with the law, and that the newspaper must either refuse to print the advertisement or advise customers how to rephrase it (Elizabeth Brinch, personal communication).

More subtle signals that are not illegal, like the use of language describing preferred qualities complying with traditionally male gender-stereotypes, like *målrettet* 'goal-oriented' and *konkurrencebevidst* 'competitive', or traditionally female stereotypes, like *omsorgsfuld* 'caring' and *fleksibel* 'flexible', which are probably intended to elicit applications from the preferred gender group, may not have an obvious effect today, as many young women consider themselves to be goal-oriented and competitive, and some young men also think of themselves as caring and flexible.

5.2 Affirmative action?

Even in fields dominated by one gender it is not allowed to advertise specifically for the underrepresented group without an exemption from the Act of Equal Treatment, because this is a prohibitive act that is to prevent discrimination. In the light of this act, affirmative action in favor of one gender will be seen as discriminating against the other. Exemptions from the Act of Equal Treatment have been quite difficult to achieve, not least within the universities.

However, a passage like "Considering the unequal distribution of the sexes in the workplace, the company welcomes applications from both women and men" is legal. Nowadays it has become routine, e.g. for the universities, but only a few years ago it was highly controversial. It has become a signal that the company or institution in question wishes to do something about equality issues. However, in order to comply with the Danish laws, it is still only allowed to hire a person of the underrepresented gender if his/her qualification is the best. Making a person's gender decisive in cases where the qualifications of a male and a female applicant are equal (or nearly equal) is not allowed.

5.3 Pronominal splitting and neutralization

The Equal Status Council has on several occasions pointed to the problem caused by the generic use of the third person singular pronoun *han* 'he'. As a consequence, the Ministry of State in 1980 issued a regulation that generic *han* 'he' was to be avoided in new legal texts and that in revisions the wording of older laws should be changed accordingly.

Suggestions by feminists to create a gender-indefinite third person singular personal pronoun **hån*, **hin*, **høn*, **huan* referring to both women and men (inspired by Finnish *hän*) have not been of any consequence (Dansk Sprognævn 1981).

Some feminists made an effort to introduce the female pronoun *hun* 'she' in generic use, i.e. referring to women only as well as to mixed groups, but this never became a widespread strategy, and it is not much used today. There are currently two competing solutions: either pronominal splitting *han/hun* (and less frequently *hun/han*) or avoidance of pronouns and use of neutral para-phrases, such as the somewhat cumbersome *vedkommende* or *den pågældende* 'the person in question'.

5.4 Family names

Family names have been an important arena of language politics and legislation, and they are the only case where a certain language use is prescribed by law in linguistic detail.

Before 1981, family names were patriarchal. When a couple married, the woman automatically received the man's family name, as did any children born in wedlock. It was possible for the woman to keep her original family name (i.e. her father's name!), if she filled in a special form before the wedding. Most women changed their family name at least once during a lifetime.[4] Children born out of wedlock automatically received the mother's family name, but is was legal for them to receive the father's family name, if paternity was established.

This state of affairs was criticized by feminists. Along with this criticism went alternative forms of life, where many heterosexual couples decided not to get married at all, but to merely live together as partners, even if they had children. This led to a new Names Act in 1981, stating that a couple may both keep their original family name on getting married. They remain *Eva Hansen* and *Ole Brun*. The couple can, however, decide that they want to have the same family name, choosing either the woman's or the man's family name as their married name: *Eva & Ole Hansen* or *Eva & Ole Brun*. In such cases, the partner who takes a new married name is entitled to keep his or her original name as a middle name if they want to do so: *Ole Brun Hansen, Eva Hansen Brun*. If a couple gets divorced, they must revert to their original names. Similar name rules were extended to lesbian and gay couples, when in 1989 these were permitted to enter what is legally termed a "registered partnership".

For children, the Names Act states that first names must be unambiguous in terms of gender. Is is not allowed to include a female name among a boy's first names and vice versa. E.g., a Roman Catholic family is not allowed to name their baby boy **Ole Maria Brun*, and a baby girl cannot have her father's first name as a middle name **Eva Robert Hansen*. When it comes to family names, the law no longer distinguishes between children born in or out of wedlock. It states that if the parents have the same family name, the child will automatically receive this name at birth. If the parents have different family names like our couple *Eva Hansen* and *Ole Brun*, they must decide to give the child either the mother's name *Hansen* or the father's name *Brun*, or make a combination of the two names: *Brun-Hansen* or *Hansen-Brun*. This has been handled in many individual ways, some couples giving all their children the same family name, either preferring the more unusual family name or making a combination of

both names, others giving the children different family names: e.g. the first child may be given the family name of one parent and the second child the family name of the other, or a girl may receive the mother's family name and a boy the father's, etc.

As it is very common for divorced people to establish new families with children from their previous marriages and new children, many families end up with name-signs on their doors displaying long lists of different names. There are no statistics on people's actual choices of married names or names for children. In this area, further research is needed.

5.5 The press

The Danish press has been fairly interested in language reform, e.g. supporting new female compounds ending in *-kvinde*. Such words, however, seem to be on the wane again in favor of neutralizing language, which is the most obvious solution in Danish.

A successful example of the use of gender-neutral terms is the word *regentparret* lit. 'the regent couple' – the official designation for the Danish Queen Margrethe and Henrik, the Prince Consort. The model is the word *kongeparret* lit. 'the king couple' which is used for a king with a queen consort. Such words designate a married couple, and the first part of the compound must name the principal person. But *konge* 'king' in *kongeparret* is lexically male and cannot be used for a woman. *Dronningeparret lit. 'the queen couple', where the first part of the compound is lexically female, can only designate two women, it cannot refer to a queen and a prince consort. *Regentparret*, which was invented by the press, has the advantage that the Latin loanword *regent* is perceived as gender-indefinite in modern Danish, like *lærer* 'teacher', *præst* 'vicar', and *kontorassistent* 'clerk'. A gender-indefinite word can designate a man or a woman alike, and, consequently, *regentparret* can designate a couple where the monarch – male or female – is the principal person and the spouse the subordinate one. It will be interesting to see if the word *regentparret* from now on remains the official word, or whether the press will revert to the word *kongeparret* when the Danish Crown Prince becomes king.

In Aarhus the local newspaper some years ago launched a competition for the best alternative to the title *rådmand* 'alderman'. The jury (made up of both women and men) consisted of the mayor and another local politician, university professors, and a journalist. They decided in favor of *stadsråd* 'city counselor', but the term was never adopted. A subordinate mayor is still called *rådmand*,

and a woman in this position has the choice of either calling herself *rådmand* like her male colleague, or using the female-specific *rådkvinde* lit. 'alderwoman'. So far, the latter solution has only been preferred by one woman in this position. This may seem but a detail, but it is clearly indicative of a widespread public indifference towards equality issues in language.

6. Conclusion

Due to the structural properties of Danish, it is easy to adopt gender-fair language use. Language reform in Denmark in terms of neutralization has been quite successful. Gender-indefinite human nouns have become far more frequent than they were around 1980 (Jarvad 1995). The small remaining group of gender-marked human nouns that are nowadays used for both female and male referents, like *sygeplejerske* 'nurse', *jordemor* lit. 'earth-mother = midwife', *formand* 'chairman' and perhaps *vognmand* lit. 'carriage-man = lorry driver', *bedemand* lit. 'bidding-man = undertaker' and *styrmand* lit. 'steering-man = navigator', seem to be acceptable to the majority of the population, in particular the originally male-specific words which have a long history of use for female referents. Discussing the issue with a female local politician who chairs the municipal Equal Status Committee in Aarhus and calls herself *formand* 'chairman', we received the answer that she did not believe that language was so important. What mattered was social change. The female chair of the former Equal Status Council on the national level had the same attitude. There is a general feeling that if a linguistic form is too unusual, people will make the speaker the object of ridicule rather than considering the message.

As linguists and feminists we believe that the use of gender-specific words for jobs and functions like *sygeplejerske* or *vognmand* for both female and male referents is linguistically inadequate and ought to be avoided. As this only concerns a relatively small group of words, it should be possible for linguists, the press, and the public to come up with gender-indefinite replacements.

Politically, Denmark is a progressive country in issues of Equal Status, so progressive that many young women and men seem to think that problems of inequality are solved and that we need not bother any further, but underneath the progressive surface, indifference and even ridicule are common reactions. A recent example that is typical of this atmosphere was a newspaper advert for men's underwear depicting a young man in shorts with a couple of scantily dressed, quite décolletée "nurses" looking in a very sexually interested way at

what was underneath his shorts. (The only text was the name of the product.) The Danish Nurses' Council complained about this representation of their profession to the Consumers' Ombudsman, who resolved that this particular advertisement was sexist and thus illegal, and that the company must stop it. This proves that the protection against sexist advertising works. But the next day the local newspaper printed an editorial accusing both the nurses and the Consumers' Ombudsman of lack of humor, implying that a sexually liberated person ought to accept advertising of this type (*Århus Stiftstidende*, January 24, 1998). Apart from one letter to the editor (*Århus Stiftstidende*, January 29, 1998) saying that depicting a nurse in this particular way quotes pornographic or semi-pornographic material, the attitude of the newspaper did not cause any discussion among the readers.

Personally, we do not agree with the widespread indifference to problems concerning gender and language in Denmark. We believe that there is an interplay between language and reality. One cannot provoke social change just by changing language behavior, and yet, language reveals attitudes and to some extent governs cognition and perception (Hamilton 1997). Thus it cannot be trivial if women and men are treated asymmetrically in language, and women (or men!) are ignored, deprecated and stereotyped. Both social change and language reforms are necessary.

Notes

1. The Faroe Islands and Greenland are both part of the kingdom of Denmark but largely self-governing. Iceland had a similar status until 1944 when it became an independent republic (cf. Wulff & Axmark & Hansen 1996).

2. For a history of the Danish language see Skautrup (1944–1970), Haugen (1976) and Karker (2001). A comparative description of the Scandinavian languages is Haugen (1982). Important grammars are Diderichsen (1957), and Hansen (1997). A sociolinguistic description of the urban speech community of the Danish capital Copenhagen is Gregersen & Pedersen (1991). Standard dictionaries are *ODS* (1919–1956) and *Nudansk Ordbog* (1999).

3. *Rødstrømperne* 'Redstockings' was the name of the new rebellious women's movement in Denmark (1970–1985). The name was inspired by two sources. It constitutes a historical reference to the Bluestockings of the 18th and 19th century in combination with the colour red to indicate a left-wing point of view. Furthermore, an article entitled "Redstocking Manifesto" by a radical feminist group in New York was translated into Danish in 1970 and discussed by the women in the movement (cf. Dahlerup 1998: 173f).

4. This was sometimes confusing, in particular with women who had functions outside the family. An example of this can be found in the references for this chapter, where it needs an insider to know that the linguist *Pia Jarvad* and the linguist *Pia R. Petersen* are the same person.

References

Anker-Møller, Søren & Jørgensen, Peter S. 1997. *Politikens slangordbog* [Politiken's Slang Dictionary]. 5th ed. København: Politiken.

Bom, Kaj. 1974. *Slangordbogen* [The slang dictionary]. København: Politiken.

Borchorst, Anette. 1994. *The Danish Equal Status Council: A political niche.* Aarhus: Department of Political Science, University of Aarhus.

Brinch, Elizabeth. 1997. "Sådan er annonce-reglerne for ligebehandling" [Rules for equal treatment in advertising]. *Nyhedsbrev om ligestilling på arbejdsmarkedet* 40: 34–35.

Brink, Lars. 1988. "Den danske udtale" [The pronunciation of Danish]. In *Sproget her og nu*, eds. Erik Hansen & Jørn Lund. København: Gyldendal, 20–39.

Dahlerup, Drude. 1998. *Rødstrømperne.* Den danske Rødstrømpebevægelses udvikling, nytænkning og gennemslag 1970–1985 [The development, new ideas, and impact of the Danish Redstocking Movement 1970–1985] 1–2. København: Gyldendal.

Dansk Sprognævn. 1981. "Haves: Han og hun. Ønskes: Kønsneutralt stedord" [For sale: *He* and *she.* Wanted: Gender-neutral pronoun]. In *Årsberetning* 1981: 16–17.

Diderichsen, Paul. 1957. *Elementær dansk grammatik.* København: Gyldendal.

Gomard, Kirsten. 1985. "Sexistische Sprachmuster im Dänischen und Tendenzen des sprachlichen Wandels." In *Sprachwandel und feministische Sprachpolitik: Internationale Perspektiven*, ed. Marlis Hellinger. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 85–95.

Gomard, Kirsten. 1995. "The (un)equal treatment of women in language: A comparative study of Danish, English and German." *Working Papers on Language, Gender, and Sexism* 5: 5–26.

Gomard, Kirsten. 2001. "Negotiating competence and gender: An analysis of televised political debates in Denmark." In *Instead of the ideal debate. Doing gender and doing politics in Nordic political campaign discourse*, eds. Kirsten Gomard & Anne Krogstad. Aarhus: Aarhus University Press, 60–96.

Gregersen, Frans & Inge Lise Pedersen, eds. 1991. *The Copenhagen study in urban sociolinguistics.* 1–2. København: Reitzel.

Hagemann, Henrik. 1988. "Hej, du der: Brugen af *du* og *De* gennem 30 år i personlig belysning" [Hi, you there: The use of *du* and *De* through 30 years of personal experience]. In *Sproget her og nu*, eds. Erik Hansen & Jørn Lund. København: Gyldendal, 136–145.

Hamilton, Mykol C. 1997. "The huwom race: Sexist language as a tool of dominance." In *Communication of gender. Kommunikation von Geschlecht*, eds. Friederike Braun & Ursula Pasero. Pfaffenweiler: Centaurus, 147–163.

Hansen, Aage. 1967. *Moderne dansk* [Modern Danish] 2. København: Grafisk Forlag.

Hansen, Erik. 1997. *Dæmonernes Port* [The Gate of Demons]. 4th ed. København: Reitzel.

Hansen, Erik & Eugeniusz Rajnik. 1982. *Movierung der Personenbezeichnungen im Deutschen und Dänischen.* (Kontra. Dänisch-deutsche kontrastive Grammatik. Arbeitsbericht 5.) København: Københavns Universitet, Institut for Germansk Filologi.

Haugen, Einar. 1976. *The Scandinavian languages: An introduction to their history.* London: Faber & Faber.

Haugen, Einar. 1982. *Scandinavian language structures: A comparative historical survey.* Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Jacobsen, Lis. 1912. *Kvinde og Mand. En Sprogstudie fra dansk Middelalder* [Woman and man. A language study from the Danish Middle Ages]. Kristiania og København: Gyldendal.

Jarvad, Pia. 1995. *Nye ord – hvorfor og hvordan?* [New words – why and how?]. København: Gyldendal.

Jysk Ordbog [The Jutlandic dictionary], ed. Jutlandic Department of the University of Aarhus. Aarhus: University of Aarhus. ⟨www.jyskordbog.dk⟩

Karker, Allan. 2001. *Dansk i 1000 år* [One thousand years of Danish]. 2nd ed. København: Reitzel.

Kjær, Iver & Bengt Holbek. 1969. *Ordsprog i Danmark* [Proverbs in Denmark]. København: Paludan.

Kunøe, Mette. 1979. "Kvindebilleder i ordsprog, bevingede ord og faste vendinger" [Images of women in proverbs, familiar quotations and idioms]. *Meddelelser fra Dansklærerforeningen* 4: 349–365.

Kunøe, Mette. 1981. "Sprog og køn" [Language and gender]. *Forum for Kvindeforskning* 1: 21–26.

Kunøe, Mette. 1992. "Fruentimmer – kvinde – dame" [Madam – woman – lady]. In *The Nordic languages and modern linguistics 7*, eds. Jonna Louis-Jensen & Jóhan Hendrik W. Poulsen. Tórshavn: Føroya Fróðskaparfelag, 327–337.

Nudansk Ordbog [Modern Danish Dictionary]. 1–2. 1999. København: Politiken.

ODS = Ordbog over det danske sprog [Dictionary of the Danish language]. 1919–1956. 28 vols. København: Gyldendal.

Pedersen, Inge Lise. 1992. "Kvindeligt og/eller offentligt sprog" [Female and/or public language]. In *Språk, språkbruk och kön. Rapport från ASLA's nordiska symposion Uppsala, 7–9 november 1991*, eds. Britt-Louise Gunnarsson & Caroline Liberg. Uppsala: ASLA, 253–272.

Pedersen, Inge Lise. 1998. "Sprog og køn" [Language and gender]. NyS 24: 9–40.

Pedersen, Karen Margarethe. 2000. *Dansk sprog i Sydslesvig: Det danske sprogs status inden for det danske mindretal i Sydslesvig* [The Danish language in South Slesvig: The status of the Danish language in the Danish minority in South Slesvig] 1–2. Aabenraa: Institut for Grænseregionsforskning.

Petersen, Pia R. 1975. "Bedepiger, styrkvinder og formandinder" [Girl undertakers, female navigators, and chairwomen]. In *At færdes i Sproget. Iagttagelser og synspunkter.* ed. Dansk Sprognævn. København: Gyldendal, 53–54.

Petersen, Pia R. 1978. "Kønnenes sproglige ligebehandling" [The equal treatment of the sexes in language]. *Dansk Presse (October)*: 10–11.

Skautrup, Peter. 1944–1970. *Det danske sprogs historie* [The history of the Danish language]. 1–5. København: Gyldendal.

Wulff, Carsten & Flemming Axmark & Preben Hansen, eds. 1996. *Denmark.* Copenhagen: The Royal Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

Gender in French

Structural properties, incongruences and asymmetries

Elmar Schafroth
University of Augsburg, Germany

1. Introduction

The development of the individual Romance languages can be attributed mainly to the regionalisation of spoken Latin, due to substrate and superstrate influences in the Romanised areas. French is a West Romance language and,

along with Occitan and Franco-Provençal, belongs to Galloromance. Thus, the decisive substrate influence on the variety of Latin spoken in the area called Gaul was that of Gaulish, a Celtic language. The most influential superstrate influence on the Galloromance speech in France (i.e. on what was to become French) was West Franconian, a Germanic language. Accordingly, French is the Romance language containing the most Germanic elements in its lexicon (cf. also Schafroth 2002). Research has also assumed Franconian influence with regard to the phonetic-phonological and morphosyntactic criteria of French, although to what degree is debated. For example, the obligatory use of the personal pronoun with the verb (*je chante* 'I sing', *tu chantes* 'you sing' vs. Ital. *canto*, *canti* or Span. *canto*, *cantas*) is regarded as a consequence of the Germanic superstrate. In pronunciation, the existence of the *h aspiré* (aspirated h) in words such as *la hache* 'the hoe', *la harpe* 'the harp' or *le hanneton* 'the May beetle' is viewed as an adaptation of the Germanic initial /h/. The basis of the French language is Francien, the dialect of the Ile-de-France, which has prevailed over the other dialects since the High Middle Ages, particularly due to the politically privileged position of Paris (seat of the King). The main codification of French took place through the standardising work of several grammarians (esp. Vaugelas), the foundation of the Académie française in 1635 and through the role model of individual *bons auteurs* (good authors) such as Racine, La Fontaine, Corneille; this form remained the model in the following two centuries as well. The realisation that this standard was no longer adhered to in spoken language led to the *crise de la langue française* (crisis of the French language) in the first half of the 20th century. This crisis still persists today and has given rise to linguistic purism and to several *arrêtés* 'degrees' and language laws in order to support the *Bon usage* (proper usage) (cf. Berschin & Felixberger & Goebl 1978:239ff).

French is today spoken as native and official language in the whole of France (beside other languages and dialects), furthermore in francophone Belgium (including bilingual Brussels), in *Suisse romande* (French-speaking Switzerland), in Luxemburg, Monaco and in parts of North America, especially in Canada (Quebec, Acadia). In numerous other parts of the world, e.g. in Africa, French is used as an official or trade language or as a language of education enjoying special status (cf. Pöll 1998, Gaudino-Fallegger 1998:53ff). In this chapter, the focus is on French as it is generally used in France.

According to typological classifications based on phonological and grammatical criteria, French (usually along with Romanian and Sardinian) shares the fewest similarities with other Romance languages (cf. Geckeler & Dietrich 1997:136f). In French, the "prespecifying-analytical type" predominates in

many paradigms, whereas Latin is a highly "postspecifying-synthetical" language; cf. Fr. *plus fort* 'stronger' vs. Lat. *fortior* or Fr. *je chante* 'I sing' vs. Lat. *canto* (see Geckeler & Dietrich 1997: 134f). The prespecifying character (grammatical morpheme before lexeme) is manifested particularly in the oral code (*code phonique*):

code phonique	code graphique	
/ʒəʃɑ̃t/	*je chante*	'I sing'
/tyʃɑ̃t/	*tu chantes*	'you sing'
/ilʃɑ̃t/, /ɛlʃɑ̃t/	*il(s) chante(nt)*	'he sings (they, m, sing)'
	elle(s) chante(nt)	'she sings (they, f, sing)'
/ɔ̃ʃɑ̃t/	*on chante*	'one sings'

In the case of *nous chantons* (/nuʃɑ̃tɔ̃/) 'we sing' and *vous chantez* (/vuʃɑ̃te/) 'you (pl) sing', however, we have both pre- and postspecification.

Grammatical gender is marked on the noun as well as on the adjective in a postspecifying-synthetical way: *blanc/blanche* /blɑ̃, blɑ̃ʃ/ 'white (m/f)', *africain/africaine* /afrikɛ̃, afrikɛn/ 'African (m/f)', *vendeur/vendeuse* /vɑ̃dœr, vɑ̃døz/ 'shop assistant, seller (m/f)'.

Further typological characteristics of French include:

a. the fact that among the Romance languages, French is the one whose inherited words (i.e., those coming directly from Latin) have undergone the most radical syllable loss (e.g., Lat. *facere* > Fr. *faire* 'make', Lat. *aestatem* > Fr. *été* 'summer', Vlt. *peduculus > Fr. *pou* 'louse');

b. the fact that in the course of its history, the possibility of forming diminutives and augmentatives with the help of suffixes was drastically reduced;

c. the obligatory use of personal pronouns;

d. the oxytone accent (accent on the last syllable) within the *mot phonétique* (phonetic realisation of the word), although there are exceptions to this rule due to the possibility of affectually or consciously emphasising a syllable other than the last, particularly in certain text types such as radio or television news.

A further characteristic feature is a marked discrepancy between spelling and pronunciation, which is explicable mainly by the retention of historical and etymologising spellings that have not taken account of developments in pronunciation, e.g. *temps* 'time' [tɑ̃], *août* [u(t)] 'august', *eau* [o] 'water' (cf. in contrast the Italian correspondences, in which there is nearly a one-to-one relationship between spelling and pronunciation: *tempo*, *agosto*, *acqua*).

2.   Categories of gender in French

2.1 Grammatical gender

2.1.1   *Grammatical gender classes and agreement*

French has two genders: masculine and feminine (see also Bußmann 1995, Parris 1975). The neuter gender of Classical Latin in many cases merged with the class of masculines as early as Vulgar Latin (cf. e.g., Lat. *genus*, n, 'gender' and Fr. *genre*, m). Diachronically speaking, the masculine acquired a wider function from Latin to French through the absorption of many neuter words. In contemporary French, the concept of neuter remains – semantically – only in indefinite pronouns (e.g. *le* 'it' OBJ.PRON, *il* 'it' SUBJ.PRON, *cela* 'this', *quoi* 'what', cf. Goosse 1991, Marchello-Nizia 1989).

The genders are marked on nouns, adjectives, determiners,[1] and pronouns.[2] With few exceptions, participles are gender-marked only in spelling (*il est venu* 'he has come' vs. *elle est venue* 'she has come'). Thus, the noun phrases in (1a) and (1b) are all marked for gender in three ways: on the determiner (*ce* vs. *cette* 'this m/f'), the adjective (*beau* vs. *belle* 'beautiful m/f') and inherently in the noun (*poème* 'poem' vs. *chanson* 'song').

(1) a.   *ce   beau   poème*
          this.MASC.SG beautiful.MASC.SG poem.MASC.SG
          'this beautiful poem'
     b.   *cette   belle   chanson*
          this.FEM.SG beautiful.FEM.SG song.FEM.SG
          'this beautiful song'

In (2), *il* as the masculine subject pronoun refers to *Pierre, la* as the object pronoun (direct object) is gendered and resumes the feminine phrase *sa nouvelle voiture* 'his new car'.

(2) *Pierre adore sa   nouvelle   voiture*
     Pierre adores POSS.3SG.FEM new.FEM.SG car.FEM.SG
     et   il   la   montre à tout le monde.
     and he 3SG.FEM.ACC shows   to everyone
     'Pierre adores his new car and shows it to everyone.'

In the object pronouns *les* (direct object, plural), *lui* and *leur* (indirect object, singular and plural, respectively) the two genders coincide, cf. example (3), which does not allow for any attribution of gender.

(3) *Je les   lui   (leur)   donnerai.*
    I   them to.him/her to.them will.give
    'I will give them to her/him (them).'

In (4), the feminine gender, besides being expressed in the determiner (*la* 'the'), the adjective (*délicate* 'delicious') and the (head) noun (*mousse au chocolat* 'chocolate mousse'), is marked on the participle *mangée* 'eaten', albeit only in writing.

(4) *C' est la   plus délicate   mousse   au*
    this is the.FEM.SG most delicious.FEM.SG mousse.FEM.SG of
    chocolat que j' ai   jamais mangée.
    chocolate that I have ever   eaten.FEM.SG
    'This is the most delicious chocolate mousse that I have ever eaten.'

Thus, masculine and feminine are expressed either phonologically and/or morphologically on the noun itself (cf. Section 2.1.2), or manifest themselves lexically (cf. Section 2.2) or morphosyntactically (cf. Section 2.3) as well as by agreement (cf. Section 3.3).

In French, possessives (and other determiners) agree in gender and number with the following noun regardless of the gender of the "possessor" (cf. (5a)), whereas e.g. in German, the gender-number-relation is created anaphorically with the logical point of reference (the "possessor"), and the number-case-relation is created cataphorically (cf. (5b)):

(5) a. *La commission   a perdu son   président.*
        the commission.FEM.SG has lost   POSS.3SG.MASC president.MASC.SG
        'The commission has lost its president.'
    b. *Die Kommission   hat ihren   Vorsitzenden*
        the commission.FEM.SG has POSS.3SG.MASC president.MASC.SG
        verloren.
        lost
        'The commission has lost its president.'

Syntactic units such as *son cahier* (m) 'his/her exercise book' and *sa règle* (f) 'his/her ruler' are also solely motivated by the (grammatical) gender of the "possession" and not by the (referential) gender of the "possessor" as in English.

The opposition between masculine and feminine can be neutralised in French in several ways: in the plural forms of the article (definite, indefinite), demonstrative and possessive (cf. (6)), furthermore – in the *code phonique* (oral code) before an initial vowel – in the singular forms of the definite article, the

demonstrative, possessive and the interrogative or exclamative determiners (cf.
(7))[3] as well as in the object pronoun forms *les, lui* and *leur* (cf. above):

(6)   singular (masculine vs. feminine)
      un/le/ce/son restaurant vs. *une/la/cette/sa brasserie*
      'a/the/this/his or her or its restaurant' vs.
      'a/the/this/his or her or its brasserie'
      plural (no gender differentiation)
      des/les/ces/ses restaurants, brasseries
      'Ø/the/these/his or her restaurants, brasseries'

In contrast see, for example, Italian: *il ristorante* (m.sg) vs. *i ristoranti* (m.pl), *la
taverna* (f.sg) vs. *le taverne* (f.pl).

(7) | code phonique | code graphique | |
      |---|---|---|
      | /lami/ | *l'ami, l'amie* | 'the boy friend, the girl friend' |
      | /sɔ̃nãplwaje/ | *son employé, son employée* | 'his/her male/female employee' |
      | /sɛtɛ̃vite/ | *cet invité, cette invitée* | 'this male/female guest' |
      | /kɛlelɛv/ | *quel élève, quelle élève* | 'which male/female pupil' |
      | but: | | |
      | /œ̃nami/ vs. /ynami/ | *un ami, une amie* | 'a boy friend, a girl friend' |
      | /okœ̃nami/ vs. /okynami/ | *aucun ami, aucune amie* | 'no boy friend, no girl friend' |

2.1.2   *Gender assignment*

> There seems to be no practical criterion by which the gender of a noun in
> German, French, or Latin could be determined. (Bloomfield 1933:280)

This statement will be modified in the following with regard to French. The
question is: Are there rules in French that allow the prediction of the grammatical gender of a noun? *Lexical* oppositions for the designation of "natural"
gender (for animate nouns) are immediately determined by the semantic
feature [+male] or [+female], respectively (cf. also Section 2.2): *femme* (f)
'woman', *homme* (m) 'man'. Apart from some asymmetries, this is a clear-cut
case. Regarding the *phonological* level, in Corbett's (1991) terms *phonological
assignment*, the question is a different one: Are there any correlations between

the phonological structure of lexeme terminations and the grammatical gender of lexemes and, if so, how significant are they? A high correlation between the two factors would mean that there should be cases of analogy in the direction of the "normal case". For the problem of the feminisation of occupational terms (cf. Schafroth 1998; Burr, this vol.) this would mean that certain agent nouns considered to be gender-neutral, such as *journaliste* 'journalist', *biologue* 'biologist' – in other French-speaking countries also *juge* 'judge' and *ministre* 'minister' – are typically assigned to a specific gender class. According to Mel'čuk (1974), the rule (based on 6,000 nouns) according to which words ending in a pronounced consonant are feminine and those ending in a pronounced vowel are masculine, applies in 85% of cases. If words ending in /-Cr(ə)/ and /-Cl(ə)/ are excluded, rule conformity even comes to 94%.

If Mel'čuk's results are applied to French professional terms, the surprising observation emerges that lexemes terminating in /-œr/ should typically be regarded as feminine. As Mel'čuk's corpus apparently does not include agent nouns such as *vendeur* 'shop assistant, seller', *professeur* 'professor' – or at least not to a representative degree – this regularity must be reconsidered empirically. In Juilland's reverse dictionary (Juilland 1965), of 1265 nouns terminating in /-œr/ 1190 are masculine and 75 feminine. Two are both masculine and feminine: *teneur* (f) 'substance, tenor', *teneur* (m) 'bookkeeper'; *vapeur* (f) 'vapour', *vapeur* (m) 'steamboat'. Thus, Mel'čuk's corpus was far too small. Nevertheless, the results of this study cannot be brushed aside completely. The rule of thumb that words ending in a consonant are usually feminine finds some support in colloquial analogical formations. Thus, Frei (1929:51) reported that certain words terminating in a short vowel were used as masculines (*auto* 'car', *dynamo* 'dynamo', *toux* 'cough'), and others ending in a consonant were treated as feminine (e.g. *âge* 'age', *hôtel* 'hotel', *air* 'air', *office* 'office', *autobus* 'bus'):

> […] le genre semble surtout dicté par la nature de la terminaison. […] les suffixes terminés dans la prononciation par une voyelle (brève) tendent à être interprétés comme masculins, tandis que les terminaisons à consonne finale prononcée sont conçues comme féminines.

> '[…] the gender seems everywhere to be dictated by the nature of the termination. […] the suffixes ending in a (short) vowel in pronunciation tend to be interpreted as masculines, whereas the terminations with a pronounced final consonant are conceived of as feminines.'

Based on the results by Tucker & Lambert & Rigault (1977), Corbett (1991:59f) states that considerable phonological regularities in gender assignment can be observed in French. The combination of several individual rules leads to the following generalisation:

Phonological assignment
1. Nouns in /ɛzɔ̃/, /sjɔ̃/, /zjɔ̃/, /ʒjɔ̃/ and /tjɔ̃/ are feminine;
2. remaining nouns in /ɔ̃/ are masculine.

Regarding the morphological level (termed *morphological assignment* by Corbett), there are cases in which morphological rules (word-formation devices) correlate with a certain gender. Compounds of the type V–N are masculine: *un porte-parole* 'a speaker', *un tire-bouchon* 'a cork-screw', *un essuie-glace* 'a windscreen', *un tourne-disques* 'a record-player', *un ouvre-boîte* 'a can-opener', *un lave-vaisselle* 'a dishwasher' (cf. also 3.1.2). With other devices, the morphological and phonological levels overlap, e.g.:

a. Derivations (with the suffix *-ier*) designating fruit trees are masculine: *pommier* 'apple-tree', *poirier* 'pear tree', *cerisier* 'cherry tree'.
b. Derivations for the designation of machines etc. (instrument nouns) often contain the feminine suffix *-euse* (*perceuse* 'hammer', *tondeuse à gazon* 'lawn-mower').
c. Deverbal nominalisations in *-ation* are feminine (*formation* 'formation, education', *réalisation* 'realisation'), in *-age* (*emballage* 'wrapping', *nettoyage* 'cleaning') and *-ment* masculine (*regroupement* 'grouping together', *renouvellement* 'renewing').

In all three cases, however, one could just as well attribute the gender to *phonological assignment:* e.g., *-ation* has the "typical" feminine termination /-sjɔ̃/, while *-age* /-ʒ/ and *-ment* /-ā/ are "typical" masculines.

2.2 Lexical gender

In lexical gender nouns, female or male gender is an integral part of the lexical meaning. Such cases can be found predominantly within the domains of kinship terms, terms of address as well as in some general personal nouns (cf. Tables 1–3).

As the tables show, the grammatical gender of lexical gender nouns generally follows semantic gender assignment. With Corbett (1991:57), semantic gender assignment can be described as follows:

Table 1. Kinship terms

Female/feminine	Male/masculine
mère 'mother'	*père* 'father'
sœur 'sister'	*frère* 'brother'
tante 'aunt'	*oncle* 'uncle'
cousine 'cousin'	*cousin* 'cousin'
fille 'daughter'	*fils* 'son'
femme 'wife'	*mari* 'husband'

Table 2. Terms of address

Female/feminine	Male/masculine
Madame 'Mrs, madam'	*Monsieur* 'Mr, sir'
Mademoiselle 'Miss'	

Table 3. General personal nouns

Female/feminine	Male/masculine
femme 'woman'	*homme* 'man'
jeune fille 'girl'	*garçon* 'boy'
hôtesse 'stewardess'	*steward* 'steward'
reine 'queen'	*roi* 'king'

Semantic assignment
1. Sex-differentiable nouns denoting males are masculine.
2. Sex-differentiable nouns denoting females are feminine.

For 1. *père* 'father', *frère* 'brother', *oncle* 'uncle', *garçon* 'boy' etc. may be adduced, they are all masculine and express male referential gender. Deviations such as *la sentinelle* 'the sentry' or *la recrue* 'the recruit' are explicable historically. In addition, there are exceptions (i.e. male-specific feminine terms) with pejorative connotations, e.g. *une brute* 'a brute', *une femmelette* 'a weakling', *une fripouille* 'a scoundrel'. Of course, male reference can also be achieved by neutral feminine terms such as *une personne* 'a person', *une victime* 'a victim', *une star* 'a star', cf. Section 2.3.

For 2. *mère* 'mother', *sœur* 'sister', *tante* 'aunt', *jeune fille* 'girl' may be adduced as examples. Exceptions are, e.g., *un laideron* 'an ugly woman or girl', *un bas-bleu* 'a blue-stocking', *un tendron* 'very young mistress of an older man', which have pejorative connotations. Of course, female reference can also be achieved by neutral masculine terms such as *un membre* 'a member', *un otage* 'a

hostage', *un personnage* 'a character', cf. Section 2.3.

Nouns referring to "natural" gender mostly contain different lexical stems formed from different etymological bases. From a synchronic perspective, no formal gender marker can be discovered in older terms: *homme – femme* 'man – woman', *roi – reine* 'king – queen', *seigneur – dame* 'lord – lady', *moine – religieuse* 'monk – nun', *amant – maîtresse* 'male – female lover'. In more recent oppositions a morphological gender marker (e.g. *-esse*) may occur, as in *steward – hôtesse (de l'air)* 'steward – stewardess'.[4]

Within the context of efforts to achieve linguistic equality, a terminology commission was implemented in France in 1984 that was to create lacking feminine occupational terms and titles (cf. Burr 1999 and this vol.). When the commission's suggestions were discussed, the technique of creating lexical oppositions was favoured in some cases particularly by the Académie française, not least because this also allowed masculinisation: e.g., instead of *accoucheuse* → *accoucheur* 'midwife → male midwife', the pair *sage-femme* 'midwife' → *maïeuticien* 'male midwife' was suggested. The commission, however, rejected this in all cases but one: *une docteur* 'a (female) doctor' as an equivalent to *un médecin* 'a medical doctor' (cf. Houdebine-Gravaud 1989: 126). In Switzerland, for instance, we find the suggestions *sage-homme/sage-femme* 'male/female midwife (lit. wise man/wise woman)' and *valet/soubrette* 'man servant/maid' (*Dictionnaire féminin-masculin* 1991).

For obvious reasons, the possibility to create lexical oppositions has to be regarded as extremely restricted. It contradicts linguistic economy and the need for redundancy, as no psychologically, cognitively or mnemotechnically relevant parallelism exists – this is especially true for the masculine *maïeuticien* 'male midwife' propagated by the Académie as the counterpart to *sage-femme* 'midwife'. Furthermore, there are no *creationes ex nihilo* – the opposing members would thus have to be recruited from pre-existing lexical material. This would enlarge the semantic complexity of individual lexemes and thereby their extension. More recent examples are often based on (English) loanwords. Compare, for example, the oppositions *barkeeper/dame de bar* 'male/female barkeeper' and *intendant de cabine/hôtesse de l'air* 'male/female flight attendant' given in the *Dictionnaire féminin-masculin* (1991). Oppositions with purely English stems, such as *cameraman/camerawoman* (Switzerland), require a separate treatment. In France, we here find *un cadreur* (m) 'cameraman/ camerawoman' for both female and male referents (*Nouveau Petit Robert* 1995).

2.3 Referential gender

As can be seen, there are lexemes whose grammatical gender is incongruent with the gender of the person so designated. This incongruence can be (a) partial, i.e. grammatical gender and referential gender correspond (e.g., *un membre*, m, 'a member', *une star*, m/f, 'a star') or (b) total, i.e. grammatical gender and referential gender are always contradictory (e.g., *un alto*, m, 'a contralto', *une basse*, f, 'a bass'). In this case, grammatical gender thus does not *refer* to extralinguistic reality – in contradistinction to a lexical pair such as *oncle – tante* 'uncle – aunt'.

In many cases, such incongruencies occur with disrespectful personal nouns and invectives. Feminists have often complained that languages contain numerous pejorative masculine words for women, but far less pejorative feminine words for men. Marouzeau (1946: 245), on the contrary, assumes a prototypically negative character of the feminine, the strongest expression of which he finds in the use of feminine terms of abuse for men (see also Spence 1986: 348).

The following presentation is based on Grevisse (1993: §476), Yaguello (1989) and *Nouveau Petit Robert* (1995). However, in cases such as *recrue* (f) 'recruit' and *sentinelle* (m) 'sentry', due to social changes we are not dealing with exclusiveness any longer, although in the French-speaking area, female recruits and soldiers still seem to be the exception. These lexemes are about to enlarge their semantic extension. A different case is *mannequin* (m) 'mannequin' (originally denoting 'little man') which can nowadays – albeit far less frequently – also refer to men. In addition, we find a development towards a double gender noun, i.e. *un/une mannequin*, which is already the rule in Quebec (cf. Parent 1994: 129). Deviating gender attributions, as occurring in spoken language (e.g. *un ordonnance* 'an aid-de-camp') have to be disregarded here. In some cases (e.g. *crapule* 'crook', *louchon* 'cross-eyed person', also *laideron* 'ugly woman or girl' and *souillon* 'slattern, slut'), opinions differ as to gender. *Laideron* is a special case inasmuch as for a long time it was a feminine noun (*une laideron*), but in analogy to nouns ending in *-on* it came to be used as a masculine (since Rousseau). Moreover, a form *laideronne* has existed since the 17th century, so that referential gender and grammatical gender are actually not in conflict. *Souillon* 'slattern, slut' must be classed as a double gender noun (*un/une souillon*) – this is not only supported by the Académie française (cf. Grevisse 1993), but also by Yaguello (1989) and the *Nouveau Petit Robert* (1995). Quite different is the fact that statistically it is mostly used for women (whether grammatically masculine or feminine). Vice versa, this also applies to

the double gender noun *(un/une) arsouille* 'ruffian', which refers predominantly to men. A further case is *tanagra* 'girl, delicate and gracious young woman', which, though used exclusively for females, occurs mainly as grammatically feminine, but can also be used as a grammatical masculine. Thus, it is only tentatively that this word can be placed in category 2 (cf. below). Finally, *barbouze* 'secret agent' does not belong here either, for apart from being used as a feminine it also occurs as a masculine (category 1, cf. below), in which case we have agreement between referential and grammatical gender. *Filou* 'crook, swindler' is masculine and is almost exclusively used for men; besides this, however, there also exists a feminine *filoute* (*Nouveau Petit Robert* 1995).

According to the sources cited, the following French lexemes can be listed as exhibiting stable gender incongruence, be it total (1 and 2) or partial (3 and 4):

1. *Feminine* 'male'

   non-pejorative: *basse* 'bass', *ordonnance* (elliptical for *un officier d'ordonnance* 'aide-de-camp'), *vigie* 'watch', *Sa Sainteté* 'His Holiness'

   pejorative: *frappe ≈ gouape* 'blackguard', *lope* 'coward', *tapette* 'passive homosexual'

2. *Masculine* 'female'

   non-pejorative: *alto* 'alto', *trottin* 'errand girl'

   pejorative: *bas-bleu* 'bluestocking', *tendron* 'very young mistress of an older man'

3. *Feminine* 'female' or 'male'

   non-pejorative: *coryphée* 'expert', *idole* 'idol', *personne* 'person', *recrue* 'recruit', *sentinelle* 'sentry', *star* 'star', *vedette* 'star', *victime* 'victim'

   pejorative: *bête* 'dumb person', *brute* 'brute', *canaille* 'idiot', *crapule* 'crook', *dupe* 'dupe', *femmelette* 'weakling', *fripouille* 'scroundrel', *mauviette* 'wimp, weakling', *ordure* 'filth', (Swiss) *charrette* 'shiftless person scoundrel'

4. *Masculine* 'female' or 'male'[5]

   non-pejorative: *cas* 'exemplar', *contralto* 'contralto', *être* 'being', *exemple* 'example', *gourmet* 'gourmet', *individu* 'individual', *membre* 'member', *modèle* 'model', *original* 'original', *otage* 'hostage', *personnage* 'character', *phénomène* 'phenomenon', *spécimen*

'specimen', *symbole* 'symbol', *témoin* 'witness', *type*
'type'

pejorative: *bandit* 'bandit', *charlatan* 'quack, charlatan', *escroc*
'crook, swindler', *gangster* 'gangster', *louchon*[6]
'cross-eyed person', *monstre* 'monster', *pirate* 'pirate'

An additional type is the combination of an inherently male or female lexeme such as *garçon* 'boy' or *fille* 'girl' with an attribute denoting the other gender: e.g. *ma mégère masculine* 'my male shrew' (Grevisse 1993: §491).

Strictly speaking, cases of lexical doublets should also be treated here, e.g. *un directeur/une directrice* 'a (male/female) director' as parallel designations for women. However, this is a different case inasmuch as in *directrice* '(female) director' there is no contradiction between grammatical and referential gender, and the use of the one or the other form depends on the context and is thus a phenomenon of use, not of the language system (cf. also Section 2.4).

2.4 Social gender

Social gender results from stereotypical assumptions about what are appropriate social roles for women and men. It includes expectations about who will be a typical member of a given person category, e.g. 'politician', 'surgeon' or 'nurse'. The social gender of a personal noun becomes manifest when deviations are formally marked, as in Engl. *female surgeon* or *male nurse*. Social and referential gender need not necessarily coincide: *surgeon* can denote a woman, *nurse* a man, but according to social norms, these instances are marked cases. A French noun such as *chef* 'boss, head of sth.' for example, bears the feature [proto-typically male].[7] According to Houdebine-Gravaud (1995: 393) evidence for this can be found (based on the results of relevant studies, cf. Houdebine 1989) in the spontaneous attribution of referential gender to "gender-neutral" forms such as *journaliste* 'journalist' and *juge* 'judge', which in 80% to 100% of instances were classed as prototypically male. This also applied to designations such as *médecin* 'medical doctor' and *professeur* 'professor' (cf. also Section 3.2, note 28).

In France, the problem of social gender finds its expression particularly in the widespread reluctance of speakers to accept feminine terms for proto-typically male and at the same time prestigious professions. This has, among other things, led to what we have termed "functional doublets" (Schafroth 2001: 135ff): In some cases, the functional domain seems to be split up between morphological masculine and feminine, with social prestige and social importance

of the profession being the decisive criteria. Thus, morphologically regular feminines such as, e.g., *ambassadrice* 'female ambassador', *conseillère* 'female consultant, advisor', *contrôleuse* 'female inspector', *inspectrice* 'female inspector', *présidente* 'female president', are used mainly for socially less important jobs or particularly for charity work. The use of the respective masculine forms (*ambassadeur, conseiller, contrôleur, inspecteur, président*), on the other hand, is restricted to women in more prestigious or socially eminent activities in what was formerly – and partly even today – regarded as "classical" male domains, i.e. politics, diplomacy, higher administration, law. One look at the *Who's who in France* and the chronicles of the *légion d'honneur* (Legion of Honour) regularly printed in *Le Monde* will show this still to be the case today.

2.5 Generic masculines

In French today, the masculine occurs in its triple function of 1. designating males, 2. generic masculine, 3. designating females (cf. Burr, this vol., also Schafroth 2001:142). Examples (8) and (9) illustrate the generic function:

(8)   *Tous les candidats* (m) *ont été reçus à l'examen.*
      'All candidates have passed the exam.'

(9)   *L'étudiant moyen* (m) *est obligé* (m) *de travailler pendant ses études.*
      'The average student has to work for a living during his studies.'

In feminist language critique, the controversy about the generic use of the masculine is to a large degree influenced by the discussion about the "markedness" or "unmarkedness" of the grammatical genders. However, we can here not deal with the theory of markedness in the light of feminist linguistics (cf., e.g., Hellinger 1990:92ff). The feminine (e.g., *musicienne* 'female musician') is on the one hand formally marked, and on the other hand distributionally restricted and semantically unambiguous – it can never be used as a gender-indefinite form (like the masculine *musicien* 'musician'), but only gender-specifically. In addition, the masculine expressions *maire* 'mayor', *écrivain* 'writer', *auteur* 'author', *professeur* 'professor' etc. also appear instead of the feminine forms in female-specific contexts, as in (10) which exemplifies a type that is unremarkable in French.[8] By contrast, the feminine is the normal choice in German, cf. (10b):

(10)   a.   *Elle est l'auteur* (m) *de deux romans.*
            'She is the author of two novels.'

b.   *Sie ist Autorin* (f) *zweier Romane.*
     'She is the author of two novels.'

A generic masculine in the sense of markedness theory would be the one in (11):

(11)   *une nouvelle génération d'auteurs* (m.pl) *dramatiques*
       'a new generation of dramatic authors (m.pl)'

It is obvious that feminist language critique also considers (11) to be unacceptable. In the following, we will list two arguments each for and against the generic masculine, thus summarising some of the central aspects of this debate (cf. Schafroth 1998: 108 ff):

Arguments for the generic masculine:

1.   The masculine in its generic use is gender-neutral, because it assumes the function of an archilexeme in neutral contexts. In such contexts, it is not the quality that counts, but only the function.
2.   The generic masculine makes sense from the point of view of linguistic economy, it is stylistically desirable and, in addition, indispensable in those cases in which it abstracts from referential gender and only indicates a function. The legibility and intelligibility of a text are of prime importance.

Arguments against the generic masculine:

1.   Psycholinguistically and cognitively, the use of the generic masculine evokes the association 'male'. The mixture of neutrality and masculine gender is thus inadmissible.
2.   The use of the masculine as a form meant to include men and women is sexist. Women want to be explicitly mentioned in all contexts, even the so-called neutralised ones ("Ce qui n'est pas nommé n'a pas d'existence" 'That which does not have a name does not exist'). Arguments based on linguistic economy or stylistics are thus either irrelevant or are of a subordinate nature. The intelligibility of a text can be increased with the help of neutralisations or gender-neutral lexemes.

3.   Gender-specification in French

In the linguistic system of French, the morphological operations and lexical oppositions for expressing the female gender are somewhere between *minimal* and *maximal* feminisation (see also Houdebine-Gravaud 1989: 125 f). Maximal

feminisation consists in the existence or the creation of a special lexeme for the feminine so that its stem is different from the masculine word (cf. Section 2.2). By minimal feminisation is meant the introduction of double gender as in *le/la docteur* 'the male/female doctor' (cf. Section 3.2). Between these two poles, there are several more or less explicit morphological procedures that fall in the domain of word-formation (cf. Section 3.1).

3.1   Word-formation

3.1.1   *Derivation*

We regard the phonic level as having priority and only take recourse to spelling when the sound shape does not distinguish between masculine and feminine. Furthermore, we shall only consider those patterns that are 1. productive and 2. allow gender oppositions with regard to agent nouns. Consequently, in the following, morphological gender in French shall exclusively be illustrated by occupational terms. Productivity is determined according to the number of new formations in French as spoken in France (first tokens in *Nouveau Petit Robert* 1995) and three other (partially) French-speaking countries (Belgium: *Mettre au féminin* 1994; Switzerland: *Dictionnaire féminin-masculin* 1991, *Dictionnaire suisse romand* 1997; Canada/Quebec: *Au féminin* 1991, *Classification nationale des professions* 1993). In principle, one new formation is enough to establish limited productivity. By new formations, we mean first occurrences of feminine forms since 1950.[9] The following productive patterns for the feminisation of French agent nouns or professional terms thus contain at least one new formation. All further gender oppositions, particularly those for adjectives (e.g. *faux/fausse* 'wrong, false m/f'), personal nouns (e.g., *époux/épouse* 'husband/ wife', *pays/payse* 'male/female compatriot')[10] and ethnic nouns (e.g., *Anglais/ Anglaise* 'Englishman/English woman'), must be disregarded here, if they do not form agent nouns. For these cases we refer to Grevisse (1993: §478–491).

Feminine markers such as written *-e* will be treated as suffixes on a par with the "classic" derivational suffixes (e.g. *-euse*).

Additive suffixation
Additive means: The feminine morpheme is added to the stem or to the masculine morpheme without any phonological change involved. As a sign for 'zero' we select the symbol Ø.[11]

An exception in the feminine formation of French is the purely graphematic suffix ⟨-e⟩, which is mainly added to words ending in a (stressed) vowel, e.g.,

apprenti → *apprentie* 'apprentice'), and in a few cases also to lexemes in *-al* (*principal* → *principale* 'director'). The endings [-ɛl/-ɛl], [-ɛf/-ɛf] and [-ik/-ik] are also without consequences in the phonic code; however, they do become visible graphically: *-el/-elle* (*contractuel* → *contractuelle* 'contract worker') *-f/-ffe* (*chef* → *cheffe* 'boss') and *-ic/-ique* (*syndic* → *syndique* 'union member'). However, in both cases an epenthetic vowel [ə] is possible in the feminine. This also applies to the type [-œr/-œr], i.e. *-eur/-eure* (*prieur* 'prior' → *prieure* 'prioress', Quebec/Switzerland: *professeur* → *professeure* 'professor').[12]

Phonically and graphically additive are thus the following examples:

code phonique	code graphique	
[-Ø/-ɛt]	*-Ø/-ette*	*beur/beurette* 'second generation North African living in France'; partly with stem deformation: *zoulou/zoulette* 'Zulu'[13]
[-a/-at]	*-at/-ate*	*avocat/avocate* 'lawyer'; Belgium, Switzerland, Québec: *magistrat/magistrate* 'magistrate, judge'
[-y/-yt]	*-ut/-ute*	Switzerland: *substitut/substitute* 'substitute'
[-ɛr/-ɛrt]	*-ert/-erte*	Switzerland: *expert/experte* 'ex-pert'
[-ar/-ard]	*-ard/-arde*	*snobinard/snobinarde* 'snob', *smicard/smicarde*[14]
[-ã/-ãt]	*-ant/-ante*	*doctorant/doctorante* 'doctoral student', *lieuten-ant/lieutenante* 'lieutenant'

Suppletive suffixation

From a strictly synchronic point of view, *suppletive suffixation* refers to the alternation between two phonically different suffixes that are each added to a lexical stem. Phonically – and only partly graphically – suppletive are:

code phonique	code graphique	
[-e/-ɛr]	*-er/-ère*	*cocher/cochère* 'coachman, driver', *horloger/horlogère* 'watchmaker
[-ɛ̃/-ɛn]	*-ain/-aine*	*riverain/riveraine* 'resident'; Québec: *écrivain/écrivaine* 'writer'; *-en/-enne doyen/doyenne* 'dean'
[-jɛ̃/-jɛn]	*-ien/-ienne*	*sémioticien/sémioticienne* 'semiotician'
[-ã/-an]	*-an/-ane*	*artisan/artisane* 'artisan'
[-ɛ̃/-in]	*-in/-ine*	*citadin/citadine* 'urban dweller'; Switzerland: *marin/marine* 'mariner, seafarer'
[-ɔ̃/-ɔn]	*-on/-onne*	*vigneron/vigneronne* 'wine farmer'

[-jɔ̃/-jɔn]	*-ion/-ionne*	*champion/championne* 'champion', *espion/ espionne* 'spy'
[-je/-jɛr]	*-ier/-ière*	*infirmier/infirmière* 'male/female nurse', *ambulancier/ambulancière* 'ambulance man/woman'
[-o/-ɔt]	*-ot/-ote*	*typo/typote* 'compositor',[15] *cheminot/cheminote* 'railway person'; Switzerland: *camelot/camelote* 'street vendor', *matelot/matelote* 'sailor'
[-œr/-øz][16]	*-eur/-euse*	*vendeur/vendeuse* 'shop assistant', *pupitreur/ pupitreuse* 'systems operator', *programmeur/ programmeuse* 'programmer'
[-tœr/-tris]	*-teur/-trice*	*auditeur/auditrice* 'hearer, auditor', *enquêteur/ enquêtrice*[17] 'interviewer'; *ambassadeur/ ambassadrice* 'ambassador'

Suppletive suffixation also exists in loanwords (especially from Italian): Switzerland: *pizzaiolo/pizzaiola* 'pizzamaker', *impresario/impresaria*[18] 'male/ female impresario'.

Suffixation on the basis of acronyms
The way in which acronyms are subjected to the process of suffixation is particularly illuminating. Here, it can be observed that only "unproblematic" suffixes are chosen, that is, elements that form patterns and allow the formation of a regular feminine, be it through suppletive suffixation (a), or additive suffixation (b), be it through the double gender suffix *-iste* (c) or as a double gender noun without suffix (d); a peculiarity exists in the formation with the lexeme *femme* 'woman' (e):

a.   acronym + *-ien/-ienne*:
     CAPES → *capésien/capésienne* or *capessienne* 'CAPES-student' (= Certificat d'aptitude au professorat de l'enseignement du second degré)
b.   acronym + *-ard/-arde*:
     SMIC → *smicard/smicarde*,[19] TUC → *tucard/tucarde*[20]
c.   acronym + *-iste*:
     CGT → *un/une cégétiste* 'union member of C.G.T.' (= Confédération générale du travail), VTT (*vélo tout terrain* 'mountain bike') → *un/une vettétiste* 'a person riding a mountain bike'
d.   acronym as double gender noun:
     PDG → *un/une P.D.G.*,[21] TUC → *un/une tuc*

e.   *femme* + acronym:
     PDG → *une femme P. D. G.*

Derivational patterns that are not or no longer productive, but still relevant as professional terms in contemporary French, particularly concerning the question of use or non-use of the feminine, include: *speaker → speakerine* 'announcer', *marchand → marchande* 'merchant', *maire → mairesse*[22] 'mayor'; partly with stem alternation: *docteur → doctoresse*[23] 'doctor' or *vendeur → venderesse*[24] 'seller, shop assistant'.

3.1.2   *Compounding*

Gender can also be made explicit in French through compounding: *une femme professeur/un professeur femme* 'a woman professor', *un homme grenouille* 'a frogman'. Compounds, i.e. complex words consisting of at least two lexical morphemes, can be classified according to the internal relationship of their members as determinative and copulative compounds. In the first case, which includes the personal nouns mentioned, we are dealing with a subordinating relationship, in the second with a coordinating relationship (cf. also Thiele 1985). The grammatical gender of determinative compounds is "predictable" inasmuch as it corresponds to the gender of the determinatum (determined), if the compound is of the Romance type (determined-determiner): Fr. *agent* (m) *de police* (f) 'police officer', It. *agente* (m) *di polizia* (f), Sp. *agente* (m) *de policía* (f). The gender of the first member of the compound thus determines the gender of the whole compound.

Regarding the feminisation of occupational terms, the type *une femme professeur*, 'a woman professor' (e.g. *une femme chef* 'a woman boss', *une femme écrivain* 'a woman writer', *une femme ingénieur* 'a woman engineer') is far more frequent than *un professeur femme* 'a professor woman', *un architecte femme* 'an architect woman', or *un député femme* 'a delegate woman'. The function of the formation pattern *femme* + masculine or masculine + *femme* is a double one. It either serves as a "compromise formula" for avoiding unusual or problematical morphological feminines (cf. (12)) or for the identification of or focussing on female referential gender (cf. (13)), especially with double gender nouns such as *ministre* 'minister' (Schafroth 1998, 2001; also Burr, this vol.).

(12)   […] *un menuisier, une polisseuse de métaux, une femme sculpteur et une jeune fille qui fabrique des masques* […]
       'a joiner, a female metal whetter, a female sculptor and a girl who produces masks' (*Le Monde*, 16 September 1988: 12)

(13)   *Le porte-parole des Verts, première femme député du Jura*, […]
       'The speaker of the Greens, first female delegate of the Jura […]'
       (*Le Monde*, 3 June 1997:41)

3.2 Morphosyntax: Double gender

In contrast with the type *vendeur/vendeuse* 'shop assistant', *maire/mairesse* 'mayor', lexemes such as *touriste* 'tourist', *partenaire* 'partner' have no gender marker. Neither are they inherently – that is semantically – [male] or [female]. Femaleness or maleness only becomes clear referentially, i.e., through reference to the extralinguistic correlate. Only with the help of additional linguistic elements, e.g. a determiner, or through textual-deictic means can grammatical and referential gender be determined on the level of expression. For this reason, Houdebine-Gravaud (1989) calls this type of feminine formation *féminisation minimale* (minimal feminisation). In French publications, these lexemes are often termed *épicènes*.[25] We will call them *double gender nouns*.[25]

However, in linguistics and grammatical tradition, the term *épicène* 'epicene' is used in at least two different ways:

1. *Épicènes* are nouns that can be used for male as well as female referents without any formal changes. Depending on referential gender, they are used with masculine or feminine agreement forms and can thus be seen as nouns with double gender. In French, the most common cases are words ending in ⟨-e⟩. Most of these are formed with suffixes such as *-iste*, *-ogue* and *-aire*: *linguiste* 'linguist', *biologue* 'biologist', *locataire* 'tenant', but also *architecte* 'architect', *comptable* 'accountant', *concierge* 'caretaker', *dactylo* 'typist', *prof* 'professor', *syndic* 'union member'. The same lexeme can be used as an *épicène* (*le/la poète* 'poet') and/or be suffixed (*le poète/la poétesse* 'poet/poetess'). This depends on the preference of the respective French-speaking community.

Acronyms can also be specified for gender in this way, although this happens less frequently: *une P. D. G.*,[26] *une S. C. F.*[27] (cf. Section 3.1.1).

2. *Épicènes* are nouns with fixed grammatical gender regardless of whether the designated person is female or male. This view is, for example, taken in *Bon Usage* (Grevisse 1993: §476b; cf. also Vogel 1996, 1997). Here belong all "problematical cases" in *-eur*, as well as individual lexemes, which are only used in the masculine, such as *bourgmestre* 'mayor' (esp. in Belgium), *chef* 'boss', *échevin* 'alderman, principal county magistrate', *écrivain* 'writer', *gourmet* 'gourmet', *médecin* 'medical doctor', *témoin* 'witness', *tyran* 'tyrant' or, more generally:

> [...] notamment des professions qui pendant longtemps n'ont été exercées que par les hommes [...] ou [...] des désignations pour lesquelles le sexe de la personne n'a pas d'intérêt.
>
> '[...] especially professions which for a long time were only taken up by men [...] or [...] designations for which the person's gender plays no role.'
> (Grevisse 1993: §476b)

This category also includes nouns that are only used in the feminine, such as *fripouille* 'blackguard, scoundrel', *personne* 'person', *recrue* 'recruit', *star* 'star', *vedette* 'star', *victime* 'victim'. *Épicènes* in the sense of (1) are regarded as 'unchangeable nouns' in Grevisse.

Épicènes were favoured by the members of the French terminology commission (cf. Houdebine-Gravaud 1989; Burr 1999 and this vol.), because masculines such as *docteur* 'doctor' or *ingénieur* 'engineer', if they are regarded as unchangeable forms, could be subsumed under the first category and be feminised in this way: *un/une docteur, un/une ingénieur*. In addition, all those cases that exhibit no formal masculine marker, but may be regarded as prototypically male, such as *chef* 'boss', could be categorised as double gender nouns.[28]

3.3 Conflicts in agreement

3.3.1 *Textlinguistic dimension*
For Corbett (1991), the function of grammatical gender manifests itself on the syntagmatic level, i.e. in the agreement of those parts of the sentence correlated with the noun. The gender system of a language is characterised by the fact that it "is reflected beyond the nouns themselves in modifications required of 'associated words'" Corbett (1991:4).[29]

First of all, agreement is of course a grammatical phenomenon: The noun – be it a lexeme with overt grammatical or lexical gender (*vendeuse* 'female shop assistant' or *tante* 'aunt' respectively), a double gender noun (*biologue* 'biologist') or even a noun in which grammatical and referential gender disagree (*membre* 'member', *personne* 'person') – is identified in grammatical gender and number on the syntagmatic level through those parts of the sentence that are dependent on it: e.g., *elle* 'she' and (in writing) *venue* 'come (f)' in *Marie, elle aussi, est venue hier soir* 'Marie, she has also come (f) yesterday evening' or *la* 'the (f)' and *écrite* 'written (f)' in *la lettre* (f) *que j'ai écrite* 'the (f) letter (f) that I have written (f)'.

On the level of language use, agreement frequently implies a semantic and

social dimension (cf. Hellinger & Bußmann, this vol.). In French this is expressed especially through incongruencies on the syntactic level. Compare the following examples adapted from Hanse (1994:427). Decisive is the referential gender of the person concerned (*Louise Dupont* 'female'):

(14)   *Maître Louise Dupont est une excellente avocate.*
       'Maître (m) Louise (f) Dupont is an excellent lawyer (f).'

(15)   *Maître Louise Dupont est un excellent avocat.*
       'Maître (m) Louise (f) Dupont is an excellent lawyer (m).'

(16)   *Maître Louise Dupont est inscrite au barreau de Bruxelles.*
       'Maître (m) Louise (f) Dupont is registered (f) at the Brussels law court.'

(17)   *Maître Louise Dupont est un des meilleurs avocats de Bruxelles.*
       'Maître (m) Louise (f) Dupont is one (m) of the best lawyers (m.pl) in Brussels.'

The lack of agreement in (15) and (17), which is solely due to the prototypically male social gender of a lexeme such as *maître*, represents one of the core problems of French grammar in the domain of gender (the other is the *servitude grammaticale* 'grammatical subservience', cf. Section 3.3.2). We cannot deal here with the sociolinguistic and psychological problems of this phenomenon (but cf. Burr, this vol.; also Schafroth 1998, 2001). Instead, we will briefly discuss the textlinguistic dimension of gender agreement. After all, because of communicative factors, it is by no means arbitrary when and where in a sentence agreement fails to occur. For this reason, Corbett (1991:225ff) constructs the following agreement hierarchy:

> The Agreement Hierarchy
> attributive < predicate < relative pronoun < personal pronoun
> […]
> As we move rightwards along the hierarchy, the likelihood of semantic agreement will increase monotonically (that is, with no intervening decrease).

In other words: Pronominal resumption of the subject yields the lowest probability of grammatical gender agreement – including the cases where grammatical and referential gender contradict each other, as with *maître* or *avocat* in the examples above. Corbett's examples (1991:226f) include the following, cf. (18) and (19):

(18)   *Sa Sainteté* (f) *n'est pas si ombrageuse* (f) *de s'en formaliser.*
       'His Holiness (f) is not so indignant (f) as to get excited about it.'

(19) *Sa Majesté* (f) *fut inquiète* (f), *et de nouveau il* (m) *envoya La Varenne à son ministre.*
'His majesty (f) was worried and once again he (m) sent La Varenne to his minister.'

A sentence such as (20) seems to corroborate Corbett's hypothesis (cf. Schafroth 1998: 103):

(20) *Marie-Josée Jacobs, actuel* (m) *Président* (m) *du Conseil des ministres de l'UE* […]. *Elle a détaillé les priorités de la Présidence luxembourgeoise* […].
'Marie-Josée (f) Jacobs, current (m) president (m) of the European Council of Ministers […]. She explained in detail the priorities of the Luxembourg presidency […].' (*La Lettre de Femmes d'Europe* 75, 1997: 2)

But the subject – and this is by no means irrelevant – has already been identified as to referential gender! The "probability" of formal gender agreement that Corbett talks about thus has to do with essential communicative needs which we have termed "identification expectation" or "identification necessity". These depend to a high degree on the textlinguistic status of the respective element: Was it specified before? If so, is it a constellation of proximity or distance? Or are we dealing with a first mention? As our analysis of the intralinguistic factors of the use of feminine nouns has demonstrated (Schafroth 1998: ch. 8), apart from the apposition, it is mainly in the syntactic function of the predicative that a designation remains in the masculine even if it refers to a woman. Examples from the language of newspapers demonstrate that the communicative necessity of explicating the feature [female] through a feminine form is at its lowest in such syntactic constellations, and at its highest in the functions of subject and genitive attribute. The question of linguistic redundancy and identification expectation of the recipient of the text also depends to a large degree – as mentioned before – on the textinternal relationships of a word (anaphoric/cataphoric, first mention/specification beforehand). If a designation is mentioned in a linguistic context without the previous identification of referential gender (first mention), it is consequently not specified in this respect – which in turn increases identification expectation and necessity. This applies particularly if the designation in question functions as the subject; cf. (21):

(21) *Une jeune femme médecin, qui s'entendait dire que ce manteau à 7000 francs était "une affaire à ne pas laisser passer", devint véhémente.*
'A young female doctor (m) who is supposed to have said that this 7000 franc coat is 'a must', became upset (f).'
(*Le Monde*, 29 March 1995, R01; male writer).[30n]

By contrast, in (22) we are dealing with the syntactic function apposition. Identification expectation and necessity are low, as both nouns have been specified before, and there is a constellation of proximity:

(22)   *Jacqueline Lafontaine-Dosogne, professeur* (m) *à l'UCL, chef* (m) *de départe-*
       tement honoraire aux MRAH
       'J. (f) L.-D., professor (m) at the UCL [= Université Catholique de
       Louvain], head (m) of the honorary department of the MRAH [=
       Musées royaux d'art et d'histoire]'
       (*Le Soir* 15 March 1995, *MAD/Agenda: Conférences et rencontres*, 21)

3.3.2   *The principle of servitude grammaticale[31]*

As mentioned before, there is one other problem within the domain of gender agreement – the principle of syntactic agreement, the so-called *servitude grammaticale* 'grammatical subservience' often also rendered by the catchphrase "Le masculin l'emporte sur le féminin" 'the masculine is victorious over the feminine' (cf., e.g., Damourette & Pichon 1911–1927: 368). This principle not only underlies French, but all Romance languages and is inherited from Latin. *Servitude grammaticale* in cases of coordinated nouns of different gender is explained briefly in *Bon Usage* (Grevisse 1993: §433):

> Si les donneurs ne sont pas du même genre, le receveur se met au genre indifférencié, c'est à dire au masculin.

> 'If the controllers are not of the same gender, the agreement target appears in the undifferentiated gender, that is to say the masculine.'

As an example, the following quotation from Stendhal (*Le rouge et le noir* II, 15) is cited: *Avec une gaîté et un accent GASCONS* 'with Gasconian (m.pl) cheerfulness (f) and accent (m)'. In §434 the reader then learns that in earlier stages of French, agreement in the adjective or verb was determined by the noun that directly preceded them.[32] While Malherbe criticised this practice, Vaugelas accepted it for adjectives, but not for verbs. The authors of the 17th century, and to a large degree also those of the 18th century, however, largely followed this tradition. It is clear that this "rule" violates linguistic equality and – like the generic masculine as such – is in the focus of feminist language critique. What could be justified as a principle of economy for nouns of the category inanimate (23) becomes a problem in the category animate (24):

(23)   *le texte* (m) *et la signature* (f) *examinés* (m.pl) *par le tribunal*
       'the text (m) and the signature (f) examined (m.pl.) by the court'

(24) *Lucien* (m) *et Françoise* (f) *se sont aperçus* (m.pl) *en même temps de leur
erreur.*
'Lucien (m) and Françoise (f) became aware (m.pl.) of their mistake at
the same time.'

4. Conclusion

The description of gender-relevant questions and problems in French suffers
from a lack of interdisciplinary studies. Hitherto there has been a one-sided
emphasis on system-linguistic (morphological, quantitative and historical)
aspects. Only the domain of the feminisation of occupational terms seems to
have been studied in a more comprehensive manner, although particularly in
this area the historical and sociolinguistic components deserve more attention.
There are hardly any textlinguistic studies on grammatical gender. A synthesis
of historical, typological, textlinguistic, sociolinguistic and psycholinguistic
approaches and more in-depth studies in each of these areas are ceertainly
needed within French linguistics, as in research on female and male discourse.

Notes

1. This includes the indefinite and definite article in the singular (*un/une* 'a (m/f)' resp. *le/la*
'the (m/f)'), the demonstrative pronoun in the singular (*ce livre* 'this book (m)', *cet événe-
ment* 'this event (m)' vs. *cette photo* 'this photograph (f)', *cette explication* 'this explanation
(f)'), the possessive pronoun in the singular (*mon/ma* 'my (m/f)', *ton/ta* 'your (m/f)', *son/sa*
'his (m/f), her (m/f)'), the interrogative or exclamatory pronoun (*quel/quelle/quels/quelles*
'which (m.sg/f.sg/m.pl/f.pl)') as well as the indefinite pronoun (*aucun/aucune* 'no (m/f)',
tout/toute 'all (m/f)', *nul/nulle* 'none (m/f)', *certains/certaines* 'certain (m.pl/f.pl)', *tel/telle/
tels/telles* 'such (m.sg/f.sg/m.pl/f.pl)').

2. E.g., *il* 'he', *elle* 'she', *ils* 'they (m)', *elles* 'they (f)' as subject-, *le* 'him', *la* 'her' as object
personal pronouns, *ce/celui/celle/ceux/celles* 'this (neuter, esp. in *c'est*)/this (m.sg)/this (f.sg)/
these (m.pl)/these (f.pl)' as subject demonstrative pronouns, *le mien/la mienne* 'mine (m/f)',
le leur/la leur 'theirs (m/f)' as possessive pronouns, *lequel/laquelle/lesquels/lesquelles* 'which
(m.sg/f.sg./m.pl/f.pl)' as interrogative pronouns, *quelques-uns/quelques-unes* 'some (m/f.pl)',
aucun/aucune 'no (m/f)' as indefinite pronouns. In spoken language, however, some
oppositions are neutralized for number: *il/ils* [il], *elle/elles* [ɛl], *celle/celles* [sɛl], some for
gender: *lesquels/lesquelles* [lekɛl], and others for both number and gender: *quel/quelle*,
quels/quelles [kɛl].

3. This of course only applies, if the noun itself is gender-indifferent in the *code phonique*. In *cet amateur* 'this amateur (m)' vs. *cette amatrice* 'this amateur (f)' the gender can be deduced from the noun. Not so in *cet artiste* 'this artist (m)' vs. *cette artiste* 'this artist (f)', at least not in phonic realisation.

4. Stehli (1949:137) classes word-pairs of the same stem, but with different forms for masculine and feminine, in a special category: *fils – fille* 'son – daughter', *serviteur – servante* 'servant (m-f)', *gouverneur – gouvernante* 'governor – governess'. This seems unnecessary, as either historically speaking we are dealing with a derivative relationship (cf. Lat. *fili-us/fili-a*, *servante* from *servant*), or there is no semantic parallelism: *gouverneur* (12th century) and *gouvernante* (15th/16th century) designated and still designate completely different concepts.

5. We do not (like Grevisse 1993:§476b) include masculines such as *auteur* 'author' and *écrivain* 'writer', as in a large part of the French-speaking area, these are already feminised, and as in contrast to *bandit* 'bandit' and *escroc* 'crook', there is a social and psychological necessity to identify the feminine gender on the lexeme. However, the categorisation in *Bon Usage*, regarding France, is understandable not only from a normative point of view. The gender attributions in French definition dictionaries, which can be assumed to have a claim to descriptivity, do not differ from the ones in Grevisse.

6. Grevisse (1993:§476a, Rem. 1) gives one instance each for *une louchon* and *louchonne* 'cross-eyed woman'. Our decision is made on the basis of the *Nouveau Petit Robert* (1995), which describes *louchon* as a masculine that can be used for both men and women.

7. In addition, on the basis of phonological regularities, cognitive gender attribution would imply masculine gender for nouns ending in /-f/ (cf. Section 2.1.2).

8. At least this applies to French as spoken in France. In other French-speaking countries, it is precisely this phenomenon that is undergoing linguistic and social change.

9. Feminines such as *doyenne* 'dean' are also classed as new formations. They are historically documented, but hitherto have not been feminised in a given meaning or are only being feminised recently in certain varieties of French.

10. "*Fam. ou région.* Personne du même pays" '*Fam.* or *region.* Person from the same country' (*Nouveau Petit Robert* 1995).

11. Mok (1968:43ff) on the other hand, proceeds "subtractively", starting from the feminine and supposing a privative relationship between masculine and feminine.

12. The historically legitimate formation in *-eure* (from masculines in *-eur*) contains a virtual [ə], which in emphatic speech can be actualised for disambiguation (cf. Schafroth 1999).

13. The suffix *-ette* seems to have taken over part of the function of *-esse*. This also applies for usages that range from the ironic or humorous to the pejorative: e.g., *Jospin et ses Jospinettes* 'Jospin and his Jospinettes' (Durand 1998). According to Hasselrot (1972:71), *-ette* has neither a true diminutive nor a purely hypocoristic component as a feminine suffix. On the suffix *-ette* in nouns of the category [inanimate] see Milner (1989).

14. "*Fam.* Personne qui est payée au S.M.I.C., qui ne touche que le salaire minimum […]" '*Fam.* Person who is paid minimum wage' (*Nouveau Petit Robert* 1995).

15. *Nouveau Petit Robert* (1995): "en argot de métier" 'in professional slang' (for *typographe*).

16. Dingel (1987) was able to show that in the 14 years of lexicographical development of the *Petit Larousse*, productivity and importance of the suffixes *-eur/-euse*, *-teur/-trice* as well as *-eur* and *-teur* (in exclusively masculine formations) and *-euse* and *-trice* (in exclusively feminine formations) have seen a decline. In relation to all nouns newly listed in the *Petit Larousse* 1981 (in comparison with the *Petit Larousse* 1968, including the cases *adj. et n.*), the recently included suffixations came to 5.1%, whereas the eliminations made up 9.1%. The most productive suffixations were those in *-eur* and *-teur*, which are used only in the masculine; among them are agent nouns such as *cadreur* 'cameraman', *conserveur* 'canner' but particularly terms for machines, instruments, substances etc. In the paradigms in *eur/-euse* and *-teur/-trice*, on the other hand, the number of nouns that have vanished just about equals that of the new ones. This proves the productivity of these formations – predominantly personal nouns – but also their short-lived existence. Only the minority of these nouns are occupational terms. Schapira's view (1995: 386) that occupational terms in *-euse* are today hardly formed any more, is disproved by professional glossaries such as the *Dictionnaire féminin-masculin* (1991) or the Canadian *Classification nationale des professions* (1993).

17. *Enquêteur, trice*: "Personne chargée d'effectuer des sondages, des enquêtes" 'person whose job it is to conduct investigations, surveys' (*Nouveau Petit Robert* 1995), *enquêteur, euse*: "(Rare au fém.) Personne chargée d'une enquête [...] *Enquêteur de police* [...]" '(infrequent in the feminine) Person whose job it is to conduct an investigation' (ib.). Grevisse (1993: §489b), however, regards *enquêtrice* as "n'appartenant pas au français régulier" 'not occurring in regular French' and advocates *enquêteuse*.

18. In French as spoken in France, however, *pizzaiolo* 'pizzamaker' according to the *Nouveau Petit Robert* (1995), is only common as *nom masculin* 'masculine noun', and *un impresario* or *un imprésario* 'impresario' applies to both men and women.

19. See note 14.

20. Derived from the acronym *Travail d'utilité collective* 'work of collective use'. Competing forms are *un(e) tuc*, *un(e) tuciste*.

21. Both examples for *P.D.G.* (*président-directeur général* 'general president-director' following Helfrich (1993: 92).

22. Boel (1976: 26f) lists the following examples in *-esse*: *abbesse* 'abbess', *chanoinesse* 'canoness', *chasseresse* 'huntress', *comtesse* 'comptesse', *déesse* 'goddess', *demanderesse* 'female plaintiff', *devineresse* 'female soothsayer', *diablesse* '(female) devil', *(grande-)duchesse* 'great duchess', *enchanteresse* 'sorceress, enchantress', *ivrognesse* 'female drunkard', *hôtesse* 'hostess', *maîtresse* 'mistress, head of', *négresse* 'negress', *papesse* 'female pope', *pauvresse* 'beggar woman', *pécheresse* 'female sinner', *poétesse* 'poetess', *prêtresse* 'female priest', *princesse* 'princess', *prophétesse* 'female prophet', *Suissesse* 'Swiss woman', *traîtresse* 'traitress', *vengeresse* 'avengeress'. *Ministresse* 'minister's wife' and *peintresse* 'female painter' are in a special category. For this suffix see also Grevisse (1993: §486). The non-productivity of *-esse* is confirmed, for instance, by Mortagne (1981).

23. More precisely, on the basis of the Latin (or, in the case of *diaconesse* 'deaconess' Greek) stem, not the French. *Déesse* 'goddess' and *notaresse* 'female solicitor' are formed accordingly. Cf. Damourette & Pichon (1911–1927: 319).

24. In *vendeuse* 'female shop-assistant' and *venderesse* 'female vendor' we have the rare case of a formal and semantic doublet.

25. Yaguello (1978: 117) defines *épicène* (synonyms: *ambigène*, *agénérique*) as a lexeme "qui ne porte pas formellement de marque d'appartenance au masculin ou au féminin" 'which is not overtly marked for masculine or feminine'.

26. See note 21.

27. In Stehli (1953: 15) for the designation of a woman working in the *Service Complémentaire Féminin* during World War II. Far more frequently, a gender-neutral derivation is formed on the basis of an acronym: *Confédération générale du travail* 'General Labour Confederation' → *C. G. T.* [seʒete] → *cégétiste* → *un/une cégétiste*.

28. However, it is debatable whether in cases such as *chef* 'boss', *juge* 'judge', *ministre* 'minister', or even *architecte* 'architect', *biologue* 'biologist', and *journaliste* 'journalist', there really is no masculine marker – be it only of a psychological nature (cf. Section 2.4). The only rarely documented type *homme* 'man' + *épicène* – such as *hommes-ministres* 'men-ministers' (1800), *hommes-chefs* 'men-bosses' (1910), *hommes-soldats* 'men-soldiers' (1918) (cf. *Trésor de la langue française* 1971–1994: 9) – implies such a state of affairs. (Diachronically speaking, Lat. *minister*, in opposition to *ministrix*, is, of course, a masculine). Spence (1986: 351) also remarks on the *épicènes*, "that some terms are so totally restricted to the designation of males, whether for biological or cultural reasons, that they cannot reasonably be counted as epicene". But regardless of this question it is not admissible to treat lexemes like those mentioned above together with *docteur* 'doctor', *professeur* 'professor' etc. in the same category ("noms uniquement masculins" 'exclusively masculine nouns', as, for example, suggested by Dupré (1972: II, 991b).

29. Corbett here follows Hockett, who defines genders as "classes of nouns", "reflected in the behaviour of associated words" (Hockett 1958: 231; as cited in Corbett 1991: 1).

30. (21) and (22) following Schafroth (1998: 469). For all instances, it was documented whether the journalist was female or male.

31. On different types of "gender resolution" – as this phenomenon is also called – see Corbett (1991: 261–306).

32. This is also emphasised by Moreau (1991: 10), who points out that in medieval times, in analogy to existing parallel professional terms, there was a far greater number of grammatical pairs of the type *iceux et icelles, cils et celles* lit. 'these (m.pl) and these (f.pl)', *tuit et toutes* lit. 'all (m.pl) and all (f.pl)'.

References

Au féminin. Guide de féminisation des titres de fonction et des textes. 1991. Quebec: Publications du Québec.

Berschin, Helmut & Josef Felixberger & Hans Goebl. 1978. *Französische Sprachgeschichte.* München: Hueber.

Bierbach, Christine & Beate Ellrich. 1990. "Französisch: Sprache und Geschlechter. Langue et sexes". In *Lexikon der romanistischen Linguistik* V, eds. Günter Holtus & Michael Metzeltin & Christian Schmitt. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 248–266.

Bloomfield, Leonard. 1933. *Language.* London: Allen & Unwin.

Boel, Else. 1976. "Le genre des noms désignant les professions et les situations féminines en français moderne". *Revue Romane* 11: 16–73.

Burr, Elisabeth. 1999. "Geschlechtergerechter Sprachgebrauch in Frankreich. Was bestimmt die Sprachpolitik?". *Grenzgänge* 6 (11): 113–152.

Bußmann, Hadumod. 1995. "*Das* Genus, *die* Grammatik und – *der* Mensch: Geschlechterdifferenz in der Sprachwissenschaft". In *Genus. Zur Geschlechterdifferenz in den Kulturwissenschaften*, eds. Hadumod Bußmann & Renate Hof. Kröner: Stuttgart, 114–160.

Classification nationale des professions. 1993. I: *Index des appellations d'emplois.* II: *Descriptions des professions.* Ottawa: Ministre des Approvisionnements et Services Canada.

Corbett, Greville G. 1991. *Gender.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dahmen, Wolfgang & Günter Holtus & Johannes Kramer & Michael Metzeltin & Wolfgang Schweickard & Otto Winkelmann, eds. 1997. *Sprache und Geschlecht in der Romania. Romanistisches Kolloquium* X. Tübingen: Narr.

Damourette, Jacques & Édouard Pichon. 1911–1927. *Des mots à la pensée. Essai de grammaire de la langue française.* Vol 1. Paris: D'Artrey.

Dictionnaire féminin-masculin des professions, des titres et des fonctions. 1991. Genf: Metropolis.

Dictionnaire suisse romand. Particularités lexicales du français contemporain. 1997. Carouge-Genève: Éditions Zoé.

Dingel, Irene. 1987. *Beobachtungen zur Entwicklung des französischen Vokabulars: Petit Larousse 1968–Petit Larousse 1981.* Frankfurt am Main: Lang.

Dupré, Paul. 1972. *Encyclopédie du bon français dans l'usage contemporain.* 3 vols. Paris: Trévise.

Durand, Dominique. 1998. "Charité bien ordonnée". *Le Canard Enchaîné* 11 (3): 8.

Frei, Henri. 1929. *La grammaire des fautes.* Paris: Geuthner. (Slatkine Reprints, Genf 1971).

Gaudino-Fallegger, Livia. 1998. *Grundkurs Sprachwissenschaft Französisch.* Stuttgart: Klett.

Geckeler, Horst & Wolf Dietrich. 1997. *Einführung in die französische Sprachwissenschaft.* 2nd ed. Berlin: Schmidt.

Goosse, André. 1991. "Le genre et le sexe. Communication à la séance mensuelle (de l'Académie royale de langue et de littérature françaises) du 10 décembre 1977". In *Mélanges de grammaire et de lexicologie française*, André Goosse. Louvain-la-Neuve: Peeters, 74–91.

Grevisse, Maurice. 1993. *Le bon usage. Grammaire française.* 13th ed. Paris: Duculot.

Hanse, Joseph. 1994. *Nouveau dictionnaire des difficultés du français moderne.* 3rd ed. Louvain-la-Neuve: De Boeck-Duculot.

Hasselrot, Bengt. 1972. *Etude sur la vitalité de la formation diminutive française au XXe siècle.* Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksells.

Helfrich, Uta. 1993. *Neologismen auf dem Prüfstand. Ein Modell zur Ermittlung der Akzeptanz französischer Neologismen.* Wilhelmsfeld: Egert.

Hellinger, Marlis. 1990. *Kontrastive feministische Linguistik. Mechanismen sprachlicher Diskriminierung im Englischen und Deutschen.* München: Hueber.

Hockett, Charles F. 1958. *A course in modern linguistics.* New York: Macmillan.

Houdebine, Anne-Marie. 1989. "La féminisation des noms de métier en français contemporain". In *Contrastes: La différence sexuelle dans le langage*, ed. Georges Kassai. Nizza: Z'éditions, 39–71.

Houdebine-Gravaud, Anne-Marie. 1989. "Une aventure linguistique: La féminisation des noms de métiers, titres et fonctions en français contemporain". *Terminologie et Traduction* 2: 91–145.

Houdebine-Gravaud, Anne-Marie. 1995. "Des femmes dans la langue et les discours." In *Mélanges René Lepelley*, eds. Catherine Bougy & Pierre Boissel & Bernard Garnier. Caen: Musée de Normandie, 385–398.

Juilland, Alphonse. 1965. *Dictionnaire inverse de la langue française.* London: Mouton.

Marchello-Nizia, Christiane. 1989. "Le neutre impersonnel". In *Genre et langage*, eds. Eliane Koskas & Danielle Leeman. Paris: Université Paris X, 173–179.

Marouzeau, J. 1946. "Un aspect du féminin français". *Le Français Moderne* 14: 241–245.

Mel'čuk, I. A. 1974. "Statistics and the relationship between the gender of French nouns and their endings". In *Essays on lexical semantics* I, ed. Viktor Ju. Rozencvejg. Stockholm: Skriptor, 11–42. [Russian original 1958].

Mettre au féminin. Guide de féminisation des noms de métier, fonction, grade ou titre. 1994. Brussels: Direction générale de la culture et de la communication, Service de la langue française.

Milner, Jean-Claude. 1989. "Genre et dimension dans les diminutifs français". In *Genre et langage*, eds. Eliane Koskas & Danielle Leeman. Paris: Université Paris X, 191–201.

Mok, Quirinius Ignatius Maria. 1968. *Contribution à l'étude des catégories morphologiques du genre et du nombre dans le français parlé actuel.* The Hague: Mouton.

Moreau, Thérèse. 1991. "Langage et sexisme". In *Dictionnaire féminin-masculin des professions, des titres et des fonctions.* Genf: Metropolis, 7–21.

Mortagne, Marie-Josée. 1981. "Fonctions féminines, fonctionnement du féminin". *Rapports – Het Franse boek* 51: 11–28.

Le Nouveau Petit Robert. Dictionnaire alphabétique et analogique de la langue française. 1995. Nouvelle édition du Petit Robert de Paul Robert. Réimpression et mise à jour mars 1995. Paris: Dictionnaires Le Robert.

Parent, Monique. 1994. "Féminisation et masculinisation des titres de professions au Québec". *La Linguistique* 30: 123–135.

Parris, David L. 1975. "A quoi sert le genre grammatical en français moderne?" *Le Français dans le Monde* 111: 24–30.

Pöll, Bernhard. 1998. *Französisch außerhalb Frankreichs. Geschichte, Status und Profil regionaler und nationaler Varietäten.* Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Schafroth, Elmar. (forthcoming). *Die Feminisierung von Berufsbezeichnungen im französischen Sprachraum. Mit einem vergleichenden Blick auf das Deutsche und andere Sprachen.* Habilitationsschrift. University of Augsburg, Germany. *Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für Romanische Philologie*, Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Schafroth, Elmar. 1999. "Zur Virtualität des [ə]. Forschungsbericht, Fragen und Ergebnisse zu einem bekannten Phänomen". *Zeitschrift für französische Sprache und Literatur* 109: 113–147.

Schafroth, Elmar. 2001. "Zwischen Tradition und *political correctness*. Zum Problem der femininen Berufsbezeichnungen in französischsprachigen Ländern". In *Gender, Genre, Geschlecht. Sprach- und literaturwissenschaftliche Beiträge zur Gender-Forschung*, ed. Ingrid Neumann-Holzschuh. Tübingen: Stauffenburg, 125–150.

Schafroth, Elmar. 2002. "Aufbau und Differenzierung des Wortschatzes im Französischen". In *Handbuch Französisch. Studium, Praxis, Lehre*, eds. Ingo Kolboom & Thomas Kotschi & Edward Reichel. Berlin: Schmidt, 179–188.

Schapira, Charlotte. 1995. "La féminisation des noms de métiers dix ans après". In *Tendances récentes en linguistiques française et générale: Volume dédié à David Gaatone*, eds. Hava Bat-Zeev Shyldkrot & Lucien Kupfermann. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 383–390.

Spence, Nicol C. W. 1986. "Gender and sex in personal names in the French language". *Zeitschrift für Romanische Philologie* 102: 331–356.

Stehli, Walter. 1949. *Die Femininbildung von Personenbezeichnungen im neuesten Französisch.* Bern: Francke.

Stehli, Walter. 1953. "Le langage des femmes. Enquête linguistique à l'échelle mondiale." *Orbis* 2: 7–18.

Thiele, Johannes. 1985. *Wortbildung der französischen Gegenwartssprache. Ein Abriß.* 2nd ed. Leipzig: Enzyklopädie.

Trésor de la langue française. Dictionnaire de la langue du XIXe et du XXe siècle (1789–1960). 1971–1994. 16 vols. Paris: Gallimard.

Tucker, G. Richard & Wallace E. Lambert & André A. Rigault. 1977. *The French speaker's skill with grammatical gender: An example of rule-governed behavior.* The Hague: Mouton.

Vogel, Klaus. 1996. "Un joli mannequin est amoureuse – Inkongruenzen beim Genusgebrauch im Französischen: Sprachliche Tradition oder Sexismus?". In *Sprache, Sprachen und Kulturen. Entdecken, erforschen, lernen, lehren. Thematische Festschrift zum 65. Geburtstag für Heribert Rück*, ed. Thomas Rist. Landau: Knecht, 405–424.

Vogel, Klaus. 1997. "L'usage du genre en français: Tradition linguistique ou sexisme?" *Le Français dans le Monde* 289: 26–33.

Weinrich, Harald. 1982. *Textgrammatik der französischen Sprache.* Stuttgart: Klett.

Yaguello, Marina. 1978. *Les mots et les femmes.* Paris: Payot.

Yaguello, Marina. 1989. *Le sexe des mots.* Paris: Belfond.

Gender and language politics in France

Elisabeth Burr

University of Duisburg, Germany

1. Introduction

55 years after French women were conceded the right to vote in 1944 and 50 years after the publication of *Le deuxième sexe* by Simone de Beauvoir the French Congress decided that parity (*parité*) between men and women was to be inscribed into the constitution. The first article of the respective *Loi constitutionnelle no 99–569 du 8 juillet 1999 relative à l'égalité entre les femmes et les hommes* says, in fact: "La loi favorise l'égal accès des femmes et des hommes aux mandats électoraux et fonctions électives." 'The law favours equal access of women and men to electoral mandates and functions.' (Congrès 1999).[1] Although this law represents the realisation of the goal the Jospin government set itself in its initial political declaration (Jospin 1997), it was not to be the last step with respect to the equal treatment of men and women. Instead, the Prime Minister announced a

proposal of law which states that lists of candidates for elections can only be approved if the principle of parity is respected (Jospin 1999). In June 2000, the *Assemblée Nationale* voted in favour of this law (Assemblée Nationale 2000).

Language use has been an integral part in the battle for the equal treatment of women and men. In this respect the politically most influential step taken by French women in the last few years was the demand to be addressed as *Madame la Ministre*,[2] put forward by 6 of the 8 female ministers of the Jospin government after their nomination by the new Prime Minister.

While similar initiatives of former ministers in France had failed (cf. Houdebine 1987:17; Houdebine-Gravaud 1998:24, note 9; Schafroth 2001), these politicians now had their feminine titles printed on their official paper and had the signs on the doors of their offices changed accordingly (cf. Yaguello 1998:119). This not only led to a passionate discussion in France and to a revolution in the language use of the French press (cf. Yaguello 1998:122), but also to the publication of a circular in favour of feminisation (Jospin 1998a) and the inclusion of this question in the political program for equality (Ministère de l'Emploi et de la Solidarité 1999).

These facts are of great importance because change could only come from the very top of the hierarchy itself. In fact, reluctance to use feminine denominations has always been strongest with respect to high-level professions, functions, grades and titles traditionally reserved for men, and women who had themselves reached the top of the hierarchy were among the fiercest opponents of this use.[3] Not even the first circular in favour of feminisation published back in 1986 (Fabius 1986) was able to effect a real change as long as this hostile attitude towards feminisation prevailed above all among high-level women.

2.   French language policy and gender-fair language

France was the first European country to adopt political measures in favour of a less gender-biased language use (cf. Burr 1999a,b). The question was not raised, however, by a commission for the equal rights of men and women as in other countries, but by Yvette Roudy, the minister charged by François Mitterrand in 1981 exclusively with the rights of women (*Le ministre délégué auprès du Premier ministre, chargé des droits de la femme*). Notwithstanding this narrow definition of her office, her first action was to pass a law on behalf of the professional equality between men and women in 1983. As the ministry of public affairs, due to the lack of feminine terms in French, had difficulties

applying those articles which proscribed sexual discrimination in job offers, it asked Yvette Roudy to suggest such designations (cf. Houdebine 1994: 330). Roudy's call to specialists to solve this problem led to the institution of a terminology commission by the Prime Minister Laurent Fabius in 1984. This commission, whose chairperson was the author Benoîte Groult, was entrusted with the investigation of the feminisation of titles and functions (cf. Rémy 1985: 109).

According to the original plans of Yvette Roudy, in between the law of 1983 and the work of this commission there was to be a law against discrimination on the basis of gender (*Projet de loi du 15 mars 1983*). Language reform was thus to be the third component of a political programme aimed at assuring equality between women and men, at doing away with sexual discrimination, and at promoting the visibility of women (cf. Rémy 1985: 110).

2.1 The commission of 1984

However, as the law against sexual discrimination had not been realised when the terminological commission was installed (cf. Rémy 1985: 110 and 113), the topic of sexism in language use or discourse did not become central to its work. Instead, as the name *Commission de terminologie relative au vocabulaire concernant les activités des femmes* 'Terminological commission with respect to the vocabulary concerning the activities of women' indicates, the question of a bias-free language was reduced to filling terminological gaps with respect to the designation of women who had entered domains which for a long time had been reserved for men, and of legitimating by such terms the social functions and professions now also occupied by women. The aim of the commission was thus not much different from that of the other 22 French terminology commissions in office at the same time (cf. Houdebine 1994: 330), which had the task to create French terms in response to the development of new technologies and by doing this to defend French against the influence of English (*défense de la langue française* 'defence of the French language').

The commission, which counted among its members linguists like Anne-Marie Houdebine, Edwige Khaznadar, and André Martinet, investigated dictionaries and grammars, language use in the media and in different professional domains, as well as the attitudes and the behaviour of speakers.[4] The works of Canadian feminists and linguists had also been taken into account.[5] The commission proposed feminising all professional terms with the help of double gender nouns (Table 1) or through the use of derivations which already exist or can easily be created (Table 2) (cf. also Schafroth, this vol.).

Table 1. Double gender nouns

	Masculine	Feminine	Plural
'journalist'	*le journaliste*	*la journaliste*	*les journalistes*
'professor'	*le professeur*	*la professeur*	*les professeurs*
'boss'	*le chef*	*la chef*	*les chefs*[6]

Table 2. Derivations

	Masculine	Feminine	Plural
'delegate'	*le délégué*	*la déléguée*	*les délégués/déléguées*
'mason'	*le maçon*	*la maçonne*	*les maçons/maçonnes*
'researcher'	*le chercheur*	*la chercheuse*	*les chercheurs/chercheuses*

The results of the commission's work consisted not only of proposals of feminine terms and rules for their formation. Instead, aiming at linguistic and ideological coherence, the commission had also raised the question of occupational terms which up to that moment existed exclusively in a feminine form, like *dentellière* 'lace maker', *bonne* 'housemaid', *lingère* 'seamstress', *sage-femme* 'midwife', *femme de ménage* 'cleaning lady' (cf. Bourgoin 1984: 59), and had elaborated procedures for the formation of masculine counterparts of such terms: *dentellier, domestique, linger, sage-homme, homme de ménage* (cf. Houdebine 1987: 34).

2.2 The circular of 1986

Yet, as the name *Circulaire du 11 mars 1986 relative à la féminisation des noms de métier, fonction, grade ou titre* 'Circular with respect to the feminisation of the names of professions, functions, grades or titles' suggests, the masculinisation of professional terms was not one of its issues. Instead, it was devoted exclusively to prescribing the usage of feminine terms in official documents and to providing the rules for the feminisation of professional terms or titles (cf. Fabius 1986).[7] The following rules are published in the appendix:

1. With denominations of professions, functions, grades and titles held by women, determiners such as articles and demonstrative pronouns are used in the feminine form (*une, la, cette*). With denominations which in their written form end in a "silent *e*" (*e muet*) the masculine and feminine form are the same: *un* (m)/*une* (f) *architecte* 'architect', *un* (m)/*une* (f) *comptable* 'accountant'. The suffix *-esse* as in *poétesse* 'female poet' is no longer used.

2. If the written form of a masculine denomination does not end in an *e muet* but in some other vowel (*un chargé de mission* 'person designated to carry out a given task', *un délégué* 'a delegate'), the feminine form ends in an *e*, as in *une chargée de mission*, *une déléguée*.

3. Where masculine denominations end in a consonant, as in *un médecin* 'doctor', *un agent* 'agent', *un huissier* 'caretaker', or *un mécanicien* 'mechanic', the feminine noun is either identical with the masculine, as in *une médecin* or takes an *e* as in *une agente*. In some cases affixing the denomination with *e* requires an accent on the last vowel (*une huissière*) or to the doubling of the last consonant (*une mécanicienne*). Excepted from this rule are denominations in *-eur* (*professeur* 'professor') which do not have a verbal basis; they have to be treated like the denominations of the first type: *un* (m)/*une* (f) *professeur*.[8]

4. With masculine denominations like *un acheteur* 'buyer, consumer' or *un animateur* 'animateur, red-coat', derived from verbs by the suffix *-(t)eur*, the feminine is either formed with the suffix *-euse* (*une acheteuse*) if the *t* is part of the verbal stem (*acheter*), or with *-trice* (*une animatrice*) if the *t* is not part of the basic verb (*animer*).

2.2.1   *The circular and the feminist debate in France*
As can be seen, the circular reduces the question of the unequal treatment of men and women to a terminological and formal matter, thus reflecting not only the historical tendency in France to identify language with vocabulary but also the minimalistic approach taken by feminist members of the commission. This approach certainly does not reflect the state of the feminist discussion in France, where with Simone de Beauvoir's *Le deuxième sexe* one of the most influential books of feminism appeared, where the concept of *L'écriture féminine* was constructed by Hélène Cixous and where the philosopher Luce Irigaray (1974) opened the discussion about *la différence sexuelle*. Nor does it mirror the research carried out with respect to gender in French and sexism in language use.[9] It was nevertheless adopted, because feminists hoped that by showing respect for the two fundamental concepts of French linguistic culture, i.e. *l'usage est le maître* 'usage is the master', and linguistic rules having to reflect *le génie de la langue* 'the genius of the language',[10] the opponents could be convinced of the rightfulness of the endeavour and success would be granted to feminisation.[11] When in 1986 the proposals of the commission were greeted with almost universal indifference, whereas the announcement of its installation in the spring of 1984 had caused a massive sexist and political uproar,[12] this was

taken as evidence that the commission had indeed succeeded in convincing its opponents (cf. Houdebine 1987: 13).

2.2.2   *The circular, occupational titles and sexism in discourse*

Yet, research carried out on the more or less persistent tendency towards designating women with masculine denominations shows that the circular did not have much effect. Instead, a few years after its publication resistance to the feminisation of professional terms and titles in France is still nearly absolute (cf. Yaguello 1989: 32). Especially with regard to prestigious positions, there seems to prevail what Schafroth (1993: 65) calls a barrier to feminisation.[13] Even the fact that from 1991 to 1992 France was governed for the first time by a female Prime Minister had no real impact: Édith Cresson was usually referred to with the masculine forms *le premier ministre* (m) 'the Prime Minister' and *le chef* (m) *du gouvernement* 'the head of government' in newspapers and journals (cf. Brick & Wilks 1994: 236).

That this continued usage of masculine forms in certain domains is of an ideological nature is shown by Muller (1994: 103, 107–109). Taking a closer look at the lists of candidates presented on the occasion of the European elections 1994, he finds that while the masculine used with respect to women who hold prestigious positions or jobs is generally on its way out and the feminine form, despite the resistance against the feminisation of titles, is readily used with names of public functions formed on the basis of an adjective (*attachée* 'attachée') or a participle (*présidente* 'female president'), there is also evidence that the ultimate choice between feminine or masculine denominations varies considerably in accord with the *couleur* of the political parties.

In this and other research the usage of feminine or masculine denominations is, however, no longer conceived of as a mere terminological question. Instead, in the years following the publication of the circular of 1986 there has also been a growing feeling that the discussion within the terminological commission was not far-reaching enough and that not only the problem of denominations but above all that of sexism in language use or discourse had to be approached as well (cf. Houdebine-Gravaud 1989, Houdebine 1994). Sexism and the transportation of stereotypical implications are, in fact, found to be at the very basis of the seemingly chaotic and incoherent usage of masculine and feminine denominations in newspaper reports about women in politics (Brick & Wilks 1994) and Charles Muller, who is certainly not a feminist linguist, has to acknowledge that only male chauvinism can be the reason why masculine denominations were used in certain lists of candidates presented at the European elections (cf. Muller 1994: 103).

Particularly interesting in this respect is the study by Edwige Khaznadar (1993) of how women are designated in an extensive collection of phrases referring to professional and political women, put together in the years after the publication of the circular of 1986. The aim of this study is to consider

> [les] dénominations féminines pour ce qu'elles sont dans la réalité du discours, des données linguistiques, au contraire du raisonnement grammatical traditionnel qui pose le féminin non comme une donnée mais comme un processus, une 'formation'. On verra non pas comment 'se forme' le féminin mais par quels moyens linguistiques est effectivement dénommée et identifiée une femme. (Khaznadar 1993: 144).[14]

> '[the] feminine denominations for what they are in real discourse, i.e. linguistic facts, in opposition to the traditional grammatical reasoning which sees the feminine not as a fact but as a process, a 'formation'. We will not ask how the feminine 'is formed', but by which linguistic means a woman is factually denominated and identified.'

By taking into account not just the lexical means used to identify women, like most other studies did before, but semantic and syntactic aspects as well, Khaznadar arrives at the following picture of a complex conceptual relationship between referential, grammatical and social gender[15] which is reflected in the language used in the French press:

1. The gender of a person is either identified by means of a personal noun, as in *la mort d'une policière* 'the death of a policewoman', by prefixing a term with *Mme* or *M*, as in *Mme le professeur*, by using the first name, for example *Édith Cresson*, because the surname on its own would be perceived as referring to a male person, by the feminine form of determiners or adjectives, as in *Nasrin Rasooli, exécutée* 'Nasrin Rasooli, executed (f)', where the foreign origin of the first name *Nasrin* does not allow the identification of the gender of the person, or by pronominal substitution, as in *l'ancien premier ministre* (m) *explique qu'elle* (f) 'the former prime minister explained that she'.

2. The identity of women is split into a male and a female half, which themselves correspond to a certain order and are revealed alternatively: If women are denominated with terms that are marked as masculine syntactically, e.g. by an article, as in *le ministre*, or morphologically (e.g., *gardien* '(security) guard', *policier* 'police officer'), it is always their profession or their prestigious or authoritative position which is at stake, whereas the female part of their identity is normally indicated by *Édith*, *mère*, *femme* or *madame*, i.e. by indications of their civil status.

3. When a woman is referred to with a masculine denomination, there are numerous cases of syntactic incoherence (*ataxie*) which show that there is a conflict between syntax and semantics, as in *mais le premier ministre* (m) *n'est pas vraiment inquiète* (f) 'but the prime minister (m) is not really concerned (f)'.

4. Journalists try to solve the problem of *ataxie* by either avoiding prestigious titles next to gender-variable forms, or by making frequent use of indications of civil status.

5. Because this procedure entails a loss of information, journalists, despite the strong opposition to feminisation and the social pressure in favour of promoting the masculine to the form which stands for seriousness, solidity, strength and decision, are led quite frequently to feminise professional denominations by either using determiners in the feminine form, e.g., *sa* (f) *fidèle* (f) *ministre*[16] 'his faithful (f) minister' or by prefixing the term with the gender-specific *Madame*, or by turning to the regular alternation *policier/policière* (cf. Khaznadar 1993: 147–158).

This state of affairs can be summarised by the following example:

> *Une* (f) *femme* (f) *-policier* (m), *shériff-adjoint* (m) […] *vient d'être renvoyée* (f). *Le* (m) *policier* (m), *dont l'identité n'a pas été révélée, aurait porté la main aux parties génitales de deux collègues masculins* (m). *Un* (m) *autre shériff-adjoint* (m), *de sexe masculin, a été mis* (m) *à pied avec le* (m) *policier* (m) *sanctionnée* (f). *Les* (m/f) *deux policiers* (m) *sont accusés* (m) *d'attouchement commis pendant le service.*

> 'A (f) woman (f) police officer (m), deputy sheriff (m) […] has been suspended (f). The (m) police officer (m), whose identity has not been revealed, is supposed to have put the hand on the genitals of two male colleagues (m). Another (m) deputy sheriff (m), of male sex, has been suspended (m) along with the (m) sanctioned (f) police officer (m). The (m/f) two police officers (m) have been accused (m) of touching when on duty.'

Khaznadar's conclusion is that there is altogether great uncertainty and uneasiness among journalists because they find themselves in the middle of a conflict between the male social norm they have internalised and the regular functioning of the language. According to her, for journalists this conflict turns writing about women into a hazardous journey teeming with ambushes which they try to circumvent acrobatically without being able to avoid them entirely. They try to obey what they take to be a linguistic norm, but which, on the contrary, is a social constraint conflicting with the linguistic rule that a woman has to be

designated with a feminine term and a man with a masculine one (cf. Khaz-nadar 1993: 158).

2.3 The so-called generic masculine

Although it is exactly the interpretation of the masculine as a generic which expresses this male social norm and which is responsible for the effacement of women in discourse (cf. Houdebine 1994: 347–348), the genericity of the masculine has never been really central to the discussion among feminist linguists in France. It plays, however, an important role in the argumentation of the opposition. In accord with traditional grammars they, in fact, regard the masculine as the proper means of neutralisation in cases where the gender of a person is said to be irrelevant: *un professeur a le devoir d'enseigner* 'a teacher has the duty to teach'. It is further understood, that masculine terms in the plural may not only refer to a group of male beings but also to a group composed of women and men: *les Français aiment leur langue* 'the French love their language'.[17] The usage of the masculine is also prescribed whenever there is a question of agreement between determiners, pronouns, adjectives or participles and a series of nouns of different grammatical genders (cf. the above example): *Un policier* (m) *et une policière* (f) *sont accusés* (m) (not *accusées* (f)) *d'attouchement qu'ils* (m) (not *elles* (f)) *auraient commis pendant le service* (cf. also Schafroth, this vol.).

According to Khaznadar, however, these rules are themselves the product of a certain kind of linguistic theory and language description, their realisation in discourse is due to the way gender is taught in schools[18] and the supposedly generic character of masculine nouns derives from the fact that women are not referred to in accordance with their gender. Points supporting this view are:

1. The presence of a feminine personal noun renders the masculine term specific, i.e. *bacheliers* 'A-level students' in *les bacheliers* (m) *et les bachelières* (f) can only refer to male A-level students. Thus, were the usage of feminine terms for women to become the norm, the number of apparently generic masculine terms would decrease considerably.
2. We can only be sure that *les bacheliers* refers to boys and girls at the same time if this is made explicit by the context, because in former times A-level courses could, after all, only be taken by boys.
3. Neutralisation with respect to people can never mean 'neither masculine nor feminine'; individual people are always either male or female, and groups of people are composed of male and female persons (cf. Khaznadar 1993: 145–146).

The discussion of gender-fair language has, however, not (yet) considered the problem of masculine generics as outlined by Khaznadar,[19] nor has it taken up her request to change the teaching in schools in such a way that the rejection of the feminine gender is done away with (cf. Khaznadar 1993:158). Instead, the discussion revolves nearly exclusively around feminisation and the use of feminine terms with specific reference to women.

2.4 The circular of 1998

Still, it is precisely the question of feminisation that has turned France into the European country where most discussion about language and gender is taking place at the moment. Those who are responsible for this situation are the six female ministers of the Jospin government, who not only asked to be addressed as *Madame la ministre*, but who also took the steps necessary for getting what they had asked for. This seems, at least in part, to explain why this time the request did not remain unheard. Instead, at the end of the meeting of the *Conseil des ministres* on December 17, 1997, the decision was taken that in the future women should be addressed with feminine titles. That this decision was directly put into practice can be seen in the press declaration distributed after the end of the meeting (Conseil des ministres 1997), where the four women nominated for important posts during the meeting appear as *directrice* and not *directeur*, as would have been the case before. This official recognition led to a fierce protest from the *Académie française* which even appealed to the French President Jacques Chirac not to allow ministers to change French grammar and usage (cf. AFP 1998).

This protest notwithstanding, the denomination of women with feminine terms was legalised by the Prime Minister in March 1998 with the *Circulaire du 6 mars 1998 relative à la féminisation des noms de métier, fonction, grade ou titre* (Jospin 1998a). This circular in itself is not a revolutionary step, as it merely resurrects the circular published in 1986. What is new, however, is the determination with which Jospin declares the action of the six women to be a turning point in the process towards referring to women with feminine denominations becoming the norm. In the same circular he announces, furthermore, that he has already asked the general commission of terminology and neologisms to carry out a study on the present situation, taking into account also the usage in other French-speaking countries, and that the *Institut National de la Langue Française* will elaborate a guide where the feminine forms most suitable in France will be recommended.

That Jospin really intended to make language change part of his policy for parity is shown by various facts, such as the publication of the circular in the *Journal Officiel* of the French Republic precisely the following International Women's Day, by his annual speech dedicated to this occasion where he declares explicitly that gender-biased language use has nothing to do with the *génie de la langue* but with society, and by the fact that all through this speech he refers to women with feminine titles.

2.4.1   *The report of the general commission of terminology and neologisms*
The study which the Prime Minister had requested from the *Commission générale de terminologie et de néologie* was concluded in October 1998 with the presentation of the voluminous (54-page) *Rapport sur la féminisation des noms de métier, fonction, grade ou titre.*[20] In this report the commission tries not to further excite public opinion, but to calm down the passionate debates about feminisation by a careful consideration of the various aspects of the question. A closer analysis than is possible here would, however, reveal that the report is full of contradictions and that it is really attempting to save what can be saved of the prestige of the masculine gender.

The commission, in fact, introduces a fundamental distinction between *espace public* 'public sphere' and *espace privé* 'private sphere', between *la personne* 'person' and *l'individu* 'individual', and between public and private activities. As professions belong to the private sphere and thus are part of the individual's identity (CGTN 1998: 38–39), the commission, in principle, accepts the legislation on the feminisation of professional terms. Although the government can, as it states, only take measures with respect to the public sector, it sees no obstacles to feminisation of professional terms in the private sector either, as feminisation in this field is already part of current usage. For legal and practical reasons the commission firmly opposes, however, any reformulation of public norms which govern certain professions of the public sector (*professions réglementées*) like civil servants, for example (CGTN 1998: 40–42). With respect to functions, titles and grades, which according to the commission belong fully to the public sphere, the commission argues that the "unmarked" masculine gender has to be used (a) on the legal level because the "subject" of the law is indifferent to gender and (b) on the institutional and political level because the female and male individuals have to be distinguished from their functions and from the exercise of this function (CGTN 1998: 42–44). The commission proposes, therefore, that:

1. The form of address in the sphere of private relations, conversations, or personal correspondence can be adapted to the wish of the (female) addressee, i.e. it can be either feminised or left in the masculine; the same applies when an official text is signed.
2. In statutory texts, the generic masculine is to be used because splitting would not only make the texts cumbersome but would also imply that all texts would have to be rewritten. Apart from this, feminisation of such texts would be in contradiction with the Republican idea of institutions belonging to the public sphere.[21]
3. When a function is in question, as at the moment of being nominated for the position, the female holder of the function has to be designated with the statutory masculine term; if, however, reference is to a specific individual as such, it is normal to feminise the denomination.
4. In regulations which make reference to functions the generic masculine should be used (cf. CGTN 1998: 44–49).

As the commission saw its task to be the analysis of the problem in general and of the implications feminisation would have in particular situations, it does not propose any specific designations nor any rules for their formation. It aims, instead, at making recommendations which conform to the *génie de la langue* and to the specificity of the French law. The task of filling lexical gaps is to be left to the *Institut National de la Langue Française* (cf. CGTN 1998: 3), charged by the circular to elaborate a guide.

2.4.2   *The guidelines of the Institut National de la Langue Française*

The *Institut National de la Langue Française* completed this task in 1999 with the publication of *Femme, j'écris ton nom … Guide d'aide à la féminisation des noms de métiers, titres, grades et fonctions* (CNR/INaLF 1999),[22] which seems to have two functions: (a) to handle the morphological side of feminisation and to fill the gaps in the lexicon with concrete designations, and (b) to position the question of feminine designations historically as well as ideologically and to describe gender and the genericity of the masculine in less political terms than the general commission.

The chapter devoted to morphology by and large follows the rules given in the appendix to the circular of 1986, except for a few additional rules for abbreviations (*une extra* 'assistent, help'), loan words (*une clown* 'clown', *une jockey* 'jockey'), the handling of special cases like *un confrère/une consoeur* 'colleague, peer', *un homme-grenouille/une femme-grenouille* 'frogman/frog-

woman' or complex denominations like *une chef adjointe* 'joint chief', *une directrice financière* 'financial director' (cf. CNR/INaLF 1999: 26–27).

The guide differs, nevertheless, significantly from the first circular as far as the attitude to the norm is concerned. The INaLF takes into account the propositions made in Switzerland, Québec and Belgium, even where they differ from those published in the first circular. In the case of masculine nouns in *-eur* which are not derived from verbs or where the semantics of the verbal base is not directly related to the meaning of the noun, the guide allows, for example, a choice between the Belgian solution, which consists of treating such a noun as a double gender noun indicating referential gender by the determiner alone, as in *une ingénieur* 'engineer', and the Canadian and Swiss solution of treating it as a masculine noun and forming the feminine by appending an *-e*, as in *une ingénieure* (cf. CNR/INaLF 1999: 24), thus allowing the feminine to remain visible also in the plural. The same goes for nouns like *auteur* 'author' or *docteur* 'doctor' for which feminine forms in *-trice* are not available today. The guide allows, in fact, choosing between *une auteur* or *une auteure* (cf. CNR/INaLF 1999: 25) and thus proposes forms which had been proscribed by the commission in 1984 due to the minimalistic and normative approach then adopted.

As regards the completion of the lexicon, an extensive alphabetical list of masculine and feminine terms for professions, titles, grades and functions is given at the end of the book (CNR/INaLF 1999: 61–123). It is followed by a short appendix concerning the masculinisation of feminine terms (CNR/INaLF 1999: 124). The guide proposes, for example, masculinising *bonne* 'housemaid' with *domestique*, *jardinière d'enfants* 'kindergarden teacher' with *jardinier d'enfants* and *sagefemme* 'midwife' either by using the term *maïeuticien*, created artificially by the *Académie française* but not really used, or by *sagehomme* (cf. CNR/INaLF 1999: 124). The guide thus differs also in this respect from the circular published in 1986 where the proposals made by the commission with respect to masculinisation were not adopted.

The ideological and historical aspects of the question are treated right at the beginning of the book: The guide contains extensive information on the use of feminine denominations in the history of the French language, it discusses the arguments put forward against the use of feminine personal nouns and draws attention to the correspondence of grammatical gender and referential gender in designations for human beings. Concerning the question of the generic usage of the masculine, the guide generally follows the line of the general commission of terminology and neologisms and thus does not accept the usage in other French-speaking countries where splitting is preferred, as in *recrutement d'un*

(m) *ou une* (f) *attaché(e)* (m/f) *parlementaire* 'recruitment of a female or male parliamentary attachée' (CNR/INaLF 1999:38).

3.   Future perspectives – does it matter?

As we have seen, with respect to personal nouns, times are generally ripe for change, even in a country like France with its normative approach to language. Whether female-specific nouns are used depends, however, on the value women attribute to themselves. If they see themselves as autonomous persons and express their individuality with self-confidence, they can provoke change. It naturally helps if they are women who have arrived at the top and thus have the power to promote change. This means at the same time that high-level women are in part responsible if there is no change.

That the way women are addressed or talked about does matter in French society can be seen by the fact that every time the question of feminine personal nouns arises there is loud protest from men, from patriarchal institutions like the French Academy, and from women who either accept the structures and values men have created or who are afraid of losing their face, being ridiculed or attacked.

The question of why it matters how women are named should answer itself if we accept that the way people talk to each other and about each other determines the way they recognise and value each other, how they form their relationships with each other and whether they confirm each other's identities. Entities, however, which are not named can neither be recognised nor valued (cf. Lalouschek & Wodak 1997:89). At the same time, the lack of a name indicates clearly that the respective entity is currently of no particular value for the linguistic community (cf. Houdebine 1987:17). Thus, if a function has only a masculine designation one thinks automatically that the function belongs to men (cf. Agacinsky-Jospin 1998). If, however, as Houdebine-Gravaud (1998:15) expresses it, instead of hiding women behind masculine denominations they are named using feminine professional terms, then women appear as complete social beings, and young women (as well as grown-up women) have the chance to dream of new professions when they hear these names in everyday discourse.

As regards the specific linguistic means, they are certainly, as Monique Rémy says, secondary in nature in comparison with the fundamental question of the social function of change. In fact, as long as the feminine term *directrice d'école* 'school director (f)' is accepted, whereas *directrice d'une entreprise*

'director of an enterprise (f)' or *directrice générale d'une société* 'general director (f) of a company' is *not*, women who hold these positions are either still seen or see themselves as having climbed too high up in the hierarchy for them to remain women and to carry a feminine title (cf. Rémy 1985:112). On another level this question is, however, not secondary at all. As in French only specifically feminine forms like *directrice* remain clearly feminine also in the plural (*directrices*), whereas expressions like *la/ma/cette docteur*, where gender is expressed by the determiner alone, lose this distinction in the plural, because there is no gender-differentiation in the plural form of the determiner, only the first type of forms will make the intentions of the speaker clear. With expressions such as *les/mes/ces docteurs* we will never know whether they are supposed to refer to male or to female doctors or to a mixed group of doctors. Only expressions like *les/mes/ces docteures* (f) or *docteurs* (m) *et docteures* (f) would allow us to know what is really intended. It is true that the final *-e* in these cases is not pronounced, yet in a literate society speaking and writing are not at all autonomous entities; rather, the written form is conceptually present when we speak. Thus, if the written form is *docteure* we are much more likely to have a feminine form in our mind and infinitely more likely to use agreement on related words accordingly than if masculine and feminine denominations are written alike and social gender is allowed to play a role in disambiguation.

Neutral terms like *personne* (f) 'person' or *individu* (m) 'individual' are appropriate means for substituting the traditionally masculine terms in laws or regulations and for attaining a less patriarchal conception of institutions. The rector of a university, after all, does not take decisions alone but together with her or his colleagues. It would be more honest and precise, therefore, to talk about *le rectorat* 'rectorate' instead of arguing that *le recteur* does not mean an individual but a function.

More has to change, however. Even today the idea of the predominance of the masculine over the feminine gender is part of our grammatical culture and underlies traditional theories of gender (cf. Baron 1986). In order to change this, the idea of genericity has to be questioned thoroughly. Research has to be carried out into the historical origin, meaning and applicability of this idea and into the consequences the usage of the so-called generic masculine has for our understanding of the world.

The idea of the masculine gender being nobler than the feminine is also the foundation for the traditional description of nouns which name the actor-subject (*nomina agentis*) and their presentation in dictionaries and school books. In fact, even feminist linguists not only use the term *féminisation* but

describe feminine forms as derived from the masculine ones even in the case of the determiner (cf. for example Houdebine 1987: 32). This means that *la/une/cette/ma* are understood as being derived from *le/un/ce/mon* and feminine terms like *directrice* (f) 'female director' as being derived from *directeur* (m) 'director'.

This type of description strongly recalls traditional ideas such as "only women are sexual beings" and "since their creation women are secondary to men". Nouns like *directrice* 'female director' or *acheteuse* 'female consumer' are, in fact, not derived from *directeur* or *acheteur*; rather the masculine and the feminine form are both derived, individually, from the same genderless stem by means of affixation: *direc-trice/direc-teur*, *acht-eur/acht-euse*.[23] In order to do away with the above mentioned ideas, the concept of derivation will have to be defined in more precise terms and the feminine has to become a positive term. This can only be achieved if we stop (a) describing feminine personal nouns as derivations or even deviations from masculine terms, and (b) fostering the concept that the masculine is primary, unmarked and generic whereas the feminine is secondary, marked and specific.

Notes

1. This text has since become the 5th paragraph of Art. 3 of the constitution.

2. Over the years, this expression has acquired symbolic status in the battle for the usage of feminine professional names with respect to women.

3. See Durand (1936), Yaguello (1978), Malinowski (1980), Bourgoin (1984), Groult (1984), Houdebine (1984a, 1994), Hartmann-Brockhaus (1986), Spence (1986), Schafroth (1992, 1993).

4. See, for example, Bourgoin (1984) and Houdebine (1984b).

5. Under the influence of developments in North America, the question of feminisation had been discussed much earlier in French-speaking Canada than in France.

6. In French-speaking Canada, however, some of these denominations such as *syndic*, *professeur* and *ingénieur* are not considered to be double-gender nouns but masculine forms to which correspond specific feminine terms, i.e. *syndique* 'union member', *professeure* 'professor (f)' and *ingénieure* 'engineer (f)'. This has the advantage that the feminine remains visible also in the plural (cf. Biron 1991: 27–32).

7. The reduction of the question of gender-fair language to 'feminisation' constitutes the biggest difference between France and other countries. See for example the Italian *Raccomandazioni per un uso non sessista della lingua italiana* (Sabatini 1987/1993) or the Spanish *Recomendaciones para el uso no sexista de la lengua* (Ministerio de Educación y Ciencia 1988), where reference to sexist language use is explicitly made in the title.

8. To the regret of certain of its members the commission had not proposed the Canadian forms in *-eure* (*une professeure*, *une recteure*) because the rule of "simplicity" had been adopted (cf. Houdebine 1987:33, 1994:345).

9. Cf. the works of Benoîte Groult (1984), Michèle Bourgoin (1984), Claire-Antonella Forel (1979, 1983), Anne-Marie Houdebine (1984a) and Marina Yaguello (1978) and the thorough study of sexism in scientific discourse by Claire Michard-Marchal and Claudine Ribery (1982). For a more extensive presentation see Bierbach & Ellrich (1990).

10. These two concepts are in fact used by the *Académie française* and others whenever they try to stop language change.

11. Cf. Bourgoin (1984:57), Groult (1984:24–25), Houdebine (1984a:17, 1984b).

12. An article published in *Le Figaro* by members of the French Academy opened a denigrating campaign sustained by men, women and the media of all political *couleurs*, and even led to an appeal to the *Assemblée Nationale* (cf. Houdebine 1987).

13. See also Houdebine (1994:347) for a critical evaluation of the commission's initial hopes in the light of her own findings concerning the usage of feminine denominations with respect to prestigious jobs.

14. Khaznadar seems to be the only linguist who accepts neither the idea of "formation" nor that of "derivation" and talks of "alternation" instead.

15. See Hellinger (1990:61) for the introduction of this term.

16. This procedure is applied above all to denominations like *ministre* which can be understood as double gender nouns.

17. Women, however, had been excluded from the right to vote until 1944 not least because this right was granted by law to *les Français* (m) and not to *les Françaises* (f) also (see Introduction to Yaguello 1994 by Suzette Triton). Furthermore, since the times of Charles de Gaulle, *les Français* is not considered to include women. Instead, politicians always address the French people with *Françaises* (f)*! Français* (m)*!* (cf. Houdebine 1987:19).

18. See, for example, the rule *le masculin l'emporte sur le féminin*, which can be traced back to the verdict of Favre de Vaugelas who in 1697 declared that the masculine gender had preponderance over the feminine gender because it is *plus noble* (the nobler gender). For a more extensive delineation of the presence of this idea and its development in early grammars of Romance languages see Burr (2000, 2001).

19. In fact, most feminists in France do not even question the genericity of masculine forms in the plural.

20. The report can be downloaded from the Internet at ⟨http://www.culture.gouv.fr/culture/dglf/cogeter/feminisation/accueil-feminisation.html⟩ (December 20, 2002).

21. According to the commission the French Republic is different from Anglo-Saxon democracies because it does not interpret society as a juxtaposition of individuals or communities but as a juxtaposition of *espace public* and *espace privé*, *personne* and *individu*. Institutions belong to the *espace public* and thus are concerned with *personne* and not with a differential treatment of individuals.

22. On March 17, 2000, the *Institut National de la Langue Française* made available an Internet site called *Du Féminin* where the lexicon and the rules published in the guide can be searched online (cf. CNR/INaLF 2000).

23. The same goes for German where, in spite of the exceptional productivity of the suffix *-in*, (*Lehrer – Lehrerin*), derivation cannot be said to be the only means for the creation of feminine denominations, see for example *Kund-in/Kund-e* 'customer', *Beamt-e/Beamt-er* 'civil servant', *Angeklagt-e/Angeklagt-er* 'defendent', or *Bäck-er/Bäck-in* 'baker' in former times (cf. also Bußmann & Hellinger, this vol.).

References

a. Official documents

Allègre, Claude & Ségolène Royal. 2000. "Appéllations professionnelles: Féminisation des noms de métiers, fonctions, grades ou titres", *Bulletin Officiel de l'Education Nationale* 10 (March 9) ⟨http://www.education.gouv.fr/botexte/bo000309/MEND0000585X.htm⟩ (December 20, 2002).

Assemblée Nationale. 2000. "Loi no2000-493 du 6 juin 2000 tendant à favoriser l'égal accès des femmes et des hommes aux mandats électoraux et fonctions électives", ⟨http://www.assemblée-nationale-fr/dossiers/parite/mandats.asp⟩ (December 20, 2002).

Biron, Monique. 1991. *Au féminin: Guide de féminisation des titres de fonction et des textes* (= Guide de l'Office de la langue française). Québec: Publications du Québec.

CGTN = Commission Générale de Terminologie et de Néologie. 1998. *Rapport sur la féminisation des noms de métier, fonction, grade ou titre.* Premier Ministre: Octobre 1998 ⟨http://www.culture.gouv.fr/culture/dglf/cogeter/feminisation/accueil-feminisation.html⟩ (December 20, 2002).

CNR/INaLF = Conseil National de la Recherche/Institut National de la Langue Française. 1999. *Femme, j'écris ton nom … Guide d'aide à la féminisation des noms de métiers, titres, grades et fonctions.* Paris: La documentation française.

CNR/INaLF = Conseil National de la Recherche/Institut National de la Langue Française. 2000. *Du féminin* ⟨http://zeus.inalf.fr/gsouvay/scripts/feminin.exe⟩ (December 20, 2002).

Congrès. 1999. "Loi constitutionnelle no 99–569 du 8 juillet 1999 relative à l'égalité entre les femmes et les hommes". *Journal Officiel* 157 (9 Juillet 1999): 10175.

Conseil des Ministres. 1997. "Compte rendu du conseil des ministres 17.12.1997" ⟨http://www.archives.premier-ministre.gouv.fr/jospin_version2/GOUV/171297.HTM⟩ (December 20, 2002).

Constitution = La Constitution du 4 octobre. 1958. ⟨http://www.premier-ministre.gouv.fr/fr/p.cfm?ref=6979⟩ (December 20, 2002).

Fabius, Laurent. 1986. "Circulaire du 11 mars 1986 relative à la féminisation des noms de métier, fonction, grade ou titre". *Journal Officiel de la République Française*, 16 mars 1986: 4267; see also ⟨http://www.culture.gouv.fr/culture/dglf/cogeter/feminisation/accueil-feminisation.html⟩ (December 20, 2002).

Jospin, Lionel. 1997. "Déclaration de politique générale", Assemblée Nationale, le 19 juin 1997 ⟨http://www.archives.premier-ministre.gouv.fr/jospin_version2/PM/D190697.HTM⟩ (December 20, 2002).

Jospin, Lionel. 1998a. "Circulaire du 6 mars 1998 relative à la féminisation des noms de métier, fonction, grade ou titre, NOR: PRMX9802741C". *Journal Officiel* 57, 8 mars 1998: 3565; see also ⟨http://www.culture.gouv.fr/culture/dglf/cogeter/feminisation/accueil-feminisation.html⟩ (December 20, 2002).

Jospin, Lionel. 1998b. "Discours à l'occasion de la journée internationale des femmes. Dimanche 8 mars 1998" ⟨http://www.penelopes.org/archives/pages/docu/politique/discours.htm⟩; revised edition ⟨http://www.archives.premier-ministre.gouv.fr/jospin_version2/PM/D080398.HTM⟩ (December 20, 2002).

Jospin, Lionel. 1999. "Intervention du Premier ministre lors des questions d'actualité à l'Assemblée National", Paris, November 9, 1999 ⟨http://www.archives.premierministre.gouv.fr/jospin_version2/PM/D091199.HTM⟩ (December 20, 2002).

Ministère de l'Emploi et de la Solidarité. 1999. "Dossier de presse: Une volonté gouvernementale. Une politique active de l'égalité. 25 actions" ⟨http://www.social.gouv.fr/femmes/actu/doss_pr/34_990623.htm⟩ (December 20, 2002).

Ministerio de Educación y Ciencia. 1988. *Recomendaciones para el uso no sexista de la lengua.* Madrid: Ministerio de Educación y Ciencia.

Sabatini, Alma. 1987/1993. "Raccomandazioni per un uso non sessista della lingua italiana". In *Il sessismo nella lingua italiana*, Alma Sabatini. Roma: Presidenza del Consiglio dei Ministri, 95–119.

b. General references

AFP = Agence France Press. 1998. "Guardians of French language resist feminist progress". AFP, January 9, 1998.

The Feminist Majority Foundation Online – Feminist News – January 14, 1998 ⟨http://www.feminist.org/news/newsbyte/uswirestory.asp?id=783⟩ (December 20, 2002).

Agacinsky-Jospin, Sylviane. 1998. "Femmes: Le combat de la parité". *L'Express*, March 5, 1998.

Baron, Dennis. 1986. *Grammar and gender.* New Haven: Yale University Press.

Bierbach, Christine & Beate Ellrich. 1990. "Französisch: Sprache und Geschlechter. Langue et sexes". In *Lexikon der romanistischen Linguistik* V, eds. Günter Holtus & Michael Metzeltin & Christian Schmitt. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 248–266.

Boel, Else. 1976. "Le genre des noms désignant les professions et les situations féminines en français moderne". *Revue Romane* 11: 16–73.

Bourgoin, Michèle. 1984. "Les noms de métiers et la dérivation". *Medias et langage* 19/20: 57–59.

Brick, Noelle & Clarissa Wilks. 1994. "Et Dieu nomma la femme: Observations sur la question de la féminisation des noms d'agent et sur les désignations d'Édith Cresson dans la presse". *French Language Studies* 4: 235–239.

Burr, Elisabeth. 1999a. "'Comme on est mal dans sa peau, on peut se sentir mal dans ses mots.' Das Selbstverständnis der Frauen und die französische Sprachpolitik". *Linguistik Online* 1 ⟨http://www.linguistik-online.de/heft1_99/burr.htm⟩ (December 20, 2002).

Burr, Elisabeth. 1999b. "Geschlechtergerechter Sprachgebrauch in Frankreich. Was bestimmt die Sprachpolitik?". *Grenzgänge* 6: 133–152.

Burr, Elisabeth. 2000. "Beschreibung und Normierung des Genus in frühen Grammatiken des Französischen, Italienischen, Portugiesischen und Spanischen". In *Geschichte des Sprachbewußtseins in romanischen Ländern. Akten der Sektion 2, Romania I, Jena 28.09.-02.10.1997*, eds. Gerda Haßler & Hans-Josef Niederehe. Münster: Nodus, 17–32.

Burr, Elisabeth. 2001. "Grammatikalisierung und Normierung in frühen Grammatiken des Französischen, Italienischen, Portugiesischen und Spanischen. Genus und Kongruenz". *Zeitschrift für Romanische Philologie* 117: 189–221.

Durand, Marguerite. 1936. *Le genre grammatical en français parlé à Paris et dans la région parisienne.* [Bibliothèque du français moderne]. Paris: D'Artrey.

Forel, Claire-Antonella. 1979. "Aspects of sex difference in language". In *Sprache und Geschlecht* III. [OBST 10], ed. Verena Aebischer. Osnabrück, 113–120.

Forel, Claire-Antonella. 1983. "Françaises, Français …". In *Parlers masculins, parlers féminins?*, eds. Verena Aebischer & Claire Forel. Neuchâtel: Delachaux et Niestlé, 21–34.

Giroud, Françoise. 1999. "Le féminisme selon Françoise Giroud". *Le Figaro*. February 12, 1999.

Groult, Benoîte. 1984. "Je suis une écrivaine … Entretien avec Benoîte Groult, par Alain Fantapié". *Medias et Langage* 19/20: 20–25.

Hartmann-Brockhaus, Kathrin. 1986. "Madame le ministre – Die Verrenkungen der französischen Sprache bei weiblichen Berufsbezeichnungen". In *Studium Feminale*, ed. Arbeitsgemeinschaft Frauenforschung der Universität Bonn. Bonn: Nora Frauenverlag, 252–264.

Hellinger, Marlis. 1990. *Kontrastive feministische Linguistik: Mechanismen sprachlicher Diskriminierung im Englischen und Deutschen*. München: Hueber.

Houdebine, Anne-Marie. 1984a. "La féminisation des noms de métiers ou les femmes devant la langue". *Bulletin du CRIF* 5: 13–17.

Houdebine, Anne-Marie. 1984b. "Problématique d'une recherche linguistique". *Medias et Langage* 19–20: 61–63.

Houdebine, Anne-Marie. 1987. "Le français au féminin". *La Linguistique* 23: 13–34.

Houdebine, Anne-Marie. 1994. "Féminisation des noms de métiers et simplification linguistique". *Simple – Simplification. Cahiers du Français Contemporain* 1: 329–349.

Houdebine-Gravaud, Anne-Marie. 1989. "L'une n'est pas l'autre (ou genre et sexe en français contemporain)". *LINX* 21: 107–128.

Houdebine-Gravaud, Anne-Marie. 1998. *La féminisation des noms de métiers. En français et dans d'autres langues.* Paris: L'Harmattan.

Irigaray, Luce. 1974. *Speculum. De l'autre femme.* Paris: Éditions de Minuit.

Khaznadar, Edwige. 1989. "Le dédoublement en genre en français. Étude lexicale et morphologique". *LINX* 21: 137–145.

Khaznadar, Edwige. 1993. "Pour une première: La dénomination de la femme dans l'actualité. Dichotomie, affixation et alternance". *Cahiers de Lexicologie* 63: 143–169.

Lalouschek, Johanna & Ruth Wodak. 1997. "'Liebe gnädige Frau …' Sprache und Sprechen über Frauen/mit Frauen". In *Art of Speech. Frauen. Sprache. Macht*, eds. Antonia Cicero & Ulrike Horn & Caroline Klima & Julia Kuderna. Wien: Passagen, 87–101.

Malinowski, Arlene. 1980. "Form and application of feminine agentives in French occupational terms". *The Michigan Academician* 13: 207–217.

Michard-Marchal, Claire & Claudine Ribery. 1982. *Sexisme et science humaines: Pratique linguistique du rapport de sexage.* Lille: Presses Universitaires de Lille.

Muller, Charles. 1994. "Du féminisme lexical". *Cahiers de Lexicologie* 65: 103–109.

Rémy, Monique. 1985. "Féminisation des titres et professions: Dissonances à propos du *la*". In *Communicating and translating: Essays in honour of Jean Dietrickx*, eds. Gilbert Debusscher & Jean Pierre van Noppen. Bruxelles: Editions de l'Université, 109–118.

Schafroth, Elmar. 1992. "Feminine Berufsbezeichnungen in Kanada und Frankreich". *Zeitschrift für Kanada-Studien* 12: 109–125.

Schafroth, Elmar. 1993. "Berufsbezeichnungen für Frauen in Frankreich – Sprachpolitische Maßnahmen und sprachliche Wirklichkeit". *Lebende Sprachen* 38: 64–66.

Schafroth, Elmar. 2001. "Zwischen Tradition und *political correctness*. Zum Problem der femininen Berufsbezeichnungen in französischsprachigen Ländern". In *Gender, Genre, Geschlecht. Sprach- und literaturwissenschaftliche Beiträge zur Gender-Forschung*, ed. Ingrid Neumann-Holzschuh. Tübingen: Stauffenburg, 125–150.

Spence, Nicol C.W. 1986. "Gender and sex in personal names in the French language". *Zeitschrift für Romanische Philologie* 102: 331–356.

Yaguello, Marina. 1978. *Les mots et les femmes.* Paris: Payot.

Yaguello, Marina. 1989. *Le sexe des mots.* Paris: Belfond.

Yaguello, Marina. 1994. "Le langage de l'égalité au service de la parité. Une interview de Marina Yaguello, par Suzette Triton". *Parité-Infos* 7.

Yaguello, Marina. 1998. "Madame la ministre". In *Petits faits de langue*, ed. Marina Yaguello. Paris: Le Seuil, 118–139.

Zwangenburg, Wiecher. 1988. "Flexion et dérivation: Le féminin en Français". In *Aspects de linguistique française: Hommage à Q.I.M. Mok*, ed. Ronald Landheer. Amsterdam: Radopi, 191–208.

Engendering female visibility in German

Hadumod Bußmann
University of Munich, Germany

Marlis Hellinger
University of Frankfurt am Main, Germany

1. Introduction

German (*Deutsch*) derives from the West Germanic branch of the Indo-European family of languages, along with Dutch, English, and Frisian. As a native language it is currently spoken by some 100 million people worldwide. It is the official national language in Germany (with ca. 82 million speakers), Austria (7.5 million), and one of the official languages of Switzerland (*Schwyzerdütsch*, 4.2 million), with smaller groups of speakers in Luxemburg, Liechtenstein and Belgium.[1] An estimated minimum of 9 million people consider German their mother tongue in countries such as the USA (6 million), Argentina, Brazil, Canada, Australia, and Namibia (formerly South West Africa). The variety of German called *Yiddish* (Judeo-German) is spoken as first or second language by about three million people in all parts of the world, especially in Israel, Poland, the USA, and the former Soviet Union (cf. Ammon 1995).

German differs from the other Germanic languages due to the results of the Second Sound Shift of the Old High German period, whose regional distribution is also the basis for distinguishing between major dialects: *Niederdeutsch* (Low German) in the north, *Mitteldeutsch* (Central German, i.e. Central Franconian, Rhenish Franconian, Thuringian), and *Oberdeutsch* (Upper German, i.e. Bavarian, Swabian and Alemannic) in the south. Due to the political and cultural fragmentation of the German-speaking regions of Europe, a standard form of German (on the basis of East Central German) emerged much later than the corresponding standard languages of England and France. The invention of the printing press (1450), the translation of the Bible by Martin Luther (1522–1534), and the use of German instead of Latin for legal records fostered the development of a standard language (cf. Besch & Betten & Reichmann & Sonderegger 1999).

The history of High German is divided into the periods of Old High German (from the beginning of written documentation until around AD 1050), Middle High German from 1050 to 1350 (including the so-called "classical" period of the court epic, strongly influenced by French), and Early New High German (1350–1600). The main phonological differences between Old and Middle High German concern the vowel reduction in unstressed syllables, which caused the loss of numerous inflectional distinctions; e.g., the reduction of verbal inflection resulted in an increase of the use of pronominal forms.

Among the structural characteristics of Modern German (as compared to other Germanic languages) are the following: the lack of voiced stops in the syllable coda (word-final devoicing), a relatively well preserved and productive

inflectional system with four cases (nominative, genitive, dative, accusative), three grammatical genders (feminine, masculine, neuter), two numbers (singular and plural), and the characteristic second position of finite verbs in main clauses and final position in subordinate clauses.[2]

2. Categories of gender

2.1 Grammatical gender

Grammatical gender is a central category in the structure of the German nominal system. Within the Germanic group of languages, German shares this categorial property only with Frisian, Icelandic and Norwegian *Nynorsk*. While these three languages have retained the Indo-European three gender system with masculine, feminine, and neuter, even closely related languages differ in the number and properties of their gender classes: Danish, Dutch, Norwegian *Bokmål* and Swedish have reduced the number to two by combining masculine and feminine as *genus commune* i.e. "common" gender (cf. Gomard & Kunøe this vol., Gerritsen vol. II, Bull & Swan vol. II, Hornscheidt this vol.), whereas English has lost the category of grammatical gender completely (cf. Hellinger vol. I; Romaine vol. I).

Any German noun belongs to (only) one of the three gender classes. Exceptions are rare, e.g. *Barock* 'baroque', *Bonbon* 'bonbon', *Dotter* 'yolk', *Joghurt* 'yogurt', *Virus* 'virus' and *Zölibat* 'celibacy' may be treated as both neuter and masculine, *Salbei* 'sage', *Sellerie* 'celery', and *Butter* 'butter' (southern), as masculine or feminine. These exceptions result from historical "contingencies", e.g. analogy, processes of borrowing, or from regional or technical differences (cf. Duden 1998: 208–212).

While gender-class membership is not consistently marked on the noun itself, it is overtly evident from (singular) dependent elements, primarily articles and pronominal forms. In the plural, these word classes show no gender distinctions, cf. Table 1.

2.1.1 *Gender assignment*
For approximately 90% of German monosyllabic nouns, gender class membership can be predicted from morphophonological criteria. But respective regularities are so complex that they hardly assist in language learning (cf. Köpcke 1982, Köpcke & Zubin 1983, Eisenberg 1999: 148–156).

Table 1. The three gender classes in German

	Nominative singular
MASC	*ein grüner Abgeordneter … er* a.MASC green.MASC delegate.MASC he.MASC 'a green delegate … he'
FEM	*eine grüne Ministerin … sie* a.FEM green.FEM minister.FEM she.FEM 'a green female minister … she'
NEUT	*ein grünes Haus … es* a.NEUT green.NEUT house.NEUT it.NEUT 'a green house … it'
	Nominative plural
All genders	*grüne Abgeordnete/Ministerinnen/Häuser … sie* 'green delegates/ministers/houses … they'

Word-formation (derivation) is more reliable in predicting grammatical gender, since there exist about 200 suffixes which trigger a certain grammatical gender on the noun. Thus, nouns with the suffixes *-heit, -keit, -schaft, -ung* and, of course, *-in,* are feminine:

(1) | **base** | | **derived form** | **meaning** |
|---|---|---|---|
| *trocken* | 'dry' | *Trocken-heit* (f) | 'dryness' |
| *traurig* | 'sad' | *Traurig-keit* (f) | 'sadness' |
| *Wissen* | 'knowledge' | *Wissen-schaft* (f) | 'science' |
| *bezieh-* | 'relate' | *Bezieh-ung* (f) | 'relationship' |
| *Student* | '(male) student' | *Student-in* (f) | 'female student' |

De-verbal nouns ending in *-er* are masculine:

(2) | **base** | | **derived form** | **meaning** |
|---|---|---|---|
| *druck-* | 'print' | *Druck-er* (m) | 'printer' |
| *öffn-* | 'open' | *Öffn-er* (m) | 'opener' |
| *fahr-* | 'drive' | *Fahr-er* (m) | 'driver' |

Diminutive nouns ending in *-chen* and *-lein* are neuter:

(3) | **base** | | **derived form** | **meaning** |
|---|---|---|---|
| *Mann* (m) | 'man' | *Männ-chen* (n) | 'little man' |
| *Frau* (f) | 'woman' | *Fräu-lein* (n) | 'Miss' |
| *Buch* (n) | 'book' | *Büch-lein* (n) | 'little book' |

Gender assignment may also be predicted with some probability from a combination of morphological and lexical-semantic criteria, although exceptions are frequent (cf. Zubin 1986, Zubin & Köpcke 1984, 1986). Thus, the names of days, months, seasons, points of the compass, most names of mountains and minerals are grammatically masculine:

(4) *(der) Montag*   'Monday'
     (der) Mittwoch   'Wednesday'
     (der) Januar   'January'
     (der) März   'March'
     (der) Frühling   'spring'
     (der) Sommer   'summer'
     (der) Mount Everest
     (der) Mont Blanc

Numerals, names of ships und planes, most flowers and trees are feminine:

(5) *(die) Eins*   '(the number) one'
     (die) Hanseatic
     (die) Boeing
     (die) Tulpe   'tulip'
     (die) Palme   'palmtree'

Cars are masculine (*der Porsche/Audi/Fiat*); when they carry a female name, usage is mixed: *ein Alfa Gulia* (m)/*die Gulia* (f). Colours, metals, towns, and countries are neuter:

(6) *(das) Rot*   'red'
     (das) Gold   'gold'
     Berlin … es   'Berlin … it'
     Italien … es   'Italy … it'

There are very few exceptions to the rule that a noun's grammatical gender is invariant: Only nominalized adjectives and participles may be assigned either of the three genders by the choice of dependent categories. Thus in (7), the article signals the noun's gender class; note that the noun itself shows morphological variation when it is combined with an indefinite article (only in the nominative singular masculine and neuter), as in (7b):

(7) a. *die Kranke* (f)   'the sick person (female)'
         der Kranke (m)   'the sick person (male)'
         → from *krank*.ADJ   'sick'

    b.   *eine Reisende* (f)   'a traveler (female)'
          ein Reisender (m)   'a traveler (male)'
          → from *reisen*.VERB   'travel'

Gender assignment of personal nouns, which constitute a central and culturally significant nominal category, requires individual attention. The assumption that, in principle, the assignment of a German noun to one of the three gender-classes is arbitrary, is particularly unfounded in the field of animate/personal nouns, where explicit relations between grammatical gender and the noun's lexical specification can be formulated.[3]

2.1.2   *Agreement*

As is typical for a language with grammatical gender, elements within German noun phrases (determiners, adjectives, pronouns), but also outside noun phrases (primarily anaphoric pronouns) "agree" with the noun, showing morphological variation according to the noun's grammatical gender (as well as number and case). The selection of appropriate inflectional endings is determined by the grammatical gender of the noun, i.e. a formal property; therefore, the lexical specification of the noun, e.g. as [−animate] or [+human], is in principle irrelevant for agreement relations:

(8) a.   *der*   *Platz*   *an der*   *Sonne*
          the.MASC place.MASC in the.FEM.DAT sun.FEM.DAT
          'the place in the sun'
     b.   *die*   *Entscheidung des*   *Wählers*
          the.FEM decision.FEM the.MASC.GEN voter.MASC.GEN
          'the voter's decision'

In the area of human nouns, which may lexically be described as female-specific, male-specific or gender-indefinite, semantic agreement may override formal agreement, i.e. the choice of anaphoric pronouns is sensitive to the noun's lexical specification, cf. Table 2.[4]

    Unlike Italian or French, German pronominal forms are not gender-variable in the plural, i.e. coordination of a feminine and masculine noun will create no agreement conflicts in anaphoric relations:

(9)   *Gestern waren sie* (pl) *Ingenieure* (m), *Ärztinnen* (f), *Pastoren* (m), *Schneiderinnen* (f), *Elektriker* (m). *Heute sind sie* (pl) *freigewählte Volksvertreter* (m).

Table 2. Agreement

Gender Category		Anaphoric Pronoun	
Grammatical Gender	Lexical Gender	Formal Agreement	Semantic Agreement
*das Mädchen.*NEUT 'the girl … she'	female	*es* (n)	*sie* (f)
*das Männchen.*NEUT 'the little man … he'	male	*es* (n)	*er* (m)
*das Individuum.*NEUT 'the individual … she/he'	indefinite	*es* (n)	*sie* (f)/*er* (m)
*der Tennisstar.*MASC 'the tennis star … she/he'	indefinite	*er* (m)	*sie* (f)/*er* (m)

> 'Until yesterday they (pl) were engineers (m), doctors (f), vicars (m), seamstresses (f), electricians (m). Today they are freely elected representatives (m) of the people.'

Typical agreement conflicts occur in the case of "generic" masculines (cf. Section 3.4) which anaphorically relate to a preceding female-specific feminine, cf. (10):

(10) *Die Finnin* (f) *ist eine* (f) *von rund 450 Mitarbeitern* (m) *der neugeschaffenen Europäischen Zentralbank.*
'The Finn (f) (= Finnish woman) is one (f) of the roughly 450 employees (m) … in the newly created European Central Bank.'

Other asymmetries show up more on the lexical level.

2.2 Lexical gender

Lexical gender relates to the property of non-linguistic maleness or femaleness as encoded in a noun's lexical meaning. Thus, terms may be lexically marked as female-specific or male-specific, as in (11):

(11) a. FEM/female-specific   MASC/male-specific
          Tante   'aunt'   *Onkel*   'uncle'
          Tochter   'daughter'   *Sohn*   'son'
      b. *Tagesmutter* 'childminder' *Stiefvater* 'stepfather'
          Betschwester 'nun (derog.)' *Saufbruder* 'drunkard, boozer'

Putzfrau	'cleaning woman'	*Hausmann*	'man who stays at home and does the housework'
Geschäftsfrau	'businesswoman'	*Geschäftsmann*	'businessman'

Typically, in the field of kinship terms, address forms and a few general personal nouns, there is a correspondence between a noun's grammatical and lexical gender. This includes compounds as listed in (11b) which contain one of these nouns as a second element. In this group, grammatical gender may be said to perform a symbolic function.

There are, however, a few personal nouns where lexical gender does not correspond to grammatical gender. Thus, *Mädchen* 'girl' is grammatically neuter (as all derived nouns ending in *-chen* are), but has the lexical property 'female-specific', while *Männchen* 'little man' is also grammatically neuter, but lexically male-specific (cf. Table 2).

In each grammatical gender class there are a few nouns that may be described as genuinely gender-indefinite, and which may be readily used to refer to both female and male referents (i.e. epicene nouns, cf. Corbett 1991:67f).

(12)   FEM   MASC   NEUT
       Person 'person'   *Mensch* 'human being'   *Individuum* 'individual'
       Kraft 'help'   *Säugling* 'infant'   *Mitglied* 'member'
       Leiche 'corpse'   *Opfer* 'victim'
                                                                   Genie 'genius'

In these cases, context and cultural/societal knowledge will ensure appropriate interpretations of intended reference. E.g., expressions such as *Mitglied des Deutschen Ärztinnenbundes* 'member of the German association of (female) physicians' or *Vergewaltigungsopfer* 'rape victim' will receive a female-specific interpretation, while expressions such as *grüne Parteimitglieder* 'members of the Greens party' will be interpreted as referring to both women and men. The term *Oberhaupt* (n) 'head' stereotypically illustrates social gender (cf. Section 2.3): *Familienoberhaupt* 'head of the family, breadwinner', *Staatsoberhaupt* 'head of state, president' have a clear male bias, while *Oberhaupt der katholischen Kirche* 'head of the Catholic Church' will receive a male-specific interpretation only.

Deviations from the correspondence between grammatical gender and lexical specification often have negative, and sometimes sexual connotations; many are old-fashioned, informal or metaphorical:

(13)   NEUT or MASC/female-specific   FEM/(mostly) male-specific
       Weib (n)   'woman'   *Memme* (f)   'coward'
       Frauenzimmer (n) 'woman, broad (derog.)' *Tunte* (f)   'homosexual'
       Blaustrumpf (m) 'spinster, blue-stocking' *Schwuchtel* (f) 'homosexual'
       Backfisch (m)   '(silly) teenager'   *Transe* (f)   'transsexual
       Vamp (m)   'vamp'   male'
       Drachen (m)   'dragon'
       Besen (m)   'tyrannical woman (derog.)'

2.3 Social gender

Social gender is a non-linguistic category which reflects social and cultural stereotypes of female and male character traits, behaviors and roles. In English, social gender emerges in practices of pronominalization, when anaphoric *he* is chosen to refer to occupational terms such as *lawyer*, *physician*, or *scientist*, but *she* for *secretary*, *nurse*, or *schoolteacher* in contexts where referential gender is either not known or irrelevant. In German, similar socio-cultural norms motivate the choice (and traditional prescription) of masculine nouns in generic contexts, so that expressions such as *jeder Arzt* (m) 'every doctor' or *alle Steuerzahler* (m) 'all taxpayers' may be used to refer to both men and women. More explicitly, social gender is illustrated by asymmetric expressions as in (14), which are by no means rare in texts relating to hierarchically structured domains such as the hospital, office, university, etc.:

(14)   *Ärzte* (m) *und Krankenschwestern* (f)
       'doctors (m) and nurses (f)'
       der Chef (m) *und seine Sekretärin* (f)
       'the boss (m) and his secretary (f)'
       Piloten (m) *und Stewardessen* (f)
       'pilots (m) and flight attendants (f)'

Social gender has to do with stereotypical assumptions about what are appropriate social roles for women and men, including expectations about who will be a typical member of the class of, say, 'pilot' or 'nurse'. Deviations from such assumptions will frequently require formal markings, as in *weiblicher Pilot* 'female pilot' or *männliche Krankenschwester* 'male nurse'.

3.   Referring to women and men in German

As in other languages, personal nouns have emerged as the central issue in the debate about language and gender in German.[5] In the following, the major morphological and syntactic strategies are discussed which may be employed in German in order to specify or abstract from referential ("biological") gender.

3.1 Specification of referential gender

3.1.1   *Grammatical means*
In contrast to English, German may use grammatical gender to make referential gender explicit or overt. This is the case for singular personal nouns which are derived from adjectives (e.g. *krank* 'sick') or verbs (e.g. *reisend* present participle of *reisen* 'travel'; *abgeordnet* past participle of *abordnen* 'delegate'). Gender-specification occurs through the assignment of feminine or masculine gender:

(15)	FEMININE/female	MASCULINE/male	
	die Kranke	*der Kranke*	'the sick person'
	die Reisende	*der Reisende*	'the traveler'
	eine Abgeordnete	*ein Abgeordneter*	'a delegate'

This type of variable gender-membership has been called *Differentialgenus* 'differential gender' (cf. Wienold 1967: 147 ff).

Since articles and other determiners do not vary morphologically for grammatical gender in the plural (*die Kranken/Reisenden/Abgeordneten*), gender-specification in the plural must be achieved by other means, for example by use of the adjectival modifiers *weiblich/männlich* 'female/male': *die weiblichen Abgeordneten* 'the female delegates', *die männlichen Abgeordneten* 'the male delegates'. However, while *die Abgeordneten* can have both female or male referents, the expression seems to contain a male bias, since potential referents are expected to be male rather than female (social gender). On the other hand, a plural nominal such as *Büroangestellte* 'office workers' will be associated more readily with female than male referents, while *die Reisenden* 'travelers' or *die Behinderten* 'disabled persons' may be interpreted as more genuinely gender-indefinite or gender-neutral.

Indefinite pronouns (*jed-* 'each, every', *kein-* 'no', *jemand* 'someone', *niemand* 'no one') can also be described as having "differential gender". In the case of *keine/jede* (f), *keiner/jeder* (m), *keines/jedes* (n), grammatical gender is marked morphologically and can thus be used to specify referential gender:

(16) a. *Das   weiß   doch jed-e.*
          this.ACC know.3SG PRT everyone-FEM.NOM
          'Everyone (female) knows this.'
      b. *Das   glaubt   uns   kein-er.*
          this.ACC believe.3SG we.DAT no.one-MASC.NOM
          'No one (male or "generic") will believe us.'

In the case of *jemand* and *niemand*, which are morphologically invariable for grammatical gender, referential gender can be made explicit by various pronominal forms. In (17a), the masculine relative pronoun *der* anaphorically relates to *niemand*, and in (17b), the choice of the possessive pronoun *ihr* 'her' rather than *sein* 'his' expresses female reference relating to *jemand*:

(17) a. *Da gab es niemand, der* (m) *nicht zupacken wollte.*
          'There wasn't anyone, who (m, male or "generic") didn't want to help.'
      b. *Kann mir jemand mal ihr* (f) *Fahrrad leihen?*
          'Can anyone lend me her bicycle, please?'

Innovative expressions such as (17b) can now be heard more frequently in colloquial speech.

3.1.2   *Lexical means*

Adjectival modification
In examples such as *weibliche Beschäftigte/männliche Beschäftigte* 'female employees/male employees', gender-specification may be achieved by adjectival modification of the gender-indefinite plural nominal. The adjectives are derived from personal nouns with lexical gender: *Weib* (neuter/female) 'woman' in the case of *weiblich* 'female', and *Mann* (masculine/male) 'man' in the case of *männlich* 'male'. *Weiblich/männlich* can be combined with any human noun which is gender-indefinite, regardless of the noun's grammatical gender:

(18) *eine weibliche/männliche Person* (f)   'a female/male person (f)'
      ein weiblicher/männlicher Rockstar (m)   'a female/male rock star (m)'
      ein weibliches/männliches Genie (n)   'a female/male genius (n)'

Compounding
A second type of lexical gender-specification is compounding. German has a number of occupational and functional terms which are compounds containing

-*mann* '-man' (in a few cases *-herr)* or *-frau* '-woman' (with very few instances of *-herrin*) as a second element:

(19) *Kaufmann/Kauffrau*   'businessman/businesswoman'
      Feuerwehrmann/Feuerwehrfrau '(male/female) firefighter'
      Amtmann/Amtfrau   '(male/female) senior civil servant'
      Ratsherr/Ratsfrau   '(male/female) member of city council'
      Bauherr/Bauherrin   '(male/female) client for whom a house
                                     is being built'

In cases where the masculine/male terms were compounded first – which is true for practically all *mann*-compounds indicating a higher social status (as in *Staatsmann* 'statesman'), or a (stereo)typically male occupation (as in *Feuerwehrmann* 'firefighter') – German tends towards the formation of corresponding *frau*-compounds, rather than the derivation of feminine counterparts by suffixation; among the exceptions are *Bauherrin* and *Hausherrin* 'female host', while terms with *-männin* are rarely used; thus, the more traditional term *Landsmännin* 'female compatriot' is being replaced by *Landsfrau*, while the controversial term *Amtmännin 'female senior clerk' is no longer used (cf. Hellinger 1990:132f).

3.1.3   *Morphological means: Derivation*

German has numerous suffixes for the derivation of animate/personal nouns from nominal, verbal, or adjectival stems (cf. Fleischer & Barz 1995). These suffixes have two major functions:

a. Syntactically, they determine word-class membership (i.e. noun) as well as grammatical gender:

(20) Noun   *Sport* (m) 'sports'   *Sport-ler* (m) 'athlete'
      Verb   *schwimmen* 'swim'   *Schwimm-er-in* (f) '(female) swimmer'
      Adj   *grob* 'rough'   *Grob-ian* (m) 'brute'

b. Some suffixes make the noun gender-specific; this applies primarily to the suffix *-in*:

(21) *Läufer* (m) 'runner'   *Läufer-in* (f)   '(female) runner'

The major suffix that derives masculine human nouns in German is *-er*, with the variants *-ler* and *-ner*. The resulting nouns are always male-specific, but may, in addition, be used in generic contexts (cf. Section 3.4):

(22) *-er*   *Maler*   'painter'
      -ler   *Sportler*   'athlete'
      -ner   *Rentner*   'pensioner'

Of minor importance are:

(23) *-ling* *Lehrling*   'trainee'
      -ant   *Intendant* 'director'
      -ent   *Dirigent*   'conductor'
      -eur   *Friseur*   'hairdresser'
      -ist   *Marxist*   'Marxist'
      -or   *Inspektor* 'inspector'

Feminine human nouns are almost exclusively derived by the suffix *-in*. In most cases, these nouns are derived from existing masculine terms, e.g. *Maler*, *Sportler*, *Bischof*, *Dirigent*:

(24) *Malerin*   '(female) painter'
      Sportlerin '(female) athlete'
      Bischöfin   '(female) bishop'
      Dirigentin '(female) conductor'

The suffix *-in* is well established in German word-formation;[6] it is an indispensable means of achieving female visibility, a situation very different from current English, which has no productive word-formation pattern for the derivation of female terms. The few formations ending in *-ess* which are still in current use have additional denotational or connotational features (as in *governess* or *mistress*).

There are only a few other feminine (female) suffixes in German; in fact, most of these – or rather the derived female-specific words containing them – are borrowed from French, for example:

(25) *Chansonette*   '(female) singer, songwriter'
      Souffleuse   '(female) prompter'
      Garderobiere '(female) cloakroom attendant'
      Direktrice   'senior female employee in a fashion store'
      Politesse   'meter maid, traffic warden'

Stewardess was borrowed from English, the suffix itself being, of course, of French origin. None of these suffixes is equivalent to *-in*, either in terms of productivity or in terms of semantic specification. While *-in* derives feminine nouns which form largely equivalent pairs with the corresponding masculine nouns (*Rentner/Rentnerin* 'pensioner'), derivations in *-ette* or *-euse* generally

carry negative connotations; in pairs of words, the masculine (where this exists or is used in German) usually denotes an occupational activity of higher social status, as in *Direktor/Direktrice* 'director, head of a company/senior female employee in a fashion store'. *Chansonsängerin* 'female singer' is more serious than *Chansonette*. The term *Garderobenfrau* lit. 'cloakroom woman' has become more acceptable than *Garderobiere*; *Gouvernante* 'governess' is old-fashioned, and does not denote a female state governor (i.e. *Gouverneurin*), and the official feminine counterparts of *Friseur* 'hairdresser' and *Masseur* 'masseur' are *Friseurin/Masseurin* since *Friseuse* and especially *Masseuse* for some speakers contain frivolous or sexual connotations.

3.2 Neutralization of referential gender

German has two major strategies for the achievement of gender-indefinite expressions which provide equal chances for men and women to feel "included": neutralization and feminization.

Neutralization
The neutralizing strategy can be further differentiated into "lexical" and "syntactic" neutralization. The former implies the choice of epicene nouns, i.e. lexical items that are gender-indefinite, regardless of which grammatical gender class they belong to:

(26) *Person* (f)   'person'   *Kind* (n)   'child'
      Fachkraft (f)   'expert'   *Individuum* (n)   'individual'
      Mensch (m)   'human being'   *Parteimitglied* (n)   'party member'
      Gast (m)   'guest'   *Unfallopfer* (n)   'accident victim'

The second strategy involves the use of plural forms of nominalized adjectives and participles: *die Alten* 'the elderly', *die Studierenden* 'the students', *die Angestellten* 'the employees'. These nouns can be used appropriately in contexts where referential gender is irrelevant, and/or where both women and men may equally figure as potential referents.

Feminization
Feminization is achieved by using forms that make the inclusion of female referents explicit. The various forms of "splitting", i.e. the co-ordination of a lexically female-specific feminine noun and a male/masculine lexical element are therefore instances of a feminizing strategy. The nouns or pronouns may be

co-ordinated by *und* 'and', *oder* 'or', or *beziehungsweise* (abbreviation: *bzw.*) 'respectively', resulting in expressions illustrating so-called *langes Splitting* 'long splitting' or the use of *Paarformen* 'pair forms':

(27)   *alle Lehrerinnen* (f) *und Lehrer* (m)
        'all (female and male) teachers'
        Männer (m) *und Frauen* (f)
        'men and women'
        die Nürnberger Stadtväter (m) *und -mütter* (f)
        'the Nuremberg city fathers and mothers'
        jeder (m) *Wähler* (m) *oder jede* (f) *Wählerin* (f)
        'each (male or female) voter'
        jemand, die (f) *bzw. der* (m)
        'someone (female or male) who'

In some cases, abbreviated splitting, sometimes called *Sparformen* 'economy forms', may be used; this type is marked by various orthographical symbols:

(28)   *Bürger/innen*   'citizens'
        → *Bürger* (m) and *Bürgerinnen* (f) are combined and separated by a slash

        keineR   'no one'
        → the indefinite pronouns *keiner* (m) and *keine* (f) are combined, marked by "capital R"

        LeserInnen   'readers'
        → *Leser* (m) and *Leserinnen* (f) are combined, marked by "capital I"

        Verband Schweizerischer StudentInnenschaften/Union Nationale des EtudiantEs de Suisse 'Association of Swiss students'
        → use of "capital I" in the German compound, and of "capital E" in the French participle equivalent

The so-called "capital I", which is restricted to written usage, has become the focus of emotional and sometimes hostile reactions against reformed language in German (cf. Häberlin & Schmid & Wyss 1992, Ludwig 1989). The major argument against the use of "capital I" has been that it distorts orthographic continuity and that words containing it cannot be pronounced. However, the use of a word-internal capital letter, esp. in compounds, as an attention-getting device (as in *BahnCard* 'annual rail pass for 50% reduction on fares', or *InterRegio* 'train connecting regional centers') has increased in recent years, not only in advertising language. Pronunciation of words containing the "capital I" is, of course, possible: "Capital I" may be realized either by a glottal stop, or by zero.

Zero-realization would make the gender-indefinite *LeserInnen* identical with the feminine *Leserinnen*, suggesting a generic potential of feminine forms, an argument which presumably underlies resistance against the "capital I". Nevertheless, forms with "capital I" are used more frequently now in written texts, even outside left-wing or feminist contexts.

Other *Sparformen* are not widely used, especially since the formation of acceptable (non-nominative) forms is problematic, due to the fact that in most singular forms, feminine and masculine nouns (as well as dependent elements) show obligatory morphological variation according to grammatical case. Thus only nominative singular expressions such as *jede/r Abgeordnete* 'every delegate' or *kein/e WählerIn* 'no voter' can be found occasionally, while oblique cases cannot be derived at all. These must be rendered by unabbreviated splitting:

(29)   *Das dürfte jedem   Mieter*
       this should each.MASC.DAT tenant.MASC.DAT
       und jeder   Mieterin   bekannt   sein.
       and each.FEM.DAT tenant.FEM.DAT know.PART be.INF
       'This should be known to each (female and male) tenant.'

(30)   *die Pflichten einer   jeden   Staatsbürgerin*
       the duty.PL a.FEM.GEN each.FEM.GEN citizen.FEM.GEN
       bzw. eines   jeden   Staatsbürgers
       resp. a.MASC.GEN each.MASC.GEN citizen.MASC.GEN
       'the duties of each and every (female or male) citizen'

A third type of splitting is adjectival splitting by means of double adjectival modification of a gender-indefinite noun:

(31)   *männliche und weibliche Abgeordnete/Führungskräfte/Senatsmitglieder*
       'male and female delegates/executives/members of the senate'

In principle, the overt adjectival modification in (31) is unnecessary, since the nouns do not have lexical gender. However, adjectival splitting is sometimes used in order to emphasize intended reference to both women and men, especially in cases where the noun has a male bias (social gender), as in the case of *Senatsmitglied* 'member of the senate' or *Führungskraft* 'executive'. Adjectival modification may also occur with masculine nouns, whose generic interpretation – despite prescriptive traditions – can no longer be assumed to be generally available; in such cases, female participation is explicitly marked:

(32)   *weibliche und männliche Chirurgen/Piloten/Politiker*
       'female and male surgeons/pilots/politicians'

3.3 Abstraction from referential gender

Finally, abstraction from referential gender must be mentioned as a special type of gender-indefinite formulation. In order to ensure reference to both women and men, the use of human nouns (masculine "generics" in particular) can be avoided altogether. Thus, instead of masculine terms such as *Minister* 'minister, secretary', *Präsident* 'president', *Geschäftsführender Leiter* 'executive director, head', or *Redakteure* 'editors', *Arbeiter* 'workers', *Verkäufer* 'sales persons', the following collective nouns are possible alternatives:

(33) *das Ministerium*   'the Ministry'
      das Präsidium   'the presidency'
      die Geschäftsführende Leitung   'the management'
      die Redaktion   'the editorial staff'
      die Belegschaft   'the staff'
      das Verkaufspersonal   'the sales personnel'

Of course, these alternatives are not necessarily semantically equivalent to expressions containing personal nouns. An expression such as (34) suggests that it may not be the minister her/himself who conducts the negotiations and thus individual responsibilities are potentially obscured:

(34) *Das Ministerium führt die Verhandlung.*
      'The Ministry conducts the negotiation.'

3.4 Marked feminines and "generic" masculines

As shown in Section 3.1.3, terms for females are typically derived from existing masculine/male terms and have therefore been described as marked and secondary: *Ingenieur* (m) – *Ingenieur-in* (f) 'engineer'. This reflects the historical fact that originally men were the first to perform most prestigious or "male" occupations and professions, while only few, and generally low-status occupational terms developed from female domains: *Krankenschwester* 'nurse', *Hebamme* 'midwife', *Putzfrau* 'cleaning woman'. Significantly, these words did not serve as the basis for the derivation of corresponding masculine/male terms. When men began to enter these occupational domains, new and more neutral masculine terms were created: *Krankenpfleger* 'male nurse', *Entbindungshelfer* 'male midwife', *Mitglied des Reinigungspersonals* 'member of the cleaning personnel'.

Generally, only very few existing feminine/female terms have served as the basis for parallel masculine/male terms. Most of these terms belong to the

domain of personal relationships: *Braut – Bräutigam* 'bride – bridegroom', *Witwe – Witwer* 'widow – widower'.

Underlying these morphological and semantic asymmetries is the ideology of MAN ("male as norm"), which considers the male/masculine as the higher, more prestigious category and the female/feminine as secondary and subordinate.[7] This ideology also motivates the prescription that in neutral contexts, masculine forms should be the default choice for personal nouns (cf. Kalverkämper 1979, Lieb & Richter 1990, Stickel 1988). However, the prescription of masculine terms in neutral contexts which are intended to include women, as in (35), has increasingly been interpreted as sexist practice in German. The choice of the lexically male possessive pronoun *seinem* 'his' (which is a neuter dative form relating to the neuter noun *Stimmrecht* 'right to vote') is motivated by the masculine subject NP:

(35)   *Jeder* (m) *Wähler* (m) *sollte von seinem Stimmrecht Gebrauch machen.*
         'Every (m) voter (m) should exercise his right to vote.'

As opposed to nouns such as *Kind* (n) 'child' or *Individuum* (n) 'individual', masculine words like *Wähler* 'voter' or *Steuerzahler* 'taxpayer' generally have morphological counterparts (*Wählerin*, *Steuerzahlerin*) which are grammatically feminine and lexically female-specific. Therefore, not using these feminine terms is considered as contributing towards female invisibility. In addition, one cannot always be sure whether a personal masculine does or does not include women. An example is (36):

(36)   *45 Millionen Bürger* (m) *sind zur Bundestagswahl aufgerufen.*
         '45 million citizens (m) are called upon to vote for the Bundestag.'

The masculine noun *Bürger* can only be interpreted as including women if the reader knows that the sentence relates to the former German Federal Republic (before 1990), which at the time had some 60 million citizens, of whom 45 million were of voting age; the majority of these were women. In fact, the full original quotation from a German newspaper is this:

(37)   *45 Millionen Bürger* (m) *sind zur Bundestagswahl aufgerufen. Etwa 24 Millionen Frauen und 21 Millionen Männer sind wahlberechtigt, wenn …*
         '45 million citizens (m) are called upon to vote for the Bundestag. Approximately 24 million women and 21 million men are entitled to vote, when …'

Frequently, use of "generic" masculines may evoke unintended associations, i.e. interpretation of the plural *Türken* (m) as implying the meaning [homosexual]:

(38) *Ehe zwischen zwei jungen Türken* (m) *endet nach wenigen Monaten mit einer Tragödie.*
'Marriage between two young Turks (m) ends in tragedy after only a few months.'

Also, allegedly generic masculines will reveal their male bias in contexts where use of a female-specific feminine such as *Frauen* 'women' shifts the interpretation of the preceding masculine noun towards 'male-specific'. A representative example is taken from an article on immigration (in the weekly newspaper *Die Zeit*, March 2000) which contains numerous personal masculines such as *Gastarbeiter* 'guest workers', *Einwanderer* 'immigrants', *Computerexperten* 'computer experts', etc. Doubts as to the generic interpretation of these nouns arise from consideration of the following excerpt:

(39) *Junge, qualifizierte Ausländer* (m) *werden die Mühsal, Deutsch zu lernen, nur auf sich nehmen, wenn es sich langfristig für sie lohnt, wenn sie sich also fest niederlassen, selbständig machen, Frauen und Kinder mitbringen dürfen.*
'Young, qualified foreigners (m) will only submit to the toil of learning German, if this pays off longterm, i.e. if they are allowed to settle down permanently, to set up their own business, to bring along their wives and children.'

More subtle but equally revealing is the case where a "generic" masculine receives modification by stereotypically male attributes, such as *Krawatte* 'tie', *Bart* 'beard, moustache', *Anzug* 'suit':

(40) *Die Biologen* (m) *und Chemiker* (m) *wechselten Jeans, Birkenstock und T-Shirt gegen Anzug und Krawatte.*
'The biologists (m) and chemists (m) changed from jeans, sandals, and T-shirt into suit and tie.'

In order to ensure a generic interpretation of the masculine, additional information is often provided, as in (41):

(41) *Apropos Navratilova: Sie hat als bisher einziger* (m) *Tennisspieler* (m) *mehr als 10 Millionen Dollar an Preisgeldern eingenommen – egal ob weiblich oder männlich.*
'Apropos Navratilova: She is the only (m) tennis-player (m) – whether male or female – who has won more than 10 million dollars in prize money.'

In contexts where women are excluded as potential referents, this may also be marked by a gender-specific adjective, as in the following job advertisement:

(42)   *Wir suchen: Männliche Hausdetektive* (m)
       'We are looking for male store detectives (m)'

Marked feminine usage occurs in contexts where female participation is the exception. In such cases, two practices have evolved: In more traditional usage, a personal masculine is modified by the female-specific adjective *weiblich* 'female', as in (43):

(43)   *Catherine David, erster weiblicher documenta-Chef* (m) …
       'Catherine David, the first female director (m) of the documenta (art exhibition) …'

A second strategy emphasizes the female interpretation of a personal female-specific feminine by additional (and, in principle, unnecessary) adjectival modification:

(44)   *Es ist außergewöhnlich, dass ein Spieler eine weibliche Trainerin* (f) *hat.*
       'It is unusual that a player has a female coach (f).'

Such examples illustrate an increasing insecurity concerning the interpretation of personal masculines. In addition, they support the observation of a recent tendency in German towards a closer correlation between grammatical and lexical/referential gender. It appears that masculine personal nouns are losing some of their (alleged) "generic" potential and are becoming more male-specific.

4.   The psychological reality of German masculine generics

German masculine and feminine personal nouns show asymmetries on various levels: on the morphological level, where feminines are generally derived from existing masculine forms; on the semantic level, with masculine terms carrying more positive connotations than feminine terms, and on the distributional level, where masculines occur more frequently than feminines and in more contexts such as textbooks, dictionaries, newspapers, etc.[8] In addition, there are serious cognitive asymmetries: Masculine terms automatically trigger expectations as to a most suitable (perhaps prototypically) – male – representative of the noun.

  For English and other languages, numerous studies have provided empirical evidence challenging the assumption that masculine/male expressions are in

fact interpreted generically.[9] By implication, the observation of variability in the use of personal nouns, the mere existence of a large number of guidelines for the equal linguistic treatment of women and men, as well as the ongoing public debate on reformed language use, suggest that also for German, generic readings of personal masculines are no longer taken for granted. However, surprisingly few empirical studies are available for German.[10]

Using various theoretical frameworks and empirical methodologies, all of these studies arrive at similar conclusions. Klein (1988) shows that personal masculines are not necessarily associated with gender-neutrality. (Pro)nominal splitting does allow for more inclusive interpretations, but the extent to which males and females are associated equally with a particular expression depends on additional contextual clues. Irmen & Köhncke (1996), testing the availability of the concepts 'female' and 'male' for various linguistic expressions ("generic" masculines, gender-specific masculines, and feminines), find that personal masculines are not consistently interpreted as having generic readings. The results of Braun & Gottburgsen & Sczesny & Stahlberg (1998) show that, compared to the use of masculine generics, splitting enhances the visibility and cognitive inclusion of women. A similar, but even more pronounced tendency is documented in Stahlberg & Sczesny & Braun (2001), where splitting is found to promote the recall of female persons to a significant degree.

It can be concluded that masculines are ambiguous in that they denote males and sometimes human beings, while feminines only denote females, and are therefore always sexualized (cf. Schmid 1999).

5.   Gendered messages in German

5.1   Discourse: German women and men speaking

The investigation of gender-preferential communicative behavior has developed into an important subdiscipline of language and gender research in Germany.[11] It has been claimed that women are more sensitive than men to sociolinguistic norms and prestige patterns, which contributes to a more "correct" behavior oriented to a greater degree towards standard varieties (see Werner 1983, Schmidt 1988).

Trömel-Plötz (1984a) maintained that women and men use German differently to an extent which justifies the postulation of two separate codes, that is, a female and a male variety of German. She analyzed Swiss TV discussions in terms of turn-taking categories such as length of turn, interruption, and topic

selection. The finding that women were interrupted more frequently than men was interpreted as a massive restriction of women's conversational rights. On the other hand, Trömel-Plötz (1984b) evaluates positively what she considers to be typical for female conversational behavior, such as active involvement in other participants' contributions, explicit reference to other speakers, and the joint development of a topic.

However, Grässel's (1991) analysis of 95 conversational variables in TV talk-shows could not identify any significant gender-related differences. Where differences did emerge, however, these could often be interpreted in terms of male dominance and female subordination. More importantly, the idea that it is primarily speaker-gender which determines conversational dominance is rejected: Other factors, for instance a speaker's expert vs. non-expert status, may be just as important.

Wodak's (1981) sociolinguistic analysis of therapeutic discourse is of major importance in that it provides empirical support for assumptions about the interaction of gender, social class, and verbal behavior. However, contrary to stereotypical assumptions about female and male conversational behavior, no conclusive evidence emerged: Men did not take longer turns of speech than women; and while men interrupted women more frequently than vice versa, women did interrupt both male and female members of a lower social class. Women tended to use different strategies to achieve conversational goals; for example, they used questions rather than more aggressive acts such as rejections, which were preferred by men. It seems that men tended towards a more competitive style, while women tended to avoid conversational conflicts.[12]

In a study of how power and dominance are actively negotiated in private discourse, Thimm (1990) analyzed conflict situations involving intimate partners. Participants have various options in attempting to reach their conversational goals. They may even change strategies; for example, if an assertive strategy is insufficient for the maintenance of conversational dominance, an evasion strategy may turn out to be more successful. Again, no clear distribution of these strategies to men and women could be established.

So far no general assumptions can be made about how women and men behave verbally in German.[13] Apart from gender, age, social class, and individual networks, it is essential to consider the situational roles of speakers in particular interactions, which again must be placed in a wider institutional or cultural context. Also, quantitative analyses must be supplemented by qualitative analyses which take into account the fact that the occurrence of the same linguistic phenomenon may have different functions in different contexts.

5.2 Proverbs and metaphorical expressions

As in many other languages, proverbs and metaphorical expressions in German provide a rich source for the transmission of gendered messages.[14] They can be described as verbal manifestations of traditional and stereotypical assumptions about socially acceptable gender roles and patterns of behavior. Relatively few such expressions portray men from a female perspective, while the reverse, i.e. viewing the world from a male (and by implication human) perspective, is the norm. Characteristically, proverbs featuring male protagonists emphasize male dominance and authority:[15]

(45)   *Wer am Weib den Bengel spart, ist kein Mann von rechter Art.*
'He who spares the rod on the woman is not a proper sort of man.'
Viele Söhne, viel Segen – viele Töchter, viel Regen.
'Many sons, much blessing – many daughters, much rain.'
Wenn die Henne kräht vor dem Hahn, und die Frau redt vor dem Mann, dann muss man die Henne kochen und die Frau mit dem Prügel pochen.
'If the hen crows before the cock and the woman speaks before the man, then one must cook the hen and beat the woman with a stick.'
Wo die Frau regiert den Mann, da ist der Teufel Hauskaplan.
'Where the woman reigns over the man, there the devil is house chaplain.'

By contrast, women are portrayed as displaying various kinds of socially unwelcome traits such as talkativeness, unreliability, and inappropriate (since "male") behavior:

(46)   *Ist eine Frau auch dumm, so ist sie niemals stumm.*
'Even if a woman is stupid, she is never dumb.'
Gebären fällt den Frauen leichter als schweigen.
'Women find it easier to give birth than to hold their tongue.'
Küstern, Priestern und Frauen ist nicht zu trauen.
'Vergers, priests and women are not to be trusted.'
Mädchen, die pfeifen und Hühnern, die krähn, soll man beizeiten die Hälse umdrehn.
'Girls that whistle and hens that crow should have their necks screwed in time.'

Of course, it must be noted, that most of these proverbs are no longer used to any significant extent, but they are indicative of an earlier – but still effective – underlying socio-cultural belief system.

More frequently used are metaphorical expressions of various kinds (cf.

Bornemann 1974). Typically, women are described as emotional, talkative and the like, while men will often appear as sexually over-active:

(47) FEM/female-specific   MASC/male-specific
      Heulsuse   'crybaby'   *Hurenbock*   'whoremonger, lecher'
      Quasselstrippe   'chatterbox (derog.)' *Platzhirsch*   'boss-type, big noise'
      Plaudertasche   'chatterbox'   *Schürzenjäger* 'skirt-chaser, womanizer'
      Klatschbase   'gossip'   *Lustmolch*   'dirty old man'

Of course, other metaphorical expressions such as *Schlafmütze* 'sleepyhead' *Leckermaul* 'sweet tooth', and *Dickkopf* 'pig-headed person' have no such gender bias. Well-established in everyday communication are metaphorical expressions like the following, which portray the world from an all-male perspective. No "female" counterparts are readily available:

(48) *da platzt einem doch der Kragen*
      lit. 'this makes one's collar burst', i.e. 'this makes one blow one's top'
      sich auf den Schlips getreten fühlen
      lit. 'to feel as if someone had stepped on one's tie', i.e. 'to feel hurt'
      vor jemand den Hut ziehen
      'to take one's cap off to someone'
      eine weiße Weste haben
      lit. 'to have a white waistcoat', i.e. 'to have a clean slate, to be guiltless'
      jemand um den Bart streichen
      lit. 'to stroke someone's beard', i.e. 'to try to get round someone'

6.   Language planning as a reaction to the feminist critique of language

6.1 Variation and change in the area of German personal nouns

In German, the influence of the women's movement is particularly salient in the area of personal nouns, which is marked by increasing variation. Primarily, this variability reflects ongoing changes regarding the interpretation of masculine "generics". Over the past three decades, the referential range of personal masculines has become more narrow and there is a growing tendency towards more agreement between grammatical gender and referential gender. On the other hand, feminines are expanding their referential range, and occasionally are even used as generics, albeit in contexts which are marked for pro-feminist attitudes. For example, in *Emma*, a German feminist magazine, feminine nouns such as *Leserinnen* 'readers' or *Demonstrantinnen* 'demonstrators' are frequently

used to include potential male referents. While no solution to the problem of "male as norm", since they replace androcentric usage by an equally unacceptable ideology of "female as norm", such usages are well suited to create and maintain awareness of referential asymmetries.

More importantly, a tremendous number of new personal feminines, derivations (49a) as well as compounds with *-frau* as second element (49b), have contributed to more female visibility in current German. Note that some of the compounds in (49b) were created after an existing masculine form (which the new feminine term may parallel more or less closely), while for others there was no such model.

(49) a. *Flugzeugbauerin*   'female aircraft constructor'
          Bundeskanzlerin   'female Federal Chancellor'
          Boxerin   'female boxer'
          Soldatin   'female soldier'
          Bankerin   'female banker'
          Bischöfin   'female bishop'
      b. *Kneipenfrau*   'woman working in a pub'
          Notruffrau   'woman on duty for emergency calls'
          Landsfrau   'female compatriot'
          Steuerfrau   'helmswoman'
          Torfrau   'female goal keeper'
          Ratsfrau   'female member of council'

While the feminine forms in (49a) are generally derived from existing masculines, there are various patterns in (49b): In some cases there is a parallel masculine term (*Landsmann*, *Steuermann*), in other cases the masculine term ends in *-herr* rather than *-mann* (*Ratsherr*), and in some cases the feminine terms are new creations with no masculine equivalents (*Notruffrau*).

New pronominal formations are the gender-specific pronouns *frau* 'woman' and, less frequently used, *mann* 'man, male person' and even the gender-indefinite *mensch* 'human being, person' (cf. Pusch 1984: 6ff). They were built on the model of *man* 'one, you', and originally, of course, derived from the masculine noun *Mann*. *Frau* is used as an indefinite pronoun referring specifically to women (50a), *mensch* is a generic form that includes both female and male referents (50b), whereas *mann* emphasizes exclusively male reference (50c):

(50) a. *Über die neue Abtreibungsregelung muß frau sich genau informieren.*
          'Every woman (everyone) should gather precise information about the new abortion regulations.'

    b.   *Was macht mensch damit?*
        'What does one do with this?'

    c.   *In Uniform fühlt mann sich ganz anders.*
        'Wearing a uniform a man (one) feels quite different.'

Even pronominal splitting occurs with *man/frau*, suggesting that traditional *man* has lost at least some of its generic potential:

(51)   *Man und frau kommt, sieht und wird gesehen.*
       'People come, see and are seen.'

Such tendencies of linguistic variation and change have been observed in all German-speaking countries, based on material from numerous domains of public usage: the print media, TV, job advertising, legal language, political language, educational language, and literature.[16]

6.2   German guidelines for non-discriminatory usage

Guidelines are an instrument of language planning symbolizing the dissonance between traditional prescriptions and reformed usage. Guidelines for non-sexist language are a reaction to changes in the relationships between women and men, which have caused overt conflicts on the level of language comprehension and production. Guidelines offer solutions by suggesting gender-fair (inclusive) alternatives to traditional/conservative usage. Most guidelines explicitly articulate their political foundation by pointing out that equal treatment of women and men must also be realized on the level of communication (cf. Frank 1989).

    While English guidelines – representative examples are McGraw-Hill (1972) and UNESCO (1999) – emphasize neutralization, symmetry and the avoidance of stereotyping, in German guidelines the principle of female visibility has the highest priority. This is a consequence of several factors: the existence of grammatical gender in German, the tendency in current usage towards more agreement between grammatical and semantic/referential gender, and the fact that the derivation of feminine personal nouns is deeply embedded in the system of German word-formation. Again, there are no major differences between the three German-speaking countries concerning the form and function of the guidelines.[17]

    Female visibility is recommended in all contexts that include female referents, but is mandatory in gender-specific contexts. Avoidance of "generic" masculines in German includes the strategy of neutralization, for example by using gender-indefinite nouns such as *Lehrpersonen, Lehrkräfte* 'teachers' or

nominalized plural forms, which do not differentiate grammatical and hence referential gender in German: *Auszubildende* 'trainees', *Drogensüchtige* 'drug addicts'. In the singular, however, female visibility must be articulated. Of course, masculine forms which are part of inanimate compounds are not subject to change: *Benutzerhandbuch* (n) 'user manual', *Arbeitgeberpolitik* (f) 'employer politics', *Führerschein* (m) 'driving license'. Guidelines also discuss orthographic alternatives of various forms of splitting, esp. long splitting (*Lehrerinnen und Lehrer* 'female and male teachers'), and abbreviated or economy splitting (*Lehrer/innen, LehrerInnen*).

7.   Concluding remarks

In contrast to historically and/or structurally related languages, German displays a clear tendency towards more agreement between grammatical gender and referential gender. Increasingly, personal feminines are used for female reference, and fewer personal masculines for neutral or gender-indefinite reference. This trend derives from unique structural prerequisites: In contrast to morphological equivalents in other languages, the German derivational suffix *-in* is perfectly suited to express female reference, since it is extremely productive and carries no negative connotations. The suffix can easily be attached to loanwords also, as in *Cheerleaderin, Punkerin, Streetworkerin, Talkmasterin*. The use of feminine terms for female reference is no longer an emotional issue.

The present status of guidelines for German must be characterized as heterogeneous and variable. Acceptance of the recommendations varies between two extremes: discouraged usage where non-discriminatory alternatives are rejected and sole official usage where these have become the norm.[18] Currently, the majority of recommendations have the intermediate status of tolerated or encouraged usage. Increasingly, the linguistic visibility of women, and practices which conform to the principles of symmetry and avoidance of stereotyping, are not only tolerated but receive active support. However, the question remains of what impact such changes in official (and predominantly written) language have on spoken and more informal domains of German. One might well speculate, however, that German personal masculines will continue to lose more of their generic potential in the future.

Notes

1. Furthermore, there are German-speaking minorities in about 40 other countries (cf. Ethnologue 2000:689): France (Alsace-Lorraine: 1.5 million), Italy (South Tyrol: 225.000) and more than two million speakers in Eastern Europe (the former Soviet Union, Romania, Hungary, Slovakia, the Czech Republic, and former Yugoslavia).

2. Structural descriptions of German: Fox (1990), Hawkins (1987), Russ (1994), Duden (1998), Eisenberg (1998/1999), Zifonun & Hoffmann & Strecker (1997); History: Besch & Betten & Reichmann & Sonderegger (1998/1999/2000), Leiss (2000); Sociolinguistic descriptions: Barbour & Stevenson (1990), Clyne (1984), Stevenson (1995), Eichhoff-Cyrus & Hoberg (2000); Dictionaries: Langenscheidt (1996), Duden (1999).

3. Zubin & Köpcke (1984) provide empirical evidence for the fact that affect/gender-related criteria may determine gender class membership. Thus, abstract compounds with *-mut* as the second element, associated with weakness and subordination, are feminine: *die Schwermut* 'melancholia', *Sanftmut* 'gentleness, meekness', *Armut* 'poverty', perhaps in analogy to "introverted" abstract feminine nouns such as *Scheu* 'timidity', *Furcht* 'fear', *Angst* 'fear, anxiety'. Those associated with power and braveness, are masculine: *Lebensmut* 'courage to face life', *Übermut* 'being cocky', *Wagemut* 'boldness', perhaps in analogy to "extroverted" masculine nouns such as *Hohn* 'disdain', *Wille* 'wish', *Ärger* 'anger'.

4. For a more detailed discussion of hybrid nouns and the agreement hierarchy in different languages, cf. Corbett (1991:225ff).

5. On personal nouns in German, including aspects of word-formation, cf. Braun (1997), Doleschal (1992), Oksaar (1976), Wittemöller (1988).

6. For a diachronic view of the suffix *-in* cf. Hellinger (1990:74–78), Rabofski (1990); on the explicit use of both masculine and feminine personal reference in medieval texts, cf. Ennen (1987) and Grabrucker (1993:82–108).

7. Reference to the historical background of this underlying ideology can be found in Bußmann (1995:123ff); for English see Baron (1986:Ch.6).

8. On the feminist critique of the German language cf. Pusch (1984, 1990, 1998), Trömel-Plötz (1982, 1984a,b, 1992). A contrastive perspective of German and English is taken by Hellinger (1990).

9. Cf. Corbett (1991:218–221), Martyna (1980), MacKay & Fulkerson (1979); for a comparative study see Batliner (1984); also Hellinger (1991).

10. Cf. Klein (1988), Scheele & Gauler (1993), Irmen & Köhncke (1996); also Hellinger (1980), Braun & Gottburgsen & Sczesny & Stahlberg (1998), Stahlberg & Sczesny & Braun (2001).

11. For overviews and more comprehensive treatments see Schoenthal (1985, 1998), Günthner & Kotthoff (1992), Frank (1992), Postl (1991), Thimm (1990), and Kotthoff (1996); a bibliography is Peyer & Groth (1996).

12. Similarly, Kotthoff (1984) tested the ways in which conflict situations were solved by female and male students in an academic setting. While the women used a more co-operative

strategy, taking care not to risk a break-up of the conversation, the men pursued their original goal using a more competitive style. Kotthoff concludes that women contribute towards their own conversational subordination.

13. For a critical view of earlier studies, cf. Schoenthal (1985:169f). She warns against generalizations derived from limited data. Thus, interruptions may have other communicative functions than violating a person's conversational rights, such as signaling emotional involvement. Schmidt's (1988) analysis of academic discourse allows for a similar assessment. Frank (1992:29) suggests that some of the alleged differences between female and male discourse behavior may be explained as a function of stereotypical perceptive mechanisms.

14. E.g., for Arabic cf. Hachimi vol. I, for Turkish cf. Braun vol. I, for Chinese cf. Zhang vol. II.

15. A collection of German proverbs is Beier & Herkt & Pollmann & Pietsch (1997). A comparative approach is taken by Daniels (1985), Sabban & Wirrer (1991) and Schipper (1996). An international bibliography is Mieder & Sobieski (1998).

16. For German see Schoenthal (1998) and Trempelmann (1998). Doleschal (1998) provides an overview of the consequences of feminist language critique in Austria. Peyer & Wyss (1998) describe developments in Switzerland.

17. The first German guidelines were Guentherodt & Hellinger & Pusch & Trömel-Plötz (1980). Representative examples of German-German guidelines are Braun (2000), Bickes & Brunner (1992), Müller & Fuchs (1993), Hellinger & Bierbach (1993); of Austrian-German guidelines Wodak & Feistritzer & Moosmüller & Doleschal (1987), Kargl & Wetschanow & Wodak & Perle (1997); and of Swiss-German guidelines Häberlin & Schmid & Wyss (1992) and Schweizerische Bundeskanzlei (1996).

18. So far, sole official usage can only be observed in very few cases; for example, the German term of address for a female adult is *Frau* 'Mrs' while *Fräulein* 'Miss' is no longer acceptable in official usage. A comparison of official German recommendations can be found in Hellinger (1995:305–309).

References

Ammon, Ulrich, ed. 1995. *Die deutsche Sprache in Deutschland, Österreich und der Schweiz.* Berlin: de Gruyter.

Barbour, Stephen & Patrick Stevenson. 1990. *Variation in German: A critical approach to German sociolinguistics.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Baron, Dennis. 1986. *Grammar and gender.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Batliner, Anton. 1984. "The comprehension of grammatical and natural gender." *Linguistics* 22: 831–856.

Beier, Brigitte & Matthias Herkt & Bernhard Pollmann & Barbara Pietsch, eds. 1997. *Lexikon der Sprichwörter und Zitate.* Dortmund: Harenberg.

Besch, Werner & Anne Betten & Oskar Reichmann & Stefan Sonderegger, eds. 1998/1999/ 2000. *Sprachgeschichte. Ein Handbuch zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und ihrer*

Erforschung. (= HSK 2). 2nd ed. 3 vols.: I (1998), II (1999), III (2000). Berlin: de Gruyter.

Bickes, Hans & Margot Brunner, eds. 1992. *Muttersprache frauenlos – Männersprache Frauenlos? PolitikerInnen ratlos?* Wiesbaden: Gesellschaft für deutsche Sprache.

Bornemann, Ernest. 1974. *Sex im Volksmund. Der obszöne Wortschatz der Deutschen.* 2 vols. Reinbek: Rowohlt.

Braun, Friederike. 2000. *Mehr Frauen in die Sprache. Leitfaden zur geschlechtergerechten Formulierung.* 3rd ed. Kiel: Ministerium für Justiz, Frauen, Jugend und Familie des Landes Schleswig-Holstein.

Braun, Friederike & Anja Gottburgsen & Sabine Sczesny & Dagmar Stahlberg. 1998. "Können *Geophysiker* Frauen sein? Generische Personenbezeichnungen im Deutschen." *Zeitschrift für Germanistische Linguistik* 26: 265–283.

Braun, Peter. 1997. *Personenbezeichnungen: Der Mensch in der deutschen Sprache.* Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Bußmann, Hadumod. 1995. "Das Genus, die Grammatik und – der Mensch: Geschlechterdifferenz in der Sprachwissenschaft." In *Genus: Zur Geschlechterdifferenz in den Kulturwissenschaften*, eds. Hadumod Bußmann & Renate Hof. Stuttgart: Kröner, 114–160.

Clyne, Michael. 1984. *Language and society in the German-speaking countries.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Corbett, Greville G. 1991. *Gender.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Daniels, Karlheinz. 1985. "Geschlechtsspezifische Stereotypen im Sprichwort." *Sprache und Literatur* 56: 18–25.

Doleschal, Ursula. 1992. *Movierung im Deutschen. Eine Darstellung der Bildung und Verwendung weiblicher Personenbezeichnungen.* Unterschleißheim/München: Lincom Europa.

Doleschal, Ursula. 1998. "Entwicklung und Auswirkungen der feministischen Sprachkritik in Österreich seit 1987." In *Feministische Linguistik – Linguistische Geschlechterforschung*, ed. Gisela Schoenthal. Hildesheim: Olms, 87–115.

Duden. 1998. *Grammatik der deutschen Gegenwartssprache*, ed. Dudenredaktion, with Peter Eisenberg, Hermann Gelhaus, Helmut Henne, Horst Sitta & Hans Wellmann. 6th ed. Mannheim: Dudenverlag.

Duden. 1999. *Das große Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache.* 3rd ed. 10 vols. Mannheim: Dudenverlag.

Eichhoff-Cyrus, Karin M. & Rudolf Hoberg, eds. 2000. *Die deutsche Sprache zur Jahrtausendwende. Sprachkultur oder Sprachverfall?* Mannheim: Dudenverlag.

Eisenberg, Peter. 1998/1999. *Grundriß der deutschen Grammatik.* Vol I (1998): *Das Wort*, vol. II (1999): *Der Satz.* Stuttgart: Metzler.

Ennen, Edith. 1987. *Frauen im Mittelalter.* 3rd ed. München: Beck.

Ethnologue. 2000. *Ethnologue: Languages of the world*, eds. Barbara F. Grimes & Joseph E. Grimes. 2 vols. 14th ed. Dallas, TX: SIL International.

Fleischer, Wolfgang & Irmela Barz. 1995. *Deutsche Wortbildung.* 2nd ed. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Fox, Anthony. 1990. *The structure of German.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Frank, Francine Wattman. 1989. "Language planning, language reform, and language change: A review of guidelines for nonsexist usage." In *Language, gender, and professional writing:*

Theoretical approaches and guidelines for nonsexist usage, eds. Francine Wattman Frank & Paula A. Treichler. New York: MLA, 105–133.

Frank, Karsta. 1992. *Sprachgewalt: Die sprachliche Reproduktion der Geschlechterhierarchie. Elemente einer feministischen Linguistik im Kontext sozialwissenschaftlicher Frauenforschung*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Grabrucker, Marianne. 1993. *Vater Staat hat keine Muttersprache*. Frankfurt am Main: Fischer.

Grässel, Ulrike. 1991. *Sprachverhalten und Geschlecht. Eine empirische Studie zu geschlechtsspezifischem Sprachverhalten in Fernsehdiskussionen*. Pfaffenweiler: Centaurus.

Guentherodt, Ingrid & Marlis Hellinger & Luise F. Pusch & Senta Trömel-Plötz. 1980. "Richtlinien zur Vermeidung sexistischen Sprachgebrauchs." *Linguistische Berichte* 69: 15–21.

Günthner, Susanne & Helga Kotthoff, eds. 1992. *Die Geschlechter im Gespräch. Kommunikation in Institutionen*. Stuttgart: Metzler.

Häberlin, Susanne & Rachel Schmid & Eva Lia Wyss. 1992. *Übung macht die Meisterin. Richtlinien für einen nicht-sexistischen Sprachgebrauch*. München: Frauenoffensive.

Hawkins, John A. 1987. "German." In *The world's major languages*, ed. Bernard Comrie. London: Croom Helm, 110–138.

Hellinger, Marlis. 1980. "Zum Gebrauch weiblicher Berufsbezeichnungen im Deutschen – Variabilität als Ausdruck außersprachlicher Machtstrukturen." *Linguistische Berichte* 69: 37–58.

Hellinger, Marlis. 1990. *Kontrastive feministische Linguistik. Mechanismen sprachlicher Diskriminierung im Englischen und Deutschen*. München: Hueber.

Hellinger, Marlis. 1991. "Feminist linguistics and linguistic relativity." *Working Papers on Language, Gender, and Sexism* 1: 25–37.

Hellinger, Marlis. 1995. "Language and gender." in *The German language in the real world*, ed. Patrick Stevenson. Oxford: Clarendon, 281–314.

Hellinger, Marlis & Christine Bierbach. 1993. *Eine Sprache für beide Geschlechter. Richtlinien für einen nicht-sexistischen Sprachgebrauch*. Bonn: Unesco.

Irmen, Lisa & Astrid Köhncke. 1996. "Zur Psychologie des generischen Maskulinums." *Sprache und Kognition* 15: 152–167.

Kalverkämper, Hartwig. 1979. "Die Frauen und die Sprache." *Linguistische Berichte* 62: 55–71.

Kargl, Maria & Karin Wetschanow & Ruth Wodak & Néla Perle. 1997. *Kreatives Formulieren. Anleitungen zu geschlechtergerechtem Sprachgebrauch*. Schriftenreihe der Frauenministerin 13. Wien: Bundesministerium für Frauenangelegenheiten und Verbraucherschutz.

Klein, Josef. 1988. "Die Benachteiligung der Frau im generischen Maskulinum – eine feministische Schimäre oder psycholinguistische Realität?" In *Vorträge des Germanistentages Berlin 1987*. Vol. 1: *Das Selbstverständnis der Germanistik*, ed. Norbert Oellers. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 310–319.

Köpcke, Klaus-Michael. 1982. *Untersuchungen zum Genussystem der deutschen Gegenwartssprache*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Köpcke, Klaus-Michael & David A. Zubin. 1983. "Die kognitive Organisation der Genus-zuweisung zu den einsilbigen Nomen der deutschen Gegenwartssprache." *Zeitschrift für Germanistische Linguistik* 11: 166–182.

Kotthoff, Helga. 1984. "Gewinnen oder verlieren? Beobachtungen zum Sprachverhalten von Frauen und Männern in argumentativen Dialogen an der Universität." In *Gewalt durch Sprache. Die Vergewaltigung von Frauen in Gesprächen*, ed. Senta Trömel-Plötz. Frankfurt am Main: Fischer, 90–113.

Kotthoff, Helga. 1996. "Die Geschlechter in der Gesprächsforschung. Hierarchien, Theorien, Ideologien." *Deutschunterricht* 48: 9–15.

Langenscheidt. 1996. *Langenscheidts Handwörterbuch Englisch: German/English, English-German.* München: Langenscheidt.

Leiss, Elisabeth. 2000. "Gender in Old High German." In *Gender in grammar and cognition*, eds. Barbara Unterbeck et al. Berlin: de Gruyter, 237–258.

Lieb, Hans-Heinrich & Helmut Richter. 1990. "Zum Gebrauch von Personenbezeichnungen in juristischen Texten: Stellungnahme anläßlich der Novellierung des Berliner Hoch-schulgesetzes." *Deutsche Sprache* 18: 148–157.

Ludwig, Otto. 1989. "Die Karriere eines Großbuchstabens – zur Rolle des großen 'I' in Personenbezeichnungen." *Der Deutschunterricht* 41: 80–87.

MacKay, Donald & David Fulkerson. 1979. "On the comprehension and production of pronouns." *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior* 18: 661–673.

Martyna, Wendy. 1980. "The psychology of the generic masculine." In *Women and language in literature and society*, eds. Sally McConnell-Ginet & Ruth Borker & Nelly Furman. New York: Praeger, 69–78.

McGraw-Hill. 1972. *Guidelines for equal treatment of the sexes in McGraw-Hill Book Company publications.* Highstown, NJ: McGraw-Hill.

Mieder, Wolfgang & Janet Sobieski. 1998. *Proverb iconography: An international bibliography.* New York: Lang.

Müller, Sigrid & Cornelia Fuchs. 1993. *Handbuch zur nichtsexistischen Sprachverwendung in öffentlichen Texten.* Frankfurt am Main: Fischer.

Oksaar, Els. 1976. *Berufsbezeichnungen im heutigen Deutsch.* Düsseldorf: Schwann.

Peyer, Ann & Ruth Groth. 1996. *Sprache und Geschlecht.* Heidelberg: Groos.

Peyer, Ann & Eva Lia Wyss. 1998. "'JazzmusikerInnen – weder Asketen noch Müsli-Fifis' – Feministische Sprachkritik in der Schweiz, ein Überblick." In *Feministische Linguistik – Linguistische Geschlechterforschung*, ed. Gisela Schoenthal. Hildesheim: Olms, 117–154.

Postl, Gertrud. 1991. *Weibliches Sprechen. Feministische Entwürfe zu Sprache und Geschlecht.* Wien: Passagen.

Pusch, Luise F. 1984. *Das Deutsche als Männersprache. Aufsätze und Glossen zur feministisch-en Linguistik.* Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.

Pusch, Luise F. 1990. *Alle Menschen werden Schwestern: Feministische Sprachkritik.* Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.

Pusch, Luise F. 1998. *Die Frau ist nicht der Rede wert: Aufsätze, Reden und Glossen.* Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.

Rabofski, Birgit. 1990. *Motion und Markiertheit.* Frankfurt am Main: Lang.

Rosch, Eleanor. 1977. "Human categorization." In *Advances in cross-cultural psychology*, ed. Neil Warren. London: Academic Press, 1–49.

Russ, Charles V. J. 1994. *German language today*. London: Routledge.

Sabban, Annette & Jan Wirrer, eds. 1991. *Sprichwörter und Redensarten im interkulturellen Vergleich*. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.

Scheele, Brigitte & Eva Gauler. 1993. "Wählen Wissenschaftler ihre Probleme anders aus als WissenschaftlerInnen? Das Genus-Sexus-Problem als paradigmatischer Fall der linguistischen Relativitätsthese." *Sprache und Kognition* 12: 59–72.

Schipper, Mineke. 1996. "*Eine gute Frau hat keinen Kopf*". *Europäische Sprichwörter über Frauen*. München: dtv.

Schmid, Monika S. 1999. "Marginalization or objectivization – German gender asymmetry revisited." *Communication & Cognition* 3/4: 189–199.

Schmidt, Claudia. 1988. *Typisch weiblich – typisch männlich. Geschlechtstypisches Kommunikationsverhalten in studentischen Kleingruppen*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Schoenthal, Gisela. 1985. "Sprache und Geschlecht." *Deutsche Sprache* 13: 143–185.

Schoenthal, Gisela, ed. 1998. *Feministische Linguistik – Linguistische Geschlechterforschung*. Hildesheim: Olms.

Schweizerische Bundeskanzlei. 1996. *Leitfaden zur sprachlichen Gleichbehandlung im Deutschen*. Bern: Schweizerische Bundeskanzlei.

Stahlberg, Dagmar & Sabine Sczesny & Friederike Braun. 2001. "Name your favourite musician. Effects of masculine generics and their alternatives in German." *Journal of Language and Social Psychology* 20: 464–469.

Stevenson, Patrick, ed. 1995. *The German language and the real world: Sociolinguistic, cultural, and pragmatic perspectives on contemporary German*. Oxford: Clarendon.

Stickel, Gerhard. 1988. "Beantragte staatliche Regelungen zur "sprachlichen Gleichbehandlung der Geschlechter". Darstellung und Kritik." *Zeitschrift für Germanistische Linguistik* 16: 330–355.

Thimm, Caja. 1990. *Dominanz und Sprache. Strategisches Handeln im Alltag*. Wiesbaden: Deutscher Universitätsverlag.

Trempelmann, Gisela. 1998. "Leserinnen/LeserInnen Ost wie West. Zu Bezeichnungen und Anredeformen in den östlichen Bundesländern." In *Feministische Linguistik – Linguistische Geschlechterforschung*, ed. Gisela Schoenthal. Hildesheim: Olms, 33–47.

Trömel-Plötz, Senta. 1982. *Frauensprache: Sprache der Veränderung*. Frankfurt am Main: Fischer.

Trömel-Plötz, Senta. 1984a. "Gewalt durch Sprache." In *Gewalt durch Sprache. Die Vergewaltigung von Frauen in Gesprächen*, ed. Senta Trömel-Plötz. Frankfurt am Main: Fischer, 50–67.

Trömel-Plötz, Senta. 1984b. "Weiblicher Stil – männlicher Stil." In *Gewalt durch Sprache. Die Vergewaltigung von Frauen in Gesprächen*, ed. Senta Trömel-Plötz. Frankfurt am Main: Fischer, 354–394.

Trömel-Plötz, Senta. 1992. *Vatersprache – Mutterland. Beobachtungen zu Sprache und Politik*. München: Frauenoffensive.

UNESCO. 1999. *Guidelines on gender-neutral language*. (1st ed. *Guide to non-sexist language* 1987). Paris: Unesco.

Werner, Fritjof. 1983. *Gesprächsverhalten von Frauen und Männern*. Frankfurt am Main: Lang.

Wienold, Götz. 1967. *Genus und Semantik*. Meisenheim: Hain.

Wittemöller, Regina. 1988. *Weibliche Berufsbezeichnungen im gegenwärtigen Deutsch. Bundesrepublik Deutschland, Österreich und Schweiz im Vergleich.* Frankfurt am Main: Lang.

Wodak, Ruth. 1981. *Das Wort in der Gruppe: Linguistische Studien zur therapeutischen Komunikation.* Wien: Akademie der Wissenschaften.

Wodak, Ruth & Gert Feistritzer & Sylvia Moosmüller & Ursula Doleschal. 1987. *Sprachliche Gleichbehandlung von Frau und Mann.* Wien: Bundesministerium für Arbeit und Soziales.

Zifonun, Gisela & Ludger Hoffmann & Bruno Strecker. 1997. *Grammatik der deutschen Sprache.* 3 vols. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Zubin, David. 1986. "Natural classification in language: A study of the German gender system". *Buffalo Cognitive Science Report No. 2.* Buffalo: SUNY.

Zubin, David & Klaus-Michael Köpcke. 1984. "Affect classification in the German gender system." *Lingua* 63: 41–96.

Zubin, David & Klaus-Michael Köpcke. 1986. "Gender and folk taxonomy: The indexical relation between grammatical and lexical classification." In *Noun classes and categorization*, ed. Colette S. Craig. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 139–181.

Women, gender and Modern Greek

Theodossia-Soula Pavlidou
Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Greece

1.   Introduction

Greek (*τα ελληνικά* [ta elinika]) is an Indo-European language which, similarly to Albanian and Armenian, builds a branch of its own. The Greek language,[1] as documented by written records, has had a continuous life of more than 3,500 years, in which the following stages can be distinguished: Mycenean, Classical, Hellenistic, Medieval, and finally, the Modern stage, which began about 500 years

ago and extends up to the present time. Some of the changes that the Greek language underwent throughout the centuries – and these changes are relatively small as compared to those that other languages, e.g. English, have gone through in less time – include: loss of distinction between long and short vowels, development from tone to stress, decrease of the number of cases in the nominal system, decrease of the number of inflectional endings, loss of the infinitive in the verb system, tendency towards greater analyticity. Orthography has not been adjusted to the phonological changes that took place mainly in the last three centuries B.C. As a consequence, there is a great discrepancy between the written and the spoken form of words, as is the case with other languages. The main features of what is nowadays called Modern Greek developed long before the 15th century. Modern Greek is spoken today by some 13 million people, with 10 million living in Greece, about half a million in Cyprus, and the rest in the diaspora (mainly the USA, Australia, Central Europe and the former Soviet Union).

The long history of the Greek language has also been characterized by diglossic tendencies ever since Hellenistic times, in the sense that the written form of the language underwent pressure to stay as close as possible to classical Attic Greek, while the spoken variety – being difficult to tame in a similar manner – went its natural way. The rise of national consciousness in the late 18th century that led to the revolution (1821–1829) against a 400 year long Turkish occupation intensified the need for a national language. The newly founded Greek state (1830) chose as its language of administration and education the so-called *katharevousa* 'the purifying', i.e. a puristic variety which had been proposed before the revolution as a compromise between two poles: the "demoticists", that is the defendants of the people's spoken language (*dhimotiki*) and the "archaists", the proponents of the revival of Ancient Greek. In the decades to follow, *katharevousa* was put under further "purification" in haphazard ways. While *katharevousa* became more and more artificial, a demotic koiné (based on the Peloponnesian dialect) evolved among the people as the language of everyday use and gradually claimed growing strength in poetry and literary prose. By the end of the 19th century, when *dhimotiki* had consolidated its position in literature, demoticists not only strengthened their stance, but also took further challenging steps (e.g. translation of the New Testament in *dhimotiki*) and demanded that *dhimotiki* became the language of education. The so-called language question in Greece was in full flourish in the first two decades of the 20th century, effecting on the one hand restricted entrance of *dhimotiki* in primary education, but also consolidation of the status

of *katharevousa* as the official language of the Greek state, on the other.[2]

The symbolic power of the two varieties had long surpassed the boundaries of national identity to include political dimensions: "progressive" (socialist, communist, etc.) for *dhimotiki*, "conservative" for *katharevousa*. Although two major works in the codification of *dhimotiki* were accomplished between the two world wars, i.e. Tzartzanos' (1991) syntax (whose first edition appeared in 1928) and Triandafyllidis' (1978) grammar (first published in 1941), the political events after World War II, especially the military dictatorship (1967–1974), enhanced the official position of *katharevousa*. The formal termination of the Greek diglossia came in 1976, with a law that made the "Modern Greek (demotic)" the language of education and administration, and since that time the Greek linguistic community has been searching its way towards a standard variety. This variety, though demotic in structure, definitely bears features (mainly lexical) of the learned language, and is usually referred to as Standard Modern Greek. It is this variety that the following remarks on gender will mainly refer to.

2. Grammatical gender

In Greek, grammatical gender is an integral part of the language system, pertaining to all nouns, articles (definite and indefinite), pronouns,[3] participles, adjectives, and certain numerals. In the following, I will focus on nouns, since they are the determining element in matters of agreement.

2.1 Grammatical gender and inflection

Modern Greek nouns are divided into three classes of inflectional paradigms. In contrast to Ancient Greek, these classes (called first, second and third declension) correspond directly to "masculine", "feminine" or "neuter", for example (in the nominative singular):[4]

(1)	Masculine	Feminine	Neuter
	ο δρόμος	*η θάλασσα*	*το βουνό*
	o δromos	i θalasa	to vuno
	'the road'	'the sea'	'the mountain'

Generally, the gender of any Greek noun can be determined on morphological grounds alone. This does not mean, however, that morphology always yields

unambiguous results, since certain endings, e.g. -*os*, can appear in all three gender classes:

(2) Masculine   Feminine   Neuter
     ο δρόμος   *η άμμος*   *το δάσος*
     o δromos   i amos   to δasos
     'the road'   'the sand'   'the forest'

Ambiguities may also arise on the phonetic level, although the written forms – due to differences in the spelling of the endings – are unambiguous; e.g., the word-final vowels in the nouns of (3) are pronounced identically:

(3) Feminine   Neuter
     η πόλη   *το αγόρι*
     i poli   to aγori
     'the city'   'the boy'

As is clear from these examples, such ambiguities concerning grammatical gender can be resolved – at least in the singular – by other means, e.g. the articles (definite or indefinite).[5]

The differences between the masculine and feminine declension paradigms are more marked in the singular than in the plural, the greatest differentiation appearing between the nominative and genitive cases: In the most representative cases of the paradigm, feminine nominative (which has the same form as the accusative and vocative cases) is marked by a zero-ending, whereas feminine genitive has the ending -s; in masculine nouns, it is exactly the other way around.[6] Take, for example, the feminine nouns *γυναίκα* (jineka) 'woman', *πόλη* (poli) 'city' and the masculine nouns *άντρας* (andras) 'man', *δρόμος* (δromos) 'road':

(4)   Feminine   Masculine
     Nominative   jineka, poli   andras, δromos
     Genitive   jinekas, polis   andra, δromu

2.2 Personal nouns: Gender assignment

The relationship between grammatical gender and referential gender is largely determined by the feature of animacy. The neuter declension class usually comprises nouns denoting inanimate things, while the feminine and masculine classes are associated with animacy. But there are overlaps between the classes, in the sense that the masculine and feminine classes also include nouns denoting

inanimate things; on the other hand, there are also neuter nouns which denote animate beings:

(5)   Male   Female   Gender-indefinite
      το αγόρι (n)   *το κορίτσι* (n)   *το παιδί* (n)
      to aɣori   to koritsi   to peδi
      'the boy'   'the girl'   'the child'

However, all three classes contain nouns denoting abstract entities; in this sense, one can claim that there is no clear semantic motivation for gender assignment.

However, if we restrict our attention to animate beings only, we find that nouns denoting males are usually masculine, while those denoting females are feminine (cf. e.g. Triandafyllidis 1978 [1941]:215f). In other words, when nouns denote persons or animals, there seems to be a semantic motivation for gender assignment. The correspondence between grammatical and referential gender is not as powerful in the case of animals, since there are nouns of either gender that function as generics, referring to both male and female representatives of a species:

(6)   Masculine   Feminine   Neuter
      ο λύκος   *η αλεπού*   *το φίδι*
      o likos   i alepu   to fiδi
      'the wolf'   'the fox'   'the snake'

For some of these nouns there may be specific forms for males and females, respectively, which are used in a context where the gender of the animal is known, e.g.:

(7)   Masculine   Feminine
      ο λύκος   *η λύκαινα*
      o likos   i licena
      wolf (male)   wolf (female)

But when it comes to male and female human beings, the relation between grammatical and referential gender is even less arbitrary. As a matter of fact, while there are certain cases where females may be denoted with nouns of the masculine gender (cf. examples below of augmentatives for feminine nouns and female occupational terms), there are scarcely any instances of feminine nouns denoting male human beings.

In addition to grammatical gender, gender-specification can also be achieved in Greek through lexical marking; for example, the nouns in (5) above

are all grammatically neuter, but lexically, the first, *αγορ-* (aɣor-) 'boy', is specified as [male], the second, *κοριτσ-* (korits-) 'girl', as [female] and the third, *παιδ-* (peδ-) 'child', as gender-indefinite in most contexts (but see below, for some restricted uses of *παιδ-* with male reference only). Moreover, as in other languages, the gender of a person can be specified by adding to a noun which may be ambiguous or indefinite as to referential gender, the words *άντρας* (andras) 'man' or *γυναίκα* (jineka) 'woman':[7]

(8) *άντρας κοινωνικός λειτουργός*   *γυναίκα γιατρός*
     andras cinonikos lituryos   jineka   jatros
     'man social worker'   'woman doctor'

As one may expect, this type of compounding is particularly relevant in the case of occupational terms for women (cf. Section 4 below).

2.3 Agreement and coordination

Word classes like determiners, adjectives, pronouns (e.g., third person personal pronouns) and participles (as used in the passive voice) are gender-variable and syntactically agree with the related noun's gender class, cf. (9, 10):

(9) a. *η   ωραία   γυναίκα*
         the.FEM beautiful.FEM woman.FEM
         'the beautiful woman'
     b. *ο   ωραίος   άντρας*
         the.MASC beautiful.MASC man.MASC
         'the handsome man'

(10) *Η   ωραία   γυναίκα   της   οποίας*
      the.FEM beautiful.FEM woman.FEM the.FEM whose.FEM
      τον   άντρα   γνώρισες χθες   θα φύγει
      the.MASC man.MASC met (you) yesterday will leave
      αύριο.
      tomorrow
      'The beautiful woman whose husband you met yesterday will leave tomorrow.'

In (11), a verbal participle which syntactically functions as a predicative adjective, shows agreement with the head noun of the subject NP:

(11) *Αυτή   η   φοιτήτρια   είναι πολύ κουρασμένη.*
     this.ꜰᴇᴍ the.ꜰᴇᴍ student.ꜰᴇᴍ is   very tired.ᴘᴀʀᴛ.ꜰᴇᴍ.sɢ
     'This female student is very tired.'

In coordination of a feminine and a masculine noun, the conflict between the two competing genders in the noun phrase is – predictably – resolved in favor of the masculine participle, as in (12):

(12) *Αυτή   η   φοιτήτρια   και εκείνος   ο*
     this.ꜰᴇᴍ the.ꜰᴇᴍ student.ꜰᴇᴍ and that.ᴍᴀsᴄ the.ᴍᴀsᴄ
     φοιτητής   είναι πολύ κουρασμένοι.
     student.ᴍᴀsᴄ are   very tired.ᴘᴀʀᴛ.ᴍᴀsᴄ.ᴘʟ
     'This female student and that male student are very tired.'

2.4 Proper names

Generally, in all Greek first names grammatical gender corresponds to referential gender (except for those that are loans from other languages, e.g. *Alex, Stef*). Diminution can change the gender of a proper name (more generally, of a noun);[8] feminine personal names can become feminine, neuter, or even masculine in their diminutive form (DIM), cf. e.g. the feminine name *Soula*:[9]

(13) | Feminine | Feminine | Neuter | Masculine |
|---|---|---|---|
| *Σούλα* | *Σουλίτσα* | *Σουλάκι* | *Σουλάκος* |
| sula | sulitsa | sulaci | sulakos |
| Soula | Soula.ᴅɪᴍ | Soula.ᴅɪᴍ | Soula.ᴅɪᴍ |

In contrast, diminutive forms of masculine proper names are never neuter or feminine.

In rural areas, a woman could also be called by a name derived from her husband's first name:

(14) | Masculine | Feminine |
|---|---|
| *ο Γιώργος* | *η Γιώργαινα* |
| o jorγos | i jorjena |
| 'George' | 'George's wife' |

In other words, the feminine name is formed by ascribing a woman to her husband. Thus, the (feminine) morpheme *-αινα* (-ena) means 'wife of'. The same morpheme may be used to derive feminine nouns from masculine nouns denoting an occupation, e.g. *γιατρός* (jatros) 'physician', *γιάτραινα* (jatrena)

'the wife of a physician'. Such practices, though clearly in recess now, may still be employed by speakers of Standard Modern Greek for stylistic effects.

Turning to Greek family names, a woman's family name (e.g. *Pavlidou*) is always the genitive singular of a related man's name (e.g. *Pavlidis*).[10] In other words, a woman's official identification is always based, at least morphologically, on a man's identity. And until recently, a woman's name, if she was single, had to be the genitive of her father's name; it changed into the genitive of her husband's name the moment she got married. Legislative changes in Greece in the mid-1980s pertaining to women's equal rights, effected that women keep their own family name after marriage; for social purposes they may use their husband's name. However, there is no choice (for either women or men) regarding the family name as used for any document issued by the state, e.g., identity card or passport. Moreover, the couple decides at marriage what the family name of their children will be: her name, his name or a combination of the two. In practice, however, the vast majority of the children continue to get their father's name only, and the whole family is identified via the man's name.[11]

Both first names and family names can be used as terms of address,[12] with or without one of the following titles *δεσποινίς* (δespinis) 'Miss', *κυρία* (ciria) 'Mrs', *κύριε* (cirie) 'Mr', indicating differing degrees of formality:[13]

(15)   Least formal   More formal[14]   Most formal
        Soula   *Mrs Soula*   *Mrs Pavlidou*

Although the use of *κυρία* (ciria) 'Mrs', either in addressing or referring to a woman regardless of her marital status, has been extended in recent years, the use of *δεσποινίς* (δespinis) 'Miss' is by no means seriously restricted.

3.   Gender asymmetries

3.1 Generic use of the masculine gender

According to two pioneers in the study (and codification) of Modern Greek, Tzartzanos (1991 [1946]:47, 50, 68) and Triandafyllidis (1978 [1941]:216), the masculine gender is "the strongest" in Modern Greek. This implies, for one, the generic use of the masculine gender in nouns, adjectives, participles etc., which is well known also from other languages. For example:

(16) *Ο   φοιτητής   έχει το δικαὶωμα να* […]
      o   fititis   eçi to ðiceoma na […]
      the student.MASC has the right   to […]
      'Students have the right to […]'

(17) *οι   Έλληνες   της Κύπρου*
      i   elines   tis cipru
      the Greeks.MASC of Cyprus
      'the Greeks of Cyprus'

(18) *ο   λαβών* [PART]
      o   lavon
      the receiver.MASC (followed by the person's signature, as e.g. in receipts)
      'the undersigned'

(19) *ο   βεβαιών* [PART]
      o   veveon
      the confirming/certifying.MASC (followed by the person's signature)[15]
      'the undersigned'

For another, the prevalence of the masculine gender also implies that this gender is dominant in agreement, e.g. in coordination of a masculine and a feminine noun:

(20) *Ο γιος και η κόρη της είναι πολύ ανήσυχοι.*
      o jos ce i kori tis ine poli anisiçi.MASC
      'Her son and her daughter are very worried.'

(21) *Είδα γυναίκες και άντρες αγκαλιασμένους.*
      iða jineces ce andres aŋgaλazmenus.MASC.
      'I saw women and men who were embraced.'

Finally, in all Greek grammars it is taken for granted that it is the feminine personal nouns that are derived from existing masculine equivalents by means of derivational suffixes like -tria, -a, -iða, as in (22):

(22) Masculine   Feminine
      φοιτητής (fititis) 'student (m)'   *φοιτήτρια* (fititria) 'student (f)'
      δάσκαλος (ðaskalos) 'teacher (m)'   *δασκάλα* (ðaskala) 'teacher (f)'
      Γάλλος (γalos) 'Frenchman'   *Γαλλίδα* (γaliða) 'Frenchwoman'

3.2 Lexical and pragmatic asymmetries

In this section, the focus is on the most prominent gendered pair of nouns,

άντρας (andras) 'man' – *γυναίκα* (jineka) 'woman'. Even when these nouns undergo the same morphological processes, the semantic/pragmatic results are not identical.

Both words form augmentatives[16] which apply to body size and strength, usually with a positive connotation: *άντρακλας* (andraklas) 'big man', *γυναικάρα* (jinekara) 'big woman'; but the feminine augmentative is more likely to carry the connotation of a sexually appealing person. Diminution, on the other hand, cancels the semantic symmetries between 'man' and 'woman'; while *γυναικάκι* (jinekaci) 'little woman' is clearly pejorative, *αντράκι* (andraci) 'small man' can also have a positive meaning, so that one can say, admiringly, to a friend:

(23)   *Ο γιος σου έγινε ολόκληρο αντράκι!*
        o jos su ejine olokliro andraci
        'Your son has become a real little man!'

The equivalent phrase for a friend's daughter would be an insult, since *γυναικάκι* (jinekaci) means 'little woman' mainly in a metaphorical sense, i.e. it has the connotation of 'unimportant, unworthy woman'. There is another pair of diminutives derived from the pair 'man' – 'woman', which can be used affectively when applied to one's husband or wife: *αντρούλης* (andrulis) – *γυναικούλα* (jinekula); but again, the feminine term may also imply connotations of naivety and simplicity. This is why it is possible to talk of the *γυναικούλες του λαού* (jinekules tu lau) 'simple women of the folk', but not of the *αντρούληδες του λαού* (andruliδes tu lau) 'simple men of the folk'. In other words, although theoretically it is possible to derive the masculine diminutive, the result would be semantically anomalous in certain contexts.

The Greek nouns meaning 'man' and 'woman' are not exactly equal, even in their most symmetrical appearance: *andras* has connotations of braveness, truthfulness, integrity, and significance,[17] whereas *jineka* implies cowardliness, insincerity, slyness, triviality. Hence, calling a man *jineka* is an insult, but it is impossible to offend a woman by calling her *andra*, unless one wants to imply that she is a lesbian. Accordingly, derivatives from the two lexemes have opposing meanings; as, e.g., the adjectives *αντρίκιος* (andricos) and *γυναικείος* (jinecios) in the phrases *αντρίκια λόγια* (andrica loja) 'a man's words', *γυναικείες κουβέντες* (jinecies kuvendes) 'a woman's talk': Men's words have to be seriously considered, while women's talk can be neglected or discarded. Moreover, the meaning of the word *jineka* has been extended in the last two decades or so to cover also the meaning 'cleaning lady', or as it appears in a recently published dictionary (Kriaras 1995) 'a person who serves the others'.

In addition, contemporary dictionaries of Modern Greek include numerous compounds containing female-specific lexical morphemes (as the second constituent) with pejorative adjectives like *παλιο-* (palo-) 'old' and *βρομο-* (vromo) 'dirty', e.g. *παλιοθήλυκο* (paloθiliko) 'nasty female', *βρομοκόριτσο* (vromokoritso) 'dirty girl', *παλιογύναικο* (palojineko) 'nasty broad'. But there are no male-specific equivalents; the only compound words with such pejorative adjectives as *παλιο-* (palo-) and *βρομο-* (vromo) that may be used for males, have an additional semantic specification: (a) a second constituent meaning 'of old age', as in *παλιόγερος* (palojeros) 'nasty old man', *βρομόγερος* (vromojeros) 'dirty old man' which of course have their feminine counterparts *παλιόγρια* (palogria) 'nasty old woman', *βρομόγρια* (vromogria) 'dirty old woman', or (b) a gender-unspecified second element like *παιδι* (peδi) 'child', *μούτρο* (mutro) 'rascal': *παλιόπαιδο* (paloρeδo) 'naughty child', *παλιόμουτρο* (palomutro) 'naughty rascal', *βρομόπαιδο* (vromopeδo) 'nasty (lit. 'dirty') child'.

This differentiation is partly the reason why the entries for 'man' and 'woman' are of different length in the Thesaurus of the Modern Greek language (Vostantzoglou 1962): The entry for 'woman' is twice as long as that for 'man' (see also Pavlidou 1987). And this is the case despite a number of lexical gaps, the most prominent of which refers to the process of maturation: the verb *αντρώνομαι* (andronome) 'to become a man, to become mature' deriving directly from the word *andras* applies only to young boys who become adult. There is no equivalent for women, since the closest (morphological) counterparts of *αντρώνομαι* would be *εκθηλύνομαι* (ekθilinome) or *απογυναικώνομαι* (apojinekonome), derived from *θηλ-* 'female' and *γυναίκ-* 'woman'; but these again can only be used of a man, meaning, pejoratively of course, that he has become effeminate.

Finally, I would like to mention another asymmetry not directly connected with the pair 'man' – 'woman', but with the related pair applying to male and female human beings of young age: *αγόρι* (aγori) 'boy' and *κορίτσι* (koritsi) 'girl'.[18] Along with these nouns, which have lexical gender, there is a gender-indefinite noun, which can be used generically for both boys and girls: *παιδί* (peδi) 'child'.[19] However, in certain contexts and varieties, *παιδί* (peδi) refers only to males, as in the following example (cf. Lexiko 1998):

(24) *Έχει δύο παιδιά κι ένα κορίτσι.*
       eçi δio peδja c ena koritsi.
       '[S/he] has two sons (children) and a girl.'

In other words, the gender-indefinite form has in this context become male-specific,[20] thus granting implicitly a more general status to the latter than to the female-specific term.

4.   Feminine occupational terms

4.1 The problem

The problem with feminine occupational terms in Modern Greek does not only consist in making female work visible linguistically; it also poses a test case for the independence of the standard language from the diglossic past in Greece. When Greek women started to work in fields traditionally occupied by men, the need for designating the new female activities was covered with forms supplied by the (then) official language, *katharevousa*. Some of these terms, e.g. *υπάλληλος* (ipalilos) 'clerk', *φιλόλογος* (filoloγos) 'philologist', *αρχαιολόγος* (arçeoloγos) 'archeologist' were "two-gendered" – this was the characterization used in Greek school grammars of the time (e.g., in Tzartzanos (1972) which provides this description) – in the sense that the same noun (with its inflectional paradigm) could be used to denote both males and females. Others, however, were genuinely masculine forms, e.g. *γραμματεύς* (γramatefs) 'secretary', *ταμίας* (tamias) 'cashier', *γυμνασιάρχης* (jimnasiarçis) 'highschool director'. However, since a noun, in referring expressions, is always preceded by an article, numeral, etc. (cf. Section 2.1), there was normally no ambiguity involved as to the gender (grammatical and referential) of the whole noun phrase, at least not in the singular.

As early as 1953, one year after the first woman was elected to the Greek parliament,[21] Triandafyllidis, whose name is inseparably associated with the first official grammar of demotic Greek (cf. Triandafyllidis 1978 [1941]), brought up the issue of feminine occupational titles and argued for the employment of demotic feminine forms. He emphasized that, in contrast to languages like French or English, the Greek language "requires distinct forms, particularly in the singular, for feminine occupational terms" (Triandafyllidis 1963 [1953]: 327). He also stressed that, although in Ancient Greek the two genders, feminine and masculine, were not necessarily distinguished through different terminations, the history of the Greek language testifies to a continuous effort to keep feminine and masculine forms apart. For example, the word *o/η θεός* (o/i θeos) 'god, goddess' was originally "two gendered", but very early developed two distinct forms with either male or female denotation: *o θεός* (m) and *η θεά* (f);[22] on the

other hand, the originally "two-gendered" noun *o/η άνθρωπος* (o/i anθropos) 'human being', lost the feminine and retained only the masculine form.

The devoted demoticist could not but propose that occupational titles for women be formed by means of the two genuinely demotic derivational suffixes *-ina* and *-isa*. In other words, instead of saying *η βουλευτής* (i vuleftis) 'member of parliament', which would be unnatural in demotic Greek, since the ending is masculine and it is only by means of the article that the female reference becomes clear, he argued for *η βουλευτίνα* (i vuleftina), to the exclusion of alternative forms that had been suggested by others. Of course Triandafyllidis (1963[1953]: 333), being a keen observer of language use, did not fail to remark that there was a prestige differential between the two forms; he hurried, however, to assure users, that "if we are a bit willing and get used to it in print" the form *βουλευτίνα* would no longer be disturbing.

4.2 The current situation

Given the early insights of Triandafyllidis, one would expect that the question of occupational titles for women was long settled in Greece. After all, the number of women working outside their domestic environment has also been growing since then. However, the hegemony of *katharevousa* in public life until the mid-seventies (enhanced by the linguistic practices of the military junta), actually left no room for experimentation with Triandafyllidis' proposals. In the decade that followed, during the process of consolidating the presence of more demotic varieties in formal domains of communication, several philologists brought up the subject of feminine occupational titles (e.g. Kriaras 1987, Lypourlis 1990, but also Tsopanakis 1977); their line of argumentation has consistently been, how to make female occupational terms compatible with the system of demotic Greek.

In this same decade (1975–1985) the neo-feminist movement emerged in Greece, and although it never evolved into a mass movement, it did have its greatest impact during that time. Questions of the presence and visibility of women in public life also became salient, in some cases even with respect to occupational terms. In a certain sense, the feminist interest in changing the occupational terms towards more visibility of women in different occupations coincided with the aims of the philologists mentioned above: In contrast to *katharevousa* the demotic language system guarantees the distinction of the feminine gender from the masculine in all cases. Nevertheless, the demotic forms, although their use is somewhat more extensive today in certain instances, have not replaced the learned or *katharevousa* forms in all cases.

4.3 Two exploratory studies

The first attempt to investigate this issue from a sociolinguistic perspective was undertaken in Pavlidou (1985a). In an exploratory study, a questionnaire concerning the use of occupational terms (and the use of generic masculines) was developed and distributed to 86 persons. The majority of these came from a high school in Thessaloniki (two full classes with a total of 60 students), 10 linguistics students, 16 women from autonomous feminist groups. On the whole, this study confirmed the extensive prevalence of the *katharevousa* forms in the use of feminine occupational terms, but it also showed some important differentiations in their use, which may account for the development up to now:

a. The choice of an explicit feminine termination, i.e. the demotic one, depends on the type of the original, learned termination (which, as mentioned above, can be both masculine and feminine). The termination -*os*, which in Ancient Greek and in *katharevousa* counted as "two-gendered", is much more rarely replaced by a demotic form; in contrast, for masculine terminations that were never "two-gendered", like -*ης*, -*ας*, there was a greater tendency to replace them with something else.[23]
b. The younger boys in the sample and the women belonging to a feminist group showed a slightly stronger tendency to use demotic terminations.
c. The choice of an explicit feminine termination is not favored in more formal contexts, i.e. titles or statement of occupation.

These results suggested that the question of feminine occupational terms was more complex than generally assumed. Subsequent attempts to study the use of these terms by means of naturally occurring data (e.g. within the classroom, or in group discussions with adolescents) have not been carried out systematically due to technical reasons. However, basically the same questionnaire was distributed by this author's students, as part of their semester work in a sociolinguistics class in 1989, to high school students (total number 404) in various parts of Central and Northern Greece. Results suggested that, on the whole, there was a slight rise in the preference for *katharevousa* terminations, i.e. for those that are "two-gendered". The preference for *katharevousa* terminations was stronger in the big urban center of Thessaloniki than in smaller cities. On the whole, no differentiation between boys and girls was observed. This second study also confirmed that the type of the original, learned termination influenced the choice of an explicit feminine termination, i.e. -*os* is much more rarely replaced by a demotic form as compared to the terminations -*ης*, -*ας*.

The above results indicate that contemporary users of Modern Greek, at least as far as the feminine occupational terms are concerned, are more reluctant to adopt the pure demotic forms than Triandafyllidis had assumed. It also shows, indirectly, that Standard Modern Greek has moved some steps away from the demotic, as envisaged by Triandafyllidis and others, and closer to learned varieties in certain respects. In the case of feminine occupational terms, this development might have been different, if the presence of the women's movement had been stronger in Greece in the last decade and collective demands for female visibility in language and society had been articulated.

5.   Language and gender in Greece: The public debate and tendencies of change

5.1   Language critique

The point made in the previous section foreshadows that there is not a lot to be said on feminist language critique in Greece. Although language critique – pertaining to the diglossic situation and, after 1976, to matters of adequacy, standardization and teaching of the demotic variety – has always been very lively and a matter of public interest in Greece (cf. Pavlidou 1991a), linguistic sexism has hardly been an issue at all. This is not to say that there have not been any voices criticizing linguistic practices that support the maintenance of sexism in Greek society. For example, the use of δεσποινίς (δespinis) 'Miss' or of generic masculines has been criticized by some women (journalists, linguists and others, e.g., Tsokalidou 1996) over the last two decades. But such voices have been rather isolated, effecting only restricted changes.

There are several reasons for this, one of them being that the Greek society has been much too preoccupied with issues arising from the new (officially non-diglossic) situation to recognize any other linguistic issue as important. But the main reason lies in the deep-rooted androcentrism and the absence of any major women's movement. This can be exemplified with two cases from the academic area, more specifically from Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, with more than 60,000 students the largest university of Greece. At this university, there has existed since 1983 the Women's Studies Group consisting mainly of faculty members; as a matter of fact, this has been the only collective attempt at a Greek University to work on gender issues. But there have been scarcely any women's groups among the students. One of the few, which also managed to

survive for almost three years, was in the Faculty of Philosophy. In 1982 this group (I was the only non-student member) sent out letters to Ministries, organizations, etc., suggesting that generic masculines be dropped and that the feminine gender be used along with the masculine, that *δεσποινίς* (δespinis) 'Miss' be replaced with *κυρία* (ciria) 'Mrs' in all contexts, etc. We never received any response, nor was there any pressure from other women in that direction. The second example shows this even more lucidly: During 1991–1993, while chairing the School of Philology, I replaced the generic masculine with forms of splitting in the students' guide. The feminine gender disappeared as soon as my successor (male as has always been the case, with my exception) took over. No protest, either from students or from colleagues was to be heard.

There is yet a third reason for the fact that no extensive changes in language have been undertaken from a feminist point of view: Grammatical gender is a much more deeply rooted category in the Greek language system than in any of the languages (e.g. English, German, French) for which guidelines have been formulated. For example, in German, another inflecting language quite similar to Greek as far as gender is concerned, it is possible to avoid gender-marking by using plural forms of nominalizations derived from participial forms: *die Studierenden* 'the students' (cf. Bußmann & Hellinger, this vol., Section 3.1).

In Greek, however, such a solution is impossible, since the plural would also be gender-differentiated, for example:

(25) a. *o   διδάσκων*   → *οι   διδάσκοντες*
          o   δiδaskon   i   δiδaskondes
          the person.teaching.MASC → the persons.teaching.MASC
      b. *η   διδάσκουσα*   → *οι   διδάσκουσες*
          i   δiδaskusa   i   δiδaskuses
          the person.teaching.FEM   → the persons.teaching.FEM

In this context, it is to be expected that the recently published guidelines (Tsokalidou 1996), which provide a summary of the debate in Greece over the last two decades, will not effect any radical changes.

5.2 Tendencies of language change

As already suggested, even though restricted or superficial, there have been some tendencies of change towards elimination of sexism in the Greek language (cf. also Makri-Tsilipakou 1996). For example, the use of *κυρία* (ciria) 'Mrs' for unmarried women is more frequent now, especially with rising formality and age,

although there is still a long way to go until it fully replaces δεσποινίς (δespinis) 'Miss'. Nor has the dominance of generic masculine pronouns remained unquestioned: The feminine gender also appears, e.g. in some official printed forms. Also, more people now, presumably due to acquaintance with feminists and/or the Anglo Saxon usage of pronominal splitting (*he or she*, *s/he*), have begun to use more gender-fair alternatives. But this is definitely a very small percentage of the Greek-speaking population.[24] There are also some other signs of change in the vocabulary; some people (again a very small percentage) try to avoid male-biased words like επανδρώνω (epanδrono) 'to staff', whose stem *-anδr-* 'man' makes it hard for women to imagine themselves in the respective position. Instead, the word στελεχώνω (stelexono) is preferred, whose stem *stelex-* literally means 'trunk' and thus carries no connotations of gender.

Moreover, certain new words, echoing women's struggle towards equality and the breaking of some taboos, have entered the Greek vocabulary. This is partly reflected in the dictionaries as well; for example, the most recently published dictionary of the Greek language (Lexiko 1998) contains entries like σεξισμός (seksizmos) 'sexism', *(σεξουαλική) παρενόχληση* (seksualici perenoxlisi) 'harassment', but also τεκνατζού (teknadzu) 'a woman who pursues sexual relationships with men younger than her'. Although the latter word is mostly derogatory, it nevertheless captures the possibility that a woman actively seeks for a sexual partner, who additionally is younger than her, thus breaking two taboos.

However, one should not rush to interpret these changes as unambiguously reflecting positive changes in the Greek society. For one, along with the words mentioned above, other words, quite pejorative for women, have entered the vocabulary of Modern Greek and now appear in dictionaries (e.g. Lexiko 1998). For example: *Κατίνα* (katina), a female proper name, now implying a woman of little education who gossips a lot, κότα (kota), literally meaning 'hen', now also implying a silly woman, a woman with no will power or prone to gossip,[25] γκόμενα (gomena) 'mistress, lover', but now also referring to an attractive woman or indicating any sexually attractive woman. It is interesting to note that, whereas words like σεξισμός (seksizmos) 'sexism' or παρενόχληση (parenoxlisi) 'harassment', would be thought to belong to more learned or formal varieties, the pejorative words would be used only in informal settings or by lower class speakers.

The second reservation as regards a too optimistic attitude towards ongoing changes has to do with the fact that "positive" words can undergo pretty fast semantic changes in unintended directions (e.g. in English, the use of the supposedly generic term *chairperson* to mean 'a female person who chairs',

while retaining *chairman*). For example, the word *φεμινισμός* (feminizmos) 'feminism' and its derivatives have entered everyday usage mainly in the 1980s (in the dictionaries of Modern Greek it can be found at least as early as 1933 applying to the suffragette movement). It appears that there are tendencies of change pulling in different directions concerning the use of the term 'feminist': Many women (who actually seemed to have nothing in common with the women's movement) have not hesitated to declare: *Είμαι φεμινίστρια* 'I am a feminist (f)', but at the same time, many prominent women who, although they seemed to practice emancipation in their own lives, declared in public: *Εγώ δεν είμαι φεμινίστρια* 'Me, I am not a feminist (f)'. In addition, there are some men who coquettishly claim *Είμαι φεμινιστής εγώ* 'I am a feminist (m) myself'!

The situation is keenly reflected in Matesis' (1998) novel "Always well", where several of the heroines – all the main characters are female –, but also some male characters, use words like 'feminist' or 'feminism'. Although 'feminism' is understood as having somehow to do with women's liberation, even in the heroines' and heroes' worlds, the word seems to be applicable to anything progressive or anybody, male or female, "having guts". For example, one heroine (who is described as being the most feminist-minded in the group), says angrily to the man she is flirting with: "Don't you have any feminism in you? Nor romanticism? … Are you actually a man or a sheep?" (Matesis 1998:275). Thus the characters of the novel use the word 'feminism' even in senses that are totally contradictory to feminist positions. For example, another heroine talking to women friends at the hairdresser's, and trying to defend her relationship to a certain man: "Kids! (she corrected herself) Women! (she corrected herself) Girls! *We should keep things apart! Feminism is one thing and fucking another!*" [emphasis T-SP] (Matesis 1998:194).

A certain exaggeration aside, the way Matesis' characters use the word 'feminism' is quite indicative of the relationship between language and society in matters of gender in Greece. Due to historical developments (the military dictatorship) and to the social make-up of the Greek society as profoundly androcentric, the neo-feminist repercussions reached this part of the world late (as compared to the USA, the UK or Germany) and stayed all too short, before they got rapidly customized to the needs of the Greek society: no substantial changes as to the relation of women and men. Consequently, no drastic changes towards the elimination of linguistic sexism have taken place.

5.3 The contribution of linguistics

Linguistic work on the Greek language from a feminist perspective only started to be produced in the 1980s (cf., e.g., Makri-Tsilipakou 1984, 1989; Pavlidou 1984, 1985a,b, 1987; Tsokalidou 1989). This is partly due to reasons discussed above, but also to the fact that an approach to language, as expressed by the principles and methods of contemporary sociolinguistics, was a new endeavor within Greek linguistics. Although the 1990s have seen a number of linguistic studies on language and gender, their percentage in the total linguistic work produced on Greek still remains very small; moreover, this work does not necessarily share feminist goals.[26]

Results do not always align with the conclusions drawn from other studies in different speech communities around the world. For example, in Makri-Tsilipakou's (1994) study on simultaneous speech (overlaps, shallow and deep interruptions) in conversations among friends and relatives, men do not emerge as intruders in comparison to women, from a quantitative point of view. However, it is the women who use simultaneity in a supportive (affiliative) manner, whereas men are more dissent- or disagreement-prone. This cooperative behavior is also observed in another setting, i.e. in the classroom. Archakis (1992) found that girls interrupt the teacher less often than boys, but also that most of the girls' interruptions are cooperative, whereas most of the boys' intrusions are of the dominant kind.[27]

My analysis of the same recordings of high school classes as in Archakis (1992) yielded that girls participate to a lesser extent in dialogues with the teacher, but also that they develop less verbal initiative in class than boys (cf. Pavlidou 1999). Seen from the politeness perspective, girls were found to have a smaller share of face-threatening turns of the class to the teacher; however, if viewed proportionally, i.e. within their own amount of initiative turns, girls and boys do not differ at all with respect to face-threats to the teacher. Taking into account some other factors as well, e.g. that girls attempt the most severe assaults to the teacher's face, girls by no means appear as unequivocally more polite than boys, as has been claimed elsewhere (cf., e.g., Holmes 1995:199).

6. Conclusion

During the last quarter of the 20th century, in the liberal spirit after the fall of the military junta, Greek society has been experiencing a number of changes

which have had an impact on language. The official end to diglossia has given rise to endless public debates on language issues. The neo-feminist movement brought issues of women's liberation and equality into society's awareness and helped effect a number of legislative changes regarding the relationships between women and men. Although there are some signs of change towards less gender bias in the Greek language, such changes do not necessarily indicate that a re-construction of gender roles is under way. For example, changes in the vocabulary have not (yet?) affected other kinds of semantic or pragmatic asymmetries and, although there have been some attempts to counterbalance the omnipotence of the masculine forms, Greek equivalents of generic *he* have only suffered rather minor losses up to now. Finally, the few empirical studies on the linguistic behavior of women and men in Greece do show some differentiation between female and male speakers, which however cannot be unambiguously related to changes in female and male roles.

Still, there seem to be small scale changes under way in the discursive practices of the younger generation, which allow for some optimism. As has been observed also by colleagues and friends, children and adolescents, if exposed to relevant stimuli in their environment, tend to practice and expect non-sexist language in a very relaxed and natural way. Such signs of change are difficult to assess quantitatively at the moment, but in the long run, they may bring forth more significant qualitative changes in gendered language practices than any prescriptive measures that have been applied in other countries.

Notes

1. For more information on the Greek language, readers may consult, e.g., Mirambel (1959), Browning (1969), Palmer (1980), Mackridge (1985), Joseph & Philippaki-Warburton (1987).

2. As is well known, the Greek situation has served as a defining case for what has been termed "diglossia" by Ferguson (1959), i.e. the co-existence of two varieties of a language with strict functional differentiation (but also different in the mode of acquisition). In the case of Greek, *katharevousa* is the high variety, and *dhimotiki* the low variety. The terms "high" and "low" refer to a social stratification, since everybody acquires the low variety, but only the privileged can learn the high variety through formal education, and to the prestige attached to each variety by all members of the linguistic community.

3. Not every pronoun is marked for gender, for example the personal pronoun has gender-specific forms only in the third person.

4. Greek examples are given in the Greek script, followed by an IPA-based transcription.

5. Other means include certain numerals and adjectival pronouns (interrogative and indefinite).

6. In the case of the masculine, however, the nominative case differs in form from the accusative and the vocative and, for reasons that are not of interest here, it would be preferable to say that the genitive gets no -s rather than claiming that this absence is equivalent to a zero-ending.

7. In a similar manner, the gender of an animal can be specified by adding to a gender-indefinite noun the attributes *θηλυκή* (θilici) 'female' or *αρσενικό* (arseniko) 'male', as in *θηλυκή κουκουβάγια* (θilici kukuvaja) 'female owl'.

8. Diminutives of personal names are widely used among friends or relatives in Greece to express endearment, but also in order to show familiarity among interlocutors without a very close relationship.

9. This name itself is the result of a diminution process plus truncation: *Θεοδοσία* (θeoδosia) → DIM: *Θεοδοσούλα* (θeoδosula) → TRUNCATION: *Σούλα* (sula).

10. This is not always the case when a Greek female name is translated or transcribed into a foreign language; in such cases, a woman's family name is frequently given in exactly the same form as the man's, e.g. *Pavlidis (Kostas)*, but also *Pavlidis (Maria)*. Presumably this goes back to bureaucratic practices, e.g. issuing of passports (it used to be the case that the "head" of the family received a passport for the whole family on his name). The rationale behind this must have been something like the following: Since other languages, unlike Greek, are not inflecting, they would not reflect the "belonging" of a wife to a husband, in other words they would appear with different family names, although they belonged to the same family. Unfortunately, such a practice has survived even today, and sometimes even among single academic women. So we find publications in foreign languages by Greek women under the names of *Papadopoulos*, *Stavridis*, *Mardas* etc., although no Greek or Greek-speaking person would normally assume a female author behind such a name, until they see the first name accompanying these family names. A possible counter-argument, which however has never been articulated to me (when I ask Greek women why they continue this practice), would be: Why keep the genitive, since this genitive is indicative of "possession", thus expressing that the woman belongs to a man? While I think there is a point in this, I consider it to be the lesser evil, if we take into account (a) the lack of any totally different alternative in the naming practice in Greece, (b) that the nominative, e.g. *Pavlidis*, blatantly turns a female into a male!

11. Living in a family where both partners have kept their names and our daughter has a double name, we have been experiencing a number of awkward, if not unpleasant, situations. For example, it took me five years to get my name appear in my daughter's school certificate, along with her father's name, at one of the most liberal Greek high schools. However, until her graduation school correspondence was still addressed to her father alone, notably under my name, i.e. as Mr Pavlidis, which by wrong inference was assumed to be the family name.

12. On address terms in Greek, cf. Makri-Tsilipakou (1984) and Petrits (1989).

13. Family names are normally used only in connection with *δεσποινίς* 'Miss', *κυρία* 'Mrs', *κύριε* 'Mr'; but in certain situations, as e.g. when teachers address their students, family names are used on their own.

14. This type of address is, at the same time, indicative of the speaker's lower social class.

15. Under such a phrase I was once expected to sign a form issued by Olympic Airways before getting onto a plane: With this form, the airline asked all pregnant women who were in the last phase of their pregnancy to declare in which month they were. I roared with laughter while correcting the masculine participle into the feminine form, but the airline representatives showed no understanding, neither for my humor nor for my point.

16. Augmentatives are always of either masculine or feminine gender.

17. A very recent example comes from a newspaper article, written by a young and quite liberal university professor, on the attitude of the Greek people to the dramatic events of Öcalan's kidnapping: "I am going as far as to state that Greece today is not so much in need of the technocrats in politics as of 'political men' (whatever this implies with respect to reliability, honor, decisiveness, self-sacrifice)" (*Ta Nea*, 23 February 1999).

18. These terms show another interesting asymmetry: While the feminine form can be used as an address term for girls and/or women, as in 'Hey, girls', the corresponding 'Hey, boys' would not be an acceptable address form especially for adult men.

19. The grammatical gender of all three nouns is neuter.

20. According to Christos Tzitzilis (p.c.), this is to be found also in other Balkan languages.

21. 1952 was the year when Greek women finally came to the unrestricted rights for electing and being elected.

22. Triandafyllidis (1963 [1953]:328) mentions that "even in Homer, we find alongside with the traditional *η θεός* the Aeolean neologisms *η θεά* and *η θέαινα*".

23. Other linguistic factors, like the kind of lexical morpheme with which the termination appears, as well as the case and number in which the noun appears, also seem to be involved.

24. However, it is noteworthy that the examination of all daily newspapers of one day in the fall of 1998, yielded scarcely any pseudo-uses of the generic masculine; i.e., in almost all instances where the masculine was used, there were no contextual cues that implicitly restricted its use to male-specific reference.

25. No such meaning is attested in dictionaries published earlier than thirty years ago for this word; but even then, the word *κότα* (kota) had the metaphorical meaning of 'a woman who (sexually) yields easily' (cf. Pavlidou 1991b, 1999, 2001).

26. A number of these recent studies are doctoral or MA theses, e.g., Makri-Tsilipakou (1991), Archakis (1992), Topsakal (1995), Zymvrakaki (1998); cf. also Altani (1992), Papazachariou (1998). In addition, several articles have been published in Greece or abroad, cf. e.g. Kakava (1995), Makri-Tsilipakou (1994, 1996), Pavlidou (1999, 2001). In contrast to earlier work, most of the more recent studies focus on female practices in the use of Modern Greek employing a variety of methods.

27. The specification of the terms "cooperative" and "dominant" interruption is based on Tannen (1990:ch. 7).

References

Altani, Cleopatra. 1992. *Gender construction in classroom interaction: Primary schools in Greece.* Ph.D. dissertation, University of Lancaster, England.

Archakis, Argyris. 1992. *Το φαινόμενο της διακοπής στα σχολικά συνομιλιακά πλαίσα και η κατά φύλα διαφοροποίησή του* [Interruption in school context and its differentiation according to sex]. MA thesis, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Greece.

Browning, Robert. 1969. *Medieval and Modern Greek.* London: Hutchinson.

Ferguson, Charles A. 1959. "Diglossia". *Word* 15: 325–340.

Holmes, Janet. 1995. *Women, men and politeness.* London: Longman.

Joseph, Brian & Irene Philippaki-Warburton. 1987. *Modern Greek.* London: Croom Helm.

Kakava, Christina. 1995. "'Do you want to get engaged, baby?' The cultural construction of gender through talk". In *Cultural performances. Proceedings of the Third Berkeley Women and Language Conference, April 8–10, 1994.* Berkeley, CA: Berkeley Women and Language Group, 344–354.

Kriaras, Emmanuel. 1987. *Τα πεντάλεπτά μου και άλλα γλωσσικά* [My five-minutes-broadcasts and other remarks on language]. Thessaloniki: Malliaris.

Kriaras, Emmanuel. 1995. *Νέο ελληνικό λεξικό της σύγχρονης δημοτικής γλώσσας* [New Greek dictionary of contemporary demotic language]. Athens: Ekdotiki Athinon.

Lexiko. 1998. *Λεξικό της κοινής νεοελληνικής* [Dictionary of Standard Modern Greek]. Thessaloniki: Institute of Modern Greek Studies.

Lypourlis, Dimitrios. 1990. *Γλωσσικές παρατηρήσεις: Από την καθαρεύουσα στη δημοτική* [Remarks on language: From katharevousa to demotic]. Thessaloniki: Paratiritis.

Mackridge, Peter. 1985. *The Modern Greek language.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Makri-Tsilipakou, Marianthi. 1984. "Απόπειρα περιγραφής της νεοελληνικής προσφώνησης" [An attempt to describe the forms of address in Modern Greek]. *Studies in Greek Linguistics. Proceedings of the 4th Annual Meeting of the Department of Linguistics, Faculty of Philosophy, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, 16–18 May 1983,* Thessaloniki: Kyriakidis, 219–239.

Makri-Tsilipakou, Marianthi. 1989. "The gender of *άνθρωπος*: An exercise in false generics". *Proceedings of the 3rd Symposium on the Description and/or Comparison of English and Greek. Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, School of English, Department of Theoretical and Applied Linguistics.* Thessaloniki: University Studio Press, 61–83.

Makri-Tsilipakou, Marianthi. 1991. *Agreement/disagreement: Affiliative vs. disaffiliative display in cross-sex conversations.* Ph.D. dissertation, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Greece.

Makri-Tsilipakou, Marianthi. 1994. "Interruption revisited: Affiliative vs. disaffiliative intervention." *Journal of Pragmatics* 21: 401–426.

Makri-Tsilipakou, Marianthi. 1996. "Τι άλλαξε λοιπόν?" [So, what has changed?]. *Studies in Greek Linguistics. Proceedings of the 16th Annual Meeting of the Department of Linguistics, Faculty of Philosophy, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, 4–6 May 1995.* Thessaloniki. 435–446.

Matesis, Pavlos. 1998. *Πάντα καλά* [Always well.] Athens: Kastaniotis.

Mirambel, André. 1959. *La langue grecque moderne. Description et analyse.* Paris: Klincksieck.

Palmer, Leonard. 1980. *The Greek language.* London: Faber and Faber.

Papazachariou, Dimitris. 1998. *The social construction of identity: The sociolinguistic role of intonation among adolescents in Northern Greece.* Ph.D. dissertation. University of Essex, England.

Pavlidou, Theodossia. 1984. "Γλώσσα – γλωσσολογία – σεξισμός" [Language – linguistics – sexism]. *Sinchrona Themata* 21: 69–79.

Pavlidou, Theodossia. 1985a. "Παρατηρήσεις στα θηλυκά επαγγελματικά" [Remarks on feminine occupational terms]. *Studies in Greek Linguistics. Proceedings of the 5th Annual Meeting of the Department of Linguistics, Faculty of Philosophy, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, May 2–4, 1984.* Thessaloniki: Kyriakidis, 201–217.

Pavlidou, Theodossia. 1985b. "Sprache und Geschlecht im Neugriechischen". In *Sprach-wandel und feministische Sprachpolitik: Internationale Perspektiven*, ed. Marlis Hellinger. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 76–83.

Pavlidou, Theodossia. 1987. "*Εμείς και η γλώσσα*" [We, women, and language]. Text for eight broadcasts by ERT1-Macedonia, May–July 1987.

Pavlidou, Theodossia. 1991a. "Linguistic nationalism and European unity: The case of Greece". In *A language policy for the European Community*, ed. Florian Coulmas. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 279–289.

Pavlidou, Theodossia. 1991b. "Cooperation and the choice of linguistic means". *Journal of Pragmatics* 15: 11–42.

Pavlidou, Theodossia-Soula. 1999. "Η γλωσσική πρωτοβουλία στη σχολική διεπίδραση" [Verbal initiative in classroom interaction]. *Ελληνική Γλωσσολογία '97. Πρακτικά του Γ΄ Διεθνούς Συνεδρίου για την Ελληνική Γλώσσα* [Greek Linguistics '97. Proceedings of the 3rd International Conference on Greek Language]. Athens: Ellinika Grammata, 648–656.

Pavlidou, Theodossia-Soula. 2001. "Politeness in the classroom? Evidence from a Greek highschool". In *Linguistic politeness: The case of Greece and Turkey*, eds. Arin Bayrak-taroglu & Maria Sifianou. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 105–136.

Petrits, Angeliki. 1989. "Η προσφώνηση ως επικοινωνιακή στρατηγική" [Addressing as a communicative strategy]. *Studies in Greek Linguistics. Proceedings of the 9th Annual Meeting of the Department of Linguistics, Faculty of Philosophy. Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, 18–20 April 1988.* Thessaloniki: Kyriakidis, 581–598.

Tannen, Deborah. 1990. *You just don't understand. Women and men in conversation.* New York: Ballantine.

Topsakal, Maria. 1995. *Η επίδραση του γραμματικού γένους στην αντίληψη του φύλου στην ελληνική. Σύγκριση με αντίστοιχες επιδράσεις στη γερμανική και αγγλική* [The influence of grammatical gender in the perception of sex. Comparison with corresponding influences in German and in English]. MA thesis. Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Greece.

Triandafyllidis, Manolis. 1963 [1953]. "Η 'βουλευτίνα' και ο σχηματισμός των θηλυκών επαγγελματικών ουσιαστικών" [The 'parliament-member-fem' and the formation of feminine occupational terms]. In *Άπαντα Μανόλη Τριανταφυλλίδη* [Collected works of Manolis Triandafyllidis], Vol. 2. Thessaloniki: Institute of Modern Greek Studies, 326–334.

Triandafyllidis, Manolis. 1978 [1941]. *Νεοελληνική γραμματική (της δημοτικής)* [Modern Greek grammar (of the demotic)]. Reprint with corrections of the 1941 edition. Thessaloniki: Institute of Modern Greek Studies.

Tsokalidou, Petroula. 1989. "Linguistic misogyny: A language universal? Observations, questions and ideas". *Proceedings of the 3rd Symposium on the Description and/or Comparison of English and Greek. Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, School of English, Department of Theoretical and Applied Linguistics.* Thessaloniki: University Studio Press, 363–381.

Tsokalidou, Petroula. 1996. *Το φύλο της γλώσσας: Οδηγός μη σεξιστικής γλώσσας για τον δημόσιο ελληνικό λόγο* [The gender of language: A guide to non-sexist language for public Greek speech]. Athens: Syndesmos Ellinidon Epistimonon.

Tsopanakis, Agapitos. 1977. "Ο δρόμος προς την δημοτική: θεωρητικά, τεχνικά και γλωσσικά προβλήματα. Σχηματισμός επαγγελματικών θηλυκών" [The way towards demotic: Theoretical, technical and linguistic problems. The formation of feminine occupational terms]. *Nea Estia* 1204: 1120–1142.

Tzartzanos, Achilleas. 1972. *Γραμματική της αρχαίας Ελληνικής* [*Grammar of the Ancient Greek language*]. Athens: OESB.

Tzartzanos, Achilleas. 1991 [1946]. *Νεοελληνική σύνταξις (της κοινής δημοτικής)* [Modern Greek syntax (of common demotic)]. Vol. 1. Reprint of the second edition of 1946. Thessaloniki: Kyriakidis.

Vostantzoglou, Theologos. 1962. *Αντιλεξικόν ή Ονομαστικό της νεοελληνικής γλώσσης* [Thesaurus of the Modern Greek language]. 2nd edition. Athens.

Zymvrakaki, Fani. 1998. *Κριτική ανάλυση του λόγου: Η προώθηση των φαρμακευτικών προϊόντων* [Critical discourse analysis: The promotion of pharmacy products]. MA thesis, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Greece.

Gendered structures in Japanese

Janet S. Shibamoto Smith

University of California, Davis, USA

1.   Introduction

Japanese (*Nihongo*) is spoken by approximately 131 million people worldwide.[1] Apart from some 5 million speakers in Brazil, the United States and elsewhere, these speakers comprise the overwhelming majority of the population of Japan. Japanese is often linked to Korean and, more tentatively, to an "Altaic" language family but is, strictly speaking, a language isolate. It is the only major world language whose genetic affiliations remain unclear.

Typologically, Japanese is an agglutinating SOV language. Its syntax is consistently head-final: noun phrases are followed by postpositional particles (*Emiko ga* 'Emiko SUBJ', *kôen de* 'park at/in', etc.), the possessor modifies the possessed (*Arison no hon* 'Alison GEN book'), and relative clauses modify head

nouns ([*yoku warau*] *tomodachi* 'a friend who often laughs', lit. '[often laugh] friend'). Its morphology is predominantly suffixing. An important, and for learners, problematic aspect of Japanese syntax is the topic construction; see (1):

(1) a. *Hanako ga   Hiroyuki no inu o   ket-ta.*
Hanako SUBJ Hiroyuki GEN dog OBJ kick-PAST
'Hanako kicked Hiroyuki's dog.'

b. *Hanako wa Hiroyuki no inu o   ket-ta.*
Hanako TOP Hiroyuki GEN dog OBJ kick-PAST
'As for Hanako, [she] kicked Hiroyuki's dog.'

c. *Hiroyuki no   inu wa Hanako ga   ket-ta.*
Hiroyuki GEN dog TOP Hanako SUBJ kick-PAST
'As for Hiroyuki's dog, Hanako kicked [it].'

As Shibatani notes, the use of the topic marker *wa* in (1b,c) most closely fits one aspect of the usual definition of subject as something that is being talked about; the *ga*-marked nominal *Hanako ga* of (1a), on the other hand, expresses an actor or agent, also part of the western notional definition of subject (Shibatani 1994: 1811).

Anaphoric reference in Japanese is usually not overtly expressed; referents are recovered from context, including discourse context, such as the use of verbal honorific endings, interactional (or, sentence-final) particles, and the like. It is a classifier language (cf. Hellinger & Bußmann, this vol.), with interesting psycholinguistic properties, i.e. relative preference for material- vs. shape-based classifications. Japanese falls between the much-studied Mayan languages (Lucy 1996) and pluralizing languages like English (Imai & Gentner 1993).

Standard Japanese has a relatively simple, albeit not uncontroversial,[2] phonology, with five vowel phonemes /a e i o u/ and sixteen consonant phonemes /p t k b d g s z h r m n w j/ including the moraic[3] nasal phoneme /ŋ/ and the moraic non-nasal phoneme /Q/ (Amanuma & Ôtsubo & Mizutani 1978: 58, 78; Shibatani 1990: 159). Some arguments suggest that Japanese is a tone language, although not one in which tone must be specified for each syllable (Haraguchi 1977); others describe Japanese as having a pitch accent system (Higurashi 1983).

What it lacks in phonological complexity, Japanese makes up for in the areas of the lexicon and the writing system. Looking from the perspective of provenance, the Japanese lexicon comprises *wago* '("native") Japanese words', *kango* 'Sino-Japanese loanwords', and *gairaigo* '(European language-derived) loanwords'. In some semantic domains, this provides the speaker with a rich array of lexical choices for "the same" object or phenomenon, although it is

always important to keep in mind that words are not simply different because their origins are different but because they play specific roles in the contextualized construction of meaning (Miyajima 1977).

Written Japanese combines three basic scripts: *kanji*, a logo/morphographic script, and *hiragana* and *katakana*, two syllabaries (Shibamoto Smith 1996).[4] Numerous scholars have concurred with Backhouse (1984:220) that "the presence of a plurality of scripts makes for a potential flexibility of orthography on a scale which is inconceivable in more familiar writing systems". And, in fact, not just orthographically but lexically and sociolinguistically, Japanese stands out in providing a very high degree of alternative ways of writing or saying the same thing.

Although Japan has numerous dialectal divisions extreme enough to render mutual intelligibility problematic, Japanese speakers today communicate through *kyôtsû-go*, a 'common language' which is heavily influenced by Standard (Tokyo) Japanese, but which retains local dialectal features such as accent (Shibatani 1990:186).

Although Japanese does not have grammatical gender and Japanese verbs do not conjugate for (gendered) person or number, linguistic descriptions of Japanese continue to support in large measure Kindaichi's famous claim that Japanese is distinctive by virtue of having a very special women's language (Kindaichi 1957). Notions of "women's language" continue to focus on sets of forms that have been packaged and presented as *joseigo* 'women's language', which is, according to Inoue (1996:2):

> […] a set of linguistic forms and functions of language exclusively or most likely used by women […] that are very often associated with certain feminine demeanor, roles and attributes such as being soft-spoken, polite, uncertain, empathetic, gentle, and non-assertive.

Ideology aside, women's and men's speech exhibit somewhat different phonological properties. Shibatani (1990:371–374) also lists a number of lexical and syntactic characteristics of women's and men's speech. Under lexical items, he treats special interjections/exclamatory expressions, special first person pronominal forms, sentence-final particles; as a syntactic characteristic, he points to "the exclusive possession by female speakers of a syntactic rule which is triggered by the presence of the particle *yo*" (Shibatani 1990:373). The rule deletes copular *da* when it is followed by *yo*, as in *Kirai da yo → Kirai Ø yo* 'I dislike [you/him/her/it]'. Shibatani also mentions in passing other "gendered" qualities of men's vs. women's Japanese: women's less frequent use of Sino-

Japanese forms in preference to native Japanese forms, women's avoidance of rough forms, and women's higher frequency of polite forms. These are discussed in more detail below.

2.   Gendered structures

A social constructionist approach to language and gender asks how gender relations are enacted and maintained in talk. Such an approach mutes an earlier interest in the field of language and gender in structural biases in grammar and lexicon. Indeed, Weatherall (1998:1) argues that research on language and gender has (unintentionally) "polarized, essentialized and stereotyped" language differences between women and men, despite the fact that research has demonstrated that some features of language encourage a negative bias against women and despite the fact that, if theory goes too far in denying the importance of "general, dichotomous gender categories, it loses touch with most people's experience of reality" (Preisler 1998:285). This is certainly true in the Japanese case, a society where the hegemonic ideologies concerning the natures of women and men represent gender as binary. So, although one agrees that word meaning is not stable and "essentially" gendered in quite the way models of linguistic dominance would suggest, it is to the lexical aspects of "gender reference", defined by Kitto (1989) as terms and phrases which are marked as being male or female, that we now turn.

2.1   Talking about women: Lexical bias

There is clearly lexical gender in some subparts of the Japanese nominal system. Human nouns such as *otoko* 'man', *onna* 'woman', *chichi* 'father', *haha* 'mother' and other kin terms are semantically gender-specific, as are some animal terms (*mendori* 'hen' vs. *ondori* 'rooster', *meuma* 'mare' vs. *ouma* or *osuuma* 'stallion'). Patterns of zero-anaphora, plus the existence of commonly used gender-indefinite terms such as *ningen* 'human' and *hito* 'person', however, permit considerable latitude for ungendered person reference. Nonetheless, considerable attention has been paid to the possible erasure of women from such supposedly ungendered terms as *hito* and *ningen*, as well as to the descriptions and characterizations of women underlying terms such as *onna* 'woman', *josei* 'woman', and other lexical items as they may contribute to a negative bias against women.

Endô (1991) examines dictionary definitions for *otoko* 'man', *onna* 'woman', and other terms for male and female humans. Her examination reveals pervasive associations of *onna* with characterizations such as *kirei na* 'pretty' and *yasashii* 'gentle', while definitions for *otoko* include terms such as *tsuyoi* 'strong', *rippa na* 'noble, admirable, magnificent', *meiyo* '[having] honor, reputation', and *menboku* 'honor'. Endô also notes that the combinatory forms *otoko no ko* 'boy' (lit. 'man child') and *onna no ko* 'girl' (lit. 'woman child') have also been used differently; they form a simple descriptive pair in childhood, but only *onna no ko* has continued to be used for adult women. This latter use has, it is true, decreased in recent years, Endô notes, as both words that derogate women overtly and words that locate women in lower social positions than men by treating women as the marked or lesser case have come to public attention (Endô, forthcoming). In common usage, then, some asymmetries are changing today, but not all changes have yet been recorded lexicographically. Nurita (1993), for example, discusses the histories and various nuances of three common terms for women: *fujin*, used when women as members of society are being discussed, has slightly formal overtones and de-emphasizes women's sexuality; *onna*, on the other hand, stresses those very sexual aspects of woman-hood; and *josei*, currently the most unmarked term for women, has a slightly chic (*sumâto na*) connotation, derived from its use to gloss feminine gender in Indo-European languages in the Meiji Period (Nurita 1993:136). Thus, she concludes, the various aspects of women are divided, rendering women less than whole.

Endô (1991) also examines the forms *dansei* 'man' and *josei* 'woman'. These are Sino-Japanese terms with meanings roughly equivalent to *otoko* and *onna*; for discussion of the multi-tiered lexicon of Japanese, see Miyajima (1977). As noted by Endô, when these terms are used alone, they symmetrically denote women and men; when combined with other nouns, however, an interesting pattern appears. *Kisha* 'reporter' pairs with *joseikisha* 'woman reporter'; *shokuin* 'employee' pairs with *joseishokuin* 'woman employee'. And why, Endô asks in conclusion, are there *josei mondai* 'women's problems/issues' but no *dansei mondai* 'men's problems/issues'? Women's problems include sexual harass-ment, naming practices for married couples, adequate support for child and elder care, and the like.

Other scholars have examined wider ranges of terms for women; *Kotoba to Onna o Kangaeru Kai* 'Women and Language Group' (lit. 'Society for thinking about women and language') (1985)[5] analyzed terms for women into a set of revealing categories. Their search for terms referring to women in a series of

dictionaries yielded numerous terms for women outside of marriage. First are the immature: *musume* 'daughter/girl', *shôjo* 'young girl', *shojo* 'virgin'. These pair relatively evenly with *musuko* 'son/boy', *shônen* 'youth', and *dôtei* '(male) virgin'. Then there are the adult unmarried: *shinguru* 'single' (derived from English *single*) is a neutral, perhaps even stylish, reference to both male and female unmarried adults, but *dokushin* 'bachelor' has as its counterpart the dreaded *urenokori* 'unsold leftover'. For sexually active unmarried women, we have *jôfu* 'mistress',[6] *aijin* 'lover' (lit. 'love person' and, thus, formally neutral, but in practice most commonly applied to women), *mekake* 'mistress, concubine', and *baishunfu* 'prostitute'.

Words referring to married women, with the exception of *shufu* 'female head of household', which pairs with *shujin* 'master/male head of household',[7] and *tsuma* 'wife', which forms a pair with *otto* 'husband', notoriously carry connotations of domestic confinement, or, at least, confinement to domestic roles. *Nyôbô* (or alternatively, *nyôbo*) 'wife', originally a term referring to the *room* of a court woman, and *kanai* '(one's own) wife' (lit. 'inside the house') are the terms most commonly used for one's own wife, while *okusan* '(someone else's) wife' (lit. 'Mrs Inside the Room') is used to refer to another man's wife. Many men today use the English loan word *waifu* 'wife' to refer to their own wives, thus avoiding the negative connotations of *kanai*; this form is not, however, available for use to refer to others' wives and is not, then, "neutral" in the same sense as English *wife*. Finally, the editors identify biases in terms for women who are parents. Feelings of maternal love, for example, are lexically encoded in the very common form *boseiai* 'maternal love' (lit. 'mother-nature love'), which is crucially distinguished from and superior to the "love" a father might feel (*Kotoba to Onna o Kangaeru Kai* 1985: 161f). The editors locate the basis for the numerous words found with discriminatory meanings in history, citing the past discrimination against or devaluation of women, the traditional divisions of labor, and the old patriarchal *ie* 'house' system (*Kotoba to Onna o Kangaeru Kai* 1985: 225). They conclude that, while words are not direct indexes of cultural ideas or practices, the way the words relating to women are treated by lexicographers reflects the circumstances into which women are placed and that careful analysis of the kinds of words and definitions found in dictionaries help one to see how women are conceptualized in society.

2.2 Women talking

Given the absence of grammatical gender in Japanese, one might reasonably ask

why the truism that Japanese is, if not unique, at least unusual in having a "true women's language" (Kindaichi 1957) persists. Is this just, as suggested by Inoue (1996), a late 19th and early 20th century discursive construct, developed during Japan's period of modern nation-state formation? Or does this notion have wider currency? And, if so, upon what structural features is this notion based? Below are some of the structural features upon which the claims to a "true" women's language are based (see also Ide, this vol., on historical predecessors of Japanese women's language).

2.2.1   *Phonology*

Common in descriptions of Japanese "women's language" are the claims that Japanese women use higher pitch than is explicable on physiological grounds alone and exploit a greater pitch range than do Japanese men. Ohara (1992, 1997) provides experimental support for these claims, concluding that these features constitute part of a femininity display.

Three features of female speech mentioned in Shibamoto (1985) are /i/ deletion as in (2), /r/ assimilation (3), and both vowel and consonant lengthening (4):

(2)   *Iya   desu → Ya(a) desu*
      disgusting is
      'No way!/I don't want to!'

(3)   *Wakaranai → Wakannai*
      [I] don't.understand
      'I don't get it.'

(4)   a.   *Yoku kiku no yo   → Yo:::ku kiku no yo*
          well   listen PRT PRT
          'Listen [very very] carefully.'
     b.   *Totemo   tanoshikatta → Tottemo tanoshikatta*
          absolutely fun
          '[It] was <u>ab</u>solutely fun!'

It must be noted that, although the associations with women speakers make these features gendered, the actual use of these features is not gender-exclusive. Issues of their structured sociolinguistic properties would require further investigation.

Finally, one finds a stereotypical association of a particular form of diphthong reduction (/ai ae oi → eː/) with male speakers. When Ichiko, a fictional representative of Japanese womanhood described in Section 3, says *Waa, itee*

'wow! [it] hurts', she is applying a male-speaker exclusive rule which reduces /ai/, /ae/, and /oi/ to /eː/:

(5)   a.   /ai/ → /eː/   *itai* → *itee*
                            '[It] hurts.'
      b.   /ae/ → /eː/   *omae* → *omee*
                            'you' (familiar)
                            temae → *temee*
                            'you' (inferior)
      c.   /oi/ → /eː/   *sugoi* → *sugee*
                            'Cool!'

2.2.2   *Exclamations*

Women and men use different exclamatory words (Jorden 1974, Shibamoto 1985).[8] Some such forms associated with male speakers, in roughly descending order of civility, are *nâ* 'you know', *oi* 'hey', *bakayarô* 'damn' (lit. 'stupid fellow'), and *kuso* 'shit'. Exclamatory forms associated with female speakers are *ara* 'oh, good gracious', *maa* 'well' or 'dear me', and *chyoito* 'look here'.

2.2.3   *Pronouns*

Pronouns are typically claimed to be a central component in the structured gendering of Japanese. Before pursuing issues of gendered pronominal forms in Japanese, however, one first must address the following question: Are Japanese pronouns really pronouns? Many scholars have suggested that they are not (Kuroda 1965, Miller 1967). Indeed, pronouns have largely been assumed to be a syntactic rather than a lexical category. However, only lexical items are held to undergo relatively rapid semantic change, but Japanese pronouns have undergone numerous such relatively rapid semantic changes. Also, Japanese pronouns are modifiable and have numerous stylistic variants; both of these features are uncharacteristic of pronouns cross-linguistically. Noguchi (1997) reviews the evidence, i.e. the forms which might be considered as personal pronouns in Japanese, and concludes that they are, nonetheless, pronouns, although they do not behave like English pronouns. His reasoning is that

> [...] personal pronouns have the general characteristics of being referentially defective even though they can refer: they do not denote by themselves, but rather they are referentially dependent on entities in linguistic as well as nonlinguistic contexts [...] (Noguchi 1997: 782).

Having established that Japanese pronouns are pronouns, we may now ask: Are they marked for gender? Well, yes and no. Japanese has the following personal pronouns: first person (*watakushi* and variants), second person (*anata* and variants), and third person (*kare* 'he', *kanojo* 'she'). The third person pronouns are little used, being stylistically marked (see Martin 1975:1075, *Nihongo Kyôiku Gakkai* 1982:358) and used just as often to mean 'boyfriend' or 'girlfriend' as to refer simply to some neutral male or female referent.

First- and second-person pronouns have, however, been one of the center-pieces of the literature on language and gender in Japanese. Women and men share the formal first-person pronouns *watakushi* and *watashi*, although the contexts in which they are used by female vs. male speakers differ (Ide 1979a, Shibamoto 1985, Shibatani 1990). In less formal contexts, male-speaker associated first-person pronouns are *boku*, *ore*, *jibun*, and *washi*; female-speaker associated first-person pronouns are *atakushi*, *atashi*, and *atai*. See Table 1:

Table 1. Gender distinctions in first-person pronominal forms, by context

	Context			
	Formal			Informal
Men	*watakushi* (*jibun*)	*watashi* (*washi*)	*boku*	*ore*
Women	*watakushi*	*watashi*	*atashi* (*atakushi*)	(*atai*)

Both Ide (1979a) and Shibatani (1990) suggest that *boku* is the only male-speaker form appropriate to contexts at mid-level formality. Uchida (1997), however, claims that, while this is true of male-male interactions, men in such contexts use *ore* to female interlocutors.[9] *Boku* is also widely recognized as being used, experimentally perhaps, by young, high school and college-aged women; this appears to be an age-graded practice abandoned in adulthood. *Atashi* is apparently now gaining ground or even superseding *watashi* for use in all but the most formal contexts, a change since the 1970s (Uchida 1997:89).

Of the peripheral, or less-often used, forms associated with men (given in parentheses in Table 1), *washi* is attributed solely to rustic old men, *sumô* wrestlers, and baseball players (Martin 1975), although its use by middle-aged and older white-collar corporate male speakers was attested in my data from 1975 on and is described in Kanemaru (1997). *Jibun* has masculine, militaristic

overtones and is restricted in use to circumstances where hierarchical relations are emphasized (Kanemaru 1997). In the case of women, *atakushi* is relatively rare, and *atai* lower class. On a final note, it is important to keep in mind that women's assessments of a given context's formality also may differ from men's, leading to a different pattern of pronoun choice across context (Ide & Hori & Kawasaki 1986).

Turning to second-person pronouns, women and men share the formal *anata* and the less formal, less "classy" *anta*, although the latter is a minor form for male speakers. Men have two forms, *kimi* and *omae*, which are relatively-to-very informal/intimate as well as two quite insulting forms, *kisama* and *temee*.[10]

Table 2. Gender distinctions in second-person pronominal forms, by context

	Context			
	Formal . . . . Informal			
Men	*anata*	*kimi* (*anta*)	*omae*	*kisama* *temee*
Women	*anata*			*anta*

It is important to note that Tables 1 and 2 and the pronoun forms discussed are described in reference to Standard Japanese, a construct centered on the speech forms used by middle class Tokyo women and their male counterparts (Inoue 1996). The obvious erasures of the women and men of other classes and other regions make it advisable to view descriptions of gendered pronoun use "in Japanese" with caution. Fairly little is known about the intersection of class and gendered language or of regional dialect and gendered language; one study that contrasts dialects with similar gendered pronoun systems to that of Standard Japanese and dialects in the Tôkai region which lack such systems is Yamaguchi (1991). Tajiri (1991) discusses gendered pronoun forms in Kyûshû dialects.

2.2.4   *Sentence particles*

A second focus of gendered language studies are interactional (sentence-final) particle forms. These particles typically follow the verbal (and all other postverbal) morphology, although they often occur mid- or inter-clausally as well. They serve to indicate the speaker's stance with respect to the proposition with which they are associated. There are numerous forms either used exclusively by women or men, or strongly associated with one or the other. McGloin

(1997: 33) lists *zo*, *ze*, *sa*, *na* as male-exclusive final forms, *wa* as female-exclusive. *Yo* is also commonly reported as masculine, (*na*) *no* as feminine. Some of these forms occur mid- or inter-clausally as well. Reynolds (1985) provides an analysis of these gendered particles, linking women's use of the non-assertive forms to their traditionally lower status in society:

Table 3. Gendered sentence-final particles, ordered on an assertiveness scale

Non-assertive .... Assertive

wa	*yo*	*sa/ze*	*zo*
na no		*na*	

Another important – and more comprehensive – study of the structural gendering of sentence-final particles is Kawaguchi (1987). Her data on sentence-final particles were drawn from Ide (1979b), a study of the speech of college students. Her findings are outlined in Table 4.

Table 4. Gendered sentence particle use among college students (Ide 1979b), excerpted and adapted from Kawaguchi (1987)

Particles used only or predominantly by men	Particles used by both women and men		Particles used only or predominantly by women
yo na	a.	men use more than women	*wa ne*
yo naa		*yo*	*no yo*
ze		*ka naa*	*kashira*
mon na		*mon*	*na no ne*
mon naa			*wa yo*
zo	b.	equal use	*no yo*
naa		*yo ne*	*wa*
na		*ne*	*na no*
saa		*sa*	*no ne*
	c.	women use more than men	*mon ne*
		na no?	*no?*
		no	
		yô	

This is an analysis of use rather than structure, and it may be argued that considerable shift in gender roles has occurred since the 1970s. Nonetheless, it

is instructive to compare Kawaguchi's (1987) findings with the particle continuum in Table 3. *Wa* and *no*, as predicted, are used only or largely (≥80%)[11] by women. On the male side, we see that the particles claimed to be assertive/male are, indeed, for the most part used exclusively or predominantly (≥80%) by men: *zo*, *ze*, *na*, and the lengthened variant of *sa* (*saa*) all fall in column one of Table 4. Short *sa*, however, is used by both women and men, surprisingly, perhaps, in light of Reynolds' classification of *sa* as highly assertive. Reasons for this may have to do with ongoing changes in gendered language practices among younger Japanese speakers (Okamoto & Sato 1992, Okamoto 1995). *Ne*, likewise, is used commonly by both women and men. One may conclude from this that neither *sa* nor *ne* are central parts of the structural pattern of gendered sentence-final particles. Such forms as *ze*, *zo*, and, one might argue, *na/naa* in various combinations such as *yo na* and *mon na*, directly index coarse intensity; *wa* and its related forms *wa ne*, *wa yo*, etc. directly index delicate intensity (Ochs 1992: 342). These forms, centrally implicated in indirectly indexing male vs. female "voice", appear to function as suggested in Table 3.

It is common to claim for the gendered sentence particles described above an association with "tradition", whether that tradition be the traditional gender roles of women and men in Japan or the traditional speech patterns of (gendered) authority and subordination. Inoue (1994, 1996) warns us against the regional and class assumptions underpinning the first association, reminding us that contemporary language forms associated with *joseigo* 'women's language' are forms drawn from the speech patterns of a particular class of women (middle to upper middle class) in a particular setting (Tokyo) at a particular historical moment (the period of modern state formation after the Meiji Restoration in 1868). Matsumoto (1996) also cautions against the second association. She challenges the assumed historical depth of the distinction between male and female forms, in particular the specific forms that now are typically adduced as *joseigo*, pointing out that today's "feminine" Japanese sentence particles – what Matsumoto terms *teyo-dawa*[-*noyo*] – came into the toolkit of *joseigo* as recently as the Meiji Era. Of these, -*teyo* is already archaic (Matsumoto 1996: 462). Further, Matsumoto (1996: 456) claims that the *da*, *yo*, and *ne* forms formerly classified as typically masculine forms have developed into gender-neutral forms under a shift in femininity stereotypes from the traditional deference and subordination to childlike cuteness. One may perhaps expect more structural shift in the gender patterns of sentence-final forms in the near future. And, as with pronouns, the above description is confined to Standard Japanese forms; not all regional dialects have gendered sentence-final

forms, and even those that do may not have forms that pattern isomorphically with Standard Japanese.

2.2.5   *The zero-rule*

The zero-rule is a syntactic rule, noted by Shibatani (1990), which deletes the copula form *da* when followed by the interactional particle *yo*:

(6) *Iya   da yo   →   Iya Ø yo*
       disgusting is   PRT
       'No way!/I don't want to!'

Shibatani claims that this is a rule exclusive to women speakers of Japanese. This has arguably been a female-exclusive rule in the past; it has not, moreover, received much, if any, attention in the literature on the gender-neutralization of Standard Japanese. Analyses of dialogue extracted from contemporary mass market literature, television representations of gendered language, and the transcripts of conversational data taped in several regions throughout Japan between 1997–2001, however, suggest that this rule, along with other forms, may profitably be re-examined.

2.2.6   *Keigo (politeness forms)*

It is a truism that Japanese women's speech patterns are "more polite" than those of Japanese men. What structural systems underlie this truism? The Japanese system of politeness marking and honorification is sketched in Table 5, illustrating the basics of the system with the verb *kak-* 'to write'.

Table 5. Politeness and honorific marking

		Plain Form	Distal Form
Honorific (*sonkeigo*)	*Sensei ga* *Sensei ga*	*o-kaki ni naru* *kakareru*	*o-kaki ni narimasu* *kakaremasu*
	'The professor writes.'		
Neutral	*Tomodachi ga*	*kaku*	*kakimasu*
	'[My] friend writes.'		
Honorific *kenjôgo*	*Watakushi ga* *(sensei no tame ni)*	*o-kaki suru* *(o-kaki itasu)*[a]	*o-kaki shimasu* *o-kaki itashimasu*
	'I will write [it] on behalf of the professor.'		

[a] Very archaic.

Honorific forms come in two sets. The first indexes respect to the subject of the clause, as in *sensei ga hon o-kaki ni naru/narimasu* 'the professor (= SUBJ) will write something'; these forms are called *sonkeigo*. The second set of honorific forms indexes respect for a non-subject individual implicated in the clause; often this is an individual for whom something is being done, as in *ga* [*sensei no tame ni*] *o-kaki suru/shimasu* '[I] will write [it] [for the professor]'. This form of honorific is termed *kenjôgo*, lit. 'self-humbling language', as the structures effectively "lower" the performer of the action. Each subtype of honorific has two levels, indicated in Table 5 by relative distance from the neutral, non-honorific forms in the center. Choice between plain and distal forms indicate relative social distance between speaker and addressee. Actually, the situation is a bit more complex than simple assessment of social distance; choice between plain and distal verb forms also implicates speaker's sense of the formality of the context, topic structure, and a number of other factors.

The essence of the claim that Japanese women are more polite in their speech than Japanese men revolves around the more frequent use of both *sonkeigo* and *kenjô* honorification forms, both in the plain and the distal verbal formations. Certainly, since relative frequency of production is a matter of use, we might conclude that there is no structural difference to address. I would argue that there is, but it is in the gendered structuring (or categorization) of event types and their subsequent realization in choice of honorification forms that the differences lie. Here, I refer to the findings of Ide & Hori & Kawasaki (1986). In one of the most important studies of gender and politeness in Japanese, Ide's group found (a) that women and men assign different values to the individual forms of polite/honorific verbal morphology, with women systematically assessing particular forms as less polite than men, and (b) that women and men systematically assess how "polite" they should be to a particular interlocutor differently, with women generally asserting a need to be more polite to a particular individual than men, but not always. Women feel less need to "be polite" to children, neighbors, and the like (cf. Ide & Hori & Kawasaki 1986: 35). Both these assessments separate women and men in their choice of honorific forms. Further, preliminary analysis of the use of honorifics in six corporate workgroups (four headed by women, two headed by men) suggests an additional possible line of reasoning. It may be possible that, in addition to the differences pointed out by Ide and her group, the very indexical properties of honorific verbal morphology may differ for Japanese women and men, in the following ways. Patterns of male speaker use both of politeness forms and of honorific verbal morphology suggest close attention to the hierarchical and

ingroup/outgroup (*uchi/soto*) relationships among participants in verbal interaction and choice of verbal morphological formations to reflect/index those relationships. Women's patterns, on the other hand, suggest considerably more attention to the use of politeness and honorific forms in the construction of the classed/educated/refined and/or feminine self. One might speculate, then, that the structural differences underlying the gender-differentiated patterns of linguistic politeness in Japanese are, in fact, systematic differences in the meanings of the forms to male and female speakers coupled with systematically different assessments of context (see also Ide, this volume). Much more work is needed, even for Standard Japanese, to sort out the various factors influencing normative patterns of polite language across gender of speaker.

   Related to politeness if not honorifics *per se* is the issue of directives and requests. Very few, if any, directive or request forms are marked as male- or female-exclusive. Possible male-exclusive or strongly male-speaker-associated forms are *-ro/yo*, *-tamae*, negative *na*, verb$_{plain}$ +*no da*, and *-te kure*:

(7) a. *Oki-ro*
        get.up-IMP
        'Get up!'
     b. *Kake-tamae*
        sit.down-IMP
        'Sit down!'
     c. *Ugoku na*
        move   NEG.IMP
        'Don't move/Freeze!'
     d. *Oki-ru   no da*
        get.up-NON-PAST NOM COP
        'Get up!' (lit. 'It is the case that you will get up.')
     e. *Hayaku oki-te   kure*[12]
        quickly get.up-GER please
        'Please get up quickly!'

Female-speaker-associated, but not female-exclusive, candidates are *-te* and *chôdai*:

(8) a. *Oki-te*
        get.up-GER
        'Get up!'
     b. *Oki-te   chôdai*
        get.up-GER please
        'Please get up!'

A preliminary analysis of gender differences in directives and requests supports these possibilities (Smith 1992), which are but a handful of the many imperative and request forms of Japanese. The degree to which they are structural differences rather than differences in use over a broad range of contexts requires much more careful attention to the relations between the two as mediated by language ideology.

3.   A case study: Interpreting Ichiko

Akashi Ichiko is a fictional representation of one of the 131 million speakers of Japanese worldwide. She is the protagonist of Shimizu Ikkô's novel *Onna jûyaku* 'Woman director' (1988), a 'business novel' (*keizai shôsetsu*), i.e. a popular form of fiction with a primarily male readership. Ichiko is the managing director (*torishimariyaku*) of Dai'ichi Department Store's Publicity Department. As we join Ichiko, she is leaning back in her chair and surveying her options. A plump, fifty-one year old wife and mother who has distinguished herself in the male-oriented business world (*danson-johi no bijinesukai*), her actions are subject to constant scrutiny. Ichiko speaks. And, often, is criticized – not so much for what she says as for how she says it.

As noted in the introduction, Japanese stands out sociolinguistically in providing a very high degree of alternative ways of writing and saying the same thing. And it is precisely with these alternative ways of saying the same thing that Ichiko runs into trouble. As she speaks, Ichiko makes choices about language forms "suitable" to a boss, "suitable" to a woman, "suitable" to the context in which she finds herself. Rarely do these choices "suit" her interlocutors, the men (and only men) who are her bosses and her subordinates. They complain. In the following brief analysis of the metalinguistic (and largely negative) commentary on Ichiko's speech, I have taken those of Ichiko's utterances that elicited a comment from the author of the novel, either as narrator or as attributed to one of Ichiko's co-workers. An assessment of the speech elements that trigger each metalinguistic comment illustrates the day-to-day workings of the structural properties of Japanese which have an impact on the relationship between language and gender. See (9–13), where Ichiko's "mistakes" (in the form of mismatches of language-gender ideology and language use) are exemplified. (The relevant forms and responses are in boldface; numbers in parentheses indicate page numbers of the original text.)

(9) a. Ichiko's utterance
   *Waa **itee**.*
   'Wow, that **hurts**!'
   b. Narrator/interlocutor's response
   *Ichiko wa **ranbô ni** koe o ageta.*
   'Ichiko raised her voice **roughly**.' (9)

(10) a. Ichiko's utterance
   *Kore ijô shinzô ni warui koto o iwanai **de yo**.*
   '**Don't** say anything more to give me a heart attack.'
   (lit. 'that is bad for my heart')
   ***Tamaran yo washa** (washi wa) …*
   '**I can't take it**.'
   b. Narrator/interlocutor's response
   *Tereru de mo nai magao de Ichiko wa **otoko no yô ni itta**.*
   'Unabashedly, with a straight face, Ichiko **said [it] like a man**.' (88)

(11) a. Ichiko's utterance
   *Datte K Byôin wa kabu no omowaku de Kôseishô ni shimeagerarete appuappu shichatte **ru n ja nai ka**.*
   'But K Hospital is struggling (lit. 'gasping for breath'), being pressured by the Ministry of Health and Welfare for stock speculation, **isn't it**?'
   *Imasara kabu-nushi-ken no kôshi da nante sonna yûchô na koto itte irarenai **n da yo ne**.*
   '[They] **surely** can't be so easygoing (lit. 'slow') as to be saying that [they will] exercise [their] stockholder's rights at this late date.'
   *Dakara uchi to toppu mo ginkô kara no hanashi o tsuppaneta **n da** to omou **yo**.*
   'So, our top [officers] rejected the bank's offer.'
   b. Narrator/interlocutor's response
   *Ichiko wa **otokokotoba to onnakotoba o gotcha ni** Hirayama no kuchô o tsukihanasu yô ni itta.*
   'Ichiko spoke as if throwing off (lit. 'thrusting away') Hirayama's words, **jumbling together a mix of men's language and women's language**.' (83)

(12) a. Ichiko's utterance
   *Aru ka nai ka, sore o shinchô ni kangaete iru n dakara **sa**.*
   'They are thinking carefully whether they have [one, i.e. 'a good plan' or *meian*] or not, **you know**.'
   *B-Japan ni D Hyakkaten ga kyôryoku shinakereba naranai gimu wa nai **n da yo ne**.*

'D Department Store is under no obligation to cooperate with
B-Japan, **you know.**'
Sô desho.
'Isn't that right.'

b. Narrator/interlocutor's response
*Ichiko wa sukoshi zutsu ji o mukidashi ni **otokokotoba o majiete
shaberihajimeta.***
'Ichiko began to speak, **mixing in men's language** [with her "nor-
mal" speech], revealing her true nature little by little.' (134)

(13) a. Ichiko's utterance
*Watashi datte wakaranai **n da yo.***
'Even I don't know.'
*Mada shachô ni aete inai shi, kyô jômukai ga hirakareru no ka dô ka
mo kimatte inai **n da.***
'I haven't been able to meet with the President yet, and it hasn't been
decided whether there will be a Managing Directors' Meeting or
not.'

b. Narrator/interlocutor's response
*Ichiko wa … **ranbô na kuchô de itta.***
'Ichiko said **in a rough tone.**' (273f)

Example (9) shows the male-associated (and rough, casual, or working class)
pronunciation of the adjective *itai* '[it] is painful' as *itee*. This elicits the
comment that Ichiko's speech is *ranbô* 'rough'.[13] Another trigger to meta-
linguistic commentary is a pronoun. In (10), Ichiko uses an abbreviated form
washa (< *washi wa*) of the male-associated first-person pronoun *washi*. *Washi*
is the only instance of any form other than *watashi* used by Ichiko in the novel
and, along with the verb form *tamaran* for *tamaranai*, elicits the remark that
Ichiko is speaking like a man. Additionally, sentence-final forms seem to trigger
commentary: *n da*, *da yo*, *ja nai ka*, and the interactional particles *sa* and *yo*
(11–13) all focus attention on the masculinity of Ichiko's speech. In sum,
Ichiko's speech is characterized throughout the novel as (a) rough and (b)
mixed/jumbled with male speech forms (that is, bad).

Is Ichiko always "manly"? No, she does, indeed, have a "feminine" side. My
brief sketch of her speaking patterns excludes all dialogue with her husband, her
son, or her parents; only dialogue representing speech with colleagues is
included. Nonetheless, the womanly Ichiko emerges from time to time, even in
a professional context, and – just like the more masculine Ichiko – is duly
commented upon. See (14–16) for samples of Ichiko's "feminine" side:

(14)   a.   Ichiko's utterance

         Ara sô na no.

         '**Oh, really?**'

         Suru to shachô kôtai no fukumi made aru gôi tte **wake** Ø **ne**.

         'Then, **it's the case of** a mutual agreement, even implying a change of president.'

   b.   Narrator/interlocutor's response

         … kotobazukai wa **hikaeme** *de atta.*

         '… [her] speech was **reserved**.' (172)

(15)   a.   Ichiko's utterance

         Ie, o-wakakatta desu.

         'No, you were **young**.'

         Sono koro **o-gushi** *mo mada kuroguro to shite imashita.*

         '**Your hair** was still pure black then.'

   b.   Narrator/interlocutor's response

         O-tsuishô-*magai na Ichiko no kotoba ni, Kôtarô wa ôgesa ni waratta.*

         'Kôtarô laughed exaggeratedly at Ichiko's insincere **flattery**.' (105f)

(16)   a.   Ichiko's utterance

         Subete **gozonji** *datta no ka mo shiremasen.*

         'Maybe he (an officer of the company) **knew** everything.'

   b.   Narrator/interlocutor's response

         Ichiko wa **hikaeme** *ni itta.*

         'Ichiko said **modestly**.' (299)

In (14), Ichiko uses the special "feminine" exclamatory form *ara.* In (15), she praises her company president (using *desu/masu* forms; this is expected, but she also uses beautification *o-* twice in making a personal comment about the president) and in (16), she uses honorifics. Her personal comment about the company president triggers the comment that Ichiko is offering false flattery. Otherwise, the "feminine" Ichiko is seen as *hikaeme* 'reserved'. In all these examples, Ichiko's speech includes polite and/or honorific forms (*o-wakakatta, o-gushi, gozonji*) and post-verbal morphology (sentence-final particles) that is associated with female speakers (*na no, ka mo shiremasen*). In (14), the zero copula (*wake* Ø *ne*) also reinforces the feminine quality of the utterance.

4. The feminist debate

Tanaka (1995) outlines the distinctive characteristics of the "new" Japanese feminist movement from the 1970s to the 1990s. In essence, this "new" movement was a reaction to the postwar socialist movement which left women with little scope for active, creative agency. It made "sexual liberation" the cornerstone of its philosophy and challenged the (male) cultural value of economic productivity, leading feminists to focus on reproductive issues such as access to contraception, in particular the birth control pill, etc.

The movement's methodology focused strongly on consciousness raising in order to "hack through" women's own gender-role socialization and discriminatory experiences (Tanaka 1995: 345f). Part of this socialization, along with part of the discrimination, is seen to be linguistic. And, in fact, virtually all the aspects of talk about women and talk by women treated in Sections 2 and 3 have been touched on in the Japanese feminist literature. Prescribed language norms of politeness and subordination, the use of terms that derogate or simply belittle women have been identified as problematic. Changes in women's lives have led women to shift away from the prescriptive norms of *joseigo* – norms reflecting women's normatively subordinate position in society – and toward a more neutral or even male-speaker-associated pattern of language use (Okamoto & Sato 1992, Okamoto 1995). A "growing sensitivity to issues of gender equality" (Fujimura-Fanselow 1995: xxxii) has led both government and the media (newspapers, in particular) to eliminate some of the most offensive terms for women, such as *busu* 'ugly', *urenokori* 'unsold merchandise' – a term used for single women past the *tekireiki* 'suitable age' for marriage – and *orudo misu* 'old miss' (cf. Endô 1995). Much work, nonetheless, remains if women and men are to speak and be spoken about in equal terms.

At least tangentially linguistic, contemporary debates include discussions concerning *fûfu bessei* 'married couples taking/keeping separate [last] names'. Hotly contested by many, some couples have called for changes to the Japanese Civil Code, which currently requires married couples to take a single surname; this may be either the wife's or the husband's, although it is more commonly the latter. Proponents of *fûfu bessei* say that it allows women to continue a career or other pursuit without the discontinuities of name changes; opponents claim that the practice is "selfish" and conducive to the breakdown of families.[14]

5.   Conclusion

Despite the absence of grammaticalized gender in the Japanese language, gender is a pervasive, highly salient category in Japanese society. The imprint of this saliency on language was defined in the late 19th and early 20th centuries as the complex of features comprising *joseigo* 'women's language', a construct which is today under challenge from many directions. Clearly, much empirical work is necessary to outline the parameters of change in gendered language structures and practices and to associate them with the rapid social changes affecting Japanese women and men. As noted in the introduction to this chapter, Japanese stands out in providing a very high degree of alternative ways of writing or saying the same thing. As the lifeways of Japanese women and men provide more flexible and nuanced alternatives in the early 21st century, one may predict that gendered language will continue to be a central component of those "alternative ways of saying the same thing", albeit in new and only partially predictable ways.

Notes

1. The CIA World Factbook 2000-Japan: http://www.cia.gov/cia/publications/factbook/geos/ja.html#Into; Ethnologue-Japanese: http://www.sil.org/ethnologue/countries/Japa.html#JPN

2. For more extended discussion of the issues surrounding the identification of Japanese phonemes, see Hokama & Sagawa (1984), or, in English, Vance (1987).

3. A mora is a quantitative unit of phonological time.

4. *Rômaji* 'romanized script', *eimoji* 'English script' (an alphabetical script used for writing non-Japanese words), and various *kigô* 'symbols' are also commonly found interspersed in texts (cf. Shibamoto Smith 1996:213).

5. The members of which are Endô Orie, Kobayashi Mieko, Takahashi Midori, Hongô Akemi, Maruyama Wakako, and Mitsui Akiko.

6. With a different character for *-fu*, this becomes '(male) lover', a term which is, however, much less common.

7. Note that, interestingly, the female *-fu* of the first term in this pair is counterpart to gender-indefinite (but male) *-jin* 'person' in the second.

8. These are defined by Martin (1975:1041) as words which are "characteristically set off from the rest of the discourse by major junctures and are often accompanied by special voice qualifiers [such as glottal stops] or intonation features".

9. One reviewer disagrees with Uchida, suggesting that the use of *ore* depends on how close the relationship between the interlocutors is, not necessarily on their gender.

10. *Kisama* was initially a polite form but was considered insulting for most of the 19th and has continued so for all of the 20th century; *temae* is used to clear status inferiors.

11. That is, of all the occurrences of these particular sentence-final particles present in the data, ≥80% were produced by women.

12. The abbreviation NOM stands for nominalizer. *Kure* is the plain imperative of the donatory auxiliary verb *kureru* 'to do a favor [for someone]'; *kureru* is, itself, the neutral, or non-polite, form of *kudasaru*, the imperative form of which is the more familiar 'please' of Japanese language texts, *kudasai*.

13. As one reviewer correctly notes, *ranbô ni* 'roughly' modifies the manner in which Ichiko was speaking, not the content of her speech. She could, indeed, have said something like *itai wa* 'it hurts + SFP', which is very feminine, in a rough manner just as well. In the text, however, the only remarks of Ichiko's that receive this sort of evaluation (that is, of roughness) are those that contain male-associated language forms.

14. A good collection of Japanese websites on this topic can be found at http://www.webstyle.ne.jp/pub/village/b/59.

References

Amanuma, Yasushi & Kazuo Ôtsubo & Osamu Mizutani. 1978. *Nihongo onseigaku* [Japanese phonetics]. Tokyo: Kuroshio Shuppan.

Backhouse, Anthony E. 1984. "Aspects of the graphological structure of Japanese." *Visible Language* 18 (3): 219–228.

Central Intelligence Agency. 2000. *The world factbook 2000*. http://www.cia.gov/cia/publications/factbook/geos/ja.html.#Into

Endô, Orie. 1991. "Kotoba to onna [Language and women]." *Kokubungaku Kaishaku to Kanshô* [National Literature Studies: Interpretation and Appreciation] 722: 28–37.

Endô, Orie. 1995. "Aspects of sexism in language." In *Japanese women: New feminist perspectives on the past, present, and future*, eds. Kumiko Fujimura-Fanselow & Atsuko Kameda. New York: The Feminist Press at The City University of New York, 29–42.

Endô, Orie & Janet Shibamoto Smith. (forthcoming). "Women and words: The status of sexist language in Japan as seen through contemporary dictionary definitions and media discourse." In *Japanese language, gender, and ideology*, eds. Shigeko Okamoto & Janet S. Shibamoto Smith. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ethnologue-Japanese. 2000. ⟨http://www.sil.org/ethnologue/countries/Japa.html#JPN⟩

Fujimura-Fanselow, Kumiko. 1995. "Introduction." In *Japanese women: New feminist perspectives on the past, present, and future*, eds. Kumiko Fujimura-Fanselow & Atsuko Kameda. New York: The Feminist Press at The City University of New York, xvii–xxxviii.

Haraguchi, Shôsuke. 1977. *The tone pattern of Japanese: An autosegmental theory of tonology*. Tokyo: Kaitakusha.

Higurashi, Yoshiko. 1983. *The accent of extended word structures in Tokyo Standard Japanese*. Tokyo: EDUCA Inc.

Hokama, Shuzen & Sagawa, Masayoshi, eds. 1984. *Nihon gengogaku yôsetsu* [A general outline of Japanese linguistics]. Tokyo: Asakura Shoten.

Ide, Sachiko. 1979a. *Onna no kotoba otoko no kotoba* [Women's language, men's language]. Tokyo: Nihon Keizai Tsûshinsha.

Ide, Sachiko. 1979b. *Daigakusei no hanashikotoba ni mirareru danjo sa'i* [Sex differences in the speech of college students]. *Monbushô Kakenhi Tokutei Kenkyû "Gengo" Chûkan Hôkoku* [Interim report of the Ministry of Education Special Research Grant in Linguistics]. Tokyo: Ministry of Education.

Ide, Sachiko & Motoko Hori & Akiko Kawasaki. 1986. "Sex difference and politeness in Japanese." *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 58: 25–36.

Imai, Mutsumi & Dedre Gentner. 1993. *Linguistic relativity vs. universal ontology: Cross-linguistic studies of the object/substance distinction.* Paper presented at the 29th Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society.

Inoue, Miyako. 1994. "Gender and linguistic modernization: Historicizing Japanese women's language." In *Cultural performances: Proceedings of the Third Berkeley Women and Language Conference*, eds. Mary Bucholtz & A.C. Liang & Laurel A. Sutton & Caitlin Hines. Berkeley, CA: Berkeley Women and Language Group, University of California, 322–331.

Inoue, Miyako. 1996. *The political economy of gender and language in Japan.* Ph.D. dissertation, Washington University, St. Louis, MO.

Jorden, Eleanor H. 1974. "Female speech: Persisting myth and persisting reality." In *Report of the Second U.S.–Japan Joint Sociolinguistics Conference under the U.S.–Japan Cultural and Educational Cooperative Program*, eds. Chie Nakane & Eleanor H. Jorden. Tokyo: Japan Society for the Promotion of Science, 103–118.

Kanemaru, Fumi. 1997. "Ninshô daimeishi, koshô" [Person pronouns and address terms]. In *Joseigo no sekai* [The world of women's language], ed. Sachiko Ide. Tokyo: Meiji Shoin, 33–41.

Kawaguchi, Yôko. 1987. "Majiriau danjo no kotoba: jittai chôsa ni yoru genjô" [The intersecting speech of men and women: The current situation as assessed by survey]. *Gengo Seikatsu* [Language Life] 429: 34–39.

Kindaichi, Haruhiko. 1957. *Nihongo* [Japanese]. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.

Kitto, Joanna. 1989. "Gender reference terms: Separating the women from the girls." *British Journal of Social Psychology* 28: 185–187.

Kotoba to Onna o Kangaeru Kai [Women and Language Group], eds. 1985. *Kokugo jiten ni miru josei sabetsu* [Sex discrimination in Japanese dictionaries]. Tokyo: San-ichi Shobô.

Kuroda, Shigeyuki. 1965. *Generative grammatical studies of the Japanese language.* Ph.D. dissertation, MIT, Cambridge, MA.

Lucy, John A. 1996. "The scope of linguistic relativity: An analysis and review of empirical research." In *Rethinking linguistic relativity*, eds. John J. Gumperz & Stephen C. Levinson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 37–69.

Martin, Samuel E. 1975. *A reference grammar of Japanese.* New Haven: Yale University Press.

Matsumoto, Yoshiko. 1996. "Does less feminine speech in Japanese mean less femininity?" In *Gender and belief systems. Proceedings of the Fourth Berkeley Women and Language Conference*, eds. Natasha Warner & Jocelyn Ahlers & Leela Bilmes & Monica Oliver & Suzanne Wertheim & Melinda Chen. Berkeley, CA: Berkeley Women and Language Group, University of California, 455–467.

McGloin (Maguroin), Naomi Hanaoka. 1997. "Shûjoshi" [Sentence-final particles]. In *Joseigo no sekai* [The world of women's language], ed. Sachiko Ide. Tokyo: Meiji Shoin, 33–41.

Miller, Roy Andrew. 1967. *The Japanese language*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Miyajima, Tatsuo. 1977. "Goi no taikei." [The organization of the lexicon]. In *Iwanami Kôza Nihongo: Goi to Imi* [Iwanami Series [on] Japanese: The lexicon and meaning], eds. Susumu Ôno & Takeshi Shibata. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1–41.

Nihongo Kyôiku Gakkai [Japanese Language Education Association], eds. 1982. *Nihongo kyôiku jiten* [Japanese language education dictionary]. Tokyo: Taishûkan Shoten.

Noguchi, Tohru. 1997. "Two types of pronouns and variable binding." *Language* 73: 770–797.

Nurita, Kazuyo. 1993. "'Fujin', 'onna', 'josei' …: onna no ippan koshô-kô" ['Matron', 'woman', 'lady': Thoughts on common terms for women]. In *Onna to nihongo* [Women and Japanese], ed. Katsue Akiba Reynolds (Reinoruzu). Tokyo: Yûshindô, 123–158.

Ochs, Elinor. 1992. "Indexing gender." In *Rethinking context: Language as an interactive phenomenon*, eds. Alessandro Duranti & Charles Goodwin. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 335–358.

Ohara, Yumiko. 1992. "Gender-dependent pitch levels: A comparative study in Japanese and English." In *Locating power: Proceedings of the Second Berkeley Women and Language Conference*, eds. Kira Hall & Mary Bucholtz & Birch Moonwomon. Berkeley, CA: Berkeley Women and Language Group, Linguistics Department, University of California, 469–477.

Ohara, Yumiko. 1997. "Shakaionseigaku no kanten kara mita nihonjin no koe no kôtei" [Japanese speakers' pitch from the perspective of sociophonetics]. In *Joseigo no sekai* [The world of women's language], ed. Sachiko Ide. Tokyo: Meiji Shoin, 42–58.

Okamoto, Shigeko. 1995. "'Tasteless' Japanese: Less 'feminine' speech among young Japanese women." In *Gender articulated: Language and the socially constructed self*, eds. Kira Hall & Mary Bucholtz. New York: Routledge, 297–325.

Okamoto, Shigeko & Shie Sato. 1992. "Less feminine speech among young Japanese females." In *Locating power: Proceedings of the Second Berkeley Women and Language Conference*, eds. Kira Hall et al. Berkeley CA: Berkeley Women and Language Group, Linguistics Department, University of California, 478–488.

Peng, Fred C. C., ed. 1981. *Nihongo no danjosa* [Male/female differences in Japanese]. Tokyo: The East-West Sign Language Association.

Preisler, Bent. 1998. "Review article: Deconstructing 'feminist linguistics'." *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 2: 281–295.

Reynolds, Katsue Akiba. 1985. "Female speakers of Japanese in transition." In *Proceedings of the First Berkeley Women and Language Conference*, eds. Sue Bremner et al. Berkeley, CA: Berkeley Women and Language Group, Linguistics Department, University of California, 183–196.

Shibamoto, Janet S. 1985. *Japanese women's language*. Orlando, FL: Academic Press.

Shibamoto Smith, Janet S. 1996. "Japanese writing." In *The world's writing systems*, eds. Peter T. Daniels & William Bright. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 209–217.

Shibatani, Masayoshi. 1990. *The languages of Japan*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Shibatani, Masayoshi. 1994. "Japanese." In *The encyclopedia of language and linguistics*, Vol. 4, ed. Ronald E. Asher. Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1809–1811.

Shimizu, Ikkô. 1988. *Onna jûyaku* [Woman director]. Tokyo: Kôbunsha.

Smith, Janet S. 1992. "Women in charge: Politeness and directives in the speech of Japanese women." *Language in Society* 21: 59–82.

Tajiri, Eizô. 1991. "Hôgen ni arawareta danjosa: Nishi-nihon hôgen (Kyûshû)" [Sex differences in dialect: Western Japanese dialects (Kyushu)]. *Kokubungaku Kaishaku to Kanshô* [National Literature Studies: Interpretation and Appreciation] 722: 84–89.

Tanaka, Kazuko. 1993. "Shinbun ni miru kôzôka sareta seisabetsu hyôgen" [Sexist expressions in newspapers]. In *Onna to nihongo* [Women and Japanese], ed. Katsue Akiba Reynolds. Tokyo: Yûshindô, 97–122.

Tanaka, Kazuko. 1995. "The new feminist movement in Japan, 1970–1990." In *Japanese women: New feminist perspectives on the past, present, and future*, eds. Kumiko Fujimura-Fanselow & Atsuko Kameda. New York: The Feminist Press at The City University of New York, 343–352.

Uchida, Nobuko. 1997. "Kaiwa kôdô ni mirareru seisa" [Sex differences in conversation]. In *Joseigo no sekai* [The world of women's language], ed. Sachiko Ide. Tokyo: Meiji Shoin, 75–93.

Vance, Timothy J. 1987. *An introduction to Japanese phonology.* Albany NY: State University of New York Press.

Weatherall, Ann. 1998. "Re-visioning gender and language research." *Women and Language* 21: 1–9.

Yamaguchi, Kôyô. 1991. "Hôgen ni okeru danjosa: Higashi-nihon hôgen" [Sex differences in dialect: Eastern Japanese dialects]. *Kokubungaku Kaishaku to Kanshô* [National Literature Studies: Interpretation and Appreciation] 722: 71–77.

Women's language as a group identity marker in Japanese

Sachiko Ide

Japan Women's University, Tokyo, Japan

1. Introduction

Whereas Shibamoto Smith (this volume) discusses some of the issues connected with present-day women's language, this chapter investigates whether the historical development of women's language has made any contribution to current female speech. It is intended to provide both the basis for an understanding of and a new perspective for the analysis of women's language in general.

It is generally said that Japanese women use what could be called "more polite" language, which is mainly characterized by the use of honorifics and sentence-final particles. This language has generally been interpreted as an indication of deference, and has been equated with an indication of women's powerless status. This seems doubtful in view of recent work such as that of Ide & Hori & Kawasaki & Ikuta & Haga (1986), in which it is argued that the source of women's more polite speech is the difference in their role rather than a

difference in their status. That is, housewives are more frequently engaged in socially oriented, more private activities, whereas men are more frequently involved in efficiency-oriented activities. Since it is a general tendency to use more polite speech in social interaction than in workplace interaction, it is natural for both men and women to use polite speech in ways that reflect this general distinction. Furthermore, the explanation offered in Ide (1991) is that features marking polite speech convey demeanor, by which is meant "good manners" (a feature associated with prestigious status, cf. Goffman 1967). Such features include the use of more polite linguistic forms, the use of more formal forms of personal pronouns, avoidance of deprecatory personal pronouns, avoidance of vulgar expressions and the use of beautification honorifics.

Ide & Inoue (1992) present evidence that supports this analysis based on the language of women working in Japanese corporations. It is generally believed that women of lower status, meaning those that have less power, use more polite forms of expression to acknowledge the difference in status. Contrary to such expectations, it was found that women with higher positions in the workplace use more polite expressions than women of lower positions. (For a discussion of these features, see Shibamoto Smith, this volume.) These executives use more polite expressions as a tool or even a weapon to express demeanor in keeping with their status, not to show deference to those they address.

2.   The indigenous way of looking at women's language

The issues of feminism have certainly reached Japanese scholarship and have triggered a number of studies of women's language in the last two decades. However, in Japan, the interest in studies of Japanese women's language goes as far back as 1929, when Kikuzawa wrote an article entitled "On the features of women's language". Following this, a number of descriptive studies of women's language varieties were published. The approach taken in them reflects traditional Japanese linguistics, called *kokugogaku* ('Japanese linguistics'), where the study of language focuses exclusively on Japanese. Interestingly, these works do not deal with women's language in contrast to men's, but view it as a "section" of language termed *isoo* 'phase'. None of the roughly equivalent English terms such as *register* or *dialect* would really reflect the concept of *isoo*. This linguistic/ pragmatic category is a prime example of the traditional Japanese way of looking at language; i.e. the variety of language used is an identification marker of the professional or social role of the speaker. In the Japanese view, the

speakers shape themselves into representatives of their profession. Molding oneself in this way is seen as an integral part of personality formation. The use of language specific to the domain of each professional world is both the means to mold oneself as a representative of that profession and the means to recognize and reinforce one's sense of self.

The analysis of *isoo* can be linked to the analysis of speech. If a sentence is divided into segments, the result is the parts of speech. On a larger scale, if one disassembles examples of various kinds of speech according to the group to which the speakers belong, the result will be segment languages, called *isoo go*, meaning *isoo* language. Fundamental to the segment language approach is the way Japanese linguists view language; i.e. they regard language as the sum of many different languages. These languages differ with regard to age, generation, social, regional, and professional background, as well as class, and gender. In other words, people are viewed as speaking different languages according to the groups they belong to. Among the many section languages of professions are the languages of monks, merchants, scholars, *samurai* (military), and craftsmen.

In the significant body of respected Japanese traditional linguistic literature, the field of women's language has secured its own position as one of the easily differentiated section languages.

3. Women's languages in women's worlds

The historical development of Japanese women's language may shed light on the current uses of women's language, and provide the context for its reanalysis. The focus here will be on two kinds of women's language in women's worlds: the language of what might be termed court ladies, in Japanese *nyoobo kotoba* ('court ladies' language'); and the language of the demi-monde or courtesans (lit. 'play ladies'), *yuujo go* ('courtesans' language'). Both these ways of speaking are specific to women's domains and both are said to have influenced contemporary women's language, though not as predecessors. Women today do not speak like court ladies or courtesans of old.

The earliest specific features that marked women's language in Japanese can be traced back as far as the 8th century, when *Manyooshuu*, a collection of poems composed by people of all classes, was compiled. It contains second person pronouns indicative of speaker's or addressee's gender. In the 11th century, *hiragana*, the phonetic writing system of *yamatokotoba*, the Japanese language of the day, was devised and used by women, while men were using

Chinese, similar to the use of Latin in Europe during the Middle Ages. It is known that the *Tale of Genji*, a novel by Lady Shikibu Murasaki (ca. 1010), was written in this vernacular. Thus, women were able to write in a language closer to their usual way of expressing themselves than men were allowed to do.

The beginnings of the language of the court ladies are documented in the 14th century, those of the language of the courtesans date from the 17th century. A closer look at these two varieties will reveal the implications these languages have for contemporary Japanese women's language. (For a detailed explanation of languages of court ladies and courtesans see R. Ide & Terada 1998.)

3.1 *Nyoobo kotoba*: The language of court ladies

Nyoobo, court ladies, lived in the inner quarters of the imperial court or in the residences of noble families, where they served imperial families and nobles. These women were originally members of the noble class and had a close association with the imperial family. They were hired to serve the imperial court with the official rank of "court ladies". Therefore, being a *nyoobo* was a profession, just like being a *samurai* 'soldier' was. Their job was to manage the bureaucratic tasks of controlling the accounting of the dynasty, and the daily affairs and activities in various aspects of life. In addition, it was in the hands of the court ladies to educate royal or noble children. They served as the transmitters of important information from emperor to public; press secretary would be the modern equivalent. This work brought with it the possibility that the *nyoobo's* personal opinion could be integrated and passed on to the public.

Court ladies placed themselves in a subservient position to the emperor and the nobles, but they were career women who played an indispensable role in court life. They had great influence over imperial and noble families through the education of their children and the management of their daily lives and events. This means that they had virtual power, though it was of a different nature than that of men.

Court ladies are known to have existed since the 8th century, but it was not until the 14th century that the language of the court ladies, *nyoobo kotoba*, emerged. It was during the Muromachi Period (between the 14th and the 16th century), a period of instability, that a special language developed in the world of the court ladies. This period was the transitional period from the Middle to the Pre-modern Ages. The power of the emperor was beginning to decline, even as the *samurai* began to gain power. It was a time when the imperial and noble families began to face economic difficulties. Secret words in the world of the

nyoobo were created in order (a) to conceal the difficult condition of the emperor and nobles, and (b) to avoid uttering words that could betray the poverty of the nobles; in other words, they needed to create secret words to avoid ill omens. Thus, the language of the court ladies functioned as a communicative code, useful among in-group members, and useful in excluding outsiders.

   Court ladies, who cultivated high culture in court life, thus created a secret language in their secluded world. This secret language was different from ordinary language only in lexical aspects, while phonology and syntax remained unchanged. They created new lexical items in the field of daily life, such as food and clothing. An analysis of a large list of *nyoobo kotoba* ('words from the language of the court ladies') shows that the formation of lexical items follows some recurring patterns:

Mentioning only initial syllables:

(1) *u*   for *unagi*
      'eel'   'eel'

Reduplicating initial syllables while deleting final syllables:

(2) *katsu-katsu*   for *katsuo*
      'bonito-bonito'   'bonito' (a kind of oceanic fish)

Playing with language, here, an alternate reading for a Chinese character:

(3) *o-yone*   for *kome*
      HON-rice   'rice'

Honorification of nouns and verbs:

(4) a.   *o-mi-ashi*   for *ashi*
           HON-HON-foot   'foot'
      b.   *mesh-agaru*   for *kuu*
           HON (suppletive form)-eat   'to eat'

Alternative adjectives are created. An example which is common in present-day Japanese is (5):

(5) *oishii*   for *mumakikoto*
      'tasty'   'tasty'

(1) to (5) were created in the domain of court ladies so that outside people could not comprehend the meaning of these codes. The common function of these secret words is to obscure explicit meanings of words.

Devices for secret codes are as follows. In (1), only the initial syllable is uttered. In (2), only the two initial syllables are repeated. In (3), the different reading of the Chinese character is uttered. In (4a), two honorific prefixes are placed before the noun. In (4b), a suppletive honorific form is used. In (5), an alternative secret element is created.

Why was it necessary for court ladies to create a secret language? Primarily, as mentioned, they needed to conceal the economic difficulties of court life. If they were overheard saying that a certain family "was running out of rice", in a country where rice is the most basic food, it would soon have been widely known that that family had fallen on hard times. The word for rice is written with a Chinese character which has at least three different readings (*kome*, *yone*, and *bei*), so they chose *yone* instead of the ordinary reading *kome* and prefixed it with the honorific *o-* (see example (3)). Court ladies could thus discuss a family's real difficulties with no fear that outsiders would understand what they were saying. In addition, they needed to have a special language to emphasize their gentle appearance while in actual fact holding virtual power. To balance the strength supported by power, court ladies dissembled, acting as though they were weak and gentle by avoiding the use of straightforward lexical items, using instead a language of their own. Imitating children's repetitive words as we see in example (2) was one way of making themselves appear like innocent children and thus non-threatening, incompetent and charming.

The language of court ladies began to spread into the world outside the royal court in the course of time. It first spread in inner quarters of the imperial household, then among *samurai* (soldiers') households, then into the ordinary people's world. Since the social rank of a *samurai* was not as high as that of the court ladies, the language of the court ladies was the model to which they aspired. In the 17th century, in the Edo Period, the language of the court ladies was portrayed as the model of expression for women in etiquette books, as it was regarded as a prestigious language.

The spread of the language of court ladies has continued into contemporary Japanese, making the language rich in synonyms. A number of vocabulary items that originated in the language of court ladies are now used by both men and women; some of them still carry the nuance of women's language. The addition of vocabulary items from this language variety has made the language as a whole seem softer and more polite to the speaker of Japanese, as can be seen in the following examples:

(6) *o-mi-otuke*   for   *misosiru*
    HON-HON-miso soup   'miso soup'

(7) *o-me moji*   for   *au*
    HON-eye word   'to see'

3.2 *Yuujogo*: The language of the courtesans

It was between the 17th and the 19th centuries, in the stable time of the Edo Period, that the play ladies' language came into existence. While the country was ruled by the Tokugawa Shogunate and closed itself off from the outside world, the common people enjoyed a blossoming of popular culture. On the surface, the people were categorized into four rigid ranks: soldiers, farmers, engineers, and merchants, as listed in descending order. But in red light districts, people were treated equally as long as they had money. *Yuujo*, courtesans, literally 'play ladies', were much respected professionals. Japanese courtesans had to master the art of making *haiku* and other types of poems, and were expected to have a reading knowledge of Chinese. They were supposed to be versed in playing music, singing and dancing. They entertained their clients with witty conversation supported by sophisticated knowledge and creative talents in the arts, and they charmed them with aesthetic performances. In the entertainment districts of well-populated areas in Kyoo, Naniwa and Edo, present day Kyoto, Osaka and Tokyo, special languages were created to achieve a common means of communication among people from different regions and different social backgrounds, and speaking different dialects. This special language was also a useful means of concealing a courtesan's accent, which would otherwise have reflected the rural regions they came from. Speaking the special language of the night, the play ladies created a unique atmosphere of indulgence and amusement. The real world was forgotten in this special world.

Some of the linguistic features of the language of the entertainment district have special forms of predication: auxiliary verb endings attached to the verb, and first and second person reference terms. The elaboration in ending forms and the use of person reference terms reflects the world of the entertaining business, where sensitivity in interactional behavior has the highest priority, because these linguistic features do not add anything to the meaning but give richness in the choice of expressions according to the mood of the speaker-hearer, cf. the following examples:

(8) *o-yomi-ni*   *naru*
     REF.HON-'read'   'do'

(9) *o-yomi*   *nasaru*
     REF.HON-'read'   REF.HON-'do'

Instead of the ordinary honorific formation (8), the form *nasaru* as in (9) was created and used by courtesans.

   In the domain of courtesans, new terms for first and second person reference were created and used: for the first person, instead of *wacchi*, *wachiki* was used, and for the second person, *somoji* was used instead of ordinary *nushi*, cf. (10) and (11):

(10) *wacchi*   *wachiki*
      1st pers. sing.   1st pers. sing.
      'I'

(11) *nushi*   *somoji*
      2nd pers. sing.   2nd pers. sing.
      'you'

The language of the courtesans was shared by people in the entertainment districts, or at least passively understood by those men and women who came and went. The courtesans, who were sophisticated and had high culture, attracted the attention and admiration of the public. Their language was described in *Kabuki* (classical Japanese drama) and the literature of common people, which ordinary women began to imitate and use as a part of their ordinary language. As in the case of the language of court ladies, the language of courtesans was first disseminated among ordinary women. In the course of time, the vocabulary items lost their original status as belonging to the language of courtesans, and eventually the language of one special women's domain came to be used by both men and women in contemporary Japanese.

4.   The impact on present-day women's language

To recapitulate, women's language can be shown to have existed since *Manyoo-shuu*, the earliest collection of poems dating from the 8th century. It is assumed that men and women were speaking slightly differently at this time, but as yet no studies exist on this aspect of the language. Women's languages in women's worlds have had a great impact on women's language today, but not because contemporary Japanese women's language has simply incorporated these languages. The following three aspects of impact can be observed.

4.1 Establishing women's language as a group language

What remains from the concept of the languages of court ladies and courtesans is the function of language as the language of group identity. In women's language, lexical items are constantly changing, since the freshness of a word or an expression can be believed to decrease as people use the same word for some time. For example, *nasu* 'eggplant' for *nasubi* was adopted from the court ladies' language and was frequently used by women. It has gradually lost its particularly feminine flavor, and now men and women both use it as an ordinary word. This made necessary the creation of a new form that could express the aspect of women's language. Thus, *o-nasu* was created with the honorific prefix *o-*, and its use indexes the speaker's gender identity as a woman. This honorific does nothing to honor the delicious eggplant, the prefix is merely a beautification honorific added to express the demeanor of the speaker. Thus, the languages of court ladies and courtesans are not direct predecessors of present-day women's language etymologically, but rather they were the first recorded instance of gendered usage, in which new lexical items continue to be created today.

4.2 Indexing group identity and molding the speaker's self

As has been discussed, another aspect of women's languages is their function as markers of occupational group identities. By using the special languages of the special worlds, these women (a) created a feeling of group solidarity, (b) identified themselves as members of these groups, and (c) molded themselves into people suitable for membership in that group. Thus, these women's languages should be regarded as having functioned as a means of creating solidarity within the group, as identity markers of the group and as a means of molding selves into appropriate models of their respective occupational roles.

4.3 Adding valuable image

The dissemination of women's languages from women's worlds should be interpreted as an indication of how positively they were regarded. There are many lexical items in present-day Japanese that stem from those languages. Examples (12) to (16) show a variety of forms of the lexical item 'eat':

Vulgar form:

(12) *kuu*
      eat.INF

Plain form:

(13) *taberu*
      eat.INF

Polite honorific form:

(14) *o-tabe   ni-naru*   (ordinary honorific form)
      HON-eat.INF become-HON

Polite honorific form from the language of court ladies:

(15) *meshi agaru*
      meal eat.HON

Polite honorific form from the language of courtesans:

(16) *tabe   nasaru*
      eat.INF do.HON

This addition of expressions is felt to have enriched contemporary Japanese, especially because the expressions from the women's worlds such as (15) and (16) are more sophisticated and carry more elegant connotations. In other words, the image of women's language was one of something valuable.

5.   Conclusion

The goal of this survey of language in the past was to highlight two possible pitfalls in language study that can be avoided in the future. The compartmentalization of research, which led to the idea that one could study a language without recourse to the history of that language, may have led scholars to overlook the contributions of past developments in the language and past research on the language to topics of current interest. It is to be hoped that this investigation of communication in Japanese culture at different times, and between different groups, in connection with the analysis provided by traditional Japanese linguistics, has indicated new possibilities for similar investigations in other cultures.

There may have been the tendency, also followed by scholars, to transfer every-day assumptions without scrutiny into scholarship; this led to the commonly-held belief that women's language is associated with lower status and lesser power. In view of the evidence presented here and elsewhere pointing

to a rather different function of Japanese women's language, a new analysis seems warranted, since it appears there are positive aspects that have been disregarded. If these positive aspects have been overlooked in Japanese, a relatively well-studied language, this may also have been the case elsewhere.

The value of looking at the history of these languages and their traditional treatment does not lie in trying to trace these early languages into their present form as women's language. An analysis of both what has happened to these languages and the way traditional linguists have understood them shows that Japanese women's language is yet another of the many group languages. Every person belongs to several groups, and therefore has learned several group languages, for example, teachers' language, women's language, Tokyo language, downtown language, mother-of-a-child language. But the group languages taken together do not make up the whole of the Japanese language like mosaic stones (with each one having a distinct border and a form distinct from all others). Instead, the group languages overlap like colored oil drops heated on a projector slide. Thus, women's language, Tokyo language and teachers' language, for example, all play a role in determining how a female teacher from Tokyo will express what she has to say, since her language will reflect her identity as a member of all three groups.

The idea that many groups have a jargon, and that the use of this jargon is obligatory to mark membership in the group, is not new. Even the field of linguistics has such a vocabulary, and work has been done on the languages of many other groups. Nor is the fact that Japanese women use words that Japanese men would not use limited to language use in Japanese. Other languages have words that only women or only men would use (for example, *ducky* or *love* in British English, not to mention words or expressions felt to be unsuitable in mixed company).

Much of the work to date concerning Japanese women's language has asserted or implied that women's language in Japanese was rooted in the subservience and powerlessness of Japanese women in contrast to men. Any value attributed to it was assessed in terms of its effect on and in society.

What is new in the approach used here is the discovery of history, and with it the source of the positive value of women's language. By showing the function of women's language as a group identity marker as well as a marker of the speaker's position in society, it becomes obvious that women's language is an important factor in strengthening both the woman's sense of self and the group as a whole. A serious consideration of work done in the tradition of Japanese linguistics led to the discovery that it has much to offer to the analysis of current

linguistic topics more generally. It has identified concepts that apply not only to phenomena in Japanese, but may well prove useful when applied to other languages and other cultures.

References

Goffman, Erving. 1967. *Interactional ritual: Essays on face-to-face behavior.* New York: Doubleday.

Ide, Risako & Tomomi Terada. 1998. "The historical origins of Japanese women's speech: From the secluded worlds of 'court ladies' and 'play ladies'." *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 129: 139–156.

Ide, Sachiko & Motoko Hori & Akiko Kawasaki & Shoko Ikuta & Hitomi Haga. 1986. "Sex differences and politeness in Japanese." *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 58: 25–36.

Ide, Sachiko. 1991. "How and why do women speak more politely in Japanese?" In *Aspects of Japanese women's language*, eds. Sachiko Ide & Naomi MacGloin. Tokyo: Kurosio Publishers, 63–79.

Ide, Sachiko & Miyako Inoue. 1992. "Onna kotoba ni miru aidentiti" [Identity in women's language]. *Gekkan Gengo* 11: 46–48.

Katsumata, Senkichiro. 1954. *Kenkyusha's new Japanese-English dictionary.* Tokyo: Kenkyusha.

Kikuzawa, Toshio. 1929. "Fujin no kotoba no tokuchou ni tuite" [On the features of women's language]. *Kokugo Kyouiku* 3: 66–75.

Martin, Samuel E. 1975. *A reference grammar of Japanese.* New Haven: Yale University Press.

Murasaki, Shikibu. ca. 1010. *The tale of Genji. n.A. ca. 750.* Manyoosyuu.

ORIYA

Linguistic and socio-cultural implications of gendered structures in Oriya

Kalyanamalini Sahoo
Norwegian University of Science and Technology, Trondheim, Norway

1.   Introduction[*]

Oriya (*oḍiaa*)[1] is an Indo-Aryan language; together with Iranian, it belongs to the Indo-Iranian branch of the Indo-European language family. The Indo-Aryan language family has three stages of development (Pradhan & Dash & Mohanty & Sadangi & Srichandansingh 1995): Old Indo-Aryan (from approx. 1500 BC to 600 BC), Middle Indo-Aryan (from 600 BC to 1000 AD), and New Indo-Aryan (after 1000 AD). Sanskrit originated during the Old Indo-Aryan stage, all the Prakrit and Apabhransa languages during the Middle Indo-Aryan stage, and Oriya (together with Bengali, Assamese, Hindi, Punjabi, Gujarati, Sindhi, Bhojapuri, Marathi, Sinhala, Maithili etc.) during the New Indo-Aryan stage.[2]

Oriya is one of the 18 "scheduled" languages, i.e. major languages mentioned in the Constitution of India. It is mainly spoken in Orissa, a province in the eastern part of India, by about 32 million people (cf. Directorate of census operation Orissa 1991). Due to the influence of the languages of the neighbouring states, Oriya has a number of dialects like Mughalbandi (Standard Oriya), Southern Oriya, Western Oriya (Sambalpuri), North Balasore Oriya, Koraput Oriya (Desia Oriya). The variety discussed here is the standard dialect, which is generally used in books, the mass-media and in everyday conversation.

Oriya is an SOV language with morphological inflection. In a sentence, the subject shows agreement with the verb in person, number and honorificity. Oriya has no grammatical gender, i.e. basically, gender is a lexical-semantic category. Thus, there are nouns such as *pua* 'son' or *baagha* '(male) tiger', which refer to male entities, nouns such as *jhia* 'daughter' or *gaai* '(female) cow', which refer to female entities, and inanimate nouns such as *bahi* 'book' or *santosa* 'satisfaction', which are neutral.

According to the traditional grammarians (Mohapatra & Das 1962), Oriya has four etymological classes of words: words that are of native origin (*deshaja* 'coming from their own country'), words which have been derived from Sanskrit (*tadbhava* 'originated from that'), words which are similar to those in Sanskrit (*tatsama* 'similar to that'), and words borrowed and assimilated from other languages (*baideshika* 'coming from foreign countries'). Except for some of the *tatsama* words, which follow the grammatical gender system of Sanskrit, in all the other groups of words gender is determined by lexical/referential properties.

There are many controversies regarding grammatical gender in Oriya. Beames (1872–1878:147) claims that Bengali and Oriya have no linguistic gender at all, except in the pure Sanskrit Tatsamas, which retain the form of the Sanskrit genders. Priestly (1983:345f) maintains that many Indic languages

(e.g., Assamese, Bengali, Nepali, Oriya) have lost gender. Klaiman (1987: 500), on the other hand, claims that the Magadhan languages (e.g. Oriya, Assamese and Bengali) show evidence of a gender system, although the category is no longer productive in any of the modern Magadhan languages. In this contribution, we assume that Oriya marks only "natural" gender (as opposed to grammatical gender). In Oriya today, only few traces remain of the original system of grammatical gender.

2. Gender in Oriya

2.1 Referential gender

In Oriya, semantic or referential gender may be marked on the noun and on the adjective. Thus, gender is overtly realised in nouns such as *chhaatra* 'male student', *chhaatri* 'female student', as well as in some adjectives such as *sundara* 'handsome' vs. *sundari* 'beautiful', *kaḷaa* (m) vs. *kaaḷi* (f) 'black', *moṭaa* (m) vs. *moṭi* (f) 'fat', or *aḷasuaa* (m) vs. *aḷasei* (f) 'lazy'. It must be emphasized, however, that female forms, even where they exist, are not used consistently, because male forms function as generics. As male forms are the more general ones, it is also the "male" form of the adjective that agrees with nouns which lack a gender distinction. Therefore *gachha* 'tree' and *hrada* 'lake', for example, combine with *sundara* and not *sundari* (*sundara hrada* 'beautiful lake' vs. **sundari hrada*).

The pronominal system shows no gender distinctions at all. In (1) and (2), the third person singular personal pronoun *se* 'he, she' is invariable, while the adjectives show variation with respect to referential gender:

(1) *Se   chatura.*
    s/he intelligent.MASC
    'He is intelligent.'

(2) *Se   chaturi.*
    s/he intelligent.FEM
    'She is intelligent.'

However, an inanimate subject pronoun like *ehaa/eiṭaa* 'it' would take an adjective in the masculine/male form. This indicates again that the female term is the marked form in Oriya, while the unmarked male term can be used in both male and inanimate contexts.

Referential gender is not marked in the verbal system of Oriya. The subject and the verb show agreement for person, number and honoroficity, but not for gender.

2.2 Gender marking

Referential gender can be reflected in the morphological structure of a noun. There are a number of morpho-phonological differences between the male and the female forms of words, cf. (3):

(3) *raajaa* 'king' (male)   *raani*   'queen' (female)
     lekhaka 'male writer'   *lekhikaa* 'female writer'

In general, personal nouns with female reference can be created from corresponding male words in three different ways: by suffixation, compounding, and adjectival modification.

2.2.1   *Suffixation (derivation)*

A number of female suffixes are used, e.g. *-ni, -aani, -uni*, etc. Frequently, suffixation involves additional morphological changes of the noun.

a.   The suffix *-ni*

muliaa   'male labourer'   *muliaa-ni*   'female labourer'
kaacaraa 'male bangle-seller'   *kaacaraa-ni* 'female bangle-seller'

Also, adjectives can be the basis for this derivational process. What is involved here is an optional adjectival distinction for 'male' and 'female', from which nominals may be derived without further morphological changes:

baayaa   'mad man'   *baayaa-ni*   'mad woman'

b.   The suffix *-aani*

ṭhaakura 'god'   *ṭhaakur-aani* 'goddess'
ḍaaktara 'doctor'   *ḍaaktar-aani* 'female doctor'

c.   The suffix *-uni*

kamaara   'male blacksmith'   *kamaar-uni*   'wife of a blacksmith'[3]
baagha   'tiger'   *baagh-uni*   'tigress'

Again, there are nominalizations from adjectives such as:

andha   'blind man'   *andh-uni*   'blind woman'

d.   In addition, there are more complex derivational patterns involving multiple changes:

kaṇaa   'one-eyed man'   *kaaṇi*   'one-eyed woman'

paaṇa	'man from a caste called *paaṇa*'	*paaluṇi*	'woman from the caste *paaṇa*'
gaayaka	'male singer'	*gaayikaa*	'female singer'
paaṭhaka	'male reader'	*paaṭhikaa*	'female reader'

2.2.2   Compounding

A second strategy for the creation of female nouns is compounding, i.e. adding a lexically female noun to that of an existing male noun. The addition of *maataa* 'mother' to a proper noun indicating the name of a country or state forms a compound with female associations, as in (4):

(4)   *bhaarata* 'India'+ *maataa* 'mother'
= *bhaarata maataa* 'Mother India' (female)
utkaḷa 'Orissa' + *maataa* 'mother'
= *utkaḷa maataa* 'Mother Orissa' (female)

2.2.3   Adjectival modification

Thirdly, referential gender can be marked by the use of gendered words, in particular the adjectives *aṇḍiraa* 'male' and *maai(kinaa)* 'female', either before or after the head noun (which may be a common or proper noun), cf. (5):

(5)   *aṇḍiraa baachuri* 'male calf'   *maai baachuri*   'female calf'
aṇḍiraa pilaa 'male child'   *maaikinaa pilaa*   'female child'
aṇḍiraa loka 'male human'   *maaikinaa loka*   'female human'

With proper names, gender distinctions can be made explicit as in (6). The nouns concerned are borrowed from Sanskrit, their grammatical gender (in Sanskrit) usually corresponds to the gender of the name bearer:

(6)   *saroja* 'lotus' (m) + *kaanta* 'husband' (m)
= *saroja kaanta* 'husband of a lotus', i.e. the sun (male)
saroja 'lotus' (m) + *kaanti* 'beauty' (f)
= *saroja kaanti* 'beauty of a lotus' (female)

Saroja kaanti is a female name, but may sometimes be used as a male name also.

The processes described in this section are not productive in Oriya; formations are very few in number, and can thus be placed in the lexicon.

2.3 Lexical gender

Lexical items may be male- or female-specific, irrespective of their phonological or morphological forms, cf. (7):

(7) *saṇḍha* 'bull' *gaai* 'cow'
     purusa 'man' *stri* 'woman'
     bara 'bride-groom' *kanyaa* 'bride'

Lexical distinctions between male-specific and female-specific forms are particularly frequent in kinship terminology and in address terms for relatives, cf. Table 1.

Table 1. Oriya kinship terms used as terms of address

Father – *baapaa, baabaa, nanaa, baa, ḍaaḍi*[4]	Mother – *maa, bou, maamaa, mami*
Father-in-law – the same as for father	Mother-in-law – the same as for mother[6]
Elder brother – *bhaai, bhaainaa, nanaa*[5]	Elder sister – *naani, apaa, dei, didi*
Father's elder brother – *baḍaapaa, dadei*	Father's elder brother's wife – *baḍamaa, deṭhei*
Father's younger brother – *daadaa, kakei*	Father's younger brother's wife – *khuḍi*
Father's sister's husband – *piusaa*	Father's sister – *naani, apaa*
Mother's brother – *maamu*	Mother's brother's wife – *maain*
Mother's sister's husband – *mausaa*	Mother's sister – *maausi*
Brother-in-law – the same as for brother	Sister-in-law (wife's sister) – the same as for sister
	Sister-in-law (brother's wife) – *bhaauja, nuaabou*
Grandfather (paternal) – *jejebaapaa*	Grandmother (paternal) – *jejemaa, maa*
Grandfather (maternal) – *ajaa*	Grandmother (maternal) – *aai*

The use of the variants depends on the social class and caste system.[7] For example, if we consider the variants for the term 'father', we find that *baapaa* is the commonly used form by the non-brahmins, *baabaa* is used by a few people from certain regions, *nanaa* is exclusively used by the brahmins, *baa* is the form used by the uneducated people in the rural areas, *ḍaaḍi* is used only by the rich and educated people irrespective of caste. It is important to note that not only is gender largely lexicalised in kinship terms, but also paternal kin are distinguished from maternal kin in address forms.

3.   Women and men in Oriya society

Women and men are socially different because of the different social roles imposed upon them by society. If we consider the status of women in Oriya society, we find that women, usually, work at home. They cook, clean, bring up the children, take care of the household, while men work outside and earn money. It is the man who usually initiates love and sexual activities.

A woman's life is always constrained by particular social rules. Before marriage, she is in the custody of her parents. After marriage, she is in the custody of her husband and in-laws. In old age, she is in the custody of her son. She is never free to do anything of interest to herself. She has to seek permission for everything she does: for education, for going out, for choosing a career, for getting married, etc. But all this does not apply to men. Property gets inherited in the name of a son; and although the law allows a daughter to inherit the property of her parents, usually, daughters do not claim it. One finds more educated men than educated women. In poor families, where parents do not have enough money to send all their children to school, usually a son receives preference over a daughter. In the case of any mishap in the house, the woman is mostly blamed. The men in the house eat first, and then the women. The woman cooks food, serves her husband, children, and in-laws, and eats at the end.

Of course, according to the official law, women have the same rights as men. Theoretically, they have the same opportunities as men in the work sphere. There are places reserved for women in the professional and educational fields. A number of government organisations as well as non-government organisations like *mahiḷaa samiti* 'women's society', *mahiḷaa samabaaya kendra* 'women's co-operative centre' are designed to work for the welfare of women. There is a strong group protest against alcoholism, as men tend to squander money in drinking irrespective of the family's financial condition. The magazine *Sucaritaa*, the magazine dealing with good subjects/stories, provides enough space for articles on women's issues. In spite of all these legal rights for women, wife-beating can be found, too. Educated men use terms of abuse for women, instead of beating them. Abuses like bride-burning commonly associated with the dowry system, still persist these days.

As Poojari (1999) puts it, a family with more than one daughter is considered a cursed family even today. There is no point in spending money on the education of a daughter, for sooner or later the girl will get married. She will then live in her husband's house and create a world of her own which is

different from the world of her parents. A son, on the other hand, will follow the rituals after the death of his parents.[8]

4.   Address forms

4.1   Kinship terms used as terms of address

Kinship terms are adopted for usage among non-kin to establish or strengthen personal relationships. Usually, kinship terms are chosen for use among kin's friends and friends' kin. The parents of a friend are usually addressed as *maausi* 'aunt' (mother's sister), and *mausaa* 'uncle' (mother's sister's husband). A wife addresses her in-laws in exactly the same way as her husband addresses them, and likewise, a husband also addresses his in-laws in the same way as his wife addresses them. The social motivation for this is that husband and wife are supposed to be a single entity in heart and mind. So, anyone having any kind of relationship to either of them (husband or wife) bears the same relationship to the other also. E.g., a man addresses the elder brother or elder sister of his wife as *bhaai* 'elder brother', *naani* or *apaa* 'elder sister' (though he/she, *bhaai* or *naani*, may be younger than him). Thus, one could say that the address form is based on relationship. The most commonly used address forms are *mausaa* 'uncle', *maausi* 'aunt' (to elderly people), *apaa/naani* 'elder sister', *bhaai* 'elder brother' (to seniors), and *baabu* 'sir', *saar* 'sir' to any official. Even college students in class use *saar* 'sir'[9] and *maaḍaam* 'madam' to address their male and female teachers, respectively.

Interestingly, in a school, a male teacher is always addressed as *saar* 'sir' (which is a term of respect), but a female teacher is always addressed as *didi*, *apaa* 'elder sister', i.e. by a kinship term.[10] A woman is often portrayed as a sister, mother, etc., irrespective of the work she does. A nurse in a hospital is also addressed as *didi* 'sister' (not 'madam'). The reason is probably that it is the woman who takes care of the whole family, by giving priority to the needs of others over her own. She is portrayed as a source of affection, a mother or a sister, but not as a professional.

A male servant addresses his master as *baḍa baabu* 'big master', his master's son as *saana baabu* 'young master', his master's wife as *maa* 'mother', and his master's daughter as *dei* 'elder sister' (although all of them may be younger than the servant). It is interesting to note that the servant addresses the male members of his master's family by using the honorific term *baabu* 'sir', while he

addresses the female members of the family by using kinship terms such as 'mother' or 'sister'. While this indicates that among non-kin, status is given importance over age in address forms, the role of gender remains to be described in more detail.

4.2 Address forms and identity

Men can be addressed by their first names or by their family names/surnames. Women, before marriage, are addressed by their first names. But after getting married, they are usually addressed as 'Mrs X', where X is the husband's surname, or 'Y's mother', where Y is the name of the first child in most cases, and only sometimes by their first names. Take, for example, a man called Mohan Das and his wife Mira; Mira is addressed as 'Mrs Das', which is supposed to be a term of respect for her. But Mohan is never addressed as 'Mr Mira', which would be a humiliation. A woman does not have an identity of her own. Her identity derives from being a wife or mother; she gives priority to the needs of her husband and children over her own, and this is manifested on the linguistic level, too.

4.3 Friendship terms

Terms of endearment are used at home, among close friends and relatives. Friendship constitutes the strongest social bond among the non-kin. The degree of a friendly relation is manifested linguistically. The word *saanga* 'friend' (used for both male and female) is attached to words and phrases signifying some sort of social association, such as *kaleja saanga* 'college friend', *hastel saanga* 'hostel friend', *afis saanga* 'office friend'. To emphasize interpersonal relationships between friends, metaphorical expressions signifying friendship are used as address forms, cf. (8):

(8)   *golaapa*   'rose'
      khajuri   'date palm'
      chakleṭ   'chocolate'
      bauḷa   'mango flower'
      sangaata, mita   'somebody close to one's heart'

Instead of addressing each other by name, two friends may customarily use any of these words as a common term of address for each other. According to informal observation, women seem to use these words more than men do.

4.4 Occupational/professional terms

Different professional terms, such as the Oriya equivalents for Engl. *doctor*, *professor*, *BDO (Block Development Officer)*,[11] *driver*, and others are frequently used to address professionals. Addressing a male person by his professional title + *baabu/mahaasaya* 'sir' (a morpheme carrying the feature [+honour]) is common, cf. (9):

(9) *ḍaaktara* 'doctor' + *baabu* 'sir'   = *ḍaaktara baabu* 'doctor'
     okila 'lawyer' + *baabu* 'sir'   = *okilabaabu* 'lawyer'
     esḍio 'SDO' (Sub-divisional officer)[12]
     + *mahaasaya* 'sir'   = *esḍio mahaasaya*
     Biḍio 'BDO'+ *mahaasaya* 'sir'   = *Biḍio mahaasaya*

Professional titles are used as terms of address. The implication is that in Oriya society, the social role of a person is more important than his/her individuality. However, terms for occupations of lower status like *kiraani* 'clerk', *piana* 'peon, office boy, assistant', *mochi* 'cobbler', *kaarigara* 'carpenter', *bhanḍaari* 'barber', *muliaa* 'labourer', etc., are not used as address forms. They are used as general terms of reference. E.g., when referring to the barber Madhu, instead of saying *madhu aasilaaṇi* 'Madhu has come', one can say *bhanḍaari aasilaaṇi* 'the barber has come'. Sometimes, such people are addressed by using their occupational title(s) or occupational title + *bhaai* 'brother', but they are never addressed by using *baabu* 'sir' or *mahaasaya*, a term of respect. This leads to the assumption that profession plays a major role for the social status hierarchy, and thus professional, but not ordinary occupational titles, are used as terms of address.

   Baabuaaṇi 'madam', the female counterpart of *baabu* 'sir' is used to address the wife of a *baabu*, but rarely to address a woman as an independent individual. Take, for example, a doctor. A male doctor is usually addressed as *ḍaaktara baabu*, and his wife (irrespective of the work she does) is addressed as *baabuaaṇi* 'madam'. But a female doctor (in a context where she is not with her husband), is usually addressed as *maaḍaam* 'madam', or *maa* 'mother'. Likewise, a term of respect like *mahaasayaa* 'madam' is never used in everyday speech. It is used only in the written form or formal speech.

4.5 Honorific titles

Panḍita mahaasaya 'learned sir' (commonly used to address the Sanskrit teachers in the schools), *gosein mahaapuru* 'god' (addressing a *brahmin*) or *saar/saare* 'sir'

(to address teachers and high officials) are the words used to show ample respect to a man. However, a female brahmin or a brahmin's wife does not receive the same respect from others. She is treated and addressed just like any other woman in society. In fact, *paṇḍitiaaṇi*, the feminine counterpart of *paṇḍita* 'learned person', can be used as a term of humiliation for any woman. The assumption is that education is not desirable for women, as it does not conform to the traditional values.

4.6 Terms of abuse and derogatory address forms

Terms associated with social misfits or anti-social activities, such as *chora* 'thief', *saitaan* 'devil', *paaji* 'wicked', *bajaari* 'loafer', and terms associated with animals, such as *gadha* 'donkey', *kukura* 'dog' or *ghusuri* 'pig', may be used as derogatory address forms when expressing anger. Allan & Burridge (1991: 120) have rightly maintained that "Hearer-or-Named may be named or addressed dysphemist-ically using animal names, most of which have their own peculiar denotation." The male forms of these animal names may be used to refer to men and the female forms for women, e.g. *kukura* 'dog' – *kuti* 'bitch'.

Terms of family relations, such as *saḷaa* 'wife's brother', *saaḷi* 'wife's sister', are used as mild forms of abuse. *saḷaa* is frequently used among college students. When a male speaker uses *saḷaa* for another, the implication is that the former is challenging the latter by proposing indirectly to marry his sister. Note that nobody uses terms like *diara/deḍhasura* 'husband's brother' or *naṇanda* 'husband's sister' as words of abuse. This shows that a husband's family members are more important than those of a wife.

Words like *raaṇḍi* 'widow', *baanjhuṇi* 'barren' or *daari* 'whore', are used as terms of abuse for women, but similar words are never used for men. The assumption is that to be a widow, or barren, or a whore is entirely the fault or doing of the woman, and never the fault or doing of the man. Terms like these, therefore, carry a social stigma. Only women are stigmatised by means of these expressions, although men are equally prone to similar misfortunes.

For a couple, to have a male child is considered so mandatory that a word like *aaṇṭhukuḍi* 'a woman having no child' is used as a term of abuse. They might even have several daughters, but daughters do not count, in some parts of Orissa, towards not being an *aaṇṭhukuḍi*.

Men and women are supposed to behave in specific ways in society. If they do not, e.g. suppose a man behaves like a woman or a woman like a man, then

maaichiaa 'effeminate', and *aṇḍiraachaṇḍi* 'man-like' (or similar expressions) are used as words of abuse for men and women respectively.

Taboo expressions include terms related to sexual activities. Insults denigrating one's mother or sister are more common than those that refer to one's father or brother. E.g., *maa gihaa* 'mother-fucker' and *bhauṇi gihaa* 'sister-fucker' are very often used as terms of abuse for men. However, terms of abuse for the expression 'having sex with father/brother' are very rarely used for women. This is related to the fact that it is the man who mostly initiates sexual activities.

Taboo expressions concerning death also reflect the gender-bias of Oriya society. Expressions like *pua khaai* 'to be sonless' (lit. 'the woman who eats her own son') or *ghaitaa khaai* 'to be a widow' (lit. 'the woman who eats her own husband') are used as terms of abuse for a married woman. But terms of abuse for the expression 'to be a widower' are rarely employed for men. Also, *jhia khaai/khiaa* 'to be daughterless' hardly occurs as a term of abuse. This indicates that very little importance is attached to the life of a female child.

4.7 Euphemisms used to refer to one's spouse

Most speakers of Oriya avoid using the words for 'wife' and 'husband' in reference to their own spouse or those of acquaintances. A number of words and phrases like *aama baabu* 'our sir', *aamara sie* 'our he/she', or as child's father/mother (by taking the name of the child) are employed to replace these two words. Certain phrases like *haihe suṇuchha* 'hello, do you hear me' are used to initiate a talk between spouses. *Aamara sie* 'our he/she' is commonly used among friends and acquaintances, *mo stri* 'my wife', *aama baabu* 'our sir' among acquaintances on formal occasions. Note that while the husband uses *mo stri* 'my wife', the wife does not use *mo swaami* 'my husband'; rather, she uses a phrase indicating respect, that is, *aama baabu* 'our sir'. Interestingly, when referring to his wife, a husband never says *aama baabuaaṇi* 'our madam', unless he is in a jovial mood. But such a term (*aama baabu*) 'our sir' is never employed before children or intimate friends. The wife is not supposed to utter the name of her in-laws (elders) or even of her husband, but there is no such restriction on the husband. The husband can address his wife by her name. Probably, showing respect to someone and not addressing the person by name go together. However, *mo misṭar* 'my Mr' for one's husband and *mo mises* 'my Mrs' for one's wife are now extremely common among educated people.

5.   Idiomatic expressions

Gender plays an important role in certain types of expressions. E.g., when a person Y receives a blessing from somebody, if Y is a woman, then she receives a blessing like *haatakaaca bajra heu* 'your bangle shall be unbreakable',[13] which literally means 'never be a widow', but if Y is a man, he receives a blessing like *aayusmaan hua* or *buḍhaa hoithaa* 'have a long life'. There is no expression like 'never be a widower' used for a man. This shows the importance of a husband for a wife, as opposed to that of a wife for a husband, which is characteristic of Oriya society. Of course, unmarried girls do receive blessings like *aayusmati hua* or *buḍhiṭie hoithaa* 'have a long life'.

Certain expressions, as in example (10), are typically used by women only:

(10)   *kapaaḷaṭaa mora phaṭaalo mū kahibi kaahaaku?*
       'I am ill-fated, whom should I tell?'

Getting married is considered immensely important in Oriya society. So, if one dies without getting married, terms like *atharabaaḍuaa*, *atharabaaḍei* (lit. 'an elderly unmarried man/woman') are used as derogatory expressions for men and women, respectively.

In the case of a second marriage, if it is a man, then an expression like *se baahaa hoigalaa* 'he got married' is used, but if it is a woman, then one says *se thuaathoi hoigalaa* 'she is just kept (as an object)'. The assumption is that in male-dominated Oriya society, a man can marry several times; but a woman can marry only once, and if she re-marries, her marriage status is regarded as diminished and she is described as a kept object of the family.

An expression like (11) is well believed by the Oriya people:

(11)   *ihia janama para gharaku.*
       'A daughter is born to be sent to somebody's house.'

The implication is that a girl child is fated to be sent to somebody else's house; that is, after marriage, the daughter usually lives with her husband in her in-laws' family. Thus, she is of no help to her parents any more. On the other hand, after marriage, the son lives with his parents and can support them and other family members. This explains the preference of a son over a daughter.

Certain expressions do not have any female counterpart, e.g. *manara maṇisa* lit. 'mind's man' or 'the man of one's heart', *pati parameswar* 'husband is the sole God'. As Hasan (1997) explains, the husband is the sole god for his wife, the god of her life in this world as well as in her afterlife.

6. Lexical asymmetries

Asymmetry in lexical meaning is linked to perceptions of gender roles. Certain words have been lexicalised as gender-specific. Words like *raaṇḍi/bidhabaa* 'widow', *daari/besyaa* 'whore' or *baanjhuṇi* 'barren', are used as terms of abuse, and are applicable only to women. There is hardly any male counterpart for any of these words. The reason would seem to be that in a male-dominated society like that of Oriya, it is believed that misfortunes which arise in the course of marriage, like barrenness, widowhood, divorce as well as socially unacceptable conduct such as prostitution, are events or acts associated only with women. Words like *rakhitaa* 'kept woman, mistress', *kuḷaṭaa* 'having an extra-marital affair', *patitaa* 'fallen woman' (commonly used for women having extra-marital relationships) do not have male counterparts,[14] as these acts are not considered to be serious misconduct if committed by men.

Traditionally, women are not supposed to smoke or drink alcohol. Thus, terms like *maduaa* 'drunkard', *biḍiaa* 'smoker', *ganjeiaa* 'hashish-addict', *aapuaa* 'opium-eater', etc. are used exclusively with reference to men. Even if a woman were to qualify as a drunkard, smoker, or drug-addict, a periphrastic expression would be used, but never the male term.

In certain occupations or professions, only men are supposed to work and therefore, one does not find the corresponding female counterparts for the expressions in (12):

(12) *kaarigara*   'carpenter'
      bindhaaṇi   'smith'
      sainika   'soldier'
      daarogaa   'constable'
      raasṭrapati   'President of the country'
      jaguaaḷa   'watchman, security guard'
      ḍaaka piana   'postman'
      laainmyaan   'electrician'
      niāā libhaaḷi   'fireman'
      draaibhara   'driver'
      byabasaayi   'businessman'
      saapuaa   'snake-charmer'
      roseiaa/pujaari   'cook'

Although it is the woman who always cooks at home throughout her life, there is no term for a female cook. Nor does one find a female cook in a hotel or in a public place.

Certain words (borrowed from English), like *polis* 'police', are considered to be male-specific, whereas *nars* 'nurse' is assumed to have female reference only. Consequently, one finds expressions like *maaikinaa polis* 'female police', and *aṇḍiraa nars* 'male nurse', also.

Caasuṇi, the female counterpart of *casaa* 'farmer', usually means 'farmer's wife', not 'female farmer'. Other occupational terms have female counterparts also, but again, they denote the wife of the man who is in the occupation, as in *kamaaruṇi* 'wife of a black-smith', *camaaruṇi* 'wife of a cobbler', or *keuṭuṇi* 'wife of a fisherman'. These female-specific terms are never used to denote a 'female blacksmith', 'female cobbler', or 'fisherwoman'.

7. Male generics

Male terms may be used generically, as in *manusya maraṇasiḷa* 'man is mortal'. Here, *manusya* 'man' indicates all human beings including women (the same applies in Sanskrit and other Indic languages).

(13) *daiba dauḍi maṇisa gaai, jeṇiki   oṭaare teṇiki jaai.*
      fate   rope man   cow wherever pulls   there goes
      'Man is fated.'

In (13), *maṇisa* 'man' indicates the whole human race irrespective of a person's gender.

Bandhu 'friend' is also used as a generic term, although the female counterpart *baandhabi* 'female friend', is available. In a situation where someone steps on a person Y by mistake, s/he utters the name *bisnu/bisṭū* (Bisnu is a god in Hinduism), which is supposed to mean 'sorry' irrespective of whether Y is a man or a woman. The implication is that every human being is a representation of God and should be respected and not hurt. The surprising thing is that nobody uses *Lakhmi*, the female counterpart of Bisnu in such a situation (Lakhmi is a powerful goddess in Hinduism, and portrayed as the wife of Bisnu).

In an example like (14), which is often used in religious books, *saadhujane* 'gentlemen' indicates both male and female, as it is used as an address form for the whole audience:

(14) *suṇa suṇa saadhujane dei   mana karna.*
      listen listen gentlemen with mind ear
      'O gentlemen! Please listen to me carefully.'

In an expression like (15), *amaṇisa* lit. 'not a human being' 'worthless/hopeless person' is used in a generic sense, which includes both male and female:

(15)   *amaṇisa bhaḷiaa heuchhu kaahĩki?*
       no-man like   behave why
       'Why do you behave like a non-human being?'

This taboo term has some emotional effect on the hearer, since it diminishes his/her status as a human being (Agyekum 1996: 125).

A male term like *pua* 'son' is used as a generic term. Consider example (16):

(16)   *pua naahin   maa   peṭare*
       son NEG.AUX mother's womb.in
       puara baapaa khaḍu   gaḍhaauchhi banamaaḷipura haaṭare.
       son's father bracelet make.PROG Banamalipur   market.in
       'The child is not even in his mother's womb, but the father of the child is making bracelets for the child in Banamalipur market [i.e. he is too ambitious].'

Here, *pua* 'son' has been used generically for 'child'. This also shows the preference of a male over a female child.

However, occasionally one finds the use of female terms in a generic function, as in the non-personal compound *maatrubhaasaa* 'mother tongue' (but not *pitrubhaasaa* 'father tongue'). Here, *maatrubhaasaa* 'mother tongue' refers to the language a child acquires first in childhood, presumably from her/his mother.

8.   'You' in Oriya

The second person singular pronoun 'you' in Oriya has three lexical realisations: *tu*, *tume* and *aapaṇa*. If we consider this lexical variation, it is very difficult to determine one of the three forms as a base form. So we shall call them simply variants of the second person singular pronoun which differ in their semantics and distribution:

Tu is an intimate pronoun which is used for close friends, relatives, female family members or younger people. Due to its lack of honorific content, it is usually used for servants, socially low class people, etc.

Tume[15] occupies an intermediate position between *tu* and *aapaṇa* (cf. below) both in terms of intimacy and respect or honorification. It is therefore

employed in a wide range of contexts, e.g. for one's spouse, in-laws, male family members, colleagues, strangers (of the same age-group), neighbours, all the elders, etc.

The pronoun *aapaṇa* is a honorific form which is adequate to use for teachers, officials, people of high social status, etc.

The distribution of the three pronouns is thus determined by the dimensions of intimacy and respect or honorification (according to social status). These variants of the second person singular occur in symmetrical as well as asymmetrical usage. For example, one uses the *tu* variant of 'you' for one's elder brother and sister as well, but *tume* for one's sister-in-law (brother's wife), and the brother-in-law (sister's husband). This is due to the difference in the degree of intimacy between brothers and sisters on the one hand and the in-laws on the other. In rural areas, usually a wife uses *tume* for her husband while the husband uses *tu* for his wife. Of course, in urban areas, both husband and wife use *tume* for each other. A child uses the *tume* variant for his/her father, but *tu* for the mother. Parents usually use *tu* for their children. Two friends exchange *tu*, whereas two colleagues in an office can choose *tume* and *aapaṇa* when speaking to each other. Students use *aapaṇa* for a teacher, while the teacher can use either *tu* (in primary school) or *tume* (in secondary or high school).

9.   Conclusion

The preceding discussion shows that Oriya has "natural" or semantic gender, which may be marked at different linguistic levels, with various socio-cultural implications. Generally, the choice of the appropriate variant of the second person pronoun in Oriya indicates the correlation of the structure of language and the structure of society. Gender bias in Oriya society also determines the use of address forms. People from different social groups are distinguished by the use of address forms with profound social consequences, which include a differential treatment of women and men.

A topic of concern for further investigation includes the role of the feminist movement in enhancing the quality of women's lives in Orissa. Some gendered terms like *raanḍa/bidhabaa* 'widow', *besyaa* 'prostitute', *baanjha* 'barren', or *daari* 'whore' are not favourable to women, while there are no such terms for men. The question is how women react in such a situation. Has the education of women been able to influence the relationship between women and men? Does the emerging feminist movement address the issue of gender bias in language?

Female terms for women can (easily) be created in Oriya by making use of a number of morphological and syntactic strategies. There are certain male terms which are used generically, although the female counterparts of these male nouns are available. But the use of female terms is usually considered to be the marked practice. The question is: Due to the women's movement, is anything changing in language use, towards the employment of more female terms, or are these terms used less frequently? Is there any systematic attempt to document such gender bias in language and to design an agenda to remove the inequality?

Another possible area of further research concerns minorities. It would be important to find out in which ways language is used by the religious or ethnic minorities in Orissa and whether gender-related socio-cultural facts are reflected in language use.

Beyond all considerations of language, it is essential that social projects dealing with the welfare and empowerment of women in Oriya society are developed and implemented.

Notes

* I acknowledge my sincere thanks to Dr. Assibi A. Amidu and the anonymous Benjamins checker who have read the earlier drafts of this paper and have provided many invaluable comments and suggestions to improve it.

1. In the transcription used here, letters such as *ḍ, ṭ, ŋ* and *ḷ* stand for retroflex sounds; *a* marks the half-open back vowel, while *aa* marks an open back vowel.

2. For a general overview cf. Klaiman (1987); reference grammars are Beames (1872–1878), Pradhan et al. (1995); an Oriya dictionary is Praharaj (1931–1940).

3. The female counterpart of the word denotes 'wife of a blacksmith', not 'female black-smith'. However, such type of lexical asymmetry is linked to the perception of gender roles in Oriya society.

4. *Daaḍi* 'daddy' is borrowed from English.

5. Note that the term *nanaa* for 'brother' is used by non-brahmins only, as brahmins use *nanaa* for 'father'. Brahmins usually use *bhaainaa* for 'brother'.

6. *Mami* 'mother' is borrowed from English.

7. In the hierarchy of the social caste-system, *brahmin* 'one who devotes his/her time to religious pursuits', comes in the highest rank, followed by *khyatriya* 'people from the warrior class', *vaisya* 'business-class people', and *shudra* 'those who serve the above three classes of people'.

8. In Hinduism, following the rituals is considered mandatory for the salvation of the soul.

9. *Saar/saare* 'sir' is borrowed from English.

10. At the college or university level, of course, a female teacher is addressed as *maaḍaam* 'madam'.

11. A 'Block' is a small unit of administration.

12. Orissa is divided into a number of divisions and sub-divisions. Each sub-division is a unit of administration.

13. A married woman is supposed to wear bangles all the time, as long as her husband is alive. But those bangles are destroyed when the woman becomes a widow, and she is deprived of wearing bangles for the rest of her life. Wearing a finger-ring is assumed to be the marital symbol for men, but this is not obligatory.

14. Of course, there is the word *patita* 'fallen man', but the association is not necessarily with the "sin" of an extramarital affair committed by a man.

15. The pronoun *tume* 'you' can also be used as a second person plural form.

References

Agyekum, Kofi. 1996. Akan verbal taboos in the context of the ethnography of communication. *Working Papers in Linguistics*, No. 30. Trondheim: NTNU.

Allan, Keith & Kate Burridge. 1991. *Euphemism and dysphemism: Language used as shield and weapon.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Beames, John. 1872–1878. *A comparative grammar of the modern Aryan languages of India: To wit, Hindi, Panjabi, Sindhi, Gujarati, Marathi, Oriya and Bengali.* Reprint 1966. Vol. 2. Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal.

Directorate of census operation Orissa. 1991. *General population tables.* Part II-A, Series 19. Orissa.

Hasan, Kumar. 1997. *aadimaru aadhunika* [From ancient to modern]. Cuttack: Popular publications.

Klaiman, Miriam H. 1987. "Bengali." In *The world's major languages*, ed. Bernard Comrie. London: Croom Helm, 490–513.

Mohapatra, Pandit Narayana & Sridhar Das. 1962. *sarbasaara byaakaraṇa* [The best grammar]. Cuttack: M/s New Student's Store.

Poojari, Sailabala. 1999. *naari* [Woman]. Cuttack: Sahadev Pradhan, Friends' Publishers.

Pradhan, Sarat Chandra & Gaganendra Nath Dash & Panchanan Mohanty & Kursnachandra Sadangi & Subhendra Mohan Srichandansingh. 1995. *oḍiaa byaakaraṇa* [Oriya grammar]. Cuttack: Board of Secondary Education, Orissa.

Praharaj, Gopal Chandra. 1931–1940. *bhaasaa kosa* [Oriya lexicon]. 7 vols. Cuttack.

Priestly, Tom M. S. 1983. "On 'drift' in Indo-European gender systems." *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 11: 339–363.

Language and gender in Polish

Gabriela Koniuszaniec
Adam Mickiewicz-University, Poznań, Poland

Hanka Błaszkowska
Adam Mickiewicz- University, Poznań, Poland /
Europa-Universität Viadrina, Frankfurt an der Oder, Germany

1.   Introduction

Polish (*polski*) is a West Slavic language with more than 40 million speakers, most of them in the Republic of Poland. A common national language has developed over centuries, at first only orally and since the 14th century also in a written form. In contemporary Polish five dialects of limited areal extension can be distinguished: Kashubian, Mazovian, Great Polish, Little Polish and Silesian.

Polish is an inflecting language. The declensional paradigms comprise seven cases (nominative, genitive, dative, accusative, instrumental, locative, vocative) and two numbers (singular and plural). There are two main declensional types: the nominal and the pronominal-adjectival declension. Moreover, there is the highly complex inflection of the cardinal numerals and a specific declension of some pronouns. Polish has three grammatical genders (cf. Section 2).

The verb is inflected for three persons in two numbers. It can be used in three tenses (present, past, future) and three moods (indicative, conditional and imperative). In addition, there are two aspects, the imperfective and the perfective aspect.[1]

2.   Categories of gender in Polish

2.1 Grammatical gender

The three grammatical genders of Polish are: masculine, feminine and neuter. In principle, grammatical gender assignment is independent of extra-linguistic factors (see, however, Sections 2.2 and 2.3).

Compared with gender distinctions in other European languages, Polish shows a greater variety of forms, and the masculine gender is far more visible than the feminine. In the singular, two subgenders can be distinguished: animate masculine, as in *chłopiec* 'boy' or *kot* 'cat', and inanimate masculine, as in *but* 'shoe'. The animate masculine is characterised by identical forms in the genitive and accusative, while the inanimate masculine has identical forms in the nominative and accusative:

(1)   Masculine Animate   Masculine Inanimate
   NOM   *kot*   'cat'   *but*   'shoe'
   GEN   *kota*   *buta*
   DAT   *kotu*   *butowi*
   ACC   *kota*   *but*

In addition, supremacy of the masculine in the Polish language is found in the plural, where a division is drawn between the masculine personal gender with declensional forms of its own and the non-masculine personal gender, also called feminine-object gender. The non-masculine personal gender comprises animate and inanimate words that are feminine and neuter in the singular, as well as masculine non-personal words:

(2) Nominative Plural
   ci chłopcy   'these boys'
   te dziewczyny/książki/dzieci/koty   'these girls/books/children/cats'

   Accusative Plural
   tych chłopców
   te dziewczyny/książki/dzieci/koty

To summarize, the Polish gender system is structured in the following way:

Singular: masculine (animate, inanimate)
            feminine
            neuter
Plural: masculine personal
            non-masculine personal (feminine, neuter; non-personal
            masculine)

As illustrated in (2), in the plural, terms for women (personal nouns) are in the same gender class as terms for objects (inanimate nouns) and animals (non-personal nouns). This is the most obvious manifestation of the unequal position of women and men in the Polish gender system.

2.2 Agreement

Modifiers agree with the gender of the noun with which they are in a syntactic relationship. This applies to demonstrative pronouns, numerals and adjectives, as in (3); all these word classes are marked morphologically for the respective grammatical gender:

(3) *ten jeden mały chłopiec* (m)   'this one little boy'
    ta jedna mała dziewczynka (f)   'this one little girl'
    to jedno małe dziecko (n)   'this one little child'

The use of the demonstrative pronoun (*ten*, *ta*, *to*) is not obligatory in Polish:

(4) *Widzę* (*tę*) *kobietę*   / (*tego*) *mężczyznę*   / (*to*) *dziecko.*
    'I see (this) woman   / (this) man   / (this) child.'

However, the use of the demonstrative can function as an indicator of referential gender for epicene nouns, that is, nouns ending in *-a* which can denote both a woman or a man. *Skarżypyta* 'telltale', for example, is a feminine noun which is used for female as well as male referents. When it refers to men, agreement can be feminine or animate masculine. The masculine demonstrative *ten* (m)

can therefore express referential (male) gender: *ten* (m) *skarżypyta* 'this telltale'. *Niezdara, ciamajda, gapa, maruda*, all meaning 'slouch' or 'slowcoach', function in a similar way. Among those word classes which also change their form depending on the noun's gender are relative pronouns (5), possessive pronouns (6) and quantifiers (7):

(5) a. Relative Pronouns (Singular)

        list (m), *który* (m)   'letter which'

        rzecz (f), *która* (f)   'thing which'

        zagadnienie (n), *które* (n)   'question which'

    b. Relative Pronouns (Plural)

        mężczyźni (m.pers), *którzy* (m)   'men who'

        kobiety (non-m.pers)*/rzeczy/*   'women, things, animals

        zwierzęta, które (non-m.pers)   who/which'

(6) Possessive Pronouns

    Adam (m) *i jego* (m) *żona* (f)   'Adam and his wife'

    Ewa (f) *i jej* (f) *mąż* (m)   'Ewa and her husband'

    dziecko (n) *i jego* (n) *zabawka* (f)   'the child and its toys'

(7) Quantifiers

    jakiś (m) *pan* (m)   'a (any, some) gentleman'

    jakaś (f) *pani* (f)   'a lady'

    jakieś (n) *dziecko* (n)   'a child'

The indefinite pronouns *ktoś* 'someone', *ktokolwiek* 'anybody', *nikt* 'no-one' and the interrogative *kto* 'who', which may all refer to females as well as males, require masculine agreement, e.g.:

(8) *Nikt*   *nam tego nie powiedział.*

    nobody.ᴍᴀsᴄ us   this not told.ᴍᴀsᴄ

    'Nobody told us that.'

Like nouns, personal pronouns also distinguish three genders in the singular: *on, ona, ono* 'he, she, it', and two in the plural: *oni* (m.pers) 'they', *one* (non-m.pers) 'they'.

    A characteristic feature of Polish is gender agreement between the subject and predicate in the past tense in all persons of the singular and plural:

(9) Singular   Plural

    on pisał (m) 'he wrote'   *oni pisali* (masculine personal) 'they wrote'

    ona pisała (f) 'she wrote'   *one pisały* (non-masculine personal) 'they wrote'

    ono pisało (n) 'it wrote'

Similarly, adjectives which syntactically function as complements in the predicate, show different inflectional forms both in the singular and in the plural:

(10) *(ja) jestem szczęśliwy* (m)[3]/*szczęśliwa* (f)   'I am happy'
      (ty) jesteś szczęśliwy (m)/*szczęśliwa* (f)   'you are happy'
      (on) jest szczęśliwy   'he is happy'
      (ona) jest szczęśliwa   'she is happy'
      (ono) jest szczęśliwe   'it is happy'
      (my) jesteśmy szczęśliwi (m)/*szczęśliwe* (f)   'we are happy'
      (wy) jesteście szczęśliwi (m)/*szczęśliwe* (f)   'you are happy'
      (oni) są szczęśliwi (masculine personal)   'they are happy'
      (one) są szczęśliwe (non-masculine personal)   'they are happy'

The distinction of masculine and non-masculine agreement forms in the third person plural can be interpreted as adding to the dominance of the masculine element in Polish.

If the subject coordinates two nouns with different grammatical genders, the form of the verb or predicative adjective which follows must indicate masculine personal gender:

(11) a. *Adam i Ewa pisali* (m.pers).
          'Adam and Ewa wrote.'
      b. *Adam i Ewa są szczęśliwi* (m.pers).
          'Adam and Ewa are happy.'

2.3 Lexical and referential gender

Polish words with lexical gender (often kinship terms) may be illustrated by pairs such as *mężczyzna – kobieta* 'man – woman', *chłopiec – dziewczyna* 'boy – girl', *ojciec – matka* 'father – mother', *brat – siostra* 'brother – sister'.

The asymmetry in the treatment of women and men becomes apparent when a neutral collective form is required, comprising both male and female reference, as such words can only be formed from a masculine base, e.g., *bratostwo* 'brother and his wife', from *brat* (m) 'brother'; *ambasadorostwo* 'ambassador and his wife', from *ambasador* (m) 'ambassador'.

Referential gender does not necessarily coincide with grammatical gender. In many cases referential gender is difficult to identify, or may even be in conflict with grammatical gender, as in nouns like *dziecko* (n) 'child', *osoba* (f) 'person', or *człowiek* (m) 'man, human being'. In some cases grammatical gender directly contradicts referential gender: The noun *obojnak* 'hermaphrodite'

is grammatically masculine, but is interpreted as referring to someone who is both female and male.

Complex nouns which contain modifying adjectives or participles may be gender-indefinite, irrespective of their grammatical gender, e.g., *grono pedagogiczne* (n) 'teaching staff', *siła robocza* (f) 'labour force', *chodząca encyklopedia* (f) lit. 'a walking encyclopaedia', 'somebody who knows everything'.

3.   Word-formation

The male gender is also decidedly favoured in word-formation. Feminine personal nouns are derived from masculines by suffixes such as *-ka*, *-ini/yni*, *-ica* or *-a*, and in a few cases also by *-owa*, *-aczka*, *-ina/yna*, *-ówna* or *-anka*, or even *-ówka* (Grzegorczykowa 1998:422). The result of these derivational processes are semantically asymmetrical pairs of words, with the feminine term typically denoting some relationship to a male, while the masculine term denotes an independent male individual or the agent of some profession or function.

The gender hierarchy is also visible in the structure of family names for wives and daughters, which are derived from the masculine names by means of the above mentioned suffixes, as in (12):

(12)   a.   *Pawlakowa* (wife of *Pawlak*), *Pawlaczka* (wife or daughter of *Pawlak*), *Pawlakówna* (daughter of *Pawlak*)
      b.   *Sekulina* (wife of *Sekuła*), *Sekulanka* (daughter of *Sekuła*)
      c.   *Kuleszyna* (wife of *Kulesza*), *Kuleszanka* (daughter of *Kulesza*)

All affixes used for the derivation of feminine forms indicate a woman's, wife's or daughter's relation to a man. Officially, however, a wife's or daughter's name must be exactly like the husband's or father's, that is *Pawlak*, *Sekuła* or *Kulesza*. Referential gender is then indicated by the address forms *pan* (m) 'Mr', *pani* (f) 'Mrs' or *panna* (f) 'Miss'. However, if the man's name ends in *-ski*, female family names are constructed by changing word-final *-i* to *-a*, as in *Adamski–Adamska*. The *-a*-suffix is also used to change a masculine first name into a feminine one, e.g., *Gabriel–Gabriela*.

For the wives of craftsmen and functionaries the suffixes used are *-owa*, e.g., *szewc* (m) 'cobbler' – *szewcowa* (f) 'cobbler's wife', *profesor* (m) 'professor' – *profesorowa* (f) 'professor's wife', or *-ina* if the name originates from a title or office and ends in *-a* or *-i/-y*: *starosta* (m) 'governor' – *starościna* (f) 'governor's wife', *podstoli* (m) 'Lord Steward' – *podstolina* (f) 'wife of the Lord Steward'.

The suffix *-owa* may at times be used to form the feminine term for a female performer of a certain function, e.g., *szef* (m) 'manager' – *szefowa* (f) 'manageress'. The basis for feminine derivatives in *-yni* are masculine agentive nouns ending in *-ca*, e.g. *wychowawca* (m) 'tutor' – *wychowawczyni* (f) 'female tutor', but other base forms are also possible, e.g., *gospodarz* (m) 'host' – *gospodyni* (f) 'hostess'. When a word ends in *-k*, as a rule the feminine suffix is *-ini*, as in *członek* (m) 'member' – *członkini* (f) 'female member'. However, there are exceptions such as *pracownik* (m) 'employee' with the feminine derivations *pracownica* and *pracowniczka* (f) 'female employee'.

Terms for female animals contain the typical suffix *-ica*, as in *lisica* 'vixen'. Sometimes, however, this suffix is even used to construct feminine forms of personal nouns from masculine nouns in *-ec*, e.g., *ulubieniec* (m) 'favourite' – *ulubienica* (f) 'female favourite', and from masculine nouns in *-ik*, e.g., *zakonnik* (m) 'monk' – *zakonnica* (f) 'nun'. This establishes a morphological (and perhaps semantic) affinity between animal terms and terms for women.

An extremely productive suffix in the Polish language is *-ka*, as in *lekarka* 'doctor', its productivity being, however, subject to some constraints (Section 4.3).

The suffix *-ostwo* forms collective terms, especially for married couples, derived from the name of a male person who is related by marriage, bears a title, occupies a certain position or has a certain profession (cf. examples in 2.3). The names for married couples can also be formed from proper nouns, but here also the base will be the name of a male, e.g., *Adamostwo* 'Adam and his wife' or the variant form *Adamowie*. All the above mentioned nouns ending in *-ostwo* are formally neuter singular, but denote collectives and require plural qualifiers in masculine personal forms, e.g., *nasi kochani bratostwo/wujostwo* 'our dear brother and his wife/uncle and his wife'.

Masculine terms can be derived from feminine ones by means of the suffixes *-or* and *-iec* (denominal forms), as well as *-ik* (deverbal forms): E.g., *gęsior* (m) 'gander' is derived from *gęś* (f) 'goose', or *kaczor* (m) 'drake' from *kaczka* (f) 'duck'. There is also an isolated word *gwiazdor* (m) 'star' in this group. The word is derived from the feminine noun *gwiazda* 'star', but its use is restricted to the metaphorical sense and mostly denotes male film stars. In other spheres the feminine *gwiazda* denotes both women and men, e.g., *gwiazda tenisa* (f) 'tennis star'. Another example is *wdowiec* (m) 'widower', derived from the feminine *wdowa* (f) 'widow'. As to names of professions, the deverbal formation *położna* (f) 'midwife' (< *położyć* 'lay down') is definitely older than *położnik* (m), but while *położna* (f) denotes a nurse qualified to deliver babies, *położnik* (m) is a doctor specialized in obstetrics.

Nouns derived from adjectives or participles may be grammatically feminine or masculine, depending on referential gender:

(13)   *Chory   zostanie przewieziony do szpitala.*
      sick.MASC will.be   taken.MASC   to hospital
      Chora   zostanie przewieziona do szpitala.
      sick.FEM will.be   taken.FEM   to hospital
      'The sick will be taken to the hospital.'

4.   Male as norm in Polish

In the Polish language, the use of feminine and masculine expressions denoting persons shows a number of asymmetries. Generally, the masculine gender predominates over the feminine.

4.1   Word order

In coordinated expressions, the masculine personal noun is usually placed in first position, e.g., *ojciec i matka* 'father and mother', *mąż i żona* 'husband and wife', *Klaudiusz i Messalina* 'Claudius and Messalina'. The titles of children's stories follow the same pattern: *Jaś* (m) *i Małgosia* (f) or *Ptyś* (m) *i Balbina* (f). This word order is by no means accidental, it is a manifestation of the social hierarchy in which a man ranks higher than a woman. It is also according to this principle that all questionnaires, forms and other documents are constructed – the father's name always precedes the mother's name. In grammar books, descriptions of personal pronouns (*on/ona/ono* 'he/she/it'), adjectival forms (*zielony* (m) – *zielona* (f) – *zielone* (n) 'green'), and the names of the genders themselves (*rodzaj męski, rodzaj żeński, rodzaj nijaki* 'masculine, feminine, neuter [gender]') are always arranged in the same order. Only for the sake of courtesy does the feminine form precede the masculine when mixed groups are addressed, as in *drogie panie, drodzy panowie* 'dear ladies, dear gentlemen'.

4.2   Proper names

Another example of asymmetry is the practice of referring to men and women by proper names. As a rule, a man is referred to in full by his first name and surname, while a woman is frequently mentioned by her first name only, e.g.:

(14) *Lech Wałęsa z żoną Danutą*   'Lech Wałęsa and wife Danuta'
      Jan III Sobieski i Marysieńka   'Jan III Sobieski and Marysieńka'

It may happen that a male professional person and a female subordinate, for instance a secretary, are introduced to a party as *dyrektor Kowalski i jego sekretarka* 'director Kowalski and his secretary', i.e. the woman remains unidentified by name. As there are still more men in higher positions and more women in subordinate functions, this often results in asymmetric practices of reference.

4.3 Generic masculines

A major source of asymmetry in the Polish language is the fact that the masculine gender has two referential functions: gender-specific, i.e. referring exclusively to males, as in *Polacy* (m) 'Polish men' as opposed to *Polki* (f) 'Polish women', or generic, i.e. referring to males as well as females, as in (15):

(15) *Polacy   są narodem słowiańskim.*
      Poles.MASC are nation   Slavonic
      'The Polish (i.e. men and women) are a Slavonic nation.'

Likewise, a bank form talks about *właściciel rachunku* (m) 'holder of a bank account', a labour code about *pracodawca* (m) 'employer' and *pracownik* (m) 'employee', a tax return form about *podatnik* (m) 'tax payer', a ballot paper about a *kandydat* (m) 'candidate' of a political party, and so on.

Only the masculine forms can fulfil a generic function; the feminine forms cannot be used to include male persons. Feminine forms, which are always gender-specific, can only be used metaphorically to describe males, with distinctly negative connotations:

(16) *Ale   z niego baba!*
      what of him   female.FEM
      'What a ninny!'

This constitutes an exception to the rule: *baba* (f) 'female, broad' is a coarse word for a woman or wife, in many contexts it expresses a negative meaning. When used to describe a male, the expression is contemptuous and denotes excessive sensitivity, if not downright effeminacy.

Masculine forms can be used (alternatively to feminine forms) to refer to specific individual female persons. In (17), for example, *właścicielem* (m) 'owner' was preferred to *właścicielka* (f) '(female) owner' in reference to the speaker's wife:

(17) *Moja   żona   jest właścicielem mieszkania.*
      my.FEM wife.FEM is   owner.MASC of.apartment
      'My wife is the owner of the apartment.'

With certain official terms, applying the masculine form to female persons is the standard practice and feminine alternatives are not used, e.g. *posiadacz rachunku* (m) 'account holder', *podatnik* (m) 'taxpayer'. Sometimes, the use of a masculine term with female reference implies a certain positive evaluation, as in (18):

(18) *Dobry   z niej kumpel.*
      good.MASC is she pal.MASC
      'She is a good pal.'

The masculine term is chosen to depict the female as a pal, although the parallel feminine forms *kumpela* or *kumpelka* are available and could also be used.

In spite of the fact that there are feminine terms, the masculine forms are preferred when talking about women; thus (19a) is the norm rather than (19b):

(19) a. *Ona* (f) *jest dobrym* (m) *lekarzem/nauczycielem/prawnikiem/ specjalistą* (m).
          'She is a good (m) doctor/teacher/lawyer/specialist (m).'
      b. *Ona* (f) *jest dobrą* (f) *lekarką/nauczycielką/prawniczką/specjalistką* (f).
          'She is a good (f) doctor/teacher/lawyer/specialist (f).'

The masculine forms are often preferred by women themselves, as many consider them to be more prestigious. This partly results from the fact that many professional terms are ascribed an evaluative meaning, with the feminine stereotypically denoting the less prestigious profession. For instance, *profesor* (m) 'professor' is usually associated with a university, and *profesorka* (f) 'female professor' with a secondary school; *kierownik* (m) 'manager' with a company, *kierowniczka* (f) 'manageress' with a shop, *sekretarz* (m) 'secretary', with a political party, *sekretarka* (f) 'woman secretary' with the subordinate function in a company.

Another type of asymmetry occurs in pairs of related nouns, with the masculine denoting the (typically male) holder of a profession, and the feminine denoting a non-personal entity. Examples are:

(20) Masculine   Feminine
      dyplomata 'diplomat'   *dyplomatka* 'kind of briefcase'
      szermierz 'fencer'   *szermierka* 'kind of sport-fencing'
      drukarz   'printer (person)' *drukarka*   'printer (object)'

pielgrzym	'pilgrim'	*pielgrzymka*	'pilgrimage'
cukiernik	'confectioner'	*cukiernica/*	'sugar bowl'
		cukierniczka	

Another, even more striking example of asymmetry is the lack of feminine terms for certain professions and positions. The numerous nouns terminating in -*log* have no feminine counterparts. Examples include: *archeolog* (m) 'archeologist', *filolog* (m) 'philologist', *kardiolog* (m) 'cardiologist', *meteorolog* (m) 'meteorologist' and *psycholog* (m) 'psychologist'. Neither is it possible to derive feminine forms from masculine nouns ending in -*owiec*, such as *jaskiniowiec* (m) 'cave-dweller', *bankowiec* (m) 'banker', *fachowiec* (m) 'expert, specialist', *handlowiec* (m) 'tradesman', *szkoleniowiec* (m) 'instructor, coach', *wyczynowiec* (m) 'record-holder' or *sportowiec* (m) 'sportsman'. The latter may sometimes be modified to *sportsmenka* (f) 'sportswoman'. Likewise, *biznesmenka* (f) is a loan word denoting 'businesswoman'. Both have been formed by borrowing from English (*sportsman*, *businessman*) and adding the suffix -*ka*. The word *fachman* (m) 'specialist' is borrowed from German and exhibits a similar structure as *biznesmen* in that it is related to a compound with the element 'man'. However, the association with professional competence, which is usually ascribed to male persons, may have blocked the derivation of a feminine form (*fachmanka) in this case.

Feminine counterparts are hardly ever derived from foreign words like *chirurg* (m) 'surgeon', *szpieg* (m) 'spy', *internista* (m) 'general doctor, specialist in internal diseases' or *jubiler* (m) 'jeweler', or from certain nouns terminating in -*ec*, for instance, *głupiec* (m) 'fool', *poczciwiec* (m) 'good soul', *ślepiec* (m) 'blind man', or from nouns ending in -*y* denoting certain professions, like *leśniczy* (m) 'forest-ranger', *motorniczy* (m) 'tram driver'.

The majority of borrowed personal nouns in Polish occur only in the masculine, although each one of them could be the basis for a corresponding feminine form with the suffix -*ka*. Only in the case of *boss* can the lack of a feminine derivation be explained as an avoidance of homophony: The pronunciation of *bosska* (< *boss*) would be identical with the adjective *boska* 'divine'. Examples of (masculine) loanwords without feminine derivatives include: *agent* 'agent', *akwizytor* 'canvasser', *dealer* 'car dealer', *dystrybutor* 'distributor', *finansista* 'financier', *inwestor* 'investor', *konsument* 'consumer', *makler* 'broker', *menedżer* 'manager', *producent* 'producer, manufacturer', *serwisant* 'employee in customer services' and *sponsor* 'sponsor'.

5.   The linguistic representation of women in Polish newspapers

The media offer a wealth of material for a linguistic analysis of cultural manifestations of gender inequality. In particular, newspapers provide countless examples of the scope of language problems triggered, as it were, by women who are active socially and politically. Though underrepresented in political institutions, they have been able to mark their presence in recent years. Their modest involvement in politics is customarily accounted for by their slight interest in politics and by discrimination, an argument that has often been raised by women themselves. Characteristically, inequality of women and men is significant in the nouns denoting high public functions; most of those positions have until recently been reserved for men, hence no feminine counterparts are used. This is illustrated by examples (21)–(28), which are taken from an article on "Panie przy władzy" 'Women in power', which appeared in the regional newspaper *Głos Wielkopolski* 'The Voice of Wielkopolska' on February 25, 1998.

(21)   *Marszałek* (m) *Senatu, minister* (m) *sprawiedliwości – prokurator generalny* (m), *minister* (m) *kultury i sztuki, szef* (m) *Kancelarii Prezydenta RP, prezes* (m) *NBP – to podstawowy stan posiadania polskich kobiet na szczytach władzy.*
'The Speaker (m) of the Senate, the Minister (m) of Justice – Attorney General (m), the Minister (m) of Culture and Art, the head (m) of the office of the President (m), the President (m) of the National Bank of Poland – these are the basic assets of Polish women at the height of power.'

Even in the case of reference to a specific "known" individual woman, masculine forms are used:

(22)   *Spośród pań* […] *najbardziej eksponowane stanowisko zajmuje Alicja Grześkowiak* […], *która jest marszałkiem* (m) *Sejmu* […] *z zawodu jest prawnikiem* (m) *i nauczycielem akademickim* (m) […]
'Among women […] the most prominent position is held by Alicja Grześkowiak […] who is the Parliament Speaker (m) […] is a lawyer (m) and university teacher (m) by profession […]'

Masculine forms are also used with reference to women holding lower ranking positions:

(23)   […] *ani jedna pani nie jest członkiem* (m) *prezydium Sejmu* […]. *Kobiety są natomiast we władzach dziewięciu komisji sejmowych, przy czym trzema kierują, a w sześciu innych są zastępcami* (m) *szefów.*
'[…] not a single woman is a member (m) of the presiding body of the

Parliament […]. Women can be found in the executive of nine parliamentary committees, chairing three of them, in the other six they are deputies (m).'

However, feminine forms are used when the particular committee members are mentioned explicitly:

(24)   […] *Krystyna Łybacka z SLD pełni funkcję wiceprzewodniczącej* (f). *Inna posłanka* (f) *jest szefową* (f) *Komisji Samorządu Terytorialnego* […] *Maria Smerczyńska* […] *kieruje Komisją Rodziny, a jej zastępczyniami* (f) *są dwie inne panie.*
'[…] Krystyna Łybacka of the SLD has the function of a vice-chairwoman (f). Another woman MP is a female head (f) of a Local Government Committee […] Maria Smerczyńska […] chairs the Family Committee, and she has two other ladies as deputies (f).'

A female bearer of the following functions or titles may be named by masculine or feminine forms:

(25)   *szef* (m)/*szefowa* (f)   'boss, female boss'
       zastępca (m)/*zastępczyni* (f)   'deputy, female deputy'
       wiceprzewodniczący (m)/*wiceprzewodnicząca* (f)   'vice-chairman/
                                                            vice-chairwoman'

If, however, a woman occupies a higher ranking position, she is referred to with masculine forms:

(26)   *W ścisłym składzie rządu jest 17 panów i tylko trzy panie, zaś kilka innych kobiet pełni funkcję wiceministrów* (m) *i pełnomocników* (m) *rządu w randze sekretarzy* (m) *i podsekretarzy* (m) *stanu.*
'The Government includes seventeen men and only three women, whereas several other women are vice-ministers (m) and undersecretaries (m) of the Government in the rank of secretaries (m) and undersecretaries (m).'

The same holds true for nouns denoting affiliation with major institutions:

(27)   *Hanna Gronkiewicz* […] *będzie zajmowała stanowisko prezesa* (m) *NBP, Gryżyna Zielińska jest prezesem* (m) *Krajowego Urzędu Pracy. Dwie kobiety – Elżbieta Modzelewska-Wąchal i Elżbieta Ostrowska są wiceprezesami* (m) *Urzędu Ochrony Konkurencji i Konsumenta* […]
'Hanna Gronkiewicz […] will become President (m) of NBP – [the National Bank of Poland], Grażyna Zielińska is President (m) of the

National Office of Labour. Two other women – Elżbieta Modzelewska-Wąchal and Elżbieta Ostrowska – are vice-presidents (m) at the Office for Protection of Competition and Consumers […]'

The words denoting 'spokesman', i.e. *rzecznik prasowy* (m) 'spokesman' and *zastępca rzecznika prasowego* (m) 'deputy spokesman', occur in the masculine form only, regardless of referential gender:

(28) *Zastępcą* (m) *rzecznika prasowego* (m) *prezydenta RP jest Alfa Hermańska.*
      'Alfa Hermańska is a deputy spokesman (m) for the President of the PR.'

The use of both masculine and feminine nouns denoting the profession and position of a woman in the same context is frequent in Polish newspapers. This even includes synonyms with both forms as options, e.g., *lekarz* (m)/*lekarka* (f) 'physician/female physician', *medyk* (m)/*medyczka* (f) 'medic/female medic':

(29) *Mirosława Mielczarek-Landowska zdobyła licencję zawodowego pilota* (m) […] *jest lekarzem* (m), *ale jej pasja to latanie* […] *Latająca medyczka* (f) *wstawała o czwartej* […] *Na początku jako pierwszy oficer* (m) *tłukła się po krajowych liniach archaicznymi AN-24.*
      'Mirosława Mielczarek-Landowska has received the licence of a professional pilot (m) […] is a physician (m), but flying is her passion […] The flying medic (f) got up at four […] In the beginning, she was first officer (m) and flew domestic lines on the archaic AN-24 planes.'
      (Women's Magazine *Twój STYL* 'Your STYLE' 4/1998, "Jestem jak bumerang" 'I am like a boomerang')

Another example is:

(30) *Dyrektorem artystycznym* (m) *i przewodniczącą* (f) *Rady Programowej Roku Krzysztofa Pendereckiego jest Elżbieta Penderecka.*
      'Elżbieta Penderecka is art director (m) and chairwoman (f) of the Programme Council of the Year of Krzysztof Penderecki.'
      (Women's Magazine *Twój STYL* 'Your STYLE' 4/1998, "Wielkanoc z Beethovenem" 'Easter with Beethoven')

Typically, polite forms or terms of address that accompany nouns denoting profession or rank, will be combined with masculine titles:

(31) *Hanna Gronkiewicz-Waltz – pani* (f) *prezes* (m) *NBP, szef* (m) *banku centralnego*
      'Hanna Gronkiewicz-Waltz – Mrs (f) President (m) of NBP, head (m) of the central bank'

(*Gazeta Wyborcza* 'The Electoral Daily', February 20, 1998, "Zrobić
lepiej" 'How to do it better')

Significantly, more and more mixed forms occur in the language of newspapers;
they consist of a masculine noun denoting the profession practiced by the
woman, and a feminine attributive adjective:

(32) *Jest jednym* (m) *z najważniejszych w świecie polityków* (m) [....] *Pani* (f)
      sekretarz (m)? [...] *Faktycznie nowa* (f) *sekretarz* (m) *w niczym nie
      przypomina Christophera* [...].
      'She is one (m) of the most important politicians (m) in the world [...]
      Mrs (f) Secretary (m)? [...] Indeed, the new (f) secretary (m) bears no
      resemblance to Christopher whatsoever [...].'
      (Women's Magazine *Twój STYL* 'Your STYLE' 3/1998, "W łagodnych
      ostrych słowach" 'In gentle harsh words')

The noun phrase *nowa sekretarka* (f) 'new secretary', with its traditional
connotation of office work is deeply rooted in Polish society, and does not
reflect the prestige and power of the position in question, hence the choice of
the masculine form *sekretarz* (m); nevertheless, referential gender is marked on
the adjectival modifier *nowa* (f) – a phenomenon which can be interpreted in
terms of semantic agreement overriding grammatical agreement.

     Mixed forms are, as a rule, used in the case of nouns denoting professions
or positions in which men are dominant:

(33) *Niemiecka* (f) *minister* (m) *ochrony środowiska Angela Merkel* [...]
      'German (f) Minister (m) for Environmental Protection Angela Merkel
      [...]'
      (*Głos Wielkopolski* 'The Voice of Wielkopolska', March 20, 1998,
      "Anuklearny protest" 'Anti-nuclear protest')

In the following example, the past tense verb form *powiedziała* 'she said' agrees
with the referential (female) gender and not with the grammatical gender of the
masculine noun *komisarz*:

(34) *Także niemiecki komisarz* (m) *w Brukseli Monika Wulf-Mathies
      powiedziała* (f) *w świątecznym wywiadzie dziennikowi 'Tagesspiegel', że
      Niemcy w Brukseli mówią zbyt wieloma głosami.*
      'The German commissioner (m) in Brussels Monika Wulf-Mathies said
      (f) in an interview given to the Easter edition of the daily newspaper
      'Tagesspiegel' that in Brussels the Germans speak with too many voices.'

(*Gazeta Wyborcza* 'The Electoral Daily', April 15, 1998, "Marudna Bawaria" 'Peevish Bavaria')

As examples (34) and (35) show, agreement between the subject and the verb works independently of whether the noun denoting a profession or position is used together with a (masculine) attribute or without determiners:

(35)   *Gościem* (m) *piątkowego śniadania w Rzeczypospolitej była* (f) *minister* (m) *Hanna Suchocka.*
'Minister (m) Hanna Suchocka was (f) a guest (m) at the Friday breakfast of the daily newspaper *Rzeczpospolita*.'
(*Rzeczpospolita*, February 14/15, 1998, "O sądach i sędziach" 'On courts of law and judges')

When no female first or family name is given, nor any other description provides a cue, only the inflected form of the verb will give an indication of referential gender:

(36)   *Nie sprzedałabym* (f) *go za żadne pieniądze – mówi hodowca* (m) *cornishów.*
'I would not sell (f) it at any price, says a breeder (m) of Cornish cats.'
(*Głos Wielkopolski* 'The Voice of Wielkopolska', March 20, 1998, "Bezcenne koty" 'Priceless cats')

Newspaper job advertising is a spectacular example of how opaque the indication of gender can become. Article 10 §1 of the Polish Code of Labour, which took effect on January 1, 1975, states that "Każdy (m) ma prawo do swobodnie wybranej pracy" 'Everyone (m) has the right to choose his/her work freely'. This does not mean that a woman stands the same chance as a man of getting just the kind of job she would wish. This can partly be supported by a sample analysis of job offers which appeared in *Gazeta Wyborcza* 'The Electoral Daily' (February 9, 1998) and in *Głos Wielkopolski* 'The Voice of Wielkopolska' (May 9/10, 1998). Various posts in diverse professions were advertised, e.g., *gastronomik* (m) 'gastronomer', *specjalista komputerowy* (m) 'computer specialist', *kierownik produkcji* (m) 'production manager', *dyplomowany plastyk* (m) 'graphic arts designer', and *prezes zarządu* (m) 'board director'.

At times, advertising companies need a larger number of employees, such as *złotników* (m) 'goldsmiths', *bankowców* (m) 'bankers', *kosztorysantów* (m) 'estimators', *techników farmacji* (m) 'pharmaceutical technicians', *przedstawicieli handlowych* (m) 'trade representatives', *konsultantów oświatowych* (m) or *reklamowych* (m) 'education or advertising consultants', *tłumaczy języka angielskiego* (m) 'English language translators', *kierowników sklepów* (m) 'shop

managers', *agentów ubezpieczeniowych* (m) 'insurance agents'. The terms for all these jobs and positions are grammatically masculine, whether used in the singular or the plural. Consequently, the forms used in the further context of the advertisements are masculine, too:

(37)   *Idealny kandydat* (m) *powinien* (m) *posiadać* […]
       'The ideal candidate (m) should (m) have […]'
       Zatrudnionemu kandydatowi (m) *oferujemy* […]
       'The candidate (m) employed will be offered […]'

Presumably, the advertisements are not exclusively directed to men, thus the masculine form can be interpreted as generic. It is, however, doubtful whether a woman would be appointed "on the grounds of gender and not merits" to one of the managerial positions. The issue is relatively open when the word *osoba* (f) 'person' is used instead of *kandydat* (m) 'candidate':

(38)   *Osoba* (f) *ta będzie odpowiedzialna* (f) *za* […]
       'This person (f) will be responsible (f) for […]'

Occasionally, nominal splitting can be found:

(39)   *Idealny kandydat* (m)/*kandydatka* (f) *to osoba młoda* […]
       'The ideal candidate (m/f) is a young person […]'

However, there are advertisements which leave no doubt as to the gender of the desired candidate:

(40)   *Historyka sztuki* (m) *(mężczyznę) zatrudnimy.*
       'We will employ an art historian (m) (male).'

In some rare cases, advertisements specifically seek women for traditionally "female" jobs like *ekspedientka* (f) 'woman shop assistant', *sekretarka* (f) 'woman secretary', *pielęgniarka* (f) 'nurse', *kosmetyczka* (f) 'beautician', *szwaczka* (f) 'seamstress', *asystentka prezesa* (f) 'woman assistant to the chairman', *projektantka mody* (f) 'woman fashion designer' or *opiekunka do dziecka* (f) 'baby-sitter'.

With some other jobs and positions, female or male forms may occur:

(41) | Masculine | | Feminine | |
       |---|---|---|---|
       | *chałupnik* | 'out-worker' | *chałupniczka* | 'female out-worker' |
       | *krawiec* | 'tailor' | *krawcowa* | 'female dressmaker' |
       | *księgowy* | 'book-keeper' | *księgowa* | 'female book-keeper' |
       | *sprzedawca* | 'salesman' | *sprzedawczyni* | 'saleswoman' |

If the job advertised explicitly refers to women and men, advertisers usually make use of gender-specific lexemes, as in *kobiety i mężczyźni* 'women and men', *panie i panowie* 'ladies and gentlemen', or of gender suffixes, as in *studentki i studenci* 'female students and male students'; rarely, they employ the strategy of splitting using slashes, as in (42):

(42) *Przyjmę barmanów/nki*[3]
    'Barmen/-maids wanted'

Splitting is used exclusively in advertisements placed by German companies, unless the offer is open specifically only to women or to men. Polish advertisements are obscure and ambiguous in this matter. Those explicitly directed to women are limited to non-managerial and auxiliary positions, which provides a misleading picture of women's qualifications and professional skills, as well as of the situation on the labour market in Poland more generally.

6. Feminism as a social movement and feminist linguistics in Poland

The issue of language and gender has so far failed to attract attention among Polish linguists. Polish research has focussed on the position of women in society rather than on how this is reflected in the language. Nevertheless, it is noteworthy that the First Polish Women's Conference held in Lublin in 1989 produced a volume entitled *Kobieta w kulturze i społeczeństwie* 'Woman in culture and society' (Jedynak 1990). Another conference on *Sex in language and culture* was held at Karpacz in 1991, organised by Janusz Anusiewicz and the Group for Cultural Linguistics at the Institute of Polish Philology at the University of Wrocław with the scientific cooperation of Kwiryna Handke.[4]

It can be assumed that the use of masculine forms to denote professions performed by women is not only a matter of higher prestige, but also of low social awareness. Most women do not realize the patriarchal structure of Polish society, nor do they attach any importance to the language which reflects it in a more or less conspicuous way. This is not surprising if one considers the fact that even among those women who are professionally involved in the study of language, one can come across the view expressed by Nagórko (1996: 95) that actually "bez większej przesady możemy […] powiedzieć, że gramatyka polska uprzywilejowuje mężczyzn […]. Dopóki jednak dzieje się tak tylko w języku, kobiety mogą być spokojne" 'it can without much exaggeration […] be said

that Polish grammar favours men […]. As long as this is restricted to the language only, women can take it easy'.

On the other hand, those women who are becoming independent and active in public life are not at all eager to create terms which would immediately identify the female gender; rather, they tend to avoid grammatically feminine and female-specific forms.

The results of a questionnaire which was distributed by the authors of this chapter among students of the Faculty of Modern Philology at the University of Poznań are significant in this respect. 85 respondents took part in the study (74 female and 11 male students). The majority had come across the phenomenon of sexism in language and saw the media to be the major source of sexist usage, followed by school and university. Not all of them thought that this kind of language discriminated women and saw linguistic sexism as congruent with tradition, thus not necessarily requiring change.

Some students were of the opinion that there were things more important than language reform. Nevertheless, the majority, including almost all male students – in this case probably out of courtesy towards the women – expressed a readiness to use non-sexist language, should concrete proposals be formulated, reserving the right, however, to dismiss funny and weird suggestions.

However, all participants consistently said that the media would have the most important role to play in disseminating non-sexist language use, which is a case of wishful thinking, since it was also the media that were considered the main source of sexism. Future changes will rather depend on conscious and consistent activities on the part of women.

The feminist movement in Poland is primarily concerned with defining women's identity, their adjustment to new roles, commitment to political, social and scientific activities, involvement in environmental issues, as well as with the definition of a "new femininity" (cf. Walczewska 1992). Thus, various feminist organisations are establishing themselves. Recently, two strongly debated issues have been eco-feminism and feminist theology, to the latter of which the monthly journal *Więź* 'Tie' (1/1998) dedicated its January 1998 edition. The magazine discussed the so-called "new feminism" with regard to the papal approach to women's issues. The vision of John Paul II has been interpreted as being in opposition both to radical feminism and to feminism as a phenomenon which is regarded pejoratively by the traditional Catholic view.

The attitudes women in Poland take towards the facts of present-day life certainly do not take the form of a nation-wide political and intellectual movement. Yet feminism, as women's engagement in certain common interests,

has become increasingly popular. In this respect, it is worth noting that a number of translations of feminist publications have flowed onto the Polish market in recent years, including *Słownik teorii feminizmu* 'The dictionary of feminist theory' by Maggie Humm (1993), translated from English.

In recent years, feminist issues have mainly been discussed by sociologists (cf. Domański & Titkow 1995; Gorczyńska & Kruszyńska & Zakidalska 1997; Handke 1986; Hołówka 1982, Pakszys & Sobczyńska 1997; Reszke 1991; Siemieńska 1990, 2000; Sikorska 1997; Ślęczka 1999; Walczewska 1999; Żarnowska & Szwarc 1997).

7.   Strategies for the avoidance of sexist language

As women increasingly achieve higher positions and ranks which until quite recently were reserved for men, they might be expected to become more aware of their rights and aptitudes and strive to employ linguistic means which emphasize their social position. However, the mere fact that women may now enter the same professions or perform the same functions as men is regarded as a special favour by a large part of society, and using a masculine term to denote a woman's occupation adds to that splendour. This is probably why highly educated and competent women, doctors and lawyers in particular, who want to be treated as equals with their male colleagues, refuse to place a feminine form of their professional title on the door of their offices. This avoidance of feminine terms can only partly be justified by the fact that at least some of these terms carry the connotation of 'male possession', as well as by their relatively high frequency of occurrence in rural areas in the past.

There are two major strategies to avoid discriminating language use from the viewpoint of feminist linguistics: feminisation and neutralisation. As to the first strategy, the representation of women in language can be enhanced by a more frequent use of existing feminine forms, as well as by introducing new feminine forms. The strategy of neutralisation, on the other hand, abandons gender-specification in favour of neutral, i.e. gender-indefinite, personal nouns (cf. Hellinger 1990).

The feminisation strategy seems more advantageous for the Polish language, as this language offers a variety of means for the creation of feminine personal nouns. In addition, the numerous gender-variable forms of adjectives, pronouns, numerals and verbs provide an opportunity of enhancing the linguistic visibility of women.

Of course, the avoidance of masculine generics and their replacement with gender-neutral forms may also be an effective way of achieving linguistic gender balance. Neutralisation (e.g., through the use of collectives) is feasible in the following cases:

(43) *pracownicy* (m)   'employees'   *personel* (m)   'personnel/staff'
                                        obsługa (f)   'personnel/service'
      naukowcy (m)   'researchers' *kadra naukowa* 'research staff'
      klienci (m)   'customers'   *klientela*   'customers'
      fachowiec (m)   'specialist'   *siła fachowa*   lit. 'force of specialists'

There are cases which lend themselves to employing both feminisation and neutralisation; thus, the generic masculine *Polacy* (m) 'Poles' can be replaced in many contexts by either *Polki* (f) *i Polacy* (m) 'Polish women and Polish men' or *naród polski* 'the Polish nation'. This is true for other personal nouns, too, including de-adjectival nouns, e.g. *chorzy* (m) 'the sick' – *chorzy* (m) *i chore* (f) 'sick men and sick women' or *osoby chore* (f) 'sick persons', and nouns derived from verbs, e.g. *palacze* (m) 'smokers' – *palacze* (m) *i palaczki* (f) 'smoking men and women' or *osoby palące* (f) 'smoking persons'.

The following recommendations have been designed on the basis of the German guidelines for equal linguistic treatment of women and men (cf. Hellinger & Bierbach 1993). Using German as an orientation for the development of gender-fair expressions in Polish is motivated by the fact that the two languages share a number of structural properties, in particular the fundamental category of grammatical gender.

a. Terms of address should be used in both gender forms; an alternative would be a neutral paraphrase covering both genders:

(44) Current Usage   Alternative
      Rodacy! (m)   *Rodaczki* (f) *i rodacy* (m)*!*
      'Compatriots!'   'Countrywomen and countrymen!'
      Drodzy czytelnicy (m)*!* *Drogie czytelniczki* (f) *i drodzy czytelnicy* (m)*!*
      'Dear readers!'   'Dear women readers and dear men readers!'
      Drodzy zebrani (m)*!*   *Szanowne audytorium* (n)*!*
      'Dear gathered!'   'Dear audience!'

First names, surnames and titles should be used symmetrically:

(45) *Król Jan III Sobieski i*   *Król Jan III Sobieski i królowa*
      Marysieńka   *Marysieńka*
      'King Jan III Sobieski and 'King Jan III Sobieski and Queen
      Marysieńka'   Marysieńka'

Jan III Sobieski i Marysieńka	*Jan III Sobieski i Maria Kazimiera*
'Jan III Sobieski and	*d'Arquien zwana Marysieńką*
Marysieńka'	'Jan III Sobieski and Maria Kazimiera
	d'Arquien called Marysieńka'
Lech Wałęsa z żoną Danutą	*Lech Wałęsa i Danuta Wałęsowa*
'Lech Wałęsa with wife Danuta'	'Lech Wałęsa and Danuta Wałęsowa'

b. Existing feminine occupational titles ending in the suffix *-ka* or *-ina*, should be used more consistently instead of generic masculine nouns:

(46)   Masculine   Feminine
     lekarz   'doctor'   *lekarka*   'woman doctor'
     prawnik   'lawyer'   *prawniczka* 'female lawyer'
     sędzia   'judge'   *sędzina*   'female judge'
     wojewoda 'governor'   *wojewodzina* 'female governor'

In cases where the feminine form denotes an object, as in *pilotka* (f) 'a cap worn by pilots', while the masculine is a personal noun, i.e. *pilot* (m) 'pilot', the use of the feminine personal form can be promoted through repetition in contexts which unambiguously convey personal reference.

Although certain feminine terms, like *architektka* (f) 'female architect', derived from *architekt* (m), have not been in use for phonetic reasons, they stand a pretty good chance of becoming part of the lexicon, since already there exist complex phonetic structures in Polish. This includes some existing feminine nouns terminating in *-ka* which are derived from masculine nouns ending in *-a*, e.g. *ortopeda* (m) 'orthopedic doctor' – *ortopedka* (f) 'female ortho-paedic doctor'. The highly productive suffix *-ka* could be used more often to derive feminine counterparts from the masculine occupational titles which are being introduced into Polish from English:

(47)   Masculine   Feminine
     agent   'agent'   *agentka*   'female agent'
     menedżer 'manager'   *menedżerka* 'female manager'

The noun *internautka* (f) 'female Internet user' derived from *internauta* (m), which is formed on the model of *astronauta* 'astronaut', constitutes one of the few exceptions of a positive attitude towards new formations.

Perhaps the feminine forms ending in *-ka*, derived from a relatively large number of nouns in *-log*, will gain acceptance, e.g. *psycholog* (m) 'psychologist' – *psycholożka* (f) 'female psychologist', although the latter still sounds funny and facetious. First attempts to use such words can be encountered in women's

magazines. An alternative might be the use of the suffix *-istka*, as in *biolog* (m) 'biologist' – *biologistka* (f) 'female biologist'.

Feminine occupational titles should also be given more support in those walks of life which are predominantly occupied by men. The suffix *-yni* could serve to derive feminine nouns from the masculine nouns ending in *-owiec*, e.g. *naukowiec* (m) 'scholar, scientist' – *naukowczyni* (f) 'female scholar, scientist'. In the case of clerical and political posts, the forms with the feminine suffix should be advocated wherever this is possible structurally, regardless of how prestigious a post might seem to be; this would include university posts, e.g. *profesor* (m) 'professor' – *profesorka* (f) 'female professor', or public functions, e.g. *premier* (m) 'prime minister' – *premierka* (f) 'female prime minister', meaning that the intermediate forms of *pani* (f) *profesor* (m) 'Mrs professor' or *kobieta* (f) *premier* (m) 'woman prime minister' type would have to be abandoned.

c.   The use of so-called generic masculine pronouns as in (48a) can be avoided by pronominal splitting, cf. (48b):

(48)   a.   *Każdy* (m) *ma wolny wybór.*
           'Everyone (m) has the choice.'
           Wszyscy (m) *mają wolny wybór.*
           'All (m) have the choice.'
      b.   *Każdy* (m)*/każda* (f) *ma wolny wybór.*
           'Everyone (m/f) has the choice.'
           Wszyscy (m)*/wszystkie* (f) *mają wolny wybór.*
           'All (m/f) have the choice.'

Gender-indefinite reference would necessitate the use of 'person' or 'people':

(49)   *Każdy* (m) *człowiek* (m) *ma wolny wybór.*
       'Every person has the choice.'
       Wszyscy ludzie (pl) *mają wolny wybór.*
       'All people have the choice.'

When a sentence contains more than one pronoun, multiple splitting should be used, as in (50):

(50)   *Ci* (m), *którzy* (m) *chcą, mogą zostać.*
       'Those (m) who (m) want can stay.'
       Ci (m)*/te* (f), *którzy* (m)*/które* (f) *chcą, mogą zostać.*
       'Those (m/f) who (m/f) want can stay.'

In writing, the two forms could be separated by a slash or by placing them in brackets, e.g. *Ci (te), którzy (które)* […]. In both cases, however, the feminine form appears in second place, thus confirming its secondary status in relation to the masculine gender; in the case of bracketing, the information in brackets is usually regarded as complementary. In spoken language, both forms could be connected by conjunctions such as *i* 'and', *lub* 'or', *albo* 'or', *bądź* 'either', *czy* 'either'.

8.   Conclusion

There can be no doubt that the changes proposed here are difficult to implement, as they demand considerable linguistic tolerance within society. In particular, repeated splitting in longer texts contradicts the principle of economy in language use. Polish, being a highly inflectional language, would require splitting of the noun, pronoun, adjective, numeral and partly of the verb, which would significantly add to the length and complexity of a text. It would be interesting to see, therefore, how certain passages could be formulated in non-sexist, yet plain language, e.g.:

(51)   *Tegoroczni* (m)/*tegoroczne* (f) *maturzyści* (m)/*maturzystki* (f) *częściej od historii wybierali* (m)/*wybierały* (f) *matematykę jako drugi przedmiot pisemnej matury.*
'This year's (m/f) school graduates (m/f) chose (m/f) mathematics more often than history as the second subject for the written final examination.'

An alternative formulation would be:

(52)   *Osoby* (f) *zdające* (f) *w tym roku maturę częściej od historii wybierały* (f) *matematykę jako drugi przedmiot egzaminu pisemnego.*
'Persons (f) taking the final examination this year more often chose (f) mathematics than history as the second subject for the written examination.'

Neutralisation is in principle possible also in the area of idiomatic expressions, e.g., *podjęła męską decyzję* 'she took a manly decision' – *podjęła stanowczą decyzję* 'she took a firm decision', *z dziada pradziada* 'from the time of the forefathers' – *od wielu pokoleń* 'for many generations'.

However, the strategies outlined above stand little chance of being implemented in the near future. In addition, as some people say (among them not exclusively men), the extent to which the masculine forms are used with reference

to women reaches the point which Miodek (1998:87) characterizes as follows: "[…] gdy w tekstach mówionych pojawiają się tradycyjne postacie żeńskie z przyrostkami, coraz częściej wywołują one u odbiorców poprawnościowy niepokój" '[…] when spoken texts present the traditional feminine forms with suffixes, they increasingly create unease in listeners concerning correctness'. This certainly indicates that we are dealing with a powerful male bias both in the Polish language system and in the way the Polish language is used.

Notes

1. Important reference works on Polish are: General: Stone (1987), Westfal (1985); grammars: Brooks (1975), Karpowicz (1999); history: Mazur (1993), Kuraszkiewicz (1981), Klemensiewicz (1985); dictionaries: Pogonowski (1997), Sławski (1958–1965), Szymczak (1999).

2. The use of anaphoric pronominal subjects in Polish depends on whether there is emphasis or not. Information about gender, number and person is expressed in verbal inflection; thus subject pronouns are omitted unless there is special emphasis (i.e. Polish is a pro-drop language). In the following examples the pronominal subject is placed in round brackets.

3. Splitting has been carried out incorrectly. The correct form would be *barman/ki* in the singular, while the plural would be derived from the stem of the noun, i.e *barman/ów/ki*.

4. See the introductory remarks in Anusiewicz & Handke (1994).

References

Anusiewicz, Janusz & Kwiryna Handke. 1994. "Płeć w języku i kulturze" [Sex in language and culture]. *Język a kultura* [Language and culture] 9. Wrocław: Wydawnictwo "Wiedza o kulturze" Fundacji Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego.

Brooks, Maria Zagorska. 1975. *Polish reference grammar*. The Hague: Mouton.

Dejna, Karol. 1973. *Dialekty polskie* [Polish dialects]. Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich – Wydawnictwo.

Domański, Henryk & Anna Titkow, eds. 1995. *Co to znaczy być kobietą w Polsce* [What does it mean to be a Polish woman]. Warszawa: Polska Akademia Nauk, Instytut Filozofii i Socjologii.

Gorczyńska, Zofia & Sabina Kruszyńska & Irena Zakidalska, eds. 1997. *Płeć, kobieta, feminizm* [Sex, woman, feminism]. Gdańsk: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Gdańskiego.

Grzegorczykowa, Renata, ed. 1998. *Gramatyka współczesnego języka polskiego. Morfologia* [Grammar of present-day Polish. Morphology]. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.

Handke, Kwiryna. 1986. "Rola kobiet w przekształcaniu współczesnej polszczyzny kolokwialnej" [The role of women in the transformation of contemporary colloquial Polish]. *Rozprawy Komisji Językowej* [Papers of the Language Committee] XXXII. Łódź: Łódzkie Towarzystwo Naukowe.

Hellinger, Marlis. 1990. *Kontrastive feministische Linguistik: Mechanismen sprachlicher Diskriminierung im Englischen und Deutschen.* München: Hueber.

Hellinger, Marlis & Christine Bierbach. 1993. *Eine Sprache für beide Geschlechter. Richtlinien für einen nicht-sexistischen Sprachgebrauch.* Bonn: Unesco.

Hołówka, Teresa, ed. 1982. *Nikt nie rodzi się kobietą* [No-one is born as woman]. Warszawa: Czytelnik.

Humm, Maggie. 1993. *The dictionary of feminist theory.* New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Jedynak, Barbara, ed. 1990. *Kobieta w kulturze i społeczeństwie* [Woman in culture and society], Vol. 1. Lublin: Uniwersytet Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej.

Karpowicz, Tomasz. 1999. *Gramatyka języka polskiego* [Grammar of Polish]. Warszawa: Muza.

Klemensiewicz, Zenon. 1985. *Historia języka polskiego* [History of the Polish language]. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.

Kuraszkiewicz, Władysław. 1981. *Historische Grammatik der polnischen Sprache.* München: Sagner.

Mazur, Jan. 1993. *Geschichte der polnischen Sprache.* Frankfurt am Main: Lang.

Miodek, Jan. 1998. *Rozmyślajcie nad mową* [Think about speech]. Warszawa: Prószyński i S-ka.

Nagórko, Alicja. 1996. *Zarys gramatyki polskiej* [An outline of Polish grammar]. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.

Pakszys, Elżbieta & Danuta Sobczyńska, eds. 1997. *Kobiety w poznaniu naukowym wczoraj i dziś* [Women in scientific cognizance yesterday and today]. Poznań: Uniwersytet im. Adama Mickiewicza, Wydawnictwo Naukowe.

Pogonowski, Iwo Cyprian. 1997. Unabridged Polish-English dictionary. 3 vols. New York: Hippocrene Books.

Reszke, Irena. 1991. *Nierówności płci w teoriach* [Sex discrimination in theories]. Warszawa: Polska Akademia Nauk, Instytut Filozofii i Socjologii.

Siemieńska, Renata. 1990. *Płeć, zawód, polityka: kobiety w życiu publicznym w Polsce* [Sex, profession, politics: Women in public life in Poland]. Warszawa: Uniwersytet Warszawski, Instytut Socjologii.

Siemieńska, Renata. 2000. *Nie mogą, nie chcą czy nie potrafią? O postawach i uczestnictwie politycznym kobiet w Polsce* [They cannot, they do not want to or they are not able to? About the attitudes and political participation of women in Poland]. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe SCHOLAR & Fundacja im. F. Eberta.

Sikorska, Liliana. 1997. "Feministyczna poprawność polityczna? Utopia językowa czy podstawa nowoczesnego społeczeństwa?" [Feminist political correctness: Linguistic utopia or foundation of a modern society?]. *Neofilolog* 15: 32–39.

Sławski, Franciszek. 1958–1965. *Słownik etymologiczny języka polskiego* [The etymological dictionary of Polish]. Kraków: Wydawnictwo (Drukowanie) Uniwersytet Jagielloński.

Ślęczka, Kazimierz. 1999. *Feminizm: Ideologie i koncepcje społeczne współczesnego feminizmu* [Feminism: Ideology and social conceptions of contemporary feminism]. Katowice: Wydawnictwo Książnica.

Stone, Gerald. 1987. "Polish". In *The world's major languages*, ed. Bernard Comrie. London: Croom Helm, 348–366.

Szymczak, Mieczysław, ed. 1999. *Słownik języka polskiego*. 3 tomy [Dictionary of Polish. 3 vols.]. Warszawa: PWN.

Walczewska, Sławomira, ed. 1992. *Głos mają kobiety* [Women are allowed to speak]. Kraków: Fundacja Kobieca eFKa.

Walczewska, Sławomira. 1999. *Damy, rycerze i feministki* [Ladies, knights and feminists]. Kraków: Fundacja Kobieca eFKa.

Westfal, Stanislaw. 1985. *The Polish language.* 2nd ed. London: Veritas Foundation Publication Centre.

Żarnowska, Anna & Andrzej Szwarc, eds. 1997. *Kobieta i kultura życia codziennego wiek XIX i XX* [Women and every-day culture in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries]. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo DiG.

The expression of gender in Serbian

Elke Hentschel

University of Bern, Switzerland

1.   Introduction

Serbian (*srpski*), like Bosnian (*bosanski)* and Croatian (*hrvatski*), belongs to the South Slavic branch of the Indo-European languages. The three languages used to be considered as one, called "Serbo-Croatian" (*srpsko-hrvatski* or *hrvatsko-srpski*) since the Vienna Conference in 1850. The term "Serbo-Croatian" for the language

was probably coined by Jacob Grimm (1824) in his introduction to the *Small Serbian Grammar* by Vuk Stefanović Karadžić (cf. Okuka 1998:16).[1] It was a linguistic term, accounting for the fact that the various dialects spoken in Serbia, Bosnia and Croatia were obviously very closely related, exhibited identical grammatical structures, and were mutually intelligible to their speakers. In former Yugoslavia, the term covered several varieties of a common base, but most interestingly, there was no standard variety. At least two wide-spread varieties, *jekavski* (also sometimes called *ijekavski*) and *ekavski*,[2] were taught in school and used equally in the media, whereas the other varieties were, and still are, mostly considered as dialects, although many of them have been used in literary works.

In 1981, there were at least about 16 million speakers of Serbo-Croatian varieties in former Yugoslavia.[3] Grammars and reference works were mostly considered as belonging to the variety they had been written in, notwithstanding the fact that many of them called themselves grammars for "Serbo-Croatian" (cf. for instance "The contemporary Serbo-Croat language" by Stevanović 1989a, 1989b, a Serbian grammar). The oldest grammar is by Vuk Stefanović Karadžić (1814/1964), who described a variety spoken in the Hercegovina. He called his book a "Grammar of the Serbian language" and added in the subtitle that it was "according to the way simple people speak, written down by Vuk Stefanović, Serbian".

The difference between a language and a dialect cannot not be defined in linguistic terms only, but is also decided upon on a political level: The historical events of the 1990s led not only to the splitting of Yugoslavia, but also to the division of Serbo-Croatian into three languages: one for each of the new states where varieties of Serbo-Croatian used to be spoken. This article takes into account the fact that three independent languages have been defined, and have since been under the influence of more or less strict language politics. The political intention to alter or even to "cleanse" the language was probably the strongest in Croatia, where particularly the lexicon has undergone many changes.[4] Similar politics, although maybe to a lesser degree, were applied in Bosnia,[5] while the fewest efforts in this respect were to be witnessed in Serbia. However, there are not only the effects of language politics to be taken into consideration. The cultural context and the social conditions are changing as well, including the situation of women in society. It seems that any attempt to describe the three languages as one, when it comes to the actual use of structurally identical patterns, must be undertaken with utmost care, and, in fact, such a description may not really be possible any longer. The focus of this article will therefore be on only one of the three, Serbian.[6]

In Serbia, as well as in Bosnia and Hercegovina, both the Cyrillic and the Latin script were used side by side. Some newspapers, like *Naša borba* 'Our battle' in Belgrade or *Oslobodjenje* 'Liberation' in Sarajevo, were even in the habit of using Cyrillic on one page, and Latin on the next, changing the lettering of the front page with each issue. In contrast, it used to be Latin only in Croatia.[7] Today, Serbian is officially written only in Cyrillic, but the Latin alphabet is still used by many people. This article will make use of the Latin alphabet with the diacritic signs that have been developed for these South Slavic languages.

The Serbian language makes use of a very rich repertoire of bound morphemes for lexical as well as morphosyntactic purposes. Verbs are marked for two aspects (perfect and imperfect), seven tenses (present, future I, future II, perfect, pluperfect, aorist, imperfect), four moods (indicative, imperative, potential I, potential II), three voices (active, passive, and so-called *se*-passive, which might be considered as a middle voice), and four participles, two of which regularly express gender. Nouns, adjectives and pronouns are marked for singular and plural (with a few remaining duals), and seven cases (nominative, genitive, dative, accusative, vocative, instrumental, locative), as well as for three grammatical genders. Apart from number, case and gender, adjectives express definiteness and indefiniteness. They can assume comparative and superlative forms, while nouns can be submitted to augmentation and diminution. Two forms each, a full one and a clitic one, exist for the *casus obliqui* of the personal pronouns, the future auxiliary and the auxiliary/copula verb 'to be'. Pronominal subjects can be omitted, as is characteristic for pro-drop languages.[8]

2. Gender in Serbian

2.1 Grammatical and lexical gender

Serbian comprises three grammatical genders: masculine, feminine and neuter. Every noun has an inherent gender, which in the case of nouns denoting inanimate objects reflects a semantically random distribution due to their belonging to certain declensional paradigms.[9] It is therefore most interesting to see how nouns denoting humans and other living beings fit into the highly developed gender system. Basic words with lexical gender are masculine or feminine, according to the gender of the denoted person or animal; gender-indefinite words denoting children or young animals are grammatically neuter (cf. Tables 1–3).

Table 1.   Masculine nouns denoting males

muškarac	'man' (in the sense of 'male human being')
otac	'father'
sin	'son'
brat	'brother'
stric	'uncle' (the father's brother)
ujak	'uncle' (the mother's brother)
tetak	'uncle' (husband of a sister of mother or father)
petao	'rooster'

Table 2.   Feminine nouns denoting females

žena	'woman'
majka	'mother'
kćer	'daughter'
sestra	'sister'
tetka	'aunt' (sister of mother or father)
ujna	'aunt' (wife of the mother's brother)
strina	'aunt' (wife of the father's brother)
kokoška	'hen'

Table 3.   Neuter nouns denoting children or young animals

dete	'child'
pile	'chicken'
prase	'piglet'

As in other Indo-European languages, grammatical and lexical gender in nouns denoting animals correspond only in those cases where the animal's gender is economically important, which is the case with domestic animals like pigs, cows, horses, etc. Usually in these cases, there is even a separate word for the whole family, one for the female and one for the male animal, one for the small animal, and one for the castrated male (cf. Table 4).

Table 4.   Terms for animals

goveče	'cattle' (n)
krava	'cow' (f)
bik	'bull' (m)
vo	'ox' (m)
tele	'calf' (n)

With most wild or only partly domesticated animals, gender is not as important, so there is just one word denoting the whole family, and its grammatical gender is more or less random.[10]

This contribution will limit itself to the distribution of gender in personal nouns, where one would expect a correspondence between grammatical and lexical/referential gender.

There are a few epicene nouns referring to human beings that are gender-indefinite: Feminine are *osoba* 'person', *žrtva* 'victim'; masculine is *član* 'member'. However, the term *čovek* 'man', which also means 'human being' (cf. *čovečanstvo* 'mankind', *čovečanski* 'human') and should therefore be gender-indefinite, too, as well as its suppletive plural *ljudi* 'men' (cf. *ljudski* 'human') refer primarily to males. This becomes clear when one considers expressions like *jedan čovek i jedna žena* 'one man and one woman' or *ljudi i žene* 'men and women', where the gender-specificity is manifest.

2.2 Inflectional paradigms and agreement

Generally, nouns belonging to the same declensional pattern share the same grammatical gender. Thus, nouns following the first of the four declensions have masculine gender, while those belonging to the third and the fourth declensions have feminine gender.[11] However, clashes between a noun's inflectional class and its gender class may occur. E.g., nouns like *Pera*, *Ljubiša*, *Nikola* or *Saša*, which are male proper names, have masculine grammatical gender and occur only with masculine agreement, although they belong to the third declension. The same is true for a small group of nouns in the same inflectional class, like *sudija* 'judge' or *sluga* 'servant'.[12] Some nouns in this class may take feminine or masculine agreement, depending on referential gender, and can therefore be considered as cases of double gender (cf. Corbett 1991: 232). In (1) the adjective *pravi* 'real' variably agrees with the masculine/male and the feminine/female subject although its head noun, *varalica*, could be expected to trigger feminine agreement:

(1) a. *On je prav-i   varalica.*
         he   is real-MASC cheat
         'He is a real cheat.'

     b. *Ona je prav-a   varalica.*
         she   is real-FEM cheat
         'She is a real cheat.'[13]

Furthermore, there are cases of masculine nouns belonging to the second declension (which otherwise contains words with neuter gender) including the animate masculine accusative, and masculine agreement.[14] Examples are (nick) names like *Bane*, *Frle*, or *Djole*. On the other hand, Croatian male (nick) names like *Mate*, *Sime* or *Frane*, although exhibiting the same vowel ending *-e*, follow the declensional pattern of the third, otherwise feminine paradigm, but require masculine agreement.

However, this mixed status is only found with nouns of the second (neuter) or third (feminine) declension that refer to male persons. Other nouns are invariable as to their grammatical gender. The masculine gender of nouns like *inženjer* 'engineer', *profesor* 'professor' or *mehaničar* 'mechanic' cannot be changed, i.e. they cannot be used with feminine agreement forms, even if reference is to female persons. A sentence like (2) is ungrammatical according to standard prescriptive rules (cf. Mrazović & Vukadinović 1990: 678 f, Stevanović 1989b: 132–152) and is, in fact, considered unacceptable by Serbian speakers.[15]

(2) **Inženjer   je   nacrtal-a   skicu.*
     engineer.MASC AUX drawn-FEM sketch
     'The (female) engineer has drawn a sketch.'

Generally, members of the nominal word classes and their satellites, i.e. determiners, pronouns (cf. Section 2.4), adjectives, and verbal participles, express grammatical gender as well as number and case. Gender marking can therefore occur quite redundantly, as in (3):

(3) *Nek-a   nepoznat-a   žen-a   je otvoril-a   vrata.*
     some-FEM unknown-FEM woman-FEM AUX opened-FEM door.NEUT
     'Some unknown woman opened the door.'

Since Serbian is a highly inflecting language, the feminine markers denote not only feminine gender, but at the same time include information about number and case. In the case of tensed participles like *otvorila*, this information is reduced to gender and number, but these two categories must always be expressed. All three genders are marked in the plural as well, cf. the feminine plural forms in (4):

(4) *Nek-e   nepoznat-e   žen-e   su*
     some-FEM.PL unknown-FEM.PL woman-FEM.PL AUX
     otvoril-e   vrata.
     opened-FEM.PL door.NEUT
     'Some unknown women opened the door.'

2.3 Coordination

In coordination, feminine plural endings are used regularly only if the coordinated nouns are exclusively feminine. When mixed grammatical gender occurs, plural masculine agreement is required, as in (5):

(5) *Došl-i   su ljud-i   i   žen-e.*
    come-MASC.PL AUX people-MASC.PL and woman-FEM.PL
    'Men and women came.'

This phenomenon, well known in other Indo-European languages, too (for example in Italian, cf. Marcato & Thüne, vol. II), suggests that mixed groups of people are grammatically referred to by masculine expressions as in (5) and (6a). However, syntactic proximity may overrule the prescription of the "generic" masculine in mixed coordination, cf. (6b):

(6) a. *Drag-i   student-i   i   student-kinje!*
       dear-MASC.PL student-MASC.PL and student-FEM.PL
       'Dear (male and female) students!'
    b. *Drag-e   student-kinje i   student-i!*
       dear-FEM.PL student-FEM.PL and student-MASC.PL
       'Dear (female and male) students!'[16]

2.4 Pronouns

The majority of the numerous pronouns show feminine as well as masculine and neuter forms. In Table 5 only masculine and feminine singular forms are given, but, of course, neuter singular pronominal forms exist, as well as plural forms in all three genders.[17]

Table 5. Masculine and feminine pronouns

Masculine	Feminine	
onaj	*ona*	'that one there'
taj	*ta*	'that one'
ovaj	*ova*	'this one'
svako	*svaka*	'everyone, each one'
neko	*neka*	'someone'
takav	*takva*	'such (a person)'
ovakav	*ovakva*	'such' (near to speaker)
onakav	*onakva*	'such' (far from speaker)

The extensive pronominal variability allows for the explicit and frequent expression of referential gender, including the feminine indefinite pronoun as in (7):

(7)   *Nek-a   je došl-a   i   pital-a   za tebe.*
      someone-FEM AUX come-FEM and asked-FEM for you
      'A woman came and asked for you.'

In many cases, pronouns and determiners are homonymous (cf. Mrazovič & Vukadinovič 1990: 246, 317), but with *neko* 'someone' there is a distinction in the masculine singular: *neko* is the pronoun, *neki* the determiner. Since the masculine pronoun *neko* 'someone' can also be used to refer to a woman, one could claim that example (7) contains the determiner, not the pronoun, and is therefore elliptical, leaving out *žena* 'woman' or *devojka* 'girl'.

The interrogative pronoun *ko* 'who' and the indefinite pronoun *niko* 'nobody' do not possess feminine forms, and sentences like (8) and (9) therefore require masculine agreement:

(8)   *Ko   je   zvao?*
      who.MASC AUX called.MASC
      'Who called?'

(9)   *Niko   ni-je zvao.*
      nobody.MASC NEG-AUX called.MASC
      'Nobody called.'

It is possible to use the gender-sensitive pronouns *neko/neka* in the same context, cf. (10a) and (10b):

(10) a. *Da li   je nek-o   od njih zvao?*
          CONJ QUESTION.PRT AUX someone-MASC of them called.MASC
          'Has someone called?'
      b. *Da li   je nek-a   od njih zval-a?*
          CONJ QUESTION.PRT AUX someone-FEM of them called-FEM
          'Has a woman called?'

Sentences like (10a) are interpreted as gender-indefinite, i.e. the 'someone' in (10a) is a "generic" masculine and refers to men and women. The use of feminine pronouns or determiners[18] as in (10b) is restricted to those cases where the speaker is specifically referring to a female (e.g., she is expecting a call from her colleagues, all of them being women). The principle that the masculine pronoun refers to men and women alike, while the feminine is female-specific, holds true throughout the system of the three varieties.

3.   Word-formation

3.1   Derivation

The major process of word-formation in Serbian is derivation: There is a rich repertoire of derivational patterns, while compounding is almost non-existent or at least very rare.[19] Derivation allows for changes on the lexical level of a word as well as the level of word-class and gender. It is the latter type of derivation that concerns us here. Feminine derivational suffixes are more frequent than masculine ones, which are only marginal. The masculine derivational suffix -*ac*, mostly used in order to derive (personal) nouns from adjectives (as in *star* 'old' > *starac* 'old man') can also be used to derive masculine equivalents of feminine nouns, like in *žaba* (f) 'frog' > *žabac* (m) '(male) frog'. However, although the language system allows the suffix to function in this way, it is rarely used, and there are very few derivations of this kind.

Derivations of feminine/female nouns from originally masculine/male stems occur much more frequently. The major feminine derivational suffixes are shown in Table 6.

Table 6. Feminine suffixes

-*ica*	*prijatelj*	'male friend'	> *prijateljica*	'female friend'
-*inja*	*rob*	'slave'	> *robinja*	'female slave'
-*ka*	*ministar*	'minister'	> *ministarka*	'female minister, wife of a minister'
-*kinja*	*Srbin*	'male Serb'	> *Srpkinja*	'female Serb'

The use of these suffixes depends on various factors. The suffixes -*inja* and -*kinja* are usually considered as less productive. However, especially in derivations from words of foreign origin, -*inja* and -*kinja* can be found quite regularly, cf. *sociologinja* 'female sociologist', *psihologinja* 'female psychologist', *teologinja* 'female theologian', *filozofkinja* 'female philosopher', *terapeutkinja* 'female therapist', etc. The suffixes -*ica* and -*ka* are mostly seen as regional variants, with -*ka* being considered the Serbian, -*ica* the Western or Croatian morpheme. However, both derivational patterns can be found in Serbian. Not all words seem to allow for derivation in -*ka*; for instance, the feminine/female equivalent of *majstor* 'craftsman' would – if formed at all (see below) – rather be ?*majstorica* and not *majstorka. In addition, derivations in -*ica* can be used even where forms in -*ka* exist. Thus, feminine pairs such as *profesorica* and *profesorka* 'female professor', *doktorica* and *doktorka* 'female doctor' occur in the same

regional and/or social contexts. The lack of a general derivational rule can be interpreted as a consequence of the fact that there is still no standard solution to the problem of how to refer to women in such professions.

3.2 Diminutives and augmentatives

With most concrete nouns, it is possible to form a diminutive or augmentative by adding certain suffixes to the stem. Diminutive suffixes vary, usually depending on the grammatical gender, or, to be more precise, on the noun's declension. In most cases, the diminutive will have the same grammatical gender as the base word it was derived from, cf. Table 7:

Table 7. Diminutives

devojka (f)	'girl'	>	*devojčica* (f)	'little girl'
dečko (m)	'boy'	>	*dečkić* (m)	'little boy'
dete (n)	'child'	>	*detence* (n)	'little child'

It is interesting to note that the feminine diminutives use the suffix *-ica*, which is homonymic with other non-diminutive feminine derivations (*-ica*). Because of the different noun bases they are formed upon – a masculine noun in one case, a feminine in the other – the two cannot be confused. Theoretically, the homonymic pattern could be used for linguistic jokes, but this does not usually seem to be the case. However, the similar sound pattern may trigger certain connotations. For instance, one informant stated that *rektorica* 'lady principal' sounded "cuter" than the corresponding form *rektorka.*

In contrast to diminutives, augmentatives are always feminine, regardless of the original noun's grammatical gender or declension class. This might seem all the more significant in view of the fact that augmentatives are mostly pejorative, cf. Table 8:

Table 8. Augmentatives

baba (f)	'granny'	>	*babetina* (f)	'old hag'
muškarac (m)	'man'	>	*muškarčina* (f)	'he-man'

Augmentatives can only be translated into other languages with great difficulty. *Babetina* could be used in the same context as 'ugly old witch', and even *muškarčina*, although denoting a he-man and therefore a positive pattern

in the given cultural contexts usually means that the man in question is somewhat overdoing the macho part.

4. Referring to women in Serbian

4.1 Current language use in Serbia

In a society that has been under the doom of dictatorship, war, and economic catastrophe for many years, it may not be all too surprising that the common interest in linguistic issues like the use of gender is not actually all that substantial. It is far more surprising that the problem is discussed at all, although authors like Svenka Savić (1995: 228) complain: "During the last 25 years, the number of research articles on the relation of language and gender has grown all over the world. However, they did not have any perceptible impact over here."[20]

The discussion itself is by no means new: As early as in the 1950s there were attempts to discover general rules for the linguistic representation of the new social reality. After all, there had not been many female professors, engineers or captains before that time. One of the authors from this early period, Svenka Nikolić, states the problem quite clearly:

> When we talk about native words denoting professions that have been open to women for a longer time […] then we usually have the formation of special words, of special forms for male and for female persons. […] *učiteljica* 'female teacher', *radnica* 'female worker', *pomoćnica* 'female helper' (here, for example, we have only *kućna pomoćnica* 'household helper'-FEM and never *kućni pomoćnik* 'household helper'-MASC for a woman who works in the household for money), etc. However, when we come to talk about a new profession, job, position or title that women did not have or did not occupy in earlier days, then the doubting begins. Should one say: *drugarica kapetanica* 'comrade-FEM captain-FEM'; *Jovanka S., inženjer hemije* 'Jovanka S., chemical engineer.MASC' or *Jovanka S., inženjerka hemije* 'Jovanka S., chemical engineer-FEM' etc.? (Nikolić 1954/1955: 150)

However, as early as 1934 Janjanin (1934: 203) described forms like *gospodja profesor* 'Mrs professor (m)' not only as "faulty and wrong" but as an "attempted assassination on our language", and voted strongly for the use of feminine nouns when referring to women. But his attitude did not gain acceptance, as authors of recent works uniformly complain. The use of the nouns mentioned is still characterized by uncertainty and contradictory judgments concerning their correctness.

As Nikolić pointed out, the problem is particularly salient in the area of academic titles and occupational terms, and in branches formerly inaccessible to women. In these cases, exclusively masculine/male forms were traditionally used to denote the (supposedly male) representative of a title or profession. If the fact that now women may also occupy those same positions is to be reflected by linguistic means, there are generally three possibilities at the speaker's disposal, cf. (11)–(13):

a.   The use of "generic" masculine forms for both men and women:

   (11)   *Moj   novi   profesor   iz   matematike je žen-a.*
        my.MASC new.MASC professor.MASC from mathematics is woman-FEM
        'My new professor in mathematics is a woman.'

b.   The use of the masculine in connection with an adjectival modifier meaning 'female':

   (12)   *Iz   matematike imam   žensk-og   profesor-a*
        from mathematics have.1SG female-MASC.ACC professor-MASC.ACC
        'I have a female professor in mathematics.'

c.   The use of derived feminines:

   (13)   *Ov-o   je moj-a   nov-a   profesor-ka   iz   matematike.*
        this-NEUT is my-FEM new-FEM professor-FEM from mathematics
        'This is my new professor (f) in mathematics.'

4.2 Occupational titles for women

The question as to which of these possibilities is to be preferred has indeed remained as unsolved as it was fifty years ago. This can be illustrated by a small, non-representative survey carried out by the present author, in which 15 native speakers of Serbian answered questions like the following: "What would you normally say, when referring to a woman, and what sounds most natural to you?"

profesor	'professor (m)'
ženski profesor	'female (m) professor (m)'
profesorka/profesorica	'professor (f)'

Apart from the problem of choice between *profesorka* vs. *profesorica* (see also Section 3.1), the survey considered the reasons for the choices made by informants. The decision was to be taken by everyday users of the language, who were more educated than the average person, but who on the other hand were

not linguists and most likely had never consciously considered the problem before. The results mainly reflected two different views. Some speakers were of the opinion that the feminine words indicate a marital relation with an office bearer; in this case *Ona je profesorka/profesorica* would mean 'She is a professor's wife'. For instance, one of the speakers in the sample reported that the teacher who taught him Serbian in grammar school insisted on being called *profesor* instead of *profesorica* because the latter, in her opinion, meant only 'a professor's wife'.[21]

In fact, denoting the wife of an office bearer was formerly the most frequent function of these forms. Correspondingly, feminine forms of family names are still derived by a feminine suffix, as in:

gospodja Petronijević 'Mrs Petronijević' → Petronijevićka

Forms like these are quite common, although some speakers consider them slightly archaic.

Only one of the native speakers of Serbian in the survey saw a difference of meaning between the forms *-ka* and *-ica*. In his opinion, *profesorica* meant 'lady professor' and *profesorka* 'the professor's wife'. In contrast to this perception of the potential semantic difference in the derivations, the grammar of Stevanović (1989a: 480, 526) seems to imply that it might rather be the other way round. If there ever was a tendency towards such a differentiation, it obviously did not gain acceptance. On the one hand, the role of a woman is no longer, or at least not exclusively, defined through the job of her husband. On the other hand, the increasing awareness of "nationally correct" forms has led to the interpretation of derivations in *-ka* as "real Serbian" because they are more widespread in the Eastern parts of the former Serbo-Croatian language area.

Almost all of the informants agreed that the feminine forms could also refer to female office bearers, but they thought very differently about the possibilities of using these nouns. They stated that they sometimes used masculine nouns to describe women even though there might be a feminine alternative, simply because the masculine nouns are more common. For this reason, most speakers considered the form *majstorica* 'craftswoman' unacceptable as an alternative for the obviously completely unacceptable form *majstorka* and voted for the use of the masculine noun *majstor* 'craftsman' instead. In other cases, such as *prevodilac* 'interpreter' and *vojnik* 'soldier', no feminine form exists at all, and therefore speakers have no alternative to the use of the masculine noun.

Apart from these results of the small survey it must be stated that most women use the masculine form to refer to themselves. They accept this form as

"normal", whereas the feminine is perceived as strange and unusual, sometimes even as degrading. Of course, the latter perception has its roots in prejudices against women: Female pilots are supposed to be less qualified than male pilots, female professors less competent than male professors, etc. (cf. Frank 1992: 87–89). This explains a phenomenon described by Savić (1998). In her investigation about the use of feminine forms in 500 newspaper articles of the years 1990 to 1996, Savić (1998: 101) states that "[i]f the feminine form of a job title appears in the headline, the authors of the articles express in most cases a negative view of the female character they write about [...]". It is therefore no wonder that in official registers like the publication for the centenary of the Belgrade Philosophical Faculty, feminine forms were used only for very few women who belong to the Centre for Gender Research and therefore insisted on being referred to by feminine nouns.

5. Proverbs, idiomatic expressions and obscene language

5.1 Gendered proverbs

Most proverbs concerning women are rather archaic and will not often be heard in urban contexts any more, although they might be quite alive in rural areas. Stereotypically, they describe women in traditional and dependent roles und behavior patterns:

Women's place is in the house:

(14) *Kuća na ženi počiva.*
'The house is founded on the woman/wife.'

(15) *Žena muža nosi na licu, a muž ženu na košulji.*
'The wife shows her husband in her face, and the husband shows his wife on his shirt.'

(16) *Ženi je mesto u kuhinji.*
'A woman's place is in the kitchen.'

(17) *Svaka žena dobre ćudi, kuva što vole ljudi.*
'Every good-natured woman cooks what people like.'

(18) *Kuvarice, manje zbori, da ti ručak ne izgori!*
'Cooking woman, talk less, so that your lunch will not be burned!'

Women use crying as a means of deception:

(19) *Trgovac te laže sa smehom; žena laže suze prosipajući.*
'A trader lies to you with a smile; a woman lies while shedding tears.'

(20) *Žena se uzda u plač, a lupež u laž.*
'A woman relies on her tears, a crook on his lies.'

Women are inferior:

(21) *Žene se biju čibukom, a ljudi nožem ili puškom.*
'One beats women with a pipe, but men with a knife or a gun.'

(22) *Ženu i izderanu kapu lasno je steći.*
'A woman and a worn out cap are easy to obtain.'

Women cannot hold their tongues:

(23) *Žena će samo onu tajnu sačuvati koju ne zna.*
'A woman will keep only the secret she doesn't know.'

(24) *Možeš je (ženu) ubiti ali jezik nikada.*
'You can kill her (a woman), but never her tongue.'

The already mentioned admonition to the woman as a cook to talk less in (18) could be subsumed under this latter stereotype, too.

5.2 Idiomatic expressions

Idiomatic expressions reveal a similar picture, and in contrast to the proverbs they are very frequent and are used in various contexts. *Ženska glava*, lit. 'woman's head', is a pejorative expression for a woman, carrying the connotation of an empty or stupid head, while *muška glava*, lit. 'man's head', occurring in contexts like *U kući je potrebna muška glava* 'The house needs a man', means the head of the family. *Ženska logika* 'woman's logic' stands for a way of thinking based exclusively on emotions or intuition. *Ženska pamet* 'woman's reason' means roughly the same. However, such expressions do not convey the use of intuition in a positive sense, but only of the lack of "male logic", which is perceived as negative. *Ženska posla* 'women's affairs' is rather vague and may suggest different meanings, such as 'something insignificant', or 'women's way of seeing things', but again the connotation is negative. *Ženska ruka* 'female hand', on the other hand, is positive insofar as the expression can refer to order (especially in the household) or beauty (typically referring to decoration, e.g. an

arrangement of flowers or the like), showing at the same time where women's duties and abilities lie.

5.3 Obscene language

Swearing is almost exclusively sexual: The target of an insult will be represented as the passive or receiving object of male sexual activity (for similar obscene expressions in Russian, cf. Doleschal & Schmid, vol. I). Thus, in expressions like *psovati nekome majku* 'to swear at someone's mother' or *opsovao mu je sve po spisku*, approximately 'he swore at everything on his list', the verb *psovati* 'to swear' is always perceived as a polite reference to the most common swearing verb, *jebati* 'to fuck (as a male activity)'.[22]

The most common ways of swearing or insulting someone are illustrated by the everyday expressions, as in (25–27):

(25) *Jebi ga!*
      'Fuck it/him!'
      [expressing resignation, not addressed to any particular person]

(26) *Jebem ti boga/sunce!*
      'I fuck your god/sun!'
      [expressing discontent, slight insult]

(27) *Jebem ti majku!*
      'I fuck your mother!'
      [personal insult]

It is obvious that the sexual act, seen from a male point of view, is perceived as something causing damage to the object, dishonoring it. This can clearly be seen in the case of a god: It is the other person's god and religion that is verbally sallied and therefore dishonored. The verb *jebati* 'to fuck' can be used with almost any object at all – for instance, it would be quite natural to swear at a bus that is late or overcrowded by saying *Jebem ti autobus!* 'I fuck your bus!' – but it becomes a personal insult as soon as a relative of the addressee is the object of the verbal sexual activity. The most common object, in such a context, will be the mother, denoted by different words, cf. (28):

(28) *Jebem ti majku/mater/mamicu/majčinu/majku milu …*
      'I fuck your mom/mother/mommy/mother.AUG/dear mom …'

Instead of the mother, either the sister or the father of one's opponent may be chosen as the object of a personal insult. An aunt may sometimes be the target

as well; this is considered as somewhat less insulting. Interestingly enough, it is never the brother that occurs in this context.

The fact that being at the receiving end of sexual activity is considered negative in this cultural context can be shown by other common ways of swearing, too. E.g., *Kurac!* 'penis (vulgar)!' stands for lack of success, and *Kurac ćeš dobiti!* 'You will get a penis!' means something like 'You won't get anything at all!' When terms for women's genitals are used in swearing, they either denote a place someone is metaphorically sent to, or they are used in order to insult a person's character. So the equivalent to *Go to hell!* would be (29) or (30):

(29) *Idi u pičku materinu!*
       'Go into your mother's cunt!'

(30) *Nosi se u pičku materinu!*
       'Carry yourself into your mother's cunt!'

The epithet *pička materina* is so wide-spread that even the use of the two first letters, *p.m.*, is enough to convey the meaning of the phrase.

Referring to someone as a *pička* 'cunt' means that he or she has a very bad character. The term is also used as a metaphor in order to illustrate negative feelings, cf. (31):

(31) *Smrznuo sam se kao pička.*
       'I was freezing like a cunt.'

5.4 The empirical investigation of obscene language: Two pilot studies

Obscene expressions are used by men and women alike, although they are more common among men. Danko Šipka (1999) carried out two studies on swearing: a pilot study in 1992 with 200 speakers of Bosnian, Croatian and Serbian, and an additional study in 1998, this time with 205 speakers living in the Federative Republic of Yugoslavia and in the Serbian parts of Bosnia. He asked his informants to mark several linguistic items on a scale of indecency from 1 to 5, where 1 stood for "not indecent at all", 2 for "somewhat", 3 for "rather", 4 for "very much" and 5 for "extremely so". The items given were 18 single words like *jebati* 'to fuck', *kurac* 'penis (vulgar)' or *pička* 'cunt', and six phrasal expressions used for swearing, all of them containing the verb *jebati* 'to fuck', such as *Jebem ti sestru!* 'I fuck your sister!' (cf. Šipka 1999: 52).

The results of both studies are very similar. It is most interesting to see that the tolerance for all these expressions was very high. In the case of the single

words, only one of them reached the mean value of 3, i.e. it was the only one which was at least "rather indecent": *drkati* 'to wank' showed the highest level of obscenity, which was, however, only a mean value of 3.02 (the values given here are from the second study). The phrasal expressions for swearing were perceived as much more indecent, the most obscene of them being *Jebem ti sestru* 'I fuck your sister!' with a mean value of 3.85, followed by *Jebi mater!* 'Fuck your mother!' with 3.68; the other sentences were all below the mean value of 3.[23] The author comments on this as follows: "The first two positions clearly express how deeply the Balkan cult of mother and sister is rooted." (Šipka 1999: 56). However, it shows something else, too: The female members of the family, although of high value, are considered as objects in the possession of the male family members, who are supposed to protect them, preferably by keeping them in a safe place.

6. Language critique and language reform

While most speakers are indifferent towards feminine nouns or even reject them, feminists demand the consistent use of feminine forms in all contexts with potential female reference. Savić (1998: 118–128) offers an extensive list with examples and suggestions of how to handle the problem of female invisibility.

One of the easiest ways in written (although, of course, not in spoken) language is the use of splitting, i.e. the explicit use of both, masculine and feminine. The nouns (or noun phrases) may appear either in full length (e.g. *učitelj/učiteljica* 'teacher') or shortened form, separated by a slash (e.g. *učitelj/ica* 'teacher'). However, since it is not always possible to derive feminine terms, this suggestion falls short in a number of cases.

The other major possibility is to replace job titles and function names by terms for the profession or function itself, as in (32):

(32) a. *Režiser   filma   je NN.*
         director.MASC film.GEN is NN
         'The director of the film is NN.'
     b. *Film je   snimljen u režiji   NNa.*
         film AUX shot   in direction NN.GEN
         'The film has been shot under the direction of NN.'

Although one might be tempted to argue that this way of speaking does not solve the problem of how to address and refer to the people fulfilling the

functions, the use of abstract terms is certainly an elegant way of neutral phrasing, for instance, of job advertisements. It is, however, interesting to see that feminists like Savić (1998: 121) even suggest using constructions like *zvanje profesora* 'the position of a professor (m)' in the sense of 'professorship', although it contains the masculine term, so that the abstraction does not really eliminate the problem of "male as norm", but only shifts it to the attribute. Obviously even this small change of focus is perceived as helpful. What is more, in the example of *traži se privlačna diplomirana ekonomistkinja*, roughly 'looking for an attractive lady economist with MBA', where the noun *ekonomistkinja* (f) is used, the author suggests the phrase *diplomirani ekonomista* (m) 'MBA' instead (Savić 1998: 123). This would, of course, avoid the rather discriminating "attractive" part, but at the same time it means returning to the use of an exclusively masculine term.

The third suggestion is the use of masculine and feminine terms at the beginning of longer texts, followed by the explanation that only one of them will be used in the following text. Examples are (33) and (34):

(33)   *Svi studenti i studentkinje (u daljem tekstu studenti)*
       'All students (m) and students (f) (in the following text students, m)'

(34)   *Oni/one (u daljem tekstu 'one')*
       'They (m/f) (in the following text they, f)'

This is a very simple suggestion to follow, and might therefore be implemented most often. However, in all probability it will be the masculine form that will be chosen, as in (33), so that the explicit mentioning of women will occur only once per text. This does not seem all too great an achievement, but of course it is better than not mentioning women at all.

It remains to be seen whether any, and if so, which of these suggestions will actually find their way into everyday texts in the long run.

7.   Conclusion

The new situation that arose with the end of the former Republic of Yugoslavia makes it very difficult to predict how gender-related linguistic problems will be dealt with in the future. So far, important questions such as the following have not met with more than marginal interest, if any:

–   whether to use masculine nouns or to make use of feminine derivations in referring to women

- how to form the correct feminine derivation of a given personal noun
- how these forms are perceived by the speakers
- whether feminine agreement might be acceptable with masculine nouns.

Apart from a few feminists, linguists in all three countries simply have not given their attention to these issues. Even for Croatian, where new linguistic norms have been developed quite successfully in domains like orthography or the lexicon, gender-related questions have not been taken into consideration. The same is true for Serbian, where, so far, there have been no normative efforts to speak of, and the situation is more or less the same as before the war. It remains to be seen, therefore, which course the Serbian language will take with respect to the linguistic treatment of women.

Notes

1. "Die zusammengesetzte Benennung Serbo-Kroatisch ist kein volkstümlicher Name, sondern von der gelehrten Forschung gegeben, weil für die Mundarten, um die es sich handelt, kein passender Gesamtname vorhanden war." (Leskien 1914: XVIII).

2. The differences are due to the different realizations of ě, a vowel in Old Church Slavonic, which can appear as *i* (in the so-called *ikavski* variety, spoken in the Dalmatian area), *je*, *ije* or *e* respectively. Thus, for instance, 'beautiful child' would be *lepo dete* in *ekavski*, while it would appear as *lijepo dijete* in *(i)jekavski*.

3. Although there are many dialectological works (cf. Ivić 1958), even on small dialects, it is very difficult to say how many people exactly speak, or spoke, which variety or language. The official sources give only the number of persons who declared themselves as members of a nationality or ethnic group. The estimated number of 16 million is based on the 1981 census and roughly encompasses the inhabitants of Bosnia, Croatia, Montenegro, and inner Serbia minus the national minorities there, plus the Serbian and Croatian inhabitants of Macedonia, Kosovo and Vojvodina; cf. Bobot (1985: 86, 91, 103, 109, 115, 120).

4. To wit, take the title of Šimundić (1994): *Rječnik suvišnih tudjica u hrvatskomu jeziku* [Dictionary of superfluous foreign words in the Croatian language].

5. A comprehensive overview of Bosnian language politics is given in Okuka (1998).

6. There are no differences between the basic systems, and the definition of "Serbian" is not always easy, since the variety spoken by Bosnian Serbs has much in common with Bosnian and Croatian, while it is less similar to the variety spoken in inner Serbia or the Vojvodina. In this article, the examples are given in the phonetic/phonological realisation that is used in Serbia and the Vojvodina (i.e. *ekavski*). This is, however, not the variety Vuk Stefanović Karadžić (1814/1964) described as "Serbian".

7. Further back in history, however, the Glagolitic alphabet (*glagoljica*), was used in Croatia, and it stayed in use for liturgical purposes until the 20th century.

8. For a grammatical description of Serbo-Croatian cf. Stevanović (1989a,b), on language history see Leskien (1914); Benson (1998) is a bilingual dictionary of Serbo-Croatian (sic!) and English.

9. As a result of their historical development, abstract nouns, especially those derived by suffixation, almost exclusively belong to the feminine gender. This phenomenon can be observed in other Indo-European languages, too, and the feminine gender seems to have been the original basis even for turning adjectives into abstract nouns (cf. Brugmann 1904: 341).

10. The claim that grammatical gender is purely coincidental in such cases has been challenged in early feminist work like Pusch (1984: 35). However, there is no obvious system in the grammatical gender assignment with mice (masculine), bees (feminine), spiders (masculine), fish (masculine and feminine) or squirrels (feminine) in the languages in question.

11. The numbers are used following Stevanović (1989a: 189–247 et passim).

12. Some nouns of this type, where declension and grammatical gender clash, show feminine agreement in the plural, although this is considered as ungrammatical in the singular. This would, for instance, be the case with *kolega* 'colleague'. Cf. Corbett (1991: 232), Stevanović (1989b: 131).

13. Cf. Mrazović & Vukadinović (1990: 206). However, in many varieties it is also possible to say *On je prava varalica* 'He is a real (f) cheat (f)'.

14. As in many Slavic languages, nouns in the masculine declensional paradigm denoting living beings use the genitive ending for the accusative, while nouns of the same paradigm denoting inanimate objects use the same endings for accusative and nominative. As to the question of whether these different patterns have to be considered as sub-genders, cf. Corbett (1991: 161–168).

15. This type of construction, with referential gender overriding grammatical gender, can in fact be found occasionally in Croat feminist texts and might possibly spread. It is, however, too early to say whether the construction will become standard in Croatian and whether the same type of construction will develop in Serbian, too.

16. Strangely enough, this pattern is not mentioned in standard grammars like Stevanović (1989b) or Mrazović & Vukadinović (1990). A somewhat similar case where the syntactic position overrules the default plural agreement can be found in Stevanović (1989b: 129), who comments: "In such sentences with a subject of several words used in a row, the predicate will in some cases agree with the nearest one, not only in grammatical number but also in gender." (transl. E. H.). However, the two examples given show only the use of singular instead of plural, there is no clash of grammatical gender.

17. Thus, for instance, the nominative forms for 'this one' would be *onaj* (m), *ona* (f), *ono* (n) in the singular and *oni* (m), *one* (f), *ona* (n) in the plural. The following examples give only the masculine and feminine forms in the singular.

18. Note that the masculine determiner *neki* 'someone' cannot be used in the same context, so in this case, *neka* should be considered as a pronoun.

19. Most compounds are loan translations from other languages, like the Croatian word *kolodvor* 'railway station', which is a translation of German *Bahnhof*. In Serbian, however, this type of word-formation is so rare that it is not even mentioned in the chapter on word-formation in grammars like Mrazović & Vukadinović (1990).

20. Here and in the following text, the Serbian quotations have been translated by Elke Hentschel.

21. The same word *profesor* is used both for teachers in grammar schools and for university professors.

22. When the verb *jebati* 'to fuck' is used as a transitive verb, it can only denote the sexual activity of a biological male (human or animal). If one wants to refer to a woman's sexual activity by using the same rather vulgar verb, one has to apply a reflexive construction, and the partner is added by using *sa* 'with'.

23. In the first study, the two most obscene expressions held switched positions: *Jebem ti sestru* 'I fuck your sister!' with a mean value of 3.65 occupied the second place, while *Jebi mater!* 'Fuck your mother!' was in first position with 3.69.

References

Benson, Morton. 1998. *Standardni englesko-srpskohrvatski, srpskohrvatsko-engleski rečnik: rečnik bosanskog, hrvatskog, i srpskog standarda* [Standard English – Serbo-Croatian and Serbo-Croatian – English dictionary: A dictionary of Bosnian, Croatian, and Serbian Standard]. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bobot, Rajko, ed. 1985. *Tatsachen über Jugoslawien*. Belgrad: Bundessekretariat für Informationen.

Brugmann, Karl. 1904. *Kurze vergleichende Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen*. Strassburg: Trübner. Repr. Berlin: de Gruyter 1970.

Corbett, Greville G. 1991. *Gender*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Frank, Karsta. 1992. *Sprachgewalt: Die sprachliche Reproduktion der Geschlechterhierarchie. Elemente einer feministischen Lingusitik im Kontext sozialwissenschaftlicher Frauenforschung*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Grimm, Jacob. 1824. "Vorrede." In *Wuk's Stephanowitsch kleine Serbische Grammatik. Nebst Bemerkungen über die neueste Auffassung langer Heldenlieder aus dem Munde des Serbischen Volks, und der Übersicht des merkwürdigsten jener Lieder von Johann Severin Vater. Verdeutscht und mit einer Vorrede von Jacob Grimm*, Wuk Stephanowitsch. Leipzig: Reimer, XVIII–LXIX.

Ivić, Pavle. 1958. *Die serbokroatischen Dialekte. Ihre Struktur und Entwicklung*. Vol. I: *Allgemeines und die štokavische Dialektgruppe*. The Hague: Mouton.

Janjanin, Milan. 1934. "Gospodja profesor" [Mrs professor]. *Naš jezik, nova serija* [Our language, new series] 5/6: 202–204.

Karadžić, Vuk Stefanović. 1814/1964. *Pismenica serbskoga jezika. Po govoru prostoga naroda napisana Vukom Stefanovićem Srbijancem* [Grammar of the Serbian language. According to the way simple people speak, written down by Vuk Stefanović, Serb]. Wien: Schürer/

Prosveta. = *O jeziku i književnosti* I, *Sabrana dela Vuka Karadžića* 12 [About language and literature I. Collected works of Vuk Karadžić, 12]. Belgrad 1964.

Leskien, August. 1914. *Grammatik der serbo-kroatischen Sprache. Lautlehre – Stammbildung – Formenlehre.* 2nd ed. 1976. Heidelberg: Winter.

Mrazović, Pavica & Zora Vukadinović. 1990. *Gramatika srpskohrvatskog jezika za strance* [Grammar of the Serbo-Croat language for foreigners]. Novi Sad: Dobra vest.

Nikolić, Svenka. 1954/1955. "Oblici imena zvanja" [The forms of job titles]. *Naš jezik, nova serija* [Our language, new series] 5/6: 148–152.

Okuka, Miloš. 1998. *Eine Sprache – viele Erben. Sprachpolitik als Nationalisierungsinstrument in Ex-Jugoslawien.* Klagenfurt: Wieser.

Pusch, Luise F. 1984. "Der Mensch ist ein Gewohnheitstier, doch weiter kommt man ohne ihr. Eine Antwort auf Kalverkämpers Kritik an Trömel-Plötz' Artikel über 'Linguistik und Frauensprache'". In *Das Deutsche als Männersprache. Aufsätze und Glossen zur feministischen Linguistik*, Luise F. Pusch. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 20–43.

Savić, Svenka. 1995. "Jezik i pol II. Iztraživanja kod nas" [Language and gender II. Research in Yugoslavia]. *Ženske Studijie* [Women's studies] 2/3: 228–244.

Savić, Svenka. 1998. "Žena sakrivena jezikom medija: Kodeks neseksisticke upotrebe jezika" [The woman hidden by the language of the media: A codex for non-sexist language use]. *Ženske Studijie* [Women's studies] 10: 89–132.

Šimundić, Matije. 1994. *Rječnik suvišnih tudjica u hrvatskomu jeziku* [Dictionary of superfluous foreign words in the Croat language]. Zagreb: Barka.

Šipka, Danko. 1999. *Opscene reči u srpskom jeziku* [Obscene words in the Serbian language]. Beograd/Novi Sad: CPL/Prometej.

Stevanović, Mihail. 1989a. *Savremeni srpskohrvatski jezik. Gramatički sistemi i književnojezička norma I. Uvod, fonetika, morfolgija* [The contemporary Serbo-Croat language. Grammatical system and norm for written language I. Introduction, phonetics, morphology]. 5th ed. Beograd: Naučna knjiga.

Stevanović, Mihail. 1989b. *Savremeni srpskohrvatski jezik. Gramatički sistemi i književnojezička norm. II Sintaksa* [The contemporary Serbo-Croat language. Grammatical system and norm for written language II. Syntax.]. 5th ed. Beograd: Naučna knjiga.

Perceptions of gender in Swahili language and society

Rose Marie Beck

University of Frankfurt am Main, Germany

1.   Introduction

Swahili (*Kiswahili*) is a Bantu language of the Sabaki subgroup of Northeast Coast Bantu, which belongs to the Niger-Congo language family. With approximately 32 million speakers it is one of the most widely spoken African languages in and outside Africa.[1] It is the official language of Tanzania and Kenya, used widely in parts of the Congo Republic (Kivu, Shaba/Katanga), Uganda, Somalia,

and The Comores. It is spoken to a lesser extent in Oman, the United Arab Emirates, Rwanda, Burundi and Mozambique. In spite of the large area where it is spoken and the great number of speakers, only five million people speak Swahili as their mother tongue. They mainly live along the East African coast from southern Somalia down to the south of Tanzania, and its offshore islands Lamu, Mombasa, Pemba, Zanzibar, Mafia, and Kilwa. This area links the Indian Ocean culture area with the African mainland and comprises a cosmopolitan and multicultural society defined by its language, religion (Islam) and common cultural practices (Middleton 1992). From here Swahili has spread in all directions since the early 19th century.

In Tanzania, Swahili is most widely spoken in all domains of public life, whereas in other regions it is mainly spoken as a lingua franca. In Kenya even pidginized forms evolved in the 20th century, but they are now slowly replaced by Standard Swahili. The latter is based on the Zanzibarian dialect and was developed during colonial times (Whiteley 1969). For centuries Swahili was written exclusively in Arabic script until colonial rule. The earliest preserved literary work dates back to 1728 (Knappert 1971:5). From the mid-20th century onward, literary production has been very lively not only on the coast but especially on the mainland, resulting in quite a corpus of novels, short stories and poetry (see Bertoncini 1989).

Century-long contact with the Arab world has led to considerable borrowing of Arabic vocabulary. In addition to older loans from Portuguese, Indian languages, Persian, Turkish and German, Swahili has borrowed extensively from English in modern times.[2]

2.   Noun classes in Swahili[3]

Swahili is an agglutinative language, i.e. grammatical and semantic information is conveyed by attaching affixes to roots and stems. It has an elaborate noun class system: It divides its nouns into 15 morphological classes, most of which are grouped into pairs of singular and plural (see Table 1, p. 314). All dependent elements show agreement. Though to a certain degree, the classes contain also semantic information, there is no correspondence of any class to the specification of a noun as female-specific or male-specific. Swahili, in the terminology of Hellinger & Bussmann (this vol.), is thus not a gender language, but a noun class language. Swahili noun classes may be defined as the combination of a morphological class (controller gender) and its set of agreement markers (target

gender; cf. Corbett 1991:151f). A noun is marked for a morphological class by an affix which is placed before its stem. Likewise, agreement markers are prefixed to the dependent elements.

2.1 Swahili noun classification and agreement

It is generally agreed that there are 15 morphological classes which are numbered consecutively from 1 to 11, and 15 to 18, in accordance with the Proto-Bantu class system.[4] All elements that refer to a noun, within the noun phrase (adjectives, pronouns, demonstratives, numerals, connectors) as well as the verb phrase or subordinated clauses (e.g. relative clauses), are required to take agreement in the form of affixes.[5] With the exception of classes 11, 15, 16, 17 and 18, all classes are grouped together in pairs of singular and plural. For instance, a noun with a class 1 prefix in the singular takes a class 2 prefix in the plural, a noun with a class 3 prefix takes a class 4 prefix, etc.[6]

The following example is taken from class 7/8 which has the most regular agreement markers and may illustrate both agreement as well as the singular/plural pairing:

(1) a. *Ki-su   ki-le   ki-zuri   ch-a   mama*
         (7)-knife (7)-DEM (7)-good (7)-GEN (9).mama
         ki-li-cho-anguka   ki-me-vunjika sasa
         (7)-PAST-(7).REL-fall (7)-PF-broken now
         'That good knife of mother which fell is broken now.'
     b. *Vi-su   vi-le   vi-zuri   vy-a   mama*
         (8)-knife (8)-DEM (8)-good (8)-GEN (9).mama
         vi-li-vyo-anguka   vi-me-vunjika sasa
         (8)-PAST-(8).REL-fall (8)-PF-broken now
         'Those good knives of mother that fell down are broken now.'

Table 1 shows that some nouns form semantic clusters within noun classes. But this is not consistent with all nouns of a noun class. Rather every class contains nouns whose attribution is not easily explained on semantic grounds. This "untidy" situation has intrigued generations of Swahilists (and Bantuists). One of the most prevalent questions was whether it is possible to find an underlying semantic concept that could coherently account for all nouns of a noun class, and the answers show all shades from yes to no. Recent approaches use semantic network analysis, which prove to be only more (Contini-Morava 1997) or less (Moxley 1998) convincing. Taking into account the comparative Bantuist

Table 1. Swahili noun classes and their agreement markers[7]

Morphological class	Nominal prefix	Agreement forms		Semantic assignment
		Adjectival prefix	Verbal prefix	
1	m-	m-	a-	animates: human, generic terms for animals
2	wa-	wa-	wa-	
3	m-	m-	u-	plants, trees, and their useful products, parts of the body; a few supernatural beings
4	mi-	mi-	i-	
5	ji-/0-	ji-/0-	li-	fruits, liquids, paired things (dual), augmentatives; some kinship and relationship terms; (loanwords); 6: abstract nouns, diverse
6	ma-	ma-	ya-	
7	ki-	ki-	ki-	things, instruments, tools, diminutives, manner; some humans
8	vi-	vi-	vi-	
9	N-[a]	N-	i-	animals, things, some humans, (loanwords)
10	N-	N-	zi-	long, thin objects, names of countries
11	u-	m-	u-	abstract nouns, diverse
15	ku-	ku-	ku-	(infinitives)
16	-; (-ni)	pa-	pa-	definite place
17	-; (-ni)	ku-	ku-	indefinite place
18	-; (-ni)	mu-	mu-	inside place

[a] = homorganic nasal

view by Denny & Creider (1986), Unterbeck takes the approach of "count-mass" and "shape" distinctions (Unterbeck 2000: xviii ff).

2.2 Animate nouns: Semantic vs. automatic agreement

Nouns of a certain morphological class, say class 5, take the agreement markers of the same class. This is sometimes called "automatic agreement" as opposed to "semantic agreement" (Heine 1982: 194). In Swahili, "semantic agreement" is chosen in the case of nouns with the semantic property 'animate', i.e. humans and animals. A noun denoting a living being may belong to any one of the classes 1 to 11 (classes 15–18 are excluded for semantic reasons), but takes agreement of class 1 for the singular and of class 2 for the plural. Though a rather recent development within Swahili (cf. Wald 1975: 283), this marks the only semantic distinction that coherently applies to the Swahili noun class system (cf. Heine 1982: 194, also Corbett 1991: 49). At the same time, it collides with the formerly purely automatic agreement system.

The semantic property 'animate' is shared by all nouns from classes 1/2, where we find only terms for human beings – with the exception of *m.nyama/wa.nyama* 'animal/s, mammal/s' and *m.dudu/wa.dudu* 'insect/s', two generic terms. Examples from other classes are nouns and titles referring to people (*mama*, *baba*), relationship terms (*shangazi* 'aunt', *shoga* 'friend', *rafiki* 'friend', *adui* 'enemy'), and names of animals (*kifaru* 'rhino', *mbwa* 'dog', *kuku* 'chicken').[8]

(2) *Yu-le   karani   m-dogo a-li-m-piga*
     (1)-DEM (5).clerk (1)-small (1)-PAST-(1).OBJ-strike
     karani   w-angu.
     (5).clerk (1)-my
     'That small clerk struck my clerk.'
     (Treece 1989: 193)

(3) *Vi-faru   wa-le   wa-kubwa ni wa-kali.*
     (8)-rhino (2)-DEM (2)-big   are (2)-dangerous
     'Those big rhinos are dangerous.'

A noun's morphological class membership is visible from its prefix in both the singular and the plural (e.g., 1/2: *m.tu/wa.tu* 'person', 7/8: *ki.faru/vi.faru* 'rhino'), from the plural prefix or its absence (5/6: *rafiki/ma.rafiki* 'friend', or 9/10: *rafiki/rafiki* 'friend', *shangazi/shangazi* 'aunt', *kuku/kuku* 'chicken'), or from the possessive pronoun (10: *adui z.angu* 'my enemies', 9: *baba y.angu* 'my father'; cf. also Section 2.4).

Basically the question arises how to treat such nouns with reference to the noun class system. Corbett distinguishes between noun class and gender: "[…] *kifaru* ['rhino'] belongs to morphological class 7/8 but its gender is 1/2" (Corbett 1991: 46, my addition). With this distinction Corbett accounts for the fact that noun class is a combination of morphological class and agreement. We may thus say that nouns denoting living beings are in noun class 1/2, but may belong to various other morphological classes (cf. Section 2.4 on personal nouns).

According to Corbett (1991: 47) the semantic assignment of nouns denoting animate beings is overruled by the diminutive or augmentative. In Swahili any noun can be assigned to the noun classes 7/8 (*ki-/vi-*) forming a diminutive, or 5/6 (*ji-/ma-*) forming an augmentative.[9] For these nouns Corbett claims automatic agreement (cf. also Herms 1995). However, there are counter examples. Thus, Heine (1982: 195), for instance, says that:

> […] Swahili speakers have the option between semantic and automatic agreement with animate nouns of the augmentative (5/6) and diminutive (7/8). In this case, semantic agreement is unmarked as opposed to automatic agreement, which is marked.

He gives the following examples:

(4) a. *zee*   *yu-le*
         (5).old.man (1)-DEM
         'that old man'
     b. *zee*   *li-le*
         (5).old.man (5)-DEM
         'that funny/extraordinary/extremely old man'

In (4b) agreement is automatic (i.e. both noun and adjective carry the same class marker) and thus contrasts with the default choice for human beings, i.e. semantically motivated agreement as in (4a). Whenever both types of agreement are acceptable, automatic agreement (as in 4b) implies a semantic modification of the head noun.

2.3 Coordination

A deeper understanding of the animate/non-animate distinction can be obtained by looking at the agreement forms triggered by a subject that contains nouns belonging to various noun classes (indeterminate gender resolution, cf.

Wald 1975: 275).[10] If all nouns are animate (irrespective of their morphological class (on this possibility see below), then class 1/2 agreement is required:

(5) *Abla, dada   ya-ke, mama   ya-ke, na rafiki*
    Abla (9).sister (9)-her (9).mother (9)-her and (9).friend
    ya-ke   Ashura wa-li-kw-enda   sinema.
    (9)-her Ashura (2)-PAST-INF-go (9).cinema
    'Abla, her sister, her mother and Ashura's friend went to the cinema.'

If the subject contains nouns of various noun classes including personal nouns, the tendency is to position the nouns denoting humans at the end of the enumeration and thus trigger class 2 agreement (example taken from Möhlig & Heine 1995: 128):

(6) *Mi-zigo na abiria   w-ote wa-li-anguka*
    (4)-load and (10).passenger (2)-all (2)-PAST-fall
    'The loads and all passengers fell.'

In the case of enumerations containing non-human nouns of varying classes, usually class 8 agreement is used. Interestingly, "*non-human animates* do *not* also induce class 2 concord when N[oun]s of different classes are conjoined, but rather exhibit non-semantically motivated class 8 concord typical of any conjunction involving non-humans" (Wald 1975: 275, his emphasis):

(7) *M-ke-we   a-ka-mw-uliza,   Jinsi   gani Bwana,*
    (1)-wife-his (1)-SUBS*-(1).OBJ-ask (5).kind which (5).sir
    nguo   z-ako   na farasi   vi.ko   wapi?
    (10).cloth (10)-your and (10).horse (8)-LOC.COP where
    'His wife asked him, "How now, Bwana, where are your clothes and your horse?"' (example from Ashton 1944: 311)

    * SUBS = subsecutive (cf. Schadeberg 1992)

In the following example, a noun denoting a female person in conjunction with a noun denoting an inanimate entity invokes class 8 agreement. Since this is the only case known to me so far, it is unclear how to interpret it. Dialectal variation is a possibility. The author of the text cited is from Mombasa, whose dialect (Kimvita) may differ in this respect from Standard Swahili. Mukama (1995: 385) takes this sentence to represent the view that women are regarded as properties of men. Probably this example indicates that at least in some contexts it is possible to treat female-specific nouns as non-human:

(8) *Nyumba   safi,   m-ke   safi   w-a*
     (10).house (10).clean (1)-wife (1).clean (1)-GEN
     ki-wili-wili   – ndi-vyo   vi-na-vyo-m-vutia
     (7)-body-body   COP-(8).REL (8)-PRES-(8).REL-(1).OBJ-attract
     m-ume   nyumba-ni   mapema.[11]
     (1)-husband   (10).house-at early
     'A clean house, a clean wife (in body) – are [the things] which attract a
     husband back home early.'

2.4 Personal nouns

While for all nouns of classes 1/2 both their prefixes and sets of agreement markers consistently mark their affiliation (i.e. there are no exceptions), this is not the case for personal nouns from other classes (3/4, 5/6, 7/8, 9/10, and maybe 11).

Class affiliation can be determined in two ways. First, with agreement within the noun phrase, and here with the elements closest to the noun, and second, with the plural noun class prefix. The greater the syntactic distance between noun and dependent element, the more likely the possibility that agreement is taken from classes 1/2. Usually, it is only the possessive pronoun that shows agreement with the morphological class, cf. (9a,b):

(9) a.   *Rafiki   y-angu a-me-fika.*
          (9).friend (9)-my (1)-PF-arrive
          'My friend has arrived.'
     b.   *Rafiki   z-angu wa-me-fika.*
          (10).friend (10)-my (2)-PF-arrive
          'My friends have arrived.'
     c.   *Ma-rafiki z-angu   wa-me-fika.*
          (6).friend (10)-my (2)-PF-arrive
          'My friends have arrived.'

Sometimes the noun class prefix and the agreement forms may even be hybrid, as in example (9c), where the prefix is from class 6 but agreement belongs to class 10. Since this happens only with nouns of the morphological class 9 with the possibility of a plural in class 6, this may reflect a merging of the morphological classes 6 and 10 for these cases (Contini-Morava, personal communication; and see below).

An important question is why personal nouns are found in various classes. One reason may be that many loanwords have been allocated to the classes 5/6

and 9/10, because in most cases the initial syllable of a loan does not collide with the morphological form of the class marker, which for class 5 is zero before a consonant of the stem, or in class 9 a nasal.[12]

In the morphological classes 3/4 we find very few nouns denoting humans, i.e., nouns taking the agreement of noun classes 1/2: *mungu/miungu* 'god', *mzimu/mizimu* 'spirit of an ancestor', *mtume/mitume* 'messenger, the Prophet', *mzuka/mizuka*[13] 'evil spirit, apparition'. All nouns belong to the inherited lexicon, i.e. they are common in Bantu languages. The allocation of these nouns to morphological classes 3/4 seems to be semantic, based on the feature 'supernatural beings'. This raises a question about *mtume*, generally understood as the Prophet (Mohammed). The noun is a derivation from the verb *-tuma* 'send' and as a deverbal noun rather prone to belong to the morphological classes 1/2. Though the Prophet is certainly not understood to be a heavenly being (as Jesus is for Christians), he is probably seen as a human with supernatural characteristics.[14]

A number of nouns denoting human beings can be found in classes 7/8. They are usually assumed to belong to the group of diminutives, which may connote a derogatory meaning. Therefore the question has frequently been raised as to whether person reference within these classes implies that such persons are considered to be "less human" than persons within other classes. Examples to support this hypothesis usually are the nouns *kiziwi* 'dumb person', *kipofu* 'blind person', *kiwete* 'lame person', *kilema* 'cripple' (Mreta & Schadeberg & Scheckenbach 1997). Contini-Morava (1997:611) subsumes them in her semantic network under 'immature beings' and 'small body parts', and Moxley (1998:234–237) was enticed to collapse the diminutive/derogative and the idea of 'instrumental artefact' altogether, the latter notion taken from Denny & Creider (1986:223). However, Mreta et al. (1997:36–39) convincingly show that the metaphor underlying these nouns has to do mainly with *namna* 'kind'[15] or *upekee* 'singularity'. Most of the nouns derived in these classes undergo a change in meaning through metaphor, metonymy, simile and diminutive (Mreta et al. 1997:31f). With reference to persons with disabilities the authors conclude that metonymy is a common technique of semantic expansion that is not per se linked to a derogatory or discriminative meaning (Mreta et al. 1997:48).[16]

The literature is not very informative on the ratio of distribution of personal nouns not in morphological classes 1/2. The comprehensive and representative material collected by Contini-Morava[17] from the Johnson dictionary (Johnson 1939) gives a good impression: Slightly more than one fifth

of all human nouns were found in morphological classes 7/8 and almost four fifth in classes 5/6 and 9/10 (41% and 35%). Morphological classes 3/4 were represented with ca. 1.5% and class 11 (which is doubtful anyway) with less than 1%. One should take into account here that the data in Johnson (1939) may differ from contemporary dictionaries. Nevertheless, fluctuation is considerable especially between the nouns of classes 5/6 and 9/10, to a degree that we may even speak of their having merged into a noun class 9/6/10. It is clear that extensive research is needed here.

3.   Referring to women and men

In Swahili the distinction between male or female is not generally marked. This pertains to pronominal forms as well, since Swahili has no gender-variable pronouns:

(10)   a.   *a-na-imba*
             (1)-PRES-sing
             'she/he is singing'
        b.   *ki-tabu   ch-ake*
             (7)-book (7)-her/his/its
             'her/his book'

But of course Swahili has possibilities to specify referential gender explicitly, which shall be shown in the following sections.[18]

3.1   Lexical and covert gender

In Swahili we find relatively few nouns with lexical gender. These are basic terms for 'woman', 'man', titles, terms of address and kinship terms.

   Table 2 shows that these basic terms are quite symmetrical. One could argue that the word *binadamu* 'human being' has a male bias, because its literal translation is 'son of Adam'. It is risky to draw conclusions from the etymology to its connotations. Whether the assumption of male bias is valid or not must be proven by studies on the use of the word in discourse.

   Viergutz (1994) undertook a pilot study of selected nouns which are, in principle, unspecified for gender. The results of this study are summarized in Table 3 (cf. Viergutz 1994: 91).

Table 2. Basic terms referring to human beings

Generic	Female-specific	Male-specific
binadamu 'human being' (lit. 'son of Adam') *mwanadamu* 'human being' (lit. 'child of Adam') *mtu* 'person' *mtu mzima* 'adult person'	*mwanamke* 'woman' *mke* 'wife'	*mwanamume* 'man' *mume* 'husband'
mwana 'offspring, child (without reference to age), unmarried person'		
mtoto 'child'	*binti* 'daughter'	*bin* 'son'
vijana 'youth, young and unmarried people'		(*kijana*) '(unmarried) youngster'
	msichana 'girl'	*mvulana* 'boy'

Table 3. Covert gender in some basic terms

Noun		Covert gender
mwenyeji	'resident, proprietor'	generic
mwana	'child, offspring'	generic
mwalimu	'teacher'	generic
mtu	'person'	probably slight male bias
kibarua	'worker'	slight male bias
fundi	'artisan'	slight male bias
rafiki	'friend'	slight male bias
kijana	'youth'	male-specific
shoga	'friend'	female-specific

However, the questionnaire used by Viergutz, though carefully designed, was probably too lucid, so that the interviewees may have given answers according to their perceptions of dominant gender ideologies. Nevertheless I agree with her conclusion, that there is a tendency for reference to a female person to be overtly marked while general terms denoting human beings are preferentially interpreted to be male. The value of her findings can be seen, for instance, with the noun *kijana* (plural *vijana*) for which a gender bias has been confirmed by other sources: While the plural form *vijana* seems to be gender-indefinite, referring to young people, i.e. young boys or girls, the singular form *kijana* tends to be male-specific (Viergutz 1994:87, Scheckenbach 1997).[19]

Many terms seem to define people in relation to their social status: Being married or unmarried, e.g., is an important division. But while for men the semantics of a term simply states 'unmarried', for girls or women 'unmarried' is connoted with virginity, as in *msichana*, *bikira* and *mwanamwali* 'girl, virgin' (cf. Viergutz 1994: 42 ff). Related to *bikira*, of Arabic origin, we find *-bikiri* 'to deflower' and *ubikira* 'virginity'. *Mwanamwali* is compounded from *mwana* 'child' and *mwali* which refers to 'a girl or boy before or while in the initiation rites' (Johnson 1939: 318b). For *mwari* (or *mwali*) Sacleux (1939: 644a) gives the translation 'fille (à marier), pucelle, grande demoiselle'. In addition, for *mwari* he provides the meaning 'secluded person' (a boy before circumcision or a person after a spirit possession rite). The TUKI dictionary (1981: 203) also focuses on the meaning of seclusion: during initiation/circumcision, during a treatment against sickness, and during the honeymoon that traditionally includes a seven-day period of seclusion (*fungate*). In the Muslim society of the East African coast girls, once they reached puberty, they were kept in strict seclusion at home. The example of *mwali* (or *mwari*) with its assumed primary meaning of 'secluded person' shows how the cultural context leads to a gender-specific interpretation.

3.2 Kinship terms and terms of address

Kinship terms very closely reflect the perception of members of a family and their roles. In the coastal Swahili context the extended family is central to people's lives. Often kinship terms are used as terms of address as well.

The organization of families is much more complex than can be shown here and differs considerably, depending on class and region (cf. Middleton 1992: Ch. 4, Caplan 1969). It is notable, though, that the female kin of the mother's generation and vice versa, the male kin of the father's generation, are expressed by descriptive terms, while the cross-gender references are etiquettes. The exception here is an Arabic loan, *ami* 'paternal uncle'. Arabic is closely connected to Islam which in turn is patrilineally oriented. Therefore it is not surprising to find a separate term for a male relation on the father's side. Also, this term is a honorific title. The term for the maternal uncle, *mjomba*, on the other hand, is of Bantu origin. The known Arabic synonyms today are mostly dialectal.[20] In a strictly patrilineal system the maternal uncle does not play an important role. But with these terms we find the influence of African coastal kinship systems that were (and still are to a certain degree) matrilineal: Usually children (sons) inherited from their mother's brothers, not from their father's. Another instance of

Table 4. Kinship terms

Female terms	Male terms
mama 'mother; female ancestor; aunt on mother's side' (Johnson 1939:258a)	*baba* 'father; uncle on father's side; ancestor; patron; protector; guardian' (Johnson 1939:23a)
mama mkubwa 'mother's elder sister or cousin' lit. 'big mother'	*baba mkubwa* 'father's elder brother or cousin' lit. 'big father'
mama mdogo 'mother's younger sister or cousin' lit. 'small mother'	*baba mdogo* 'father's younger brother or cousin' lit. 'small father'
shangazi 'aunt, father's sister'	*ami* 'uncle, father's brother' (Arabic loan)
anti 'auntie' (fr. English)	*mjomba* 'uncle, mother's brother'
bibi, nyanya 'grandmother'	*babu* 'grandfather'
ndugu 'brother, sister, cousin, relation, fellow tribesman' (Johnson 1939:332b)	*ndugu* 'brother, sister, cousin, relation, fellow tribesman' (Johnson 1939:332b)
ndugu mke 'sister'	*ndugu mume* 'brother'
dada '(elder) sister'	*kaka* '(elder) brother'

cultural importance of a kinship term is *shangazi* 'paternal aunt', which is often used with special deference. Since cross-cousin marriage is a very common practice in the coastal towns, the paternal aunt often is the mother-in-law at the same time. She therefore is very influential and may be feared for her power.

Although kinship terms are fairly symmetrical, when used as terms of address or titles they are not necessarily so. It seems that female terms are associated with colloquial or familiar style, while terms for men imply more distance and honourability. This reflects the ideal of the position of men as aloof, distanced and not being involved with everyday affairs, in contrast to women who are said to be emotionally more accessible, and less concerned with honour and social position (cf. Swartz 1991:160, see also Section 4.1). For instance, a woman of marriageable age unknown to the speaker may be addressed on the street as *mama*, whereas it is (on the Kenyan coast) impossible

to address a man with *baba*. Rather, one could probably use *mjomba* 'maternal uncle' or *ami* 'paternal uncle', the latter being more honorific or formal, the former a more familiar register. Similarly, young women could be called *dada* – or by the more colloquial and sometimes a bit suggestive term *sista*. On the other hand I have never heard anybody address a male stranger by *kaka* 'elder brother', it would rather be *ndugu*,[21] or more formally *bwana* 'Mr' or the honorific *mzee* 'old man'. The formal and honorific address term for a woman would be *bibi* 'grandmother'. *Shangazi* 'aunt' is often used as a deferential title for an older female relative (usually on the father's side).

3.3   Overt gender marking: Attributing 'female/male'

Overt gender specification can only be achieved by attributing to a gender-indefinite noun either the nouns *mke* 'woman' or *ume* 'man', or by adding an attributive expression: *-a kike* 'of female kind' or *-a kiume* 'of male kind':

(11)   a.   *m-toto   w-a   ki-ke*
             (1)-child (1)-GEN (7)-female
             'girl'
       b.   *m-toto   w-a   ki-ume*
             (1)-child (1)-GEN (7)-male
             'boy'

Such attribution is used for terms that are gender-indefinite like *mtu* 'person', *mwana* 'child, offspring', *mtoto* 'child'. Viergutz (1994: 48ff) found that for the introductory passages of stories this kind of overt marking is used to refer to female and immature persons only (women and children) while the unmarked forms are usually male-specific:

(12)   *Katika nchi alikuwako* **maskini** *mmoja, naye alikaa pwani na* **mkewe**
       akazaa **mtoto wa kiume** *[…]*
       'In a country lived a **poor person** and he lived at the shore with his **wife**
       and bore a **boy** […]'[22] (Baker 1962: 19, cited from Viergutz 1994: 48)

The stems *-ke* and *-ume* may also be used metaphorically: *-ke*, representing the female gender, may then carry connotations such as 'like a woman, timid, stupid' and as the noun or adverb *kike* 'a female of any kind, anything of feminine style, womanly behaviour (namely meaning 'weakness, timidity, foolishness')' (Johnson 1939: 181f). Likewise, for *-ume* (as adjective) Johnson (1939: 499) gives the meanings '(1) of the male sex, male, masculine; (2) like a man, virile, strong,

courageous, prudent; (3) of things – strong, firm, reliable, big'. But the examples he gives show that maleness may also comprise infertility or even impotence:

> *Mnazi mume*, the male coco-nut tree – comparatively unfertile.
> *Mahindi maume*, small inferior grains of maize.

The noun *ume*, however, is clearly associated with 'manliness, courage, pluck, potency':

> *Ume wa leo na kesho*, true courage lasts for more than a day [lit. courage of today and to-morrow]. *Anajipa lakini hana ume*, he boasts but he is impotent [lit. 'he gives himself but he has no potency'].[23] (Johnson 1939:499)

3.4 Obscene language

Terms of insult and abuse, and of course, obscene expressions, tend to be clearly gendered. The example of the noun *shoga* 'female friend' shows how a female-specific noun, when used for men, can be perceived to be extremely derogatory and subsequently may undergo semantic expansion (or rather, derogation). *Shoga* is exclusively used among women on the southern (Tanzanian) coast, while men use *rafiki* among themselves. Friends across respective genders would call each other *rafiki*, though these cases are rather rare, because in areas with strict gender segregation any cross-gender relationship would usually be interpreted as containing a sexual undertone. The term *rafiki* (as well as *shoga* among women) is per se void of sexual undertones.

However, in Mombasa *shoga* denotes a homosexual, or a cross-gender male who seeks the company of women (Shepherd 1987). The TUKI dictionary (1981:257) lists the following meanings:

> *mwanamume anayefanya mambo ya kike; mwanamume anayefirwa; hanithi; msenge; rambuza*
> 'a womanish man; a sodomized man; homosexual, impotent; impotent, eunuch; catamite'

This definition contains some important obscene expressions for men. All concern the "horrors" of male sexuality from a homophobic point of view: the choice of a male partner, submission and suppression, malfunction, mutilation. Other obscenities concern the place of penetration, namely the anus, but never the male organ itself (cf. Swartz 1988–1989:227).

Obscene terms for women also emphasize the aberration from the "normal" (the examples in this section are taken from Swartz 1988–1989:219–222). The

most common insult in Swahili culture is *kuma mako* 'your mother's cunt' with the variations of *kuma mayo*, *kuma nina* and *kuma nyoko* (*nyoko* arch. 'mother'). Another curse is *mamako atombwa* 'your mother is fucked' with the implication of an illicit relationship or the word *mkware* 'female with strong and constant sexual appetite'. Especially the last two terms refer to the uncontrolled sexual activities of a woman. In Swahili Muslim culture it is generally held that women are difficult to control sexually, at the same time control over them is an enormously important topic. Because women are an important source of honour and shame to a family and because they are considered to be part of the private domain of a man, it is of high priority to keep women under control (cf. Middleton 1992). To imply uncontrolled sexuality on her part, is to imply a lack of privacy and honour on the man's side or his inability to control the woman and subsequently probably also his sexual incompetence. When used among (young) men they seem to function as an attack on the social position and power of the other (young) man.

Swartz (1988–1989: 209) maintains that "the Swahili badtalk is mainly a device of the powerless and this is true regardless of the kind of badtalk considered". He also raises the question of who is considered to be powerless and who uses which insults. Old people without relatives are often the victims of boys teasing them. Under certain circumstances schoolboys may abuse their teachers from the *madrassa* (Koran school). Young men may curse each other, as well as women abuse each other. A further use of insults is from mothers to their children, especially daughters. Not all abusive language is obscene. But while young men may use obscenities concerning male and female sexuality, women would only use obscenities concerning female sexuality.

4.   Gendered speech

Every community formulates norms and expectations regarding speech. Such notions direct speech and communicative behaviour in two ways. Firstly, they provide a framework within which behaviour is judged to be adequate by other members or by society in general. Secondly, they define areas of "forbidden" communication and subsequently may give rise to strategies of avoidance. Even though such strategies may be socially inadequate, speakers will try to mask their inadequacy by conforming to some communicative rules but not to others. They do so to protect either themselves, their interlocutors or the society they live in (see Brown & Levinson 1987, Bavelas & Black & Chovil & Mullett 1990;

for Swahili society see Yahya-Othman 1994, 1995, Beck 2000a, 2001).

As the following examples will show, one will find that especially in situations of conflict, gender (here understood as a process of social construction in which the biological differences between women and men are culturally interpreted) is conveyed, constituted and reworked through disputes over power (Hirsch 1998).

4.1 *Upole* 'gentleness': Restrained speech as a cultural ideal on the Swahili coast

The central ideal in Swahili coastal culture is the freeborn man, the *mwungwana*. He is the civilized, religious, even pious, law-abiding, citizen of the stone towns, of purely Arab descent, well educated, an able poet, widely read. He values highly the notions of honour (*heshima*, *fakhri*) and privacy (*sitara*). He is the embodiment of *dini* 'religion', the dominant cultural ideal. Although the pedigree of purely Arab ancestors is important, "[i]t is the moral behaviour associated with great pedigree that matters, not the pedigree in itself" (Middleton 1992:90). Noble behaviour may be generally described as *upole* 'gentleness' as an expression of being civilized. Speech plays an important role in the maintenance of *ungwana* (the state of being a *mwungwana*): It is re-strained speech – or silence – that gives proof of one's aloofness and power and protects one's honour and privacy best (Hirsch 1998:40). Restrained speech does not only imply low voice and taciturnity, but also discretion:

> A person who is knowledgeable about clandestine affairs, the complexities of other people's most intimate lives, is potentially threatening. To know secrets is to have power; unmasked knowledge introduces uncertainty into everyday life. This may be a reason why Swahili people speak in metaphors, with double meaning. A statement may be hard to decipher. (Fuglesang 1994:26)

It is not surprising then that to speak in "double meanings" is a highly valued and idealized speech style (Shariff 1988:99f).

In contrast to such male high culture we find a realm of low culture which is mainly associated with femininity, submission, low status, the private domain, and African or slave descent, as can be captured in the terms for uncivilized persons *washenzi* and women *wanawake*. Women and slaves represent the negative aspects of speaking:

> The beliefs about speech […] suggest that the prototype devalued speaker in Swahili culture is a woman, specifically a woman who tells tales […] Emphasis on the trivial and potentially fictional quality of women's speech merges with

emphasis on its dangerous and disruptive qualities to create the impression that women's speech is suspect, not to be counted on, and to be suppressed when it gets too close home, literally. (Hirsch 1998:67)

Speech in general is seen as problematic because it implies gossip and nosiness, insult and slander, worse is only fighting and quarrelling. Especially the danger of loss of privacy and thus loss of social position and consequently powerlessness is fearfully avoided (Swartz 1991:171, Hirsch 1998:64ff). Powerlessness in turn is associated with badtalk, and with young people and women (cf. also Swartz 1988–1989).

Female speech is subject to further restrictions which are sometimes formulated explicitly, as in the following passage from the famous poem of Mwana Kupona. The poem, which the mother addresses toward her daughter, is meant to teach her good manners. It thus reflects speech behaviour as seen appropriate for (young) women in Swahili Muslim coastal society:

(13)   *Neno nao kwa mazaha/yaweteao furaha/iwapo ya ikraha/kheri kuinyamalia.*
'Talk with them [people] cheerfully/of things which give them pleasure/ but when words might give offence/it is better to hold oneself silent.' (Harries 1962:74f)

That the voice of a woman shall not be heard above the room where she speaks, is an ideal ascribed to Islamic norms (Knappert 1967:32). Generally the pressure on women to conform to socially adequate communicative behaviour is high:

Silence and forbearance on her [the woman's] part is assumed to maintain her dignity and respect within the community. She is thus placed in a powerless situation, not only in terms of her action but also in terms of what she can say. Composure will win her praise from most other women in the community; fights in public will invite censure and blame, quite apart from the possibility of sanctions from her husband as well. (Yahya-Othman 1997:145)

However, such pressure gives rise to various strategies of resistance, or, as Hirsch's study of court room speech in the Muslim courts of Mombasa and Malindi shows, to struggles over the social construction of gender. Hirsch (1998) shows how in courtroom interaction women free themselves not only from difficult marital situations, but also from speech inhibitions. They do so at the cost of their reputation – bringing to public private family affairs – but very often win the cases on the basis of Islamic law. In this contradictory way gender relations are enacted and negotiated. Though it is not appropriate for

women to speak in public, and especially not to speak about private or household matters, women's use of the Kadhi's courts along the coast has increased in postcolonial times. While it is the right of the men, in an Islamic context, to pronounce a divorce, it is the duty of the women to persevere.[24] By demanding their rights in court, women step out of their gender-specific role and narrate their conflicts in public. However, by seeking their rights at the Islamic court, they refer to the hegemonial framework of coastal culture, i.e. Islam. Therefore men find it very difficult on the one hand to accept the judgment of these courts, but, on the other hand, because the judgement refers to Islam, cannot reject them either.

4.2 Texts on textiles: Equivocal messages[25]

In the example of Islamic courts women challenge dominant cultural ideals about speech through speaking and narrating. But women have invented a communicative form that allows them to vent their feelings without speaking. It is written language printed on a wrap cloth, the *kanga*, which is thus on the one hand used to subvert dominant ideals of speech, and on the other is perceived as a way of doing gender.

The *kanga*, a wrap cloth, is an object of everyday use among women in Eastern Africa, especially on the coast. It first appeared most probably in Zanzibar around 1875 as a factory-printed cloth imported from Europe and was produced locally in Kenya and Tanzania after Independence. In the late 1890s the cloth was a veritable success, because it became the means and visible sign of the integration of former slaves and immigrants from the African mainland into Swahili-Muslim East African society. Although today the *kanga* is used by women of all social groups along the coast, it still connotes aspects of gender and status that originate from the (former) female slave population. It generally belongs to the realm of society termed *mila* 'customs' (see Strobel 1975: 281 ff, El Zein 1974), but also shows influence from the realm of *dini* 'religion' (see above). Both realms find expression on the cloth with respect to their patterns and motifs, the choice of texts and their gendered use. The *kanga* is one area where women's roles and power in society are permanently being negotiated.

A special feature of the *kanga* is the proverbial texts printed on the lower third of the cloth, right above the ornamental border that runs around its four edges. Apart from some genuine proverbs the texts usually formulate what is considered to be inappropriate or impossible to speak about openly: quarrelling on the grounds of jealousy or envy, conflicts between wife and husband or

among in-laws, gossip, and sexuality. Many inscriptions also contain maxims and well-wishes.[26] Because of the topics communicated with the *kanga*, and because this communication threatens established power-relations, as shall be shown below, it is socially inadequate to use *kanga*. The dominant cultural discourse holds that (powerless) women with low social position communicate in this way. And in fact, in a corpus of 33 cases two thirds show that it is a communication from below, i.e. the addressing party was younger than the addressee, female, and of lesser descent. However inadequate, most women can remember situations when they at least were the victims of such interactions.

Mainly, there are two possibilities to communicate with the *kanga*. First, someone, a woman or a man, gives a *kanga* as a gift to another woman. Second, a woman wears a *kanga* in the presence of another person or a group of people. In one case a young woman who had just given birth to a baby was given a *kanga* by her husband. It had the inscription *Tunda la moyo* 'fruit of the heart'. She often wore it at home, where everybody who came to visit her, could see and read it. Thus, she was able to unobtrusively demonstrate the happiness of her life.

One of the central features of *kanga* communication is an immense possibility to equivocate, to leave ambiguous or even to render unclear whether the addressing party actually did communicate or not, whether the addressee got the message or not, what was meant, what the inscription referred to and to whom, etc. This makes the genre particularly powerful, because the implicit aspects are focused in the process of the interpretation and construction of meaning. The following example illustrates this well.

> *Ataka yote hukosa yote* 'Who wants all, usually loses all'[27]
>
> About fifteen years ago, Ms Hafswa was given a *kanga* by her neighbour, Ms Yasmin. It had the inscription *Ataka yote hukosa yote* – 'Who wants all, usually loses all'. Ms Hafswa got very angry and went to confront Ms Yasmin and ask her why she gave this particular *kanga*. But Ms Yasmin denied a communicative intention by saying that because she was illiterate she didn't know the meaning of the inscription. Ms Hafswa did not believe Ms Yasmin, because it is common knowledge that even illiterate women take part in *kanga*-communication. But she had to retreat, fuming and with feelings of utter impotence and loss of dignity.

The incident occurred shortly before Ms Hafswa separated from her husband, a distinguished member of the community. With the gift of this *kanga* she felt that the blame for the breakdown of her marriage was put on her, but also that people gossiped about her. She saw this gift as an unjustified intrusion into her privacy, and also that the other woman had probably been jealous and was now rejoicing at what she saw as her failure.

The giving of the gift is culturally defined to indicate a communicative intention. However, Ms Yasmin denied a communicative intention and was evasive on the pretext of illiteracy. The task of interpretation of the situation is thus radically shifted to Ms Hafswa. She has to decide by herself, whether something was meant or not. Actually she can only speculate as to what the neighbour wanted to "say", she will draw on her memory of their relationship, of her expectations regarding the neighbour, and of her social position. Because of the little information she has, she will focus rather on what was not "said" than on what was "said" (Bavelas et al. 1990: 57).

> *Bendera hufuata upepo* 'The flag follows the wind'
>
> One day in the afternoon women came to a house to visit, as it is usual for many women. They were elder, very respectable women of high status who came to see the grandmother of the house. As usual, Aisha, one of the young women of the household had to serve the tea and snacks. Since it is very polite to cover one's head in the presence of people of higher status than one's own, she wore a *kanga* over her head. However, she had put it inside out, so that the inscription was visible in mirror writing only. Later, when she went to serve a second helping, she had rearranged the *kanga* so that the inscription was now hidden in the folds around her head. The inscription, albeit inside out, read *Bendera hufuata upepo* – 'The flag follows the wind'.

By wearing the cloth inside out, and later by hiding the inscription altogether, Aisha communicated that she did not want to communicate. This indicates that she presupposed that the visitors might have understood her *kanga* as a comment about the household situation or even about themselves. For instance as a criticism about their integrity or steadfastness in the face of conflicts, as a reproach that probably one of the women present did not take the side she or they were expected to, and so on. Aisha's attempt at preventing communication indicates that she was aware of the conflict potential of the inscription.

Interviews with other women showed that there is no way out of such situations, not even by wearing a *kanga* inside-out. They argued that if the *kanga* may be understood as a message, then it would be useless to wear the *kanga* inside out or hide the inscription in the creases. Because the pattern of a cloth is memorized with the inscription printed on it, the *kanga* is perceived as a sign in its entirety. Women are able to memorize up to several hundred "names". This is also the reason why in the first example Ms Hafswa felt cheated by Ms Yasmin: Even illiterate women are able to communicate by *kanga*, because they have someone at the shops or relatives read the inscriptions to them and then memorize the cloth.

The use of *kanga*, though seen as improper behaviour, may provoke two kinds of reaction: (a) no overt reaction at all – a strategy often used by men who prefer to pretend they have not seen anything, but eventually (and depending on the topic) feel compelled to react. This may be the case when a woman threatens to "publicize" her problem and thus the household secrets via *kanga* in the streets (when wearing the cloth as a veil), at a wedding where many women meet and may be able to see and understand the message, at the home of relatives when visiting, etc. Or (b), as in the first example, it can provoke improper behaviour, i.e. in the form of a confrontation, or a *kanga* as an answer.[28] In both cases, the socially more powerful person, the addressee, finds herself in a state of powerlessness. As a communicative genre, i.e. a socially shared coding system used under certain circumstances, it combines strategies of power and powerlessness. Though having emerged from a social position which comprises powerlessness, it has become a powerful means in negotiating social standing.

5.   Conclusion

Given the lack of research, this overview of language and gender in Swahili is, of course, preliminary. Swahili is spread over a large, culturally and socially diverse area, and one should allow for possible differences in language use in various communities.

Swahili is not a gender but a noun class language. Within these classes we may find semantic clusters, but with the exception of class 1/2, they are neither coherent nor do all nouns of a class belong to such a cluster. None of the clusters refers to femaleness or maleness. In class 1/2 we find only animate, or more precisely personal nouns and two generic terms for animals and insects. Interestingly, in Swahili we find personal nouns in almost all nominal classes, not only in the classes "reserved" for animate nouns.

In the area of human reference, basic and kinship terms seem to be fairly symmetrically distributed. Not enough is known about this yet, but the available data suggest that in Swahili, as in many other languages, gender-indefinite personal nouns (such as *mtu* 'person') tend to have a male bias, while they are marked overtly for female reference. Terms of address, mostly kinship terms, are used differently in different contexts for men and women. Whereas women are portrayed to be more easily accessible in a familiar way, men are more distanced and addressed in a more formal way.

Finally, speech is perceived to be beyond control and thus threatening to the privacy and detachment of persons, namely men. Women are said to be the main source of negatively valued speech. In this view, speech is the domain of women and silence the domain of men. Such gendered ascriptions of speech behaviour are found in other cultures as well. But the example of the *kanga* shows how women try to act in keeping with a society's ideals of silence and forbearance while at the same time subverting these ideals and thus operating in a communicative area beyond the control of men.

Notes

1. For speaker numbers, cf. Ethnologue vol. I (2000: 229, 239).

2. For an overview of Swahili cf. Ashton (1944), Whiteley (1969), Polomé (1967), Schadeberg (1992); Nurse & Hinnebusch (1993) on language history; Schicho (1980) on Shaba Swahili. Important dictionaries are Sacleux (1939) (Swahili–French), Johnson (1939), TUKI (1996) (Swahili–English), and TUKI (1981) (a monolingual dictionary).

3. In this chapter, the Standard variety of Swahili will be analysed. Dialectal variation will not be taken into account.

4. For a historical overview of noun-class classification in Swahili see Zawawi (1979: 11–36). For a recent overview of Bantu noun classes see Maho (1999), who also provides a complete list of Bantu noun classes (Maho 1999: 51). Classes 12, 13, 14 have merged with other classes: Bantu 12/13 have merged with Swahili 7/8, Bantu 14 with Swahili 11.

5. Exceptions are loanwords from Arabic, some of which take no agreement markers at all.

6. This is the reason why they are usually referred to as 1/2, 3/4, etc.

7. In this table allomorphs of agreement markers which are the result of phonological and morphophonological processes are not listed. See also Schadeberg (1992: 14–16).

8. Most animal terms with the semantic feature of 'meat, food' take morphological agreement according to the class of the noun. When the semantic feature is 'living being', they control semantically motivated agreement of noun classes 1/2, otherwise agreement of the respective noun class ("automatic agreement").

9. In Swahili, class 12 *ka-* (diminutive) has merged with class 7/8. Even though there is a semantic similarity between Bantu 7/8 (small things) and the diminutive, nouns intrinsically belonging to class 7/8 must be distinguished from the diminutive. The latter is very productive (Heine 1982: 199).

10. But see Marten (2000) for a more detailed account.

11. Dumila (1983), cited from Mukama (1995: 385). Her translation, my interlinear gloss.

12. For a more detailed account of loanword allocation, see Zawawi (1979), Pasch & Strauch (1998).

13. Alternatively also *mzuka/wazuka* (classes 1/2) (Johnson 1939: 326).

14. It should be noted that other terms for 'prophet' are in other classes: *nabii* (5/6), *rasuli* (5/6 or 9/10). Both are loanwords from Arabic. Compare also *tarishi* (5/6) 'messenger' (Arabic) and *kijumbe* (7/8) for 'secret messenger' (Bantu).

15. Cf. also the overt gender marking *-a kike/-a kiume* 'of female/male kind', see Section 3.3. The productivity of derivation into classes 7/8 with a semantic component of 'kind' or 'manner' is very common but not sufficiently represented in the literature.

16. "Tunafikiri si ubaguzi wala si heshima kumtaja mtu kwa kutumia tabia au sifa au hata kasoro fulani. Ni mbinu ya kawaida ya kibinadamu kutumia maneno na kueneza maana zake kwa njia ya metonimia." [We think it is neither discriminating nor honourable to refer to a person by her/his physical features, (other) characteristics or even a specific defect. It is common human technique to use metonymy as a means of semantic expansion.]

17. I am most grateful to Ellen Contini-Morava for sharing these data with me.

18. In this article I focus on aspects of gender pertaining to nouns. There are, however, a few other phenomena where gender-specific interpretations are inherent in the semantics of a word, as is the case for the verb 'to marry'. In its basic form *-oa* can refer to men only, while the passive form *-olewa* is used for women only: *Alioa jana* – 'he got married yesterday'; *aliolewa jana* – 'she was married yesterday ('she got married yesterday').

19. I am grateful to Gerlind Scheckenbach for sharing her material.

20. Sacleux (1939: 274) gives *hau* (Pemba) which according to Schadeberg (personal communication) is from Arabic *khaal*. The root *Kh-W-L* has the meaning of 'bestow, confer, grant, allow'.

21. *Ndugu* has the additional meaning of 'comrade, citizen'.

22. Note that the verb *-zaa* 'reproduce, bear fruit' is used for both men and women.

23. It certainly is interesting to note that the dictionary contains a much lengthier entry for *ume* than for *-ke*. This pertains to other dictionaries as well (e.g. TUKI 1981).

24. See the title of Hirsch (1998): "Pronouncing and persevering. Gender and the discourses of disputing in an African Islamic court."

25. This chapter is based on original research by the author (fieldwork in Mombasa 1994/95, 1996 and research in various archives). Strictly speaking, the following description is valid only for Mombasa, but secondary information and many informal accounts indicate that this kind of communication is common all along the coast as well as in large parts of Tanzania. See Beck (2000a, b, 2001), also Linnebuhr (1994).

26. Both thematic domains can be understood to belong to strategies of negative and positive politeness (Brown & Levinson 1987).

27. Names and other details have been changed.

28. The dialogical use of communication by means of *kanga* has been neglected here. For examples see Beck (2001: 112).

References

Ashton, Ethel O. 1944. *Swahili grammar (including intonation).* Reprint 1980. London: Longman.

Baker, E. C. 1962. *Mwarabu na binti wake na hadithi nyingine* [The Arab and his wife and other stories]. Nairobi: Heinemann.

Bavelas, Janet Beavin & Alex Black & Nicole Chovil & Jennifer Mullett. 1990. *Equivocal communication.* London: Newbury Park.

Beck, Rose Marie. 2000a. "Aesthetics of communication: Texts on textiles (Leso) from the East African Coast (Swahili)." *Research in African Literatures* 31: 104–124.

Beck, Rose Marie. 2000b. … *Zeigen ist Gold. Zur Definition einer kommunikativen Gattung in afrikanischen Gesellschaften.* Berlin: Das arabische Buch.

Beck, Rose Marie. 2001. *Texte auf Textilien in Ostafrika. Sprichwörtlichkeit als Eigenschaft ambiger Kommunikation.* Köln: Rüdiger Köppe.

Bertoncini, Elena Zubková. 1989. *An outline of Swahili literature.* Leiden: Brill.

Brown, Penelope & Stephen C. Levinson. 1987. *Politeness. Some universals in language usage.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Caplan, Pat A. 1969. "Cognatic descent groups on Mafia Island, Tanzania." *Man* 4: 419–431.

Contini-Morava, Ellen. 1997. "Noun classification in Swahili: A cognitive-semantic analysis using a computer database." In *African linguistics at the crossroads: Papers from Kwaluseni 1994*, ed. Robert K. Herbert. Cologne: Rüdiger Köppe, 599–628.

Corbett, Greville G. 1991. *Gender.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Denny, J. Peter & Chet A. Creider. 1986. "The semantics of noun classes in proto-Bantu." In *Noun classes and categorization*, ed. Colette G. Craig. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 217–239.

Dumila, Faraj. 1983. *Insha za busara* [Essays on common sense]. Nairobi: Bookwise.

El Zein, Abdul Hamid Mohamed. 1974. *The Sacred Meadows. A structural analysis of religious symbolism in an East African town.* Evanston: Northwestern University Press.

Ethnologue. 2000. *Ethnologue: Languages of the world.* eds. Barbara F. Grimes & Joseph E. Grimes. 2 vols. 14th ed. Dallas, TX: SIL International.

Fuglesang, Minou. 1994. *Veils and videos. Female youth culture on the Kenyan coast.* Stockholm: Stockholm Studies in Social Anthropology.

Harries, Lyndon. 1962. *Swahili poetry.* Oxford: Clarendon.

Heine, Bernd. 1982. "African noun class systems." In *Apprehension: Das sprachliche Erfassen von Gegenständen, I: Bereich und Ordnung der Phänomene*, eds. Hansjakob Seiler & Christian Lehmann. Tübingen: Narr, 189–216.

Herms, Irmtraud. 1995. "Diminutiva und Augmentativa." In *Swahili-Handbuch*, eds. Gudrun Miehe & Wilhelm J. G. Möhlig. Cologne: Rüdiger Köppe, 81–88.

Hirsch, Susan. 1998. *Pronouncing and persevering. Gender and the discourses of disputing in an African Islamic court.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Johnson, Frederick. 1939. *A standard Swahili-English dictionary.* Nairobi: Oxford University Press.

Knappert, Jan. 1967. *Traditional Swahili poetry. An investigation into the concepts of East African Islam as reflected in the **utenzi**-literature.* Leiden: Brill.

Knappert, Jan. 1971. *Swahili Islamic poetry.* Leiden: Brill.

Linnebuhr, Elisabeth. 1994. *Sprechende Tücher. Frauenkleidung der Swahili (Ostafrika)*. (Exhibition catalogue). Stuttgart: Linden-Museum.

Maho, Jouni. 1999. *A comparative study of Bantu noun classes*. Göteborg: Acta Universitatis Gothoburgensis.

Marten, Lutz. 2000. "Agreement with conjoined noun phrases in Swahili." *Afrikanistische Arbeitspapiere (APP)* 64: 75–96.

Middleton, John. 1992. *The world of the Swahili. An African mercantile civilization*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Möhlig, Wilhelm J. G. & Bernd Heine. 1995. *Swahili-Grundkurs*. Cologne: Rüdiger Köppe.

Moxley, Jeri L. 1998. "Semantic structure of Swahili noun classes." In *Language history and linguistic description in Africa*, eds. Ian Maddieson & Thomas J. Hinnebusch. Trenton, NJ: Africa World Press, 229–238.

Mreta, Abel Y. & Thilo C. Schadeberg & Gerlind Scheckenbach. 1997. "Kiziwi, kipofu na kilema: Ubaguzi au heshima?" [The deaf, the blind and the cripple: Discrimination or honour?]. *Afrikanistische Arbeitspapiere (AAP)* 51: 23–54.

Mukama, Ruth. 1995. "Gender stereotyping in African languages." In *Theoretical approaches to African linguistics*, ed. Adewole Akinlabi. Trenton, NJ: Africa World Press, 375–392.

Nurse, Derek & Thomas J. Hinnebusch. 1993. *Swahili and Sabaki: A linguistic history*. Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press.

Pasch, Helma & Christiane Strauch. 1998. "Ist das Klassenpaar 5/6 des Swahili ein Zwischen-lager für Lehnwörter?" *Afrikanistische Arbeitspapiere (AAP)* 55: 145–154.

Polomé, Edgar. 1967. *Swahili language handbook*. Washington, DC: Center of Applied Linguistics.

Sacleux, Charles. 1939. *Dictionnaire Swahili-Français*. Paris: Institut d'Ethnologie.

Schadeberg, Thilo C. 1992. *A sketch of Swahili morphology*. Cologne: Rüdiger Köppe.

Scheckenbach, Gerlind. 1997. "Bezeichnungen für Personen in den Klassen 7/8 (*ki-/vi-*) im Swahili." Unpublished paper.

Schicho, Walter. 1980. *Kiswahili von Lubumbashi: Sprachverwendung und Sprachwertung am Beispiel einer afrikanischen Großstadt*. Wien: Afro-Pub.

Shariff, Ibrahim Noor. 1988. *Tungo zetu. Msingi wa mashairi na tungo nyinginezo* [Our poetry. The poetics of shairi and other poems]. Trenton, NJ: Red Sea Press.

Shepherd, Gill. 1987. "Rank, gender and homosexuality: Mombasa as a key to understanding sexual options." In *The cultural construction of sexuality*, ed. Pat Caplan. London: Tavistock, 248–270.

Strobel, Margret A. 1975. *Muslim women in Mombasa, 1890–1973*. Ann Arbor: UMI.

Swartz, Marc J. 1988–1989. "God curse you, and the curse is that you be what you already are! Swahili culture, power, and badtalk." *Maledicta. The International Journal of Verbal Aggression* 10: 209–230.

Swartz, Marc, J. 1991. *The way the world is. Cultural processes and social relations among the Mombasa Swahili*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Treece, Rick. 1989. "Kiswahili agreement for kinship terms." In *Current approaches to African linguistics*, eds. Paul Newman & Robert D. Botne. Dordrecht: Foris, 191–205.

TUKI (Taasisi ya Uchunguzi wa Kiswahili). 1981. *Kamusi ya kiswahili sanifu*. [A dictionary of Standard Swahili]. Dar es Salaam: Oxford University Press.

TUKI (Taasisi ya Uchunguzi wa Kiswahili). 1996. *English-Swahili Standard Dictionary*. Dar es Salaam: Oxford University Press.

Unterbeck, Barbara. 2000. "Gender: New light on an old category. An introduction." In *Gender in grammar and cognition*, eds. Barbara Unterbeck et al. Berlin: de Gruyter, xv–xiv.

Viergutz, Signe. 1994. *Sprachliche Diskriminierung von Frauen in einer Sprache ohne Genus? Das Beispiel des Kiswahili*. M.A. thesis, University of Hamburg.

Wald, Benji. 1975. "Animate concord in Northeast Coastal Bantu: Its linguistic and social implications as a case of grammatical convergence." *Studies in African Linguistics* 6: 267–314.

Whiteley, Wilfred H.W. 1969. *Swahili. The rise of a national language.* London: Methuen.

Yahya-Othman, Saida. 1994. "Covering one's social back: Politeness among the Swahili." *Text* 14: 141–161.

Yahya-Othman, Saida. 1995. "Aren't you going to greet me? Impoliteness in Swahili greetings." *Text* 15: 209–227.

Yahya-Othman, Saida. 1997. "If the cap fits: *Kanga* names and women's voice in Swahili society." *Afrikanistische Arbeitspapiere (AAP)* 51: 135–149.

Zawawi, Sharifa M. 1979. *Loan words and their effect on the classification of Swahili nominals.* Leiden: Brill.

Linguistic and public attitudes towards gender in Swedish

Antje Hornscheidt

Humboldt-University, Berlin, Germany

1.   Introduction

Swedish (*Svenska*) is a North Germanic language, along with Danish, Faroese, Icelandic, and the two Norwegian varieties (see Bull & Swan, vol. II). It belongs to the East Scandinavian group of the North Germanic languages. Today, Swedish is a national language in both Sweden and Finland and is spoken by approximately 9 million people. There are some Swedish immigrant groups in the USA and Canada, and a very small Swedish minority in Estonia speaking varieties of Swedish. In Finland, where Swedish is one of the two official languages, only a minority of people, i.e. 5.8% of the population, speak Swedish as their mother tongue (Finnäs 1995: 1).

The development of Modern Swedish dates back to 1526, when a translation of the New Testament was first printed. The standard language began to emerge in the 17th century, based primarily on the Svea dialects spoken in Stockholm and around Lake Mälaren.

To a certain degree, speakers of Swedish, Danish and Norwegian can communicate with each other using their own native languages. In 1987 the Nordic governments (Denmark, Sweden, Norway and Iceland) ratified a convention that all citizens may use their national language(s) in other Nordic countries when in contact with official institutions. In Sweden, public discussions on language today concern the linguistic status of Swedish within the European Community and the influence of the English language.

Grammatically, the Scandinavian languages are characterised by enclitic definite articles, i.e. the suffixing of the definite article to the noun. There are no case markers on Swedish nouns except for possessive *-s.* Another characteristic feature of Swedish which makes it quite unique is a pitch accent. On the lexical level, Swedish contains numerous loanwords, esp. from Low German and High German, and more recently from English and French.

Reference works on the Swedish language are readily available: Holmes & Hinchliffe (1995) is a fairly good Swedish grammar written in English, Teleman & Hellberg & Andersson (1999) is a comprehensive monolingual grammar; Pettersson (1996) provides a good survey on Swedish from a historical perspective; and *Norstedts Svenska Ordbok* (1988) is one of the most widely used Swedish-Swedish dictionaries. There are also numerous virtual resources on the Swedish language.[1]

2.   Grammatical gender and agreement[2]

Swedish nouns can be subdivided into two grammatical gender classes: common and neuter gender, with the majority of nouns having common gender (called "utrum" in Swedish).

Gender assignment is not systematic. There are only few regularities in gender assignment, most of them morphological. Thus, nouns which have one of 45 different endings are common gender, while those with one of seven other endings are neuter gender (cf. Lindholm 1974:44f for an overview of these endings). The gender of most nouns, however, is not assigned on the basis of the noun's morphological shape, but has to be learned in the process of language acquisition. Nominal gender is almost always covert (cf. Corbett 1991:63) in that it is evident in agreement forms in the singular only, i.e. in definite and indefinite articles, adjectives in attributive and predicative position, personal pronouns, demonstrative pronouns, some possessive and some indefinite pronouns.

The definite article is suffixed to the noun: here, grammatical gender is distinguished in the singular. Note that in addition to the suffixed article a preposed determiner is used when the noun is modified by an attribute. As a rule, common gender forms of determiners end in *-n*, as in (1), while neuter gender forms end in *-t/-tt*, as in (2):

(1)   Common gender articles
    a.   *en röd cykel   / den röda cykel-n*
        a red bicycle DET red bicycle-DET
        'a red bicycle/the red bicycle'
    b.   *den kloka kvinna-n*
        DET clever woman-DET
        'the clever woman'
    c.   *den här gamla mann-en*
        DET here old   man-DET
        'this old man'

(2)   Neuter gender articles
    a.   *ett rött hus   / det röda hus-et*
        a red house DET red house-DET
        'a red house/the red house'
    b.   *det unga affärsbiträd-et*
        DET young shop.assistent-DET
        'the young shop assistant'

A distinction must be made between grammatical and semantic gender: third person singular personal pronouns (and one group of possessive pronouns) have four distinctions, whose choice is partially motivated by the noun's grammatical gender (common or neuter), and partially motivated by referential gender (when the pronouns relate to personal nouns). Thus, within both grammatical categories, common and neuter, there is a further distinction into female and male gender. The common gender noun *kvinnan* 'the woman' in (1b) would therefore be taken up by *hon* 'she', common gender *mannen* 'the man' in (1c) by *han* 'he', and the neuter gender noun *affärsbiträdet* 'the shop assistant' in (2b) by either *hon* or *han*. In contrast, the inanimate nouns *cykeln* 'the bicycle' (common gender, 1a) and *huset* 'the house' (neuter gender, 2a) would be pronominalised according to their grammatical gender as *den* 'it' (common) and *det* 'it' (neuter), respectively.

The modern Swedish gender system has so far not been described in a unified way. Applying Corbett's (1991) gender typology, Källström (1995) has provided the most detailed analysis of gender in modern Swedish, suggesting a four-gender-system in his "standard" analysis. In the 1970s the traditional model he followed was replaced by a model suggesting two different gender systems for Swedish, a "formal" and a "semantic" one (cf. Andersson 1980, 2000). This is still the most widely used grammatical description today: "semantic" gender can solely be found with reference to human beings and personified animals, all other gender classifications being purely "formal". Teleman (1993) believes these two systems function independently of each other. More recently, Dahl (2000: 101) has claimed that "[i]n any gender system, there is a general semantically-based principle for assigning gender to animate nouns and noun phrases."

Swedish grammars today normally take the distinction between "formal" and "semantic" gender as given. However, the following analysis aims to show that the distinction between "formal" and "semantic" gender as it has been described in grammars and teaching materials is not as clear-cut as has been maintained.

3.   Personal nouns

At first sight, there seems to be no obvious relationship between grammatical and referential gender in Swedish personal nouns, most of which are common gender. However, gender-specification does occur in many groups of nouns, even though it has been claimed that there is a general tendency away from

gender-specification for human nouns in modern Swedish (cf. Braunmüller 1991, Himanen 1990, Teleman 1995). It will be shown below that this claim cannot be maintained. Indeed, we must be careful to differentiate between tendencies toward *neutralisation* of referential gender, on the one hand, and toward *gender-specification*, on the other, as they appear in different contexts. In fact, the strategies of gender-specification and neutralisation are not clearly distinguishable from each other in all cases. Indeed, modern Swedish seems to be in a transitional stage of variation, in which the direction of change is not yet clear, since the strategies of neutralisation and gender-specification occur simultaneously and often with the same words and/or phrases.

A careful analysis of the relationship between grammatical gender and referential gender serves as an important preparation for the evaluation of feminist language change in Swedish as discussed in Section 6.

3.1   Nouns with lexical gender

The largest group of gender-specific personal nouns are kinship terms with either female or male reference. Grammatically, they are all common gender, cf. (3):

(3)   *mor*   'mother'   *far*   'father'
      syster   'sister'   *bror*   'brother'

Besides kinship terms there are some very frequent and therefore important basic human nouns (including address terms) with an inherent specification as either [female] or [male]; they are also common gender:

(4)   *kvinna*   'woman'   *man*   'man'
      flicka   'girl'   *pojke* 'boy'
      tjej   'girl, adult woman' *kille* 'boy'
      gumma   'old woman'   *gubbe* 'old man'
      fru   'Mrs, Ms'   *herr*   'Mr'
      fröken   'Miss'
      drottning   'queen'   *kung*   'king'

This group also includes a number of asymmetrical pairs such as *make*, which means 'husband', but also 'spouse' in a gender-indefinite sense, whereas *maka* only means 'wife'.

3.2 Gender-indefinite personal nouns

Among personal nouns which are unspecified for [female] or [male], and which can therefore be described as having generic function, are nouns of neuter and common gender. Examples are the following kinship terms which occur as plural forms: *föräldrar* 'parents' (common gender), and *syskon* 'siblings' (neuter gender). There is also a singular term *förälder* 'parent' (common gender).

Basic human nouns with generic reference are the following common gender words:

(5) *människa* 'human being'
    person 'person'
    individ 'individual'

In addition, a number of professional terms belong to this class, such as:

(6) *lärare* 'teacher'
    läkare 'doctor'
    professor 'professor'
    student 'student'
    pilot 'pilot'

Some forms are derived from adjectives or verbs, such as:

(7) *kändis* 'famous person' (from *känd* 'famous')
    ungdom 'young person' (from *ung* 'young')
    vinnare 'winner' (from *att vinna* 'to win')
    cyklist 'cyclist' (from *att cykla* 'to cycle')
    ordförande 'chairperson' (lit. 'word.lead.PART')

There are a few neuter gender nouns in this group, denoting people in diverse social roles and functions:

(8) *vittne* 'witness'
    barn 'child'
    majestät 'majesty'
    offer 'victim'
    folk 'people'

3.3 Word-formation

3.3.1 *Compounding*
Among the compounds which contain gender-specific lexical elements are
second grade kinship terms denoting grandparents, aunts and uncles, which not
only indicate referential gender, but also descent (all common gender), e.g.:

(9) *morfar*   'grandfather' (mother's father)
    mormor 'grandmother' (mother's mother)
    farfar   'grandfather' (father's father)
    farmor 'grandmother' (father's mother)

Many compounds are built from general human nouns. Nouns which have
-kvinna '-woman', or *-tjej* '-girl' as a second element are female-specific.
Conversely, most compounds with *-man* '-man' are male-specific, but may in
addition be used as generics, especially those *man*-compounds which have no
parallel terms with *-kvinna* as a second element:

(10) *riksdagsman*   lit. 'parliament man'
                '(male) member of parliament'
      statsman   'statesman'
      riksdagskvinna lit. 'parliament woman'
                'female member of parliament'

In a quantitative comparison of two daily newspaper corpora from 1965 and 1976,
Himanen (1990) concluded that in 1976 compounds in *-man* were more often
used to refer to both men and women than in 1965. Compounds in *-kvinna*
decreased both in absolute number and in the number of different forms.

There are still, however, *man*-compounds which are male-specific, with
parallel forms ending in *-kvinna*. Many examples can be found in job advertise-
ments, e.g.:

(11) *affärsman/affärskvinna*   'businessman/businesswoman'
      personalman/personalkvinna 'personnel manager (male/female)'

On the other hand, there are also examples in job advertisements with generic
function, like *personalman*. In this area, then, there seem to be two competing
systems, with *man*-compounds which are either male-specific only or, in
addition, generic.

Where morphologically parallel terms exist, semantic asymmetries can
often be observed:

346 Antje Hornscheidt

(12) *tjänstekvinna*   *tjänsteman*
     service.woman   service.man
     'female servant'   'public servant' (gender-indefinite)
     yrkeskvinna   *yrkesman*
     profession.woman   profession.man
     'woman who works in   'professional specialist' (gender-indefinite)
     a profession'
     hemmafru   *hemmaman*
     home.woman   home.man
     'woman doing housework' 'man doing housework'
     (frequently used)   (only very rarely used)
     ungmö   *ungkarl*
     young.girl   young.chap
     'spinster'   'unmarried man'
     (pejorative connotation) (positive or neutral meaning)

In order to avoid the pejorative meaning of *ungmö*, the new term *ungkarlsflicka* 'unmarried girl' (lit. 'young boy's girl, bachelor girl') has been created: the term referring to a man is taken as basic with a female-specific element added to it.

Some nationality nouns belong to the group of generic compounds ending in *-man* (all common gender):

(13) *norrman*   'Norwegian person/man'
     engelsman 'English person/man'
     fransman   'French person/man'

These are used for reference to men or as "generic" terms. Female-specific nouns are derived from the underlying adjectives by adding the suffix *-a* (all common gender):

(14) *norsk*   *norska*
     'Norwegian' 'Norwegian woman'
     engelsk   *engelska*
     'English'   'English woman'
     fransk   *fransyska*
     'French'   'French woman'

Some compounds referring to women have no male counterparts:

(15) *barnflicka*   lit. 'children's girl'   'nanny'
     hustru   'wife'

> *fruntimmer*   'woman' (pejorative meaning, neuter gender)
> *tennistjej*   'tennisgirl, woman tennis player'

Especially in the area of sports, compounds referring to adult women frequently end in *-tjej* or *-flicka* 'girl'. There are no parallel compounds in *-kille* or *-pojke* 'boy' for reference to adult men, at least in written texts.[3]

Neuter-gender compounds with "generic" reference include all nouns with *-råd* 'member', *-bud* 'messenger' and *-biträde* 'assistant' as second elements:

(16) *statsråd*   'member of the cabinet'
      justitieråd   'Lord Justice'
      stadsbud   'town messenger, porter'
      sändebud   'messenger'
      (hem) biträde   '(domestic) servant'
      modelejon   lit. 'fashion lion', 'person interested in fashion'
                        (only very rarely used)

A number of loanwords have been taken from English, e.g. *skinhead*; in job advertisements forms like *business(wo)man* can sometimes be found.

3.3.2   *Derivation*

Derived personal nouns are always common gender. While the morphologically unmarked forms belong to the group of generics, derived forms are typically female-specific.[4]

The most important Swedish suffixes deriving female-specific terms are *-inna*, *-ska*, *-ös*, *-is* and *-essa*. The suffixes *-ös*, *-is* and *-essa* are no longer productive, and the respective derivations are not frequently used.

Significantly, there are only very few cases where male-specific nouns are derived from lexically female nouns; among these exceptional cases are:

(17) *brud – brudgum*   'bride' – 'bridegroom' (both common gender)
      änka – änkling   'widow' – 'widower' (both common gender)

There are forms referring to women which do not have parallel forms referring to men. Notwithstanding, they are built according to the usual derivational patterns:

(18) *flygvärdinna*   'stewardess'
      (*flygvärd; the term referring to men is *steward*)
      sömmerska   'seamstress'
      (*sömmare; the term referring to men is *skräddare*)

> *kassörska*   'woman cashier'
> (*kassör*; the form exists but has a slightly different meaning: 'teller' or
> 'treasurer')[5]

The most frequent female suffixes are *-inna*, *-ska*, and *-a*. Many job titles have
been created with them, and they correspond to unmarked forms ending in
-are, cf. (19):

(19) *lärare*   '(male) teacher'   *lärarinna*   'female teacher'
      arbetare   '(male) worker'   *arbeterska*   'female worker'

The suffix *-inna*

In a 1987 corpus of the biggest Swedish national daily newspaper, *Dagens
Nyheter* (Holmberg 1995), the most frequent *-inna*-derivations were: *lärarinna*
'female teacher', *författarinna* 'female author', *konstnärinna* 'female artist',
målarinna 'female painter', *föreståndarinna* 'chairwoman', *överhovmästarinna*
'lady-in-waiting', as well as compounds with *-värdinna* 'female attendant' as the
second element.

In a comparison between 19th century novels and novels from 1980/1981
(both corpora have approximately the same size, i.e. ca. 3.7 million tokens),
lärarinna is one occupational term which continues to be frequently used: 98
instances in the 19th century match 72 in the 20th century corpus.[6]

Besides job-titles, female-specific terms, often associated with the sphere of
private relationships, are also derived using the suffix *-inna:*

(20) *väninna* (from *vän* 'friend')   'woman friend'
      älskarinna (from *älskare* 'lover')   'woman lover'

The frequent occurrence of such derivations shows that in the case of private
and intimate relationships gender-marking is essential.

The suffix *-ska*

Today, terms in *-ska* can be found more often and in more diverse contexts
than terms in *-inna*. In contrast to the nouns ending in *-inna*, those ending in
-ska are still frequently used (according to my own investigations in *Språk-
banken* and in Holmberg 1995). The most frequent forms are compounds with
-sköterska 'caretaker':

(21) *sjuksköterska*   'nurse'
      tandsköterska   'dental nurse'
      barnsköterska   'children's nurse'

Sjuksköterska and *barnmorska* 'midwife' can also be used with generic reference.[7] Generally, though, male reference is realised by attributing the adjectival modifier *manlig* 'male'.

There are some derived forms which are still frequently used with reference to women, e.g. *skådespelerska* 'actress' and *sångerska* 'woman singer'. The only plausible explanation for their survival is that explicit gender-specification is essential in this professional context. However, this argument cannot sufficiently account for the maintenance of female-specific terms, since other words belonging to the same professional domain would require similar forms. E.g., *dansare* 'dancer' has no parallel from **danserska*. According to my own investigations, the traditional term *dansös* is no longer used (cf. also Holmberg 1995), except in the compound *ballettdansös* 'female ballet dancer'.

The suffix *-a*

This suffix is used to derive many female-specific nouns from adjectives and participles. Nationality nouns are one of the largest lexical subgroups. In most cases, a distinction is made between female and male reference:

(22) a. *Hon är argentinska/danska/tyska.*
         'She is an Argentinean/Danish/German woman.'
     b. *Han är argentinare/dansk/tysk.*
         'He is an Argentinean/Danish/German man.'

The female terms are derived from adjectives denoting the nationality by adding the suffix *-a*. Frequently, the male terms (which are also used as generics) are not derived from an adjective, but rather from a nominal base:

(23) | Male | Female | | |
|------|--------|---|---|
| *ugandier* | *ugandiska* (from *ugandisk*) | | 'Ugandian' |
| *vitryss* | *vitryska* (from *vitrysk)* | | 'White Russian' |
| *ålänning* | *åländska* (from *åländsk*) | | 'Åland Islander' |
| *engelsman* | *engelska* (from *engelsk*) | | 'English person' |

In all cases the generic term is identical with the male-specific term. Reference to women has to be made by derived terms. Teleman's (1995) assumption that many of the nationality nouns which refer to men are used in generic function does not seem to be correct. Rather, generic reference coincides with male-specific reference and presents not one but the only possibility for generic reference.

4.   Pronominalisation

In most descriptions of pronominal agreement, it is assumed that there is a connection between the choice of the pronominal form and grammatical or semantic properties of the noun (cf. Andersson 1980, Blume 1982, Molde 1976).

4.1   Grammatical agreement

All pronouns have gender-variable forms in the singular for common and neuter gender. The choice of these forms is determined by the noun's grammatical gender. This regards personal pronouns (*den*/*det* 'it'), one set of relative pronouns (*vilken*/*vilket* 'who/which'), demonstrative pronouns (*den* (*här*)/*det* (*här*), *denna*/*detta* 'this'), and one set of possessive pronouns (*sin*/*sitt* 'her/his/ its'). In addition, third person singular personal pronouns also distinguish *hon* 'she' and *han* 'he', which mostly, but not always, express referential gender. There is an additional formal agreement rule for human nouns ending in -*a* (formerly feminine nouns, today common gender): most of them require the use of *hon* (female-feminine) irrespective of referential gender, cf. (24):

(24)   *människa … hon* 'human being … she'[8]
      sköterska … hon 'caretaker … she'
      nästa … hon   'the next … she (for female and male referent)'
      främsta … hon 'the first … she (for female and male referent)'

When these nouns refer to a man, the pronoun *han* is often used as well. In the case of pronominalised adjectives such as *nästa*, the female forms are the basic forms, having female-specific as well as generic functions, while the male forms are male-specific only, as in (25):

(25)   *näste … han*   'the next … he'
      främste … han 'the first … he'

However, the distinction between -*e* and -*a* is fading away. Today most Swedes use -*a* as the only form. In his contrastive perception studies, Batliner (1984) investigated native speakers' association with the word *människa* 'human being' and the pronominal agreement form *hon* 'she'. Unfortunately, he uses no sentences where the word *människa* has generic reference, but tests the word without context. He comes to the conclusion that – in contrast to Danish *menneske … det* 'human being … it' and German *Mensch … er* 'human being … he' – the Swedish female-feminine pronoun *hon* 'she' as an anaphoric

pronoun for *människa* is not interpreted as generic: "Still, the 'semantic range' of *hon* is intrinsically greater than that of Danish neuter *det* or of the German masculine *er* […]" (Batliner 1984: 844f). Due to his choice of test sentences, however, Batliner's study is not pertinent enough to draw general conclusions about the acceptance of the female-feminine pronoun in generic function.

4.2 Semantic agreement

It must be emphasised that a clear-cut distinction between formal and semantic gender agreement (*den/det* vs. *hon/han*), which is found in Swedish grammar books and linguistic descriptions, cannot be made in each case. As was shown in the previous section, some sets of pronouns have, in addition to the common and neuter forms, female and male forms, which may occasionally also be triggered by formal agreement; cf. (24). They are usually, but not always, used for reference to humans according to semantic criteria. In addition, even common vs. neuter forms may sometimes be chosen according to semantic criteria.

4.2.1   *Common vs. neuter gender*

Personal pronouns
Even though human nouns in Swedish are merely distinguished into common and neuter gender forms which do not semantically correlate with referential gender, it seems that the neuter is strongly associated with inanimate reference. However, neuter human nouns are not always referred to by pronouns according to formal agreement rules. Hultman (1992) maintains that no consistent pronominal reference can be found for the neuter noun *barn* 'child'. In his study, in 44% of all cases semantic agreement forms for pronominal reference to the word *barn* were chosen. Hultman demonstrates that even though in contemporary grammars of Swedish the question of pronominal agreement is discussed as a formal rule, actual language use is different. Formal and semantic pronominal agreement compete with each other. The test persons' repeated use of the common gender pronoun *den* 'it' to refer to *barn* (neuter gender) indicates that pronominal gender is currently changing from formal to semantic agreement, with *den* expressing human/animate reference. This is supported by the corresponding use in idiomatic expressions, such as *Vem är den, som …* 'Who is that [common gender], who/that …'.

Indefinite pronouns

The indefinite pronouns *någon/något* 'someone/something, anyone/anything' (and correspondingly *ingen/inget* 'no one/nothing') are worth mentioning because they show a distinction between personal reference and reference to inanimates, the common gender form referring to human beings, the neutral form to inanimates:

(26) a. *Finns det någon där?*
          'Is there anyone [common gender] there?'
      b. *Finns det något där?*
          'Is there anything [neuter gender] there?'[9]

4.2.2   *Female vs. male pronouns*

Third person singular personal pronouns show the following distinctions: *hon/henne* 'she/her' and *han/honom* 'he/him'. As a fairly straightforward rule it can be said that with the exception of the morphologically motivated use with words like *människa* 'human being', *nästa/främsta* 'the next, the first' and even inanimate nouns such as *klocka* 'clock' (see Section 4.1), and the semantically motivated use with names of ships, female pronouns serve as reference forms to female persons. Male pronouns, on the other hand, can refer to male persons or they may be used as "generic" forms (Andersson 1980, Teleman 1993), similar to English *he* or German *er*. The "generic" use of the male pronoun does, however, have a strong male bias, similar to the way it does in English and German (cf. Gastil 1990, Hamilton 1988, MacKay 1983). Teleman (1995:93), for example, doubts that a sentence like (27) can be interpreted as referring to a woman.[10]

(27) *Vi behöver en läkare genast   men han behöver inte*
      we need   a doctor immediately but he   need   not
      kunna ge   narkos.
      can.INF give.INF anaesthetic
      'We need a doctor immediately but he does not have to be able to give anaesthetic.'

The prescription of male generic pronouns applies not only to human nouns, but also to indefinite pronouns:

(28) *Om någon   vill   arbeta   här, måste han*
      if   someone want work.INF here must he
      vara äldre   än   18 år.
      be   old.COMP than 18 year.PL
      'If someone wants to work here, he has to be older than eighteen.'

Possessive pronouns

One set of possessive pronouns differentiates female and male forms whose choice depends on the referent's gender (*hennes* 'her', *hans* 'his'). Since these pronouns are only used to refer to human beings, there are no common or neuter forms. As with the personal pronouns in the third person singular, no formal agreement is possible between the human referent noun (neuter or common gender) and the corresponding possessive pronoun (female or male); the choice of the pronoun is solely semantically motivated: *biträdet … hennes/ hans liv* 'the assistent … her/his life'.

Demonstrative pronouns

Within the group of demonstrative pronouns, there exists a pair, mainly used in spoken language, which shows a gender distinction in the endings *-a* vs. *-e*: *denna* 'this' refers to a female person, *denne* 'this' to a male person. This shows that in contemporary Swedish the old feminine and masculine suffixes *-a* and *-e* can still be used to achieve gender-specification. Of course, for generic reference the masculine form is used.

However, the usage of these forms is in a process of change as well. *Denna* can now be found as a reference form to men or in generic contexts;[11] cf. the following example from *Dagens Nyheter*, May 27, 1998:

> *Bland dessa jurister domaren i tingsrätten som dömde Rahman. Denna domare har bland annat i radions Studio 1 framfört att han* […]
> 'One of these legal persons is the judge who sentenced Rahman. This judge has presented in radio Studio 1 that he […]'

5.   Other possibilities for gender-specific personal reference

Gender-specification can also be achieved by adjectival modification, i.e. use of *kvinnlig/t* 'female' or *manlig/t* 'male', to both common and neuter nouns. More rarely, female referential gender may be expressed by compounds with *kvinno-* 'woman' as a first element, as in *kvinnopräst* 'woman priest'. However, *kvinnoläkare* lit. 'woman doctor' refers to a gynaecologist, a doctor specialised in the treatment of women, and does not indicate referential gender. Correspondingly, *kvinnotjusare* denotes a '(male) woman hunter'.

For nouns with *kvinno-* as a first element, there are usually no corresponding terms with *man-*, and vice versa. Semantic asymmetries in this area are considerable. Siivonen (1994) points out another interesting phenomenon:

> […] the woman stands as a symbol for reproduction in society. Nouns with a
> feminine prefix for example denote companies which belong to another
> company: *dotterbolag* ('daughter-company'), because such a company group
> is characterised by reproduction. *Jungfruresa* ('virgin journey') and *jungfrutal*
> ('virgin speech') are nouns for the first journey or the first speech and are
> compared to sexually uninitiated women. Respective nouns with a masculine
> prefix do not exist.[12] (Siivonen 1994: 33, Engl. transl. A. H.)

In contemporary Swedish, there is still the possibility of gender-specification
through gender-related adjectival inflection, i.e. suffixation with *-e* for male
reference and *-a* for female reference. Interestingly, forms ending in *-a* can in
many cases refer to both women and men. The usage of these endings is,
however, slowly beginning to change, as Källström's (1993: 101) example shows:

(29)   *den avgångne justiteministern Anna-Greta Leijon*
        'the resigned Minister of Justice Anna-Greta Leijon'

The participial adjective *avgångne* should read *avgångna* with respect to the
female referent and grammatical agreement, but the male form is becoming not
only the generic form but the only one used. However, there are other examples
which show that both forms are still in use. This situation may be interpreted as
a sign for a language change in progress.

6.   Language change under the influence of the feminist movement

The strategy used by most linguists in Sweden and the Swedish-speaking part of
Finland to deal with feminist language change seems to be one of ignoring or
ridiculing it (cf. Molde 1976, Blume 1982, Braunmüller 1991). While there may be
benefits to such a strategy, this has aided the public perception that the problem
of sexist language either does not really exist or has been solved already.

Feminist language change was discussed for Swedish in the 1970s by both
linguists and feminists, and different alternatives were suggested (cf. Rekdal &
Skutnabb-Kangas 1979). Alternative usage was investigated in three studies,
which were based on daily newspaper corpora and can thus be said to have
analysed current usage. Himanen (1990) compares daily newspaper corpora
from the 1960s and 1970s, Holmberg (1995) uses a 1987 corpus of the largest
national daily newspaper (*Dagens Nyheter*), and Jobin (1997) compares human
nouns in German and Swedish daily newspapers. Like Holmberg, Jobin uses
material from the national daily newspaper *Dagens Nyheter*. All three studies are

concerned with the question of whether a change in the use of person reference terms can be observed from the 1960s to the 1990s. Regarding change in spoken language usage, no representative statements can be made, as there are no reliable studies available. In written material, tendencies of both neutralisation and gender-specification can be observed.

6.1 Neutralisation

The number of terms referring overtly to women in general and to women in the stereotypical role of wives has decreased since the 1960s. General human nouns which are used widely instead of gender-specific terms are, e.g., *person* 'person', *människa* 'human being', *individ* 'individual', and *representant* 'representative'.

Compounding is the most common strategy in Swedish to achieve neutralisation of human nouns. It includes the introduction of new generic compounds to replace compounds in *-man*, e.g.:

(30) *-idkare (affärsidkare)* 'person who practices sth.' ('business person')
      -ledamot   'member'
      -person   'person'

One of the very few officially propagated alternatives concerns the use of the compound *riksdagsledamot* 'member of parliament' instead of *riksdagsman* 'man of parliament'. This new form was intended to convey a gender-neutral meaning. However, today it is mainly used to denote female members of parliament, while *riksdagsman* is still used for reference to male members: the gender-indefinite form could obviously not be established in actual usage. Instances of the generic term *polis*, short for *polisman* 'police man', can be found in newspapers, but the compound is also still used for generic reference.[13]

Another strategy of neutralisation widely accepted for Swedish concerns the semantic change of terms ending in *-man*, which presumably have become gender-neutral. Himanen (1990: 102 f) names the following frequent "neutral" compounds as examples for the 1980s:

(31) *talman*   'speaker of parliament'
      rådman   'councillor'
      nämndeman   'juror'
      förman   'foreman'
      överman   'superior'
      talesman   'spokesman'

> *förtroendeman*   'intermediary agent'
> *sagesman*   'source'

However, Himanen does not discuss the notion of neutrality of these terms but rather takes it as given and thus comes to the conclusion that Swedish is on its way to becoming a more gender-fair language. But this interpretation of terms ending in *-man* (which also abound, e.g., in English) as gender-neutral has been contested by many Anglo-American perception studies (cf. Martyna 1983).

6.2 Overt gender-specification

Overt specification of referential gender is less common, but is also found for compounds, where a term ending in *-man* may have a parallel form in *-kvinna*. The formation and use of such pairs has slightly increased since the 1960s (Himanen 1990, see also *Språkbanken* 1965–1998). Examples are:

(32)   *taleskvinna*   *talesman*
       'spokeswoman'   'spokesman'
       affärskvinna   *affärsman*
       'businesswoman'   'businessman'

In contrast to practices in the 1960s, when compounds with *-kvinna* referred to individual women, or women associated with fashion, today *kvinna*-forms denote women in a wider range of jobs. In the area of sports, however, the asymmetrical distribution of gender-specific compounds ending in *-tjej* '-girl' or *-man* has not changed. Besides, Jobin (1997) has observed neologisms in *-kvinna*, e.g. *TV-kvinnor* 'TV-women', which indicates that the forms ending in *-man* are losing their generic potential – at least in some cases. Such examples suggest that it cannot be assumed that current Swedish is generally changing toward more neutralisation.

For derived personal nouns, overt gender-specification is much less common than neutralisation. In some cases, however, the unmarked generic forms are replaced by a derived female-specific form when referring to women. The introduction of new derived forms can mainly be found in the areas of sports and personal relationships (cf. Jobin 1997), e.g. *löperska* 'woman runner', *simmerska* 'woman swimmer'.

In the 1970s, derivations of female-specific nouns could especially be found in contexts related to "people and human environment" centering on accounts of individual experiences. In the domain of the natural sciences and economics such forms have always been far less common. Himanen (1990) attributes this

to the smaller degree of participation of women in this area.[14] Holmberg (1995) also found that in the 1980s, female-specific terms were used more often in some areas than in others. In contrast to Himanen's findings that job advertisements were becoming increasingly less gender-specific, Holmberg (1995) detects not only a considerable increase in gender-specific job titles but in gender-specific human nouns more generally. The texts where he found most gender-specific nouns are historical or fictitious. Especially in historical contexts, gender-specific forms were used for reference to an earlier period when these forms were still common in everyday language (like, e.g., *lärarinna* 'woman teacher'). As a result, these forms are still in use today but, besides overt gender-marking, they often convey information about the historicity of the context.

Concerning derivation, a slight increase in the use of unmarked "generic" forms as opposed to derived gender-specific forms referring to women can be observed from the 1960s to the 1970s (Himanen 1990). Especially the forms *lärarinna* 'woman teacher' and *författarinna* 'woman author' came to be used less frequently (even though *lärarinna* may still be used as a historical term for primary schoolteachers). In her comparison of job advertisements of 1965 and 1984, Himanen comes to the conclusion that these are increasingly less gender-specific in their formulations. Jobin (1997) observes a noticeable decline in the use of derived forms for reference to women in the 1990s, so that forms like *konstnär* 'artist' and *författare* 'author' are no longer male-specific only, but also "generic". All derived job titles she found in her corpus denote stereotypical women's jobs. They are classified as lexicalised and no longer understood as derivations, such as *sömmerska* 'seamstress', *städerska* 'cleaning woman'.

6.3 Pronouns

Suggestions for pronominal changes in feminist publications and official documents have concentrated on third person singular pronouns. Again, strategies of neutralisation and gender-specification have both been discussed. For neutralisation, the introduction of a new gender-indefinite third person singular personal pronoun *hän* has been proposed following the Finnish example (cf. Engelberg, vol. II). Another possibility for neutralisation is a change of the semantic potential of the third person singular common gender pronoun *den* 'it'. Today, many examples can be found where *den* is used for personal reference. Similar to the use of singular *they* in English, use of the third person plural pronoun *de* as a singular generic has also been proposed. Occasionally,

the female pronominal forms are used as generics in certain contexts. One example is the report of the evaluation of Swedish written high school exams, where female pronouns are used as generic anaphoric forms to agree with the words *lärare* 'teacher' and *elev* 'pupil'.[15] The linguist Adelswärd (1991) used female and male pronouns alternately from chapter to chapter, but not consistently. Examples of this kind are rare.

In contrast to variation and change concerning human nouns, for pronouns overt gender-specification is much more common than neutralisation. The most widespread strategy for third person singular pronouns is the use of splitting in one of the following variants: *han eller hon* 'he or she', *hon eller han* 'she or he', *han/hon* 'he/she', *hon/han* 'she/he', *han (hon)* 'he (she)'. Evidence is found in Himanen (1990), who observed a slight decrease in the generic use of male forms and a slight increase of pronominal splitting in the respective contexts since the 1960s.

A rare variant of splitting, which is opposed by grammars and official policies, consists of the form *han/hon* 'he/she'. Corresponding split forms for the third person singular object function (*honom eller henne* 'him or her' instead of *honom* 'him') and the possessive pronoun (*hans eller hennes* 'his or her' instead of *hans* 'his') are rarely used in written language, the argument being that such expressions are too complicated and cumbersome. Grammar books usually maintain that the male term has generic function or that for generic reference the use of split forms (*han eller hon* 'he or she') can be observed. Thus, a modern Swedish grammar, written in English, discusses the topic as follows:

> In cases where there is any doubt, or where the noun refers collectively to people of either sex, *han* is often used. If one wishes to be more precise one may, of course, specify *han eller hon* or *han resp(ektive) hon.*
> (Holmes & Hinchliffe 1995: 136 f)

This discussion of "generic" pronominal reference mirrors public attitudes. Generic reference expressed by pronominal splitting is described as a possible but actually unnecessary, overly correct, and sometimes even troublesome usage, as Himanen formulates in accordance with official statements:

> The use of *han eller hon*, alternatively *han/hon* can sometimes be quite tedious for the language user. Especially if texts demand a great number of pronouns, combinations are troublesome, particularly for inflected forms (*honom eller henne, hans eller hennes* 'him or her', 'his or her').[16]
> (Himanen 1990: 79, Engl. transl. A. H.)

6.4 Adjectival modification

Similar to English, a tendency towards an asymmetrical distribution of adjectival modification can be observed. Especially in the area of job titles, the distribution of *kvinnlig/manlig* 'female/male' is dependent on social expectations or the assumed referential gender. A noun such as *pilot* 'pilot' requires *kvinnlig* 'female' for female reference, but no such modification is necessary for male reference. The same holds for high status professions like *professor* 'professor' and *läkare* 'doctor', which are largely understood as male professions. Low status professions are more often associated with women, so that in this case gender-specific reference occurs only for men, as in *lärare* (in the meaning of 'primary school teacher', not for *lärare* in general) and *sjuksköterska* 'nurse'. In Himanen's corpus (1990) *kvinnlig/t* 'female' is used far more often as an attribute to a general noun than *manlig/t* 'male':

> References with *kvinnlig* occur about three times more often than those with the word *manlig*, which could mean that the male is still the norm and the female the exception that has to be specifically named.[17]
> (Himanen 1990: 75, Engl. transl. A. H.)

In addition, 50% of the contexts in which attribution with *kvinnlig* occurs have to do with equal rights and opportunities for women and men, indicating the importance of overt gender-marking in special contexts.

   The asymmetric usage of modifiers for gender specification demonstrates that no general tendency towards neutralisation in the meaning of personal nouns has taken place yet. Himanen's results have recently been confirmed by Jobin (1997) and by my own investigations in *Språkbanken* (1998), where 211 instances of *kvinnlig* were found, but only 114 instances of *manlig*.[18]

7. Public attitudes towards feminist language change in the 1990s

In Sweden and the Swedish-speaking part of Finland there exists a tradition of public debates on questions of language use and purism. Articles concerning feminist language change by journalists or linguists can regularly be found both in regional and national newspapers. Thus, the topic can be said to have some degree of public awareness.

   Generally, the literature tends to be negative about tendencies towards achieving more female visibility. Catharina Grünbaum, journalist and language advisor for Sweden's largest national newspaper, *Dagens Nyheter*, considers

gender-specification in compounds (-*kvinna* vs. -*man* '-woman' vs. '-man') to be unnecessary. Similar to Himanen (1990), she attributes a neutral connotation to *man*-compounds. In her opinion the use of compounds ending in -*kvinna* bears pejorative connotations.

A similarly disengaged attitude can be observed in the writings of Ulla Clausen, a linguist for the Swedish Language Association. She holds that compounds ending in -*kvinna* are a mere fig of fashion that will not make their way into public language usage. For female-specific reference, she advises the use of adjectival modification with the full form *kvinnlig* 'female', as in *kvinnlig affärsman* 'female businessman'. However, she does not mention male-specific reference through modification by *manlig* 'male', which suggests that she attributes generic (or implicit male) meaning to terms like *affärsman*.[19] It is precisely this referential asymmetry, however, which must be criticised, as has been done for English (cf. Hellinger 1990).

According to many linguistic sources and public discussions which explicitly address the issue, compounds with -*man* should have undergone a change towards more neutral connotations. But there is no sufficient empirical evidence available to support such an assumption. Indeed, Anglo-American studies on comparable terms ending in -*man* tend to contradict this view (cf. Ehrlich & King 1992; also the literature reviewed in Henley 1989). This gives rise to the suspicion that apart from language-typological considerations, politically informed linguistic ideology also plays an important part in the propagation of certain forms as having generic reference.

Even for third person singular pronouns, which tend to show a considerable correspondence with referential gender, no general support for a universal use of gender-specification can be found in public discourse. In official guidelines, the use of male pronominal forms is seen as sufficient for "gender-neutral" reference. Only for "absolutely gender-neutral" reference, the use of the split form *han eller hon* 'he or she' (which in turn is used only in this order and not in the reversed form *hon eller han*) is advised:

> In many texts, especially in laws, the pronoun *han* (or the masculine ending -*e*) was used throughout and referred to both genders. [...] This can still be used if both men and women are meant, when the noun is an abstraction, e.g. *arbetsgivaren* [employer], *lagstiftaren* [legislator]. [...], or in texts where one wants to achieve absolute gender neutrality one can choose one of the following forms: *han eller hon* (not *han/hon*), repetition of the noun or paraphrase in the plural.[20]
> (*Myndigheternas skrivregler* 1997: 27 f, Engl. transl. A. H.)

Only the third person singular pronoun in subject function is mentioned. Forms in object function and possessive pronouns are simply not discussed. The somewhat arbitrary differentiation between "gender-neutral" and "absolutely gender-neutral" is not logical, but renders a critical analysis of the generic potential of the third person singular male pronoun unnecessary and thus serves to maintain traditional practice. Even in the context of what is called "absolute gender-neutrality", overt gender-specification through split forms of the type *han eller hon* plays only a minor role in comparison to noun repetition or paraphrase. In addition, the argument for gender-neutrality of the male person reference forms is grounded historically, i.e. in prescription by grammars, rather than in studies of current perception (cf. Lindholm 1974).

In 1994, in accordance with official guidelines, the Swedish parliament advised the use of the split form *han eller hon* if the texts were short or contained only few pronominal forms. For longer texts which also have inflected pronominal forms, splitting is regarded as troublesome. Other periphrastic expressions (plural forms, noun repetition) are recommended where possible; where this is not the case, staying with the male forms is advised. From a stylistic point of view, the general preference of "other"(!) kinds of periphrasis is hardly comprehensible. For new legal and other official documents, gender-neutral forms should be chosen from the start. Towards the end of 1996, this discussion was resumed after a member of parliament had demanded that gender-neutral language be used in all official documents. That this inquiry was made even though official guidelines for written language exist, demonstrates that actual usage differs from these guidelines. In early 1997, the guidelines of 1994 were once more confirmed by parliament.[21] In addition, split forms of the personal pronoun in the third person singular are often used once at the beginning of a text, while the male form can be found in the subsequent wording. This is a further indication that the desire for more gender-fair language use is either not that strong, or has not found sufficient public support.

8.   Conclusion

Throughout Sweden, research on language and gender centres mainly on conversation analysis (cf. Gunnarsson 1992). Studies on the language system which do exist were undertaken in the early 1990s in Finland (Himanen 1990, Siivonen 1994) or more recently within the so-called Scandinavian studies outside of Scandinavia (Jobin 1997, Hornscheidt 1998b).

Generally, the linguistic debate on this topic seems to indicate an adherence to the ideology that gender-fair language has already been achieved for Swedish, instead of bringing up for discussion the still existing asymmetries and inconsistencies in the language system, in usage and perception. Gunnarsson (1991: 46) concludes that:

> Strangely enough, we still have not made any progress, even though we are in the nineties now. Still many language users write *läraren – han* 'the teacher – he' and *studenten – han* 'the student – he' referring to men as well as to women. (Engl. transl. A. H.)

The stagnation in the discussion of feminist language change corresponds to a lack of attention to problems of women's discrimination. This could be due to the fact that Sweden today is seen as one of the countries in which the equality of women and men is most advanced. Differences in payment have decreased, women's chances on the job market are more successfully promoted than in most other countries, men take a more active part in childraising than anywhere else in the capitalist western world. At the universities, *Gender and Women's Studies* is part of the curriculum of the humanities and the social sciences. Contrasted with these achievements, the current lack of interest in issues of language and gender is surprising. Most recommendations for anti-discriminating language usage were made in the 1970s, and even though no actual changes have been observed since that time, no new ideas or strategies have been brought up.

This does not mean, however, that from a feminist point of view today no critique of the Swedish language system and usage can be formulated. Rather, it seems that linguistic research and public debate have either not taken place to a sufficient extent or that academic circles have been caught up in questions which do not arouse public curiosity. In order to provide the discussion with a new impetus and to promote language changes effectively, it is important to direct the main emphasis of the research to perception studies.

These could offer new insights into the interpretation of human reference forms as neutral, generic or gender-specific. In the case of Swedish, such studies would have to start analysing which reference forms (e.g., pronouns) are at all accepted and produced for generic reference. In a pilot study, I found that native speakers of Swedish use *han* 'he' as generic – even if a split form (*han eller hon, hon eller han* 'he or she', 'she or he') was used for generic reference in the respective contexts. Furthermore, the view taken by some linguists (e.g. Blume 1982) that the use of split forms has been established in Swedish could

not be verified. Split forms were understood when they occurred, but were not produced, nor was their absence in generic contexts noticed. In a second step, we need to investigate in which contexts male pronominal forms are perceived as male-specific, as neutral or as generic. Similar studies on English and the question of the so-called "generic *he*" indicate that the generic quality of this pronoun depends on factors such as gender of speaker, age, feminist background, and context, but that it is on the whole rather weak (cf. Gastil 1990, Martyna 1983, Khosroshahi 1989, Hamilton 1988, MacKay 1983). Precisely because Sweden is one of the countries which are seen as least gender-discriminating world-wide, research into language perception processes from a comparative perspective which includes cultural, ideological and social aspects, remains an important task for the future.

Notes

1. The Swedish linguistic society has links to several Swedish and Nordic language pages (http://www.spraknamnden.se/). There is a database of the Swedish language (Språkbanken) with access to several text corpora (http://www.spraakbanken.gu.se/), and a virtual Swedish-English dictionary for immigrants (http://www.nada.kth.se/skolverket/sve-eng.html).

2. Thanks to Bettina Jobin, Tomas Milosch and Jenny Neumann for repeated discussions of the topic. Special thanks to Anna Grönberg for her critical comments and Melinda Chen for her comments and unique support.

3. Anna Grönberg has pointed out to me that there are compounds in -*pojke* 'boy' (at least in the Gothenburg dialect), e.g. *gamla Masthuggspojkar* 'old boys from Masthugg', *gamla Annedalspojkar* 'old boys from Annedal'.

4. Many of the forms referring to women discussed later in the text are not necessarily derivations of the forms referring to men. Instead, both forms are often derived from the same stem (Elisabeth Burr, personal communication). However, the term referring to men is usually described as the basic and consequently generic form.

5. For *kassörska*, Holmberg (1995: 70) and Himanen (1990: 122) mention generic instances.

6. The corpora can be found at Språkbanken: http://logos.svenska.gu.se/lbsv.html

7. From a morphological perspective, the form *sjukskötare* is the form from which *sjuksköterska* has been derived. It refers to an assistant within the Swedish health system. For that reason, *sjuksköterska* has become the basic form with generic meaning. This is not true for Swedish in Finland, where *sjukskötare* is the basic form with generic meaning and not a job title for a lower-status profession.

8. The use of the female-feminine pronominal forms is, however, not exclusive. The formal rule exists, but there are examples where *människa* is referred to by *han* 'he', *den* 'it' or *de* 'they'.

9. Semantic agreement can also be found for predicatives. In predicative agreement, common gender forms can be used for reference to neuter nouns, if these refer to persons. Formal agreement may occur, but is not obligatory, semantic agreement is possible as well. Thorell (1977: 29) gives the following example: *Det nya statsrådet är intresserad/intresserat … Han/hon förklarar att …* 'The new councillor of state (neuter) is interested (common/neuter) … He/she declares that …'. He formulates the following rule: "Neutral nouns which refer to persons are referred to by *han* or *hon* (h-gender). Articles and attributes are always neutral, predicates can be common (persons) or neutral gender".

10. Teleman distinguishes between contexts which refer to an individual and contexts which refer more to a function or role, as in the following example, where he interprets the function of the male pronoun as decidedly generic: *Varje läkare måste kunna tala med sina patienter om han vill att behandlingen ska lyckas.* 'Every doctor has to be able to talk to his/her (common) patients if he wants the treatment to be successful.' (Teleman 1995: 94) As will be discussed, the success of the generic reference in this case is also a matter of doubt.

11. Examples can be found in the corpus of press texts of 1998, cf. http://spraakbanken.gu.se/lb/konk/.

12. "Kvinnan står sålunda som symbol för reproduktionen i samhället. Substantiv med kvinnlig förled betecknar till exempel bolag som ägs av annat bolag: *dotterbolag*, eftersom en sådan bolagsfamilj karakteriseras av reproduktion. *Jungfruresa* och *jungfrutal* är å sin sida sammansatta substantiv som betecknar den första resan och det första talet och som jämförs med sexuellt orörda kvinnor. Motsvarande ord med manlig förled finns inte."

13. Cf. Himanen (1990: 73 f); Språkbanken (http://spraakdata.gu.se/lb/konk/), corpus from press texts in 1998: *polisman* 54 instances, *polis* 615 instances.

14. It must be noted, however, that the smaller degree of women's participation could have been created by the lesser number of references to women in this area.

15. Cf. Garme (1996). I thank Maria Ohlsson, Uppsala, for this comment.

16. "Att använda *han eller hon*, alternativt *han/hon* kan ibland vara ganska tungrott för språkbrukaren. Speciellt om texten kräver ett ymnigt bruk av pronomen blir kombinationen störande, särskilt vid böjning (*honom eller henne, hans eller hennes*)."

17. "Omskrivningar med *kvinnlig* används sålunda 3 gånger oftare än med ordet *manlig* vilket kunde tolkas så att manligt fortfarande är en norm och kvinnligt ett undantag som oftare måste påpekas."

18. In addition, Jobin (1997) describes the occasional use of newly-constructed forms such as *hon-resenär* vs. *han-resenär* 'she-traveller' vs. 'he-traveller'.

19. Cited from Siivonen (1994) from a telephone conversation with Clausen. The same opinion can be found in the regularly published "language column" of the Finnish daily newspaper *Hufvudstadabladet* where Mikael Reuter (1991) writes: "Ju fler konstlade nykonstruktioner som skapas, desto mer framstår dessutom de återstående orden på *-man* som markerat maskulina. Eftersom vi ändå under överskådlig tid får räkna med att tala om kvinnliga *lekmän*, *förmän*, *talmän*, *ombudsmän* m.m., är det lika bra att vi också fortsätter att tala om kvinnliga tjänstemän och affärsmän. Slutleden *-man* i sådana ord betyder helt enkelt inte "person av manligt kön" utan mera allmänt "människa"." 'The more neologisms are

created, the more the remaining words ending in *-man* stand out as marked masculine forms. Since we may expect to be talking about women *lekmän*, *förmän*, *talmän*, *ombudsmän* etc. in the near future, we might as well continue talking of women *tjänstemän* and *affärsmän*. The suffix *-man* in such words simply does not mean 'person of male gender', but means 'human being' in general.' [Engl. transl. A. H.] – Reuter, too, sees the necessity for explicit gender marking only in the case of reference to women.

20. "I många texter särskilt författningstexter används tidigare alltid pronomenet han (och den maskulina ändelsen *-e*), när man syftade på båda könen. […] Det är fortfarande användbart när man avser både man och kvinnor eller då substantivet är en abstraktion, t.ex. arbetsgivaren, lagstiftaren. […] eller i texter som man vill göra helt könsneutralt kan man välja några av följande sätt: han eller hon (inte han/hon), upprepning av huvudordet, omskrivning med plural."

21. Riksdagens databas, Motion 1996/97: K531.

References

Adelswärd, Viveka. 1991. *Prat skratt skvaller och gräl och annat vi gör när vi samtalar* [To chat, to laugh, to gossip, to quarrel and other things we do when we speak with each other]. Kristianstad: Brombergs.

Andersson, Erik. 1980. "Balansen mellan grammatiskt och semantiskt genus i svenskan" [The balance between grammatical and semantic gender in Swedish]. *Folkmålstudier* 26: 27–48.

Andersson, Erik. 2000. "How many gender categories are there in Swedish?". In *Gender in grammar and cognition*, eds. Barbara Unterbeck et al. Berlin: de Gruyter, 545–559.

Batliner, Anton. 1984. "The comprehension of grammatical and natural gender: A cross-linguistic experiment". *Linguistics* 22: 831–856.

Blume, Herbert. 1982. "Schwedisch *han/hon* und seine Entsprechungen im Deutschen". *Skandinavistik* 12 (2): 137–151.

Braunmüller, Kurt. 1991. *Die skandinavischen Sprachen im Überblick*. München: UTB.

Bußmann, Hadumod. 1995. "*Das* Genus, *die* Grammatik und – *der* Mensch: Geschlechter-differenz in der Sprachwissenschaft". In *Genus – Zur Geschlechterdifferenz in den Kulturwissenschaften*, eds. Hadumod Bußmann & Renate Hof, Stuttgart: Kröner, 114–161.

Butler, Judith. 1990. *Gender trouble.* London: Routledge.

Corbett, Greville G. 1991. *Gender.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dahl, Östen. 2000. "Animacy and the notion of semantic gender". In *Gender in grammar and cognition*, eds. Barbara Unterbeck et al. Berlin: de Gruyter, 99–115.

Davidson, Herbert. 1990. *Han hon den. Genusutvecklingen i svenskan under nysvensk tid* [He she it. The development of gender in modern Swedish]. Lund: Lund University Press.

Ehrlich, Susan & Ruth King. 1992. "Gender-based language reform and the social construction of meaning." *Discourse and Society* 3: 151–166.

Finnäs, Fjalar. 1995. *Finlandssvenskarna 1993. En statistisk översikt* [Finlandswedes 1993. A statistical survey]. (Finlandssvensk rapport 29), Helsingfors: Svenska Finlands Folkting.

Forer, Rosa Barbara. 1986. "Genus und Sexus: Über philosophische und sprachwissenschaftliche Erklärungsversuche zum Zusammenhang von grammatischem und natürlichem Geschlecht." In *Der Widerspenstigen Zähmung. Studien zur bezwungenen Weiblichkeit in der Literatur vom Mittelalter zur Gegenwart*. eds. Sylvia Wallinger & Monika Jonas. Innsbruck: Institut für Germanistik, Universität Innsbruck, 21–41.

Garme, Birgitta. 1996. *Svenska i utveckling. Att pröva skrivförmågan med nationella prov* [Swedish under development. Testing the ability to write in national exams]. Uppsala: FUMS.

Gastil, John. 1990. "Generic pronouns and sexist language: The oxymoronic character of masculine generics." *Sex Roles* 23: 629–643.

Grünbaum, Catharina. 1997. "Kvinnligt och manligt [Female and male]." In *Språkbladet*, Dagens Nyheter-Läsarservice. Stockholm: Dagens Nyheter, 17–19.

Gunnarsson, Britt-Louise. 1991. "*Hen, den, hon* eller *han*?" [*He, it, she* or *he*?]. *Uppsala Nya Tidning.* 5 March 1991. Uppsala.

Gunnarsson, Britt-Louise. 1992. "Forskning om språk och kön i Sverige: Statusrapport" [Research on language and sex in Sweden: The state of the art]. In *Språk, språkbruk och kön. Rapport från ASLA's nordiska symposium Uppsala, 7–9 november 1991* [Language, language use and gender. Report from the Nordic ASLA-symposium in Uppsala, 7–9 November 1991], eds. Britt-Louise Gunnarsson & Caroline Liberg. Uppsala: ASLA, 45–54.

Hamilton, Mykol C. 1988. "Using masculine generics: Does generic *he* increase male bias in the user's imagery?" *Sex Roles* 19: 785–799.

Haugen, Einar. 1982. *Scandinavian language structures. A comparative historical survey.* Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Haugen, Einar. 1976. *The Scandinavian languages.* London: Faber & Faber.

Hellinger, Marlis. 1990. *Kontrastive feministische Linguistik. Mechanismen sprachlicher Diskriminierung im Englischen und Deutschen.* München: Hueber.

Henley, Nancy M. 1989. "Molehill or mountain? What we know and don't know about sex bias in language." In *Gender and thought: Psychological perspectives*, eds. Mary Crawford & Margaret Gentry. New York: Springer, 59–78.

Himanen, Ritva. 1990. *Kvinnliga ombudsmän och manliga sjuksköterskor. Titlar och yrkesbeteckningar i nusvensk dagspress* [Female mediators and male nurses. Titles and job titles in modern Swedish newspapers]. Uppsala: Ord och stil.

Holmberg, Per. 1995. "On female job-titles in modern Swedish." In *Language and gender. Case studies from a Swedish seminar*, eds. Per Holmberg & Kerstin Nordenstam. Göteborg: MISS 11, 63–78.

Holmes, Philip & Ian Hinchliffe. 1995. *Swedish – A comprehensive grammar.* London: Routledge.

Hornscheidt, Antje. 1998a. "Grammatik als Ort von Geschlechterkonstruktion. Eine kritische Analyse." In *Kritische Differenzen – geteilte Perspektiven. Zum Verhältnis von Feminismus und Postmoderne*, eds. Antje Hornscheidt & Gabi Jähnert & Annette Schlichter. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 140–173.

Hornscheidt, Antje. 1998b. "The im/possibility of a feminist language change within a postmodern feminist perspective. A comparison of Swedish and German 'generic' pronouns." *Language, Gender and Sexism* 7: 25–46.

Hultman, Tor G. 1992. "Barnet – *han* eller *den*? Om genuskongruens vid ordet *barn* i gymnasisters språkbruk." [The child – *he* or *it*? On high school pupils' gender agreement with the word *child*]. In *Svenska i harmoni. Fyra uppsatser om kongruens* [Swedish in harmony. Four essays on agreement], eds. Gun Widmark & Tore Hultman. Uppsala: Hallgren & Fallgren, 75–154.

Jobin, Bettina. 1997. *Wie wird auf Frauen referiert? Eine kontrastive Analyse deutscher und schwedischer Tageszeitungen.* Unpublished paper.

Källström, Roger. 1993. *Kongruens i svenskan* [Agreement in Swedish]. (Nordistica Gotho-burgensia 16). Göteborg: Göteborgs universitet.

Källström, Roger. 1995. *Om svenskans genussystem: En diskussion av några analysalternativ* [On the Swedish gender system: A discussion of some alternatives for an analysis]. (MISS 9: Meddelanden från Institutionen för svenska språket vid Göteborgs universitet). Göteborg: Göteborgs universitet.

Khosroshahi, Fatemeh. 1989. "Penguins don't care, but women do: A social identity analysis of a Whorfian problem." *Language in Society* 18: 505–525.

Lindholm, Hans. 1974. *Svensk grammatik. Lärobok i svenska som främmande språk* [Swedish grammar. Learning Swedish as a foreign language]. Lund: Kursverksamhetens Förlag.

MacKay, Donald G. 1983. "Prescriptive grammar and the pronoun problem". In *Language, gender and society*, eds. Barrie Thorne & Cheris Kramarae & Nancy Henley. Rowley: Newbury House, 38–53.

Magnusson, Gunnar & Bettina Jobin. 1997. "Gender and sex in German and Swedish". In *Norm, variation and change in language. Proceedings of the centenary meeting of the Nyfilologiska sällskapet Nedre manilla 22–23 March 1996*, eds. Johan Falk & Gunnar Magnusson & Gunnel Melchers & Barbro Nilson. Stockholm: Almquist & Wiksell, 149–174.

Martyna, Wendy. 1983. "Beyond the he/man approach: The case for nonsexist language". In *Language, gender and society*, eds. Barrie Thorne & Cheris Kramarae & Nancy Henley, Rowley: Newbury House, 25–27.

Molde, Bertil. 1976. "*Han, hon, den* – eller *vad*?" [*He, she, it* – or *what*?]. *Språkvård* 1: 4–7.

Myndigheternas skrivregler [Public and official writing rules]. 1997. Stockholm: DS.

Noreen, Adolf. 1904. *Vårt språk* [Our language]. Lund.

Norstedts Svenska Ordbok [Norstedts' Swedish dictionary]. 1988. Göteborg: Norstedts.

Pauwels, Anne. 1998. *Women changing language.* London: Longman.

Penelope, Julia. 1990. *Speaking freely. Unlearning the lies of the fathers' tongues.* New York: Pergamon Press.

Pettersson, Gertrud. 1996. *Svenska språket under sjuhundra år: En historia om svenskan och dess utforskande* [The Swedish language during seven hundred years: A history of the Swedish language and research on Swedish]. Lund: Studentlitteratur.

Rekdal, Olaug & Tove Skutnabb-Kangas. 1979. "Kvinnoperspektiv på språk" [Women's perspective on language]. In *Gråt inte – forska!* [Don't cry – do research!], ed. Karin Westman Berg, Stockholm: Pismaserien, 49–69.

Reuter, Mikael. 1991. "Reuters Ruta. Tjänstemän och sjuksköterskor" [Reuter's square. Clerks and nurses]. *Hufvudstadsbladet* 12 April 1991. Helsinki.

Riksdagens databas, Motion 1996/97; K 531. Stockholm.

Seltén, Bo. 1993. *Ny svensgelsk ordbok* [The new Swedish-English dictionary]. Lund: Studentlitteratur.

Siivonen, Jonita. 1994. *Nytänkare, finstämda lyriker och kvinnor. Språklig asymmetri. En studie i det journalistiska språket ur könsperspektiv* [New thinkers, sensitive poets and women. Linguistic asymmetry. A study about journalistic language from a gender perspective]. (SSKH Helsingfors Universitet Meddelanden 32). Helsingfors: Helsingfors Universitet.

Språkbanken [The language bank]. Swedish Linguistic Society. Available from http://www.spraknamnden.se.

Svensk ordbok [Swedish dictionary]. 1986. Uppsala: Språkdata och Esselte Studium.

Tegnér d.y., Esaias. 1962 [1892]. *Om genus i svenskan* [On gender in Swedish], Stockholm: Nike-Tryck.

Teleman, Ulf. 1993. "Hur många genus finns det i svenskan?" [How many genders are there in Swedish?]. In *Grammatik på villovägar* [Grammar right off the track], ed. Ulf Teleman, Stockholm: Esselte, 106–114.

Teleman, Ulf. 1995. "*Han, hon* eller *vem som helst*" [*He, she* or *whoever*]. In *Colloquia Scandinavistica Vilnensia*, eds. Erika Sausverde & Peter Arbo. Vilnius: Tuto Alba, 91–99.

Teleman, Ulf & Staffan Hellberg & Erik Andersson. 1999. *Svenska akademiens gramatik* [The Swedish Academy's grammar]. 4 vols. Stockholm: Norstedts Ordbok.

Thorell, Olof. 1977. *Svensk grammatik* [Swedish grammar]. Stockholm: Esselte Studium.

Vikør, Lars S. 1993. *The Nordic languages: Their status and interrelations.* Oslo: Novus.

Widmark, Gun. 1979. "*Han* och *hon*" [*He* and *she*]. In *Språkform och språknorm. En bok till Bertil Molde på 60-årsdagen den 16 september 1979* [Linguistic form and linguistic norm. A book for Bertil Molde on his 60th birthday, 16 September 1979]. Stockholm: Esselte Studium, 264–271.

Notes on contributors

Rose Marie Beck, born in Luzern, Switzerland. She received her doctoral degree in African Linguistics from the University of Cologne, Germany. Currently she teaches Swahili language and communication at the Institute of African Linguistics at the University of Frankfurt am Main, Germany. Her main areas of research are: Ethnography of speaking/communication, media discourse, orature, African linguistics (Bantu).

(2001a) *Texte auf Textilien in Ostafrika. Sprichwörtlichkeit als Eigenschaft ambiger Kommuni-kation.* Köln: Rüdiger Köppe.
(2001b) "Ambiguous signs: The role of the *kanga* as a medium of communication." *Swahili Forum 8* (= *Afrikanistische Arbeitspapiere* 68): 157–169.

Hanka Błaszkowska, born in Poznań, Poland. She received her doctoral degree in German Linguistics from the Adam Mickiewicz-University in Poznań. She is Lecturer of German Linguistics at the Adam Mickiewicz-University in Poznań and lecturer of Polish at the European University Vìadrina in Frankfurt/Oder, Germany. Her main areas of research are: Foreign language acquisition, intercultural studies (Polish-German), language and gender.

(1995) "Zur sprachlichen Ungleichbehandlung von Frauen und Männern im System der deutschen Personenbezeichnungen." *Studia Germanica Posnaniensia* 21: 12–17.
(2000) "Soziopragmatische Unterschiede in der polnisch-deutschen Kommunikation." *Studia Germanica Posnaniensia* 26: 16–27.
(2002) "Asymmetrien in der Bildung und im Gebrauch femininer und maskuliner Personen-bezeichnungen im Deutschen und Polnischen." *Studia Germanica Posnaniensia* 28:19–34.

Elisabeth Burr, born in Heidenheim an der Brenz, Germany. She received her doctoral degree and her *Habilitation* in Romance Linguistics from the University of Duisburg, Germany, where she is also Professor of Romance Linguistics. Her main areas of research are: Language and gender, corpus linguistics, language and the media, grammar of the Romance languages.

(1993) *Verb und Varietät.* Ein Beitrag zur Bestimmung der sprachlichen Variation am Beispiel der italienischen Zeitungssprache (= Romanische Texte und Studien 5). Hildesheim: Olms.

(2001a) "Romance linguistics and corpora of French, Italian and Spanish newspaper language". In *New media and the humanities: Research and applications.* Proceedings of the first seminar on *Computers, literature and philology*, Edinburgh, 7–9 September, 1998, eds. Fiormonte, Domenico & Jonathan Usher. Oxford: Humanities Computing Unit, University of Oxford, 85–104.

(2001b) "Grammatikalisierung und Normierung in frühen Grammatiken des Französischen, Italienischen, Portugiesischen und Spanischen. Genus und Kongruenz". *Zeitschrift für Romanische Philologie* 117: 189–221.

Hadumod Bußmann, born in Frankfurt am Main, Germany. She received her doctoral degree in German Medieval Studies from the University of Munich. She was Senior Lecturer (*Akademische Direktorin*) of German Linguistics at the Institute of German Philology of the University of Munich. Her main areas of research are: Linguistic terminology, history of women in academia, and language and gender.

(1995) with Renate Hof, eds. *Genus. Zur Geschlechterdifferenz in den Kulturwissenschaften.* Stuttgart: Kröner.

(1997) with Hiltrud Häntzschel, eds. *Bedrohlich gescheit. Ein Jahrhundert Frauen und Wissenschaft in Bayern.* München: Beck.

(2002) *Lexikon der Sprachwissenschaft.* 3rd ed. Stuttgart: Kröner.

Světla Čmejrková, born in České Budějovice, Czechoslovakia. She received her doctoral degree in Linguistics from the Charles University in Prague. She is Head of the Czech Language Institute of the Academy of Sciences in Prague. Her main areas of research are: Sociolinguistics, textlinguistics, and discourse analysis.

(1994) with František Štícha, eds. *The syntax of sentence and text. A festschrift for František Daneš.* Amsterdam: Benjamins.

(1998) with Jana Hoffmannová & Olga Müllerová & Jindra Světlá, eds. *Dialoganalyse VI.* 2 vols. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

(2000) *Reklama v češtině. Čeština v reklamě* [Advertising in Czech, Czech in advertising]. Praha: Leda.

Kirsten Gomard, born in Esbjerg, Denmark. She received her MA in German and Art History from the University of Aarhus, Denmark, where she is Senior Lecturer in Gender Research at the Department of History and Area Studies. Her main areas of research are: Language, communication and gender; theories of gender.

(1997) "Doing gender – doing politics: Wie lösen Politikerinnen den Konflikt?" In *Kommunikation von Geschlecht*, eds. Friederike Braun & Ursula Pasero. Pfaffenweiler: Centaurus, 70–87.

(2001) "Negotiating competence and gender: An analysis of televised political debates in Denmark." In *Instead of the ideal debate. Doing politics and doing gender in nordic political campaign discourse*, eds. Kirsten Gomard & Anne Krogstad. Aarhus: Aarhus University Press, 60–96.

Marlis Hellinger, born in Pirna/Dresden, Germany. She received her doctoral degree in English Linguistics from the University of Hamburg. She is Professor of English Linguistics at the Department of English and American Studies at the University of Frankfurt am Main. Her main areas of research are: Contrastive linguistics, sociolinguistics, language and gender, and creole linguistics.

(1985) *English-orientierte Pidgin- und Kreolsprachen: Entstehung, Geschichte und sprachlicher Wandel.* Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
(1990) *Kontrastive feministische Linguistik: Mechanismen sprachlicher Diskriminierung im Englischen und Deutschen.* München: Hueber.
(1996) with Ulrich Ammon, eds. *Contrastive sociolinguistics.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Elke Hentschel, born in Freiburg im Breisgau, Germany. She received her doctoral degree in Linguistics from the Free University of Berlin. She is Professor of Linguistics at the German Department of the University of Bern, Switzerland. Her main areas of research are: Morphology and syntax, contrastive linguistics, and modal particles.

(1998a) *Negation und Interrogation. Studien zur Universalität ihrer Funktionen.* Tübingen: Niemeyer.
(1998b) Editor of *Linguistik online* ⟨www.linguistik-online.org⟩
(2003) with Harald Weydt. *Handbuch der deutschen Grammatik.* 3rd ed. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Antje Hornscheidt, born in Velbert, Germany. She received her doctoral degree in English Linguistics from the University of Kiel, Germany, and will receive her *Habilitation* in Scandinavian Linguistics from Humboldt-University, Berlin, in 2003. She is Lecturer at the Nordeuropa-Institut (Department of Northern European and Scandinavian Languages and Cultures) at Humboldt-University. Her main areas of research are: Language and identity, gender, pragmatics and cognitive linguistics, critical discourse analysis, text linguistics and intercultural communication.

(2000) "Linguistik und Gender Studies." In *Gender Studies – Eine Einführung*, eds. Christina von Braun & Inge Stephan. Stuttgart: Metzler, 276–289.
(2003a) "Die NichtRezeption poststrukturalistischer Gender- und Sprachtheorien der Feministischen Linguistik im deutschsprachigen Raum." *Zeitschrift für Germanistische Linguistik* 167/168: 2–53.

(2003b) "Pragmatics as a form of cultural studies." In *Linguistik online* 1. *Linguistics as part of cultural studies/Linguistik als Kulturwissenschaft*, ed. Antje Hornscheidt ⟨http://viadrina.euv-frankfurt-o.de/~wjournal/deutsch/index.html⟩

Sachiko Ide, born in Taipei, Formosa. She received her MA in Linguistics from the International Christian University of Tokyo, Japan. She is Professor of Linguistics at the English Department at Japan Women's University, Tokyo. Her main areas of research are: Sociolinguistics, contrastive pragmatics, and language and culture.

(1991) with Richard J. Watts & Konrad Ehlich, eds. *Politeness in language: Studies in its history, theory, and practice.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
(1988, 1989, 1993) ed. Special issues on linguistic politeness for *Multilingua I, II, III.*
(1998) with Beverly Hill, eds. *Women's languages in various parts of the world.* Special Issue for *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* [= Vol. 129].

Gabriela Koniuszaniec, born in Bydgoszcz, Poland. She received her doctoral degree in Linguistics from the Adam Mickiewicz-University, Poznan, where she is Associate Professor of Linguistics at the German Department. Her main areas of research are: Generative German syntax, word-formation, semantics, phraseology, and contrastive studies.

(1987) *Prepositional rection and valency in German and Polish.* Poznan: Uniw. im. Adama Mickiewicza.
(1992) "The culture of drinking from a contrastive point of view." In *Polish-German cultural contrastive studies.* Poznan: Wydawnictwo Naukowe UAM, 197–206.
(1997) "Collocations in the domain of tautonymy." In *Studia Germanica Posnaniensia* 23: 97–103.

Mette Kunøe, born in Odense, Denmark. She received her MA in Scandinavian Languages and Literature and German from the University of Aarhus, Denmark. She is Senior Lecturer at the Department of Scandinavian Languages and Literature at the University of Aarhus. Her main areas of research are: Language history and language acquisition.

(1974) *Barnesprog* [Children's language]. København: Gjellerup.
(1979) "Kvindebilleder i ordsprog, bevingede ord og faste vendinger" [Images of women in proverbs, familiar quotations and idioms]. In *Meddelelser fra Dansklaererforeningen* 4: 349–365.
(1990) "Toejets sproghistorie" [Language history of clothes]. In *Gulnares Hus*, eds. Annelise Bistrup et al. København: Samleren, 169–175.

Theodossia-Soula Pavlidou, born in Thessaloniki, Greece. She received her doctoral degree in Communication Research from the University of Bonn, Germany. She is Professor of Linguistics at the Department of Linguistics at the University of Thessaloniki. Her main areas of research are: Pragmatics, socio-linguistics, and language and gender.

(1997) *Επίπεδα γλωσσικής ανάλυσης* [Levels of linguistic analysis]. 2nd ed. Thessaloniki: Paratiritis.
(2000) "Telephone conversations in Greek and German: Attending to the relationship aspect of communication." In *Culturally speaking*, ed. H. Spencer-Oatey. London: Continuum, 121–140.
(2002) with K. K. Luke, eds. *Telephone calls: Unity and diversity in conversational strucure across languages and cultures.* Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Kalyanamalini Sahoo, born in Korapitha, India. She received her MPhil in English from the Central Institute of English and Foreign Languages (CIEFL), Hyderabad, India, and her PhD in Linguistics from the Norwegian University of Science and Technology, Trondheim, Norway. Currently she is a researcher at the Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore, India. Her main areas of research are: Syntax, computational morphology, semantics, and sociolinguistics.

(1997) "De-verbal compounding in Oriya." In *Phases and interfaces of morphology*, vol. II, eds. M. Hariprasad et al. Hyderabad: CIEFL, 220–237.
(1998) "The second person singular pronoun in the conditions of social role relationships in spoken Oriya". In *CIEFL Occasional papers in linguistics*, eds. M. Hariprasad et al. Hyderabad: CIEFL, 1–18.
(1999) "The syntax of definiteness in Oriya." In *The yearbook of South Asian languages and linguistics*, ed. R. Singh. London: Sage, 101–117.

Elmar Schafroth, born in Mussenhausen, Germany. He received his doctoral degree and his *Habilitation* in Romance Linguistics from the University of Augsburg, Germany. He is Professor of Linguistics at the Department of Romance Languages and Philology at the University of Graz, Austria. His main areas of research are: Lexicology and lexicography, standard and nonstandard varieties, history of spoken language, language and the mass media, language and gender, language and music, Canadian studies.

(2000) with Walburga Sarcher & Werner Hupka, eds. *Französische Sprache und Kultur in Quebec.* Hagen: ISL-Verlag.
(2001) "Zwischen Tradition und *political correctness*. Zum Problem der femininen Berufs-bezeichnungen in französischsprachigen Ländern." In *Gender, Genre, Geschlecht. Sprach- und literaturwissenschaftliche Beiträge zur Gender-Forschung.* Tübingen: Stauffenburg, 125–150.

(forthcoming) *Die Feminisierung von Berufsbezeichnungen im französischen Sprachraum. Mit einem vergleichenden Blick auf das Deutsche und andere Sprachen.* [Ms., Habilitationsschrift, Augsburg 1998]. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Janet S. Shibamoto Smith, born in California, USA. She received her PhD in Anthropology from the University of California, Davis. She is Professor of Anthropology at the University of California, Davis. Her main areas of research are: Japanese linguistic anthropology, language and gender, and linguistic expressivity.

(1985) *Japanese women's language.* New York: Academic Press.

(1992) "Women in charge: Politeness and directives in the speech of Japanese women." *Language in Society* 21: 59–82.

(1999) "From *Hiren* to *Happî-endo*: Romantic expression in the Japanese love story." In *Languages of sentiment: Pragmatic and conceptual approaches to cultural constructions of emotional substrates*, eds. G. Palmer & D. J. Occhi. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 147–166.

Name index

Subject index

In the series IMPACT: STUDIES IN LANGUAGE AND SOCIETY the following titles have been published thus far or are scheduled for publication:

1. PÜTZ, Martin (ed.): *Language Choices. Conditions, constraints, and consequences.* 1997.
2. KIBBEE, Douglas A. (ed.): *Language Legislation and Linguistic Rights. Selected Proceedings of the Language Legislation and Linguistic Rights Conference, the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, March, 1996.* 1998.
3. LINELL, Per: *Approaching Dialogue. Talk, interaction and contexts in dialogical perspectives.* 1998.
4. OWENS, Jonathan: *Neighborhood and Ancestry. Variation in the spoken Arabic of Maiduguri, Nigeria.* 1998.
5. ANDREWS, David R.: *Sociocultural Perspectives on Language Change in Diaspora. Soviet immigrants in the United States.* 1999.
6. RICENTO, Thomas (ed.): *Ideology, Politics and Language Policies. Focus on English.* 2000.
7. McCAFFERTY, Kevin: *Ethnicity and Language Change. English in (London)Derry, Northern Ireland.* 2001.
8. ARMSTRONG, Nigel: *Social and Stylistic Variation in Spoken French. A comparative approach.* 2001.
9. HELLINGER, Marlis and Hadumod BUßMANN (eds.): *Gender Across Languages. The linguistic representation of women and men: Volume I.* 2001.
10. HELLINGER, Marlis and Hadumod BUßMANN (eds.): *Gender Across Languages. The linguistic representation of women and men. Volume 2.* 2002.
11. HELLINGER, Marlis and Hadumod BUßMANN (eds.): *Gender Across Languages. The linguistic representation of women and men. Volume 3.* 2003.
12. OKITA, Toshie: *Invisible Work. Bilingualism, language choice and childrearing in intermarried families.* 2002.
13. OAKES, Leigh: *Language and National Identity. Comparing France and Sweden.* 2001.
14. WEBB, Vic: *Language in South Africa. The role of language in national transformation, reconstruction and development.* 2002.
15. BOXER, Diana: *Applying Sociolinguistics. Domains and face-to-face interaction.* 2002.
16. BRITAIN, David and Jenny CHESHIRE (eds.): *Social Dialectology. In honour of Peter Trudgill.* N.Y.P.