

GENDER
ACROSS
LANGUAGES

VOLUME 4

EDITED BY

Marlis Hellinger
Heiko Motschenbacher

JOHN BENJAMINS PUBLISHING COMPANY

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.

For an overview of all books published in this series, please see <http://benjamins.com/catalog/impact>

General Editor

Ana Deumert
University of Cape Town

Advisory Board

Peter Auer
University of Freiburg

Jan Blommaert
Ghent University

Annick De Houwer
University of Erfurt

J. Joseph Errington
Yale University

Anna Maria Escobar
University of Illinois at Urbana

Guus Extra
Tilburg University

Marlis Hellinger
University of Frankfurt am Main

Elizabeth Lanza
University of Oslo

William Labov
University of Pennsylvania

Peter L. Patrick
University of Essex

Jeanine Treffers-Daller
University of the West of England

Victor Webb
University of Pretoria

Volume 36

Gender Across Languages. Volume 4
Edited by Marlis Hellinger and Heiko Motschenbacher

Gender Across Languages

Volume 4

Edited by

Marlis Hellinger

Goethe University Frankfurt

Heiko Motschenbacher

Technical University of Braunschweig

John Benjamins Publishing Company

Amsterdam / Philadelphia



The paper used in this publication meets the minimum requirements of the American National Standard for Information Sciences – Permanence of Paper for Printed Library Materials, ANSI Z39.48-1984.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Gender Across Languages : The linguistic representation of women and men. Volume 4 /
edited by Marlis Hellinger and Heiko Motschenbacher.

p. cm. (IMPACT: Studies in Language and Society, ISSN 1385-7908 ; v. 36)

Includes bibliographical references and indexes.

1. Grammar, Comparative and general--Gender. I. Hellinger, Marlis.
II. Motschenbacher, Heiko. III. Impact, studies in language and society; 36.

P240.7 .G45 2015

415--dc21

2001037888

ISBN 978 90 272 1877 3 (Hb ; alk. paper)

ISBN 978 90 272 1878 0 (Pb ; alk. paper)

ISBN 978 90 272 6886 0 (Eb)

© 2015 – John Benjamins B.V.

No part of this book may be reproduced in any form, by print, photoprint, microfilm, or any other means, without written permission from the publisher.

John Benjamins Publishing Co. · P.O. Box 36224 · 1020 ME Amsterdam · The Netherlands
John Benjamins North America · P.O. Box 27519 · Philadelphia PA 19118-0519 · USA

Table of contents

<i>Languages of volume I, II and III</i>	VII
<i>Preface</i>	XI
<i>Acknowledgments</i>	XIII
<i>List of abbreviations</i>	XV
GENDER ACROSS LANGUAGES	
The linguistic representation of women and men	1
<i>Marlis Hellinger and Hadumod Bußmann</i>	
Some new perspectives on gendered language structures	27
<i>Heiko Motschenbacher</i>	
CROATIAN	
Structural gender trouble in Croatian	49
<i>Heiko Motschenbacher and Marija Weikert</i>	
ESPERANTO	
Gender in a planned language: Esperanto	97
<i>Sabine Fiedler</i>	
ESTONIAN	
The representation of gender in Estonian	125
<i>Cornelius Hasselblatt</i>	
GA	
Probing the manifestations of gender in Ga	153
<i>Benedicta Adokarley Lomotey</i>	
GERMAN	
Gender in Swiss German	173
<i>Helen Christen and Daniel Elmiger</i>	

HUNGARIAN

- Gender trouble in a grammatically genderless language: Hungarian** 203
Louise O. Vasvári

IGBO

- The linguistic representation and communication of gender in Igbo** 227
Arua E. Arua

KURDISH

- Gender in Kurdish: Structural and socio-cultural dimensions** 247
Geoffrey Haig and Ergin Öpengin

ONEIDA

- Gender in Oneida** 277
Karin Michelson

PORTUGUESE

- Gender in Portuguese** 303
Annette Endruschat

SLOVENIAN

- Gender in Slovenian** 333
Ursula Doleschal

THAI

- The linguistic representation of gender in Thai** 369
Korakoch Attaviriyanyapap

- Notes on contributors* 401

- Subject index* 407

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

Marjorie K. M. Chan

Charles Eттner

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

Languages of Volume III

Czech

Svetla Čmejková

Danish

Kirsten Gomard and Mette Kunøe

French

Elisabeth Burr

Elmar Schafroth

German

Marlis Hellinger and Hadumod Bußmann

Greek

Theodossia-Soula Pavlidou

Japanese

Sachiko Ide

Janet S. Shibamoto Smith

Oriya

Kalyanamalini Sahoo

Polish

Gabriela Koniuszaniec and Hanka Błaszowska

Serbian

Elke Hentschel

Swahili

Rose Marie Beck

Swedish

Antje Hornscheidt

Preface

This is the fourth volume of *Gender across languages*, a comprehensive reference work which provides systematic descriptions of the manifestations of gender in languages of diverse areal, typological and socio-cultural affiliations. To the 30 languages already analysed in previous volumes, Volume 4 adds another 12, among them languages whose gendered structures have received little or no scholarly attention in the past.

The collection includes a broad spectrum of languages, i.e. it contains languages without nominal classification, grammatical gender languages, and a classifier language, larger national languages as well as smaller languages with minority status; also, members of diverse language families are represented: Indo-European as well as Finno-Ugrian, Iroquois, Tai-Kadai and Niger-Congo. Of course, no claim can be made that all language families are covered adequately in this volume, nor in the previous volumes for that matter. Critics will easily identify languages whose gendered structures would also present extremely rich and interesting data requiring analysis. This would be especially true for the immense number of African, Asian and Austronesian languages about whose gendered structures we know very little. Thus, there remains an urgent need for future investigations into gendered linguistic structures.

The previous volumes of *Gender across languages* were the successful result of a most fruitful and cooperative collaboration between the two editors, Hadumod Bußmann and Marlis Hellinger, and all individual authors. Since the publication of Volume 3, Hadumod Bußmann has turned her academic interest on biographical research, so that the publication of any future volume depended on the emergence/formation of a new team of editors. I was most fortunate in that Heiko Motschenbacher, a widely published expert in gender and queer linguistics, agreed to join me on the project. Working with him on the fourth volume of *Gender across languages* has been a most rewarding experience.

Volume 4 continues the conceptual tradition of the previous volumes. Each chapter addresses most of the issues that were raised in our original guidelines which, however, were neither intended – nor interpreted by authors – to impose our own expectations of how gender is represented in a particular language. Therefore, chapters basically have the same overall structure, with variation due

to language-specific properties as well as the state of research on the respective language. The four volumes of *Gender across languages* illustrate the tremendous variation found in the area of gendered structures; at the same time, they provide the much-needed material required for an explicitly comparative approach to linguistic manifestations of gender.

Marlis Hellinger, Frankfurt am Main

October 2014

Acknowledgments

As for the previous three volumes of *Gender across languages*, the editors were fortunate in receiving a tremendous amount of support from many people:

- above all from our contributors, who extended their patience and active co-operation with our continued demands over the whole period of two years;
- from all our reviewers, who provided linguistic expertise and frequently native speaker competence in the language under review: Friederike Braun, Mary Esther Dakubu, Anthony Diller, Presley Ifukor, Roswitha Kersten-Pejanić, Johanna Laakso, Uwe Kjær Nissen, Elke Nowak, Franz Schindler, and Eva Lia Wyss;
- from Elena Slotosch of the Linguistics Department of Siegen University, who assisted us with the careful formal processing of the final manuscripts.

Finally, we would like to thank the team of John Benjamins Publishing Company, above all Cornelis H. J. Vaes (acquisition editor), and the General Editor of the IMPACT Series, Ana Deumert (University of Cape Town), who were both demanding and encouraging editors. Their continued enthusiasm and outstanding editorial expertise in the final processing of the text have added tremendously to the quality of this volume.

Marlis Hellinger, Frankfurt am Main
Heiko Motschenbacher, Braunschweig

Autumn 2014

List of abbreviations

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

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*
2. Gender classes as a special case of noun classes
 - 2.1 Classifier languages
 - 2.2 Noun class languages
3. Categories of gender
 - 3.1 Grammatical gender
 - 3.2 Lexical gender
 - 3.3 Referential gender
 - 3.4 “False generics”: Generic masculines and male generics
 - 3.5 Social gender
4. Gender-related structures
 - 4.1 Word-formation
 - 4.2 Agreement
 - 4.3 Pronominalization
 - 4.4 Coordination
5. Gender-related messages
 - 5.1 Address terms
 - 5.2 Idiomatic expressions and proverbs
 - 5.3 Female and male discourse
6. Language change and language reform
7. Conclusion

Notes

References

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, for example, 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 (cf. also Hall & Bucholtz 1995).

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 Iranian 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 Dyrbal, 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 Turkish⁵ 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 membership, but, of course, there is (obligatory) agreement with other word classes, both inside and outside the noun phrase. Most importantly – for our distinction – 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/Croatian/Bosnian, 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/Croatian/Bosnian 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 (cf. also Greenberg 1978). 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) ‘individual’ or *Person* (f) ‘person’, pronominal choice is usually, but not always, determined by the grammatical gender of the antecedent (see Bußmann & Hellinger, vol. III).

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 membership” (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 morphologically. 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. *muhami* (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 described 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 (cf. 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.	<i>forfatter</i>	<i>forfatter-inne</i>	‘author’
Arab.	<i>katib</i>	<i>katib-a</i>	‘secretary’
Rom.	<i>pictor</i>	<i>pictor-iță</i>	‘painter’
Engl.	<i>steward</i>	<i>steward-ess</i>	

(2) **Compounding**

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

Typically, female gender-specification occurs with reference to a particular individual (*Congesswoman 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’, *Bischöfn* ‘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.	<i>couturier</i> (m)	‘fashion designer’
	<i>couturière</i> (f)	‘seamstress, female tailor’
Germ.	<i>Sekretär</i> (m)	‘secretary of an administration, trade union or the like’
	<i>Sekretärin</i> (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, vol. III).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) *Oğlan doğuran övünsün, kız doğuran 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 observed. 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 four 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, vol. III) 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 Kramaræ & Treichler (1985:150, 175) to refer to “generic masculines”. Romaine (vol. I, Section 3.2) uses the term “androcentric generics”. Cf. Corbett & Fraser (2000) on “default genders”.
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, vol. III).

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 (vol. III).
20. For German, cf. Daniels (1985), for Moroccan Webster (1982), for Chinese 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. DOI: 10.1515/ling.1984.22.6.831
- Bergvall, Victoria L. 1999. "An agenda for language and gender research for the start of the new millennium." *Linguistik Online*. http://www.viadrina.euw-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.
- Braun, Friederike. 1988. *Terms of address. Problems of patterns and usage in various languages and cultures*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. DOI: 10.1515/9783110848113
- 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 Genusssystemen: Überlegungen zu einigen theoretischen Aspekten, verbunden mit einer Fallstudie des Zande*. Hamburg: Buske.

- Corbett, Greville G. 1991. *Gender*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
DOI: 10.1017/CBO9781139166119
- 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.
DOI: 10.1075/tsl.7
- Craig, Colette G. 1994. "Classifier languages." In *The encyclopedia of language and linguistics 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 Dyrbal language of North Queensland*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. DOI: 10.1017/CBO9781139084987
- Dixon, Robert M. W. 1982. *Where have all the adjectives gone? And other essays in semantics and syntax*. Berlin: Mouton. DOI: 10.1515/9783110822939
- Ehrlich, Susan & Ruth King. 1994. "Feminist meanings and the (de)politicization of the lexicon." *Language in Society* 23: 59–76. DOI: 10.1017/S004740450001767X
- Fodor, Istvan. 1959. "The origin of grammatical gender." *Lingua* 8: 1–41, 186–214.
DOI: 10.1016/0024-3841(59)90002-6
- 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 substantial 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*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press. 47–82.
- Grimm, Jacob. 1831. *Deutsche Grammatik* III. 3. Theil, 3. Buch: *Von der Wortbildung*. Göttingen: Dietrich.
- Härma, 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.

- 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. DOI: 10.1515/9783110905397
- 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. DOI: 10.2214/ajr.150.4.950
- 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, Cheri & 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. DOI: 10.7208/chicago/9780226471013.001.0001
- 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. DOI: 10.1016/S0022-5371(79)90369-4
- 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 WissenschaftlerInnen? 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–xlvi. DOI: 10.1515/9783110802603
- Webster, Sheila K. 1982. "Women, sex, and marriage in Moroccan proverbs." *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 14: 173–184. DOI: 10.1017/S0020743800000647
- 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 & Cherie Kramarae & Nancy Henley. Rowley, MA: Newbury House, 113–118.
- Whitehead, Harriet. 1991 [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. DOI: 10.1016/0024-3841(84)90031-7
- 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. DOI: 10.1075/tsl.7.12zub

Some new perspectives on gendered language structures

Heiko Motschenbacher

Technical University of Braunschweig, Germany

1. Introduction
2. Structural gender linguistics – A marginalised field?
3. Developments in structural gender linguistics
 - 3.1 Theoretical shifts
 - 3.2 Cognitive linguistic evidence
 - 3.3 Corpus linguistic evidence
 - 3.4 Contrastive linguistic evidence
4. Central insights from the languages of this volume
 - 4.1 The selection of languages
 - 4.2 Gender de-essentialisation via linguistic analysis
5. Conclusion

Notes

References

1. Introduction

The publication of the fourth volume of *Gender across languages*, twelve years after the third volume of the project appeared in print in 2003, is in many respects a timely event. The aspects outlined in the general introduction to the project (reprinted in this volume) – language types, linguistic gender categories, false generics and other gendered language structures – have not decreased in their relevance for gender representation. Even if grammatical gender is only relevant for linguistic gender representation in certain languages, phenomena like lexical gender, social gender and referential gender are universal in the sense that they can be verified in all languages (a status that is probably also true for false generics). The revitalisation of the *Gender across languages* project increases our understanding of linguistic gender representation by providing structural descriptions

of twelve more languages and varieties in addition to the thirty languages covered by the first three volumes: Croatian, Esperanto, Estonian, Ga, Hungarian, Igbo, Kurdish, Oneida, Portuguese, Slovenian, Swiss German¹ and Thai. The overall rationale of the fourth volume is to provide readers with much-needed additional material that documents the diversity and complexity of linguistic gender representation across languages. Furthermore, the fourth volume of *Gender across languages* reflects recent developments in the field of structural gender linguistics since the publication of the first three volumes (cf. Section 3).

2. Structural gender linguistics – A marginalised field?

It is, in the eyes of the editors, an unfortunate circumstance that the decade in which the *Gender across languages* project was in hiatus coincided with a process of marginalisation of structural gender linguistics (for recent overviews, see Hellinger 2006, 2011; Hellinger & Pauwels 2007; Hornscheidt 2011) within the field of language and gender at large. Structural linguistic descriptions once figured prominently in the early days of the field of language and gender (see, for example, Baron 1986; Bodine 1975; Schulz 1975 and, for a bibliographical overview, Thorne & Kramarae & Henley 1983: 166–215), when they were considered a fruitful means of exposing the systematic androcentric bias of many languages.

Evidence for the increasing marginalisation of structural gender linguistics within the field of language and gender since the publication of the third volume of *Gender across languages* is, for example, found in the two major recent edited collections which represent handbooks of the field today. These volumes are otherwise superb collections with contributions written by major experts in the field. However, the total absence of structural linguistic approaches to gender causes the overviews presented by them to be a partial business and a misrepresentation of what the field has to offer (see Motschenbacher 2012 for a bibliographical account of the research literature from 2000 to 2011). The mainly UK-based collection by Harrington et al. (2008), which carries the title *Gender and language research methodologies*, does not include any article on structural linguistic matters. The same is true for the international *Handbook of language, gender and sexuality*, edited by Ehrlich, Meyerhoff and Holmes (2014). What is particularly alarming in this latter case is the fact that this volume is a re-edition of an earlier volume (Holmes & Meyerhoff 2003), which in fact contained two contributions on structural linguistic issues (McConnell-Ginet 2003; Pauwels 2003) that are no longer included in the new edition. This editorial decision can be read as symptomatic for the developments highlighted here.²

The main reason for the marginalisation of structural gender linguistics is theoretical developments within the field of language and gender. Structural gender linguistics as a component of second wave feminist linguistics traditionally used to be firmly rooted in structuralist notions of language as a system of signs that are associated with stable meanings. These notions, and the feminist linguistic discussions based on them, have been described as “outdated” by third wave feminist linguists (Mills 2008:9; see also Mills 2004). Other research in language and gender since the mid-1990s has predominantly subscribed to social constructionist or poststructuralist theorisations of gender, whose focus on the locality of gender performance and the linguistic materialisation of gendered discourses, on the surface, seems to clash with structuralist ideas (cf. Ehrlich & King 1992). However, as shown in Section 3, the notion that this clash constitutes an unsurmountable obstacle is clearly not justified.

3. Developments in structural gender linguistics

3.1 Theoretical shifts

The field of language and gender has undergone a series of theoretical shifts that have also left their traces in structural gender linguistics (cf. Motschenbacher 2013). For example, among the common reform strategies to counter the use of androcentric generics, the use of feminisation as a reaction to male linguistic bias is a logical outcome of the dominance approach (e.g. Lakoff 1975; Spender 1980), while the specification of both genders through splitted forms corresponds to the spirit of the difference approach (e.g. Maltz & Borker 1982; Tannen 1990). These early approaches have been widely criticised for their essentialist treatment of gender as being invariably a matter of male dominance over women or of female-male difference.

More recent social constructionist and poststructuralist approaches (often influenced by the work of Butler 1990, 1997) see gender, in a less essentialist fashion, as a locally performed and discursively materialised phenomenon. A framework of structural gender linguistics that goes beyond the structuralist basis of second wave feminist linguistics incorporates these ideas, viewing gendered linguistic structures not as stable, but as (subtly but) constantly changing in actual linguistic performances (see Hornscheidt 2011; Motschenbacher forthcoming). In other words, what is described as “linguistic structure” – phenomena like lexical gender, grammatical gender or social gender –, has materialised across actual linguistic performances (Motschenbacher 2008), a notion that dovetails neatly with certain approaches of linguistic description that view language structures

as the frequency-based result of emergence (see, for example, Bybee & Hopper 2001). Especially referential gender is an important driving force for changes in gendered structures. When lexically, socially or grammatically gendered forms are used to refer to other groups of people than their gender value normatively dictates, this is likely to have consequences for the meanings of these forms, especially when this is done in higher frequencies and by more and more social actors.

A theoretical shift to a poststructuralist-minded structural gender linguistics has various consequences on how gendered linguistic structures are conceptualised and discussed. While a structuralist approach would see gendered linguistic structures as a consequence of the social reality of binary gender, poststructuralist approaches go beyond a merely reflective relationship between reality and language and highlight the role of language users as active shapers of discursive structures. The question is then not so much who is represented in language (or not) but how people are constructed via language, for example as male, female or gender-neutral. The term “appellation” has been used to describe this phenomenon of language use shaping social realities (see Hornscheidt 2011).

In structuralist approaches, certain forms are said to have sexist, homophobic or heterosexist meanings and are therefore discouraged. A poststructuralist orientation rules out a general prohibition of such features (cf. Queen 2006). Even overtly derogatory labels (such as *chick*, *bitch*, *queer* or *dyke*) that are clearly offensive when used by out-group members may possess local in-group prestige in certain contexts, i.e. their wounding potential is not an invariable fact (see also Butler 1997). A central contextual aspect that has an influence on how certain forms are evaluated is the question of who uses which identity label to talk about whom. Acts of self-labelling are generally less problematic than when the labelling is done to other people, particularly in cases where interactants do not know each other well. Accordingly, in a poststructuralist conceptualisation of language, linguistic forms and structures do not invariably carry harmful meanings but can maximally be said to carry a harmful meaning potential that cannot be claimed to be in effect in all contexts. Such a conceptualisation acknowledges that even forms that appear to be blatantly offensive can in some contexts not be described as offensive in any meaningful way. At the same time, it enables linguists to describe the many cases in which seemingly harmless forms contextually take on offensive meanings (for example, in contexts where women feel excluded when they are referred to by means of masculine forms).

In a poststructuralist framework, gender-deconstructionist approaches enter the picture, which take a more critical, ontologically oriented view on the formation of femaleness and maleness as a binary discursive regime, which in Queer Theory more generally and in Queer Linguistics more specifically (Barrett 2002; Davis & Zimman & Raclaw 2014; Hall 2013; Motschenbacher 2010a) is taken

to be a central component of heteronormative discourses.³ In terms of gender deconstruction, neutralisation is a pertinent remedy strategy, as it makes gender linguistically irrelevant.⁴ However, it is obvious that in a poststructuralist framework, no general solution to counter linguistic androcentricity is proposed. It is rather necessary to create an awareness of the political dimension that the use of personal reference forms is invariably associated with:

[...] the project is not a modernist attempt to construct a 'perfect' language, but a postmodernist attempt to dramatize the impossibility of such a language. [...] [W]ords can never stand in a simple and direct relationship to 'reality', [...] their use is contested and their meaning unstable. From this perspective, the object of tampering with linguistic conventions is to make the point that the way of using language which most people consider 'natural' is not natural at all; or, for those who prefer a 'cultural' metaphor, that despite invocations of the common language that serves the common good, some parties to the linguistic contract are actually more equal than others. (Cameron 1995: 155f.)

Which forms are chosen for personal reference depends crucially on the language material involved (not all strategies are possible in certain cases) and the attitudes of the language user (Motschenbacher 2014; see also Cralley & Ruscher 2005; Sarrasin & Gabriel & Gygax 2012): Is the goal to make women visible (feminisation), to treat women and men equally (splitting), to question binary gender discourses (neutralisation) or to stick to the status quo (generic masculines)?

Despite the fact that there is no single cure that fits all cases, making recommendations in the form of non-sexist and non-heteronormative language guidelines is still a relevant undertaking. Such guidelines can, in a poststructuralist framework, not be read in a normative way, as providing information on which forms have to or should be used (even though one could argue that there are certain ethical standards on which they are based). Their central goal is then not so much to change the language system and install new linguistic rules, but to offer alternatives from which language users can draw depending on their specific needs. In other words, intervention is not sought at the structural linguistic but at the discursive linguistic level. The ultimate aim of such guidelines is to increase the competition of gender-related discourses in order to weaken such hegemonic discourses as "male-as-norm", gender binarism or female-male difference.

Besides the theoretical shifts just outlined, structural gender linguistics has seen a range of other developments in recent years, which are briefly sketched out in the following sections. Researchers in structural gender linguistics today draw on various methodological approaches, which all throw a specific light on gendered language structures. The most commonly used approaches are cognitive, corpus and contrastive linguistics.

3.2 Cognitive linguistic evidence

Currently, the most vibrant research area dealing with gendered linguistic structures is the cognitive linguistic study of the perception and processing of personal reference forms. In the beginning, such studies were mainly restricted to questionnaire surveys on the perception of male and masculine generic forms in a limited number of languages (mainly English and German). Their findings were unanimous in documenting the systematic perceptual male bias that such forms possess. Today, this strand of research has considerably broadened in various respects. Firstly, researchers increasingly draw on other, largely experimental methods besides questionnaires, such as the analysis of reaction times, event-related brain potentials or eye-tracking movements. Secondly, the number of tested languages has been significantly extended to include languages such as Dutch, French, Italian, Norwegian and Spanish (e.g. de Backer & de Cuypere 2012; Gabriel et al. 2008; Garnham et al. 2012; Gygax & Gabriel 2011; Gygax et al. 2012). Thirdly, the focus of such studies is no longer exclusively on masculine and male generics but also increasingly on the perception and processing of alternative strategies of generic personal reference.

Various findings evolve from these studies. On the one hand, the traditional finding that male and masculine generics are highly likely to be perceived as male-specific rather than as generic is replicated across all studies (see Henley & Abueg 2003 for an overview of earlier studies on English and, for more recent studies, Gygax et al. 2009; Khan & Daneman 2011; Miller & James 2009). In a similar vein, it was shown in studies using German sample sentences as stimulus material that subjects evaluate mismatches between grammatical and lexical/referential gender differently: when grammatically feminine forms are used co-referentially with lexically/referentially male forms (*Diese Lehrerin ist mein Mann*. 'This teacher (f) is my husband'), the respective sentences are judged to be less correct and less normal than sentences in which grammatically masculine forms are used co-referentially with lexically/referentially female forms (*Dieser Lehrer ist meine Frau*. 'This teacher (m) is my wife'; Irmen & Kurovskaja 2010; Irmen & Schumann 2011). This finding attests once more to the wider referential potential that masculine forms are perceived to have.

The normative association of lexically and referentially female forms with the feminine grammatical gender and of lexically and referentially male forms with the masculine grammatical gender has recently also been supported by psycholinguistic evidence. In a study by Schiller et al. (2006), subjects had to decide on the correctness of a specified grammatical gender value for a given German personal noun. It turned out that subjects were faster in their decisions with female and male nouns than with lexically gender-neutral nouns, which indicates

that lexical gender represents a perceptually salient cue for grammatical gender in personal nouns.

In terms of intelligibility, a study on German personal reference forms as used on package leaflets found that female subjects judged generic masculines and their gender-fair alternatives to be equally well intelligible, while male subjects evaluated texts phrased in the generic masculine as better comprehensible (Braun et al. 2007). A study on readers' perceptions of English third person pronouns (Madson & Shoda 2006) tested four text conditions: alternation between female and male pronouns, gender splitting throughout, exclusive use of female pronouns and exclusive use of male pronouns. Readers overestimated the frequency of female pronouns in the alternating texts, except when the text was on a stereotypically feminine topic, which means that the partial use of feminine generic forms was perceptually salient. Moreover, readers judged the alternating text version to be gender-biased and lower in quality, compared to the other conditions.

Some studies have tested the consequences of the use of certain types of person reference forms in concrete interactional contexts. For example, Formanowicz et al. (2013) tested in how far the use of feminine Polish occupational terms affected the evaluation of female applicants. They found that female applicants that were introduced with a feminine job title were evaluated less favourably by a committee than both male and female applicants that were introduced by means of masculine occupational titles. However, the use of certain types of personal reference forms is not just perceived to say something about the referent, but also about the user of such forms. Vervecken and Hannover (2012), for instance, showed that German speakers who used splitting as opposed to generic masculine forms were perceived as more competent and, by subjects with positive attitudes towards linguistic gender equality, as less sexist. Another study tested the influence of the types of personal reference forms used in job descriptions on children's perception and their interest in traditionally male occupations (Vervecken & Hannover & Wolter 2013). It was found that split forms, in contrast to generic masculines, led to a higher mental accessibility of female representatives and strengthened girls' interest in stereotypically male occupations.

The way in which social gender shapes language users' mental representations of social categories has also been studied in more detail and in more languages in recent years (cf. Kennison & Trofe 2003; Oakhill & Garnham & Reynolds 2005; and Reynolds & Garnham & Oakhill 2006 on English; Pyykkönen & Hyönä & van Gompel 2010 on Finnish; Cacciari & Padovani 2007 on Italian; Misersky et al. 2014 on various languages). Some studies tested the strength of the impact of grammatical versus social gender on pronominalisation (e.g. Esaulova & Reali & von Stockhausen 2014 on German; Sato & Gyga & Gabriel 2013 on English-French bilinguals). Gyga et al. (2008), for example, found that in gender

languages like French and German grammatical gender generally outweighs social gender (i.e. masculine personal nouns are overwhelmingly perceived as male, independently of their social gender bias), while in English the social gender bias was responsible for subjects' gendered interpretations. Another study (Kreiner & Sturt & Garrod 2008) demonstrated that sentences in which an anaphoric pronoun refers back to a noun that is differently lexically or socially gendered (*king – she; minister – she*) lead to a similar slowdown effect in subjects' reception, i.e. socially and lexically based gender mismatches are apparently felt to be roughly equally strong (see also Siyanova-Chanturia et al. 2012). Interestingly, for sentences with cataphoric reference, in which the respective pronoun occurs before the personal noun, the slowdown effect was only documented for mismatches with lexically gendered nouns (*she – king*), not with socially gendered nouns (*she – minister*). This indicates that social gender becomes less relevant when lexical gender information has been provided first.

3.3 Corpus linguistic evidence

Corpus linguistic studies have improved our understanding of how and how frequently particular person reference forms are used. They allow researchers to uncover usage patterns and asymmetries associated with certain personal nouns and/or pronouns by means of quantitative evidence. The focus can in such studies be on the personal reference forms themselves (e.g. Baker 2014; Holmes & Sigley 2002; Holmes & Sigley & Terraschke 2009; Sigley & Holmes 2002) or on their collocational behaviour (e.g. Baker 2014; Pearce 2008), for example in coordination (e.g. Dant 2013; Mollin 2013; Motschenbacher 2013) or adjectival premodification (e.g. Baker 2008; Moon 2014).

As corpus studies often draw on large text collections as datasets, they are a useful way of identifying gendered discourses that are in wider circulation. The process of the discursive formation of personal reference forms can be documented particularly well when diachronic corpus analyses are carried out, which compare the usage patterns of personal reference forms across corpora from various time periods. One example of such a study is presented by Baker (2010), who investigated the development of various personal reference forms across four corpora of British English, dating from 1931, 1961, 1991 and 2006. Some of the findings suggest a development towards a more gender-equal linguistic representation. For instance, male forms (such as the male third person pronouns or the address term *Mr*) have become less frequent over time, leading to a more balanced representation of women and men. Other findings, by contrast, show little signs of change. For example, the noun *girl* is still commonly employed in a

disparaging or sexualised fashion and more likely to be used to refer to adults than *boy*. Similarly, adjectival collocates of female and male terms seem to preserve relatively stereotypical usage patterns (for example, the adjectives *powerful* and *successful* do not usually occur as collocates of female personal nouns).

A major drawback of corpus linguistics is that currently major reference corpora are simply not available for many languages, which means that English is the best described language in terms of gendered structures (but see, for example, Elmiger 2009; Goutsos & Fragaki 2009 and Posch 2011 for studies on German and Greek). Besides studies using major reference corpora as databases, one also finds others that concentrate on specific text genres and, as a consequence, document how personal reference forms are used and perceived in certain public and/or professional contexts (cf. Blake & Klimmt 2010 on German newspaper articles or Steiger-Loerbroks & von Stockhausen 2014 on German law texts).

3.4 Contrastive linguistic evidence

Contrastive linguistic analyses also form an essential component of structural gender linguistics. From a poststructuralist point of view, their value lies in their capacity to challenge and relativise discourses of gender stability and coherence by means of cross-linguistic evidence, thereby exposing gender as a highly heterogeneous, non-natural and culturally shaped phenomenon. Even though contrastive linguistics is the most traditional of the three approaches outlined here, its use in structural gender linguistics is, paradoxically, so far the least extended, which means that there are numerous research gaps to be filled in this area.

One major strand within this research tradition is concerned with the comparative analysis of grammatical gender systems and other systems of nominal classification from a typological point of view (e.g. Janse & Joseph & de Vogelaer 2011; Luraghi 2011). Related work has compared practices of gender assignment and agreement in certain (groups of) languages (e.g. Duke 2009; Geyer 2010; Kubaszczyk 2006; Schwarze 2008; van der Gucht 2003) or focussed on the areal distribution of gender systems or formal gender distinctions. Corbett (2005), for example, classifies 256 languages in terms of grammatical gender, distinguishing languages without grammatical gender (144 items in the sample), languages with sex-related grammatical gender systems (84) and languages with grammatical gender systems that are not sex-based (28). The areal distribution of patterns of gender marking in personal pronouns is presented in Siewierska (2005).

Contrastive studies that concentrate on gender representation in personal reference forms are more rarely found (see, for example, Lazovic 2009 for a comparison of English and Serbian personal nouns; Motschenbacher 2010b on female

and feminine generics across languages, or the contributions in Thüne & Leonardi & Bazzanella 2006 on lexically gendered nouns across languages). A systematic comparison of gender-fair language guidelines in Czech, English, French, German, Italian, Norwegian and Spanish is provided by Moser et al. (2011).

Typologically based studies that test whether there are correlations between certain language types and societal manifestations of gender are a fairly recent development. For example, Wasserman and Weseley (2009) found that, in a survey of sexist attitudes, subjects who had read a passage in a grammatical gender language with a masculine-feminine contrast (French or Spanish) expressed more sexist attitudes than those that had read the same passage in English. In their explanation, the authors clearly link gender-related difference thinking to dominance:

In constantly differentiating between the masculine and feminine, languages with masculine v. feminine grammatical gender may contribute to a more general belief that men and women are different. Furthermore, because women have traditionally been an oppressed group, this notion of difference may translate into a constant intimation that women are inferior and prime negative attitudes toward women's pursuit of equal opportunity. (Wasserman & Weseley 2009: 635)

Another study conducted by Prewitt-Freilino et al. (2012) tested whether the degree of gender equality in a particular country is related to the gender-relevant structures that the dominant language in this territory provides. Such an effect was indeed found, even when other potentially influential factors on gender equality (such as geographic region, religious tradition, political system, overall development) were controlled. Countries in which a language with a grammatical masculine-feminine contrast is the predominant language overall demonstrate less gender equality compared to countries in which a language is spoken that does not show such a contrast or only distinguishes gender in third person pronouns. These empirical findings clearly point to the detrimental effects that gender-binary structures may have on people's perception.

Straddling the boundary between cognitive and contrastive linguistic approaches, Everett (2008, 2011) showed in an experimental study which asked subjects to give names to non-gendered cartoon figures that native speakers of languages that have a grammatical masculine-feminine contrast (Portuguese) or a third person singular pronominal gender distinction (English) were much more likely to choose male names (i.e. to exhibit a linguistic male-as-norm bias) than native speakers of the Amazonian language Karitiâna, which lacks any such gender distinctions.

4. Central insights from the languages of this volume

4.1 The selection of languages

Most of the languages described in this volume have so far been less well or not described in terms of their gendered structures, let alone in a systematic way that facilitates cross-linguistic comparison. It is particularly fortunate that some languages and language types that had dropped out of the project in its earlier phases (Hungarian, Portuguese, a native American language) are included in the present volume. The languages that, for various reasons, did not make it into the present volume but were originally planned to be on board (Afrikaans, Basque, Catalan, Georgian) will hopefully be covered in one of the future volumes.⁵

The fourth volume provides descriptions of an interesting set of languages, both from an areal and typological point of view. It includes languages (mainly) spoken in Africa (Ga, Igbo), North America (Oneida), South America (Portuguese), Asia (Kurdish, Thai) and Europe (Croatian, Estonian, Hungarian, Slovenian, Swiss German). Among them are gender languages, with various sets of grammatical gender classes (Croatian, Kurdish, Portuguese, Slovenian, Swiss German), languages without nominal classification (Esperanto, Estonian, Ga, Igbo, Hungarian) and a classifier language (Thai). Moreover, it is the first time that a language is included which partly shows feminine generic patterns, namely Oneida (note, however, the caveat in the discussion of Oneida in Section 4.2).

A broad spectrum of language families is represented in the present volume. It ranges from Germanic (Swiss German), Romance (Portuguese), Slavic (Croatian, Slovenian) and Indo-Iranian (Kurdish) languages within the Indo-European language family to Finno-Ugrian (Estonian, Hungarian), Iroquois (Oneida), Tai-Kadai (Thai) and Niger-Congo (Ga, Igbo) languages.

As far as usage is concerned, the volume documents larger languages that enjoy national language status and partly EU official status (Thai, and the EU languages Croatian, Estonian, Hungarian, Portuguese and Slovenian), a national variety of a language (Swiss German) as well as regional and minority languages (Ga, Igbo, Kurdish, Oneida) and a planned language typically used for international communication (Esperanto).

4.2 Gender de-essentialisation via linguistic analysis

It is obvious that the structural descriptions provided in this and the three earlier volumes of *Gender across languages* attest to gender-related discourses that surface across many languages, among them androcentricity, female linguistic invisibility, female linguistic markedness and gender binarism.

Still it needs to be noted that hardly any of these macro-patterns is absolute. The shape of gender binarism, for example, varies considerably across linguistic gender categories. Whereas lexical gender appears to be the most strictly binary gender category, grammatical gender in personal nouns allows for a higher degree of variance (which is, however, often negatively connotated, as many personal nouns that show a mismatch between lexical and grammatical gender are pejorative). Social gender conceptualises gender binarism as a matter of a continuum ranging from more male to more female, but the basic male-female macro-division is not questioned and an overlap between female and male is not allowed for. Referential gender is potentially the most useful category for the deconstruction of traditional gendered structures, because it can accommodate instances of gender crossing as well as gender-neutral personal reference. It could be argued that there are coherent, gender-binary norms that influence how personal reference forms are commonly (thought to be) used. According to such norms, forms that are grammatically feminine, lexically female or socially female (or several of these at the same time) are generally used to refer to women, while grammatically masculine, lexically male or socially male forms are generally used to refer to men. By extension, grammatically neuter, lexically and socially gender-neutral personal nouns seem to be ideal candidates for generic reference. An examination of how certain personal reference forms are used, however, is likely to show that in a substantial number of cases, linguistic gender representation is more complex and configured in less than coherent ways.

Besides the macro-patterns affecting many languages that have been outlined above, it is equally obvious that the discursive construction of gender shows many aspects that are language-specific or restricted to certain groups of languages. As is appropriate for a discursive, poststructuralist approach to gendered language structures, the descriptions of gender representation in the languages of the current volume therefore also make an important contribution to gender de-essentialisation. They fulfil this task by adducing evidence for the cross-linguistic relativity of gendered language structures and for language-internal incoherences between lexical, social, referential and grammatical gender that surface in the usage of personal reference forms.⁶

In Croatian, for example, there are various substantial subsections of the personal lexicon which do not exhibit neat correspondences between the individual gender categories. Some show systematic mismatches between grammatical and referential gender (epicene nouns, generic masculines); some between grammatical and lexical gender (feminine male numerical nouns, feminine male collective nouns); some show mixed agreement patterns, partly governed by grammatical and partly governed by semantic/referential aspects (hybrid nouns, “masculine *a*-stems”); and some are lexically male, trigger (referentially motivated) masculine

agreement in their satellites, but show inflectional patterns that are typical of the feminine gender (male “masculine *a*-stems”, certain male first names). All of these patterns challenge the notion of gender as a self-evident, natural, coherent and strictly binary phenomenon and highlight its incoherence and instability even within the same language.

Linguistic gender representation in Esperanto constitutes a particularly interesting case. It may be expected that in a relatively recently created language that is associated with an egalitarian spirit and lacks grammatical gender, androcentricity is less present compared to naturally evolved languages, whose structures go back to hundreds of years in which patriarchal society has left its traces. On closer inspection, however, it turns out that androcentric structures in Esperanto seem to be even more pronounced than in many other languages. For example, while in many languages basic terms denoting female and male persons (e.g. *girl*, *boy*; German *Frau* ‘woman’, *Mann* ‘man’) and basic female and male kinship terms (e.g. *mother*, *father*; French *sœur* ‘sister’, *frère* ‘brother’) show a symmetrical configuration because they are morphologically unrelated and equally complex, in Esperanto the systematic derivation of female nouns from male roots extends even to these subfields of the personal lexicon (e.g. *vir-o* ‘man’, *vir-in-o* ‘woman’; *patr-o* ‘father’, *patr-in-o* ‘mother’), which means that one can linguistically never refer to a woman independently of a man. Furthermore, the fact that Esperanto has been created using language material from various Indo-European sources and is commonly used by native speakers of various Indo-European languages, i.e. languages that show androcentric structures, casts doubt on the notion of gender-neutrality in the Esperanto personal lexicon. Even though it has so far not been empirically tested, it seems highly likely that lexically gender-neutral personal nouns exhibit a gender bias that goes beyond the social genderisation known from naturally evolved languages, with forms such as *studento* ‘student’ or *svedo* ‘Swede’ causing a male perception because they contain the general nominal suffix *-o*, which is homonymous with masculine inflectional endings in some Indo-European languages (e.g. Italian, Spanish) and with the final vowel of many male first names of Indo-European descent (e.g. *Branko*, *Hugo*, *Otto*, *Pedro*).⁷

Oneida also constitutes a special case, because even though descriptions of this language have traditionally used the terms *masculine*, *feminine* and *neuter* to refer to some of its grammatical features, the notion of grammatical gender as surfacing in the shape of agreement patterns in satellites of the noun is not relevant to Oneida, where formal gender distinctions are restricted to prefixes to nominal and verbal stems whose use depends on referential gender (rather than on any inherent property of the noun). The traditional grammatical description of Oneida (and likely of many other languages) can therefore be said to be subject to a Euro-centric discursive regime that transfers the use of technical terms and

concepts that are adequate for the description of Western, often Indo-European, languages to other languages in which they are irrelevant or less straightforward.

A challenge to well-established notions of grammatical gender is posed by Kurdish, more specifically by Kurdish linking elements. These forms are used to link nouns with other modifying elements within the noun phrase and show formal distinctions, depending on the grammatical gender of the head noun. However, there are at least two aspects in which these forms deviate from prototypical agreement types. First, the linker is (prosodically) not attached to the satellite but to the head noun itself. A second aspect that is relevant to personal reference forms more specifically is that a substantial number of Kurdish personal nouns do not possess a stable grammatical gender value and that the choice of the form of the linker is governed by referential gender rather than grammatical agreement.

Other idiosyncrasies are exhibited by Thai, where personal nouns are frequently used in the function of personal pronouns. The first person pronominal forms show the most gender-specific patterns, whereas cross-linguistically gender distinctions are most frequently found in third person pronouns (which show hardly any gender patterns in Thai). Another aspect that adds to the complexity of personal reference in Thai is the linguistic representation of feminine men as a so-called “third gender”, whose use of first- and second-person pronominal forms is often less guided by the biological gender but rather by the social gender practices of the referent.

The contributions to this volume indicate that debates on gender-equal linguistic representation or the linguistic visibility of women have taken place in nearly all of the respective speech communities, even if to varying degrees. The only exception in this volume is Oneida, which is not surprising if one considers that it is a moribund language for which language policy efforts will logically concentrate on measures of preservation. For many of the languages covered in this volume, gender-related language policies have resulted in the creation of various kinds of official guidelines. However, the quality of such guidelines is in some cases very low, which attests to the fact that they are not based on linguistic expertise. This is illustrated by the official gender-fair language guidelines devised by the European Parliament. The Estonian, Hungarian, Portuguese and Slovenian editions of these guidelines, for example, largely consist of general recommendations, many of which have directly been translated from the guidelines for English, which means that language-specific aspects are not sufficiently covered. For Croatian, such guidelines do not even exist at the moment of writing.

In some speech communities, discussions revolving around linguistic gender representation are only in their initial stages because gender-related language policies have to compete for public attention with other types of language policies. In

the case of Estonian, for example, national language policies have clearly dominated in the years since Estonia's independence from the Soviet Union. A similar situation is found in Croatia, where language policy since the 1990s has concentrated on distinguishing Croatian as a national language from the closely related varieties Bosnian, Montenegrin and Serbian. At the same time, the systematic way of making women linguistically visible through derivation is in Serbia perceived to be a typically Croatian feature, which in turn seems to slow down similar forms of language change and reform for Serbian. In Kurdish, by contrast, language policy issues cannot draw on the legitimation by a nation state and its institutions, which means that debates on gender-related language change and reform are relegated to discussions in various Kurdish-language media.

5. Conclusion

The fourth volume of *Gender across languages*, on the one hand, continues in the spirit of the three earlier volumes, with the aim of providing structural descriptions of gender representation in languages that are so far not associated with an extensive research tradition in language and gender. On the other hand, it reflects integral developments in the field of structural gender linguistics, for example by highlighting the many ways in which linguistic gender representation is a less than coherent business and by drawing attention to the cross-cultural and cross-linguistic relativity of gender as it surfaces discursively in language use and structures.

As has been shown, the cognitive linguistic study of gendered language structures is today a vibrant research field. Consequently, there is a greater need for research using corpus linguistic and especially contrastive linguistic techniques. Another central issue is the extension of structural gender linguistic descriptions to more languages – a development that the present volume contributes to. Future research may also find it relevant to pay greater attention to the following issues, which surface only marginally in the contributions of this volume:

- the heterogeneity of gender representation within language types such as gender languages, noun class languages and classifier languages,
- systematic ways of achieving gender neutralisation (cf. Pettersson 2011; Winter & Pauwels 2006),
- gender representation in languages that are used in intercultural communication and the consequences of transcultural flows for linguistic gender representation (cf. Pauwels 2010, 2011).

Notes

1. German German was already included in volume three of *Gender across languages*.
2. For a discussion of other aspects that render this collection a misrepresentation of the contemporary field of language, gender and sexuality, see Leap (2015).
3. Heteronormative discourses are discourses that construct (certain forms of) heterosexuality as natural, normal and preferable, and women and men as fundamentally different opposites that attract each other.
4. Note that, in principle, gender subversion (i.e. the use of female forms for male reference and of male forms for female reference) would also be a strategy that is in tune with gender-deconstructionist approaches (compare, for example, practices of inverted appellation as described in Johnsen 2008). However, as this strategy is generally associated with serious drawbacks in terms of wider applicability, it is not usually mentioned in gender-related language guidelines. See Motschenbacher (2014: 252f.) for an elaboration on why neutralisation is preferable to gender subversion within an applicability-oriented non-heteronormative language policy.
5. Potential authors who are interested in providing descriptions of these four languages, or any other languages or varieties that have not yet been covered in the first four volumes, may contact the editors: hellinger@em.uni-frankfurt.de or motschenbacher@em.uni-frankfurt.de.
6. Note that such a de-essentialisation can additionally be achieved through diachronic analyses, which relativise dominant contemporary gender discourses by drawing attention to historical variability (cf. Motschenbacher forthcoming).
7. Note that, at the same time, female first names ending in *-o* are extremely rare in most European languages.

References

- Baker, Paul. 2008. "‘Eligible’ bachelors and ‘frustrated’ spinsters. Corpus linguistics, gender and language." In *Gender and language research methodologies*, eds. Kate Harrington & Lia Litosseliti & Helen Sauntson & Jane Sunderland. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 73–84.
- Baker, Paul. 2010. "Will *Ms* ever be as frequent as *Mr*? A corpus-based comparison of gendered terms across four diachronic corpora of British English." *Gender and Language* 4(1): 125–149. DOI: 10.1558/genl.v4i1.125
- Baker, Paul. 2014. *Using corpora to analyze gender*. London: Bloomsbury.
- Baron, Dennis. 1986. *Grammar and gender*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Barrett, Rusty. 2002. "Is queer theory important for sociolinguistic theory?" In *Language and sexuality: Contesting meaning in theory and practice*, eds. Kathryn Campbell-Kibler & Robert J. Podesva & Sarah J. Roberts & Andrew Wong. Stanford, CA: CSLI, 25–43.
- Blake, Christopher & Christoph Klimmt. 2010. "Geschlechtergerechte Formulierungen in Nachrichtentexten." *Publizistik* 55(3): 289–304. DOI: 10.1007/s11616-010-0093-2
- Bodine, Ann. 1975. "Androcentrism in prescriptive grammar. Singular ‘they’, sex-indefinite ‘he’, and ‘he or she’." *Language in Society* 4(2): 129–146. DOI: 10.1017/S0047404500004607

- Braun, Friederike & Susanne Oelkers & Karin Rogalski & Janine Bosak & Sabine Sczesny. 2007. "Aus Gründen der Verständlichkeit ...: Der Einfluss generisch maskuliner und alternativer Personenbezeichnungen auf die kognitive Verarbeitung von Texten." *Psychologische Rundschau* 58(3): 183–189. DOI: 10.1026/0033-3042.58.3.183
- Butler, Judith. 1990. *Gender trouble. Feminism and the subversion of identity*. New York: Routledge.
- Butler, Judith. 1997. *Excitable speech. A politics of the performative*. New York: Routledge.
- Bybee, Joan & Paul Hopper. 2001. "Introduction to frequency and the emergence of linguistic structure." In *Frequency and the emergence of linguistic structure*, eds. Joan Bybee & Paul Hopper. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1–24. DOI: 10.1075/tsl.45.01byb
- Cacciari, Cristina & Roberto Padovani. 2007. "Further evidence of gender stereotype priming in language. Semantic facilitation and inhibition in Italian role nouns." *Applied Psycholinguistics* 28: 277–293. DOI: 10.1017/S0142716407070142
- Cameron, Deborah. 1995. *Verbal hygiene*. London: Routledge.
- Corbett, Greville G. 2005. "Sex-based and non-sex-based gender systems." In *The world atlas of language structures*, eds. Martin Haspelmath & Matthew Dryer & David Gil & Bernard Comrie. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 130–133.
- Cralley, Elizabeth L. & Janet B. Ruscher. 2005. "Lady, girl, female, or woman. Sexism and cognitive busyness predict use of gender-biased nouns." *Journal of Language and Social Psychology* 24(3): 300–314. DOI: 10.1177/0261927X05278391
- Dant, Doris. 2013. "Mom and dad but men and women." In *Corpus perspectives on patterns of lexis*, eds. Hilde Hasselgård & Jarle Ebeling & Signe Oksefjell Ebeling. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 35–46. DOI: 10.1075/scl.57.05dan
- Davis, Jenny L. & Lal Zimman & Joshua Raclaw. 2014. "Opposites attract: Rethorizing binaries in language, gender, and sexuality." In *Queer excursions: Rethorizing binaries in language, gender, and sexuality*, eds. Lal Zimman & Jenny Davis & Joshua Raclaw. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1–12. DOI: 10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199937295.003.0001
- de Backer, Maarten & Ludovic de Cuypere. 2012. "The interpretation of masculine personal nouns in German and Dutch. A comparative experimental study." *Language Sciences* 34(3): 253–268. DOI: 10.1016/j.langsci.2011.10.001
- Duke, Janet. 2009. *The development of gender as a grammatical category. Five case studies from the Germanic languages*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Ehrlich, Susan & Ruth King. 1992. "Gender-based language reform and the social construction of meaning." *Discourse & Society* 3(2): 151–166. DOI: 10.1177/0957926592003002002
- Ehrlich, Susan & Miriam Meyerhoff & Janet Holmes, eds. 2014. *The handbook of language, gender, and sexuality*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell. DOI: 10.1002/9781118584248
- Elmiger, Daniel. 2009. "Sprachliche Gleichbehandlung von Frau und Mann. Eine korpusgestützte Untersuchung über den Sprachwandel in der Schweiz." *Linguistik Online* 39(3): 61–73.
- Esaulova, Yulia & Chiara Reali & Lisa von Stockhausen. 2014. "Influences of grammatical and stereotypical gender during reading: Eye movements in pronominal and noun phrase anaphor resolution." *Language, Cognition and Neuroscience* 29(7): 781–803. DOI: 10.1080/01690965.2013.794295
- Everett, Caleb. 2008. "Evidence for language-mediated thought in the perception of non-gendered figures." *Texas Linguistic Forum* 52: 24–33.

- Everett, Caleb. 2011. "Gender, pronouns and thought. The ligature between epicene pronouns and a more neutral gender perception." *Gender and Language* 5(1): 133–152. DOI: 10.1558/genl.v5i1.133
- Formanowicz, Magdalena & Sylwia Bedynska & Aleksandra Cislak & Friederike Braun & Sabine Sczesny. 2013. "Side effects of gender-fair language. How feminine job titles influence the evaluation of female applicants." *European Journal of Social Psychology* 43(1): 62–71. DOI: 10.1002/ejsp.1924
- Gabriel, Ute & Pascal Gygax & Oriane Sarrasin & Alan Garnham & Jane Oakhill. 2008. "Au pairs are rarely male. Norms on the gender perception of role names across English, French, and German." *Behavior Research Methods* 40(1): 206–212. DOI: 10.3758/BRM.40.1.206
- Garnham, Alan & Ute Gabriel & Oriane Sarrasin & Pascal Gygax & Jane Oakhill. 2012. "Gender representation in different languages and grammatical marking on pronouns. When beauticians, musicians, and mechanics remain men." *Discourse Processes* 49(6): 481–500. DOI: 10.1080/0163853X.2012.688184
- Geyer, Klaus. 2010. "Genus und Genuskonflikte in einigen europäischen Sprachen." In *Aspekte der Sprachwissenschaft: Linguistik-Tage Jena. 18. Jahrestagung der Gesellschaft für Sprache und Sprachen e.V.*, ed. Bettina Bock. Hamburg: Dr. Kovač, 409–422.
- Goutsos, Dionysis & Georgia Fragaki. 2009. "Lexical choices of gender identity in Greek genres. The view from corpora." *Pragmatics* 19(3): 317–340.
- Gygax, Pascal & Ute Gabriel. 2011. "Gender representation in language: More than meets the eye." In *Language-cognition interface: State of the art*, eds. Ramesh Kumar Mishra & Narayanan Srinivasan. München: Lincom Europa, 72–92.
- Gygax, Pascal & Ute Gabriel & Arik Lévy & Eva Pool & Marjorie Grivel & Elena Pedrazzini. 2012. "The masculine form and its competing interpretations in French. When linking grammatically masculine role names to female referents is difficult." *Journal of Cognitive Psychology* 24(4): 395–408. DOI: 10.1080/20445911.2011.642858
- Gygax, Pascal & Ute Gabriel & Oriane Sarrasin & Jane Oakhill & Alan Garnham. 2008. "Generically intended, but specifically interpreted. When beauticians, musicians, and mechanics are all men." *Language and Cognitive Processes* 23(3): 1–22. DOI: 10.1080/01690960701702035
- Gygax, Pascal & Ute Gabriel & Oriane Sarrasin & Jane Oakhill & Alan Garnham. 2009. "Some grammatical rules are more difficult than others. The case of the generic interpretation of the masculine." *European Journal of Psychology of Education* 24(4): 235–246. DOI: 10.1007/BF03173014
- Hall, Kira. 2013. "'It's a hijra!'. Queer linguistics revisited." *Discourse & Society* 24(5): 634–642. DOI: 10.1177/0957926513490321
- Harrington, Kate & Lia Litosseliti & Helen Sauntson & Jane Sunderland, eds. 2008. *Gender and language research methodologies*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Hellinger, Marlis. 2006. "Sexist language." In *Encyclopedia of language and linguistics: Volume XI*, ed. Edward K. Brown. Amsterdam: Elsevier, 265–272. DOI: 10.1016/B0-08-044854-2/01476-0
- Hellinger, Marlis. 2011. "Guidelines for non-discriminatory language use." In *The Sage handbook of sociolinguistics*, eds. Ruth Wodak & Barbara Johnstone & Paul Kerswill. London: Sage, 565–582. DOI: 10.4135/9781446200957.n38
- Hellinger, Marlis & Anne Pauwels. 2007. "Language and sexism." In *Handbook of language and communication: Diversity and change*, eds. Marlis Hellinger & Anne Pauwels. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 651–684.

- Henley, Nancy M. & Joselito Abueg. 2003. "A review and synthesis of research on comprehension of the masculine as a generic form in English." *Estudios de Sociolingüística* 4(2): 427–454.
- Holmes, Janet & Miriam Meyerhoff, eds. 2003. *The handbook of language and gender*. Oxford: Blackwell. DOI: 10.1002/9780470756942
- Holmes, Janet & Robert Sigley. 2002. "What's a word like *girl* doing in a place like this? Occupational labels, sexist usages and corpus research." In *New frontiers of corpus research. Papers from the Twenty First International Conference on English Language Research on Computerized Corpora, Sydney 2000*, eds. Pam Peters & Peter Collins & Adam Smith. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 247–263.
- Holmes, Janet & Robert Sigley & Agnes Terraschke. 2009. "From *chairman* to *chairwoman* to *chairperson*. Exploring the move from sexist usages to gender neutrality." In *Comparative studies in Australian and New Zealand English*, eds. Pam Peters & Peter Collins & Adam Smith. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 181–202. DOI: 10.1075/veaw.g39.11hol
- Hornscheidt, Antje Lann. 2011. "Feminist language politics in Europe." In *The languages and linguistics of Europe: A comprehensive guide*, eds. Bernd Kortmann & Johan van der Auwera. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton, 575–590.
- Irmen, Lisa & Julia Kurovskaja. 2010. "On the semantic content of grammatical gender and its impact on the representation of human referents." *Experimental Psychology* 57(5): 367–375. DOI: 10.1027/1618-3169/a000044
- Irmen, Lisa & Eva Schumann. 2011. "Processing grammatical gender of role nouns. Further evidence from eye movements." *Journal of Cognitive Psychology* 23(8): 998–1014. DOI: 10.1080/20445911.2011.596824
- Janse, Mark & Brian D. Joseph & Gunther de Vogelaer. 2011. "Changing gender systems. A multidisciplinary approach." *Folia Linguistica* 45(2): 237–244. DOI: 10.1515/flin.2011.010
- Johnsen, Ole Ringdal. 2008. "'He's a big old girl!' Negotiation by gender inversion in gay men's speech." *Journal of Homosexuality* 54(1/2): 150–168. DOI: 10.1080/00918360801952044
- Kennison, Shelia M. & Jessie L. Trofe. 2003. "Comprehending pronouns. A role for word-specific gender stereotype information." *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research* 32(3): 355–378. DOI: 10.1023/A:1023599719948
- Khan, Manizeh & Meredyth Daneman. 2011. "How readers spontaneously interpret *man*-suffix words. Evidence from eye movements." *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research* 40(5/6): 351–366. DOI: 10.1007/s10936-011-9173-3
- Keiner, Hamutal & Patrick Sturt & Simon Garrod. 2008. "Processing definitional and stereotypical gender in reference resolution. Evidence from eye-movements." *Journal of Memory and Language* 58(2): 239–261. DOI: 10.1016/j.jml.2007.09.003
- Kubaszczyk, Joanna. 2006. "Movierung und andere Wortbildungsmöglichkeiten sexusmarkierter Personenbezeichnungen im Polnischen und im Deutschen." *Deutsche Sprache* 34(3): 221–232.
- Lakoff, Robin. 1975. *Language and woman's place*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Lazovic, Vesna. 2009. "Cross-cultural semantic equivalence of some gender-related words." *English Language Overseas Perspectives and Enquiries* 6(1/2): 7–18.
- Leap, William L. 2015. "Review of *The handbook of language, gender, and sexuality*, eds. Susan Ehrlich & Miriam Meyerhoff & Janet Holmes. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell (2014)." *Journal of Language and Sexuality* 4(1): 175–183.
- Luraghi, Silvia. 2011. "The origin of the Proto-Indo-European gender system. Typological considerations." *Folia Linguistica* 45(2): 435–463. DOI: 10.1515/flin.2011.016

- Madson Laura & Jennifer Shoda. 2006. "Alternating between masculine and feminine pronouns. Does essay topic affect readers' perceptions?" *Sex Roles* 54(3/4): 275–286.
DOI: 10.1007/s11199-006-9344-0
- Maltz, Daniel N. & Ruth A. Borker. 1982. "A cultural approach to male-female miscommunication." In *Language and social identity*, ed. John J. Gumperz. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 195–216.
- McConnell-Ginet, Sally. 2003. "'What's in a name?' Social labeling and gender practices." In *The handbook of language and gender*, eds. Janet Holmes & Miriam Meyerhoff. Oxford: Blackwell, 69–97. DOI: 10.1002/9780470756942.ch3
- Miller, Megan M. & Lori E. James. 2009. "Is the generic pronoun *he* still comprehended as excluding women?" *American Journal of Psychology* 122(4): 483–496.
- Mills, Sara. 2004. "Third wave feminist linguistics and the analysis of sexism." *Discourse Analysis Online* 2: <http://www.shu.ac.uk/daol/articles/open/2003/001/mills2003001-paper.html> (26 September 2014).
- Mills, Sara. 2008. *Language and sexism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Misersky, Julia & Pascal M. Gygax & Paolo Canal & Ute Gabriel & Alan Garnham & Friederike Braun. 2014. "Norms on the gender perception of role nouns in Czech, English, French, German, Italian, Norwegian, and Slovak." *Behavior Research Methods* 46(3): 841–871.
- Mollin, Sandra. 2013. "Pathways of change in the diachronic development of binomial reversibility in Late Modern American English." *Journal of English Linguistics* 41(2): 168–203.
DOI: 10.1177/0075424213478980
- Moon, Rosamund. 2014. "From *gorgeous* to *grumpy*: Adjectives, age, and gender." *Gender and Language* 8(1): 5–41.
- Moser, Franziska & Sayaka Sato & Tania Chiarini & Karolina Dmitrow-Devold & Elisabeth Kuhn. 2011. *Comparative analysis of existing guidelines for gender-fair language within the ITN LCG network*. Bern: Language Cognition Gender – Marie Curie Initial Training Network.
- Motschenbacher, Heiko. 2008. "Structural linguistic gender categories and discursive materialization. A deconstructionist analysis." *Indiana University Working Papers in Linguistics* 7: 21–46.
- Motschenbacher, Heiko. 2010a. *Language, gender and sexual identity: Poststructuralist perspectives*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. DOI: 10.1075/impact.29
- Motschenbacher, Heiko. 2010b. "Female-as-norm (FAN): A typology of female and feminine generics." In *Language in its socio-cultural context: New explorations in gendered, global and media uses*, eds. Markus Bieswanger & Heiko Motschenbacher & Susanne Mühleisen. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 35–67.
- Motschenbacher, Heiko. 2012. *An interdisciplinary bibliography on language, gender and sexuality (2000–2011)*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. DOI: 10.1075/z.177
- Motschenbacher, Heiko. 2013. "Gentlemen before ladies? A corpus-based study of conjunct order in personal binomials." *Journal of English Linguistics* 41(3): 212–242.
DOI: 10.1177/0075424213489993
- Motschenbacher, Heiko. 2014. "Grammatical gender as a challenge for language policy: The (im)possibility of non-heteronormative language use in German versus English." *Language Policy* 13(3): 243–261. DOI: 10.1007/s10993-013-9300-0
- Motschenbacher, Heiko. forthcoming. "A discursive approach to structural gender linguistics: Initial considerations." In *Gender and the periphery: Grammatical and social gender from the margins*, eds. Julie Abbou & Fabienne Baider. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

- Oakhill, Jane & Alan Garnham & David Reynolds. 2005. "Immediate activation of stereotypical gender information." *Memory & Cognition* 33(6): 972–983. DOI: 10.3758/BF03193206
- Pauwels, Anne. 2003. "Linguistic sexism and feminist linguistic activism." In *The handbook of language and gender*, eds. Janet Holmes & Miriam Meyerhoff. Oxford: Blackwell, 550–570. DOI: 10.1002/9780470756942.ch24
- Pauwels, Anne. 2010. "Socially motivated language reform in a global lingua franca. The case of gender reform in English." In *Language in its socio-cultural context: New explorations in gendered, global and media uses*, eds. Markus Bieswanger & Heiko Motschenbacher & Susanne Mühleisen. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 21–33.
- Pauwels, Anne. 2011. "Planning for a global lingua franca. Challenges for feminist language planning in English(es) around the world." *Current Issues in Language Planning* 12(1): 9–19. DOI: 10.1080/14664208.2011.541386
- Pearce, Michael. 2008. "Investigating the collocational behaviour of MAN and WOMAN in the BNC using Sketch Engine." *Corpora* 3(1): 1–29. DOI: 10.3366/E174950320800004X
- Pettersson, Magnus. 2011. *Geschlechtsübergreifende Personenbezeichnungen. Eine Referenz- und Relevanzanalyse an Texten*. Tübingen: Narr.
- Posch, Claudia. 2011. "From *Aktieninhaberin* to *Freakin*. A corpus-based study on the usage of the suffix '-in' in German." In *Proceedings of the 6th Biennial International Gender and Language Association Conference IGALA 6*, eds. Claire Maree & Kyoko Satoh. Tokyo: Tsuda College, 301–315.
- Prewitt-Freilino, Jennifer L. & T. Andrew Caswell & Emmi K. Laakso. 2012. "The gendering of language. A comparison of gender equality in countries with gendered, natural gender, and genderless languages." *Sex Roles* 66(3/4): 268–281. DOI: 10.1007/s11199-011-0083-5
- Pyykkönen, Pirita & Jukka Hyönä & Roger P. van Gompel. 2010. "Activating gender stereotypes during online spoken language processing. Evidence from visual world eye tracking." *Experimental Psychology* 57(2): 126–133. DOI: 10.1027/1618-3169/a000016
- Queen, Robin. 2006. "Heterosexism and/in language." In *Encyclopedia of language and linguistics: Volume V*, ed. Edward K. Brown. Amsterdam: Elsevier, 289–292. DOI: 10.1016/B0-08-044854-2/01477-2
- Reynolds, David J. & Alan Garnham & Jane Oakhill. 2006. "Evidence of immediate activation of gender information from a social role name." *Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology* 59(5): 886–903. DOI: 10.1080/02724980543000088
- Sarrasin, Oriane & Ute Gabriel & Pascal Gyax. 2012. "Sexism and attitudes toward gender-neutral language. The case of English, French, and German." *Swiss Journal of Psychology* 71(3): 113–124. DOI: 10.1024/1421-0185/a000078
- Sato, Sayaka & Pascal M. Gyax & Ute Gabriel. 2013. "Gender inferences. Grammatical features and their impact on the representation of gender in bilinguals." *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition* 16(4): 792–807. DOI: 10.1017/S1366728912000739
- Schiller, Niels O. & Teresa Schuhmann & Alessia C. Neyndorff & Bernadette M. Jansmaa. 2006. "The influence of semantic category membership on syntactic decisions. A study using event-related brain potentials." *Brain Research* 1082: 153–164. DOI: 10.1016/j.brainres.2006.01.087
- 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.
- Schwarze, Brigitte. 2008. *Genus im Sprachvergleich. Klassifikation und Kongruenz im Spanischen, Französischen und Deutschen*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr.

- Siewierska, Anna. 2005. "Gender distinctions in independent personal pronouns." In *The world atlas of language structures*, eds. Martin Haspelmath, Matthew Dryer & David Gil & Bernard Comrie. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 182–185.
- Sigley, Robert & Janet Holmes. 2002. "Looking at girls in corpora of English." *Journal of English Linguistics* 30(2): 138–157. DOI: 10.1177/007242030002004
- Siyanova-Chanturia, Anna & Francesca Pesciarelli & Cristina Cacciari & Kevin Paterson. 2012. "The electrophysiological underpinnings of processing gender stereotypes in language." *PLoS ONE* 7(12): 1–11. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0048712
- Spender, Dale. 1980. *Man made language*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Steiger-Loerbroks, Vera & Lisa von Stockhausen. 2014. "Mental representations of gender-fair nouns in German legal language: An eye-movement and questionnaire-based study." *Linguistische Berichte* 237: 57–80.
- Tannen, Deborah. 1990. *You just don't understand. Women and men in conversation*. New York: William Morrow.
- Thorne, Barrie & Cheri Kramarae & Nancy Henley, eds. 1983. *Language, gender and society*. Rowley: Newbury House.
- Thüne, Eva-Maria & Simona Leonardi & Carla Bazzanella, eds. 2006. *Gender, language and new literacy: A multilingual analysis*. London: Continuum.
- van der Gucht, Fieke. 2003. "A corpus-based research on the formation of feminine function names in Dutch, German and English." In *PALC 2001. Practical applications in language corpora*, ed. Barbara Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 343–363.
- Vervecken, Dries & Bettina Hannover. 2012. "Ambassadors of gender equality? How use of pair forms versus masculines as generics impacts perception of the speaker." *European Journal of Social Psychology* 42(6): 754–762. DOI: 10.1002/ejsp.1893
- Vervecken, Dries & Bettina Hannover & Ilka Wolter. 2013. "Changing (s)expectations: How gender fair job descriptions impact children's perceptions and interest regarding traditionally male occupations." *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 82(3): 208–220. DOI: 10.1016/j.jvb.2013.01.008
- Wasserman, Benjamin D. & Allyson J. Weseley. 2009. "¿Qué? Quoi? Do languages with grammatical gender promote sexist attitudes?" *Sex Roles* 61(9/10): 634–643. DOI: 10.1007/s11199-009-9696-3
- Winter, Joanne & Anne Pauwels. 2006. "The personing of neutral inclusivity. Tracing the spread of person compounds in occupational naming." In *Selected papers from the 2005 Conference of the Australian Linguistic Society*, ed. Keith Allen. Victoria: Australian Linguistic Society, 1–12.

CROATIAN

Structural gender trouble in Croatian

Heiko Motschenbacher

Technical University of Braunschweig, Germany

Marija Weikert

University of Bamberg, Germany

1. Introduction
2. Categories of gender
 - 2.1 Lexical gender
 - 2.2 Grammatical gender
 - 2.3 Social gender
 - 2.4 Referential gender
 - 2.5 Androcentric generics
3. Gender-related structures
 - 3.1 Word-formation
 - 3.2 Agreement and pronominalisation
 - 3.3 Agreement and hybrid nouns
 - 3.4 “Masculine *a*-stems”
 - 3.5 Coordination and gender resolution
 - 3.6 Numerals
 - 3.7 Names
 - 3.8 Comparing Croatian with related varieties
4. Usage of personal reference forms
 - 4.1 Occupational titles
 - 4.2 Animal terms used for personal reference
 - 4.3 Address terms and marriage-related vocabulary
5. Language change and language reform
6. Conclusion

Notes

References

1. Introduction

Croatian is one of the successor languages of Serbo-Croatian that have gained national language status after the breakup of Yugoslavia in the early 1990s (alongside Bosnian, Montenegrin and Serbian). Linguistically speaking, the similarities between these national varieties are far more extensive than the differences. It is, of course, well known that the declaration of language status is a political rather than a linguistic business, and this is particularly well illustrated by Serbo-Croatian and its successor languages (cf. Škiljan 2000). Due to the extensive similarities between the varieties in question, it is also difficult to determine how many people speak Croatian or one of the other three varieties. The estimated number of native speakers within Croatia is four million. The Croatian diaspora in Europe, America and Australia consists of approximately one million speakers (Gvozdanić 2002: 134). As the structural differences between the four varieties do not systematically influence gender representation, they will not be discussed in detail here. Gender-relevant aspects in which these varieties differ are outlined in Section 3.8 below. Since the division of Yugoslavia, Croatian language policies have generally taken a path of differentiation from Bosnian, Montenegrin and Serbian, particularly on the lexical level (see Bugarski 2004; Greenberg 2004; Gröschel 2009; Tošović 2008–2010). There is a tendency for Bosnian to show more words of Turkish origin, for Serbian to show more borrowings from Western European languages (see Hentschel 2003), and for Croatian to create new words by reactivating extinct, originally Slavic lexical material (Alexander 2006: 402). Given the relatively recent independence of Montenegro from Serbia, Montenegrin language policies are still being developed (see Alexander 2006: 422f.).

Within Croatian, three major dialectal areas are distinguished: Čakavian (spoken on the Adriatic coast), Kajkavian (spoken in Western Croatia) and Štokavian (spoken in Central and Eastern Croatia), the latter of which forms the standard variety. Typologically speaking, Croatian belongs to the South Slavic branch of the Indo-European language family (besides Bosnian, Bulgarian, Macedonian, Montenegrin, Serbian and Slovenian). It distinguishes the three nominal classes masculine, feminine and neuter and is, therefore, a grammatical gender language. Croatian is a highly inflected, fusional language, which means that several grammatical functions are normally expressed by one inflectional ending. Nouns, pronouns and adjectives are inflected for the following grammatical categories: three genders, two numbers (singular, plural), and seven cases (nominative, genitive, dative, accusative, vocative, locative, instrumental). Adjectives are additionally inflected for comparison and definiteness. As is typical of Slavic languages, articles do not exist in Croatian. Verbs are inflected according to person, number, tense, mood and aspect, verbal participles also according to gender. Subject pronouns

are only used when stressed, making Croatian a pro-drop language. As is common in highly inflected languages, word order is relatively free, but there is a strict rule dictating that enclitics (short forms of pronouns and of the copula verb *biti* 'be', the future auxiliary, interrogative and reflexive particles) occupy the second position within a clause.

2. Categories of gender

2.1 Lexical gender

Lexical gender describes a denotative characteristic of personal reference forms, namely whether they contain the semantic feature female, male or gender-neutral. The semantic gender information manifest in lexically gendered nouns represents a direct gender index and is perceptually salient when compared with that of grammatical or social gender (see Sections 2.2 and 2.3). A psycholinguistic study on the lexical processing of Serbian nouns, for example, found that animate nouns that come in lexically gendered pairs (e.g. *brat* 'brother' – *sestra* 'sister'; *kralj* 'king' – *kraljica* 'queen') are processed faster than other animate nouns (e.g. *mornar* 'sailor') or inanimate nouns (e.g. *knjiga* 'book'; Radanović & Milin 2011). Within the lexical field of personal nouns, there are certain subfields that are particularly likely to contain lexically female and male forms: general nouns denoting female and male persons, kinship terms, address terms, nobility titles, nouns denoting romantic partners, and nouns denoting sexual roles. Table 1 illustrates each of these categories with Croatian examples.

In all subfields identified in Table 1, lexically male and female forms predominate. Gender-neutral alternatives do not usually exist. Exceptions are the nouns *dijete* 'child' (a lexically gender-neutral alternative to *kći* 'daughter' and *sin* 'son'), and the forms *osoba* 'person' and *ljudi* 'people' (which can be considered gender-neutral alternatives to *žena* 'woman' and *muškarac* 'man'). Note that in the subfield of terms denoting romantic partners, Table 1 lists only marriage-related terms. However, terms that are used to refer to one's romantic partner before marriage are also generally lexically gendered. Usually terms denoting young women (*djevojka*) or young men (*momak*, *mladić*, *dečko*) are used for this purpose (often in connection with a possessive pronoun, literally meaning 'my girl/boy').

In some categories, one finds semantic asymmetries between female and male terms, with the female terms often being more negative in their connotations (see Lazović 2009). For example, there are more informal or slang terms to denote a female person in general (e.g. *ženska* 'wench', *cura* 'chick', *komad* 'babe, female hottie') or a promiscuous woman (e.g. *kurva*, *drolja* both 'whore', *kurtizana*

Table 1. Lexically gendered Croatian personal nouns

Lexically female	Lexically male
General human nouns	
<i>žena</i> 'woman'	<i>muškarac</i> 'man'
<i>djevojka</i> 'girl'	<i>momak</i> 'young man'
<i>djevojčica</i> 'little girl'	<i>mladić</i> 'young man'
	<i>dječak</i> 'boy'
informal/derogatory:	informal:
<i>ženska</i> 'wench'	<i>frajer</i> 'cool guy'
<i>cura</i> 'chick'	
<i>komad</i> 'babe, female hottie'	
Kinship terms	
<i>majka</i> 'mother'	<i>otac</i> 'father'
<i>kći</i> 'daughter'	<i>sin</i> 'son'
<i>sestra</i> 'sister'	<i>brat</i> 'brother'
<i>teta</i> 'aunt, sister of parent'	<i>tetak</i> 'uncle, husband of parent's sister'
<i>ujna</i> 'aunt, wife of maternal uncle'	<i>ujak</i> 'maternal uncle'
<i>strina</i> 'aunt, wife of paternal uncle'	<i>stric</i> 'paternal uncle'
<i>nećakinja</i> 'niece'	<i>nećak</i> 'nephew'
<i>sestrična</i> 'female cousin'	<i>bratić</i> 'male cousin'
Address terms	
<i>gospođa</i> 'Mrs, lady'	<i>gospodin</i> 'Mr, gentleman'
<i>gospođica</i> 'Miss'	
<i>drugarica</i> 'female comrade'	<i>drug</i> 'male comrade'
Nobility titles	
<i>kraljica</i> 'queen'	<i>kralj</i> 'king'
<i>kraljevna</i> 'crown princess'	<i>kraljević</i> 'crown prince'
<i>princeza</i> 'princess'	<i>princ</i> 'prince'
<i>kneginja</i> 'princess'	<i>knez</i> 'prince'
<i>vojvotkinja</i> 'duchess'	<i>vojvoda</i> 'duke'
<i>grofica</i> 'countess'	<i>grof</i> 'count'
Nouns denoting romantic partners	
<i>žena</i> 'wife'	<i>muž</i> 'husband'
<i>supruga</i> 'wife'	<i>suprug</i> 'husband'
<i>zaručnica</i> 'fiancée'	<i>zaručnik</i> 'fiance'
<i>udovica</i> 'widow'	<i>udovac</i> 'widower'
<i>mlada</i> 'bride'	<i>mladoženja</i> 'bridegroom'
Nouns denoting sexual roles	
<i>ljubavnica</i> 'female lover'	<i>ljubavnik</i> 'male lover'
<i>kurva</i> 'whore'	<i>kazanova</i> 'casanova'
<i>prostitutka</i> 'female prostitute'	<i>plejboy</i> 'playboy'
<i>drolja</i> 'whore'	<i>žigolo</i> 'gigolo'
<i>koketa</i> 'coquette'	<i>bonvivan</i> 'playboy'
<i>zavodnica</i> 'female seducer'	<i>zavodnik</i> 'male seducer'
<i>zabavljačica</i> 'playgirl'	<i>zabavljač</i> 'playboy'
<i>kurtizana</i> 'courtesan'	<i>ženskaroš</i> 'lady killer'

'courtesan'), while similar male terms are less negative or even positive (e.g. *frajer* 'cool guy', *plejboj*, *bonvivan* both 'playboy', *žigolo* 'gigolo').

For some lexically gendered word pairs, female and male forms are morphologically unrelated (i.e. different roots are used; e.g. *žena* 'woman' and *muškarac* 'man'; *majka* 'mother' – *otac* 'father'). With morphologically related terms, one largely finds two configurations. Either female and male terms are equally morphologically complex, i.e. the two terms show, for example, different derivational affixes (e.g. *zaručnica* 'fiancée' – *zaručnik* 'fiancé', *kraljevna* 'crown princess' – *kraljević* 'crown prince'), or the female term is derived from the male form and therefore morphologically marked (e.g. *drug* 'male comrade' – *drugarica* 'female comrade', *grof* 'count' – *grofica* 'countess'). (For a discussion of the exceptional form *mladoženja* 'bridegroom', see Section 4.3.)

Completely gender-neutral personal nouns are exceptional in Croatian. They are systematically used to talk about children (see Section 2.2). Otherwise, many grammatically masculine personal nouns exist, whose meaning oscillates between male-specific and (pseudo-)generic functions (e.g. *liječnik* 'doctor', *student* 'student', *učitelj* 'teacher'). What distinguishes these forms from those listed in Table 1 is the fact that they do not invariably carry a male-specific meaning, even though this meaning can be contextually activated. When masculine personal nouns are coordinated with lexically female nouns, for example, their male meaning potential predominates (for example in *studenti i studentice* 'student.MASC.PL and female student.FEM.PL', hence 'male and female students').

2.2 Grammatical gender

Most Croatian nouns have one inherent grammatical gender value: masculine, feminine or neuter.¹ The grammatical gender of a noun triggers agreement in various types of satellite elements (see Section 3.2), notably in pronouns, adjectives and participles. Grammatical gender assignment is both semantically and morphologically conditioned (see Wechsler & Zlatić 2000). The attribution of a certain grammatical gender to a declension class is a matter of default and may not be applicable to individual nouns within the respective class. Most nouns ending in a consonant are masculine (e.g. *student* 'student', *most* 'bridge'; declension class I). These nouns do not possess an inflectional ending in the nominative singular.² Nouns with the inflectional ending *-a* in the nominative singular are generally grammatically feminine (e.g. *studentica* 'female student', *knjiga* 'book'; declension class II) and nouns with the inflectional ending *-o* or *-e* are neuter (e.g. *selo* 'village', *kazalište* 'theatre'; declension class IV). Apart from nominative and accusative case forms, the masculine declension class I and the neuter declension

class IV are identical in their inflections, which means that the greater formal contrast is between feminine and masculine/neuter nouns.³

There is also a smaller declension class of feminine nouns ending in a consonant (e.g. *stvar* 'thing', *ljubav* 'love'; declension class III), which only contains very few personal nouns.⁴ To this class belong feminine collective personal nouns ending in the suffix *-ad* (*momčad* 'male team'; *unučad* 'group of grandchildren'). Contrary to the other feminine declension (declension class II), declension class III is today no longer productive, i.e. when new feminine nouns are created or borrowed, they are incorporated into declension class II.

Within the masculine gender class, one can identify two subgenera (Corbett 1991: 161–164) that are only distinct in the accusative singular, where animate and inanimate nouns have different inflections (e.g. *vidim student-a* vs. *vidim most-Ø*, 'I see [a] student/bridge-ACC').

Grammatical gender assignment is at least partly semantically motivated in certain subfields of the nominal lexicon. One study found, for example, that nouns denoting fruits are predominantly grammatically feminine, while nouns denoting vegetables are more likely to be grammatically masculine (Mirković & Macdonald & Seidenberg 2005: 148). Within the lexical field of personal nouns, grammatical gender assignment is also clearly semantically motivated, i.e. female

Table 2. Croatian declension classes

Case	Decl. class I Masculine	Decl. class II Feminine	Decl. class III Feminine	Decl. class IV Neuter
Singular				
Nominative	<i>muškarac</i> 'man'	<i>žen-a</i> 'woman'	<i>stvar</i> 'thing'	<i>sel-o</i> 'village' (or <i>-e</i>)
Genitive	<i>muškarc-a</i>	<i>žen-e</i>	<i>stvar-i</i>	<i>sel-a</i>
Dative	<i>muškarc-u</i>	<i>žen-i</i>	<i>stvar-i</i>	<i>sel-u</i>
Accusative	<i>muškarc-a</i> (inanimate nouns: <i>-Ø</i>)	<i>žen-u</i>	<i>stvar</i>	<i>sel-o</i> (or <i>-e</i>)
Vocative	<i>muškarč-e</i>	<i>žen-o</i>	<i>stvar-i</i>	<i>sel-o</i> (or <i>-e</i>)
Locative	<i>muškarc-u</i>	<i>žen-i</i>	<i>stvar-i</i>	<i>sel-u</i>
Instrumental	<i>muškarc-em</i>	<i>žen-om</i>	<i>stvar-i/ju</i>	<i>sel-om</i>
Plural				
Nominative	<i>muškarc-i</i>	<i>žen-e</i>	<i>stvar-i</i>	<i>sel-a</i>
Genitive	<i>muškarac-a</i>	<i>žen-a</i>	<i>stvar-i</i>	<i>sel-a</i>
Dative	<i>muškarc-ima</i>	<i>žen-ama</i>	<i>stvar-ima</i>	<i>sel-ima</i>
Accusative	<i>muškarc-e</i>	<i>žen-e</i>	<i>stvar-i</i>	<i>sel-a</i>
Vocative	<i>muškarc-i</i>	<i>žen-e</i>	<i>stvar-i</i>	<i>sel-a</i>
Locative	<i>muškarc-ima</i>	<i>žen-ama</i>	<i>stvar-ima</i>	<i>sel-ima</i>
Instrumental	<i>muškarc-ima</i>	<i>žen-ama</i>	<i>stvar-ima</i>	<i>sel-ima</i>

personal nouns show a strong tendency to be grammatically feminine and nouns that have a male meaning potential (for example, in coordination with female nouns) have a strong tendency to be grammatically masculine. If morphological and semantic criteria do not match, semantic assignment takes precedence. This is the case, for example, with personal names like *Nikola* or *Luka*, which end in *-a* (normally evidence for feminine grammatical gender) but are lexically male and therefore require masculine agreement in satellites (e.g. *Nikola je došao* ‘Nikola has come.MASC’).

But there are also some personal nouns that do not follow either of the two patterns “female equals feminine” and “(potentially) male equals masculine”. Among these are epicene nouns, i.e. personal nouns that have a fixed grammatical gender value but are lexically gender-neutral (e.g. feminine *beba* ‘baby’, *osoba* ‘person’, *žrtva* ‘victim’; masculine *ljudi* ‘people’, *talac* ‘hostage’; neuter *dijete* ‘child’, *čeljade* ‘person’). These can easily be used for male referents, female referents or mixed-gender groups (e.g. *On je beba*. ‘he is [a] baby.FEM’; *Ov-e žene su zgodn-i ljudi*. ‘these-FEM women.FEM are nice-MASC people.MASC’).

Only few personal nouns are grammatically neuter. They usually denote children (e.g. *dijete* ‘child’, *kopile* ‘illegitimate child’), and most of them contain the diminutive suffix *-če* (e.g. *siročē* ‘orphan’, *unuče* ‘grandchild’, *nahoče* ‘foundling’, *novorođenče* ‘newborn’, *nedonošče* ‘preterm newborn’). This represents evidence for the fact that in Croatian (as in many other languages) age takes precedence over sex in the conceptualisation of children (Mladenova 2001). Furthermore, some neuter participle forms ending in *-lo* are used as personal nouns (e.g. *pričalo* ‘tattler’, *njuškalo* ‘nark’), even though they would today largely be considered as Serbian forms and, therefore, no longer compatible with standard Croatian.

Some personal nouns do not have plural forms but resort to collective nouns instead (suppletive plurals). Examples of such collective nouns are *djeca* ‘group of children’ (*dijete* ‘child’), *braća* ‘group of brothers’ (*brat* ‘brother’), *gospoda* ‘group of gentlemen’ (*gospodin* ‘gentleman’) and *vlastela* ‘group of lairds’ (*vlastelin* ‘laird’). These collective nouns are grammatically speaking feminine singular, but lexically male (*braća*, *gospoda*, *vlastela*) or gender-neutral (*djeca*). (On their agreement behaviour, see Section 3.3.)

2.3 Social gender

The concept of social gender relates to semantic gendering on the connotative level. Even though personal nouns may be lexically gender-neutral on the denotative level, the professions or roles they denote may be stereotypically associated with women or men. In languages without a grammatical masculine-feminine

contrast, this may affect pronominalisation in non-specific contexts (cf. English *any model – she; any professor – he*). In grammatical gender languages like Croatian, social gender is less likely to affect agreement patterns, because it is regularly overridden by grammatical gender (e.g. *profesor – on* ‘professor.MASC – he’; *profesorica – ona* ‘female professor.FEM – she’). This does not mean, however, that social gender does not have any linguistic consequences.

Many occupational nouns traditionally show a male bias in the sense that men are more typically associated with the respective professions than women (e.g. *kovač* ‘blacksmith’, *krovopokrivač* ‘tiler’, *kamenorezac* ‘stonemason’). It seems that the stronger this socially male bias is for a certain masculine personal noun, the weaker is the tendency to create a female-specific counterpart (cf. *vojnîk* ‘soldier’, with the female form *vojnîkinja* being much more rarely used). For (often lower-status) professions stereotypically associated with women, one may also find feminine forms without a corresponding masculine form (e.g. *domaćica* ‘female housekeeper’,⁵ *pralja* ‘laundress’, *primalja* ‘midwife’, *švelja* ‘seamstress’). The masculine form *model* ‘model’, on the other hand, cannot be feminised (there is no form **modelica*), because the social gender of the noun is so strong that a female specification would seem redundant. Nouns denoting criminals are strongly socially male and, therefore, do not usually have a corresponding female counterpart (e.g. *ubojica* ‘killer’, *lopov* ‘thief’).

2.4 Referential gender

Referential gender describes whether a certain linguistic form is used in a given context for female, male, mixed-sex or gender-indefinite reference. For referential gender, a similar – though less stringent – relationship to grammatical gender can be set up as for lexical gender: Male beings are most of the time identified by means of masculine personal reference forms, whereas female beings show a stronger tendency to be referred to with feminine forms. It is, however, obvious that the link between feminine grammatical and female referential gender is weaker than the one between masculine grammatical and male referential gender. This is the case because women are much more likely to be referred to by means of masculine forms than men are by feminine forms, which points to an asymmetry in the use of masculine and feminine personal reference forms. While masculine forms can generally be used to refer to men as well as mixed-gender groups (and are therefore in many contexts ambiguous), feminine forms can often only be used for female reference (feminine epicenes forming an exception). The referential potential of Croatian masculine personal reference forms is commonly even

extended to female-specific contexts, for example when women use them to talk about themselves (a common practice in the light of the pejoration typically found with derived female nouns; see Section 3.1).

In syntactic constructions which do not involve a head noun that could trigger agreement, referential gender is responsible for the choice of grammatically masculine or feminine forms in adjectives and participles. This is true for self-reference (1a), when talking to an addressee (1b) or when talking about a third person (1c):

(1) Referential gender in Croatian adjectives (singular)

- a. Petar: “*Umoran sam.*”
 tired.MASC.SG be.1SG
 ‘I am tired.’
 Marija: “*Umorn-a sam.*”
 tired-FEM.SG be.1SG
 ‘I am tired.’
- b. *Bio si umoran.*
 been.MASC.SG be.2SG tired.MASC.SG
 ‘You were tired.’ (said to a man)
Bil-a si umorn-a.
 been-FEM.SG be.2SG tired-FEM.SG
 ‘You were tired.’ (said to a woman)
- c. *Umoran je.*
 tired.MASC.SG be.3SG
 ‘He is tired.’
Umorn-a je.
 tired-FEM.SG be.3SG
 ‘She is tired.’

The fact that referential gender affects agreement has far-reaching consequences for gender representation. It is difficult to talk about oneself, an addressee or another individual in a gender-neutral fashion (cf. also Symons 2006). This is a common situation for third-person references in many other languages (due to the use of gendered personal nouns and third-person pronouns). An enforcement of genderisation in the first and second person as in Croatian, however, is less frequently found across languages.

For all-female and all-male groups, these patterns also hold in the plural. However, when a mixed-sex group is referred to, masculine plural forms are used, just as they would be used for a male group. (For similar pseudo-generic uses of the masculine grammatical gender, see Section 2.5.)

(2) Referential gender in Croatian adjectives (plural)

- a. *Bil-i* *ste* *umorn-i*.
 been-MASC.PL be.2PL tired-MASC.PL
 ‘You were tired.’ (said to a male or mixed-sex group)
- b. *Bil-e* *ste* *umorn-e*.
 been-FEM.PL be.2PL tired-FEM.PL
 ‘You were tired.’ (said to a female group)

Croatian has a T/V distinction in second person pronouns. While the pronoun *ti* is used in informal contexts (for example, with friends and family members), the polite form *Vi* (originally a second person plural pronoun) is used in formal contexts. While the referential gender of the addressee is also reflected in the satellite forms of the pronoun *ti* (if it is used at all; cf. (1b) above), only masculine forms can be used in connection with *Vi*, no matter whether the addressee is female or male:

- (3) *Vi* *ste* *bil-i* *umorn-i*.
 2PL be.2PL been-MASC.PL tired-MASC.PL
 ‘You were tired.’ (polite, said to a man or a woman)

Linguistic gender crossing has different implications, depending on the direction of crossing. The use of female or feminine forms to refer to men is usually highly marked and perceived as stigmatising, for example when a man is ridiculed as being a ‘girl’ (*djevojka*), ‘wench’ (*ženska*) or ‘pussy’ (*pizda*) – common forms of all-male banter. The use of masculine and male forms in reference to women is much less likely to be considered a marked usage, because female-specific uses of androcentric generics are regular practice. In most cases, such practices do not possess the subversive force typically associated with gender crossing. In fact, they are frequently perceived to be positive, for example when a feminine occupational title would have more negative connotations than its masculine counterpart. Bertoša (2006:233) also notes the use of forms like *sine* and *sinko* (lit. ‘son.voc’) as an affectionate, positively connotated way to refer to a woman (roughly in the sense of ‘darling’), whereas the female form *kćeri* (‘daughter.voc’) cannot be used to address men in a similarly positive fashion.

2.5 Androcentric generics

Another systematic mismatch between grammatical/lexical and referential gender can be found in the area of androcentric generics, i.e. masculine and/or male forms that are used to refer to groups of mixed or unknown gender (and at times

even to women exclusively). For example, plural forms of masculine personal nouns are regularly used in generic sentences, while the use of feminine nouns is invariably taken to be female-specific:

(4) Non-specific plural constructions

- a. *Liječnici mora-ju mnogo radi-ti.*
 doctor.MASC.PL must-3PL much work-INF
 ‘(Male) Doctors must work a lot.’
- b. *Liječnice mora-ju mnogo radi-ti.*
 female doctor.FEM.PL must-3PL much work-INF
 ‘Female doctors must work a lot.’

Even though the psycholinguistic dimension of Croatian masculine generics has so far not been explored, abundant cross-linguistic evidence suggests that such forms are likely to be perceived as male rather than as generic (see, for example, Braun & Sczesny & Stahlberg 2005 for German, which has a similar tripartite grammatical gender system).

As derived feminine personal nouns do in many cases carry more negative connotations than their masculine bases or do not exist at all, women are regularly identified by means of masculine personal nouns. Such usages are, of course, no longer generic in the strict sense of the word. They rather constitute specific cross-gender references:

(5) Masculine forms used for female-specific reference

- a. *Marija Radović je predsjednik komiteta.*
 Marija Radović be.3SG president.MASC committee.GEN
 ‘Marija Radović is the president of the committee.’
- b. Marija: *“Predsjednik sam komiteta.”*
 president.MASC be.1SG committee.GEN
 ‘I am the president of the committee.’

In both examples in (5), the female noun *predsjednica* ‘female president’ can also be used, but the use of the masculine form is equally common. Of course, both androcentric generics and specific cross-gender uses have for a long time been criticised by feminist linguists and, as a consequence of this linguistic activism, become less common nowadays.

Generic masculine forms may also occur when satellite elements agree with gender-indefinite pronouns. For example, the interrogative pronoun *tko* ‘who’, the indefinite pronoun *netko* ‘someone’ and the negative indefinite pronoun *nitko* ‘no one’ generally trigger masculine agreement, even in female-specific contexts, as illustrated in (6):

- (6) Masculine agreement with gender-neutral pronouns
- a. *Tko je bio trudan?*
 who be.3SG been.MASC.SG pregnant.MASC.SG
 ‘Who was pregnant?’
 - b. *Netko je bio trudan.*
 someone be.3SG been.MASC.SG pregnant.MASC.SG
 ‘Someone was pregnant.’
 - c. *Nitko ni-je bio trudan.*
 no one NEG-be.3SG been.MASC.SG pregnant.MASC.SG
 ‘No one was pregnant.’

The use of feminine forms in such contexts (e.g. **Tko je bila trudna?*) is normatively not permitted.

An example of a male generic is the noun *čovjek*, whose lexical meanings include ‘man’ as well as ‘human being’ (Kordić 2002: 175). As a consequence, both of the following sentences are possible: *On je atraktivan čovjek*. ‘He is an attractive man/person.’ and *Ona je atraktivan čovjek*. ‘She is an attractive person.’ While the meaning of *čovjek* is gender-neutral in the latter sentence, it is in principle ambiguous (male or gender-neutral) in the former, though the male meaning is salient in such contexts of specific reference. In contexts in which *čovjek* co-occurs with *žena* ‘woman’, it is clear that its male meaning potential takes precedence (e.g. *jedan čovjek i jedna žena* ‘one man and one woman’; cf. Hentschel 2003: 291). Non-specific uses lend themselves more easily to generic reference and may also occur in contexts that are clearly female (Kordić 2002: 178):

- (7) *Tako čovjek lakše može ostati trudan.*
 so man more easily can.3SG become pregnant.MASC.SG
 ‘One can more easily become pregnant this way.’

Another example of a male generic form is the collective noun *momčad* ‘team’, which is a derivation of the lexically male noun *momče* ‘lad’. It is commonly used to talk about male, mixed-gender and female teams. The national Croatian women’s soccer team, for example, is called *Hrvatska ženska nogometna momčad* (lit. ‘Croatian female football group of lads’).

3. Gender-related structures

3.1 Word-formation

Word-formation is an important mechanism that can be employed to make women linguistically more visible. In principle, two major processes are available for this purpose in Croatian, compounding and derivation, but they are not equally common for female specification.

Compounding is a common word-formation process in Croatian, also for personal nouns. The two potentially free morphemes are normally joined by a linking vowel *-o-* (as in *vatrogasac* 'firefighter' < *vatra* 'fire' + *gasiti* 'to extinguish'; *knjigovezac* 'bookbinder' < *knjiga* 'book' + *vezati* 'to bind'). However, compounding is not commonly used for gender specification. Some evidence of the existence of such forms can be found in a survey by Maček (1993), in which the participants in a questionnaire study produced the following forms: *djevojke vojnici* lit. 'girls soldiers' (p. 101), *žene biciklisti* lit. 'women bicyclists' (p. 103), *drugarica pedagog* lit. 'female comrade pedagogue' (p. 105). Other forms in occasional use include *žena dekan* (lit. 'woman dean') or *žena vatrogasac* (lit. 'woman firefighter'). However, all of these forms now compete with derived alternatives. The formation of such female compounds is connected to the social gender of the masculine base nouns. Female compounds are more likely to be formed with nouns that denote stereotypically male professions. Similar male compounds have not been documented in the research literature.

Derivation, on the other hand, is a highly productive process for the creation of female nouns in Croatian. Masculine personal nouns commonly serve as bases for such derivations. Especially in the lexical fields of occupational titles and personal ethnonyms, female derivation is common. The derivation of male nouns from feminine nouns does not occur, which ultimately leads to a situation in which it is invariably female nouns which are morphologically marked.

Croatian possesses a number of suffixes to derive personal nouns. The masculine derivations are most commonly deverbal nouns that involve agentive suffixes (e.g. *-ac*, *-ač*, *-ič*, *-ik*, *-lac*, *-nik*, *-telj*). But denominal (for example, with *-anin*, *-ar*, *-aš*) and deadjectival (for example, with *-ac*, *-ak*, *-ik*) formations also exist:

(8) Croatian suffixes used for the derivation of masculine personal nouns

- ac* deverbal: *glumac* 'actor' (*glumiti* 'to act'), *pisac* 'writer' (*pisati* 'to write'),
sudac 'judge' (*suditi* 'to judge')
- deadjectival: *starac* 'old man' (star 'old'), *mudrac* 'wise person' (*mudar*
'wise'), *svetac* 'saint' (*svet* 'holy')

- ač *plesač* ‘dancer’ (*plesati* ‘to dance’), *krojač* ‘tailor’ (*krojiti* ‘to tailor’), *vozač* ‘driver’ (*voziti* ‘to drive’)
- ak *ljevak* ‘left-handed person’ (*lijevi* ‘left’), *luđak* ‘crazy person’ (*lud* ‘crazy’), *čudak* ‘strange person’ (*čudan* ‘strange’)
- anin *Parižanin* ‘Parisian’ (*Pariz* ‘Paris’), *građanin* ‘citizen’ (*grad* ‘city’), *kršćanin* ‘Christian’ (*Krist* ‘Christ’)
- ar
denominal: *pekar* ‘baker’ (*peč* ‘oven’), *slikar* ‘painter’ (*slika* ‘picture’), *zubar* ‘dentist’ (*zub* ‘tooth’)
deverbal: *zidar* ‘mason’ (*zidati* ‘to lay bricks’), *vladar* ‘ruler’ (*vladati* ‘to rule’), *čuvar* ‘guard’ (*čuvati* ‘to guard’)
- aš *gajdaš* ‘bagpipe player’ (*gajde* ‘bagpipe’), *košarkaš* ‘basketball player’ (*košarka* ‘basketball’), *nogometaš* ‘football player’ (*nogomet* ‘football’)
- ič *vodič* ‘guide’ (*voditi* ‘to guide’), *branitelj* ‘defender’ (*braniti* ‘to defend’ [in football]), *gonič* ‘cattle driver’ (*goniti* ‘to drive’)
- ik *umjetnik* ‘artist’ (*umjetan* ‘artificial’), *vojnici* ‘soldier’ (*vojni* ‘war-related’), *radnik* ‘worker’ (*radni* ‘work-related’)
- nik *govornik* ‘speaker’ (*govoriti* ‘to speak’), *učenik* ‘pupil’ (*učiti* ‘to study’), *dopisnik* ‘correspondent’ (*dopisivati se* ‘to correspond’)
- telj *učitelj* ‘teacher’ (*učiti* ‘to teach’), *prevoditelj* ‘translator’ (*prevoditi* ‘to translate’), *skladatelj* ‘composer’ (*skladati* ‘to compose’)

Not all of these masculine suffixes are still productive (-ač, -ak, -anin, -aš, and -ič can no longer be used to create new nouns). Moreover, some masculine suffixes cannot normally be combined with female ones (e.g. -ac, -ič).

Three productive suffixes are available for creating female personal nouns: -ica, -(k)inja and -ka, with the latter being much more common in Serbian but still occasionally used in Croatian. One and the same base may take several of these suffixes, resulting in alternative forms such as *studentica* and *studentkinja* (both ‘female student’), or *psihologica* and *psihologinja* (both ‘female psychologist’). In many cases, there are regional preferences for one or the other form (see Section 3.8).

The derivation of female nouns shows three patterns. First, the female suffix can be attached to an already derived masculine personal noun (resulting in secondary female derivation), as in (9a). Second, it can replace the derivational suffix of the masculine noun, as in (9b). The last pattern involves female suffixes that are neither added to a masculine suffix nor replace a masculine suffix, as in (9c). The first and third of these processes lead to asymmetrical patterns, according to which women are (additionally) morphologically marked, whereas the second process creates morphologically symmetrical pairs of personal nouns.

(9) Usage patterns of Croatian female derivational suffixes

- a. *-ica* added to *-ač* *krojač* (m) 'tailor' – *krojač-ica* (f) 'female tailor'
vozač (m) 'driver' – *vozač-ica* (f) 'female driver'
plesač (m) 'dancer' – *plesač-ica* (f) 'female dancer'
- ica* added to *-ar* *pekar* (m) 'baker' – *pekar-ica* (f) 'female baker'
slikar (m) 'painter' – *slikar-ica* (f) 'female painter'
zubar (m) 'dentist' – *zubar-ica* (f) 'female dentist'
- ica* added to *-aš* *sportaš* (m) 'sportsman' – *sportaš-ica* (f) 'sportswoman'
odbojkaš (m) 'volleyball player' – *odbojkaš-ica* (f) 'female volleyball player'
nogometaš (f) 'football player' – *nogometaš-ica* (f) 'female football player'
- ica* added to *-telj* *prevoditelj* (m) 'translator' – *prevoditelj-ica* (f) 'female translator'
skladatelj (m) 'composer' – *skladatelj-ica* (f) 'female composer'
učitelj (m) 'teacher' – *učitelj-ica* (f) 'female teacher'
- ka* added to *-ar* *fizičar* (m) 'physicist' – *fizičar-ka* (f) 'female physicist'
bolničar (m) 'nurse' – *bolničar-ka* (f) 'female nurse'
knjižničar (m) 'librarian' – *knjižničar-ka* (f) 'female librarian'⁶
- b. *-ica* replacing *-ac* *glum-ac* (m) 'actor' – *glum-ica* (f) 'actress'
svet-ac (m) 'saint' – *svet-ica* (f) 'female saint'
star-ac (m) 'old person' – *star-ica* (f) 'old woman'
- ica* replacing *-ik* *činovn-ik* (m) 'clerk' – *činovn-ica* (f) 'female clerk'
radn-ik (m) 'worker' – *radn-ica* (f) 'female worker'
umjetn-ik (m) 'artist' – *umjetn-ica* (f) 'female artist'
- ka* replacing *-ac* *Bosan-ac* (m) 'Bosnian' – *Bosan-ka* (f) 'Bosnian woman'
Amerikan-ac (m) 'American' – *Amerikan-ka* (f) 'American woman'
policaj-ac (m) 'police officer' – *policaj-ka* (f) 'policewoman'
- c. *-ica* *student* (m) 'student' – *student-ica* (f) 'female student'
profesor (m) 'professor' – *profesor-ica* (f) 'female professor'
Hrvat (m) 'Croat' – *Hrvat-ica* (f) 'female Croat'
- inja* *rob* (m) 'slave' – *rob-inja* (f) 'female slave'
psiholog (m) 'psychologist' – *psiholog-inja* (f) 'female psychologist'
Čeh (m) 'Czech' – *Čeh-inja* (f) 'Czech woman'
- ka* *premijer* (m) 'prime minister' – *premijer-ka* (f) 'female prime minister'
inženjer (m) 'engineer' – *inženjer-ka* (f) 'female engineer'
kancelar (m) 'chancellor' – *kancelar-ka* (f) 'female chancellor'

-kinja *kandidat* (m) ‘candidate’ – *kandidat-kinja* (f) ‘female candidate’
Rus (m) ‘Russian’ – *Rus-kinja* (f) ‘female Russian’
vojvoda (m) ‘duke’ – *vojvot-kinja* (f) ‘duchess’

In some cases, only a masculine form exists. This is a regular phenomenon for strongly socially male professional terms (e.g. *brijač* ‘barber’, *strojar* ‘mechanic’, *dialektolog* ‘dialectologist’), even though more and more female forms are being created (for example, new formations like *inženjerka* ‘female engineer’ or *programerka* ‘female programmer’). In some cases, the formation of a female noun through derivation is blocked by the fact that such formations already exist but do not denote a female person but something else (e.g. *mornar* ‘sailor’ – *mornar-ica* ‘navy’, *zamjenik* ‘deputy’ – *zamjen-ica* ‘pronoun’). This problem is sometimes evaded by using the (predominantly Serbian) suffix *-ka* instead of *-ica* (e.g. *stanar* ‘tenant’ – *stanar-ka* ‘female tenant’ vs. *stanar-ica* ‘non-migratory bird’, *sanjar* ‘dreamer’ – *sanjar-ka* ‘female dreamer’ vs. *sanjar-ica* ‘dream interpretation book’).

Some low-status occupations, by contrast, only have a feminine form and no corresponding masculine form, even though the feminine noun morphologically looks like a derivation (e.g. *domaćica* ‘housewife’, but no **domać*; *babica* ‘midwife’, but no **bab*). Still, it is also evident that language change is underway: While Savić (1985: 4) stated twenty years ago that the noun *čistačica* ‘cleaning lady’ had no masculine counterpart, the masculine form *čistač* ‘cleaner’ is today in use.

Semantic asymmetries between masculine and derived feminine personal nouns are sometimes found, with the feminine forms regularly carrying lower prestige. However, as more and more such derived female nouns are created, female specification is losing some of its negative meaning potential.

In some cases, the creation of female personal nouns from masculine bases is a matter of inflection rather than of derivation. This means that no female derivational suffix is added and that the masculine noun is merely shifted to the (grammatically feminine) second declension class ending in *-a* in the nominative singular (Manova 2002: 211):

- (10) Creation of female personal nouns through inflection
suprug (m) ‘husband’ > *supruga* (f) ‘wife’
bratučed (m) ‘cousin’ > *bratučeda* (f) ‘female cousin’
kum (m) ‘godfather’ > *kuma* (f) ‘godmother’
susjed (m) ‘neighbour’ > *susjeda* (f) ‘female neighbour’

Derivation is also used in a gendered fashion beyond female specification in Croatian. The diminutive suffix *-če* is used to create affectionate, grammatically neuter personal nouns. The resulting formations may be lexically male, female or gender-neutral:

(11) Derivation of diminutive personal nouns

momak (m) 'young man' > *momče* (n) 'lad'
djevojka (f) 'girl' > *djevojče* (n) 'lass' (archaic)
unuk (m) 'grandson' / *unuka* (f) 'granddaughter' > *unuče* (n) 'grandchild'

The suffix *-ad* is used to create grammatically feminine collective personal nouns, which in turn replace the plural forms of the personal nouns ending in *-če*:

(12) Derivation of collective personal nouns

momče (n) 'lad' > *momčad* (f) 'group of lads, male team'
djevojče (n) 'lass' > *djevojčad* (f) 'group of lasses'
unuče (n) 'grandchild' > *unučad* (f) 'group of grandchildren'

Croatian possesses an elaborate system of diminutive suffixes (see also Hentschel 2003: 296). Their application depends on the declension class. The suffixes *-ić*, *-čić*, *-ak*, *-ečak* and *-ičak* are used for nouns of declension class I, the suffixes *-ica* and, more rarely, *-čica* and *-ca* for nouns of declension class II, and the suffixes *-ce*, *-ašce*, *-ence* and *-ešce* for neuter nouns of declension class IV (see 13a). Whereas the grammatical gender of the derived noun is the same as that of the base for all the suffixes named so far, the diminutive suffixes *-eljak* and *-uljak* can be attached to nouns of various declensions and grammatical genders and invariably result in grammatically masculine nouns (13b). Similarly, the suffix *-če* occurs with nouns of all declension and grammatical gender classes and invariably creates grammatically neuter nouns denoting young animates (13c).

(13) Examples of diminutive suffixes applied to personal nouns

- a. *dječak* (m) 'boy' > *dječaćić* (m) 'little boy'
djevojka (f) 'girl' > *djevojčica* (f) 'little girl'
dijete (n) 'child' > *djetešce* (n) 'little child'
- b. *djevojka* (f) 'girl' > *djevojčuljak* (m) 'little girl'
- c. *djevojka* (f) 'girl' > *djevojče* (n) 'little girl'

The diminutive suffix *-ica* is homonymous with the female derivational suffix *-ica* (as in *student-ica* 'female student'), which has been a central concern of Croatian feminist linguists (cf. Bertoša 2001). However, the two suffixes are applied to different types of bases. While the diminutive suffix is added to feminine bases of declension class II, the female suffix is never attached to this group of nouns, but typically to masculine personal nouns, or verbal or adjectival bases.

Note that with the diminutive suffixes the grammatical gender of the base, in most cases, remains the same for the derived noun. This is different for derivation by means of augmentative suffixes (*-ina*, *-čina*, *-etina*, *-urina*). These can

be attached to nouns of any declension class and invariably create grammatically feminine personal nouns (irrespective of lexical gender).

(14) Examples of augmentative suffixes applied to personal nouns

- muškarac* (m) ‘man’ > *muškarčina* (f) ‘he-man’
junak (m) ‘hero’ > *junačina* (f) ‘big hero’
žena (f) ‘woman’ > *ženetina* (f) ‘vulgar/big woman; slut’
gadura (f) ‘repulsive woman’ > *gadurina* (f) ‘very repulsive woman’
lažov (m) ‘liar’ > *lažovčina* (f) ‘big liar’
baba (f) ‘hag’ > *babetina* (f) ‘old hag’
baba (f) ‘softie’ > *babetina* (f) ‘faggot’

Whereas diminutive suffixes often create affectionate terms, augmentation in connection with personal nouns is usually perceived to result in pejorisation. This is particularly evident in the formation *babetina*, whose meaning varies with referential gender. With female referents, *baba* means ‘hag’ and the augmentative form *babetina* ‘old hag’, while with male referents, *baba* means ‘softie’ and the augmentative form *babetina* is used as a stigmatising label for a gay man (‘faggot’).

The application of diminutive and augmentative suffixes in personal nouns may lead to forms in which lexical and grammatical gender do not show the default correspondence, resulting, for example, in grammatically masculine or neuter but lexically female nouns (e.g. masculine *djevojčuljak*; neuter *djevojče*, both ‘little girl’) or in grammatically feminine or neuter but lexically male nouns (e.g. feminine *muškarčina*, *junačina* in (14); or neuter *muškarče* ‘little man’). As some of the examples illustrate, such “mismatches” between grammatical and lexical gender tend to be associated with rather negative meanings.

Finally, the grammatical gender of personal nouns has an influence on the suffixes that are used to create possessive adjectives in Croatian. Masculine (and the few neuter) personal nouns take the suffix *-ov* (*brat* (m) ‘brother’ – *bratov* ‘belonging to the brother’; *siroč*e (n) ‘orphan’ – *siročetov* ‘belonging to the orphan’), while grammatically feminine nouns take the suffix *-in* (*sestra* (f) ‘sister’ – *sestrin* ‘belonging to the sister’).

3.2 Agreement and pronominalisation

In Croatian, the grammatical gender of the head noun (the controller) is the central factor triggering agreement in satellite forms within and outside the noun phrase. Satellites show grammatical gender inflections, which are widely distinct across singular and plural as well as across the seven cases. Noun-phrase internal agreement is restricted to attributive adjectives, attributive pronouns (e.g. demonstrative and indefinite pronouns) and relative pronouns (see 15), while outside

the noun phrase agreement is found in predicative adjectives, participles (as part of complex analytic tense forms) and anaphoric pronouns (see 16).

(15) Noun-phrase internal agreement in Croatian

- a. *ovaj mlad-i student koj-i pjeva*
 this.MASC young-MASC student.MASC who-MASC sing.3SG
 ‘this young student who sings’
- b. *ov-a mlad-a studentica koj-a pjeva*
 this-FEM young-FEM female student.FEM who-FEM sing.3SG
 ‘this young female student who sings’
- c. *ov-o mlad-o dijete koj-e pjeva*
 this-NEUT young-NEUT child.NEUT who-NEUT sing.3SG
 ‘this young child who sings’

(16) Noun-phrase external agreement in Croatian

- a. *Student je bio umoran.*
 student.MASC be.3SG been.MASC tired.MASC
On sad spava.
 3SG.MASC now sleep.3SG
 ‘The student was tired. He sleeps now.’
- b. *Studentica je bila umorn-a.*
 female student.FEM be.3SG been-FEM tired-FEM
Ona sad spava.
 3SG.FEM now sleep.3SG
 ‘The female student was tired. She sleeps now.’
- c. *Dijete je bilo umorn-o.*
 child.NEUT be.3SG been-NEUT tired-NEUT
Ono sad spava.
 3SG.NEUT now sleep.3SG
 ‘The child was tired. It sleeps now.’

Gender-inflected participles are involved in the following analytic tense forms:

(17) Croatian composite tense forms involving gender-inflected participles

- present perfect: *Došao/došla je.* ‘He/she has come.’
 pluperfect: *Bio/bila je došao/došla.* ‘He/she had come.’
 future perfect: *(Kad) bude došao/došla.* ‘(When) He/she will have come.’
 present conditional: *Došao/došla bi.* ‘He/she would come.’
 past conditional: *Bio/bila bi došao/došla.* ‘He/she would have come.’

The examples in (17) do not show any overt subject pronouns (pro-drop), but masculine and feminine participle forms of the auxiliary verb *biti* ‘be’ (*bio/bila*) and the main verb (here: *doći* ‘to come’ > *došao/došla*). The remaining forms (*je*,

bi, bude) are finite verb forms of *biti* that are not gender-differentiated. As the synthetically formed imperfect and aorist tenses are not normally used in colloquial speech, it is close to impossible to talk about events that took place in the past without specifying the sex of the respective agent.

Croatian personal pronouns show grammatical gender distinctions in the third person. A tripartite gender distinction is only relevant for the nominative singular (masculine *on*, feminine *ona*, neuter *ono*) and nominative plural forms (masculine *oni*, feminine *one*, neuter *ona*). However, such subject pronouns only occur for the purpose of emphasis and are normally dropped. In the remaining cases of the singular, only the feminine and masculine/neuter forms are distinct. In the plural, the cases other than the nominative are not gender-differentiated. Table 3 shows the declension of the third-person pronouns (including full forms and unstressed short forms).

The Croatian third-person pronouns are quite different from the English pronouns *he, she* and *it*, because their use is determined by the grammatical gender of the antecedent noun and not by animacy and sex as in the English system. This means that the Croatian feminine and masculine pronouns are not restricted to female and male beings and can easily refer to nouns denoting inanimate concepts. In cases where these pronouns are not used anaphorically but deictically,

Table 3. Declension of Croatian third-person pronouns

Case	Masculine	Neuter	Feminine
Singular			
Nominative	<i>on</i>	<i>ono</i>	<i>ona</i>
Genitive	<i>njega, ga</i>		<i>nje, je</i>
Dative	<i>njemu, mu</i>		<i>njoj, joj</i>
Accusative	<i>njega, ga</i>		<i>nju, je, ju</i>
Locative	<i>njemu</i>		<i>njoj</i>
Instrumental	<i>njim, njime</i>		<i>njom, njome</i>
Plural			
Nominative	<i>oni</i>	<i>ona</i>	<i>one</i>
Genitive	<i>njih, ih</i>		
Dative	<i>njima, im</i>		
Accusative	<i>njih, ih</i>		
Locative	<i>njima</i>		
Instrumental	<i>njima</i>		

attributive adjectives/pronouns < predicative adjectives/participles < relative
pronouns < anaphoric pronouns

Even though the point at which syntactic agreement switches to semantic agreement varies for specific linguistic phenomena (see Corbett 2009:217; Wechsler & Zlatić 2000:824), it can be said that Croatian agreement patterns are generally in accordance with this hierarchy, i.e. semantic agreement is most likely to be found with personal pronouns, while attributive adjectives are least likely to show semantic agreement.

The applicability of the agreement hierarchy has, among other phenomena, been demonstrated for agreement patterns of nouns following cardinal numbers (Corbett 2009:208f.; see Section 3.6), “masculine *a*-stems” (Corbett 2009:215f.; see Section 3.4), and hybrid nouns (Corbett 2009:214), which are discussed in the present section. An example of the latter type of nouns is the (archaic) neuter noun *djevojčice* ‘girl’ (Wechsler & Zlatić 2000:804). Its typical agreement patterns are illustrated in (19):

- (19) *Ov-o djevojčice koj-e vidi-š je došl-o.*
 DEM-NEUT girl.NEUT REL-NEUT see-2SG be.3SG come.PART-NEUT
Ono/ona spava.
 3SG.NEUT/FEM sleep.3SG
 ‘That girl whom you see arrived. She sleeps.’

One can see in this example that the attributive demonstrative (*ovo*), the relative pronoun (*koje*) and the past participle (*došlo*) only allow for syntactically motivated neuter agreement, while the anaphoric pronoun allows for neuter (*ono*) as well as semantically motivated feminine agreement (*ona*). Mladenova (2001:39f.), however, notes that lexically male neuter nouns (e.g. *momče* (n) ‘lad’) show a preference for semantically motivated masculine agreement also in the other three points of the agreement hierarchy. This indicates that neuter forms, which often carry degrading undertones when applied to human beings, are perceived to be more compatible with female than with male referents.

More complex agreement patterns also occur with collective nouns. The latter are grammatically singular, but notionally plural. At the same time, they are grammatically feminine, but lexically male (e.g. *braća* ‘group of brothers’, *gospoda* ‘group of gentlemen’) or gender-neutral (e.g. *djeca* ‘group of children’). Such collectives require (semantically motivated) plural agreement in the finite verb, but (grammatically motivated) feminine singular agreement in all other satellites:

- (20) *Sv-a braća su bil-a sretn-a.*
 all-FEM.SG brothers.FEM.SG be.3PL been-FEM.SG happy-FEM.SG
 ‘All brothers were happy.’

Alternatively, semantically motivated masculine plural agreement may be found in predicative adjectives and participles (although this is less common):

- (21) *Sv-a braća su bil-i sretn-i.*
 all-FEM.SG brothers.FEM.SG be.3PL been-MASC.PL happy-MASC.PL
 ‘All brothers were happy.’

With respect to pronominalisation, both forms of agreement are possible (masculine plural *oni* or feminine singular *ona*).⁷ Feminine collective nouns ending in *-ad* show similar agreement patterns, but they also allow for singular agreement in the finite verb:

- (22) *Mlad-a momčad je/su došla.*
 young-FEM.SG group of young men.FEM.SG be.3SG/PL come.PART-FEM.SG
 ‘The male team/young men has/have arrived.’

In (22), there is also a semantic difference between singular and plural agreement. While *momčad* has the narrower meaning of ‘male team’ in connection with the singular verb form *je došla*, it means ‘group of young men’ when combined with the plural verb form *su došla*. The latter usage is today considered archaic.

3.4 “Masculine *a*-stems”

There is a substantial group of Croatian personal nouns that end in *-a*, are inflected like feminine nouns (see declension class II in Table 2), but are not lexically female.⁸ These nouns may be said to constitute a special group of hybrid nouns and are widely known under the name “masculine *a*-stems” (see also Motschenbacher 2010: 78–81). This designation, however, is a clear misnomer, as their behaviour is more complex than the name suggests. Within this group of nouns fall lexically male nouns (such as *kolega* ‘male colleague’, *vojvoda* ‘duke’, *sluga* ‘male servant’, *tata* ‘daddy’), many of which have female counterparts (e.g. *kolegica* ‘female colleague’, *služkinja* ‘female servant’). Others are lexically gender-neutral nouns that do not allow for female derivation, many of them being derogatory and/or socially male (e.g. *pijanica* ‘drunkard’, *kukavica* ‘coward’, *izbjeglica* ‘refugee’, *neznalica* ‘ignoramus’).⁹ As the nouns in question cannot be assigned to the masculine or feminine gender exclusively, they will in the following examples be glossed as *a*-stems (AST) rather than as grammatically gendered.

There is evidence that the “mismatch” between the feminine morphology and inflection of these *a*-stems and their non-female meaning is also salient for many speakers. Patterns of language change in regional (non-standard) varieties of Croatian point to an analogical change that surfaces as a tendency to inflect them like

masculines (declension class I; Sims 2005: 206f.). This means that their morphology is made to conform to their (often) lexically/socially male meaning.

Satellite forms of these *a*-stem nouns show various agreement types. Even though the nouns in question are used both with feminine and masculine satellite elements in singular and plural (see Sims 2005), there are two patterns that are considered standard usage, namely masculine agreement in the singular and feminine agreement in the plural:

(23) Normative agreement patterns of “masculine *a*-stems”

- a. *moj star-i kolega*
 my.MASC.SG old-MASC.SG male colleague.AST.SG
 ‘my old male colleague’
- b. *moj-e star-e kolege*
 my-FEM.PL old-FEM.PL male colleague.AST.PL
 ‘my old male colleagues’

Nouns that show different agreement in singular and plural are sometimes called “inquate nouns” (Corbett 1991: 173). With the lexically male *a*-stem nouns, only masculine agreement is possible in the singular. The masculine agreement can in such cases be explained as syntactically and/or semantically (lexical/referential gender) motivated:

- (24) *Taj kolega je došao.*
 this.MASC.SG male colleague.AST.SG be.3SG come.PART.MASC.SG
 ‘This male colleague had arrived.’

The lexically gender-neutral *a*-stems, by contrast, allow for masculine or feminine agreement in the singular, depending on referential gender, i.e. masculine agreement for male referents and feminine agreement for female referents. However, feminine agreement, as illustrated in (25b), is here not necessarily female-specific (Wechsler & Zlatić 2000: 813):

(25) Agreement patterns of gender-neutral “masculine *a*-stems” (singular)

- a. *Taj mušterija je došao.*
 this.MASC.SG customer.AST.SG be.3SG come.PART.MASC.SG
 ‘This male customer has arrived.’
- b. *Ta mušterija je doš-a.*
 this.FEM.SG customer.AST.SG be.3SG come.PART-FEM.SG
 ‘This (female) customer has arrived.’

In the plural, again both feminine and masculine agreement types are possible. However, the lexically male *a*-stems oscillate between male-specific and generic meanings in connection with feminine agreement (see 26c):

(26) Agreement patterns of “masculine *a*-stems” (plural)

- a. *Star-i mušterije/kolege*
 old-MASC.PL customer/male colleague.AST.PL
su došli-i.
 be.3PL come.PART-MASC.PL
 ‘Old male customers/male colleagues have arrived.’
- b. *Star-e mušterije su došli-e.*
 old-FEM.PL customer.AST.PL be.3PL come.PART-FEM.PL
 ‘Old (female) customers have arrived.’
- c. *Star-e kolege su došli-e.*
 old-FEM.PL male colleague.AST.PL be.3PL come.PART-FEM.PL
 ‘Old (male) colleagues have arrived.’

As can be seen in (26a), masculine satellite forms are used in the plural when male persons are referred to, while feminine satellite forms can be used for generic reference (26b/c). Masculine agreement is referentially (or, in the case of male *a*-stems, lexically) motivated, whereas feminine agreement can be referentially motivated or grammatically motivated by the declension of the noun (Kim 2010: 249). It is interesting to note that such cases depart from the more common pattern that masculine forms are used generically, while feminine forms tend to be female-specific (both in Croatian as well as cross-linguistically).

With “masculine *a*-stems” in the plural, the satellites may also show divergent or hybrid agreement. When this is the case, syntactic agreement usually occurs with the satellite that stands closer to the controller, while more distant targets may show semantic agreement (example modified from Corbett 2009: 161):

- (27) *Pape su napustil-e Rim i obitaval-i u Avignonu.*
 pope.AST.PL be.3PL left-FEM.PL Rome and lived-MASC.PL in Avignon
 ‘The popes left Rome and lived in Avignon.’

In example (27), the first participle (*napustile*) stands closer to the controller noun *pape* ‘popes’ than the second participle (*obitavali*). The former shows syntactically motivated feminine agreement, while the latter shows semantically motivated masculine agreement. A similar rule applies to mixed-gender agreement with stacked modifiers, i.e. cases in which attributive adjectives show different agreement in one and the same phrase (Corbett 1991: 239f.):

- (28) *njihov-i stran-e vođe*
 their-MASC.PL foreign-FEM.PL leader.AST.PL
 ‘their foreign leaders’

In (28), the adjective *strane* shows syntactically motivated feminine agreement (in accordance with the declension class of *vođa* ‘male leader’), but the preceding possessive adjective *njihovi* shows semantically motivated masculine agreement (in accordance with the male lexical gender of *vođa*).

3.5 Coordination and gender resolution

With coordinated noun phrases containing head nouns of different grammatical gender, agreement resolution shows some interesting patterns in Croatian (see Corbett 1991: 299–303 and 2009: 153–156). When the conjuncts are all plural forms of nouns belonging to the same grammatical gender class, no resolution is necessary, i.e. the satellites show the same type of agreement (Corbett 2009: 256; see (29a–c)). (Note that, although examples involving personal nouns have been chosen here, these agreement patterns also hold for inanimate nouns.)

(29) Gender resolution with coordinated plural controllers

- a. *Djevojke i žene su sretn-e.*
 girl.FEM.PL and woman.FEM.PL be.3PL happy-FEM.PL
 ‘The girls and the women are happy.’
- b. *Muškarci i dječaci su sretn-i.*
 man.MASC.PL and boy.MASC.PL be.3PL happy-MASC.PL
 ‘The men and the boys are happy.’
- c. *Pričala i njuškala su sretn-a.*
 tattler.NEUT.PL and nark.NEUT.PL be.3PL happy-NEUT.PL
 ‘The tattlers and the narks are happy.’

When the plural conjuncts do not have the same grammatical gender, the satellites generally show masculine plural inflections (even when no masculine noun is involved):¹⁰

- (30) *Žene i pričala su sretn-i.*
 woman.FEM.PL and tattler.NEUT.PL be.3PL happy-MASC.PL
 ‘The women and the tattlers are happy.’

As soon as one of the conjuncts is singular, another set of rules applies. If all conjuncts are feminine, satellites show feminine agreement (see 31a). All other combinations show masculine agreement (even if none of the controller nouns is masculine), i.e. the combinations masculine + masculine, feminine + masculine, neuter + masculine, feminine + neuter, neuter + neuter, and all other combinations of three or more noun phrases whose heads are not exclusively feminine (see 31b–f).

(31) Gender resolution with coordinated singular controllers

- a. *Djevojka i žena su sretn-e.*
 girl.FEM.SG and woman.FEM.SG be.3PL happy-FEM.PL
 ‘The girl and the woman are happy.’
- b. *Muškarac i žena su sretn-i.*
 man.MASC.SG and woman.FEM.SG be.3PL happy-MASC.PL
 ‘The man and the woman are happy.’
- c. *Muškarac i dijete su sretn-i.*
 man.MASC.SG and child.NEUT.SG be.3PL happy-MASC.PL
 ‘The man and the child are happy.’
- d. *Žena i dijete su sretn-i.*
 woman.FEM.SG and child.NEUT.SG be.3PL happy-MASC.PL
 ‘The woman and the child are happy.’
- e. *Dijete i njuškalo su sretn-i.*
 child.NEUT.SG and nark.NEUT.SG be.3PL happy-MASC.PL
 ‘The child and the nark are happy.’
- f. *Muškarac, žena i dijete su sretn-i.*
 man.MASC.SG woman.FEM.SG and child.NEUT.SG be.3PL
 happy-MASC.PL
 ‘The man, the woman and the child are happy.’

However, even when all conjuncts are feminine, one occasionally also finds masculine agreement when all conjuncts denote inanimate concepts (see Corbett 2009: 154f.; example modified from Corbett 2009: 155):

- (32) *Žustrina i lakoća zagrijal-i su ga.*
 speed.FEM.SG and ease.FEM.SG warmed-MASC.PL be.3PL 3SG.MASC.ACC
 ‘The speed and the ease warmed him up.’

It is, therefore, more precise to say that feminine agreement is obligatory for the coordination of feminine nouns of which at least one is female. For coordinated inanimate feminine nouns, feminine agreement is frequent, but not obligatory.

When deictic pronouns are involved, the predominance of the masculine cannot be explained through grammatical gender agreement with a controller noun. In such cases, it is rather (partly) male referential gender that triggers masculine satellite forms (see 33a). As can be seen in example (33b), female referential gender cannot override masculine agreement.

(33) Agreement in coordination with deictic pronouns

- a. Petar: “*Moj-a suprug-a i ja*
my-FEM.SG wife.FEM.SG and I
smo došli-i.”
be.1PL come.PART-MASC.PL
‘My wife and I have arrived.’
- b. Marija: “*Moj suprug i ja*
my.MASC.SG husband.MASC.SG and I
smo došli-i.”
be.1PL come.PART-MASC.PL
‘My husband and I have arrived.’

3.6 Numerals

The use of numerals in connection with personal reference forms shows some gender-relevant patterns that go well beyond typical adjectival agreement patterns. The cardinal number ‘one’ inflects like a regular adjective for case, number and gender (*jedan muškarac* ‘one.MASC man’, *jedn-a žena* ‘one-FEM woman’, *jedn-o dijete* ‘one-NEUT child’; see 34a). The number ‘two’ (*dva, dvije*) and the adjective ‘both’ (*oba, obje*) distinguish only two gender forms, namely feminine (e.g. *dvije žene* ‘two women’) vs. masculine/neuter (e.g. *dva muškarca/siročeta* ‘two men/orphans’).¹¹ All higher cardinal numbers (*tri, četiri, pet*, etc.) are gender-invariable. After *dva/dvije, tri* and *četiri*, the noun denoting the counted entity and its satellites stand in the counting form (a form that is originally a dual but today largely coincides with the genitive singular; glossed as CNT here), while the finite verb is in the plural (see 34b). For higher cardinal numbers, the counted noun stands in the genitive plural, while the finite verb is singular and the past participle neuter singular (see 34c).

(34) Agreement patterns of Croatian cardinal numbers

- a. *Jedn-a umorn-a žena je otišl-a.*
one-FEM.SG tired-FEM.SG woman.FEM.SG be.3SG left-FEM.SG
‘One tired woman left.’
- b. *Dvije umorn-e žene su otišl-e.*
two.FEM tired-FEM.CNT woman.FEM.CNT be.3PL left-FEM.CNT
‘Two tired women left.’
- c. *Pet umorn-ih žena je otišl-o.*
five tired-GEN.PL woman.GEN.PL be.3SG left-NEUT.SG
‘Five tired women left.’

means ‘a female and a male dancer’. Neither two female nor two male dancers can be identified with this phrase.¹³

When referring to a group of female persons, no collective number noun is available in Croatian. Instead this has to be done using cardinal numbers (*dvije* ‘two.FEM’, *tri* ‘three’, *četiri* ‘four’, *pet* ‘five’, etc.; *obje* ‘both.FEM’):

- (37) *Sv-e tri su došl-e.*
 all-FEM.CNT three be.3PL come.PART-FEM.CNT
 ‘All three women arrived.’

Note that with cardinal numbers above two, the meaning ‘female’ is not expressed by the numeral itself but by the feminine adjectival and participle forms, while numeral nouns and collective numbers can be said to carry the semantic feature ‘male’ and ‘mixed-gender’ by themselves.

3.7 Names

Female and male names show certain asymmetries in Croatian that concern their grammatical properties, their etymology, and their inheritance. At the most general level, one can say that Croatian female first names exhibit more diversity in form and origin than male first names. This has historical reasons. In former times, patriarchal naming conventions dictated that sons received the names of their fathers or grandfathers, while name choices were much freer for daughters, even though it was also possible to name them after female relatives (Virkkula 2007: 432).

The wide majority of Croatian first names are either male or female and trigger masculine or feminine agreement respectively. There are only a few names that may be given to women and men (such as *Andrea*, *Borna*, *Ivica*, *Saša*, *Val*, *Vanja*; Virkkula 2007: 433). Male names are invariably case-inflected; female names only when they end in *-a*, which is generally the case for native first names. Female names of foreign origin are not inflected for case if they do not end in *-a* (e.g. *Ines*, *Cindy*, *Lulu*). Women’s surnames that do not end in *-a* do not take case endings either (Alexander 2006: 45):

- (38) *Poznaje-m Bojan-a Barić-a, Mariju Barić i Ines Barić.*
 know-1SG Bojan-ACC Barić-ACC Marija.ACC Barić and Ines Barić
 ‘I know Bojan Barić, Marija Barić and Ines Barić.’

Male first and surnames are generally inflected like masculine nouns, female first names and surnames ending in *-a* and male surnames ending in *-a* (e.g. *Miroslav Krleža*) are inflected like feminine nouns. Within the group of male first names,

however, there is a substantial subgroup of names that is inflected like feminine nouns of declension class II, despite the fact that they trigger masculine agreement in satellite elements (Wechsler & Zlatić 2000:812) – agreement patterns reminiscent of those associated with “masculine *a*-stems” (see Section 3.4). This is true for male names ending in *-a* (e.g. *Ivica*, *Luka*, *Nikola*),¹⁴ hypocoristic male names ending in *-o* (e.g. *Ivo*, *Pero*, *Vlado*) or *-e* (e.g. *Mate*, *Ante*, *Stipe*), and hypocoristic male personal nouns ending in *-o* (e.g. *braco* ‘brother’, *dečko* ‘boy’). For the names ending in *-a*, the mismatch between feminine inflectional morphology on the one hand and masculine target gender and male lexical gender on the other hand causes speakers of some Croatian dialects to show analogic language change, i.e. they inflect these names like “normal” masculine nouns (declension class I; Tošović 2010: 147–149).

Morphologically speaking, female first names are often derived from male first names (*Petar* > *Petra*, *Ivan* > *Ivan(k)a*, *Nikola* > *Nikolina*) and not the other way round, thereby reflecting the word-formation patterns of personal nouns at large. Besides native first names ending in *-a*, there are also female hypocoristic names which do not end in *-a* but in *-e*, such as *Jele* or *Kate*.

Unlike in other Slavic languages, Croatian surnames do not (or no longer) differentiate referential gender. The practice of deriving women’s surnames from those of their husbands (*Radović* > *Radovička*) is today considered archaic. However, as foreign female surnames that do not end in *-a* cannot be inflected in Croatian, language use in the media sometimes exhibits the practice of adding the suffixes *-eva* or *-ova* to such surnames (e.g. *Steffi Grafova*, *Margaret Thatcherova*; Virkkula 2007: 436).

Croatian surnames historically stand in a patronymic tradition. They commonly end in the diminutive suffix *-ić*, often in connection with a preceding possessive suffix *-ev/-ov*, resulting in formations ending in *-ević/-ović* (see also Loma 2007: 685). Etymologically speaking, surnames are often based on (masculine) occupational terms or ethnonyms (e.g. *kovač* ‘smith’ < *Kovačević*; *hrvat* ‘Croatian (man)’ < *Horvat*), or on male first names (e.g. *Petar* > *Petrović*; Virkkula 2007: 435).

In Croatia, children generally inherit their parents’ surname. If the parents have differing surnames, the child can inherit either of the two or a combination of both. Contemporary naming laws allow married couples all thinkable options: Both partners can keep their own surnames, choose either of their two surnames for both, or choose a combination of both names (Virkkula 2007: 434f.). Even though all of these options exist, the most traditional pattern, namely to adopt the man’s surname for both partners and all children, remains the most popular pattern.

3.8 Comparing Croatian with related varieties

As far as gender-representation is concerned, the successor varieties of Serbo-Croatian show extensive similarities. The differences to be identified in this respect are relatively small. A problem of comparing the successor varieties of Serbo-Croatian is that not all of them are equally well described and codified. Tošović (2010: 132) finds that of the relevant linguistic publications, 57% deal with Serbian and 41% with Croatian. Bosnian and Montenegrin are far less well documented (2.8% and 0.1% respectively). As a consequence, the following descriptions will mainly concentrate on gender-relevant structural differences between Croatian and Serbian (for the latter, see Hentschel 2003).

Some inanimate nouns have differing grammatical gender values in Croatian vs. Serbian (e.g. feminine *minuta* vs. masculine *minut* ‘minute’; masculine *naslonjač* vs. feminine *naslonjača* ‘armchair’). In some cases, this also concerns personal nouns. For example, there is a large group of personal nouns that end in *-ist* in Croatian and in *-ista* in Serbian (e.g. *lingvist* – *lingvista* ‘linguist’, *biciklist* – *biciklista* ‘bicyclist’; Kunzmann-Müller 2003: 717), besides other forms to which Serbian adds an *-a* (e.g. *arhitekt* – *arhitektka* ‘architect’). Whereas these represent regular masculine nouns (declension class I) in Croatian, the Serbian forms are “masculine *a*-stems” (declension class II). A similar difference involves some male names which end in *-a* in Serbian but in *-o* in Croatian (e.g. *Pera/Pero*, *Jova/Jovo*).

In terms of word-formation, Croatian and Serbian often show a preference for different suffixes in derived personal nouns. For example, the Croatian masculine personal nouns *sudac* ‘judge’, *prevoditelj* ‘translator’ and *upravitelj* ‘manager’ correspond to Serbian *sudija*, *prevodilac* and *upravnik*. As far as female derivations are concerned, Serbian is more reluctant to create such forms. For example, while the Croatian noun *prevoditelj* has a common female counterpart *prevoditeljica*, the Serbian masculine noun *prevodilac* does not have a corresponding female form. Moreover, there are regional differences in the preference of female suffixes. While in Croatian the female suffix *-ica* is most widely used, Serbian shows a predominance of *-ka*. Accordingly, one can identify many Croatian-Serbian pairs like *profesorica* – *profesorka* ‘female professor’ or *slikarica* – *slikarka* ‘female painter’ etc. But also other, less regular pairs can be found (e.g. *studentica* – *studentkinja* ‘female student’; *kolegica* – *koleginica* ‘female colleague’).

Of all the successor languages of Serbo-Croatian, Croatian has gone farthest in avoiding gender discrimination in occupational titles by systematically deriving feminine personal nouns from masculine bases. In Serbia and Bosnia-Herzegovina, it is more common to use masculine forms for both male and female referents. In many cases the female form is considered non-existent or highly uncommon (*dekan* ‘dean’, *predsjednik* ‘president’, *doktor* ‘doctor’), whereas female

forms of the same nouns are in use in Croatia (*dekanica, predsjednica, doktorica*). As Rajilić (2014a/b) shows, female specification in occupational titles is, in Serbia, widely perceived to be a typical feature of Croatian and, as a consequence, the efforts of Serbian feminist linguists to introduce new female derivations are stigmatised as being incompatible with Serbian language policies. While Croatian shows a strong preference for creating female nouns through derivation, in Serbian female specification through compounding is as common as through derivation. Forms like *žena kancelar* ‘woman chancellor’, *žena vatrogasac* ‘woman firefighter’ or *žena ministar* ‘woman minister’ (vs. Croatian *kancelarka, vatrogasinja, ministrica*) are in common use and are the only option for female specification in cases in which a female derivation does not exist (e.g. *žena prevodilac* ‘woman translator’). Still, it needs to be noted that also in Serbian such compounded forms are becoming rarer. Premodifications involving the adjectives *ženski* ‘female’ and *muški* ‘male’ are now relatively rare in both varieties, but still a bit more common in Serbian, where they are sometimes used to mark cases of women working in stereotypically male professions and vice versa (for example, *ženski oficir* ‘female officer’ or *muška dadilja* ‘male nanny’; see also Maček 1993: 106, 112).

4. Usage of personal reference forms

4.1 Occupational titles

Occupational titles are a central component of public language use and therefore have traditionally attracted the attention of feminist linguists, who have found fault with the common androcentric practice of using masculine occupational terms generically (to supposedly include women). Androcentric linguistic practices derive from historical male dominance and its impact on social and professional discourse. Changed social realities, however, see many more women working across all occupational fields today. As a consequence, derived female forms are today clearly more common in Croatia than they used to be. This was already noted by Savić in 1989, who attributes this development to the growing influence of the media on public language use (Savić 1989: 552). Another example of such a change is the traditional term *medicinska sestra* ‘female nurse’ (lit. ‘medical sister’), for which a male-compatible form *medicinski brat* ‘male nurse’ (lit. ‘medical brother’) was created (Maček 1993: 109).

The Croatian Law on the Equality of the Sexes dictates that all job advertisements must make it clear that positions are open to both women and men (Glovacki-Bernardi 2012: 149f.). A small-scale study of 162 newspaper job advertisements conducted by Glovacki-Bernardi (2006: 239), however, found that job

advertisements leave much to be desired in this respect. For example, the position of a head of the finance department was advertised using masculine personal reference forms, whereas the position of an administrative secretary was advertised using the feminine form.

A similar picture evolves from a study by Čimbur (2006), who discusses the findings of the 2004 report of the public legal officer concerning gender equality in Croatia. One section of the report analysed job advertisements in the most widely read daily Croatian newspapers. All 162 job advertisements analysed failed to fulfil the legal requirement that both sexes must be specified. It is interesting to note that not even the state and local authorities (ministries, courts, universities, schools, hospitals, etc.) managed to comply with the official gender equality regulations. Most companies stated that they do not explicitly mention the female form of a profession, claiming that the masculine form is valid for both sexes.

In the statutes of most companies, very few professions are identified using female forms. The latter practice is mainly restricted to some low-prestige professions that have traditionally been performed by women (*dadilja* 'nanny', *spremačica*, *čistačica* both 'female cleaner', *tajnica* 'female secretary', *pralja* 'laundress', etc.).

A more recent study in 2007 showed that, maybe in reaction to the bleak picture of the earlier studies, male and female specification in job titles was used more systematically, except for higher-level occupations in the tertiary educational sector, which still were predominantly referred to in the masculine (Glovacki-Bernardi 2008: 94f.). As can be seen in Table 4, subsequent studies on job advertisements showed a steady rise in the percentage of the ads that followed the regulations of the Gender Equality Act.

Glovacki-Bernardi (2012: 151) further notes that, despite the fact that the Croatian National Classification of Business Activities systematically provides full forms of both masculine and feminine occupational titles, in job advertisements it is the most common practice to use a masculine occupational term plus abbreviations for 'male' and 'female' in brackets, such as in *piloti (m/ž)* 'pilot.MASC.PL (m/f)'. Moreover, she found that the high level of gender equality in the daily

Table 4. Percentages of gender-equal job advertisements in Croatian daily newspapers (Glovacki-Bernardi 2012: 150)

Year of study	Percentage of gender-equal job advertisements
2006	60%
2007	70%
2008	78%
2009	88%
2010	96%

newspapers is generally not paralleled by job advertisements in other newspapers, especially those that advertise occupations requiring a lower level of qualification. In the latter newspapers, the frequency of gender-equal advertisements depends significantly on the respective occupational sector. For example, in the fields of 'construction and architecture' and 'business, finance and insurance', employers used mainly masculine forms (e.g. *zidar* 'bricklayer', *stolar* 'carpenter', *suradnik* 'associate'), while feminine forms were used exclusively in the field of 'household and babysitting' (e.g. *dadilja* 'nanny', *kućna pomoćnica* 'female housekeeper'; Glovacki-Bernardi 2012: 153).

Čimbur (2006) also carried out interviews with 290 persons (201 female and 89 male) who had responded to a job advertisement. 61% of the interviewed subjects (53% of the male, 66% of the female informants) stated that they were in favour of ads specifying both the masculine and the feminine form. Some female informants reported that they had applied for jobs which were advertised with masculine occupational titles and were informed that a male employee was required, i.e. the masculine form was clearly not intended to be generic.

It is not surprising that the creation and discussion of female occupational titles has become much more pronounced in recent years. It has been documented that female occupational titles are more frequently and systematically used in Croatia, whereas Serbian speakers still show a stronger tendency to use masculine nouns when referring to women in the respective professions. This has, for example, been shown by Savić (1985) in a study of how occupational titles are used at the universities of Zagreb (Croatia) and Novi Sad (Serbia), as well as in a corpus of Croatian and Serbian newspapers (Savić 1989: 543). Since the 1990s, this difference has increased as a result of efforts to differentiate Croatian as a language from Serbian and of Croatia's recent negotiations for EU membership, which enforce gender mainstreaming from above (Kersten-Pejanić 2010).

Another finding of Savić's (1985: 14f.) study was that, when referring to a woman, female specification was much more common on the lower academic ranks. For example, whereas female forms such as *studentica* 'female student', *apsolventica* 'female graduate' or *asistentica* 'female assistant' were quite common, forms like *dekanica* 'female dean' or *rektorica* 'female rector' were not attested. Other factors that have, in some studies, been found to influence whether a female form is used include the length of the term, its frequency and commonality, and the pronounceability of the consonantal clusters that are created when a female suffix is added to the base. Syntactic function may also play a role, with female occupational terms being more common in subject and object function vs. predicate functions (see Savić 1989: 541). In (Croatian and Serbian) newspaper headlines, female derived nouns were shown to occur only infrequently. But

when they occurred, they were generally used in a degrading fashion. In newspaper articles, the usage of female forms was mainly restricted to contributions on the topics of sports and culture, while in articles on themes like foreign politics or civil defense female forms were notably absent (Savić 1989: 543). Of course, it can be assumed that this situation has become more balanced nowadays, as more and more women work in traditionally male professions and public functions.

In a questionnaire study conducted by Maček (1993), subjects were given sentences with blanks together with a list of professions (in the form of masculine occupational terms). Their task was to fill in the blanks with the occupational term they deemed appropriate when referring to a woman in the respective profession. Several usage patterns emerged from the data. Female derived forms were invariably used when the sentence contained a feminine attributive adjective premodifying the noun (e.g. *sv-e ov-e vojnikinje* 'all-FEM these-FEM female soldiers'). With feminine participle forms in the sentence (e.g. *sutkinja ga je kaznil-a* 'the female judge has punished-FEM.SG him'), the rate of female nouns was 66%. When the noun was used in apposition with a female name (e.g. *Predsjednica/Predsjednik Mira Novak* 'female president.FEM/president.MASC'), both masculine and feminine occupational terms were equally common. In predicative functions (*njegova je sestra sudac* 'his sister is a judge.MASC'), masculine nouns were slightly more common (56%; Maček 1993: 101–103). The choice of feminine versus masculine nouns also depended on the respective profession. For socially male terms like *sudac* 'judge', *pedijatar* 'paediatrician' and *bubnjar* 'drummer', masculine forms were overwhelmingly used, despite the fact that the subjects were supposed to identify a female referent. The socially female profession of a model, by contrast, was almost invariably identified using the female noun *manekenka* 'female model' (Maček 1993: 103). Of the three productive female suffixes, the suffix *-ica* was used most often (62%). The gender of the informants did not have any significant influence on the responses given (Maček 1993: 111).

Female occupational titles are often not even preferred by women themselves. Filipović (2011) conducted a questionnaire study among academic and professional Serbian women, in which she gave her subjects a list of masculine-feminine pairs of occupational titles. When asked to judge whether the feminine forms were adequate to be used in reference to women, many women rejected the feminine forms (for example, preferring the masculine form *policajac* 'police officer' over *policajka* 'female police officer'), often because women were rare in the respective professions (e.g. *pilotkinja* 'female pilot') or because of the negative connotations such formations are perceived to have (e.g. *spisateljica* 'female writer', *psihološkinja* 'female psychologist'; Filipović 2011: 121). In many cases, the feminine forms are clearly less common than the corresponding masculine

nouns. Moreover, they are sometimes considered to be ambiguous. *Profesorica*, for example, could be understood as ‘female professor’, but also as ‘wife of a professor’, even though the latter meaning is today less common than it used to be (cf. Kersten-Pejanić 2010: 69). As a consequence of all these aspects, women are, in many instances, referred to with masculine forms that are generally perceived to be more prestigious.

A specification of female referential gender in occupational titles is at times achieved through the addition of a female address term before the masculine noun, resulting in phrases like *gospođa profesor* ‘madam professor’ or formerly *drugarica director* ‘female comrade director’ (Savić 1989: 537f.; see also Maček 1993: 106). The use of masculine personal nouns in reference to women was traditionally legitimated by the reasoning that the feminine forms should only be used when a woman’s gender is deemed to be more important than her occupation in a given context, while the masculine forms were claimed to be the appropriate choice in contexts in which the professional role as such stands in the foreground (Savić 1989: 545). It is, of course, questionable that such a conceptual division is indeed verifiable. Moreover, this kind of reasoning reflects an asymmetry in the sense that contexts in which a man’s gender outweighs his professional role are not mentioned. In other words, whereas a woman’s gender identity can override her professional identity, male and professional identities are considered as identical or at least as not clashing.

4.2 Animal terms used for personal reference

It is well-documented that when animal names are metaphorically used to refer to human beings, they often possess a gendered quality (e.g. Fernández Fontecha & Jiménez Catalán 2003; Kiełtyka 2005; Nilsen 1996). Bosnian, Croatian and Serbian make no difference in this respect. A study on the use of animal names for human reference in Serbian (Halupka-Rešetar & Radić 2003) found the following patterns (which are very likely to operate in Croatian as well):

A detailed analysis of the corpus reveals that while stupid men are usually called *magarac* ‘donkey’, *konj* ‘horse’, *som* ‘catfish’ and *vo* ‘ox’, stupid women are typically addressed as *ćurka* ‘turkey’, *kokoška* ‘hen’, *koza* ‘she-goat’, *ovca* ‘sheep’ or *guska* ‘goose’. Similarly, whereas clumsy men are normally called *konj* ‘horse’, women are *krava* ‘cow’ or *kobila* ‘mare’. Finally, whereas *krmača* ‘sow’ is used for untidy women, *svinja* ‘pig’ tends to be used of both sexes equally. (Halupka-Rešetar & Radić 2003: 1900)

It is evident from this description that most of these terms are clearly derogatory when used to identify people and, therefore, often qualify as terms of abuse (hence commonly used in the vocative case). A semantically more positive, though objectifying, usage involves referring to a good-looking woman as *mačka* ‘female cat’. It is interesting to note that the same (negative) characteristics seem to be signified by different kinds of animals for women and men. Another pattern is that women are largely identified by means of lexically female and/or grammatically feminine animal terms, while men tend to be identified by means of lexically male and/or grammatically masculine animal nouns. Cross-gender patterns do not seem to occur.

4.3 Address terms and marriage-related vocabulary

Croatian address terms show the same asymmetries as those of many other European languages. Whereas marital status is not specified in the male address term *gospodin* ‘Mr’, there are two female address terms, one for married and one for unmarried women: *gospođa* ‘Mrs’ and *gospođica* ‘Miss’. Evidence for the current use of female address terms in Croatian is provided by a questionnaire study as described in Glovacki-Bernardi (2008:95–102). According to this survey, the form *gospođica* is mainly used for unmarried women and women below the age of thirty, whereas *gospođa* is common for married women or women older than thirty. The specification of marital status in female address terms conveys the traditional message that getting married is more essential for women than for men. This is also evident from personal nouns that denote unmarried women and men. Forms denoting unmarried men (*neženja*; *stari momak* lit. ‘old boy’) are clearly less numerous and typically less negative in their connotations than nouns denoting unmarried women (e.g. *usidjelica*, *neudata*; *gospođica* lit. ‘Miss’, *stara cura* lit. ‘old chick’ or *stara djevojka* lit. ‘old girl’; Lazović 2009).

If one considers the Croatian nouns denoting ‘bride’ (*mlada*) and ‘bridegroom’ (*mladoženja*), it is remarkable that this pair represents one of the few cases in which the male form is morphologically more complex than the female form. This means that as far as marriage is concerned, men are conceptualised as the marked case, while in almost all other domains women are marked. The word *mlada* literally means ‘young [woman]’, while the form *mladoženja* literally means ‘a young [person] getting a wife’. In other words, while it has to be specified that a young man is actually looking for a wife, it is taken for granted that young women invariably look for a husband. Similarly, it is telling that Croatian has two separate words for ‘man’ (*muškarac*) and ‘husband’ (*muž*), while the meanings of ‘woman’ and ‘wife’ are collapsed into one word (*žena*). However, for the bridal

pair a more symmetrical set of terms is also available, in which both the female and the male form are morphologically equally complex (de-adjectival nouns, derived from the adjective *mlad* ‘young’): *mladenac* ‘bridegroom’ and *mladenka* ‘bride’. To refer to the ‘bridal couple’, however, the plural form of the masculine noun (*mladenci*) is used (generically). A similar configuration pertains to personal nouns denoting engaged (*zaručnik* ‘fiancé’, *zaručnica* ‘fiancée’) and widowed people (*udovac* ‘widower’, *udovica* ‘widow’). For divorced people, one finds in Serbian the (archaic) female noun *raspuštenica*, which literally means ‘abandoned woman’ (a noun derived from the adjective *raspušten* ‘abandoned’). The fact that no corresponding male form is in common use locates the agency in terms of abandoning clearly on the male side. However, nowadays the deadjectival forms *rastavljen* ‘divorced (man)’ and *rastavljena* ‘divorced (woman)’ are normally used in Croatian.

A similarly traditional picture evolves when one looks at the verbs that are used in the sense of ‘to marry’. While there is one such verb that can be used for both sexes (*vjenčati se*), other verbs are available that denote the act of marrying from a stereotypically male or female perspective. The verb used for women is *udati se*, which usually forms constructions with the preposition *za* ‘for’ plus accusative. It conceptualises marrying as an activity in which women are rather passive – they literally ‘give’ (*dati*) themselves (reflexive pronoun *se*) to the man. The verb used for men is *ženiti se* plus instrumental case. This constructs the contrary scenario of the man being the active part in marrying. He literally ‘be-wives’ (*ženiti*) himself (*se*) using the woman as an instrument to do so (cf. instrumental case), hence also the agentive deverbal noun *ženik* ‘bridegroom’ (lit. ‘wiver’). The heteronormativity of these conceptualisations disqualifies the use of such forms for the description of same-sex weddings. The usage of the two verbs is illustrated in (39).

(39) Sex-specific marriage-related verbal constructions in Croatian

- a. *Žena se udaje za muškarc-a.*
 woman.NOM REFL.ACC give.3SG for man-ACC
 ‘A woman marries a man.’
- b. *Muškarac se ženi žen-om.*
 man.NOM REFL.ACC bewive.3SG woman-INSTR
 ‘A man marries a woman.’

Corresponding to the two gender-specific verbs, there are also female- and male-specific terms denoting ‘marriage’, *udaja* and *ženidba*. In a similar vein, these terms conceptualise marrying as an act of giving oneself away for women and as an act of getting a wife for men. A gender-neutral term for marriage is *vjenčanje*.

5. Language change and language reform

Normative Croatian grammar traditionally prescribes the use of masculine personal reference forms, independently of referential gender, i.e. for male, female, mixed-sex or gender-indifferent human referents. This prescription of masculine generics clashes with the demands of feminist linguists to promote gender-symmetrical public language use (for an overview of the debate on linguistic gender representation in Croatia, see Kersten-Pejanić 2014b) – a demand that has recently received support from the transnational European level, as Croatia entered EU accession talks and finally joined the EU in 2013 (cf. Borić 2007; Kersten-Pejanić 2010). Due to the recency of this development, EU guidelines for non-sexist language use in Croatian are not yet available on the website of the European Parliament, where such documents can be found for nearly all official EU languages. UNESCO guidelines, however, have existed since 1999 (see UNESCO 2009 [1999]). Potentially relevant information can also be obtained from recent non-sexist language guidelines for Serbian and their academic discussion (see Čanak 2009; Savić 2009; Štasni & Mitro 2009).

As is typical for a language with a grammatical masculine-feminine distinction, female specification through derivation or the use of feminine satellite forms has been recommended to make women more visible in public language use. Various forms of gender specification are available, ranging from full splitting with conjunctions (*profesor ili profesorica* ‘male professor or female professor’) or slashes (*profesor/profesorica*) to short splitting (*profesor/ica*). In job advertisements, the abbreviations *m/ž* (for the Croatian adjectives denoting ‘male’ and ‘female’) are also commonly used in combination with masculine occupational titles.

Gender specification poses problems for the satellite elements agreeing with occupational terms as controllers: adjectives, pronouns, numerals and verbal participles. For example, a gender-symmetrical means of referring to ‘some linguists’ would require gender specification in the personal noun as well as in the agreeing adjective:

- (40) *neki/neke* *lingvisti/lingvistice*
 some.MASC.PL/FEM.PL linguist.MASC.PL/female linguist.FEM.PL
 ‘some (female and male) linguists’

In cases where several satellites are affected, splitting is a relatively complex business and may be considered as too cumbersome, especially in the spoken language.

With respect to the generic use of third-person pronouns, a common strategy to avoid the use of masculine pronominal forms is pronominal splitting, i.e. the use of both masculine and feminine pronouns. As Croatian is a pro-drop language in which subject pronouns are only used for emphasis, this affects mainly

singular pronouns that occur in cases other than the nominative (namely the genitive, dative, accusative and instrumental case; for example, dative singular *njemu* may be replaced by *njemu ili njoj* ‘to him or her’). The pronominal case forms in the plural only show gender-distinct forms in the nominative.

A special problem is posed by the generic use of masculine forms agreeing with the polite second person pronoun *Vi*. As an antecedent, this pronoun normatively requires satellites such as verbal participles to show masculine plural agreement, even if a female person is being addressed (see Section 2.4). The use of feminine satellites in such contexts represents a violation of normative grammar rules but may nevertheless be practised in certain feminist-minded contexts. For example, the *Manual for Abused Women in the Autonomous House for Women in Zagreb* uses such – grammatically incorrect – constructions as *Vi ste bila* (you.PL be.2PL been.FEM.SG – ‘you have been’) or *Vi ste pokušala* (you.PL be.2PL tried.FEM.SG – ‘you have tried’) to address female readers more specifically, maybe because it is deemed absurd to address women who have been abused by men with masculine forms (Bertoša 2001).

For the derivation of female nouns from masculine personal nouns, the suffix *-ica* is most commonly used in Croatian, while the suffixes *-inja*, *-kinja* and *-ka* are generally less productive. In Standard Croatian, therefore, forms like *aktivistica* ‘female activist’, *feministica* ‘(female) feminist’ or *lingvistica* ‘female linguist’ would regularly be used rather than *aktivistkinja*, *feministkinja* or *lingvistkinja*. However, feminist linguists sometimes recommend using the less common suffixes in order to avoid the undesirable connotations that the homonymy of the female suffix *-ica* and the diminutive suffix *-ica* may cause.

Neutralisation is generally not a feasible option in Croatian, because grammatical gender pervades personal reference forms and their satellites to such a high extent that it can hardly be erased. Neuter personal nouns are not generally available for denoting adult human beings. Even pluralisation, a neutralisation strategy that is commonly recommended for other grammatical gender languages, is not an option for Croatian, because distinct grammatical gender inflections are also found in the plural. For example, when the adjective *mlad/-a/-o* is used as a deadjectival plural noun, the masculine form *mladi* ‘the young [people]’ is used generically and in reference to men (the feminine plural form *mlade* is female-specific). A more feasible strategy in this respect may be to paraphrase sentences and to remove the gendered personal reference forms or replace them with terms that denote the profession rather than the person carrying it out. For example, instead of *profesor* or *profesorica*, the term *profesura* ‘professorship’ may be used in certain contexts (see also Savić 2000 for a similar discussion of Serbian).

The avoidance of male generics can usually be more easily achieved than that of (merely) masculine generics, namely by the substitution of the respective

lexical item. For example, when words like *čovjek* ‘man’ or *momčad* ‘male team’ are used in a generic fashion, they can be replaced by alternative forms that are lexically gender-neutral such as *osoba* ‘person’ or *ekipa, tim*, both ‘team’.

Finally, there are newly created forms that have so far not been widely established and are mainly restricted to certain queer-minded academic circles, whose aim it is to deconstruct binary linguistic gender configurations. These forms can be considered blends of masculine and feminine forms, as illustrated below for nouns, participles and pronouns (examples taken from Kersten-Pejanić 2014a: 307f.):

- (41) *sudionici* (participants.MASC), *sudionice* (participants.FEM) > *sudionicei* ‘participants’
naučio (learned.MASC), *naučila* (learned.FEM) > *naučiola* ‘learned’
oni koji (those.MASC who.MASC), *one koje* (those.FEM who.FEM) > *onie koje* ‘those who’

6. Conclusion

Although in Croatian many personal nouns show typical correspondences between declension class, agreement patterns in the targets and lexical/referential gender (e.g. *žena* ‘woman’ and *muškarac* ‘man’), it is also evident that many other personal nouns do not neatly adhere to this pattern. Personal reference forms may exhibit “mismatches” between grammatical and lexical/referential gender or allow for a competition between syntactic and semantic agreement patterns. Some personal nouns are inflected like feminines but are semantically male and trigger masculine agreement (for example, “masculine *a*-stems” in reference to males or male first names ending in *-a*). Some are inflected like feminines, trigger feminine or masculine agreement and are lexically male (e.g. collective nouns like *gospoda* ‘group of gentlemen’ or *braća* ‘group of brothers’). Others are inflected like neuters, show neuter or feminine agreement and are lexically female (for example, hybrid nouns like *djevojče* ‘girl’). Many personal nouns inflect like masculines, trigger masculine agreement in satellites and are not lexically male but rather show both a male and a generic meaning potential. This fact, in turn, does not preclude them from being commonly used for female-specific reference as well. What all of these phenomena illustrate is that in Croatian (and probably in most other languages) the linguistic construction of gender is a complex business that in many cases cannot be grasped in terms of a purely binary distinction between female/feminine and male/masculine. One could therefore speak of competing gender discourses that surface in various types of language structures.

It is evident from the description in this article that one powerful discourse that systematically surfaces in the linguistic structure of Croatian is androcentricity. However, recent developments such as Croatia's joining of the EU and stringent language planning efforts to create female personal nouns have also clearly led to a higher competition between androcentric and gender-fair discourses in language use – a trend that is likely to continue.

Notes

1. Only few nouns have more than one potential grammatical gender value (e.g. *glad* 'hunger' may be feminine or masculine), sometimes with a difference in meaning. For example, when the noun *bol* 'pain' is feminine, it means 'spiritual pain'; when it is masculine, it means 'physical pain'. Some nouns have different grammatical gender values in singular and plural (e.g. *torso* 'torso' is masculine in the singular and neuter in the plural; *oko* 'eye' is neuter in the singular, but feminine in the plural).
2. Masculine nouns show a higher degree of formal variance with respect to their endings compared to feminine and neuter nouns (Šipka 2007:68). There are various groups of masculine nouns that do not end in a consonant: 1. (mainly non-personal) nouns ending in *-ao*, which goes back to an earlier consonantal ending *-al* (e.g. *posao* 'work', *ugao* 'corner', but also *anđeo* 'angel'); 2. some loanwords ending in a vowel (personal examples include *guru* 'guru', *krupije* 'croupier', *džanki* 'junkie', *žigolo* 'gigolo'); 3. some deadjectival nouns (e.g. *bližnji* 'fellow', *dežurni* 'sentry, person on duty'); 4. some hypocoristic nouns (e.g. *nestaško* 'naughty child', *dečko* 'boy') and names (see Section 3.7); 5. "masculine *a*-stems" (see Section 3.4).
3. Alternative descriptions cater for this fact by distinguishing three declensions based on the genitive singular inflection, i.e. an *a*-declension (class I and IV), an *e*-declension (class II) and an *i*-declension (class III).
4. This contradicts the notion of phonological gender assignment in Croatian, because there are substantial numbers of both masculine and feminine nouns ending in a consonant. The two feminine personal nouns *mati* 'mother' and *kći* 'daughter' are commonly treated as belonging to declension class II and III respectively, but show idiosyncratic inflectional forms. Some feminine borrowings also do not end in *-a* and are generally not inflected (e.g. *mis* 'Miss', *lejdi* 'lady', *madam* 'madam', *madmoazel* 'Mademoiselle', *klozetfrau* 'female lavatory attendant').
5. The male form *domaćin* does not have the meaning 'housekeeper' but rather means 'host, landlord'.
6. The suffix *-ka* is also regularly added to foreign bases ending in *-er*, *-ir* or *-or* (e.g. *frizer-ka* 'female hairdresser').
7. It should be noted that the forms of the predicative adjective, the participle and the pronoun *ona* are formally ambiguous, as they could be feminine singular or neuter plural. See Wechsler & Zlatić (2000:814–817) for a discussion of this issue.
8. Sims (2005:211) found 336 such nouns in her study.

9. Some researchers (notably Sims 2005:209) call the lexically male nouns “masculine *a*-stems” and the lexically gender-neutral nouns “common gender *a*-stems”. As the first of these two terms indicates a confusion of grammatical and lexical gender, it is invariably used in quotation marks here.
10. As Hentschel (2003:293) points out, syntactic proximity may take precedence over the gender resolution rules discussed here (e.g. *drag-e studentice i studenti* ‘dear-FEM.PL female student. FEM.PL and student.MASC.PL’).
11. Note that “masculine *a*-stems” can be combined with both forms, *dva* and *dvije* (Corbett 2009: 158).
12. Numerical nouns can be formed from 2 to 99, except for 21, 31 and the remaining numbers that end in 1. As a substitute for the latter, cardinal numbers (with *jedan* as a second component) are used. The noun denoting the quantified entity stands in the genitive plural.
13. Collective numbers are also used in connection with grammatically feminine human collective nouns such as *djeca* or *unučad* (e.g. *petero djece* ‘five children’; *sedmero unučadi* ‘seven grandchildren’).
14. According to Virkkula (2007:433), names ending in *-a* are subject to regional variation, i.e. a name like *Matija* may be male in one geographical area but female in another.

References

- Alexander, Ronelle. 2006. *Bosnian, Croatian, Serbian. A grammar with sociolinguistic commentary*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Bertoša, Mislava. 2001. “Jezične promjene i feministička kritika jezika [Language changes and the feminist critique of language].” *Revija za Sociologiju* 32(1/2): 63–75.
- Bertoša, Mislava. 2006. “On the language transgression of the sex/gender binary and linguistics: A very brief overview.” In *Transgressing gender: Two is not enough for gender (e)quality. The conference collection*, eds. Amir Hodžić & Jelena Postić. Zagreb: CESI, 226–238.
- Borić, Rada. 2007. *Pojmovnik rodne terminologije. Prema standardima Europske Unije* [Glossary of gender terminology. In accordance with the standards of the European Union]. Zagreb: Centar za Ženske Studije.
- Braun, Friederike & Sabine Sczesny & Dagmar Stahlberg. 2005. “Cognitive effects of masculine generics in German: An overview of empirical findings.” *Communications* 30(1): 1–21. DOI: 10.1515/comm.2005.30.1.1
- Bugarški, Ranko. 2004. “Language policies in the successor states of former Yugoslavia.” *Journal of Language and Politics* 3(2): 189–207. DOI: 10.1075/jlp.3.2.04bug
- Čanak, Marijana. 2009. “Interpretacija podataka iz registra: Jedan od mogućih pristupa odrednici *vračara* i srodnim rečima. [Interpretation of the data from the register: One of the possible approaches to the entry *female wizard* and related words].” In *Rod i jezik* [Gender and language], eds. Svenka Savić & Marijana Čanak & Veronika Mitro & Gordana Štasni. Novi Sad: Futura Publikacije, 133–163.
- Čimbur, Rujana. 2006. “O stajalištima prema jezičnoj diskriminaciji na osnovi spola: Područje rada i zapošljavanja [On views of language discrimination on the basis of gender: The domain of work and employment].” *Govor – Časopis za Fonetiku* 23(1): 49–62.

- Corbett, Greville G. 1991. *Gender*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
DOI: 10.1017/CBO9781139166119
- Corbett, Greville G. 2006. *Agreement*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Corbett, Greville G. 2009. "Morphology-free syntax: Two potential counter-examples from Serbo-Croat." In *A linguist's linguist: Studies in South Slavic linguistics in honor of E. Wayles Browne*, eds. Steven Franks & Vrinda Chidambaram & Brian Joseph. Bloomington, IN: Slavica, 149–166.
- Fernández Fontecha, Almudena & Rosa María Jiménez Catalán. 2003. "Semantic derogation in animal metaphor: A contrastive-cognitive analysis of two male/female examples in English and Spanish." *Journal of Pragmatics* 35(5): 771–797. DOI: 10.1016/S0378-2166(02)00127-3
- Filipović, Jelena. 2011. "Gender, power and language standardization of Serbian." *Gender and Language* 5(1): 111–131. DOI: 10.1558/genl.v5i1.111
- Glovacki-Bernardi, Zrinjka. 2006. "Gender perspective in public and official communication: Sociolinguistic, legal, and political aspects." In *Transgressing gender: Two is not enough for gender (e)quality. The conference collection*, eds. Amir Hodžić & Jelena Postić. Zagreb: CESI, 239–242.
- Glovacki-Bernardi, Zrinjka. 2008. *Kad student zatrudni: Razprava o rodnoj perspektivi u jeziku* [When a student becomes pregnant: The discussion of the gender perspective in language]. Zagreb: Alfa.
- Glovacki-Bernardi, Zrinjka. 2012. "Job advertisements in Croatian newspapers – Gender perspective." In *Doing gender – Doing the Balkans: Dynamics and persistence of gender relations in Yugoslavia and the Yugoslav successor states*, eds. Roswitha Kersten-Pejanić & Simone Rajilić & Christian Voß. München: Otto Sagner, 147–160.
- Greenberg, Robert D. 2004. *Language and identity in the Balkans: Serbo-Croatian and its disintegration*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gröschel, Bernhard. 2009. *Das Serbokroatische zwischen Linguistik und Politik. Mit einer Bibliographie zum postjugoslavischen Sprachenstreit*. München: LINCOM Europa.
- Gvozdanović, Jadranka. 2002. "Kroatisch." In *Sprachkulturen in Europa. Ein internationales Handbuch*, eds. Nina Janich & Albrecht Greule. Tübingen: Gunter Narr, 134–138.
- Halupka-Rešetar, Sabina & Biljana Radić. 2003. "Animal names used in addressing people in Serbian." *Journal of Pragmatics* 35(12): 1891–1902. DOI: 10.1016/S0378-2166(03)00052-3
- Hentschel, Elke. 2003. "The expression of gender in Serbian." In *Gender across languages. The linguistic representation of women and men*, vol. 3, eds. Marlis Hellinger & Hadumod Bußmann. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 287–309. DOI: 10.1075/impact.11.16hen
- Kersten-Pejanić, Roswitha. 2010. "Gendergerechte Sprache in Kroatien und Serbien im Kontext der EU-Integration." In *Theoretische und empirische Genderlinguistik in Bosnien, Kroatien und Serbien*, eds. Simone Rajilić & Roswitha Kersten-Pejanić. München: Otto Sagner, 17–99.
- Kersten-Pejanić, Roswitha. 2014a. "Grenzen und Möglichkeiten geschlechtergerechten Sprachgebrauchs. Aktuelle Trends genderlinguistischer Forderungen am Beispiel Kroatiens." In *Babel Balkan? Politische und soziokulturelle Kontexte von Sprache in Südosteuropa*, ed. Christian Voß. München: Otto Sagner, 295–311.
- Kersten-Pejanić, Roswitha. 2014b. "Sprachliches Doing Gender in Kroatien: Genderlinguistische Verhandlungen gestern und heute." In *Linguistische Beiträge zur Slavistik: XXI. JungslavistInnen-Treffen in Göttingen, 13.–15. September 2012*, ed. Hagen Pitsch. München: Otto Sagner, 119–136.

- Kiełtyka, Robert. 2005. "Zoosemic terms denoting female human beings: Semantic derogation of women revisited." *Studia Anglica Posnaniensia* 41: 167–186.
- Kim, Hyoungsup. 2010. "The use of collective numeral phrases in Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian: Morphosemantic approach." *Journal of Foreign Studies* 6: 235–256.
- Kordić, Snežana. 2002. "Das verallgemeinernde *čovjek* 'man' im Kroato-serbischen." In *Frau und Mann in der Sprache, Literatur und Kultur des slavischen und baltischen Raumes. Beiträge zu einem Symposium in Münster, 11./12. Mai 2000*, eds. Bernhard Symanzik & Gerhard Birkfellner & Alfred Sproede. Hamburg: Kovač, 165–187.
- Kunzmann-Müller, Barbara. 2003. "Kroatisch und Serbisch." In *Variationstypologie. Ein sprachtypologisches Handbuch der europäischen Sprachen in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, ed. Thorsten Roelcke. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 704–730.
- Lazović, Vesna. 2009. "Cross-cultural semantic equivalence of some gender-related words." *English Language Overseas Perspectives and Enquiries* 6(1/2): 7–18.
- Loma, Aleksandar. 2007. "Das serbische Personennamensystem." In *Europäische Personennamensysteme. Ein Handbuch von Abasisch bis Zentralladinisch*, eds. Andrea Brendler & Silvio Brendler. Hamburg: Baar, 669–687.
- Maček, Dora. 1993. "Common gender nouns in contemporary Serbo-Croat." *Scottish Slavonic Review* 21: 96–113.
- Manova, Stela. 2002. "Between inflection and derivation: On morphotactic expression of aspect and gender in Bulgarian, Russian and Serbo-Croatian." *Wiener Slavistisches Jahrbuch* 48: 203–217.
- Mirković, Jelena & Maryellen C. MacDonald & Mark S. Seidenberg. 2005. "Where does gender come from? Evidence from a complex inflectional system." *Language and Cognitive Processes* 20(1/2): 139–167. DOI: 10.1080/01690960444000205
- Mladenova, Olga M. 2001. "Neuter designations of humans and norms of social interaction in the Balkans." *Anthropological Linguistics* 43(1): 18–53.
- Motschenbacher, Heiko. 2010. *Language, gender and sexual identity: Poststructuralist perspectives*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. DOI: 10.1075/impact.29
- Nilsen, Alleen Pace. 1996. "Of ladybugs and billy goats: What animal species names tell about human perceptions of gender." *Metaphor and Symbolic Activity* 11(4): 257–271. DOI: 10.1207/s15327868ms1104_2
- Radanović, Jelena & Milin, Petar. 2011. "Morpho-semantic properties of Serbian nouns: Animacy and gender pairs." *Psihologija* 44(4): 343–366. DOI: 10.2298/PSI1104343R
- Rajilić, Simone. 2014a. "Is Serbian becoming Croatian? Nationalist counter-reactions to feminist linguistics in Serbia." In *IGALA8 - International Gender & Language Association Conference: Book of Proceedings*, ed. International Gender and Language Association (IGALA). Vancouver: Simon Fraser University, 264–278.
- Rajilić, Simone. 2014b. "Silovanje jezika! – Vergewaltigung von Sprache! Debatten über Gender und Sprache in der serbischen Presse 2001–2012." In *Babel Balkan? Politische und soziokulturelle Kontexte von Sprache in Südosteuropa*, ed. Christian Voß. München: Otto Sagner, 271–293.
- Savić, Svenka. 1985. *Pragmatic aspects of the gender of occupational terms in Serbo-Croatian*. Aarhus: Slavisk Institut Aarhus Universitet.
- Savić, Svenka. 1989. "Language and sex: Evidence from Serbo-Croatian." *S: European Journal for Semiotic Studies* 1(3): 535–556.

- Savić, Svenka. 2000. "Seksizam u jeziku – Politika omalovazavanja [Sexism and language – The policy of scorn]." In *Mapiranje mizoginije u Srbiji: Diskursi i prakse* [The mapping of misogyny in Serbia: Discourses and practices], eds. Dragana Antonijević & Marina Blagojević. Beograd: Asocijacija za Žensku Inicijativu, 65–85.
- Savić, Svenka. 2009. "Rod i jezik [Gender and language]." In *Rod i jezik* [Gender and language], eds. Svenka Savić & Marijana Čanak & Veronika Mitro & Gordana Štasni. Novi Sad: Futura Publikacije, 7–33.
- Sims, Andrea D. 2005. "Declension hopping in dialectal Croatian: Two predictions of frequency." In *Yearbook of morphology 2005*, eds. Geert Booij & Jaap van Marle. Dordrecht: Springer, 201–225. DOI: 10.1007/1-4020-4066-0_7
- Škiljan, Dubravko. 2000. "From Croato-Serbian to Croatian: Croatian linguistic identity." *Multilingua* 19(1/2): 3–20. DOI: 10.1515/mult.2000.19.1-2.3
- Šipka, Danko. 2007. *A comparative reference grammar of Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian*. Hyattsville, MD: Dunwoody Press.
- Štasni, Gordana & Veronika Mitro. 2009. "Registar imenovanja žena [Register of women's denominations]." In *Rod i jezik* [Gender and language], eds. Svenka Savić & Marijana Čanak & Veronika Mitro & Gordana Štasni. Novi Sad: Futura Publikacije, 35–129.
- Symons, Kate. 2006. "Ministrastvo unutarnjih spolova [Ministry of the interior of the sexes]: Negotiating transition in a foreign language." In *Transgressing gender: Two is not enough for gender (e)quality. The conference collection*, eds. Amir Hodžić & Jelena Postić. Zagreb: CESI, 35–39.
- Tošović, Branko, ed. 2008–2010. *Die Unterschiede zwischen dem Bosnischen/Bosniakischen, Kroatischen und Serbischen* (3 volumes). Wien: LIT.
- Tošović, Branko. 2010. "Die grammatikalischen Unterschiede zwischen dem Bosnischen/Bosniakischen, Kroatischen und Serbischen." In *Die Unterschiede zwischen dem Bosnischen/Bosniakischen, Kroatischen und Serbischen. Band 3: Grammatik*, ed. Branko Tošović. Wien: LIT, 131–188.
- UNESCO. 2009 [1999]. "Vodić za upotrebu rodno neutralnog jezika [Guide to the application of gender-neutral language]." In *Rod i jezik* [Gender and language], eds. Svenka Savić & Marijana Čanak & Veronika Mitro & Gordana Štasni. Novi Sad: Futura Publikacije, 172–177.
- Virkkula, Johanna. 2007. "Das kroatische Personennamensystem." In *Europäische Personennamensysteme. Ein Handbuch von Abasisch bis Zentralladinisch*, eds. Andrea Brendler & Silvio Brendler. Hamburg: Baar, 431–440.
- Wechsler, Stephen & Larisa Zlatić. 2000. "A theory of agreement and its application to Serbo-Croatian." *Language* 76(4): 799–832. DOI: 10.2307/417200

Gender in a planned language: Esperanto*

Sabine Fiedler

University of Leipzig, Germany

1. Introduction
2. Gender-related structures
 - 2.1 Personal nouns
 - 2.2 Pronominalization
 - 2.3 Word-formation: The gender-related affixes *-in*, *vir-* and *ge-*
3. Language reform
 - 3.1 Debates on gender-fair language use
 - 3.2 Occupational titles: A pilot study
 - 3.3 Reform proposals and their degree of implementation
 - 3.3.1 Male suffixes
 - 3.3.2 The use of *ge-*
 - 3.3.3 Towards a gender-indefinite pronoun
4. Gender in Esperanto proverbs
5. Conclusion

Notes

References

1. Introduction

In 1995, I conducted a survey among Esperanto speakers which was related to the topic of phraseology in planned languages (Fiedler 1999). I asked the subscribers to *Esperanto*, the main journal of the Universal Esperanto Association (UEA), about their knowledge of idioms and proverbs in Esperanto and other languages. The questionnaire was answered by 528 informants in 45 countries and gave an insight into the currency and usage of idioms and proverbs as well as processes of phraseological comprehension. There was, however, one striking aspect of this questionnaire study, namely the critical notes concerning the language used in the questionnaire. A number of people thought they had found linguistic errors

in the authentic text samples whose meanings and stylistic effects they had been asked about. Moreover, some respondents ‘corrected’ my introductory text and some of the words and constructions I used in the tasks.

One of the linguistic remarks referred to the practice of marking the female gender in professions and functions. In my introductory sentence *Mi estas lingvistino-esperantistino el Germanio (...)* ‘I am a female Esperantist and female linguist from Germany (...)’; some respondents crossed out or underlined the suffix *-in*, which is the marker of the female gender in Esperanto (e.g. *edzo* ‘husband’ > *edzino* ‘wife’, the latter consisting of the root *edz-* ‘husband’, the female suffix *-in* and the nominal suffix *-o*). Two respondents even added comments, which are reproduced below (original in Esperanto, my translation; S.F.):

Why not *lingvisto-esperantisto*? Is the gender really important? If *pasagero* ‘passenger’ and *viktimo* ‘victim’ etc., can be gender-neutral, why then not *lingvisto* ‘linguist’ and *esperantisto* ‘Esperantist’? See, for example “Lingvistikaj aspektoj de Eo”, where J. Wells recommends such a development.

Are you a female female? Thus a male? So much femininity frightens me.

These remarks are indicative of the fact that the expression of the female gender is a controversial topic in Esperanto. There are, obviously, different attitudes towards the necessity of making gender visible and there are different linguistic means of doing so. Furthermore, as words such as “recommends” and “development” in the comments suggest, the planned language appears to be in flux with regard to gender representation. We should also consider that native-language influence is a significant factor in a second-language community. Corrections to the questionnaires and the remarks above were made by Esperanto speakers with various L1 backgrounds and might be influenced by the feminist language movements in the speakers’ respective countries.

This article will deal with these issues in detail. It starts with an overview of Esperanto, including information on the characteristics and development of its speech community and central linguistic features. In the subsequent sections, the linguistic means of gender representation in Esperanto will be analyzed, both as laid down in reference books and in the speakers’ actual language use. It will be argued that the variation in the use of gendered forms in Esperanto is due to a number of factors, including the skeletal character of its norm, the different treatments in textbooks and grammars, and the peculiarities of second-language communication, which is influenced by speakers’ native languages and cultures. The study draws on comparative analyses of Esperanto texts and utilizes corpus data.

Planned languages (also called “universal languages”, “artificial languages”, or “constructed languages”) are language systems which have been consciously created according to definite criteria by an individual or a group of individuals for the purpose of making international communication easier (cf. Blanke 1985: 11; Wüster 1931, 1976 [1955]). Their number has probably reached almost 1,000 already. The traditional classification by Couturat and Leau (2001 [1903, 1907]) is based on the relationship of planned language systems to ethnic languages, especially with regard to their lexical material. The authors distinguish between (1) *a priori* systems, (2) *a posteriori* systems, and (3) mixed systems. Whereas the phonological and lexical systems of most *a priori* languages are formed on the basis of philosophically motivated classifications of human knowledge, as for example in John Wilkins’ (1968 [1668]) “Analytical Language” (cf. Hüllen 1984; Okrent 2009), an *a posteriori* system borrows lexical material from specific ethnic languages and adapts it to its structure. Within the group of *a posteriori* systems, an autonomous (or schematic) subgroup can be found that shows a high degree of regularity in inflection and word-formation. Esperanto and Ido are representative of this type.

Only Esperanto, initiated by Ludwik L. Zamenhof, a Jewish oculist, in 1887, has succeeded in becoming a fully-fledged language. This is due to its structural properties (cf. Janton 1993 [1973]; Nuessel 2000; Wells 1989), but above all to extra-linguistic factors (cf. Blanke 2009). Esperanto has found a sufficiently large and differentiated speech community, which has adopted it and guarantees its further development. The number of Esperanto speakers is estimated to range between 500,000 (Pool & Grofman 1989: 146) and 3.5 million (Piron 1989: 157). These speakers are connected by an active network of communication on local, national and international levels, which surfaces, for example, in an independent press, publishing houses, radio programmes, organizations, correspondence, collective travelling, meetings and conferences in which only Esperanto is spoken.

The Esperanto speech community is very heterogeneous and its sociology is an under-researched area. For the majority of speakers, Esperanto is a vehicle of culture that is worth preserving and spreading. With regard to the speakers’ group identity and language attitudes (such as linguistic loyalty, which finds its expression in the fact that the language is taught as a mother tongue; cf. Fiedler 2012), we can find certain parallels between Esperanto speakers and members of ethnic minorities (Edwards 2010; Kimura 2012).

Esperanto originated as a framework of only sixteen rules. The first part of this minimal grammar contained the alphabet with notes on the pronunciation of the 28 phonemes. The second part covered the morphosyntactic rules. Some of these rules are rather specific, as they seem to be caused by peculiarities in

ethnic languages spoken by Zamenhof, such as the avoidance of double negation (common in French and Russian) or the use of the nominative after prepositions. Some other rules were not precise enough, such as those for the use of articles, the passive *-ata/-ita* distinction or the pronunciation of some phonemes, leading to uncertainties in usage. The sixteen rules were published in the *Unua Libro* ‘First Book’ (Zamenhof 1887), together with a dictionary for Russian learners and some Esperanto texts (translations of a part of the Bible and of a poem by Heinrich Heine as well as original poetry). Further editions in Polish, German, French and other languages followed quickly. Despite their skeletal structure, the sixteen rules enabled people to learn and use the language immediately. They also provided the basis for subsequent, more detailed linguistic descriptions of Esperanto in bilingual grammars as well as in the two monolingual works that are considered to be the standard grammars of Esperanto by many speakers today, the *Plena Analiza Gramatiko de Esperanto* ‘Complete Analytical Grammar of Esperanto’ by Kalocsay and Waringhien (1985) and the *Plena Manlibro de Esperanta Gramatiko* ‘Complete Handbook of Esperanto Grammar’ by Wennergren (2005).

Esperanto is basically a European language, especially with regard to its vocabulary. The Romance languages provide approximately 75% of the Esperanto vocabulary, especially Latin and French (e.g. *filo* ‘son’, *manĝi* ‘eat’). About 20% are of Germanic origin (e.g. *haŭto* ‘skin’, *trinki* ‘drink’), and the rest is derived from various other sources, especially Slavic languages (cf. Janton 1993 [1973]:51). Parkvall (2010) employs the features catalogued in the *World Atlas of Language Structures* (WALS) (Haspelmath & Dryer & Gil 2005) to discuss the common criticism that Esperanto is too European and therefore less accessible to speakers of non-European languages. With regard to the topic of this article, it is worth mentioning that Parkvall includes the use of gender-specific pronouns as one of the “features that stand out as conspicuously European (here meaning Indo-European of Europe) in character”: “Esperanto distinguishes between ‘he’ (*li*) and ‘she’ (*ŝi*), unlike most languages outside Europe” (Parkvall 2010:69).

In typological terms, Esperanto is highly agglutinating, but also has features of inflectional and isolating languages (Gledhill 2000:37–41; Piron 1991; Wells 1989). Its agglutinating nature allows for its words to be divided into stable units of meaning. For example, the word *eksinstruistino* ‘former female teacher’ consists of five morphemes: the prefix *eks-* ‘former’, the root *instru-* ‘teach’, and the three suffixes *-ist* ‘professional’, *-in* ‘female’ and *-o* (nominal suffix). Esperanto affixes can also be used as roots¹ (for example, of adjectives, *eks-* > *eksa* ‘former’, or of nouns, *-in* > *inoj* ‘women’), and the fact that the affix system is applied consistently increases acquisitional ease (cf. Gledhill 2000).

Esperanto’s linguistic norms are documented in the *Fundamento de Esperanto* (Zamenhof 1991 [1905]), which was declared the standard of the language

at the first international Esperanto congress in Boulogne-sur-Mer in 1905. The *Fundamento* consists of three parts: the grammatical part of the first Esperanto textbook *Unua Libro* (Zamenhof 1887, first published in Russian under the title *Meždunarodnyj jazyk* ‘International Language’), the *Universala Vortaro* ‘Universal Dictionary’ (Zamenhof 1894a), and a set of exemplary sentences, the *Ekzercaro* (included in Zamenhof 1991 [1905]). The aim of the *Fundamento* was not to prevent any development but rather to protect the language against arbitrariness, as Zamenhof was convinced that the language could survive only if it developed on the basis of clearly defined and obligatory principles. At the same time, from the very beginning, he had been fully aware of the fact that once Esperanto began to spread, he could no longer claim any special authority to control its development. In *Unua Libro*, Zamenhof thus renounced all ownership of the language: “The international language, like every national language, is the property of society; the author renounces all personal rights in it forever” (Zamenhof 1887). The norms of Esperanto are supervised by the *Akademio de Esperanto* ‘Academy of Esperanto’, an international body of linguists and eminent writers, which was set up in 1905 as the *Lingva Komitato* ‘Language Committee’, renamed *Akademio* in 1908.

2. Gender-related structures

Esperanto has no grammatical gender and thus, gender is primarily a semantic category. There is a class of personal nouns with lexically male and female roots and there are gender-indefinite nouns. Gender-related structures include word-formation, pronominalization and the personal pronouns of the third person singular. The following description of these phenomena encompasses both the original presentation in the *Fundamento de Esperanto* and current usage.

2.1 Personal nouns

In terms of lexical gender, there are three groups of personal nouns in Esperanto (cf. Fischer 2003; Wennergren 2005). The first group consists of nouns with clearly male roots. It includes:

- kinship terms (e.g. *patro* ‘father’, *edzo* ‘husband’, *filo* ‘son’, *avo* ‘grandfather’, *onklo* ‘uncle’, *kuzo* ‘male cousin’, *vidvo* ‘widower’, *fianĉo* ‘fiancé’, *nepo* ‘grandson’, *nevo* ‘nephew’)
- titles (e.g. *reĝo* ‘king’, *barono* ‘baron’, *caro* ‘czar’, *princo* ‘prince’, *emiro* ‘emir’, *ŝaho* ‘shah’, *papo* ‘pope’, *imamo* ‘imam’, *mastro* ‘master [of the house]’)
- other male nouns (e.g. *viro* ‘man’, *knabo* ‘boy’, *fraŭlo* ‘bachelor’).

The suffix *-in* is used to form their female counterparts (e.g. *patrino* ‘mother’, *reĝino* ‘queen’, *virino* ‘woman’).

The number of nouns that constitute the second group, those with lexically female roots, is much smaller: e.g. *femalo* ‘female’, *damo* ‘lady’, *amazono* ‘amazon’, *matrono* ‘matron’, *muzo* ‘muse’, *primadono* ‘prima donna’, *furio* ‘fury’, *nimfo* ‘nymph’, *meĝero* ‘shrew’, *hetajro* ‘hetaira’, *gejŝo* ‘geisha’.

In addition, nouns with the hypocoristic suffixes *-ĉj* (male) and *-nj* (female) are gender-specific. Their behavior is unusual, as they cannot be used as roots and are not attached to the whole root of a word or name but to its first syllable or a shortened part of it (e.g. *patro* ‘father’ < *paĉjo* ‘dad’, *panjo* ‘mum’; *Vilĉjo* ‘Bill’, *Manjo* ‘Maggie’).

The third and probably largest group consists of lexically gender-indefinite nouns. This group includes:

- nouns designating human beings in general (e.g. *persono* ‘person’, *homo* ‘human being’) or in relation to other people (e.g. *amiko* ‘friend’, *kolego* ‘colleague’, *membro* ‘member’, *ĉefo* ‘chief’, *kamarado* ‘comrade’)
- nouns designating professions and special functions (e.g. *kelnero* ‘waiter’, *studento* ‘student’, *geografo* ‘geographer’, *redaktoro* ‘editor’, *sekretario* ‘secretary’, *turisto* ‘tourist’, *pasaĝero* ‘passenger’, *kapitano* ‘captain’)
- nouns designating inhabitants of a country or member of a group (e.g. *svedo* ‘Swede’, *judo* ‘Jew’, *slavo* ‘Slav’)
- nouns containing the suffixes *-ul* ‘person’, *-ist* ‘professional, enthusiast, adherent’, *-an* ‘member’, *-estr* ‘leader’ or *-id* ‘offspring’ (e.g. *kunulo* ‘companion’, *biciklisto* ‘cyclist’, *samlاندano* ‘compatriot’, *urbestro* ‘mayor’, *reĝido* ‘descendant of a king’)
- nominalized participles marked by the suffixes *-anto*, *-into*, *-onto*, *-ato*, *-ito*, *-oto* (e.g. *lernanto* ‘pupil’, *venkinto* ‘winner’, *savonto* ‘savior’, *nekonato* ‘stranger’, *kaptito* ‘captive’, *juĝoto* ‘somebody who will be judged’).

The principle of forming female expressions on the basis of male ones in Esperanto has been criticized from the earliest days on. The suffix *-in* had already played a role in the controversy about planned languages between the “Neogrammarians” Karl Brugmann and August Leskien and the Polish linguist Jan Baudouin de Courtenay at the beginning of the 20th century (cf. Baudouin de Courtenay 1907; Brugmann & Leskien 1907). In his reaction to Brugmann and Leskien’s criticism, Baudouin de Courtenay (1976 [1907]: 88f.) points out the following:²

There is another objection I want to raise to the formation of *patrino* (mother) on the basis of *patro* (father), of *fratino* (sister) out of *frato* (brother) [...] etc. Such formations remind me too much of the biblical legend, of the biblical worldview that has penetrated into our blood and bones, of the creation of Eve out of Adam’s

rib; it is as such unnatural, contributes to the restriction of the female sex significantly and, due to this reason alone, does not at all go with an “artificial” language, a language that makes a claim for the reflection of natural conditions. The neutral, sexless is here drastically turned into something male. [...] All living beings are principally thought to be male in their origin, and only in their derived, secondary form female as well. How many times more correct is the procedure in these cases in Hottentot and some other South African languages! These languages have for every sexually divided species (including human beings) above all one *neutral*, common form (*commune*) and, apart from this, two other forms for male and female creatures that are particularly marked.

The creator of Esperanto, therefore, if he wants to proceed rationally and naturally, should apply the same method. [...] If [...] *sinjor-in-o* [means] ‘Mrs/lady’, *knab-in-o* ‘girl’, *frat-in-o* ‘sister’, *patr-in-o* ‘mother’ ..., other suffixes should be used for the formation of male creatures, e.g. *-un-*, *-im-* or *-or-*. [...]

By the way, I do not consider the masculinization of nominal roots a fundamental mistake, but only a flaw of Esperanto. To what extent the Esperantists themselves agree on this inconsistency and unnaturalness is again their own affair. (my translation, S.F.)

In fact, not all Esperanto speakers seem to agree on the principle of deriving female forms from male ones. Critical voices have been raised in all periods of the now 126-year history of Esperanto and we will return to these in Section 3.3 when discussing reform proposals.

Even those speakers who are in agreement with Zamenhof’s word-formation principles, however, experience uncertainties in the usage of the suffix *-in*.³ There are several reasons for its heterogeneous use. One is the minimal (and occasionally contradictory) description in the *Fundamento*. In Zamenhof’s (1991 [1905]) set of model phrases (*Ekzercaro*), for example, we find the sentence *Virino, kiu kuracas estas kuracistino* ‘A woman who gives medical treatment to a patient is a doctor’, lit. ‘a woman who heals is a female healer’. For some speakers, this is an indicator that in nouns with the suffix *-ist* a female gender marker (*-in*) is necessary. Secondly, the descriptions of the suffix *-in* in Esperanto grammars and textbooks are often contradictory (cf. Fischer 2003: 144). A third reason is the influence of speakers’ native languages. If, for example, German learners of Esperanto read in their bilingual dictionaries that *instruisto* means *Lehrer* ‘teacher.MASC’ and *instruistino* is *Lehrerin* ‘female teacher.FEM’, that *kelnero* means *Kellner* ‘waiter.MASC’ and *kelnerino* is *Kellnerin* ‘waitress.FEM’, they tend to transfer the traditional usage of these words from their mother tongue to Esperanto. One should not forget that Esperanto is a foreign language that is consciously acquired. In beginners’ courses, the formation of female nouns by means of *-in* is trained intensively and maybe occasionally overemphasized. Oljanov (1988: 3) illustrates this with a typical teaching situation:

If in a beginners' course a female participant says "mi estas oficisto" ['I'm an official'], the teacher will draw her attention "Ĉu vi estas viro?" ['Are you a man?']; and he/she will make her say correctly "oficistino" ['female official']. This is the Esperanto teacher's regular behaviour because the suffixes represent new material for the learners and they have to get accustomed to using it.

As a result, a large number of Esperanto speakers adds the suffix *-in* to gender-neutral nouns as a matter of routine, although there is no necessity to do so. They find this a practical solution that is easier to apply and teach (cf. Eichholz 1983: 73).

2.2 Pronominalization

Among Esperanto pronouns, *mi* 'I', *ni* 'we', *vi* 'you' (singular and plural), *li* 'he', *ŝi* 'she', *ĝi* 'it', *ili* 'they' (and the possessives, which are formed by adding *-a* to these), a gender distinction is only expressed in the third person singular. *Li* refers to males and people whose gender is not known, thereby echoing the male generic patterns documented for many other languages. *Ŝi* refers to females, *ĝi* to things, animals, and (little) children.

In the early days, Zamenhof (1962 [1907]) preferred to use *ĝi* to indicate gender neutrality for people. He points out in *La Revuo (Respondo 23)*:⁴

When we speak about a human being, not indicating gender, then it would be regular to use the pronoun "ĝi" (as we do, for example, with the word "infano" 'child'), and if you do so, you are grammatically totally right. However, as the word "ĝi" (used especially for "animals" and "inanimate things") includes in itself something demeaning (and something unusual as well) and would be inappropriate for the "idea" of the human being, I would advise you to do the same as one does in other languages and to use the pronoun "li" for human beings.
(my translation, S.F.)

Today, *ĝi* is considered archaic, and the pronoun *li* is preferred to refer to human beings in a gender-indefinite way. The use of *li* in its gender-neutral function (i.e. as a so-called male generic) is illustrated in the *Fundamento* by a number of sentences:

- (1) [...] *ĉiu, kiu ŝi-n vid-is, pov-is pens-i, ke li*
 everyone who she-ACC see-PAST can-PAST think-INF that he
vid-as la patr-in-o-n
 see-PRES the father-female-N-ACC
 '... everybody who saw her could think that *he* sees her mother'
 (Zamenhof 1991 [1905]:90)

- (2) *Ĉar ĉiu am-as ordinar-e person-o-n, kiu*
 because everyone love-PRES normal-ADV person-N-ACC who
est-as simil-a al li [...]
 be-PRES similar-ADJ to he
 ‘As everybody normally loves a person who is similar to *himself* [...]’
 (Zamenhof 1991 [1905]:93)

However, as Fischer (2002) shows, grammar books are not always specific enough about this. Kalocsay and Waringhien (1985:72), for example, comment on the use of personal pronouns, particularly on the gender-indefinite function of *li*, as follows:

Theoretically, the distribution of the three pronouns is very clear: we use *li* ‘he’ for men, *ŝi* ‘she’ for women, *ĝi* ‘it’ for things. However, in practice, the use is a bit more complicated:

- (a) In the case of collective nouns [...]
 (b) In the case of a human being, and if we do not want to indicate the female gender precisely, we use *li*: *mi vokas la knabon kaj li venas; la ekstero de tiu ĉi homo estas pli bona ol lia interno.* (...) ‘I call the boy and he comes; the external of this human being is better than his internal’ ...
 Note II: In exceptional cases, Zamenhof uses *ĝi* to present the word: person; but *li* is at least as good.
 (c) In the case of a child whose gender does not matter we use *ĝi*.
 (my translation, S.F.)

Wennergren (2005:99) is much more precise about the use of the third-person pronouns in Esperanto:

li ‘the male person referred to or person of unknown gender’
ŝi ‘the female person referred to’
ĝi ‘the thing, animal or little child referred to’ (my translation, S.F.)

Wennergren (2005:104) concludes the chapter on the pronouns *li* and *ŝi* in the *Plena Manlibro de Esperanta Gramatiko (PMEG)* as follows:

Such a usage of *li* ‘he’ is sometimes regarded as sexual discrimination, but, in fact, is only a grammatical affair. One does not use *li* ‘he’ because one ignores women, but because it has two meanings: a male and a gender-neutral one. This can indeed cause a lack of clarity occasionally. Then one should not hesitate to express oneself more clearly, for example by saying *ŝi aŭ li* ‘she or he’, *tiu* ‘this’, *tiu persono* ‘this person’ etc.

This recommendation is indeed frequently adopted in Esperanto communication. The use of *ŝi aŭ li* ‘she or he’, *li aŭ ŝi* ‘he or she’, *li/ŝi* ‘he/she’ and other variants is discussed in Section 3.3.3.

2.3 Word-formation: The gender-related affixes *-in*, *vir-* and *ge-*

As described in Section 2.1, Esperanto has *-in* as the prototypical female-specific suffix. It is used with male roots to form their female counterparts (e.g. *filo* ‘son’ – *filino* ‘daughter’; *knabo* ‘boy’ – *knabino* ‘girl’). As Esperanto affixes can also be used independently with an appropriate ending, the noun *ino* is synonymous with *virino* ‘woman’ and the adjective *ina* means ‘female’. Affixes are applied regularly and consistently, i.e. without exception. As a result, for example, ‘widow’ is *vidvino* (< *vidvo* ‘widower’), ‘bride’ is *novedzino* (*nova* ‘new’ + *edzo* ‘husband’ + *-in*), and ‘fiancée’ is *fianĉino* (< *fianĉo* ‘fiancé’) despite the fact that in other languages it is the male form that is morphologically marked in such cases (e.g. English *widow* – *widower*, *bride* – *bridegroom*; German *Witwe* ‘widow’ – *Witwer* ‘widower’, *Braut* ‘bride’ – *Bräutigam* ‘bridegroom’). There are different opinions among members of the speech community about the usage of *-in* with some of the nouns that were described as “gender-indefinite” in Section 2.1, as the examples *lingvist(in)o* and *esperantist(in)o* in the introduction illustrate. This will be discussed in more detail in Section 3.1.

The root *vir-* ‘male’ can be used to form male nouns on the basis of gender-unspecific nouns. It can be used as a prefix-like element, as in *virĉevalo* ‘stallion’ (lit. ‘male horse’), *virŝafo* ‘ram’ (lit. ‘male sheep’). In the early days of Esperanto, the same root was used as a suffix (e.g. *ĉevalviro* ‘horse’ + ‘man’, *ŝafviro* ‘sheep’ + ‘man’). This use, however, can result in ambiguity, as, for example, *bovoviro* can be understood both as ‘Minotaur’ (‘ox’ + ‘man’) or ‘bull’ (‘ox’ + ‘male’). As Philippe (1991: 243) notes, the two types of formation were competing between 1910 and the 1930s, before the prefix-like construction prevailed. Formations like *kaproviro* ‘ram’ are considered archaic today. The use of *vir-* as a prefix-like element is not restricted to animals. With personal nouns, however, adjectival premodification is preferred (e.g. *vira prezidanto* ‘male president’).⁵

The prefix *ge-* means ‘both sexes together’. It is used to designate (1) a couple (e.g. *gepatroj* ‘father and mother’, *gefianĉoj* ‘fiancé and fiancée’), (2) a group of relatives of both sexes (e.g. *gefratoj* ‘brother(s) and sister(s)’, *gefiloj* ‘son(s) and daughter(s)’), or (3) a group of male and female people (e.g. *gesinjoroj* ‘ladies and gentlemen’, *gekollegoj* ‘male and female colleagues’). With regard to the third usage, *ge-* is often left out with gender-neutral nouns if there is no need to stress that both sexes are present. In the Esperanto version of the European Framework for

Languages (*Komuna Eŭropa Referenckadro por Lingvoj*; Council of Europe 2007), for example, *lernantoj* ‘learners’ is used to refer to both male and female learners.

3. Language reform

3.1 Debates on gender-fair language use

The principle of using male nouns as the base forms for female nouns is an inherently sexist element in Esperanto and has been criticized throughout the history of the language. As Bormann (1983) shows, the debates on non-sexist language use in Esperanto were fuelled by feminist movements in Western countries in the 1970s and 1980s, and controversial discussions concerning solutions can be found in a number of national and international Esperanto journals (e.g. Anikejev 1982; Bormann 1983; Eichholz 1980; Gilmore 1987; Golden 1984; Grady 2010; Haveman 1989; Nakamura 1979; Oljanov 1988; Pool 1992; Roff 1992; Sárközi 1981; Vaitilavičius 1991; Vesty 1986). Between 1979 and 1988 a feminist Esperanto newsletter, *Sekso kaj egaleco* ‘Gender and equality’ (edited by Anna Brennan Löwenstein) was published, which represented a forum for the debate on the fight against the world-wide discrimination against women, including linguistic discrimination.⁶

Discussions about non-sexist language use in the Universal Esperanto Association (UEA) started at the end of the 1970s in connection with a new statute of the UEA. The gender-related use in the old statute (the use of *prezidanto* and the personal pronoun *li*) was not considered acceptable by some speakers and a solution to the problem was hard to find, as Bormann (1983:9) outlines. The pronoun *ĝi* had not been met with approval due to its strong relation to inanimate objects, and it was recommended “to avoid pronouns referring to one gender only” (Bormann 1983:9). As the following passage of the statute shows, the editorial commission circumvented the problem by almost completely omitting pronouns, repeating the nouns in question instead:

Previous statute:

33. Prezidanto. La Prezidanto reprezentas la Asocion kaj subskribas kun la Ĝenerala Sekretario la ĉefajn dokumentojn. *Li* prezidas la Estraron kaj la Universalaĵajn Kongresojn. *Li* rajtas delegi alian Komitatanon por difinita tasko. Prezidanto rajtas ofici dum maksimume du deĵorperiodoj sinsekve. Je tiu punkto *li* devas retiriĝi el la prezidanta kandidateco dum almenaŭ unu deĵorperiodo.

‘33. President. The President represents the Association and signs the main documents together with the General Secretary. *He* presides on the Board and the Universal Congresses. *He* has the right to delegate another member of the Committee

for a special task. The President has the right to be in office during a maximum of two successive terms. At this point *he* has to withdraw his application for presidency for at least one term.’ (my italics and translation, S.F.)

New statute (since 1980):

34. Prezidanto. La Prezidanto reprezentas la Asocion en juraj kaj nejuraj aferoj, subskribas la ĉefajn dokumentojn kaj prezidas la Estraron kaj la Universalajn Kongresojn. *La Prezidanto* rajtas delegi alian komitatanon por difinita tasko. *Prezidanto* ne rajtas ofici dum pli ol du sinsekvaj oficperiodoj kaj je la fino de la dua oficperiodo devas retiriĝi el la prezidanteco por almenaŭ unu oficperiodo. (italics my emphasis – S.F.)

‘34. President. The President represents the Association in legal and non-legal affairs, signs the main documents and presides on the Board and the Universal Congresses. *The President* has the right to delegate another member of the Committee for a special task. *The President* may not be in office for more than two successive terms and has to withdraw from presidency for at least one term.’

(my italics and translation, S.F.)

One of the changes in language use that could be observed at the beginning of the 1980s was the use of gender-indefinite nouns to designate professions and functions of women in UEA publications. Eichholz (1983:68) reports some changes in the *UEA Jarlibro* (‘Yearbook of the Universal Esperanto Association’).⁷ Some of the occupational titles of female Esperanto delegates that included the suffix *-in* in the 1979 *Jarlibro* changed in the 1980 edition (for example, *instruistinoj* became *instruistoj*), and further changes were made in 1980 and 1982. Eichholz criticizes how, in this way, Esperanto is seen to be losing its regularity. The development corresponded to the recommendations of some linguists. Thus, in his seminal work *Lingvistikaj Aspektoj de Esperanto* ‘Linguistic Aspects of Esperanto’, Wells (1989:68) points out that

Esperanto as well can be considered a sexist language, worth being reformed in this relation. Although we can easily write *sekretari(in)o*, *instruist(in)o*, we do not have a concise spoken way of indicating both genders indifferently. However, for some words, the gender distinction is neutralized, for example, *viktimo*, *pasaĝero* [‘victim, passenger’]. One can well say *ŝi estas viktimo*, *ŝi estas pasaĝero* [‘she is a victim, she is a passenger’]. For those relatively ephemeral features, there are no problems; for the more permanent ones perhaps yes. Esperantists from English-speaking countries like to use expressions such as *ŝi estas instruisto*, *ŝi estas esperantisto*, *ŝi estas la prezidanto de la klubo* [‘she is a teacher, she is an Esperantist, she is the president of the club’]. Is this worth imitating? I think yes, it is, although, at first, this might shock those whose mother tongue is more firmly sexist. The Chinese, however, will not be shocked by this. In Chinese, gender distinction for nouns does not exist at all.

This recommendation mirrors the principle of gender neutralization which is the primary strategy adopted by English-speaking feminists, as Eichholz (1980:45) observes:

I am of the opinion that, parallel to the development in the English language, which shows ‘neutralization’ of word meanings, and due to the justified endeavour to give equal rights to women that can also be realized here [= in the Esperanto speech community, S.F.], and finally because of the influential positions that Esperantists with English as their native language had and have in our movement, one tends to leave out the suffix *-in-* more and more often in Esperanto, that one thus believes that the concerning common names for human beings are gender-neutral.

Eichholz (1980:46) argues that gender-indefinite nouns are not precise enough in an international speech community, giving the example that Merle Haltrecht-Matte, the female president of the Canadian Esperanto Association (CEA), was once presented as a man (*la prezidanto de KEA, s-ro Haltrecht-Matte* ‘the president of the CEA, Mr H.-M.’) in a Hungarian Esperanto journal, after she had been introduced before as *Prezidanto*. Furthermore, Eichholz (1980:46) warns against this development:

We should be on our guard against this development because it would force us to establish rules for which common personal nouns are also to be understood as male gender and which are not. This would complicate our language superfluously. We should continue our tradition and should always mark the female gender for persons if a personal name refers to a specific person that is female.
(underlining in original)

3.2 Occupational titles: A pilot study

A comparative analysis of the *UEA* yearbooks for 1973, 1983, 1993, 2003 and 2013 has been performed for this study, focusing on the use of gender-neutral and gender-specific occupational titles used by female delegates. Its aim was to receive information about the present use of the suffix *-in* in occupational titles in the Esperanto community and to gain an insight into the changes that have occurred in recent decades. The *UEA Jarlibro* presents a suitable basis for this investigation because the contact details of the delegates, including their professions, are based on people’s information about themselves. The analysis reveals an enormous increase in the use of nouns that do not contain a female suffix (*instruisto* vs. *instruistino* ‘teacher’, *bibliotekisto* vs. *bibliotekistino* ‘librarian’) between 1973 and 1983 (see Table 1), which confirms the observations by individual speakers about

Table 1. Use of personal nouns for female delegates in UEA yearbooks

Yearbook	Frequency of gender-neutral designations	Frequency of <i>fraŭlino</i> 'Miss'
1973	5.6%	39.9%
1983	56.5%	29.4%
1993	68.8%	16.5%
2003	63.4%	8.3%
2013	56.5%	5.9%

changes at the beginning of the 1980s mentioned above. The growth continued slightly in the period between 1983 and 1993. For both of these periods, several cases of the transition from a gender-specific to a gender-neutral designation can be documented for individual persons (cf. examples 3 through 7).

- (3) *FD (medicino): D-ino Vera di Tocco, kuracistino, [...]*
 'special delegate for medicine: Dr. (f) Vera di Tocco, doctor, [...]'
 (Jarlibro 1973: 249)
- (4) *FD (medicino): D-ino Vera di Tocco, kuracisto, [...]*
 'special delegate for medicine: Dr. (f) Vera di Tocco, doctor, [...]'
 (Jarlibro 1983: 325)
- (5) *D kaj FD (medicino; biokemio): D-rino Marjorie Flint, hospitala biokemiistino, [...]*
 'delegate and special delegate for medicine and biochemistry: Dr. (f) Marjorie Flint, female hospital biochemist, [...]'
 (Jarlibro 1983: 122)
- (6) *D: d-rino Marjorie Flint, hospitala biokemiisto, [...]*
 'delegate: Dr. (f) Marjorie Flint, hospital biochemist, [...]'
 (Jarlibro 1993: 133)
- (7) *D: s-ino Amelia Valenti Pallanca, instruisto, Marconi [...]*
 'delegate: Mrs Amelia Valenti Pallanca, teacher, [...]'
VD: s-ino Carla Gigli Lemmi, em. instruistino, Via Casa Rosse [...]
 'vice delegate: Mrs Carla Gigli Lemmi, retired female teacher, [...]'
 (McCoy 2013: 184)

In the present yearbook (cf. example 7), usage varies. Gender-neutral expressions are found in 56.5% of the female delegates' details, with varying figures for individual countries (or native languages). Gender-neutral expressions are generally preferred by delegates from English-speaking countries (76.5% for delegates from UK, USA, and Australia).

The use of the word *dommastrino* ‘housewife’ (*dom-* ‘house’, *mastr-* ‘master’, and *-in* ‘female’) in the yearbooks reflects the societal change that the majority of women are employed outside the home today: In 1973, *dommastrino* was the third most frequent occupation among female delegates (after *instruistino* ‘female teacher’ and *oficistino* ‘female official’), whereas this designation can only be found five times in 2013. Probably as a result of the general trend of substituting gender-specific designations with gender-neutral ones in the 1980s, there are even three occurrences of the gender-neutral form *dommastro* in the 1983 and 1993 editions.

Another interesting finding of the study relates to the female address form *fraŭlino* ‘Miss’. It is formed on the basis of the male form *fraŭlo* ‘unmarried man, bachelor’, which is not used as an address form in Esperanto. The analysis shows that the use of *fraŭlino* is steadily decreasing. The female delegates are generally introduced by means of *s-ino* (short form of *sinjorino* ‘Mrs’) or *d-ino* (short form of *doktorino*; ‘doctor’ [academic degree] + *-in* ‘female’).

As we have seen in the Introduction, some participants of the 1998 questionnaire study were obviously not able to tolerate the use of *-in* for female speakers. In contrast to this, the *Plena Manlibro de Esperanta Gramatiko* (Wennergren 2005: 44) considers it a question of personal preference:

Everyone has the full right to continue the traditional quasi-male use of neutral words, but everyone is also entitled to use neutral words completely gender-indefinitely. The two ways of using neutral words do not really conflict. Both of them are based on the proper meanings of the words in question, and they are both logical and in accordance with the rules of the language. It is a question of personal preference whether one insists on gender or not. For some people, gender does not present a necessary and significant piece of information, for others it very often does. (my translation, S.F.)

In their survey article in *Sekso kaj egaleco*, Brennan and Fasani (1982) discuss the pros and cons of various uses of gender-specific expressions. The principle of making women visible by means of *-in* in female-specific contexts is consistent although not very economical, as they write, and when it is applied, women cannot complain about being ignored. It is, however, based on the fact that roots are considered male, which implies the idea that women are derived from men “as Eve is derived from Adam’s rib” (*kiel Eva el la ripo de Adamo*; Brennan & Fasani 1982: 21). If nouns referring to humans are per se regarded as gender-neutral, speakers might easily forget that *prezidanto* can also be a woman. They further add that there is a sufficiently large group of definitely male roots (e.g. *patro* ‘father’, *sinjoro* ‘Mr’, and other frequently used nouns) that would have to be treated

as exceptions. Brennan and Fasani (1982:23) plead for the co-existence of different ways of expression and focus on making Esperanto speakers aware of the need for a non-discriminating language use:

As we wrote above, one cannot force Esperantists to adopt a specific usage if they do not wish to do so. The first step is therefore to make speakers aware of the necessity to use the language in a non-discriminatory way, so that they understand that it causes offence (and even misunderstanding) to assume that the whole world is male. (my translation, S.F.)

As many of the authors mentioned above suggest, gender-fair reforms could solve the problem. The following chapter will describe some of the most important reform proposals.

3.3 Reform proposals and the extent of their implementation

3.3.1 *Male suffixes*

As we have seen in Section 2.1, criticism against the system of gender-related structures in Esperanto started early. The first reform proposal was brought forward by Zamenhof himself. In 1894, obviously urged by some early friends and users of Esperanto, Zamenhof presented some proposals for changes in the journal *La Esperantisto* and also dealt with gender (Zamenhof 1894b: 37):

Some friends suggested that we introduce a separate suffix for specifically male nouns, in the same way as we have a suffix for specifically female nouns [...]. Having thought about this proposal, I found that it was not only logical, but also convenient. “Fratiro” would then mean specifically ‘brother’ and “fratino” – specifically ‘sister’, while “frato” would simply mean child of these same parents (= either brother or sister); “frati” would thus mean “gefratoj” (‘siblings’) and the prefix “ge-“ could be thrown away. [...] However, after further consideration the following thought prevented me from taking this step: our language has to be, above all, the easiest for all nations and can therefore not include anything that would be against the habit of nations and that would present a difficulty or strangeness to them; a male suffix would present a certain unpleasantness and a source for errors, at least at the beginning (a very important time!) [...]; the lack of a male suffix, as shown in the present practice, does not present unpleasantness; the result is consequently: in our purely practical affair, the inconvenient theoretical logic has to give way to the peoples’ more convenient practical habit – and the male suffix does not have to exist. (my translation, S.F.)

In the second half of 1894, the subscribers of *La Esperantisto* discussed Zamenhof’s proposals, deciding against them in two ballots (157 votes against the reform; 107 – in different degrees – for the reform). The reform was thus rejected.

As Back (2011) sees it, the 1894 proposals would have been a chance for Esperanto to eliminate some structural flaws. Later reformers adopted the principle to introduce a male suffix. Ido, the reformed version of Esperanto that was launched by Louis de Beaufront and Louis Couturat in 1907, remedied the unequal treatment of the two sexes in Esperanto by introducing gender-neutral nouns with optional endings that indicate gender. For example, *servisto* ‘waiter’ is the word for either gender. If necessary, the male form *servistulo* and the female form *servistino* can be derived. Furthermore, a gender-neutral third person pronoun *lu* was introduced in addition to the male, female and gender-neutral third-person pronouns that Ido has, which is used to refer to people of either gender and to inanimate objects as well (de Beaufront 2004).

Zamenhof’s *-ir*, which was probably chosen due to its similarity to the male prefix *vir-* and the female suffix *-in* (Golden 1984:23), was followed by a number of further proposals for a male Esperanto suffix. They include *-ur* (Sly 1980:20), *-ab* (Pool 1992) and *-un* (Roff 1992). The latter – which had already been a proposal by Baudouin de Courtenay (cf. 2.1) – even found its way into a dictionary, *Esperanta Bildvortaro* ‘Esperanto Pictorial Dictionary’ (Eichholz 1988), where it is used to denote male animals and some male human beings (e.g. *Helenuno* ‘male Hellene/Greek’, *Romanianuno* ‘male member of the Roman Empire’), although marked by asterisks indicating the non-official character of the suffix.⁸ The most popular proposal for a male Esperanto suffix, however, is *-iĉ*. It was probably coined by analogy with the male suffix *-ĉj* (cf. Section 3.1) to form a symmetry between hypocoristic and gender suffixes:

Table 2. The suffixes *-nj*, *-ĉj*, *-in* and *-iĉ*

	Intimacy/Endearment	Gender
Female	<i>-nj</i>	<i>-in</i>
Male	<i>-ĉj</i>	<i>-iĉ</i>

The Esperanto corpus of the *Leipzig Corpora Collection* includes two occurrences of *-iĉ* as a root, both of which are from the Esperanto Wikipedia and refer to animals:

- (8) *Plej oft-e, dum la proced-o la iĉ-o pren-as*
 most often-ADJ during the proceed-N the male-N take-PRES
sid-ant-a-n poz-o-n.
 sit-PRES.PART-ADJ-ACC pose-N-ACC
 ‘More often than not, during this procedure the male has a sitting position.’
 (source: <http://eo.wikipedia.org/wiki/Surikato> [15 August 2013])

- (9) *Ŝi, tamen, volont-e respond-os kaj par-iĝ-os kun*
 she however willing-ADV reply-FUT and pair-FIE⁹-FUT with
iu ajn vag-ant-a iĉ-o de ali-a grup-o.
 anyone at all roam-PRES.PART-ADJ male-N of other-ADJ group-N
 ‘However, she will gladly reply and mate with any roaming male of another
 group.’ (source: http://eo.wikipedia.org/wiki/Etiopia_lupo [15 August 2013])

It is worth mentioning, however, that some Esperanto writers use *-iĉ*, for example Jorge Camacho (Georgo Kamaĉo) in his collection of narratives *Sur la linio* (1991).

3.3.2 *The use of ge-*

The prefix *ge-*, as described in Section 2.3, is used to designate a group of at least two people. According to the *Fundamento*, it can consequently only be found in plural nouns. A number of authors believe that gender symmetry might be reached by using it with singular nouns to signal gender neutrality (e.g. Brennan & Fasani 1982: 22; Haveman 1989: 8).¹⁰ Examples are *gepatro* ‘parent’ and *geedzo* ‘spouse’, for contexts in which in Esperanto one can traditionally only say *patro aŭ patrino* ‘father or mother’ and *edzo aŭ edzino* ‘husband or wife’.

Wennergren (2005: 594) provides the following comment on *ge-*:

Such a use is not normal, however, and many people consider it illogical and incorrect. These kinds of words, however, can be understood and can be useful. The future will show whether they will be accepted. (my translation, S.F.)

It seems that the Esperanto speech community has already made its decision. Wells’ (2010) *English-Esperanto/Esperanto-English Dictionary* includes both *gepatro* and *geedzo* as variants of *patro aŭ patrino* and *edzo aŭ edzino*. In addition, *gepatro* is among the most frequent 100,000 words in the *Esperanto Frequency Dictionary* (Quasthoff & Fiedler & Hallsteinsdóttir 2014).

Another use of *ge-* that is gaining ground is its combination with an adjective in *gekaraj* ‘dear males and females’ (lit. ‘male and female dears’). Speakers are increasingly addressed by means of this abbreviated version of *karaj geamikoj* ‘dear male and female friends’,¹¹ which is why its legitimacy is currently discussed in web forums and blogs.¹²

3.3.3 *Towards a gender-indefinite pronoun*

As described in Section 2.1, Zamenhof originally recommended using *ĝi* as a gender-indefinite pronoun. Therefore, it has been brought up time and again by Esperanto speakers, as it would not violate the *Fundamento* (e.g. Haveman 1989: 9). Bormann (1983: 10) reports that in 1976 at the Universal Congress,

when giving a formal address, he used *ĝi* referring to human beings in general. When the text of the speech was later published in the journal *Esperanto*, it read *li*, as the editor believed *ĝi* to be a misprint and corrected it. A perusal of Esperanto journals shows that *ĝi* is not used to refer to human beings, with the exception of little children when their gender is not considered relevant. The introduction of new gender-neutral pronouns, such as *ri* or *zi*, has not been successful either.

Esperanto speakers prefer using standard forms for gender-indefinite expressions, above all combinations of the pronouns *li* and *ŝi*, as known in English (*he or she*, (*s*)*he*, *he/she*). Forms like *li/ŝi* are increasingly gaining ground in both written and oral communication. An early occurrence can be found in the journal *Esperanto* (1/1963), in a letter from the General Secretary of the International Esperanto Youth Organization *Tutmonda Esperantista Junulara Organizo* (TEJO):

Ni kredas, ke la Jaro de la Junularo en la Esperanto-Movado sukcesos, ni esperas, ke ĉiu plenkreska esperantisto rememorigos al si, ke *li/ŝi* iam ankaŭ estis juna, kaj ke ĉiu juna esperantisto aktive montros sian ekziston.

‘We believe that the Year of the Youth in the Esperanto movement will be a success, we hope that every adult Esperantist will remember that *he/she* too was young once and that every young Esperantist will show their existence actively.’
(my emphasis and translation, S.F.)

Fischer (2002:90) describes a change in the use of personal pronouns in UEA documents at the beginning of the 1980s. His survey of examples from recent Esperanto journals suggests a growing application of *li aŭ ŝi* (which he calls “present feminist practice”; Fischer 2002: 105) in addition to the gender-neutral use of *li*.

A corpus search (www.tekstaro.com) including the Esperanto journals *Monato* ‘Month’ and *La Ondo de Esperanto* ‘The Wave of Esperanto’ reveals that various combinations of *li* and *ŝi* occur:

<i>li/ŝi</i>	23 occurrences
<i>li aŭ ŝi</i>	12 occurrences
<i>ŝi aŭ li</i>	3 occurrences
<i>ŝi/li</i>	1 occurrence

It is worth noting that the male pronoun *li* is generally mentioned first, although, for example, Wennergren (2005:104) recommended *ŝi aŭ li* ‘she or he’ (see Section 2.2). This is presumably due to the influence of the speakers’ native tongues and cultures.¹³

The gender-indefinite pronoun *ŝili*, which was proposed by Eichholz (1980) could not be found in this corpus. The pronoun *ŝli*, mentioned by Haveman (1989:8), does not occur in this corpus either, but 14 times in the Esperanto corpus of the *Leipzig Corpora Collection*, which includes mainly internet sources. A

closer look reveals, however, that here it is only used in several Wikipedia articles on gender in Esperanto, i.e. in metalinguistic functions, and several times in the description of a game (gloss simplified here):

- (10) *Se iu ludanto nur havas minojn aŭ minbalaajn ŝipojn nesinkitajn, ŝli estas malgajnanto.*
 If a (certain) player only has mines or mine-sweeping ships unsunken (s)he is losing person
 ‘If a player has only mines or minesweepers that have not sunk, he or she is the loser.’
 (source: [http://eo.wikipedia.org/wiki/Marbatalo_\(ludo\)](http://eo.wikipedia.org/wiki/Marbatalo_(ludo)) [15 August 2013])

In almost all discussions on gender-fair language use in Esperanto journals or blogs, the question is raised whether these proposals for new suffixes and pronouns have a chance of being accepted. Against the background of the authority of the *Fundamento*, the majority of authors, aware of the non-standard character of the linguistic means proposed, are sceptical. It seems that speaker attitudes, such as linguistic loyalty and corrective consciousness, have a strong stabilizing effect on the norms of Esperanto (cf. Fiedler 2006).

4. Gender in Esperanto proverbs

The phrasicon of Esperanto can be subdivided into three types of phraseological units on the basis of their origin (cf. Fiedler 2007). The largest group is composed of those units that have entered the language through various other languages. These are loan translations, from Greek mythology and from the Bible, and ad-hoc loans that individual speakers introduce from their native languages more or less spontaneously. The second group is made up of idiomatic expressions and proverbs that have their origin in the language and cultural life of the Esperanto community. These reflect the history of the language and its speech community, sociological characteristics, the speakers’ collectively held ideas and aims, traditions as well as Esperanto literature. The third group represents a peculiarity of planned language phraseology: the conscious creation of phraseological units. The majority of these “planned” units can be traced back to Zamenhof, who published a collection of phraseological units, the *Proverbaro Esperanta* ‘Esperanto Proverb Collection’ (Zamenhof 1910) on the basis of a collection of proverbs and phrases in Russian, Polish, German and French compiled by his father, Marko Zamenhof.

The genre of proverbs can be traced back to the earliest written records (Mieder 1997: 3), with the Middle Ages as the heyday (cf. Hain 1978: 13ff.). Proverbs are manifestations of traditional or even outdated knowledge and values and include stereotypical characterizations of human behaviour. From today's perspective, the content of many proverbs is therefore regarded with a certain amount of reserve. As Zamenhof's collection is based on traditional European proverbs, the social values conveyed by many Esperanto proverbs are outdated as well. This is especially evident in proverbs on the position of women. Women are described as talkative and malicious. Their place is in the home and they should not interfere:

- (11) *La lango de virino estas ŝia glavo.*
'A woman's tongue is her sword.'
- (12) *Virino scias, tuta mondo scias.*
'A woman knows, the whole world knows.'
- (13) *Kie diablo ne povas, tien virinon li ŝovas.*
'Where the devil cannot get, he pushes a woman.'
- (14) *Rol' de virino – bona mastrino.*
'A woman's role – a good housewife.'
- (15) *Kie regas virino, malbona la fino.*
'Where a woman rules, the end is bad.'
- (16) *Virino bonorda estas muta kaj surda.*
'A good woman is mute and deaf.'

Similar proverbs can be found in many European languages. Mieder (1987) speaks of "the obvious anti-feminism prevalent in proverbs". The peculiarity concerning Esperanto, however, is the bizarre situation that centuries-old ideas and experiences are expressed in a language that is not much older than one century. Analyses, however, reveal that only a small part of Zamenhof's collection (about 7 percent) can be considered common knowledge of the speech community (Fiedler 1999).

5. Conclusion

This article has revealed that gender-related expressions are used heterogeneously in Esperanto. The differences are mainly a result of diverse descriptions in grammars and textbooks and influences by the speakers' native tongues and cultures.

More research is required to assess the impact of individual groups of speakers (for example, Esperanto speakers with English or French as their mother tongue) on Esperanto's treatment of gender. Further research on gender in Esperanto should also consider the category of social gender. Using surveys among speakers and corpus analyses, future studies could address the topic of how stereotypical assumptions about appropriate gender roles are expressed in the planned language and to what extent the issue matters in the speech community.

Esperanto in its current form, as we have seen, is not a perfect planned language and one of its flaws is that it violates gender neutrality. The same form of the noun is used for male and gender-neutral reference, and an explicit suffix is added for females. This feature has been a constant target of critique during the 126 years of Esperanto's existence. In response to objections from the speech community and under the influence of feminist language debates in many Western countries, Esperanto is undergoing a shift towards non-sexist usage. Nouns (especially designations for jobs and functions) are increasingly treated as gender-indefinite, and with regard to pronouns the use of split forms (e.g. *li aŭ ŝi* 'he and she') is gaining ground. This development toward a gradually more gender-fair language proves that Esperanto is not an artificial and sterile construct, as some people believe, but a fully-fledged language that changes in active use.

A number of reform proposals, such as the introduction of a male suffix or new pronouns, have recently been made, which are not in agreement with the standard norms of the language. They have not been adopted widely, mainly due to the speakers' metalinguistic and corrective consciousness. It is also a lesson that the Esperanto community has learnt from the history of Ido, a reformed version of Esperanto that eliminated some structural flaws from Zamenhof's creation, including its gender asymmetry, but which is only spoken by a small group of people today. It is not the quality of a language, its inherent rational structure or the ease of learning that determines the future of a language, but extra-linguistic factors. This truth applies both to planned and ethnic/national languages, as the present hegemony of English seems to demonstrate.

Notes

* I would like to thank Rudolf-Josef Fischer for very helpful comments on an earlier draft of this article, and Detlev Blanke for providing some useful ideas and relevant material.

1. Due to this characteristic, several authors refer to Esperanto prefixes and suffixes as prefixoids and suffixoids. The present article does not make this distinction.

2. Baudouin de Courtenay was a member of the *Délégation pour l'Adoption d'une Langue Auxiliaire Internationale*, a body of academics that was founded at the beginning of the 20th century to determine which of the competing planned language projects was the best and should be chosen for international communication. It decided on an improved version of Esperanto. When the reform proposals, however, were rejected by Esperanto speakers, the modified form of Esperanto was published as a distinct language project, *Ido* (lit. 'offspring'). This led to a fracture in the unity of the Esperanto movement.
3. It should be noted in this context that the suffix *-in* forms an integral part of Esperanto's highly flexible word-formation system, which allows its speakers to be self-confident and productive in their language use. Out of a single root an abundance of words can be created through affixation and compounding. For the root *patr-* 'father', for example, no fewer than 75 different words are among the most frequent 100,000 Esperanto items (cf. Quasthoff & Fiedler & Hallsteinsdóttir 2014), e.g. *patrujo* 'native country', *bopatrino* 'mother-in-law', *gepatroj* 'parents', *prapatroj* 'ancestors', *patrinece* 'in a motherly way', *gepatralingve* 'in one's mother tongue/parental language', *sampatrianoj* 'compatriots', *patrodomo* 'parental home, father's house'.
4. In these *Respondoj* ('Replies') in the journal *La Revuo*, Zamenhof answers the queries of Esperanto users and gives special recommendations on correct language use (cf. Zamenhof 1962).
5. A number of Esperanto speakers, however, might use *vir-/vira* with hesitance because it is not always obvious whether it is meant to mark the male gender, or whether it has the function of stressing masculinity in the sense of 'macho'.
6. See <http://www.gazetoteko.com/ske/index.html> [1 May 2014]. A Japanese version of *Sekso kaj egaleco* for both Esperantist and non-Esperantist readers was published at the beginning of the 1980s (<http://ilei.info/konferenco/Yamakawa.php>) [1 May 2014].
7. The *UEA Jarlibro* informs about international Esperanto organizations, important documents and publications. It includes a network of delegates (*delegita reto*) around the world, who are prepared to help other Esperanto speakers, for example, by providing information on Esperanto-related issues in their professional field or geographical area.
8. The new edition of this dictionary (2012), which is partly based on Eichholz's collection, does not continue this use.
9. FIE stands for *fientive*, "the transition into a state (the 'becoming' or 'growing')" (Haspelmath 1987: 9) that is described by the suffix *-iĝ* in Esperanto. I would like to thank Cyril Brosch for his help in glossing the word *pariĝos*.
10. Eichholz (1980: 46) proposed a new prefix, *go-*, for the same purpose.
11. A check of my own e-mail correspondence in 2012/2013 resulted in 12 messages that addressed me in this way.
12. See, for example, <http://www.ipernity.com/blog/bernardo/416085> [1 May 2014].
13. Compare, for example, *he or she* in English (Romaine 2001: 167), *han eller hon* 'he or she' in Swedish (Hornscheidt 2003: 358) and *han/hun* 'he/she' in Danish (Gomard & Kunøe 2003: 79).

References

- Anikejev, Sergej. 1982. "Reeĥe al la artikolo de János Sárközi 'Medito pri virinoj' [A reaction to János Sárközi's article 'Medito pri virinoj']." In *Akademias studoj 1982*, ed. Rüdiger Eichholz. Bailieboro, Ontario: Esperanto Press, 62.
- Back, Otto. 2011. "Bemerkungen zu Zamenhofs reformiertem Esperanto von 1894." In *Florilegium Interlinguisticum. Festschrift für Detlev Blanke zum 70. Geburtstag*, ed. Cyril Brosch & Sabine Fiedler. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 263–269.
- Baudouin de Courtenay. 1976 [1907]. "Zur Kritik der künstlichen Weltsprachen." In *Plansprachen*, ed. Reinhard Haupenthal. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 59–110.
- Blanke, Detlev. 1985. *Internationale Plansprachen. Eine Einführung*. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.
- Blanke, Detlev. 2009. "Causes of the relative success of Esperanto." *Language Problems and Language Planning* 33: 251–266. DOI: 10.1075/lplp.33.3.04bla
- Bormann, Werner. 1983. "Feminisma lingvouzo en planlingvoj [Feminist language use in planned languages]." In *Akademias studoj 1983*, ed. Rüdiger Eichholz. Bailieboro, Ontario: Esperanto Press, 49–61.
- Brennan, Anna & Marcella Fasani. 1982. "Pri inoj kaj iroj [On women and men]." *Sekso kaj Egaleco* 10 (Julio 1982): 18–23.
- Brugmann, Karl & August Leskien. 1907. *Zur Kritik der künstlichen Weltsprachen*. Straßburg: Trübner.
- Camacho, Jorge (Georgo Kamaĉo). 1991. *Sur la linio* [On the line]. Berkeley: Bero.
- Council of Europe. 2007. *Komuna Eŭropa Referenckadro por lingvoj: Lernado, instruado, pri-taksado* [Common European framework of reference for languages: Learning, teaching, assessing]. Rotterdam: UEA.
- Couturat, Louis & Léopold Leau. 2001 [1903, 1907]. *Histoire de la langue universelle*. Hildesheim: Georg Olms.
- de Beaufront, Louis. 2004. *Kompleta gramatiko detaloza di la linguo internaciona Ido*. Ponferrada: Editorio Krayono (www.literaturo.ido.li/kgd.pdf [15 August 2013]).
- Edwards, John. 2010. *Minority languages and group identity. Cases and categories*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. DOI: 10.1075/impact.27
- Eichholz, Rüdiger. 1983. "Seksa diskriminacio en Esperanto kaj eblecoj por malpliigi ĝin [Sexual discrimination in Esperanto and ways of diminishing it]." In *Akademias studoj 1983*, ed. Rüdiger Eichholz. Bailieboro, Ontario: Esperanto Press, 65–73.
- Eichholz, Rüdiger. 1988. *Esperanta bildvortaro* [Esperanto pictorial dictionary]. Bailieboro, Ontario: Esperanto Press.
- Eichholz, Vilma. 1980. "Seksa diskriminacio en nia lingvo [Sexual discrimination in our language]." In *Akademias studoj 1980*, ed. Rüdiger Eichholz. Bailieboro, Ontario: Esperanto Press, 44–47.
- Fiedler, Sabine. 1999. *Plansprache und Phraseologie. Empirische Untersuchungen zu reproduziertem Sprachmaterial im Esperanto*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- Fiedler, Sabine. 2006. "Standardization and self-regulation in an international speech-community: The case of Esperanto." *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 177: 67–90.
- Fiedler, Sabine. 2007. "Phraseology in planned languages." In *Phraseology. An international handbook of contemporary research*, ed. Harald Burger & Dmitrij Dobrovolskij & Peter Kühn & Neal R. Norrick. Berlin: De Gruyter, 779–788.

- Fiedler, Sabine. 2012. "The Esperanto *denaskulo*: The status of the native speaker of Esperanto within and beyond the planned language community." *Language Problems and Language Planning* 36(1): 69–84. DOI: 10.1075/lplp.36.1.04fie
- Fischer, Rudolf-Josef. 2002. "Das Pronominalsystem in Esperanto – noch sexusinklusiv?" In *Plansprachen und ihre Gemeinschaften. Beiträge der 11. Jahrestagung der Gesellschaft für Interlinguistik e.V.*, 23.–25. November 2001 in Berlin, ed. Detlev Blanke. Berlin: GIL, 86–106.
- Fischer, Rudolf-Josef. 2003. "Sexusneutrale und sexusindizierende Bezeichnungen für Lebewesen." *Plansprachen und elektronische Medien. Beiträge der 12. Jahrestagung der Gesellschaft für Interlinguistik e.V.*, 6.–8. Dezember 2002 in Berlin, ed. Detlev Blanke. Berlin: GIL, 110–149.
- Gilmore, Karolina. 1987. "Ina dupencaĵo [A woman's tuppence]." *La Brita Esperantisto* 83 (julio–aŭgusto 1987): 292–293.
- Gledhill, Christopher J. 2000. *The grammar of Esperanto. A corpus-based description*. 2nd ed. Munich: Lincom Europa.
- Golden, Bernard. 1984. "Revizio de la seks-rilata parto de la Esperanta leksiko [Revision of the gender-related part of Esperanto lexis]." *Esperanta Finnlando* 3: 22–23.
- Gomard, Kirsten & Mette Kunøe. 2003. "Equal before the law – unequal in language." In *Gender across languages: The linguistic representation of women and men*, vol. 3, eds. Marlis Hellinger & Hadumod Bußmann. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 59–85. DOI: 10.1075/impact.11.07gom
- Grady, Gary D. 2010. "Gender in Esperanto." *Usona Esperantisto (USA)* 6/2010. <http://bulteno.esperanto-usa.org/2010/6/70-instruado.html> [9 May 2014].
- Hain, Mathilde. 1978. "Das Sprichwort." In *Ergebnisse der Sprichwörterforschung*, ed. Wolfgang Mieder. Berlin: Peter Lang, 13–25.
- Haspelmath, Martin. 1987. *Transitivity alternations of the anticausative type*. Köln: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Köln.
- Haspelmath, Martin & Matthew S. Dryer & David Gil, eds. 2005. *World atlas of language structures*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Haveman, Roel. 1989. "Seksismo en Esperanto." *Fenomeno* 21(3), 8–9.
- Hornscheidt, Antje. 2003. "Linguistic and public attitudes towards gender in Swedish." In *Gender across languages: The linguistic representation of women and men*, vol. 3, eds. Marlis Hellinger & Hadumod Bußmann. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 339–368. DOI: 10.1075/impact.11.18hor
- Hüllen, Werner. 1984. "Bischof John Wilkins und die Fachsprachen unserer Zeit." *Fachsprache* 6: 115–122.
- Janton, Pierre. 1993 [1973]. *Esperanto. Language, literature, and community*, ed. Humphrey Tonkin. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Jarlibroj de Universala Esperanto-Asocio*. 1973, 1983, 1993, 2003. Rotterdam: UEA.
- Kalocsay, Kálmán & Gaston Waringhien. 1985. *Plena analiza gramatiko de Esperanto (kvina korektita eldono)*. Rotterdam: UEA.
- Kimura, Goro Christoph. 2012. "Esperanto and minority languages: A sociolinguistic comparison." *Language Problems and Language Planning* 26(2): 167–181. *Leipzig Corpora Collection: Esperanto Corpus*. <http://corpora.informatik.uni-leipzig.de/> [1 May 2014].
- McCoy, Roy, ed. 2013. *Jarlibro de Universala Esperanto-Asocio 2013*. Rotterdam: UEA.
- Mieder, Wolfgang. 1987. "Preface." *Proverbium. Yearbook of International Proverb Scholarship* 4: XI.

- Mieder, Wolfgang. 1997. *The politics of proverbs. From traditional wisdom to proverbial stereotypes*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Nakamura, Tazuo. 1979. "La pronomo por 'homo' [The pronoun for 'human being']." *Oomoto (Japan)* January–June 1979: 58–59.
- Nuessel, Frank. 2000. *The Esperanto language*. New York: Legas.
- Okret, Arika. 2009. *In the land of invented languages*. New York: Spiegel & Grau.
- Oljanov, Violin. 1988. "Diferencigo de la seksoj en Esperanto [Gender differentiation in Esperanto]." *Bulgara Esperantisto* 1/1988: 3–4.
- Parkvall, Mikael. 2010. "How European is Esperanto? A typological study." *Language Problems and Language Planning* 34(1): 63–79. DOI: 10.1075/lplp.34.1.04par
- Philippe, Benoît. 1991. *Sprachwandel bei einer Plansprache am Beispiel des Esperanto*. Konstanz: Hartung-Gorre-Verlag.
- Piron, Claude. 1989. "Who are the speakers of Esperanto?" In *Interlinguistics. Aspects of the science of planned languages*, ed. Klaus Schubert. New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 157–172.
- Piron, Claude. 1991. *Esperanto: European or Asiatic language? Esperanto documents* 22/A. Rotterdam: UEA.
- Pool, Jonathan. 1992. "Sekso kaj (mal)egaleco [Gender and (in)equality]." *Esperanto (USA)* 2/1992: 2.
- Pool, Jonathan & Bernard Grofman. 1989. "Linguistic artificiality and cognitive competence." In *Interlinguistics. Aspects of the science of planned languages*, ed. Klaus Schubert. New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 145–156.
- Quasthoff, Uwe & Sabine Fiedler & Erla Hallsteinsdóttir, eds. 2014. *Frequency dictionary Esperanto*. Leipzig: Universitätsverlag.
- Romaine, Suzanne. 2001. "A corpus-based view of gender in British and American English." In *Gender across languages: The linguistic representation of women and men*, vol. 1, eds. Marlis Hellinger & Hadumod Bußmann. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 153–175. DOI: 10.1075/impact.9.12rom
- Roff, Derek. 1992. "Sekso kaj (mal)egaleco [Gender and (in)equality]." *Esperanto (USA)* 2/1992: 2–3.
- Sárközi, János. 1981. "Medito pri virinoj [Meditation on women]." In *Akademiaj Studoj 1981*, ed. Rüdiger Eichholz. Bailieboro, Ontario: Esperanto Press, 62.
- Sly, Sybil V. 1980. "Virseksa pronomo [A male pronoun]." *Sekso kaj Egaleco* 2: 20.
- Vaitilavičius, Adomas. 1991. "La bovuno kornobatas Esperanton, se la prezidantuno ne defendos ... [‘The ox (marked by the suffix *-un*) strikes with horns if the president (marked by the suffix *-un*) does not defend ...’]." *Litova Stelo (Lithiania)* 2/1991: 16–18.
- Vesty, David. 1986. "Seksismo [Sexism]." *La Brita Esperantisto* 82 (julio–aŭgusto), 164–165.
- Wells, John C. 1989. *Lingvistikaj aspektoj de Esperanto* [Linguistic aspects of Esperanto]. Rotterdam: UEA.
- Wennergren, Bertilo. 2005. *Plena manlibro de Esperanta gramatiko* [Complete handbook of Esperanto grammar]. <http://bertilow.com/pmeg/> [1 May 2014].
- Wilkins, John. 1968 [1668]. *An essay towards a real character, and a philosophical language*. Menston: The Scholar Press.
- Wüster, Eugen. 1931. *Internationale Sprachnormung in der Technik, besonders in der Elektrotechnik (Die nationale Sprachnormung und ihre Verallgemeinerung)*. Berlin: VDI-Verlag.
- Wüster, Eugen. 1976 [1955]. "Die Benennungen 'Esperantologie' und 'Interlinguistik.'" In *Plansprachen*, ed. Reinhard Haupenthal. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 271–277.

- Zamenhof, Lazar Ludwik. 1887. *Meždunarodnyj jazyk* [International language]. Warsaw: Kel'ter.
- Zamenhof, Lazar Ludwik. 1894a. *Universala vortaro de Esperanto* [Universal dictionary of Esperanto]. Warsaw: Press Gins.
- Zamenhof, Lazar Ludwik. 1894b. "Al la demando pri la reformoj." *La Esperantisto* 5(3): 36–39.
- Zamenhof, Lazar Ludwik. 1991 [1905]. *Fundamento de Esperanto* [Foundation of Esperanto]. 10th ed. Pisa: Edistudio.
- Zamenhof, Lazar Ludwik. 1910. *Proverbaro Esperanta* [Esperanto proverb collection]. La Laguna: J. Régulo.
- Zamenhof, Lazar Ludwik. 1962. *Lingvaj respondoj. Konsiloj kaj opinioj pri Esperanto* [Linguistic replies. Recommendations and opinions on Esperanto]. 6th ed. Marmande: Esperantaj Francaj Eldonoj.

ESTONIAN

The representation of gender in Estonian*

Cornelius Hasselblatt

University of Groningen, The Netherlands

1. Introduction
2. Categories of gender
 - 2.1 Lexical gender
 - 2.2 Referential gender
 - 2.3 Social gender
 - 2.4 Male and female generics
3. Gender-related structures
 - 3.1 Derivation
 - 3.2 Compounding
 - 3.3 Pronominalization
4. Usage of personal reference forms
 - 4.1 Address terms
 - 4.2 Occupational terms
 - 4.3 Idiomatic expressions and proverbs
 - 4.4 Dictionaries
5. Language change and language reform
6. Conclusion

Notes

References

1. Introduction

Estonian is the official language of the Republic of Estonia and is spoken by roughly one million L1-speakers. As Estonia has been a member of the European Union since 2004, the language is also one of the official languages of the European Union. Outside Estonia the language is spoken by immigrants in Australia, Canada, Russia, Sweden, and the United States (cf. Raag 1999a). The number of Estonians abroad has been estimated as 160,000 (Kulu 1997: 14), but a major part

of these Estonians are second- or third-generation emigrants who normally speak Estonian only as a second language if at all (Kulu 1997: 15).

Together with Finnish, with which it is closely related, and several other minor or even moribund languages (cf. Blokland & Hasselblatt 2003) spoken in North-Western Russia and the Circum-Baltic area like Karelian, Lude, Vote, Veps, Ingrian and Livonian, Estonian belongs to the Finnic branch of the Finno-Ugric (or Uralic) languages (cf. Laanest 1982). These languages started to evolve about 3,000 years ago when Common Finnic split up. Whilst Baltic, (Old) Germanic and (Old) Slavic influence is common to all Finnic languages, two features of Estonian separate it from the other Finnic languages (with the possible exception of Livonian which, however, has not been as systematically investigated; cf. Raag 1987): (a) a heavy (Low) German influence over six centuries (13th–19th) resulting in approximately 23% of the lexicon consisting of loans from Low and High German (cf. Metsmägi & Sedrik & Soosaar 2013; Rätsep 1983), and (b) a period of Sovietization with heavy Russian influence during the second half of the 20th century, followed by a rapid de-Sovietization starting in the late 1980s.

The oldest texts in Estonian originate from the 16th century. The first grammar was published in 1637 and the first translation of the entire Bible was published in 1739. Until that time, two main dialects (or dialect groups) dominated in their respective areas – North (also called Tallinn) Estonian and South (also called Tartu) Estonian, the latter spoken by about one quarter or – maximally – one third of the entire population. With the publication of the complete Bible in North Estonian, this variety of the language became the basis for literary Estonian, which emerged during the 19th century (cf. Raag 1999b). As early as by the end of that century, the literacy rate among Estonians was approximately 90%.

With respect to gender research, however, a certain backlog can be detected due to the recent Soviet occupation (cf. Hasselblatt 2008). The main ideological problem analyzed in debates on gender roles seems to be the ‘trap of essentialism’ (Pilvre 2000: 69). Research on matters regarded as feminist is still modest and moderate (see, for example, Lie & Malik & Jõe-Cannon & Hinrikus 2007; Mänd & Pilvre & Sepper 2003; Marling & Järviste & Sander 2010; Pilvre 2002; Pöldvee 2013 with further references). With regard to linguistic matters even less has been done (e.g. Loog 1992; cf. Hasselblatt 1993; see also Ross 1996 and Vadi 2003), and some contributions to the field come from foreign scholars (Hasselblatt 1998, 2003 and 2010; Laakso 2005).

2. Categories of gender

2.1 Lexical gender

Estonian, like all other Finno-Ugric languages (cf. Engelberg 2002 on Finnish; Vasvári, this volume, on Hungarian; and more generally Abondolo 1998 and Comrie 1988), lacks any form of grammatical gender and has a gender-neutral third person singular pronoun (*tema* ‘he, she, it’). Lexical gender is restricted almost entirely to nouns denoting female or male persons, including address terms, nobility titles and kinship terms. The only other group are nouns denoting farm animals like *mära* ‘mare’, *täkk* ‘stallion’, or *kana* ‘hen’, *kukk* ‘cock’, etc.

There are separate words for ‘man’ (*mees*) and ‘woman’ (*naine*) which are, other than in English, etymologically independent of each other and have a gender-neutral common hypernym *inimene* ‘human being’. The same holds for the younger generation, where we find *poiss* ‘boy’ and *tüdruk* ‘girl’ (the hypernym being *laps* ‘child’), which are etymologically related to the kinship terms *poeg* ‘son’ and *tütär* ‘daughter’, respectively. Most other lexically gendered terms are also in the semantic field of kinship terms. The nouns *isa* ‘father’ and *ema* ‘mother’ are of Uralic origin. Other lexically gendered nouns are, for example, *onu* ‘uncle’, *tädi* ‘aunt’, *minia* ‘daughter-in-law’ or *väi* ‘son-in-law’. There are many more, as the complex original system of kinship terms is partly still preserved, though not fully mastered by younger speakers. The noun *onu* originally meant ‘mother’s brother’, as opposed to *lell* ‘father’s brother’, which is relatively rarely used today. The same holds for *tädi*, originally ‘mother’s sister’, as opposed to *sõtse* ‘father’s sister’. The system contained even eight different lexical items denoting ‘cousin’:

- (1) *onupoeg* ‘son of mother’s brother’
onutütär ‘daughter of mother’s brother’
tädipoeg ‘son of mother’s sister’
täditütär ‘daughter of mother’s sister’
lellepoeg ‘son of father’s brother’
lelletütär ‘daughter of father’s brother’
sõtsepoeg ‘son of father’s sister’
sõtsetütär ‘daughter of father’s sister’

The full spectrum of terms is not usually used, and there is also a gender-neutral alternative form *nõbu* ‘cousin’, which covers all meanings of the eight lexically gendered forms. It can also be used, at least regionally, for the next generation, meaning ‘nephew, niece’ (EKMS III:924), although the four lexically gendered compound nouns *vennapoeg* ‘brother’s son’, *vennatütär* ‘brother’s daughter’, *õepoeg*

'sister's son' and *õetütär* 'sister's daughter' are more common. In the grandchildren's generation, one finds the gender-neutral noun *lapselaps* 'child's child' and four more specific, lexically gendered forms: *pojapoeg* 'son's son', *pojatütär* 'son's daughter', *tütrepöeg* 'daughter's son' and *tütretütär* 'daughter's daughter'. Moreover, one finds gender-neutral nouns for a 'son's child' (*pojälaps*) and a 'daughter's child' (*tütrelaps*), which are often used in the plural (*pojälapsed*, *tütrelapsed*), when a mixed-sex group of children is referred to.

With respect to the etymology of (a part of) these terms we can observe a universal development common to all patriarchal societies: Words for male persons are more stable and have not (or hardly) changed over the millennia, whereas words for females often deteriorate semantically and/or are replaced by other words, often loans. This is partly also true for Estonian, as the words for *isa* 'father', *onu* 'uncle' and *poeg* 'son' show. They are all of Uralic/Finno-Ugric origin and have cognates even in distantly related languages. However, also *ema* 'mother', *käli* 'wife's sister', *minia* 'daughter-in-law' and *nadu* 'husband's sister' belong to the old Uralic word stock, the latter being an interesting case of a gender switch. The cognate of *nadu* in Nenets, a Samoyedic language, is *nado* and means 'younger brother of the husband' (EES: 304).

On the other hand, there is evidence that three important lexemes (and their derivations) are Baltic loans from about the second millennium B.C., viz. *tütär* 'daughter' (on which *tüdruk* 'girl' is also based), *sõsar* 'sister' (possibly connected to *sõtse* 'aunt, father's sister' and *õde* 'sister'; cf. EES: 624), and *mõrsja* 'bride'. This points to certain exogamic practices in prehistoric times between the Baltic and Finnic tribes, though we do not know in which direction: Did the Finnic men bring home Baltic brides and, with them, the new words, or did Baltic men looking for brides take the new words to what is today Finland and Estonia (cf. Kulonen 1999: 242f.)? Be that as it may, the contact must have been very intense, as is shown by many borrowed words in other central semantic fields (for example, Estonian and Finnish *hammas* 'tooth' is also a Baltic loan in Finnic).

2.2 Referential gender

As Estonian lacks grammatical gender, the possibilities to unambiguously identify a referent as female or male are restricted to lexically gendered forms. If such forms are not used, the gender identity of the referent remains unknown.

When translating from Estonian into Indo-European gender languages, translators regularly have to ask Estonian authors about the sex of persons identified as *tema* 's/he' or by gender-neutral personal nouns. The authors then often answer that they simply do not know or have not thought about it because it

is irrelevant for the plot. Some writers even play with this ambiguity and write whole stories in which the sex of the protagonist(s) is deliberately not revealed (cf. Berg 1996a/b for two translations of the same short story into German, one with a female and the other with a male disambiguation). Attempts to introduce a special female personal pronoun *tana* ('she') remained sporadic (Haawa 1914; cf. Section 5).

If a referent is introduced with a neutral occupational term and a surname, the only way to express whether this referent is male or female is to use the lexemes *mees* 'man' or *naine* 'woman' in the following sentence (e.g. *Õpetaja Kukku tuli sisse. Naine läks tahvli juurde ja ...* 'Teacher Kukku entered the room. The woman went to the blackboard and ...'). Compounds with the first elements *mees-* or *nais-* (cf. 3.2) could also be used in such a context; the same holds for the existing female suffixes (cf. 3.1). Another possibility to avoid ambiguity in writing is the use of a combination of full given name and surname instead of initials only, as the vast majority of Estonian given names are male- or female-specific. The few names available for both sexes form exceptions. One example is *Janika*, which mostly refers to a woman but there are also some men who bear this given name.

2.3 Social gender

Although most Estonian personal nouns are lexically gender-neutral, a number of lexemes have covert male bias. This is something Estonian has in common with many other languages used in patriarchal societies. However, while English *surgeon* "will frequently be pronominalized by the male-specific pronoun *he* in contexts where referential gender is either not known or irrelevant" (Hellinger & Bußmann 2001: 11), the non-existence of gender-specific third person pronouns in Estonian means that the social gender of nouns like *arst* 'physician' or *kirurg* 'surgeon' cannot be judged from pronominalization. In contemporary Estonian society more than 70% of the physicians are female (Sepp 2012: 54), which makes covert male bias less plausible.

Among the lexemes that do exhibit covert male bias are those denoting higher social or political positions like *president* 'president', *minister* 'minister' or *professor* 'professor'. For example, a leading politician suggested in 1994 that Estonia could not have a female president because the president has to be 'the father' (Lauristin 1995: 23). The same holds for some traditional, less prestigious professions like *autojuht* 'driver', *bussijuht* 'bus driver', *kaevur* 'miner' or *sepp* 'blacksmith'.

There are also lexically gender-neutral lexemes that will rather be associated with females than with males, i.e. we here deal with a covert female bias. The noun *õpetaja* 'teacher', for example, is almost exclusively associated with women as the

vast majority of school teachers in Estonia are female. Other examples are *lesk* ‘widow(er)’ (see Section 3.2) or *õmbleja* ‘sewer’, where the female bias – as in other societies – is due to the salience of female as opposed to male representatives of the respective social category (*lesk*) or due to the higher frequency of women in the profession at hand (*õmbleja*).

2.4 Male and female generics

In Estonian, there is a small group of female and male generics, i.e. words with a clearly discernible female or male lexical meaning that are (or are recommended to be; see below) used to refer to both sexes. The group of male generics is slightly larger than that of female generics.

The most prominent male generic is *esimees*, which was traditionally translated as *chairman* but nowadays is mostly rendered as *chairperson*. The components of this compound mean ‘front’ (*esi*) and ‘man’ (*mees*) respectively. The compound is a relatively recent formation, as it is first attested at the beginning of the 20th century in an Estonian textbook for Germans (Neumann 1903:172). Interestingly, in the 19th century the neutral form *ees-istnik*¹ ‘chairperson, president’ was proposed (Wiedemann 1869:140), an obvious loan-translation from German *Vorsitzende/r*, with the gender-neutral personal noun suffix *-nik*. The word was labelled a neologism by Wiedemann and did not survive. Today only *eesistuja* is found, displaying the likewise neutral suffix *-ja*, and used when denoting a body rather than a person:

- (2) *Eesti on sügise-l Euroopa Liidu eesistuja.*
 Estonia be.3SG autumn.ADE European Union.GEN chairperson
 ‘Estonia will chair the European Union in autumn.’

But for persons, the most usual word is *esimees*, which is nowadays explicitly recommended for both sexes. For example, EKSS (2009, I: 346) lists the form as *esimees (ka naise kohta)* (‘chairman (also for a woman)’). This recommendation is made because the parallel form *esinaine* ‘front woman, chairwoman’ also exists, though it is about half a century younger and occurs for the first time in the dictionaries after World War II (VÕS 1946: 132; also SÕS 1948: 122). Its use is, today, restricted to chairwomen of organizations which consist of women only (for further discussion of the pair *esimees/esinaine*, see Section 5).

Nevertheless, there are some female generics, too, although these do not end in *-naine*. The regular Estonian equivalent for ‘nurse’ is *meditsiiniõde* (lit. ‘medicine sister’) or simply *õde* (lit. ‘sister’). When men started to enter this profession, the term was also used for male nurses – at least this was recommended (cf. Section 5).

The opposite happened with *kavaler* ‘cavalier, gallant, beau’ (a loan from German *Kavalier*), which is today used in the sense of ‘award winner’. Originally a male-specific noun, it can nowadays also be used to refer to female award winners and can therefore be considered a male generic.²

3. Gender-related structures

3.1 Derivation

Like the majority of Estonian personal nouns, most of the agent nouns formed with the deverbal derivational suffix *-ja* are gender-neutral: *õpetama* ‘teach’ > *õpetaja* ‘teacher’, *näitlema* ‘act’ > *näitleja* ‘actor’. The same holds for the suffixes *-nik*, attached to nouns, and *-ur*, attached to nouns or verb stems: *kunst* ‘art’ > *kunstnik* ‘artist’, *aed* ‘garden’ > *aednik* ‘gardener’, *kala* ‘fish’ > *kalur* ‘fisher’, *kuju* ‘figure, shape, statue’ > *kujur* ‘sculptor’.

However, gender-specification through derivation is possible. Only some female suffixes exist, while male suffixes are missing. This means that the unmarked forms, which are in fact gender-neutral, may sometimes be interpreted as male. Both female suffixes are loans, *tar* from Finnish (Mägiste 1929: 31) and *-nna* from German (Mägiste 1929: 32).

In Finnish the suffix *tar/tär* (due to front/back vowel harmony in Finnish there are two forms) is derived from the lexeme *tytär* ‘daughter’. It is today rather obsolete or at least mainly restricted to dignitaries (cf. Engelberg 1998: 78f. and 2002: 113). The Finnish suffix was borrowed into Estonian by Johannes Aavik, the head and most important protagonist of the Estonian language reform movement at the beginning of the 20th century (cf. Chalvin 2010). Aavik proposed the new suffix *tar* (Estonian lacks vowel harmony) in his dictionary of new words (Aavik 1919) and described it as forming nouns denoting “female beings, virgins and spirits” (Aavik 1921: 8). His examples are restricted to two groups, viz. terms for goddesses and nouns denoting persons of a certain regional origin (e.g. *Ilmatar* ‘goddess of the air’, *pariisitar* ‘female Parisian’).

In present-day Estonian, the suffix is not very frequent and still restricted to the above-mentioned semantic fields and some occupational terms (see 4.2). Hinderling (1979: 418) lists 18 words with *tar*, among them *kuningatar* ‘queen’, *vürstitar* ‘duchess, princess’, *tsaaritar* ‘tsarina’, *juuditatar* ‘Jewish woman’, *poolatar* ‘Polish woman’, *hiinatar* ‘Chinese woman’, *näitlejatar* ‘actress’, *tantsijatar* ‘female dancer’ and *lauljatar* ‘female singer’. All of these words are rarely used and index an elevated language style rather than normal colloquial Estonian.

The second female suffix *-nna* is modelled after the German suffix *-in* and came into the language during the second half of the 19th century. In his dictionary Wiedemann still considers a word like *keizerina* ‘empress’ a neologism (Wiedemann 1869: 287), but in his comprehensive grammar a few years later, he treats *-nna* as a normal, though recent, suffix (Wiedemann 1875: 196). The suffix seemed to be restricted to nouns denoting dignitaries, but Wiedemann also records a number of female animal terms like *perdikana* ‘female monkey’ (from *perdik*), *tiigrina* ‘female tiger’ (from *tiger*; Wiedemann 1875: 197).

In contemporary Estonian, *-nna* is more productive than *-tar*. Hinderling (1979: 83f.) lists 69 lexemes with this suffix, among them many nouns denoting female representatives of various nationalities: *araablanna* ‘Arab woman’, *hollandlanna* ‘Dutchwoman’, *prantslanna* ‘Frenchwoman’, etc. This is obviously an area in which gender distinction is felt to be necessary. As it occurs overwhelmingly in such contexts, the suffix can even be reanalyzed as *-lanna*, denoting a female person belonging to the group denoted by the root it is attached to. By contrast, *-lane* denotes a male representative. Normally *-lane* “derives nouns expressing (a) a person according to his origin [...], group (*kristlane* ‘Christian’, *katoliiklane* ‘Catholic’), field of activity or some other properties (*õpilane* ‘student; disciple’ from *õppima* ‘to study’ [...]) and (b) an animal, bird or insect ([...] *mesilane* ‘bee’ from *mesi* ‘honey’)” (Erelt 2003: 81). In the field of nationalities, however, there seems to be a gendered shift towards interpreting the morphologically unmarked form as male, in contrast to the marked female forms with *-lanna*. However, *-lanna* is not restricted to nationalities, as can be seen from the pair *kangelane* ‘hero’ and *kangelanna* ‘heroine’.

The forms with *-lane* can be used for male-specific, generic and even female-specific reference, while nouns with *-lanna* can only refer to women. A German woman, for instance, can introduce herself to an Estonian with the sentence *Mina olen sakslane* ‘I am a German’. On the other hand, when Estonians were asked to describe a picture with a female and a male person distinguished by some national symbols (for example, a flag on their hats), they would probably specify the sex and say *sakslane ja prantslanna* ‘a (male) German and a Frenchwoman’.

Most lexemes can only take one of the female suffixes, except for *kuningas* ‘king’, which can be turned into *kuningatar* or *kuninganna* (both ‘queen’). A Polish woman, for example, can only be referred to as *poolatar* (the male form being *poolakas*; **poollane* does not exist), and a Jewish woman as *juuditar* (the male counterpart being *juut*, not **juutlane*).

An interesting case in this context is the word *sõber* ‘friend’, which is lexically gender-neutral but can take both female suffixes with slightly different meanings: *sõbranna* ‘female friend’ is mostly used among women when talking about their

female friends, while the less frequent noun *sõbratar* shows a tendency to index a (heterosexual) male perspective, associated with the meaning ‘girlfriend’. However, the recent English loan translations *tüdruksober* ‘girlfriend’ and *poisssober* ‘boyfriend’ are gaining ground. Ross remarks that “*sõbranna* is indisputably something more lightweight and unreliable than simply *sõber*” (Ross 2012: 167), supporting her claim with impressive examples from ÖS 2006, in which *sõbranna* almost always co-occurs with negative words like ‘jealous’, ‘jealousy’ or ‘grudge’ (Ross 2012: 167f.).

A third derivational suffix which needs to be mentioned here is the diminutive suffix *-ke*. This suffix sporadically denotes females as observed already by Mägiste (1929: 23ff.; cf. also Oksaar 1967) and has traces in most Finnic languages. The older form of the suffix was *-k*, which can still be seen in *noorik* ‘young woman’ derived from *noor* ‘young’, and also in *wennik* ‘female Russian’ (South Estonian dialect; Wiedemann 1869: 1489). Most of these forms are today archaic, but recently, in the jocular columns of newspapers, the fully productive diminutive suffix *-ke* can be found attached to words like *tema* ‘s/he’, to make the distinction between *tema* ‘he’ and *temake* ‘she’ (cf. Ross 1996: 104). The striking observation is in this case that of all possible suffixes it is the diminutive that is used to create a female form.

3.2 Compounding

The second major word-formation process in Estonian is compounding, which is highly productive in most Finno-Ugric languages. The problem of gender representation in occupational terms (cf. 4.2) should be less serious in Finno-Ugric languages than in languages with grammatical gender. Nouns like *kirjanik* ‘writer’ and *luuletaja* ‘poet’ are lexically gender-neutral and can easily be used to refer to both women and men. However, when a female compound with *nais-* is formed, it usually has more negative connotations than the gender-neutral base form (e.g. *kirjanik* ‘writer’ > *naiskirjanik* ‘female writer’). Interestingly, the word *naiskirjanik* made its first appearance in the interwar period (EÖS: 570), which might suggest that First Wave Feminism had its effect on language, too. The compound fell out of use during the first Soviet years – no entry in VÖS 1946 – but reappeared in the 1960 edition of ÖS, to remain to date.

Braun (1997: 47) states that languages with grammatical gender facilitate an equal gender representation, as their structure displays more overt possibilities for a proper representation of both sexes. In languages without grammatical gender, however, one has to deal with the covert (social) gender bias of personal nouns. This is often done by creating gender-specific forms that stress inequality

rather than cure it. Exactly this seems to have been the case in Estonian with *nais-* and *mees-* compounds.

In Wiedemann (1869) no such compounds with initial *nais-* or *mees-* can be found, nor does the first orthographical dictionary of Estonian, EKÕS, contain any compounds of this kind. What followed was a comprehensive three-volume new edition of EKÕS between 1925 and 1937 (called EÕS, changing its name from *orthographical* to *orthological*). This was for a long time the most comprehensive documentation of the Estonian lexicon, as it listed approximately 130,000 lexemes, more than six times the number of EKÕS (see Blokland 2009: 61–64 for a lexicographical overview of Estonian, including numbers of lemmata in various dictionaries), including many compounds of all kinds.

From the viewpoint of gender, the distribution of words with initial *nais-* or *mees-* in this dictionary is noteworthy. Seventy-seven compounds with *nais-* are found, among them such formations as *naisaadel* ('female aristocracy') or *naisüliõpilane* 'female student' (EÕS: 569–571).³ Note that this group does not include compounds starting with the genitive singular *naise* or the genitive plural *naiste*, which – though also missing in previous dictionaries – are of a different kind, since they are not used to express the femaleness of a human referent (cf. *naisterõivas* 'women's clothing'; *naistearst* 'gynaecologist', lit. 'women's doctor'). Compounds with *nais-*, by contrast, indicate that the person in question is female. The number of male-specific compounds with *mees-* in the same dictionary (EÕS: 484) is clearly smaller, amounting to less than 20 forms. One can conclude from this that the unmarked forms are more likely to be perceived as male, which explains why a higher number of specifically marked female forms entered the lexicon in the 1920s. This led to a gender asymmetry in the lexicon that may be thought to run counter to a gender-equal linguistic representation, as suspected by Braun (1997).

A closer look at the compounds found shows that half of the *mees-* compounds in EÕS have a corresponding female compound, resulting in gender-symmetrical pairs such as *meeskasvataja* – *naiskasvataja* 'male/female educator', *meeskoor* – *naiskoor* 'male/female choir', *meestööline* – *naistööline* 'male/female worker', or *meesõpetaja* – *naisõpetaja* 'male/female teacher'. By contrast, for the vast majority of the marked female forms no corresponding male form can be found in the dictionary.

These trends re-emerge in the most recent monolingual dictionary, EKSS (2009), which comprises approximately 150,000 entries. The respective figures for this dictionary are 62 *mees-* words (EKSS 2009, III: 378–389) and 118 *nais-* words (EKSS 2009, III: 610–614), i.e. almost twice as many female as male compounds. More than three quarters of the *mees-* words (49 lexemes) had a female counterpart (e.g. *meesakt* – *naisakt* 'male/female nude', *meeskond* – *naiskond* 'male/

female team, *meesvang* – *naisvang* ‘male/female prisoner’, or *meesüliõpilane* – *naisüliõpilane* ‘male/female student’). In other words, only 13 *mees*-forms remain that do not have a counterpart with *nais*-. Only ten of these are personal nouns:

- (3) *meeshaige* ‘male sick person’
meesiludus ‘male beauty’
meeslüksja ‘male milker’
meesnaine ‘androgynous’
meesolevus ‘male creature’
meesosaline ‘male participant’
meespartner ‘male partner’
meessanitar ‘male nurse’
meessõber ‘boyfriend’
meesteener ‘male servant’

For five of these, the lack of a female form can be characterized as an obvious (accidental) omission or mistake. *Meeshaige* ‘male sick person’, illustrated with the phrase *meeshaigete palat* ‘men’s ward (in a hospital)’ could (should?) easily have a female counterpart, as the respective section in a hospital is indeed called *naishaigete palat*. *Meesolevus* ‘male creature’ appears directly after the synonymous form *meesolend* ‘male creature’ in the dictionary, and there is no other explanation than accident that we find *naisolend* ‘female creature’ but no *naisolevus*. *Meesosaline* has the same meaning as *meesosatäitja* ‘male role’ and is mostly used in contexts like the theater or opera. We find *naisosatäitja* and *naisosa* ‘female role’ but neither *naisosaline* nor *meesosa* ‘male role’, and this asymmetry can only be explained by accidental choice or something the like. The simple fact that the dictionary entries were written by different individuals may have led to this incongruence.⁴ The same holds for *meespartner* ‘male partner’, because *naispartner* ‘female partner’ is highly plausible and can even be found elsewhere in the same dictionary (EKSS 2009, IV: 104, s.v. *partner*), and for *meessanitar* ‘male nurse’, since the missing *naissanitar* ‘female nurse’ is used in the entry for *meessanitar*:

- (4) *Välilaatsaretis oli nii mees- kui naissanitare*
 field hospital.INESS be. PAST.3SG both man- and woman nurse.PARTT.PL
 ‘In the field hospital were male and female nurses.’
 (EKSS 2009, III: 379)

A rare case is the pair *meesteener* and *naisteenija*, for which we would expect the synonymous equivalents **meesteenija* and **naisteener*. But they do not exist and here the functions of *mees*- and *nais*- indeed differ from those in the previous examples. *Teener* is glossed as ‘usually male servant’ and *teenija* respectively as ‘usually female servant’ (EKSS 2009, V: 681), i.e. the base nouns already possess

opposite social gender connotations. Apparently the original social male bias of *teener* – which in earlier times may have been stronger due to its status as a loan going back to Low German *dēner*, which has a masculine suffix *-er* – became weakened and therefore *mees-* was added in order to restore the male meaning. The same holds for the younger, lexically gender-neutral *teenija*, whose verbal base *teenima* ‘to serve’ was likewise borrowed from Low German and later on combined with the Estonian agentive suffix *-ja*. The female social gender bias of this noun also became weaker and, therefore, the *nais-*element was added to stress femaleness.

Another interesting case is *meesnaine* ‘androgynous’ (lit. ‘man woman’). The form *naismees* ‘hermaphrodite’ (lit. ‘woman man’), though not in the dictionary, is also plausible and indeed existed in the dictionary from the interwar period (EÕS:570), where we thus had full symmetry. Other than in the originally Greek compounds *androgynous* and *hermaphrodite*, in the Estonian compounds the lexical gender of the second element clearly indicates referential gender. The latter were formed on the basis of the German words *Mannweib* and *Weibmann*. But – as in German, where *Weibmann* has vanished and *Mannweib* is still in the lexicon – Estonian *naisemees* disappeared and/or was replaced by the originally Greek form *hermafrodiit*. Similarly, within the pair *meessõber* ‘boyfriend, male friend’ and *naisõber* ‘woman friend’, the latter is missing in EKSS 2009, but can be found in other dictionaries (e.g. in Saagpakk 1982:536). The rarity of *naisõber* – causing its omission in EKSS – can be explained by the existence of the two synonyms *sõbranna* and *sõbratar*, both ‘female friend’ (see above).

The two remaining forms in the list of *mees-*compounds that lack a female counterpart are *meesiludus* (lit. ‘man beauty’) and *meeslõpsja* (lit. ‘man milker’). *Meesiludus* is defined in the dictionary as (*ebamehilikult*) *ilus mees* ‘(in an unmanly manner) beautiful man’ (EKSS 2009, III: 378), which presupposes that men are not or should not be beautiful and that women normally are beautiful (note that *naisiludus* is missing in EKSS but occurs in the interwar dictionary; EÕS:579). The existence of the form *meeslõpsja* ‘male milker’ indicates that the unmarked form *lõpsja* is normally perceived as socially female. It is one of the few occupational terms with *mees-*.

A very small number of words might have covert female bias, as is common in other societies, too. One of them is the lexically gender-neutral noun *lesk* ‘widow(er)’, for which also a male and a female compound is listed in EKSS 2009 (III: 104): *lesknaine* (lit. ‘widow woman’) and *leskmees* (lit. ‘widow man’). The number of hits in an internet query reveals, however, that *leskmees* appears significantly more often than *lesknaine*, which suggests that the unmarked *lesk* has a female social gender bias. This is, to some extent, a reflection of social realities, as

in Estonia the life expectancy of women is ten years higher than that of men (cf. Eesti Statistika 2013).

On the other hand, there is also a large group of gender-neutral compounds. In sports, a male team is *meeskond* (lit. ‘man team’; most likely a calque from German *Mannschaft*), a female team *naiskond* (lit. ‘woman team’), and a mixed-sex team *võistkond* (cf. the verb *võistlema* ‘to compete’) – at least in theory (see below). An online frequency test shows that *meeskond* occurs much more often, and this is probably not just due to the fact that there are more reports on male sports events on the Internet. Finally, the relatively recent English loan translations *poissõber* ‘boyfriend’ and *tüdruksõber* ‘girlfriend’ are also not equally distributed: *poissõber* appears far more often, partly due to the existence of the forms *sõbranna* and *sõbratar*, which compete with *tüdruksõber* (see above).

Compounds with *-mees* clearly outnumber those with *-naine*. In ÕS 1960, for example, one finds 228 *-mees* and only 39 *-naine*-compounds (Hinderling 1979: 160 and 460f.). When *-mees* is the second part of a compound, the meaning is, of course, different. Here, the element *-mees* forms male generics, as the following example from Wiedemann’s dictionary shows:

- (5) *Mis asja-mees ma siis olen*
 which thing-man I then be.1SG
 ‘What kind of functionary I will become’ (Wiedemann 1869:664)

Wiedemann’s German translation stresses that also women could say this, adding in brackets “also used by girls”. The same holds for *näpu-mees* and *sõrme-mees*, both ‘thief’ (both lit. ‘finger-man’), which are translated as German *Dieb*, *Diebin* (‘male/female thief’) and *paari-mees* ‘companion, mate’ (lit. ‘couple man’), which Wiedemann translates with ‘spouse (also of the female part)’. Another male generic example is the adverb *meeshaaval* ‘man by man, one man at a time’ (**naishaaval* does not exist). The exhortative *ole meheks!* ‘thank you, be so kind’ (lit. ‘be a man’) can also be addressed to women.⁵

Among occupational terms (cf. Section 4.2) that have a female second component, formations with *-preili* and *-neiu*, both ‘young lady, Miss’ are common. Compounds with the male second elements *-noormees* ‘young man’ and *-poiss* ‘boy’ are rarely occupational terms.

3.3 Pronominalization

Estonian personal, demonstrative, indefinite, possessive, reflexive, and relative pronouns are lexically gender-neutral. Accordingly, the gender-neutral third

person singular pronoun *tema* (shorter form *ta*) is used in pronominalization, independently of the lexical gender of the controller noun:

- (6) *Nägin Eppu/Peetrit/lehma. Ta oli väga tige.*
 see.PAST.1SG Epp/Peeter/cow.PARTT 3SG be.PAST.3SG very angry.
 ‘I saw Epp/Peeter/a cow. She/he/it was very angry.’

Today, *tema* and *ta* are often translated into English as *s/he*, but in former times a male translation (*he*) was used by default, as illustrated in (7):

- (7) *ta on õpetajaks Tartus.*
 3SG is teacher.TRNS Tartu.INESS
 ‘He is a teacher in Tartu.’ (Lavotha 1973: 96)

When Matsumura (1996: 71) used the same sentence in his study on the Estonian translative, he deliberately translated it as “She is (working as) a teacher in Tartu,” i.e. using a female pronoun in order to highlight the ambiguity and covert male bias of *ta*. In an earlier study, Matsumura also had consistently translated *tema* with ‘she’ (Matsumura 1994). When translating into languages that possess gender-variable third person singular pronouns, another possibility is to switch between male and female pronouns if one wishes to avoid clumsy constructions with slashes. This principle was applied in a German-language grammar of Estonian (Hasselblatt 1992), in which all sample sentences with *tema* or gender-indefinite agent nouns were randomly translated as male or female, resulting in a more or less 50:50 distribution. Interestingly, one reviewer believed that “in the German equivalents of the sample sentences one can see that the feminine form is preferred” (Alvre 1994: 56), which is definitely not the case. However, this illustrates that female forms are marked in comparison to male forms and therefore perceived to be more frequent than they actually are.

4. Usage of personal reference forms

4.1 Address terms

The normal address term for a male person in Estonian is *härra* ‘Mr, gentleman’, that for a female person is *proua* ‘Mrs, lady, madam’. A gender-relevant asymmetry in the Estonian address system is the one known from many other languages: There is a term of address for an unmarried woman, *preili* ‘Miss’, while a corresponding address term for an unmarried man does not exist. However, nowadays the use of *preili* is restricted to the older generation. The same holds for another word denoting ‘unmarried woman’, *neiu*, which, however, is only seldom used

as an address term. Both terms are also used to denote a young woman without special reference to her marital status (cf. the compounds discussed below under 8 and 9).

4.2 Occupational terms

As has been shown above (3.2), relatively few occupational terms are formed with a male marker. More occupational terms can be combined with *nais*: *nais-agronoom* ‘female agronomist’, *naisajakirjanik* ‘female journalist’, *naisdiplomaat* ‘female diplomat’, etc. In total, there are 69 female compounds in EKSS 2009 without male counterparts. The majority of these are personal nouns denoting occupations, often those of relatively high prestige. This means that a covert male bias is still at work in many Estonian personal nouns. It needs to be noted, however, that such a bias need not necessarily reflect present-day social realities but rather relates to earlier historical periods in which men dominated in most occupational fields. In 2013, almost 40% of the members of the Estonian Writers’ Union were female, but still *kirjanik* ‘writer’ and *luuletaja* ‘poet’ have a covert male bias; otherwise words like *naiskirjanik* and *naisluuletaja* would not exist. The female forms have a slightly derogatory meaning and are never used for highly esteemed female Estonian poets like Lydia Koidula or Marie Under, but rather for writers considered second-class (cf. TEA 3: 43). The existence of the formation *naisdoktor* (*doktorikraadiga naine*), i.e. ‘female doctor (woman holding a PhD)’ also relates back to former times, while today almost 50% of Estonians holding a PhD are female (Eesti Statistika 2012).

On the other hand, compounds with *-preili* and *-neiu*, both ‘young lady, Miss’, reveal the relatively low status of the occupations in question, as can be seen from the following list of occupational terms given under the headword *preili* in a recent monolingual dictionary:

- (8) *kassapreili* ‘cash desk miss’
kontoripreili ‘office miss’
koolipreili ‘school miss’
lastepreili ‘children’s miss’
poepreili ‘shop miss’
puhvetipreili ‘canteen miss’
telefonipreili ‘telephone miss’ (EKSS 2009, IV: 391)

All these terms denote (older) professions mainly carried out by – formerly mostly unmarried – women. The same holds for *-neiu*, with which even more compounds are listed in the dictionary:

- (9) *baarineiu* 'bar girl'
karjusneiu 'shepherd girl'
kassaneiu 'cash desk girl'
lilleneiu 'country girl'
maaneiu 'office miss'
mustlasneiu 'gypsy girl'
naabrineiu 'neighbor girl'
poeneiu 'shop girl'
puhvetineiu 'canteen girl'
sekretärineiu 'secretary girl'
taluneiu 'farm girl'
telefonineiu 'telephone girl'
töölisneiu 'working class girl' (EKSS 2009, III: 636)

4.3 Idiomatic expressions and proverbs

As can be expected from a language used in a patriarchal society, many frozen expressions such as metaphors, idioms, and proverbs show gender-relevant asymmetries. Evidence from a frequency dictionary (Kaalep & Muischnek 2002: 143) suggests that men are more frequently represented in Estonian proverbs than women. A look at collections of Estonian proverbs reveals that there exist 585 types of proverbs with the element *mees* 'man' as opposed to 457 types with the element *naine* 'woman' (Krikmann & Sarv 1988: 119–122 and 132–133). This might indicate that in certain types of proverbs the lexeme *mees* is understood generically, i.e. as 'human' rather than 'male' or 'man'. On the other hand, it is questionable whether this difference is significant: Estonian has one of the largest collections of proverbs in the world with approximately 200,000 documented samples and a subdivision into 15,140 types (Krikmann & Sarv 1987: 9). The above mentioned figures are based on the number of types, thus resulting in 3.86% of proverbs with *mees* and 3.01% with *naine*. Furthermore, the respective (absolute) figures for *isa* 'father' and *ema* 'mother' show the opposite trend: there are 172 types of proverbs with *ema* and only 76 with *isa* (Krikmann & Sarv 1988: 19 and 40).

Many proverbs convey stereotypes of a gendered society or portray women in a negative light. Compare the following examples (taken from Krikmann & Sarv 1980–1985; the numbers in brackets are the numbers of the proverbs in this collection):

- (10) *Iga naine on libu oma mehele.* (no. 7196)
 'Every woman is a bitch to her own husband.'

- (11) *Kes oma naist heast materdab, see sada pattu andeks saab.* (no. 7201)
‘He who thrashes his wife severely is forgiven a hundred sins.’
- (12) *Kus on naisi, siel pole rahu.* (no. 7215)
‘Where there are women, there is no peace.’
- (13) *Naene matta ja teine võtta kosutava inimest, hobuse matta ja teine osta kautavad inimest.* (no. 7263)
‘To bury a wife and take a new one refreshes a man, to bury a horse and take a new one destroys a man.’

Like proverbs, idiomatic expressions often show similar gender patterns across languages. At first sight, one finds the same asymmetry in marriage-related idiomatic expressions as in many other languages, namely that the man plays an active and the woman a passive part:

- (14) *Mees võtab naise.*
man take.3SG woman.GEN
‘The man marries a woman.’ (lit. ‘... takes a woman’)
- (15) *Naine läheb mehele.*
woman go.3SG man.ALLAT
‘The woman marries a man.’ (lit. ‘... goes to the man’)

On the other hand, one cannot deny that in the last example the woman shows at least some agency, as she is the subject of the verb denoting ‘to go’.

4.4 Dictionaries

Due to their partly prescriptive character, dictionaries have played a prominent role in the development of Estonian language awareness, as can be judged from the dictionary data adduced in the previous sections. But dictionaries often also reveal asymmetries in language use and perception or, in other words, various social discourses manifest themselves in dictionary entries (cf. Nübling 2009). In an earlier study on an Estonian dictionary, it was shown that, despite the fact that the authors of the monolingual Estonian dictionary (EKSS) had a set of gender-neutral personal pronouns and nouns at their disposal, the majority of the examples contained lexically gendered forms. A sample of 638 gendered sentences included 72.3% male vs. 27.7% female examples (Hasselblatt 1998: 152). A similar result was obtained in a frequency analysis of one million words from literary and journalistic texts. There were 2,406 tokens of *mees* ‘man’ compared to 1,666 of *naine* ‘woman’, with similar distributions for *poiss* ‘boy’ and *tüdruk* ‘girl’, and other pairs (Kaalep & Muischnek 2002: 143).

The same asymmetry also exists at the purely quantitative level, i.e. on the space certain lexemes take up in a dictionary. In the monolingual standard dictionary, the entry for *naine* ‘woman’ consists of 58 lines (EKSS 2009, III: 610), while the entry for *mees* ‘man’ is 165 lines long (EKSS 2009, III: 377–378). Comparable results can be found for the pairs *poiss* ‘boy’ and *tüdruk* ‘girl’ (39 vs. 66 lines), *tütar* ‘daughter’ and *poeg* ‘son’ (28 vs. 58 lines), and *ema* ‘mother’ and *isa* ‘father’ (44 vs. 48 lines). The number of lines for the male entries generally exceeds that of the female entries. This asymmetry was even higher in the dictionary by Wiedemann, in which more than four columns are dedicated to *mees* (Wiedemann 1869: 663–668) and only half a column to *naine* (Wiedemann 1869: 710).

The same holds for certain adjectives which tend to be associated with one of the sexes, thus reinforcing existing gender stereotypes. The adjective *kange* ‘strong, hard, stiff’, for instance, almost exclusively occurs in examples with male lexemes (EKSS 2009, II: 90–91). The adjective *näigus* ‘pretty, handsome’, by contrast, is mainly illustrated with female examples (EKSS 2009, III: 747).

5. Language change and language reform

Since the beginning of the 20th century, there has been a strong tradition of normative dictionaries and language policies which played a role in establishing Estonian as a national language. This is understandable and even logical as Estonian always had to maintain – or first gain – its position between much larger and well-established languages like German and Russian. On the other hand, the small language community of approximately one million L1 speakers made it possible to introduce language changes from above comparatively easily. This was indeed the case in the years before independence at the beginning of the 20th century, when a small group of intellectuals under the leadership of Johannes Aavik proposed a number of profound lexical, syntactic and even morphological changes (cf. Chalvin 2010). As mentioned above (3.1), the introduction of the female suffix *-tar* dates from this period. One translator even tried to introduce a female personal pronoun *tana* ‘she’, which remained unsuccessful (Haawa 1914). Numerous other proposals were successfully implemented, although the majority of the newly proposed words did not survive. The main aim of this reform was to purify Estonian of German influences (see the programmatic article by Aavik 1912), which had been tremendous over the past centuries. Gender issues were not on the agenda.

This changed partly in the first period of Estonian independence, when the first comprehensive monolingual dictionary EÕS appeared, in which a large number of new *nais*-compounds are listed (cf. above 3.2). As mentioned above, this could be an outcome of First Wave Feminism during the interwar period (cf. the

preface in EÕS:IX–XI). In the years following the World War II, Estonia faced a completely different problem, namely that of maintaining its culture under Soviet occupation. Language policy and language planning were not abandoned, but the priorities had changed. Estonian linguists worked to protect the language against too much Russian and Soviet influence and had no time for ‘feminist issues’.

Nevertheless, there were some gender-related linguistic developments as well. Again the pair *esimees* ‘chairman’, *esinaine* ‘chairwoman’ may function as an example. Since the occurrence of *esinaine* in the post-war dictionaries, there apparently has been a discussion about the exact meaning of this new lexeme. EKMS, for example, a comprehensive lexical field dictionary compiled in exile, illustrates the use of *esimees* among others with the following female-specific example (EKMS I: 748 [1958]):

- (16) *naisühingu* *e[simehe]ks* *valiti* *pr.* *N.*
 women’s association.GEN ch[airman].TRNS elected Mrs N.
 ‘Mrs N. was elected chairman of the women’s association’

On the same page of this dictionary, the noun *esinaine* is defined as *naissoost* [sic]⁶ *esimees* ‘chairman of the female sex’ (EKMS I: 748 [1958]). Andrus Saareste, the author of EKMS, seems to suggest that *esimees* is a generic noun that should even be used for female chairpersons presiding over organizations which exclusively consist of female members. But at the same time he acknowledges the existence of the lexeme *esinaine* and glosses it with ‘a chairwoman is a female chairman’ without giving any sample sentence to illustrate its use.

It is doubtful whether Saareste really regarded the noun *esimees* as free of any male connotations, which would be the only explanation for his paradoxical gloss. However, this is exactly what contemporary Estonian linguists seem to suggest, as is documented by the development of the pair *esimees/esinaine*. The 1960 and 1976 editions of ÕS mention both lexemes without any explanation (ÕS 1960: 116; ÕS 1976: 116), but from the next edition onwards, short explanations and recommendations can be found. The 1999 edition illustrates the use of *esimees* by means of the following illustrative sentence: *Ühistu esimeheks valiti pr. Järv, aseesimeheks hr. Jõgi* (‘As chairman of the co-operative Mrs Järv was elected, as vice-chairman Mr Jõgi’ (ÕS 1999: 136). Within the entry for *esinaine*, one finds the usage comment *naisorganisatsioonil* ‘with a female organization’ and the sample phrase *naiskoori esinaine* ‘chairwoman of a female choir’ (ÕS 1999: 136). Almost the same glosses can be found in the later editions of the dictionary.

This means that the three post-Soviet editions, ÕS 1999, ÕS 2006 and ÕS 2013, suggest that *esimees* should also be used for women, even though a strong recommendation is avoided. But obviously the use of *esimees/esinaine* was still variable, as can be seen on the certificate of a literary award from 1997,⁷ on which

a female chairperson of the jury has signed with *esinaine*. This usage runs counter to the language policy at that time, as already in 1991 (i.e. before the above mentioned two dictionaries were published), the new comprehensive multi-volume dictionary EKSS had provided a clear recommendation: *esimees* (*ka naise kohta*) ‘chairman (also concerning a woman)’ can be found in EKSS ([1991], I: 316) and EKSS 2009 (I: 346). According to these dictionaries, the lexeme *esinaine* seems to be restricted to chairs of women’s organizations, although the explanatory sentences are far from clear in this respect:

- (17) *esinaine*: (*hrl. naisteorganisatsiooni*) *naisjuhataja. Naiskoori, naiskorporatsiooni, naiskomisjoni esinaine. Turismiklubi esinaine.*

‘chairwoman: (usu. of a women’s organization) female leader. Chairwoman of a female voice choir, a (women’s) sorority, a women’s commission. The chairwoman of the tourist club.’

(EKSS I: 318, also EKSS 2009, I: 347)

Here, the addition of *hrl.* ‘usu.’ suggests that the word is not exclusively used for chairs of women’s organizations, as also shown by the illustrative sentences: Although the chairpersons of a sorority and a women’s commission are likely to be female, the conductor of a female choir can in principle also be a man. However, a tourist club is particularly unlikely to consist of only female members and can equally well be presided by a man.

The uncertainty in the usage of these forms is also reflected in discussions on the Internet, where the advisory board of the Estonian Language Institute answers questions asked by the public. In February 2007, somebody inquired about the use of *esimees* and *esinaine* and received the following answer:

Occupational terms in Estonian are neutral concerning sex, therefore **esimees** can also refer to a female leader, e.g. Ene Ergma was the **esimees** of Parliament, the **esimees** of the Harju county court is Helve Särgava, the vice **esimees** of the constitutional commission of the parliament is Evelyn Sepp. The word **esinaine** can be used to designate a leader of a female staff, e.g. *chairwoman of a female voice choir, vice-chairwoman of the women’s student organisation*. Even if the majority of a group is female, this is no reason to speak of an **esinaine**, e.g. Piret Järvela is the **esimees** of the society of Estonian mother-tongue teachers (not the **esinaine**). (bold and italics as in original; my translation, C.H.)⁸

This all shows that the goal of implementing the generic use of *esimees* has not yet been successful.

Since 2004, when Estonia became a member of the European Union, Estonian language policy has also been affected at the supranational European level. In 2008, the European Parliament published the guidelines ‘Gender-neutral

language in the European Parliament' for all official languages of the European Union. The Estonian brochure (European Parliament 2008) comprises only six pages of text – as opposed to the guidelines for most other languages (with the Romanian and Maltese guidelines reaching a maximum of 14 pages).⁹ The bulk of the text consists of general remarks common to all brochures, repeating the absurd conclusion that “the occasional generic use of the masculine gender in difficult situations could then be considered acceptable” (quoted from the English version). As no definition of ‘difficult situations’ is given, language use is left to arbitrary decisions, which weakens the whole undertaking of the European Parliament.

Only the last one and a half pages are dedicated to specifically Estonian problems. Here the neutral suffix *-ja* for agent nouns and occupational terms is described as preferable (vs. *-mees* or *-naine*), and the recommendation of the Estonian Language Institute (quoted above) is transferred to the speaker of the Parliament. In other words, the EU recommendations did not contain any new aspects for Estonian language users. Problematic is the final remark (on page 8 of the document), which is unparalleled in other versions: “If no gender-neutral equivalent exists, it does not make sense to come up with one no matter what. One may use the so-called former expression in case it is not insulting to the other sex” (my translation, C.H.). This is exemplified with the following sentence:

- (18) *riigimeheliku suhtumisega poliitik Aino Tamm*
 statesmanlike.GEN behavior.COM politician Aino Tamm
 ‘politician Aino Tamm with statesmanlike behaviour’

Here, the doubtful argumentation obviously is that the (male generic) compliment of being ‘statesmanlike’ cannot be insulting for a woman and is therefore acceptable. In other words, calling a woman a man is seen as a compliment.

6. Conclusion

The representation of gender in present-day Estonian has shown at least two things. First of all, Estonian as a language lacking grammatical gender has good prerequisites to develop a gender-neutral usage patterns. Many expressions are genuinely neutral and do not display a covert gender bias.

On the other hand, many other personal reference forms show a strong covert male bias, which is no surprise if one looks at the cultural history of Estonia. Many centuries of foreign power and foreign language influence have left their traces on society and language. Linguistic gender ambiguity or neutrality is often affected by social reality, as illustrated by the many compounds with *nais-* ‘female’

as opposed to those with *mees-* ‘male’. This asymmetry is mirrored at the semantic level, where connotations of words denoting females are often more negative than those of their male counterparts, as has been illustrated by numerous examples from Estonian lexicography. In addition, the existence of the two female-specific morphemes *-nna* and *-tar* and the absence of male suffixes also reveals gendered asymmetries in Estonian. The same holds for compounding, which is much more productive with female compounds, while the unmarked gender-neutral lexemes are perceived as socially male.

A major difference between Estonian and other languages is that Estonian has an influential tradition of language planning. For more than a hundred years, Estonian linguists have attempted to actively influence the development of the language by recommending certain forms and rejecting others. Due to the relatively small number of Estonian L1 speakers, language reforms have had a strong impact on usage. However, the numerous political changes during the last century – from Tsarist suppression to a free democratic society in 1918, totalitarianism under a communist regime in 1940/44, and the move back to democratic pluralism in 1991 – have had their impact on the language and on the attempts to reform it. This is why the discussion continues, as the example of the instability in the usage of *esimees* and *esinaine* shows.

Notes

* This text benefited from discussions with Rogier Blokland, Remco Knooihuizen and Damaris Nübling, and the comments of an anonymous reviewer.

1. Wiedemann's spelling is slightly adapted here.
2. See also the recommendation of the advisory board of the Estonian Language Institute <http://keeleabi.eki.ee/index.php?leht=8&id=70> [retrieved 14 June 2013].
3. Although this dictionary is principally monolingual, a considerable number of lexemes evidently considered rare or neologisms are glossed in foreign languages, mostly German, which at that time was the most widespread academic language in Estonia.
4. EKSS 2009 does not list its authors, but as it is the second edition, we can determine who the main authors of the respective entries are (cf. EKSS III, [5], where A. Kiindok is the compiler for the section *me – mikroväetis* and F. Vakk for *naer – natu-natukene*).
5. <http://www.parnupostimees.ee/141578/kalev-vilgats-ole-meheks-marianne> [14 July 2009, retrieved 8 July 2013].
6. The form *naissoost* is an obvious spelling mistake, the regular spelling being *naissoost*.
7. Personal property of the author.
8. See <http://keeleabi.eki.ee/index.php?leht=8&id=70> [retrieved 14 June 2013]. *Ene*, *Helve*, *Evelyn* and *Piret* are unambiguously female Estonian given names.

9. See http://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/publications/2009/0001/P6_PUB%282009%290001_ET.pdf [retrieved 15 August 2014] (change the abbreviation before *.pdf* to obtain the guidelines for other languages).

References

- Aavik, Johannes. 1912. "Kõige suurem germanismus eesti keeles [The greatest Germanism in Estonian]." *Eesti Kirjandus* 7: 353–369.
- Aavik, Johannes. 1919. *Uute sõnade sõnastik. Sisaldab üle 2000 uue ja haruldase sõna ühes tuletuslõppude tabeliga* [Glossary of new words. Contains over 2,000 new and lesser used words with tables of derivational suffixes]. Tartu: Istandik.
- Aavik, Johannes. 1921. *Uute sõnade ja vähem tuntud sõnade sõnastik. Sisaldab üle 4000 uuema ja vähem tuntud ning haruldase sõna. Teine parandet ja suuresti täiendat trykk* [Glossary of new and lesser known words. Contains over 4,000 newer, lesser known and seldom used words. Second, improved and enlarged edition]. Tallinn: A. Keisermann.
- Abondolo, Daniel, ed. 1998. *The Uralic languages*. London: Routledge.
- Alvre, Paul. 1994. "Arvustus [Review]: Cornelius Hasselblatt. Grammatiches Wörterbuch des Estnischen. Wiesbaden, 1992." *Linguistica Uralica* 30: 53–57.
- Berg, Maimu. 1996a. "Im Gebirge." *Estonia* 1996(2): 47–49.
- Berg, Maimu. 1996b. "In den Bergen." *Estonia* 1996(2): 50–52.
- Blokland, Rogier. 2009. *The Russian loanwords in literary Estonian*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Blokland, Rogier & Cornelius Hasselblatt. 2003. "The endangered Uralic languages." In *Language death and language maintenance. Theoretical, practical and descriptive approaches*, eds. Mark Janse & Sijmen Tol. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 107–141. DOI: 10.1075/cilt.240.08blo
- Braun, Friederike. 1997. "Genuslose Sprache – egalitäre Sprache? Die Behandlung der Geschlechter in Sprachen mit und ohne Genus." *Jahrbuch für finnisch-deutsche Literaturbeziehungen* 29: 39–49.
- Chalvin, Antoine. 2010. *Johannes Aavik et la rénovation de la langue estonienne*. Paris: L'Harmattan.
- Comrie, Bernard. 1988. "General features of the Uralic languages." In *The Uralic languages. Description, history and foreign influences*, ed. Denis Sinor. Leiden: Brill, 451–477.
- EES = Metsmägi, Iris & Meeli Sedrik & Sven-Erik Soosaar, eds. 2012. *Eesti etimoloogiasõnaraamat* [Estonian etymological dictionary]. Tallinn: Eesti Keele Sihtasutus.
- Eesti Statistika. 2012. <http://www.stat.ee/haridus> [6 May 2013].
- Eesti Statistika. 2013. <http://www.stat.ee/34276> [8 July 2013].
- EKMS = Saareste, Andrus. 1958–1963. *Eesti keele mõisteline sõnaraamat* [Analogical dictionary of Estonian]. Dictionnaire analogique de la langue estonienne, Vol. 4, Stockholm: Vaba Eesti. [Index = Saareste 1979]
- EKÕS = *Eesti keele õigekirjutuse sõnaraamat* [Orthographical dictionary of Estonian]. 1918. Tallinn: K.-Ü. Rahvaülikooli kirjastus.
- EKSS = *Eesti kirjakeele seletussõnaraamat* [Explanatory dictionary of written Estonian]. 1988–2007. Tallinn: Valgus / Keele ja Kirjanduse Instituut / Eesti Keele Instituut / Eesti Keele Sihtasutus.

- EKSS 2009 = *Eesti keele seletav sõnaraamat. "Eesti kirjakeele seletussõnaraamatu" 2., täiendatud ja parandatud trükk* [Explanatory dictionary of Estonian. Second, enlarged and improved edition of the 'Explanatory dictionary of written Estonian']. 2009. Tallinn: Eesti Keele Sihtasutus.
- Engelberg, Mila. 1998. "Sukupuolistuneet ammattinimikkeet [Gendered professional names]." *Virittäjä* 102: 74–92.
- Engelberg, Mila. 2002. "The communication of gender in Finnish." In *Gender across languages. The linguistic representation of women and men*, vol. 2, eds. Marlis Hellinger & Hadumod Bußmann. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 109–132. DOI: 10.1075/impact.10.11eng
- EÕS = *Eesti õigekeelsuse-sõnaraamat. Eesti keele õigekirjutuse-sõnaraamatu II täiendatud ja parandatud trükk* [Estonian orthographical dictionary. Second, enlarged and improved print of the Estonian orthographical dictionary]. 1925–1937. Tartu: Eesti Kirjanduse Seltsi kirjastus.
- Erelt, Mati, ed. 2003. *Estonian language*. Tallinn: Estonian Academy Publishers.
- European Parliament. 2008. Sooneutraalne keelekasutus Euroopa Parlamendis [Gender-neutral language use in the European Parliament]. http://www.europarl.europa.eu/Reg-Data/publications/2009/0001/P6_PUB%282009%290001_ET.pdf [15 August 2014].
- Haawa, Anna. 1914. "Vastuseks ja seletuseks protestidele ning küsimustele, mis Anderseni muinasjuttude tõlke arvustajad "Eesti Kirjanduses" nr. 1 ja "Postimehes" nr. 24, 1914 avaldanud [Answer to and explanation of the protests and questions which the reviewers of the translation of Andersen's fairy tales had published in no. 1 of Eesti Kirjandus and in Postimees no. 24, 1914]." *Eesti Kirjandus* 9: 159–163.
- Hasselblatt, Cornelius. 1992. *Grammatisches Wörterbuch des Estnischen*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Hasselblatt, Cornelius. 1993. "Review of Loog, Mai. 1992. *Esimene eesti slängi sõnaraamat* [First Estonian slang dictionary]." *Ural-Altäische Jahrbücher, Neue Folge* 12: 292–296.
- Hasselblatt, Cornelius. 1998. "Die Frau im estnischen Lexikon." In *Oekeeta asijoo. Commentationes Fenno-Ugricae in honorem Seppo Suhonen sexagenarii*, eds. Riho Grünthal & Johanna Laakso. Helsinki: Suomalais-ugrilainen seura, 147–155.
- Hasselblatt, Cornelius. 2003. "Was kann die Genderforschung der Finnougristik bieten, und was kann die Finnougristik der Genderforschung bieten?" *Wiener Elektronische Beiträge des Instituts für Finno-Ugristik* 2003(3). <http://webfu.univie.ac.at/texte/hasselblatt1.pdf> [15 August 2014].
- Hasselblatt, Cornelius. 2008. "The postcolonial trap – features of recent Estonian discourse patterns." In *The end of autonomy? Studies in Estonian culture*, ed. Cornelius Hasselblatt. Maastricht: Shaker, 104–110.
- Hasselblatt, Cornelius. 2010. "Cherchez la femme or How gendered are Estonian literary histories and handbooks?" *Interlitteraria* 15(2): 312–332.
- Hellinger, Marlis & Hadumod Bußmann. 2001. "Gender across languages: The linguistic representation of women and men." In *Gender across languages. The linguistic representation of women and men*, vol. 1, eds. Marlis Hellinger & Hadumod Bußmann. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1–25. DOI: 10.1075/impact.9.05hel
- Hinderling, Robert. 1979. *Rückläufiges estnisches Wörterbuch. Eesti keele pöördõnaraamat (Sõnalõpuline leksikon). Reverse dictionary of the Estonian language*. Bayreuth: Sprach- und literaturwissenschaftliche Fakultät der Universität.
- Kaalep, Heiki-Jaan & Kadri Muischnek. 2002. *Eesti kirjakeele sagedussõnastik* [Frequency dictionary of Estonian]. Tartu: Tartu Ülikooli Kirjastus.

- Krikmann, Arvo & Ingrid Sarv. 1980–1985. *Eesti vanasõnad I–III* [Estonian proverbs I–III]. Tallinn: Eesti Raamat.
- Krikmann, Arvo & Ingrid Sarv. 1987. *Estnische Sprichwörter V* (2): 1–15140. Tallinn: Eesti Raamat.
- Krikmann, Arvo & Ingrid Sarv. 1988. *Eesti vanasõnad IV. Lisad* [Estonian proverbs IV. Supplement]. Tallinn: Eesti Raamat.
- Kulonen, Ulla-Maija. 1999. “Kulttuurisanat ja esihistoria [Cultural words and prehistory].” In *Pohjan poluilla. Suomalaisten juuret nykytutkimuksen mukaan* [On ground paths. The roots of the Finns according to modern research], ed. Paul Fogelberg. Helsinki: Suomen Tiedeseura, 240–244.
- Kulu, Hill. 1997. “Väliseestlased [Exile Estonians].” In *Eestlane olla ...* [To be Estonian ...], eds. Hill Kulu & Katrin Metsis & Tiit Tammaru. Tartu: Tartu Ülikooli Kirjastus, 11–19.
- Laakso, Johanna. 2005. *Our otherness. Finno-Ugrian approaches to women's studies, or vice versa*. Wien: Lit.
- Laanest, Arvo. 1982. *Einführung in die ostseefinnischen Sprachen*. Hamburg: Buske.
- Lauristin, Marju. 1995. “Über Armut und Emanzipation.” *Estonia* 1995(1): 21–26.
- Lavotha, Ödon. 1973. *Kurzgefaßte estnische Grammatik*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Lie, Suzanne Stiver & Lynda Malik & Ilvi Jõe-Cannon & Rutt Hinrikus, eds. 2007. *Carrying Linda's stones. An anthology of Estonian women's life stories*. Tallinn: Tallinn University Press.
- Loog, Mai. 1992. *Nende sõned, sõnad. Uurimus erialiste tüdrukute ja poiste kõnekeelest* [Their word forms, their words. Study of the colloquial language of girls and boys of different ages]. Tampere: Tampereen yliopiston suomen kielen ja yleisen kielitieteen laitos.
- Mägiste, Julius. 1929. “Nais-sugu tuletuslõpu jälgi läänemeresoome keelis [Traces of a feminine derivational suffix in the Finnic languages].” In *Keelekultuur I* [Language culture], eds. Johannes Aavik & Oskar Loorits & Julius Mägiste. Tartu: Kotikielen Seura, 22–39.
- Mänd, Kadi & Barbi Pilvre & Mari-Liis Sepper. 2003. *Tilliga ja tillita. Retsepte Eesti feministidelt* [With and without wee-wee. Recipes from Estonian feminists]. Tallinn: ENUT.
- Marling, Raili & Liina Järviste & Käthlin Sander. 2010. *Teel tasakaalustatud ühiskonda. Naised ja mehed Eestis II* [On the way to a balanced society. Women and men in Estonia II]. Tallinn: Eesti Sotsiaalministeerium.
- Matsumura, Kazuto. 1994. “Is the Estonian adessive really a local case?” *Journal of Asian and African Studies* 46–47: 223–235.
- Matsumura, Kazuto. 1996. “The Estonian translative: A corpus-based description.” In *Estonian typological studies I*, ed. Mati Erelt. Tartu: Eesti Keele õppetool, 68–122.
- Metsmägi, Iris & Meeli Sedrik & Sven-Erik Soosaar. 2013. “Eesti kirjakeele tüvevara päritolu arvudes [The origin of the word stems of written Estonian in numbers].” *Keel ja Kirjandus* 56: 313–332.
- Neumann, Mihkel. 1903. *Praktisches Lehrbuch der Estnischen Sprache für den Selbstunterricht*. Reval: M. Neumann.
- Nübling, Damaris. 2009. “Zur lexikografischen Inszenierung von Geschlecht.” *Zeitschrift für Germanistische Linguistik* 37: 593–633. DOI: 10.1515/ZGL.2009.037
- Oksaar, Els. 1967. “Estnisch *temake* – ein metaphorisches Pronomen.” *Ural-Altäische Jahrbücher* 39: 153–162.
- ÕS 1960 = Nurm, Ernst, ed. 1960. *Õigekeelsuse sõnaraamat* [Orthological dictionary]. Tallinn: Eesti Riiklik Kirjastus.
- ÕS 1976 = Kull, Rein & Erich Raiet, eds. 1976. *Õigekeelsussõnaraamat* [Orthological dictionary]. Tallinn: Valgus.

- ÕS 1999 = Erelt, Tiiu, ed. 1999. *Eesti keele sõnaraamat* [Dictionary of Estonian]. Tallinn: Eesti Keele Sihtasutus.
- ÕS 2006 = Erelt, Tiiu, ed. 2006. *Eesti õigekeelsussõnaraamat* [Estonian orthological dictionary]. Tallinn: Eesti Keele Sihtasutus.
- ÕS 2013 = Raadik, Maire, ed. 2013. *Eesti õigekeelsussõnaraamat* [Estonian orthological dictionary]. Tallinn: Eesti Keele Sihtasutus. (web version: <http://www.eki.ee/dict/qs/> [15 August 2014])
- Pilvre, Barbi. 2000. "Taming the phantom of feminism in Estonia. Equal rights and women's issues." In *Private views. Spaces and gender in contemporary art from Britain and Estonia*, eds. Angela Dimitrakaki & Pam Skelton & Mare Tralla. London: Women's Art Library, 60–71.
- Pilvre, Barbi. 2002. *Formaat. Valitud tekste klassivõistlustest ja naisküsimumusest 1996–2002* [Format. Selected texts on class struggle and the woman question]. Tallinn: Eesti Ekspress.
- Pöldvee, Aivar. 2013. "Sodomie, *gender studies* und die baltische Geschichte: Anmerkungen zu einer schwedischen Dissertation." *Forschungen zur baltischen Geschichte* 8: 220–227.
- Raag, Raimo. 1987. "Mittelniederdeutsche und skandinavische Lehnwörter im Estnischen und Livischen." In *Sprachkontakt in der Hanse. Aspekte des Sprachausgleichs im Ostsee- und Nordseeraum. Akten des 7. Internationalen Symposions über Sprachkontakt in Europa, Lübeck 1986*, ed. P. Sture Ureland. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 317–346.
- Raag, Raimo. 1999a. *Eestlane väljaspool Eestit. Ajalooline ülevaade* [The Estonian outside Estonia. Historical survey]. Tartu: Tartu Ülikooli Kirjastus.
- Raag, Raimo. 1999b. "One plus one equals one: The forging of Standard Estonian." *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 139: 17–38. DOI: 10.1515/ijsl.1999.139.17
- Rätsep, Huno. 1983. "Eesti kirjakeele tüvevara päritolu [The origin of the word stems of written Estonian]." *Keel ja Kirjandus* 26: 539–548.
- Ross, Johanna. 2012. "Sõbranna – sõbralaadne toode. Kultuurilisi representatsioone meilt ja mujalt [Female friend – a friend resembling product. Cultural representations from us and elsewhere]." *Vikerkaar* 1/2: 166–173.
- Ross, Kristiina. 1996. "Naine eesti keele grammatikas [The woman in Estonian grammar]." *Vikerkaar* 11/12: 102–106.
- Saagpakk, Paul F. 1982. *Eesti-inglise sõnaraamat. Estonian-English dictionary*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Saareste, Andrus. 1979. *Eesti keele mõisteline sõnaraamatu indeks* [Index of the analogical dictionary of Estonian]. Index du dictionnaire analogique de langue estonienne. Uppsala: Finsk-ugriska institutionen.
- Sepp, Alar. 2012. *Eesti arstide tööga rahulolu. Arst 2011. Ankeetküsitlus 1997–2006 diplomeeritud arstidele* [Estonian physicians' contentment with their work. Physician 2011. Poll among physicians graduated between 1997 and 2006]. Tallinn: TTÜ Kirjastus.
- SÕS 1948 = *Suur õigekeelsus-sõnaraamat* [Large orthological dictionary]. 1: *A-heinaleminek*. 1948. Tartu: RK Teaduslik Kirjandus.
- TEA = *TEA entsüklopeedia* [TEA encyclopedia]. 2008. Tallinn: TEA.
- Vadi, Ene. 2003. "Naise roll ja identiteet reklaamidiskursuses [The role and identity of women in advertising discourse]." In *Viro ja suomi: Kohdekielel kontrastissa* [Estonian and Finnish: Target languages in contrast], eds. Pirkko Muikku-Werner & Hannu Remes. Joensuu: Joensuun Yliopistopaino, 214–224.

- Vasvári, Louise O. this volume. "Gender in a grammatically genderless language: Hungarian."
In *Gender across languages. The linguistic representation of women and men*, vol. 4, eds.
Marlis Hellinger & Heiko Motschenbacher. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 203–226.
- VÕS 1946 = Muuk, Elmar, ed. 1946. *Väike õigekeelsus-sõnaraamat* [Small orthological dictionary]. Tartu: Teaduslik Kirjandus.
- Wiedemann, Ferdinand Johann. 1869. *Ehstnisch-deutsches Wörterbuch*. St. Petersburg: Eggers & Co.
- Wiedemann, Ferdinand Johann. 1875. *Grammatik der ehstnischen Sprache, zunächst wie sie in Mittelehstland gesprochen wird, mit Berücksichtigung der anderen Dialekte*. Leipzig: Voss.

GA

Probing the manifestations of gender in Ga

Benedicta Adokarley Lomotey

University of Ghana, Accra, Ghana

1. Introduction
2. Categories of gender in Ga
 - 2.1 Referential gender
 - 2.2 Lexical gender
 - 2.3 Social gender
 - 2.4 Male generics
3. Gendered structures
 - 3.1 Compounding
 - 3.2 Derivation
4. Usage of personal nouns
 - 4.1 Gendered terms of abuse
 - 4.2 *Yoo* 'woman' – *nuu* 'man'
 - 4.3 Gender in Ga proverbs
5. Conclusion

Notes

References

1. Introduction

Ga is the language spoken by the Ga ethnic group and one of the major languages of Greater Accra, the capital city of Ghana in West Africa. The number of native Ga speakers is estimated to be about 600,000 (cf. Lewis et al. 2013). Due to the central socioeconomic role of Accra in Ghana, Ga is one of the most important languages in the country. The Ga language belongs to the Kwa branch of the Niger-Congo language family and is a tonal language. It is closely related to Adangme, with which it forms the Ga-Dangme branch within the Kwa group of languages. Ga is mainly spoken in the southeast of Ghana, in the Accra Coast Area, but Ga speakers can also be found in other regions of Ghana and in some adjacent countries.

Ghana is a multilingual country with “approximately 50 non-mutually intelligible languages” (Anyidoho & Dakubu 2008: 142).¹ However, the Bureau of Ghana Languages publishes material in only 16 of these languages, including Ga (e.g. Bureau of Ghana Languages 1975). The writing system of the Ga language is based on the Latin script, which has been used since 1975. However, some of the oldest writings in the Ga language were produced much earlier, by Zimmermann (1858) and Anteh (1953). In her 1988 publication, Dakubu states that “Ga has been a written language for well over a hundred years” (1988: 116).

The normal word order in Ga sentences is Subject-Verb-Object-Adverb (SVOA; Dakubu 1988). Nouns in the genitive case precede governing nouns; direct objects follow predicates and adjectives follow the nouns they qualify (Manoukian 1950). The language has no nominal classification.²

Ga has been influenced by other languages some of which are no longer spoken in Ghana. Examples are English, Akan and Portuguese (Dakubu 2009, 2012a/b; Henderson-Quartey 2002).³ The languages spoken in Ghana exhibit considerable structural similarities. For example, both Ga and Akan have no grammatical gender. Although gender is one of the most important factors that determine the sociocultural organization of Ga society, gender distinctions hardly seem to manifest themselves in the Ga language. Moreover, in Ga culture God is conceptualized as both male and female or as an androgynous deity. This is also reflected in the composite name of the Supreme Being *Ataa Naa Nyɔŋmɔ* (lit. ‘Father Mother God’). This also points to the highly esteemed role that women play in Ga society, as also noted by Odamtten:

An understanding of this spiritual notion is critical to understanding the significant leadership roles, social and spiritual power designated to, assigned, or acquired by women in Ga society. (Odamtten 2012: 115)⁴

In addition, childless women play important roles in the traditional Ga religion in their function as spiritual mediums.⁵ The religion provides these women, who would otherwise be derided by society, with a means of escape. Kilson explains that “mediumship enables women to resolve various social and psychological conflicts engendered by their sexual, reproductive, and socio-economic statuses” and these women are able to “transform their status inferiority into the most powerful of all vocations” (Kilson 1971: 177).⁶

The much debated issue of non-sexist language reform that has since the 1970s been rampant for many languages and in many countries, at first glance, seems irrelevant for Ga. The present article will probe in how far the Ga language and Ga society are really indifferent to linguistic gender distinctions and asymmetries.

2. Categories of gender in Ga

2.1 Referential gender

Even though Ga does not have grammatical gender, it has (other) means of distinguishing between male and female referents. The majority of Ga personal reference forms do not specify referential gender. Examples are *oshija* ‘unmarried person’ and *lɔbi* ‘lover’. Even the personal pronoun system does not differentiate between female and male forms. This includes indefinite pronouns (e.g. *mɔ ko* ‘somebody’, *mɔ fɛɛ mɔ* ‘everybody’). As Hellinger and Bußmann point out, “generally, pronominalization is a powerful strategy of communicating gender” (Hellinger & Bußmann 2001: 14). Consequently, the absence of gender-specific pronouns in Ga highly contributes to its seemingly ‘genderless’ appearance. The nominative forms of personal pronouns in Ga are shown in Table 1:

Table 1. Ga personal pronouns (nominative forms)

Singular			
Person	1	<i>mi</i>	‘I’
	2	<i>o</i> or (emphatic) <i>bo</i>	‘you’
	3	<i>e</i> or (emphatic) <i>le</i>	‘he/ she/ it’
Plural			
Person	1	<i>wɔ</i>	‘we’
	2	<i>nyɛ</i>	‘you’
	3	<i>ame</i>	‘they’

To specify referential gender, Ga mainly uses lexical gender (Section 2.2) and compounding (Section 3.1).

2.2 Lexical gender

Even though some words which are commonly lexically gendered in other languages, such as English *boy* and *girl* or French *fille* and *garçon*, do not have gender-specific Ga equivalents (Ga knows only *gbekɛ* ‘child’), Ga has a large number of lexically gendered nouns which include kinship terms, nobility titles and terms of address. Kinship terms in Ga are also used to address people who are not relatives. For example, an elderly man or woman who is unknown to the speaker may be addressed as *awo* ‘grandmother’ or *ataa* ‘grandfather’, respectively. An elderly person addressing a younger individual who is not related to him or her may use the word *mibi* ‘my child’ as an endearment term.

Kinship terms are typically lexically female or male. However, some kinship terms are gender-neutral. For these, it is necessary to make use of the modifiers *yoo* ‘female, woman’ or *nuu* ‘male, man’ to specify referential gender. Kinship terminology is predominantly symmetrical in Ga and overt gender marking is achieved through the combination of gendered lexemes with other personal reference forms. Nevertheless most personal reference forms are mostly used without gender specification, as illustrated in the sentences below:

- (1) a. *Mi bi le ke wolo le ha Ayele.*
 my child DEF with book DEF gave Ayele
 ‘My child gave the book to Ayele.’
- b. *O-naanyo le mami e-tsu le.*
 POSS.2SG-friend DEF mother 3SG-sent 3SG
 ‘Your friend’s mother sent him/her.’
- c. *O-nyemi le wie-ɔ Blɔfo waa.*
 POSS.2SG-sibling DEF speak-3SG.HAB English well
 ‘Your sibling speaks English very well.’

Explicit gender markers are mostly added when gender specification is crucial to the intended message. Other kinship terms such as *nye bi* ‘maternal sibling’ and *tse bi* ‘paternal sibling’ are not lexically gendered but show a distinction between maternal and paternal kin. Examples of lexically gendered kinship terms are given in Table 2.

Table 2. Ga lexically gendered kinship terms

Female		Male	
<i>nye</i>	‘mother’	<i>tse</i>	‘father’
<i>naa</i>	‘grandmother’	<i>nii</i>	‘grandfather’
<i>ɲa</i>	‘wife’	<i>wu</i>	‘husband’
<i>nyekwe</i>	‘aunt’	<i>tsekwe</i>	‘uncle’
<i>nyesee nyekwe</i>	‘maternal aunt’	<i>tsesee tsekwe</i>	‘paternal uncle’
<i>biyoo</i>	‘daughter’	<i>binuu</i>	‘son’
<i>nyemiyoo</i>	‘sister’	<i>nyeminuu</i>	‘brother’
<i>shaayoo</i>	‘mother-in-law’	<i>shaanuu</i>	‘father-in-law’
<i>shaanaa</i>	‘daughter-in-law’	<i>shaanii</i>	‘son-in-law’
<i>wuyoo</i>	‘sister-in-law’	<i>shabi</i>	‘brother-in-law’
<i>ɲa fio / ɲa nukpa</i>	‘sister-in-law’, i.e. younger/elder sister of one’s wife (lit. ‘small/big wife’)	<i>wu fio / wu nukpa</i>	‘brother-in-law’, i.e. younger/ elder brother of one’s husband (lit. ‘small/big husband’)

Traditionally, men are considered to be the embodiment of power, control and authority in the Ga society. The term *wuyoo* ‘sister-in-law, husband’s sister’ (lit. ‘female husband’) seems to be a linguistic reflection of the transfer of power from a male to a female person, i.e. the husband’s sister only enjoys her prestigious social position by virtue of her relation to her brother. The term *wuyoo* is thus striking not only for the juxtaposition of contrastively gendered terms (‘female’ and ‘husband’), but also because of the fact that it reveals the power held by sisters-in-law, who are normally very influential in their brother’s marriage. Many marital problems and divorces are usually caused by them because of the rivalry that exists between them and their brother’s wife. This powerful position, however, is only held by the sisters-in-law on the husband’s side and not those on the wife’s side.

Although kinship terms in Ga are fairly symmetrical, one could argue that certain terms are male biased. The influence of patriarchy in Ga social organization seems to be reflected, for example, in the usage patterns of the word *tse* ‘father’, which can also form a (male generic) component in compounds that denotes ‘owner, proprietor, controller, head’. This is illustrated in the examples below (cf. Field 1940; Manoukian 1950).

It is necessary to point out that *tse* can also appear in other formations such as *akwadutse* ‘banana seller’ or *akututse* ‘orange seller’, but it has a different meaning (‘seller’) in these compounds, which can equally apply to women and men. A (socially) gendered interpretation of these forms would depend on the product sold by the referent rather than on the morpheme *tse*. Of the examples given in Table 3, the majority are not used to refer to women, probably because of the lexically male meaning of *tse*. However, those that have been given gender-neutral translations in the second column are also used in reference to females, even though a female form may also exist. For example, although *shianye* ‘female house owner’ exists, the (originally) male form (*shiatse*) is used more frequently to refer to female (and male) house owners.

There is a clear asymmetry involved here, since compounds with *nye* ‘mother’ are much rarer. There is the term *shianye* ‘female house owner’, probably as a consequence of the traditional, gender-segregated household arrangement of the Ga, with men and women living in separate households. It therefore also means ‘senior woman of the household’. The housing system also leads to other interesting terminological issues that reflect the sociocultural organization of the Ga in relation to gender issues. The words *yeiamli* ‘women’s premises’ (lit. ‘among women’) and *hiiamli* ‘men’s premises’ (lit. ‘among men’) signify the dwelling place of family members according to their sex. This system has nonetheless been influenced extensively by colonization, westernization and social change (see Azu 1974).

Table 3. Compounds containing the morpheme *tse* ‘father’

Compound	Meaning	Literal meaning
	male:	
<i>mantse</i>	‘male chief’	‘father, head of a town’
<i>asafoatse</i>	‘chief military man’	‘father, head of the military body of a town’
<i>dzasetse</i>	‘chief election man’	‘father, head of an electoral body’
<i>woleiatse</i>	‘chief fisherman’	‘father of fishermen’
<i>akutsotse</i>	‘male town district leader’	‘father, head of a town district’
<i>akwaashɔ̃ntse</i>	‘male senior member of the court’	‘father, head of the court’
	gender-neutral:	
<i>shiatse</i>	‘house owner’	‘father, head of the house’
<i>tsofatse</i>	‘medicine man/woman’	‘father, head of medicine’
<i>dunaatse</i>	‘person in charge of the rear end of something’; ‘person with large buttocks’ (Dakubu 2009: 62)	‘father, head of buttocks’
<i>shikatse</i>	‘rich person’	‘father, head of money’

Among other compounds with *nye*, one finds, for instance, the word *mannye* ‘queen or female leader in public affairs or war’ (lit. ‘mother of the town’), which is used, albeit infrequently, in some parts of Accra to refer to the ‘queen mother’ (a traditional office). Other terms like *shikanye* are neither morphologically unusual nor do they sound unidiomatic, but they are not used. In some contexts, such forms may be employed to create a certain stylistic effect.

Most address terms in Ga are lexically gendered and fairly symmetrical. However, some of them reflect a male bias. Just as in English, certain address terms show an asymmetry, with the female terms indicating the woman’s marital status, while the male terms do not say anything about the marital status of the referent. This is the case with *owula* ‘Mr’ and *owula ɲa* ‘Mrs’ (lit. ‘Mister’s wife’). It must be noted, however, that the latter is a loan translation from English, as *Mrs* originally did not have a Ga equivalence. The term *kpeemɔ̃yoo*, although not common, is also sometimes used. It basically means ‘married woman’ and can only be used on its own (and not in combination with a proper name).⁷

The terms *owula* and *awula* appear to be symmetrical, but in reality they are not. Apart from the meaning ‘gentleman’, *owula* also denotes ‘mister, sir’ and connotes ‘man of substance, praiseworthiness, honorability’. The term *awula*, by contrast, is not used in the sense of ‘Miss’ or ‘Mrs’, but means ‘young lady’ or ‘lady-like person’ (cf. Dakubu 2009: 43). With *awula*, there is an emphasis on the age of the referent which is absent in *owula*. Furthermore, *awula* does not have the same connotation of virtue as its male counterpart.

Traditionally, a woman addresses her husband as *owula* or *ataa* (both ‘lord, sir’). She may also use the term *mi nuɲtsɔ* ‘my boss, lord, master’. The same occurs in most other Ghanaian cultures such as that of the Akan, where wives address their husbands as *mi wura* ‘my lord’ (lit. ‘my owner’). This terminology is also extended to the husband’s brothers (her brothers-in-law), who are potential future husbands of the wife. This is because customarily, a man’s brother may inherit his wife and children after his death, if he so desires.

Another instance of asymmetry can be found in the terms *oblanyo* ‘young man’ (lit. ‘young person’) and *oblayoo* ‘young lady’. The component *nyo* used in the former is originally a lexically gender-neutral free morpheme meaning ‘person’ (see Section 2.4). As part of this compound, however, *nyo* is used to contrast with the female-specific component *yoo* ‘female’ in *oblayoo* (as opposed to the male-specific element *nuu* ‘male’, which would normally be expected to contrast with *yoo*). This points to a common cross-linguistic male-as-norm pattern, according to which gender-neutral forms are more likely to develop male than female meanings.

2.3 Social gender

Most personal reference forms in Ga are lexically gender-neutral. Nonetheless, given the important role gender plays in the social, cultural and political organization of the Ga community, it can be expected that this social category is also reflected beyond the level of lexical gender in the language. It is thus of interest to study the relevance of other linguistic gender categories, such as social gender, in lexically gender-neutral personal nouns.

For this purpose, a study was carried out to test certain personal nouns and pronouns in terms of the gender-specificity of Ga speakers’ mental representations, collocational associations and experiential visualization. A seventeen-item questionnaire containing different personal nouns such as *gbeke* ‘child’, *okwaafonyo* ‘farmer’, *oshija* ‘unmarried person’, and *gbɔmei* ‘people’ was designed and distributed to 107 native Ga speakers. The subjects were 56 women and 48 men (three people did not specify their gender). Participants were selected using simple random sampling. The inclusion of words like *gbomɔ* ‘human being’ provided an empirical yardstick for measuring whether men are conceptualized as prototypical human beings, as has been documented for many other languages.

The aim of the study was to elicit potential gender associations evoked by personal nouns as used within sentences. In the selection of the questionnaire items, care was taken to avoid the construction of stereotypically gendered scenarios by means of forms other than the personal reference forms to be tested.

It was explained to participants that the aim of the research was to examine the correlation between first names and certain human characteristics or activities among the Ga. The subjects were asked to indicate which first names they would give to the unidentified persons mentioned in the test sentences of the questionnaire. They could choose from three options: (1) *Naa Kailey* (a female name), (2) *Nii Adokwei* (a male name), and (3) *Naa Kailey aloo Nii Adokwei* (female and male name in coordination; *aloo* meaning 'or'). Respondents were informed that if they believed none of the first two names would be a good fit, then they could choose the third option. Unlike other ethnic groups (such as the Ewe of Ghana), who use gender-indefinite personal names, the Ga use exclusively gender-specific first names.⁸ Consequently, responses given by participants show common gender-related interpretations evoked by a particular stimulus term. An example of a questionnaire item is presented below (the tested noun in this sentence is *dɔkita* 'doctor'):

- (2) *A-kɛ helɔ-tɛ lɛ tee dɔkita lɛ mɛsi ni e-te*
 INDEF-with sick-owner DEF sent doctor DEF near and 3SG-got
shi koni e-ya-kwɛ lɛ.
 up so that 3SG-go-see 3SG
 'The patient was taken to the doctor and s/he got up to attend to her/him.'

Table 4 presents the responses given to the selected terms in the questionnaire.

Table 4. Ga speakers' interpretation of gender-indefinite terms⁹

Term	Male interpretation	Female interpretation	Male or female interpretation
<i>dɔkita</i> 'doctor'	41%	10%	49%
<i>mɔ</i> 'person'	17%	20%	64%
<i>gbɔmɔ</i> 'human being'	21%	7%	73%
<i>e</i> 'he/she'	12%	17%	72%
<i>okwaafoɔnyo</i> 'farmer'	71%	4%	25%
<i>tsɔɔlɔ</i> 'teacher'	29%	20%	51%
<i>gbekɛ</i> 'child'	13%	20%	67%
<i>onukpa</i> 'elder'	36%	16%	49%
<i>oshija</i> 'unmarried person'	19%	31%	50%
<i>naanyo</i> 'friend'	24%	15%	61%
<i>nyɛmi</i> 'sibling'	14%	23%	63%
<i>gbɔmɛi</i> 'people'	13%	7%	80%

The results show that some forms exhibit a social gender bias. Although in principle the word *okwaafonyo* ‘farmer’ is gender-indefinite, it is associated with a male social bias. Despite the fact that in the Ga community a person of either sex can be a farmer, male interpretations for *okwaafonyo* reached a striking 71%. Only 4% of respondents interpreted it as female, while 25% interpreted it as gender-indefinite. The pronounced male bias is probably a result of the fact that, although women also practice farming, they are predominantly regarded as helping their husbands, who are perceived to be the ‘real’ farmers. In addition, farming is normally associated with men because it involves a lot of physical strength.

The noun *onukpa* ‘elder, leader’ also shows “covert gender” (Braun 2001). Dakubu (1999: 129) lists ‘a title for a man, Mister’ as a second meaning of *onukpa*. The latter refers to an uncommon usage, if indeed it is used in this sense at all. In principle, *onukpa* is gender-indefinite, and this is also true for the context of the test sentence used in the questionnaire. However, the form seems to have a slight male social bias with 36% male interpretations, 16% female interpretations and 49% gender-indefinite interpretations. The same applies to *dɔkita* ‘doctor’. In 49% of the cases, it was interpreted as gender-indefinite. 41% of the subjects chose the male name, while only 10% chose the female name.

2.4 Male generics

Lexically male personal nouns like English *man* and Spanish *hombre* are sometimes used generically in the sense of ‘human being’. The corresponding Ga form *nuu* ‘man’, by contrast, can only be used for male-specific reference. Conversely, the words *gbomɔ* ‘human being’ or *gbomɔ adesa* ‘humanity’ are lexically gender-neutral and do not possess (strongly) male connotations (but note the slightly higher percentage of male vs. female interpretations for *gbomɔ* in Table 4 above).

However, there seems to be a tendency for translators to assign gender-specific semantic values to gender-neutral Ga terms in English translations. Despite the gender neutrality of forms like *gbomɔ* ‘human being’ or *mɔfɛmɔ* ‘everybody’, some authors, grammarians and lexicographers translate them with male generics in English. Consider, for example, the following generic sentence:

- (3) *Adzumadzaŋ (yakadeŋme) be kule*
 fruitless labor (useless work) absent otherwise
mɔfɛmɔ ena nii.
 everybody get.COND things
 ‘If there were no fruitless undertakings, everybody would get wealthy.’

In his collection of proverbs, from which this sentence is taken, Ankra (1966) translates this proverb as: “Were there no unprofitable ventures, all *men* would have been wealthy” (italics added; B.A.L.). Many more cases in which Ankra translates lexically gender-neutral Ga forms with English male generics can be found in this book. Similarly, in his textbook *Ga for Beginners* Ablorh-Odjidja (1968) translates *nitsuloi* ‘workers’ as *workmen*, and *nihool* ‘salesperson’ as *salesman*. He also translates the Ga singular third-person pronoun *e* as *he* in some parts of the book.¹⁰ However, to be precise, these authors and grammarians do not invariably use male generic forms but also sometimes provide gender-neutral translations for gender-indefinite Ga terms (see, for example, Ankra 1966: 31 and Zimmermann 1858: 148).

Interestingly, Dakubu systematically provides gender-indefinite translations of Ga forms throughout the 1999 edition of her Ga-English dictionary (though she does not maintain this in her 2009 revised edition). She does so by consistently using the slash sign:

- (4) *E-blo e-shika le fεε.*
 3SG-spent 3SG-money DEF all
 ‘S/he has spent all her/his money.’ (Dakubu 1999: 36)

It is not clear whether male generic translations of lexically gender-neutral Ga expressions can count as evidence for gendered connotations of Ga forms or whether such translations are caused by translational issues, the target language, or the author’s attitudes. It is important to note that with the exception of Dakubu (1999), the books discussed above (Ablorh-Odjidja 1968; Ankra 1966; Zimmermann 1858) pre-date the advent of feminist linguistics in the 1970s, which is a plausible explanation for the male generic translations.

In order to find out whether Ga has male generics, the questionnaire study outlined in Section 2.3 also tested the lexically gendered form *nuu* ‘man, male’. The results confirm that, like Spanish *hombre* and English *man*, *nuu* is not generally interpreted as gender-indefinite. 97% interpreted it as male, 3% as gender-indefinite and none of the subjects as female. The male plural form *hii* ‘men’ also proved to be gender-specific. Male interpretations predominated (94%). 2% interpreted it as female and 4% as gender-indefinite.

Nonetheless, other aspects seem to point to the possible existence of male generics in Ga. For example, Dakubu (1999: 125) translates the noun *oblanyo* both with a male-specific phrase (*young man*) and a gender-indefinite noun (*youth*). The same definition is given in Zimmermann (1858):

- (5) *oblanyo*, pl. *oblahii*, n. youth, lad, young man
 but
oblayō, pl. *oblayei*, n. virgin, maid, grown up girl; young woman¹¹

Zimmermann also likens the meaning of *nyo* to that of *nu*¹² ‘man, male’ and states “that the word is used to indicate the sex of men, animals and plants” (Zimmermann 1858:234),¹³ which suggests that it used to have a more pronounced male meaning potential than in contemporary Ga, where it means ‘person’ and is therefore lexically gender-indifferent. Furthermore, he translates *nyo* as ‘man’ and gives the plural of *nyo* as *mei* ‘people’ and *hi*¹⁴ ‘men’ (Zimmermann 1858:395). Additional evidence for a potential male bias of *nyo* can also be found in the form *gbonyo* ‘corpse’. The plural form of this noun is *gbohii* ‘corpses’ and can be used to refer to male and female corpses, although the pluralized form literally means ‘dead men’ (*gbo* ‘dead’; *hii* ‘men’).

Interestingly, one finding of the study discussed in Section 2.3, is also compatible with a potential male bias in *nyo*. The form *okwaafonyo* ‘farmer’, which contains *nyo*, caused a male interpretation in 71% of the subjects. However, additional studies are needed to confirm that *nyo* qualifies as a male generic form in Ga.

3. Gendered structures

3.1 Compounding

As mentioned above, most personal reference forms in Ga are lexically gender-indifferent. However, when it is necessary to specify the gender of referents, the main linguistic strategy used is compounding. In most such cases, the adjectival post-modifications *nuu* ‘male’ or *yoo* ‘female’ are employed. This normally happens with kinship terminology. For example, overt gender marking for *gbekē* ‘child’ would be achieved through the usage of such modifiers (*gbekēyoo* lit. ‘child female’, ‘girl’ and *gbekēnuu* lit. ‘child male’, ‘boy’).

It is important to point out that other gender-neutral terms such as those from the occupational field usually do not allow for such adjectival post-modification. Furthermore, the option of using adjectival post-modification to specify gender does not apply to the pronouns *ɛ* ‘him/her’ and *e* ‘his/her’, which do not allow for any descriptive modifiers. The same applies to the term *ɔbi* ‘lover’, which cannot be used in a compound form with the modifiers indicated above: **ɔbi yoo*/ **ɔbi nuu*. In these cases, gender disambiguation is normally achieved through other,

pragmatic strategies. For example, the heteronormative assumption among the Ga that romantic relationships should involve women and men helps to disambiguate the referential gender of *lobi* ‘lover’ in many contexts.

3.2 Derivation

In Ga, occupational terms seem to be a lexical field in which gender-neutralization predominates. Most of the terms denoting occupations can be used for both females and males. They are usually formed by combining a noun which denotes the profession in question with either the nominative agentive suffix *-lɔ* or the word *nyo* ‘person, kind of person’ (used in such compounds to indicate agency). The formation of occupational terms in Ga is thus performed either through derivation or compounding. There are, of course, some exceptions, often words borrowed from other languages such as *dɔkita* ‘doctor’ and *shwapotse* ‘shopkeeper’. Some examples of basic occupational terms are presented below:

Table 5. Ga occupational terms

Occupational term	Meaning
<i>tsɔɔlɔ</i>	‘teacher’
<i>nihɔɔlɔ</i>	‘salesperson’ (lit. ‘thing seller’)
<i>tsutswalɔ</i>	‘builder, mason’ (lit. ‘building hitter’)
<i>watsisaalɔ</i>	‘watch repairer’
<i>shikaŋaalɔ</i>	‘goldsmith’ (lit. ‘skillful precious metal worker’)
<i>helatsalɔ</i>	‘physician’ (lit. ‘sickness curer’)
<i>asraafonyo</i>	‘soldier’ (lit. ‘watch/camp person’)
<i>abɔifonyo</i>	‘servant, waiter’ (lit. ‘domestic service person’)
<i>okwaafonyo</i>	‘farmer’ (lit. ‘farming person’)
<i>polisifonyo</i>	‘police officer’ (lit. ‘police person’)
<i>asrefonyo</i>	‘sailor’
<i>srenkifonyo</i>	‘carpenter’

As illustrated above, occupational terms in Ga are generally gender-neutral. Gender-specification by means of the usual adjectival post-modifiers *yoo* or *nuu* (e.g. **polisifonyo yoo* / **polisifonyo nuu*) would sound highly unidiomatic for such terms. Where a specification of referential gender is felt to be necessary, speakers would rather use explicit additional statements, such as the one in (6).

- (6) *Tsɔɔ-lɔ lɛ yoo ni.*
 teach-NOM DEF female is
 ‘The teacher is a woman.’

4. Usage of personal nouns

4.1 Gendered terms of abuse

Terms of abuse can be enlightening for the study of language and gender. As García Meseguer indicates, insults are commonly used due to the absence of a quality (or qualities) which people expect in members of their sociocultural environment (García Meseguer 1984:80). Indeed, pejorative terms and obscene language provide evidence for asymmetries in the linguistic expressions used to insult women and men.

In Ga, most terms of abuse used to insult men document the negative evaluation of cross-gender references, i.e. men are often insulted by means of lexically female forms. Through this, men who lack what society esteems as a valuable indication of manhood are denigrated for their lack of manliness. Some examples are the derogatory expressions *nuu yoo* ‘man woman’ and *Kojobesia* lit. ‘female Kojo’. *Kojo* is a traditional first name given to males born on a Monday, while *besia* is an Akan word for ‘female’. Thus, the spiteful tone is emphasized through the discrepancy between the referential gender as captured in *Kojo* (male) and the adjectival post-modifier *besia* ‘female’. It can be concluded from this mechanism that masculinity is associated with worthiness and prestige, while the characteristics of femininity are seen as undesirable and humiliating (at least for men).

Conversely, some terms of abuse that are used to refer to women point out their inability to conform to traditional and stereotypical views on femininity. Women who attempt to assume the characteristics typically associated with men may be labelled *alomo jata*, lit. ‘fashionably dressed lion’ (*alomo* ‘fashionably dressed woman’; *jata* ‘lion’).

In addition, terms of abuse often target women’s sexuality. An example is the very common Ga insult *onyea yi esɔɔmi* ‘your mother’s vagina’. This obscene phrase is reminiscent of similar misogynist expressions in other languages (such as Akan *wu maame twé* ‘your mother’s vagina’, English *son of a bitch* or Spanish *hijo de puta* ‘son of a prostitute’). It is striking that such insults focus on the offender’s mother rather than on the offender himself or herself. Another common abusive term is the word *ashawo* ‘prostitute’. A woman who offends someone is very likely to be insulted with this term. Such insults insinuate that womanhood is synonymous with promiscuity and thereby support the derogation that women face in society. They clearly reflect the straitjacket of the social performance of womanhood in traditional Ga society. As Dako notes, “[i]n Ghana, as in so many other places in the world, a woman is not supposed to exhibit any overt sexual desires, modest or excessive, whoever be the judge” (Dako 2013:24).

Most common terms of abuse for women usually fall within two noticeable categories. They may either target the sexuality of women (as discussed above) or accuse them of witchcraft. Hence, *aye* ‘witch’ is also a common denigrating term for women. The two types of abusive terms normally affect different periods of a woman’s life. When a woman is young, she is labelled *ashawo* ‘prostitute’, but once she gets older, she is more likely to be accused of being a witch (*aye*). On the other hand, verbal insults that are targeted at men are often lighthearted, bawdy or frivolous. Typically, they question their manhood.

4.2 *Yoo* ‘woman’ – *nuu* ‘man’

Other areas of gender representation worth examining are the definitions and connotations of *yoo* ‘woman’ and *nuu* ‘man’. Expressions associated with women usually highlight the stereotyped views society has about them. For example, the contrast between *yoofyoo* ‘fertile, childbearing woman’ and *kene* ‘barren woman’ reflects the value attributed to fertility in Ga society. The positive term *yoofyoo* (lit. ‘woman bearing a woman’), underscores the sublime role of women in perpetuating the process of procreation and sustaining life.

Conversely, expressions associated with men usually emphasize the bravery and valor of masculinity. An example is the expression *nuu tete tse* ‘father of a male first-born child’, which stresses the importance for men to conceive male offspring. Likewise, the fact that bravery is strongly associated with manliness in Ga becomes evident in the word *nuufeemɔ* ‘bravery’, which is formed with *nuu* ‘man, male’ as its basic component. Literally, *nuufeemɔ* means ‘being a man’.

Despite the male bias and the subsidiary role assigned to females in the Ga language and culture, manifestations of female power and value can also be found. Some lexically gendered nouns, such as *yoomo* ‘old lady’, take on particularly positive connotations in certain contexts. For example, the common saying *aya bi yoomo* ‘let’s go and ask the old lady (for advice)’ reflects the important role of and reverence given to elderly women in Ga society. This is because old women are seen as ‘fountains of wisdom’ (Odamtten 2012: 116).

4.3 Gender in Ga proverbs

Proverbs form an important part of Ga culture. They are valued not only for the wisdom they impart but also for the aesthetics of their creative language. Ankra describes their importance by stating that “speech without proverbs or elegant sayings is like soup without salt” (Ankra 1966: 3). Usually, Ga proverbs are interpreted depending on the context in which they are used (see Dakubu 1981).

For the purposes of this study, Ga proverbs were collected from the relevant research literature and through interviews with native speakers, language consultants and focus groups. In traditional Ghana, proverbs, songs, riddles, and stories are the means by which traditional sociocultural values are passed on from generation to generation. Consequently, they are valuable for the analysis of the linguistic representation of women and men. Proverbs are normally considered to verbalize taken-for-granted truths and to reflect the values of a society. Particularly in a society like that of the Ga, in which elderly people are seen as fountains of wisdom, proverbs play a very important role and can thus be a strong means of perpetuating the bipolarity of gender values, i.e. the binary masculine-feminine opposition.

One such example is the belief that men should protect and provide for women because they have greater authority, power, and physical strength.

(7) *Kɛ ji yoo he tu le nuu tsu le mli eke toɔ.*

‘When a woman buys a gun, it is in the man’s room that she keeps it.’

This proverb illustrates the perception that women are always dependent on men. A woman might buy a gun, a dangerous weapon that is perceived as belonging in the hands of men (not women). However, even when she does, she cannot make much use of it unless under the supervision of a man. This proverb implies that women always need men in leadership positions to protect and guide them.

Many proverbs emphasize the values society expects in men. They are supposed to be brave and fearless, while cowardly men are derided.

(8) *Kɛ tu fe le nuu tsitsi ebaa.*

‘When there is a gunshot, it is the chest of a man that receives it.’

(9) *Amɔɔ moko nine akefi tsitsi.*

‘No one beats upon his chest to show manliness using another man’s fist.’¹⁵

Conversely, most proverbs about women reflect how women are expected to conform to the traditional, stereotypical gender roles (for example, as wives and mothers) which society assigns to them. Clear emphasis is placed on women’s role in procreation and homemaking.

(10) *Yoo shee bɔɔ gbeyei.*

‘A woman should not fear a broom.’

(11) *Yoofɔyoo kɛ ekashi le, ekajeɔ.*

‘A breastfeeding mother cultivates the habit of lying on her back. / A woman must always be attentive to the needs of her children.’

- (12) *Wuobi ni shwɛɔ enye najii ahe le, le emiɔ aga shuo.*
‘The chicken that plays around the legs of its mother picks the fattest worms.
A child who is always near its mother eats the best food.’

Despite the many proverbs that evaluate women negatively or stereotypically, one can also find a few that affirm the value and importance of women, such as the following:

- (13) *Na tamɔ asaabu.*
‘A wife is like a giant.’

5. Conclusion

Although Ga is a grammatically genderless language, there are other ways in which gender differentiation can be communicated, enacted and perpetuated in this language. Referential gender is mainly expressed through lexical gender and gender-specific compounding in Ga. Overt gender specification is normally achieved by adding the adjectival modifiers *yoo* ‘woman’ or *nuu* ‘man’ to a gender-indefinite noun. This is however, not possible in all cases. Occupational terms and some other general terms such as *nitsulɔ* ‘worker’, do not allow for such modifiers. Thus, gendered interpretations largely depend on the context. Traditional gender beliefs are consistently reproduced, for example, in sayings, proverbs and idioms, which justify gender hierarchies as natural.

The lack of research on gender representation in the Ga language proved to be a limitation for this study. More specifically, a debate on sexist language in Ga has not yet surfaced so far. In the first place, this is probably due to the fact that attention has been focused on larger languages such as English and Spanish. Secondly, Ga appears to have minimal overt gender distinctions, which may also explain the lack of research in this area.

The present article is meant to serve as an introduction to research on gender issues in the Ga language and seeks to contribute to the field of studies on other Ghanaian and, more broadly speaking, African languages and cultures. It would be desirable to undertake further studies to confirm the results obtained in this exploratory investigation.

Notes

1. Different figures are given for the number of languages spoken in Ghana. *Ethnologue* (Lewis et al. 2013) specifies the total number of languages spoken in Ghana as 81. The figures vary depending on the notions of *language* and *dialect* they are based on.
2. See Kotey (1969) for a more detailed description of the syntactic structure of the Ga language.
3. Due to the influence of colonization, certain Portuguese words can be found in Ga (e.g. *asapatre* ‘shoe’, *sàbélɔ* ‘inquisitive person’). The same applies to the English language, which still remains widely spoken in Ghana as an official language.
4. Odamtten further states: “The Ga seem to feel a need to not only place men and women at the center of Ga existence, but also ensure a reflection of the gender balance that is needed for continued existence. As it relates to Ga women however, one of the principal feminine spiritual forces is Naa Yoo (divinity of womanhood, procreation/motherhood). In this direction of women as an essential component of human existence, the Ga also believe that while children received ‘the undying part of their spiritual nature’ from God, they also receive their physical and portions of their spiritual essence from each progenitor [...]. Interestingly, the Ga conception of God as exhibiting a dual-gender has survived in the Ga translation of the Christian Bible” (Odamtten 2012: 115).
5. As in many other societies, women are often seen as the weaker sex in traditional Ga society and this often leads to gender discrimination. Barrenness is also perceived as the worst woe that could befall a woman, since child-bearing is considered to be essential among the Ga.
6. For an interesting reading on the socioeconomic history of Ga women, see Robertson (1984).
7. The absence of a male equivalence **kpeemɔnuu* ‘married man’ is nonetheless interesting. Also, Dakubu (1999) gives *akɔniaba* as the Ga word for ‘Miss’, but this is a very uncommon term.
8. The Ewe form another ethnic group in the Eastern part of Ghana and other parts of West Africa such as Togo. The Ewe of Ghana generally use traditional first names that can easily be given to boys and girls (e.g. *Eyram*, *Setor* and *Enyonam*), i.e. they use gender-neutral first names.
9. Figures do not add up to a 100% in some cases because numbers were rounded off.
10. In other parts of the same book, Ablorh-Odjidja translates *e* as *she/he*. It is not clear whether this inconsistency has been caused by accident or mistake or due to the influence of male bias. However, what is certain is that, in principle, personal pronouns in Ga are gender-indefinite.
11. Note that the female form makes reference to virginity: *oblayoo* ‘virgin, maid, grown up girl; young woman’. This is not the case for the male form *oblanyo* ‘young man’. *Oblayō* is an older spelling of *oblayoo*.
12. In modern Ga, it is spelt *nuu*.
13. According to Ga traditional beliefs, God created everything in pairs – male and female. Thus, both living and non-living entities (including plants) are either male or female.
14. This form is now spelt *hii*.
15. Proverb and translation adapted from Ankra (1966).

References

- Ablorh-Odjidja, J. R. 1968. *Ga for beginners*. Accra: Waterville Publishing House.
- Ankra Nee-Adjabeng, E. A. 1966. *Agwaseɲ wiemɔi ke abei komei* [Some elegant sayings and proverbs]. Accra: Bureau of Ghana Languages.
- Anteh, Emmanuel Ayi. 1953. *Ga ɲamɔi, salutations of the Ga people*. London: Macmillan.
- Anyidoho, Akosua & Mary E. Kropp Dakubu. 2008. "Language, nationalism and national identity in Ghana." In *Language and national identity in Africa*, ed. Andrew Simpson. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 141–157.
- Azu, Gladys Diana. 1974. *The Ga family and social change*. Cambridge: African Studies Centre.
- Braun, Friederike. 2001. "The communication of gender in Turkish." In *Gender across languages: The linguistic representation of women and men*, vol. 1, eds. Marlis Hellinger & Hadumod Bußmann. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 283–310. DOI: 10.1075/impact.9.17bra
- Bureau of Ghana languages. 1975. *New Ga spelling. A handbook on the writing of Ga and word list*. Accra: Bureau of Ghana languages.
- Dako, Kari. 2013. "The culture of sexist language among male university students in Ghana." *World Journal of English Language* 3: 19–30. DOI: 10.5430/wjel.v3n4p19
- Dakubu, Mary E. Kropp. 1981. *One voice: The linguistic culture of an Accra lineage*. Leiden: African Studies Centre.
- Dakubu, Mary E. Kropp, ed. 1988. *The languages of Ghana*. New York: Kegan Paul.
- Dakubu, Mary E. Kropp, ed. 1999. *Ga–English dictionary with English–Ga index*. Accra: Black Mask Ltd.
- Dakubu, Mary E. Kropp, ed. 2009. *Ga–English dictionary with English–Ga index*. Accra: Black Mask Ltd.
- Dakubu, Mary E. Kropp. 2012a. "The Portuguese language on the Gold Coast, 1471–1807." *Ghana Journal of Linguistics* 1: 15–33.
- Dakubu, Mary E. Kropp. 2012b. "The Portuguese language on the Gold Coast, 1471–1807: Addenda." *Ghana Journal of Linguistics* 1: 65–66.
- Field, Margaret J. 1940. *Social organization of the Ga people*. London: The Crown Agents for the Colony.
- García Meseguer, Álvaro. 1984. *Lenguaje y discriminación sexual* [Language and sexual discrimination]. Madrid: Montesinos.
- Hellinger, Marlis & Hadumod Bußmann. 2001. "Gender across languages: The linguistic representation of women and men." In *Gender across languages: The linguistic representation of women and men*, vol. 1, eds. Marlis Hellinger & Hadumod Bußmann. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1–25. DOI: 10.1075/impact.9.05hel
- Henderson-Quartey, David K. 2002. *The Ga of Ghana: History and culture of a West African people*. London: David K. Henderson-Quartey.
- Kilson, Marion. 1971. "Ambivalence and power: Mediums in Ga traditional religion." *Journal of Religion in Africa* 4: 171–177. DOI: 10.2307/1594843
- Kotey, Paul F. A. 1969. *Syntactic aspects of the Ga nominal phrase*. Ph. D. thesis. University of Wisconsin. Ann Arbor, MI: University Microfilms.
- Lewis, Paul M. & Gary F. Simons & Charles D. Fennig, eds. 2013. *Ethnologue: Languages of the world*. 17th ed. Dallas, TX: SIL International.
- Manoukian, Madeline. 1950. *Akan and Ga-Adangme peoples of the Gold Coast*. London: Oxford University Press.

-
- Odamtten, Harry Nii Koney. 2012. "They bleed but they don't die: Towards a theoretical canon on Ga-Adangbe gender studies." *The Journal of Pan African Studies* 5: 110–127.
- Robertson, Claire C. 1984. *Sharing the same bowl: A socioeconomic history of women and class in Accra, Ghana*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Zimmermann, Johannes. 1858. *A grammatical sketch of the Akra- or Ga-language with some specimens of it from the mouth of the natives and a vocabulary of the same, with an appendix on the Adanme-Dialect*. Vol I. Stuttgart: Basel Missionary Society.

GERMAN

Gender in Swiss German

Helen Christen

University of Fribourg, Switzerland

Daniel Elmiger

University of Geneva, Switzerland

1. Swiss German
 - 1.1 Linguistic status
 - 1.2 Social and legal status
 - 1.3 Usage of Standard German and Swiss German
2. Categories of gender
 - 2.1 Grammatical gender
 - 2.1.1 Articles
 - 2.1.2 Numerals
 - 2.1.3 Pronouns
 - 2.1.4 Adjectives
 - 2.2 Lexical gender
 - 2.3 Referential gender
 - 2.4 Generic masculines
3. Gender-related structures
 - 3.1 Derivation
 - 3.2 Compounding
4. Usage of personal reference forms
 - 4.1 Address terms
 - 4.2 Occupational terms
 - 4.3 Terms of abuse
 - 4.4 Proper nouns
5. Language planning and non-sexist language
 - 5.1 Swiss language planning
 - 5.2 Non-sexist language in German-speaking Switzerland
6. Conclusion

Notes

References

1. Swiss German¹

1.1 Linguistic status

The term *Swiss German* (SwG) does not refer to a formally defined entity, but is used as an umbrella term for a series of Alemannic dialects spoken in the German-speaking part of Switzerland, where it is used alongside Standard German (StG; cf. Hotzenköcherle 1984 and Werlen 2004 about the language situation in Switzerland; for a structural description of Swiss German dialects, cf. Haas 2000 and Lötscher 1983). Therefore, Swiss German should not be considered a linguistic term, but rather a nationally based notion. Swiss German should not be confounded with Swiss Standard German, which refers to the variety of Standard German – a pluricentric language – used in Switzerland.²

Swiss German, like other varieties of German, belongs both to the West Germanic branch of the Indo-European languages and can be considered part of the continental Germanic continuum, comprising languages such as German, Dutch and Luxembourgish.³

The dialects spoken in Switzerland are neither unified nor standardised. Closely related Alemannic dialects are spoken in bordering regions in Germany, Austria, Liechtenstein (whose diglossic language situation closely resembles the one in Switzerland), France and Italy, where their use is far more restricted than in Switzerland. In these countries, the standard language (Standard German, French or Italian) has a much higher impact in everyday life than in Switzerland.

The following characteristic features distinguish Swiss German dialects from Standard German:

Declension: Unlike in Standard German, there is – except for the so-called Saxon genitive – no genitive case in Swiss German (as in German dialects in general). Usually, the following constructions are equivalent to the use of the genitive in Standard German:

(1) the preposition *vo* + dative

- | | | | | |
|----|-----|------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|
| a. | StG | <i>der</i> | <i>Titel des</i> | <i>Buch-s</i> |
| | | DEF.MASC | title | DEF.NEUT.GEN book-GEN |
| | | | 'the title of the book' | |
| b. | SwG | <i>de</i> | <i>titel vo-m</i> | <i>buech</i> |
| | | DEF.MASC | title of-DEF.NEUT.DAT | book.DAT |
| | | | 'the title of the book' | |

(2) dative + possessive pronoun

- | | | | | |
|----|-----|------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|
| a. | StG | <i>der</i> | <i>Name des</i> | <i>Vater-s</i> |
| | | DEF.MASC | name | DEF.MASC.GEN father-GEN |
| | | | 'the name of the father' | |

- b. SwG *em vater si name*
 DEF.MASC.DAT father.DAT POSS.MASC.NOM name.NOM
 ‘the name of the father’

Conjugation: The preterite, used in Standard German to denote events that took place in the past, is no longer in use in Swiss German; instead, the present perfect is commonly used.

- (3) a. StG preterite: *ich hatte* ‘I had’, *ich kam* ‘I came’ vs.
 present perfect: *ich habe gehabt* ‘I have had’, *ich bin gekommen*
 ‘I have come’
- b. SwG present perfect: *ich ha ghaa* ‘I have had’, *ich bi choo* ‘I have come’

Relative clauses: In relative clauses, an invariable particle (*wo*) is used in Swiss German dialects instead of the relative pronouns *der*, *die*, *das* and *welcher*, *welche*, *welches* ‘who, which, that’. Unlike these relative pronouns, *wo* does not express any nominal inflectional category (number, gender or case).

- (4) a. StG *das Kind, das/welches ich kenne*
 DEF.NEUT child.NEUT REL.NEUT.ACC I know
 ‘the child that I know’
- b. SwG *s chind, wo ich könne*
 DEF.NEUT child.NEUT REL I know
 ‘the child that I know’

1.2 Social and legal status

In legal texts (such as the federal and cantonal constitutions), the generic term *German* is used instead of more specific terms such as *Standard German*, *High German*, *Swiss German* or *Dialect*. In the Swiss Federal Constitution, German is one of the four recognised national languages (alongside French, Italian and Romansh). It is spoken over the largest geographical territory, which encompasses roughly two thirds of the country.⁴

In the 2010 census, German was the most frequently used main language (spoken by 65.6% of the population).⁵ At home or with family members, 61.3% of permanent residents speak mostly Swiss German, which accounts for approximately 4.8 million people (cf. Bundesamt für Statistik 2012:2). This does not mean that Swiss German is confined to private use. In German-speaking Switzerland, dialects are also spoken in public contexts.

1.3 Usage of Standard German and Swiss German

In the German-speaking part of Switzerland, Swiss German is used alongside Standard German in a way that is most often described as a form of diglossia (cf. Ferguson 1959; Haas 2004; Hudson 2002), although some consider the situation to be rather an example of social bilingualism (cf. Berthele 2004). Unlike in other dialect settings within the German-speaking area, the use of Swiss German is not socially marked: Dialects are used in everyday communication in all kinds of settings, by people from all social levels, and in rural as well as urban contexts.

In the past, it has often been said that in Switzerland dialects are basically used in oral language contexts, whereas Standard German is used in written contexts. However, this simplified description does not account for certain situations where Standard German is used orally (e.g. at school, in the Federal Parliament, or on national television and in the radio news), or where dialects are written⁶ (everyday private written texts covering traditional as well as new media such as the Internet and electronic messages, but also for dialect literature).

By distinguishing between media-oriented and conceptual modes of orality and literacy, Koch and Oesterreicher (2001) have provided a framework that is useful for a language configuration such as that found in the German-speaking part of Switzerland. Hence, conceptual forms of orality are generally expressed in Swiss German, while conceptual forms of literacy favour or impose⁷ the use of Standard German, although nowadays the use of dialect can be observed in conceptual forms of literacy as well (e.g. manuscripts for speeches). Overall, the rise of the use of Swiss German in the new media (such as text messages, online chats and e-mails) has considerably raised the presence of written Swiss German in everyday life, especially in conceptually oral forms of written language (for a more specific description of the changes over recent years, cf. Christen et al. 2010).

2. Categories of gender

In the following, the gender categories in Swiss German are compared to those in Standard German, as described in detail by Bußmann and Hellinger (2003). Since grammatical as well as lexical gender function mainly like in Standard German, this type of parallel description allows us to outline the differences between Standard and Swiss German, with more detailed examples for word formation and the use of proper nouns in Swiss German given in Sections 3 and 4.

2.1 Grammatical gender

As in Standard German, there are three distinct grammatical genders in Swiss German, i.e. masculine, feminine and neuter. In principle, each noun carries one grammatical gender, which is normally the same as for the corresponding Standard German noun (for gender assignment, cf. Bußmann & Hellinger 2003: 143–146).

	StG	SwG	
(5) masculine (m)	<i>der Vater</i>	<i>de vater</i>	‘the father’
	<i>der Löffel</i>	<i>de löffel</i>	‘the spoon’
feminine (f)	<i>die Mutter</i>	<i>d mueter</i>	‘the mother’
	<i>die Gabel</i>	<i>d gable</i>	‘the fork’
neuter (n)	<i>das Kind</i>	<i>s chind</i>	‘the child’
	<i>das Messer</i>	<i>s mässer</i>	‘the knife’

In German, the system of grammatical gender is quite complex and can only partly be explained by consistent rules. As in Standard German, grammatical gender in Swiss German is more or less arbitrary for nouns that refer to inanimate objects or concepts, even though gender class membership can be predicted for most monosyllabic nouns (Bußmann & Hellinger 2003: 143; Köpcke & Zubin 1997):

(6) *de baum* (m) ‘the tree’, *d luscht* (f) ‘the desire’, *s graas* (n) ‘the grass’

However, gender assignment is in some cases predictable on the basis of morphological and lexico-semantic criteria (for example, derivations with certain suffixes, e.g. *-er*: masculine; *-keit*: feminine; *-li*: neuter, except some male personal nouns, see Section 3.1):

(7) <i>loch</i> (n)	‘hole’	<i>loch-er</i> (m)	‘hole-puncher’
<i>truurig</i> (ADJ)	‘sad’	<i>truurig-keit</i> (f)	‘sadness’
<i>tisch</i> (m)	‘table’	<i>tisch-li</i> (n)	‘little table’

Certain lexical fields are associated with a particular grammatical gender class:

(8) trees:	feminine	<i>d fichte</i> ‘the spruce’, <i>d esche</i> ‘the ash’, <i>d birke</i> ‘the birch’
cars:	masculine	<i>de Porsche</i> ‘the Porsche’, <i>de Fiat</i> ‘the Fiat’, <i>de Lamborghini</i> ‘the Lamborghini’
meals:	neuter	<i>s zmorger</i> ‘the breakfast’, <i>s zmittag</i> ‘the lunch’, <i>s znacht</i> ‘the dinner’

In Swiss German, the grammatical gender of a noun can differ from the corresponding noun in Standard German, e.g.

- (9) StG *die Bank* (f) ‘the bank’, *die Schnecke* (f) ‘the slug’
SwG *de bank* (m) ‘the bank’, *de schnäg* (m) ‘the slug’

Sometimes, the gender in Swiss German corresponds to Swiss Standard German usage:

- (10) StG *das Drittel* (n) (Swiss StG: *der Drittel* (m)) ‘the third’
SwG *de drittel* (m) ‘the third’

Gender use can vary – especially in case of borrowings – within a dialect or between dialects:

- (11) StG *die Butter* (f) ‘the butter’
SwG *de butter* (m), *d butter* (f) ‘the butter’

Swiss German, like Standard German, tends towards a “covert gender system”, “where gender is not shown by the form of the noun” (Corbett 1991:62). Since the noun does not indicate gender, the definite article, a satellite form that shows gender agreement, is conventionally used together with the noun in its citation form. The agreement rules concern the targets outlined in Sections 2.1.1 to 2.1.4, which – with the exception of the numerals ‘two’ and ‘three’ – coincide with those in the standard language. This is also the case for the interaction of gender and case when they are amalgamated in a single inflected form (e.g. *de maa* (DEF.MASC.NOM) ‘the man’, *em maa* (DEF.MASC.DAT) ‘to the man’). As in Standard German, grammatical gender markings are neutralised in the plural:

- (12) StG *die Frauen* ‘the women’, *die Männer* ‘the men’, *die Kinder* ‘the children’,
die Leute ‘the people’
SwG *d fraue* ‘the women’, *d manne* ‘the men’, *d chind* ‘the children’, *d lüüt* ‘the people’

2.1.1 Articles

In Swiss German, the definite article is used like in Standard German. The feminine and plural definite articles, which are affected by syncretism, appear in two forms in most dialects: The full form *di* is used when the article precedes an attributive adjective:

- (13) *di gross frau* ‘the tall woman’, *di grosse fraue* ‘the tall women’

When a noun is preceded by a definite article only, the latter is reduced to the clitic form *d*:

- (14) *d uni* > *duni* ‘the university’

In rapid speech, the definite article *d*, i.e. the feminine or plural article, assimilates with the initial consonant of the corresponding noun when the article is used as a proclitic, reduced form:

- (15) singular *d platte* (f) > *platte* ‘the plate’, *d milch* (f) > *pmilch* ‘the milk’, *d gable* (f) > *ggable* ‘the fork’, *d chugle* (f) > *kugle* ‘the ball’, *d täsche* (f) > *täsche* ‘the bag’
 plural *d manne* > *pmanne* ‘the men’, *d fraue* > *pfraue* ‘the women’, *d chind* > *kchind* ‘the children’

This also happens with proper names, especially first names, where the use of the definite article is mandatory in most Swiss German dialects and affects their morphological and syllabic structure (on the use of articles with nouns, cf. Seibicke 2008: 60–65).

- (16) *d iren* > *tiren* (lit. ‘the Irene’)

- (17) *d bernadet* > *pernadet* (assimilation; lit. ‘the Bernadette’)

The indefinite article is realised as three distinct forms in some Swiss German dialects: *en* (m), *e* (f), *es* (n) ‘a’.

2.1.2 Numerals

In Standard German, only the numeral ‘one’ – which corresponds to the indefinite article – is inflected. This numeral is also gender inflected in Swiss German, even though the forms are distinct from those of the indefinite article.

- (18) StG *ein Mann* (m) ‘one man’, *eine Frau* (f) ‘one woman’, *ein Kind* (n) ‘one child’
 SwG *ei maa* (m) ‘one man’, *ei frau* (f) ‘one woman’, *eis chind* (n) ‘one child’

In many Swiss German dialects, the numerals ‘two’ and ‘three’ (Standard German: invariable *zwei*, *drei*) are also gender inflected:

- (19) StG *zwei/drei Männer* ‘two/three men’, *zwei/drei Frauen* ‘two/three women’, *zwei/drei Kinder* ‘two/three children’
 SwG (Zurich) *zwee/drei mane* (m) ‘two/three men’, *zwoo/drei fraue* (f) ‘two/three women’, *zwäi/drüü chind* (n) ‘two/three children’

2.1.3 Pronouns

As in Standard German, gender-specific forms exist for the 3rd person singular, for example in personal pronouns. For these pronouns, both full and reduced forms are available. However, their phonetic shape seems to be related to an animacy hierarchy. Phonetically heavy forms are restricted to referents with the

semantic property ‘human’ or ‘pet’; the same is true for the Bernese pronoun *seie* ‘she, they’ in particular (cf. Marti 1985: 92–97), but also for the neutral pronouns *ääs* (NEUT.NOM) and *ins* (NEUT.ACC), which are generally used for female referents (see (21) below and Section 4.4). The full forms *seie/sii* ‘she’, *äär* ‘he’, *ääs* ‘it’ also serve as exophoric pronouns with a gender-specific meaning.

When used for referents with the semantic property ‘human’, reduced (often enclitic) and full pronominal forms are available. Their use depends on the degree of emphasis placed on a certain form, with full forms being stressed and reduced forms being unstressed.

(20) Singular

StG *er* (m) ‘he’, *sie* (f) ‘she’, *es* (n) ‘it’

SwG (Berne) *äär*, *är*, *-er* (m) ‘he’

seie, *sii*, *si*, *-se* (f) ‘she’

ääs/es/-s (n) ‘it’

Plural

StG *sie* ‘they’

SwG (Berne) *seie*, *si* ‘they’

(21) *Hesch ins gsee?*

have.you NEUT.ACC.SG seen

‘Have you seen her?’ (lit. ‘Have you seen it?’)

Unlike in Standard German, where masculine forms are often used generically, in Swiss German some speakers use the neuter form of indefinite pronouns generically:

(22) *s eint* (n) ‘the one’, *s andere* (n) ‘the other’

(23) *Iedes mos einischt eläi überäne.*

each.NEUT.NOM.SG must.3SG.PRES once alone to the other side

‘Everybody must go to the other side alone, someday.’

(Fischer 1960: 241)

2.1.4 Adjectives

In the Low and High Alemannic German dialects, adjectives are used the same way as in Standard German, i.e. they are generally gender inflected in the singular when they accompany a noun, but a non-inflected form is selected when the adjective is used predicatively:

(24) *e schöne löffel* (m) ‘a beautiful spoon’, *e schööni gable* (f) ‘a beautiful fork’,

schööns mässer (n) ‘a beautiful knife’

schööni löffel ‘beautiful spoons’, *schööni gable* ‘beautiful forks’, *schööni mässer*

‘beautiful knives’

- (25) *är isch schön* ‘he is beautiful’, *si isch schön* ‘she is beautiful’, *es isch schön* ‘it is beautiful’, *si sind schön* ‘they are beautiful’

However, the non-inflected form is also used after the definite article (so-called weak inflection):

- (26) *de schön löffel* (m) ‘the beautiful spoon’, *di schön gable* (f) ‘the beautiful fork’, *s schön mässer* (n) ‘the beautiful knife’

In the Highest Alemannic dialects, adjectives remain inflected when used predicatively:

- (27) Highest Alemannic SwG *äär isch schööner* (m) ‘he is beautiful’, *sii isch schööni* (f) ‘she is beautiful’, *ääs isch schööns* (n) ‘it is beautiful’

2.2 Lexical gender

There are numerous terms referring to people and animals, where biological gender is semantically encoded (e.g. *frau* ‘woman’, *meitschi* ‘girl’).

As in Standard German, the grammatical gender of a Swiss German animate noun often corresponds to its inherent lexical gender:

- | | | | |
|-----------------------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|
| (28) <i>de hängscht</i> (m) | ‘the stallion’ | <i>de schtier</i> (m) | ‘the bull’ |
| <i>d schtute</i> (f) | ‘the mare’ | <i>d chue</i> (f) | ‘the cow’ |
| <i>de brüeder</i> (m) | ‘the brother’ | <i>de vater</i> (m) | ‘the father’ |
| <i>d schwöschter</i> (f) | ‘the sister’ | <i>d mueter</i> (f) | ‘the mother’ |

A notable exception to this correspondence is the female noun *wiib* (n) ‘woman’, which has neuter gender.

Derivational or compositional word-formation processes (*leereri* ‘female teacher’, *kamerafrau* ‘female camera operator’, see Sections 3.1 and 3.2), produce gender-specific female nouns that generally have feminine grammatical gender corresponding to their lexical gender. Such a correspondence is typical for word-formation processes that do not lead to a change in word class, but to a semantic modification in terms of biological gender. Such a derivational process, which is frequent in varieties of German, is called *Movierung* ‘motion’ and describes a word-formation process by which female nouns are derived from nouns with male or gender-indefinite meaning by means of affixation: *leerer* (m) ‘(male) teacher’ vs. *leerer-i* (f) ‘female teacher’ (see Section 3.1). In some rare cases, nouns with male lexical gender can be derived from nouns with indefinite or female lexical gender by means of affixation: Standard German *Maus* (f) ‘(female) mouse’ vs. *Mäus-erich* (m) ‘male mouse’. Female lexical gender is therefore often expressed

by means of specific word-formation processes, while male lexical gender is often encoded within a root.

As in Standard German, lexical gender does not correspond to grammatical gender in diminutive derivations like

- (29) *s meitschi/meitli* (n) 'the girl'
s männli/mandli (n) 'the little man'
s fräulein/fräuli/frölein (n) 'the miss'

In German, (almost) all diminutives have neuter gender (for further details, see Sections 3.1 and 4.4), i.e. morphology overrides semantics in gender assignment.

Among the so-called epicene nouns, "which denote beings of either sex" (Corbett 1991: 67), nouns with any of the three grammatical genders can be found:

- (30) *mönsch* (m) 'human being'
persoon (f) 'person'
chind (n) 'child'

2.3 Referential gender

When referring to human beings in Swiss German, one can use gender-indefinite nouns (*mönsch* 'human being', *persoon* 'person'); in some cases, referential gender may be expressed through grammatical gender. This becomes apparent in nominalised adjectives and participles, when used for human reference. Here, the biological gender of the referent is expressed – exclusively – by means of the grammatical gender shown by the satellites, so-called *differential gender* (*Differential-genus*, cf. Bußmann & Hellinger 2003: 150):

- (31) *de jung* (m) 'the young man', *di jung* (f) 'the young woman'⁸
de verletzt(i) (m) 'the injured man', *di verletzt(i)* (f) 'the injured woman'

Nominalised present participles are not a part of traditional Swiss German grammar, but they may be used as loan forms from Standard German:

- (32) *de abwäsend(i)* (m) 'the absent man', *di abwäsend(i)* (f) 'the absent woman'
de reisend(i) (m) 'the travelling man', *di reisend(i)* (f) 'the travelling woman'

If the referents are exclusively female, simple or derived lexemes with the corresponding lexical gender are used (*fraue* 'women', *schtudäntinne* 'female students'). When referring to themselves, it has become common for women to use feminine personal nouns (*ich bi schtudäntin* 'I am a female student'). However, women are occasionally concerned that feminine occupational terms – especially for

professions with high status – might not be equal to their masculine equivalents, and thus prefer referring to themselves as, for example, *zaanarzt* (m) ‘dentist’ rather than *zaanärzti(n)* (f) ‘female dentist’.

For mixed-gender groups, “generic” masculine forms may still be used (*d schtudänte vo de uni gämf* ‘the students (m) from the university of Geneva’); however, this use has been considerably challenged by formulations that either are gender-indefinite (*d schtudänteschaft* ‘student body’; see Section 5) or specify both sexes (*d schtudäntinne und d schtudänte* ‘the female students and the male students’).

2.4 Generic masculines

As in Standard German, many nouns referring to men are ambiguous, oscillating between male-specific and generic meanings. A form such as *mini kollege* can therefore be translated as “my colleagues” as well as “my male colleagues”. However, the context usually triggers a single interpretation only. For example, when talking about mixed-gender groups, a generic interpretation is more likely (*d nochbere* ‘the neighbours’, *d schtudänte* ‘the students’). Nevertheless, a male-specific interpretation is not excluded and may even be preferred if most representatives of a category are male (cf. 33) or if a feminine form is used adjacently (cf. 34):

(33) *d prieschter* ‘the priests’

(34) *D mitarbeiterinne sind scho ggange, d mitarbeiter sind no do.*

‘The female co-workers have already left, the (male) co-workers are still here.’

This semantic flexibility of masculine forms has given rise to controversial discussions: While it has been criticised by feminist linguists since the end of the 1970s, it has been considered unproblematic or even an economical feature of language by others.

In a study about the perception of generic forms in the German-speaking and French-speaking part of Switzerland (cf. Elmiger 2008:255–315), it was shown that many linguistic laypeople are familiar with the controversial attitudes to generic masculine forms. When confronted with various alternatives, split forms (e.g. *bürgerinne und bürger* ‘female citizens and male citizens’) were preferred. Some respondents indicated that they try to avoid using masculine forms generically, while others considered it as unproblematic. Some generic masculine agreement forms that refer to morphologically invariable indefinite pronouns, such as *öpper* ‘someone’, *niemer* ‘no one’, were found to be largely uncontroversial:

- (35) *Öpper hed sis telefoon vergässe.*
 ‘Someone has forgotten his telephone.’

However, extensive empirical work on the use of personal nouns in Swiss German has yet to be carried out. For instance, when speaking about potential candidates for important political or economic functions or positions, the masculine form is frequently used (*wäär wird nöie presidänt vom gwärbeverband?* ‘Who is going to be the new (m) president (m) of the trade and crafts association?’). When a Swiss newspaper listed examples of different tax rates, it referred to the various categories as follows:

- (36) *ein Alleinstehender ohne Kinder mit einem Bruttoeinkommen von 500.000 Franken*
 ‘a single person (m) without children with a gross income of 500,000 francs’
ein Verheirateter mit zwei Kindern
 ‘a married person (m) with two children’
 (*Neue Luzerner Zeitung*, 8.12.2013)

Even though the examples above happen to be in Standard German, one may safely assume that the use of masculine nominalised participles is also found in Swiss German (*e eleischteende* ‘a single person’ (m), *e verhäraatete* ‘a married person’ (m)). The fact that a masculine singular participle rather than a gender-neutral plural form was chosen in the newspaper article may be an indication that tax payers and heads of households are thought of as being male rather than female.

3. Gender-related structures

3.1 Derivation

Swiss German dialects have a range of derivational suffixes for forming lexically gender-specific personal nouns:

- (37) female suffixes added to masculine bases:
 -*i(n)* (f): *leerer* ‘teacher’ < *leerer-i(n)* ‘female teacher’, *wirt* ‘landlord’ < *wirt-i(n)* ‘landlady’, *sportler* ‘sports person’ < *sportler-i(n)* ‘sportswoman’
 -*e* (f): *leerer* ‘teacher’ < *leerer-e* ‘female teacher’
 -*ene* (f): *wirt* ‘landlord’ < *wirt-ene* ‘landlady’

(38) female suffixes replacing corresponding masculine suffixes:

- e (f): *gränn-i* (m) 'person, who laments and whinges' < *gränn-e* 'woman, who laments and whinges'
- le (f): *greeb-el* (m) 'scruffy, messy person' < *greeb-le* 'scruffy, messy woman'

(39) male suffix:

- lig (m): *wit-lig* 'widower' (vs. *witfrau* 'widow')

The most frequent and productive suffix which is used to form female nouns is the so-called motion suffix *-i(n)* (*leerer* '(male) teacher' < *leerer-i(n)* 'female teacher'), which is associated with the feminine gender. It can be added to masculine derivations with *-er* (*leerer-i*) or to masculine roots (*wirt-i* 'landlady' from *wirt* 'landlord', *chöch-i* 'female cook' for *chooch* (m) 'cook'). The derivational suffix *-i* can trigger a vowel change in the preceding syllable. The more traditional, reduced dialectal forms with the suffix *-i* (*sportler-i* 'sportswoman') has recently received competition from forms with *-in*, which are found mainly in relatively new loanwords borrowed from Standard German (*piloot-i/-in* 'female pilot', *bundesrööt-i/-in* 'female federal counsellor') and in recent dialectal usage (*püür-in* 'female farmer'). In some Swiss German dialects the derivational suffixes *-(er)e* (f) (*leerer-e* 'female teacher') and *-ene* (f) (*wirt-ene* 'landlady') can be found. The latter suffix is limited to derivations from simple bases and probably more to archaic usage.

In Swiss German dialects, unlike in Standard German, there are nouns in *-i*, such as *stüürmi* (m) 'impetuous, impatient person' and *zanggi* (m) 'squabbler' (cf. Henzen 1965: 144), which probably go back to the diminutive forms with *-in* (cf. Odermatt 1904; Szadowski 1918) and are highly productive. Diminutives generally have neuter grammatical gender, and their tendency to become masculine is explained by a convergence of grammatical and referential gender. The fact that the masculine forms can be used for both male and female referents and are thus commonly identified as gender-indefinite is, according to Fischer (1960: 473) and Szadowski (1918), the result of a secondary transfer effect.

It is noteworthy that neuter nouns with *-i* are female-specific (*pfuusi* (n) 'plump woman') – at least in today's usage. According to the *Schweizerisches Idiotikon* (1881), in the region of Berne this co-existence of masculine and neuter derivations containing *-i* has led to a highly unusual type of differential gender, which in the Standard is restricted to de-adjectival nouns (*de schön* (m) 'the beautiful male person', *di schön* (f) 'the beautiful female person') and participles (*de aagschtellt(i)* (m) 'the male employee', *di aagschtellt(i)* (f) 'the female

employee’) (cf. Christen 2013). In the Bernese dialect, deverbal nouns with *-e* can be regarded as female equivalents of the masculine nouns with *-i* (*gränni* (m) ‘male person, who laments and whinges’, *gränne* (f) ‘female person who laments and whinges’). Whether all three genders – e.g. *gränni* (m), (f), (n) – are possible in certain dialects is not known. However, this issue would be worth investigating, especially in connection with the question of a possible (re)semanticisation of the gender of nouns referring to humans.

Pejoration, which often accompanies these derivations with *-i* and *-e*, is indifferent to gender and can affect masculine as well as neuter and feminine nouns. Pejorative connotations here seem to be due to the fact that the roots of the derivations “describe actions that are usually carried out habitually and suggest an unpleasant trait or a bodily defect” (cf. Fischer 1960:472; our translation), and are then often used derogatively. However, it may be worth noting that the diminutives which are produced by these derivational suffixes are not invariably used to verbally downgrade but also to evaluate in terms of amelioration or pejoration. Speakers can use the diminutive to assess something as pleasant and familiar, or as unpleasant and unfamiliar (cf. Werner 2012:189).

With nominal forms that were originally derived from verbs in *-(e)le* (*greebele* ‘to show an indecent behaviour’), again the masculine nouns can be used for male or female referents. The gender-specific derivations with *-le* (f) (e.g. *greeble* (f) ‘scruffy, messy woman’) are not attested everywhere, but seem to be common predominantly in the Swiss German dialects of Western Switzerland (cf. Marti 1985:193).

It is striking that, in the dialects of (only Western?) Switzerland, feminine nouns with *-e* or *-le* like *gränne* (f) ‘woman, who laments and whinges’ or *greeble* (f) ‘scruffy, messy woman’, are expressed morphologically through a process which is uncommon in German: the verbal stem (e.g. *gränn-* ‘lament, whinge’) is combined with a masculine (*-i* or *-el*) or feminine suffix (*-e* or *-le*) and, consequently, renders the nouns male or female. The productivity as well as the areal distribution of this pattern is not yet clear and requires further research.

In those dialects which have only masculine derivations with *-i* or *-el* (*gränni* (m), *greebel* (m)) without feminine equivalents, these nouns can be used generically. However, in cases where there is increasing competition from feminine nouns, the masculine terms have acquired the additional meaning ‘male’ while retaining the possibility of being used generically (for the development of gender-specific readings of nouns referring to humans, cf. Becker 2008).

Derivations with *-lig* (m) do not have personal nouns as bases and are no longer productive (*gfröörlich* ‘person who gets cold easily’ from the verb *früüre* ‘to be cold’) and are used alongside phonologically less-reduced, newer forms bor-

rowed from Standard German with the suffix *-ling*, such as *flüchtling* (m) ‘refugee’. The latter suggest a male social gender bias that is more likely to lead to practices of female than of male specification (e.g. *flüchtlingsfrau* (f) ‘female refugee’, *leertochter* (f) ‘female apprentice’ as female equivalents for *flüchtling* (m) ‘refugee’, *leerling* (m) ‘apprentice’). The form *witlig* ‘widower’ is exceptional in that it is male-specific. Note, however, that this male form is not derived from a female form as is common for nouns denoting ‘widower’ in many other languages (cf. English *widow* < *widower*). The corresponding female form (*witfrau* ‘widow’) is a compound and, therefore, also morphologically complex.

As in Standard German, non-native suffixes used to form personal nouns are restricted to loanwords from French (*ggwafföör* (m) ‘male hairdresser’, *ggwafföös* (f) ‘female hairdresser’) or English (*schteward* (m) ‘steward’, *schtewardess* (f) ‘stewardess’) and have, so far, not become productive with native stems. Rather, in archaic dialectal usage, additional native word-formation processes are sometimes used for further clarification (*ggwafföös-i* (f) ‘female hairdresser’, lit. ‘female hairdresser-ess’).

Compared to Standard German, Swiss German word-formation processes creating personal nouns are more diverse. As in the standard language, in the Swiss German dialects derivational suffixes are commonly used to derive female-specific feminine nouns from both derived and simple masculine bases (*leerer-i*, *wirt-i*). This is, however, not the case for deverbal nouns with the suffix *-i*, which are highly productive (e.g. *phaupti* (m) ‘somebody, who claims something despite obvious evidence to the contrary’, from the verb *phaupte* ‘to claim’). The source of this suffix is a diminutive, but the contemporary usage of these nouns has not yet been researched conclusively. Dictionaries and grammars of Swiss German dialects suggest, however, that the masculine *-i* derivations are gender-indefinite and, in many dialects, do not have gender-specific equivalents. Neuter nouns with *-i* have been attested (*hötschi* (n) ‘slovenly, lewd woman’). A certain level of productivity of these neuter terms is illustrated by the Standard German loanword *tussi* (n) ‘bimbo, shallow (young) woman’, which is commonly used as a neuter noun in Swiss German even though it has feminine grammatical gender in Standard German. Further research is needed to investigate the emergence of a differential gender in German. However, special attention should be given to the fact that a potential differential gender does in this case not create an equivalence between grammatical and referential gender, but uses the neuter gender to refer to female persons (for the neuter gender of nouns referring to women, cf. Köpcke & Zubin 2003).

Lexical roots that take both masculine and feminine derivational suffixes (*gränn-i* (m), *gränn-e* (f), from the verb *gränne* ‘lament, whine’) are equally uncharted territory and may be confined to certain dialects. This morphological

process differs fundamentally from the common formation of female German nouns from masculine bases (*Lehrer* (m) ‘teacher’ < *Lehrer-in* (f) ‘female teacher’) and is closer to the ‘Romance’ model (cf. Italian *amic-o* (m) ‘male friend’ vs. *amic-a* (f) ‘female friend’).

3.2 Compounding

Swiss German – like Standard German – has the possibility of expressing referential gender by compounding. Gender specification is achieved by lexically gendered components like *frau* (f) ‘woman’ or *maa* (m) ‘man’. The following gender-specific nouns may occur in compounds:

- (40) *frau* (f) ‘woman’ vs. *maa* (m) ‘man’ (*füürweerfrau* ‘firewoman’, *eierfrau* ‘female egg seller’ vs. *füürweermaa* ‘fireman’, *eiermaa* ‘male egg seller’)
- (41) *wiib* (n) ‘woman’ (*bättelwiib* ‘female beggar’, *chifelwiib* ‘feisty woman’)
- (42) *meitschi* (n) ‘girl’ vs. *bueb* (m) ‘boy’ (*hüetermeitschi* ‘female babysitter’, *götti-meitschi* ‘goddaughter’ vs. *hüeterbueb* ‘male babysitter’, *göttibueb* ‘godson’)

The base words *frau* and *maa* are regularly occurring constituents of compounds and can even be used ad hoc to create novel gender-specific occupational terms (*kioskfrau* (f) ‘lady at the kiosk’, *radiomaa* (m) ‘male radio announcer’). Word formations with *maa* may show phonological reduction. In older dialectal bi-syllabic nouns, *maa* was often phonologically reduced to *me* (*fuerme* ‘male wagoner’, *amme* ‘male civil servant’, *chaufme* ‘male merchant’ (cf. also the phonological reduction of the indefinite pronoun *me* ‘one’). The same is true for the pronunciation of homonymous family names, which go back to occupational terms (*Chaufme* < *Chaufmaa* ‘merchant’). However, contact with Standard German, which does not have reduced forms, seems to have resulted in a preference and a stabilisation of the full form, in so far as *maa* is still being used in the dialect alongside *-me* (cf. Christen 2007).

When *frau* ‘woman’ is used as a constituent of a compound, it also serves to create feminine nouns from lexically gender-indefinite but grammatically masculine nouns (*flüchtlingsfrau* (f) ‘female refugee’). The latter type of compound formation indicates the need for the possibility of deriving feminine nouns from gender-indefinite masculine nouns to refer to women. Since the suffix *-li(n)g* cannot be combined with the derivational suffix *-in*, compounding with *frau* is used instead. Whether this contributes to the fact that masculine forms with the suffix *-li(n)g* are increasingly interpreted as male or whether the male reading of lexemes that have masculine gender marking triggers the forms with *frau* has to remain open.

Word formations with *wiib* (n) ‘woman’ have a negative connotation due to the pejoration of the lexeme *wiib* ‘woman’, and are thus often used as constituents of abusive expressions (e.g. *rätschwiiib* (n) ‘female gossip monger’). There is no male equivalent. Even though word formations with *meitschi* (n) ‘girl’ and *bueb* ‘boy’ (m) are generally productive, they tend to be infrequent in the contemporary language. Semantically, the lexemes are not only gender-specific, but also carry the additional connotation ‘young, immature’. In today’s usage, these base words also have to compete with the English loanwords *görl* (n) (*kaländergörl* ‘calendar girl’) and *boi* (m) (*liftboi* ‘liftboy’), which have been borrowed into both the dialect and the standard language.

4. Usage of personal reference forms

4.1 Address terms

As in Standard German, persons that are not known to the speaker on a first-name basis are addressed by a title and their family name: *frau Müller* ‘Ms Müller’ or *herr Müller* ‘Mr Müller’. If one does not address a specific person, the forms *dame* and *herr* (*mini daame und here*, lit. ‘my ladies and gentlemen’) are used. On Swiss German TV, the use of split forms has become the rule. This phenomenon is at least partly a result of language planning efforts (see Section 5.2):

- (43) *liebi zueschauerinne und zueschauer*
 ‘dear female spectators and male spectators’

As a consequence of the feminist critique of language, the way of addressing unmarried women with *fräulein*, *fräuli* (‘Miss’) is today considered inappropriate and has largely been replaced by *frau* (‘Ms’) in the last decades, which is used irrespectively of the referent’s marital status. *Fräulein* is still occasionally used to attract the attention of waitresses, and female teachers are sometimes referred to or addressed as *fräuli*, independently of their marital status. This latter form of address has thus become quite common (for a detailed discussion of the entholinguistic evaluation of *Mademoiselle* and *Fräulein* as a form of address in French- and German-speaking Switzerland, see Elmiger 2008: 317–350).

In the context of the family, kinship terms are used to address parents, grandparents, aunts, uncles and parents-in-law. However, hypocoristic terms with *i* (see Section 3.1) (*grosi* ‘granny’, *papi* ‘daddy’) are considerably more frequent than full forms (*vater* ‘father’, *grosmueter* ‘grandmother’). An empirical study of the use of such address forms has shown that it is rather the female relatives that are addressed with kinship terms (cf. Christen 2006). The use of the first name to

address a parent has remained uncommon. However, if only one parent is addressed with his or her first name, it tends to be the father rather than the mother. Such forms of address are part of a negotiation process and it can be observed that women are more comfortable with a form of address that emphasises their role in the family rather than their individuality.

4.2 Occupational terms

As in the standard language, female occupational terms are formed by means of derivation (*schriiner* '(male) carpenter', *schriiner-i* 'female carpenter', *chooch* '(male) cook', *chöch-i* 'female cook') or compounding (*kameramaa* '(male) camera operator', *kamerafrau* 'female camera operator'), which tend to be productive (see Sections 3.1 and 3.2). As Elmiger (2008) showed in a questionnaire-based investigation, female occupational terms have gained almost unconditional acceptance in German-speaking Switzerland.

In addition to forms with *-in* or *-frau* there are some, albeit archaic, occupational terms with *-schwöschter* 'sister', *-tochter* 'daughter' or *-daame* 'lady':

- (44) *tochter* (f) 'daughter' (*puuretochter* 'farmer's daughter', *serviertochter* 'waitress', *saaltochter* 'waitress', *leertochter* 'female apprentice')
- (45) *schwöschter* (f) 'sister' vs. *brüeder* (m) 'brother' (*chrankeschwöschter* 'female nurse', *kafischwöschter* 'woman who likes to drink coffee' vs. *jabrueder* 'yes-man')
- (46) *daame* (f) 'lady' vs. *herr* (m) 'gentleman' (*baardaame* 'barmaid', *raatsherr* 'councilman')

Compounds with *tochter* (f) (lit. 'daughter') as a second element are not productive, and compounds with *soon* (m) 'son' do not occur at all. While the compound *puuretochter* (f) ('female descendant of a farming family') still implies kinship, the other lexicalised word formations with this component have become obsolete. The meanings of a few (traditional) female professions have retained only the semantic attribution 'female'. The compound *leertochter* (f) 'female apprentice' is an indication that *leerling* (m) 'apprentice' (as well as the more informal term *schtift* (m) 'apprentice') has not been considered suitable for female referents (cf. *flüchtlingsfrau* (f) above).

The components *schwöschter* and *brüeder* (including the phonological variants *schweschter*, *brieder/brueder*) are found in a range of lexicalisations. Even though the job designation *chrankeschwöschter* (f) 'female nurse', which still

evokes the (unpaid) medical care provided by nuns, has long been abandoned as an official occupational title in Switzerland (nowadays: *Fachangestellte/r Gesundheit* ‘female/male qualified health assistant’), it has survived in the vernacular. The kinship term *brüeder* is not used as part of the term for the corresponding male profession. The masculine equivalent is (*chranke*)*pfleeger* (m) or possibly the older variant (*chranke*)*wärter* (m) ‘male nurse’. Nevertheless, *schwöschter* (f) and *brüeder* (m) can still occur in compounds with the meaning ‘male’ or ‘female’ respectively, although these are usually derogatory (nonce) formations like *suuf-brueder* (m) ‘male boozing companion’.

Compounds with *daame* and *herr* are largely found in lexicalisations. Like *wiib* (see Section 3.2), the lexeme *daame* (f) ‘lady’ has been undergoing pejoration, probably due to the fact that it is also used euphemistically for *proschtituierti* (f) ‘female prostitute’ (cf. Standard German *Dame für gewisse Stunden* ‘lady of the night’). The same can be said for the lexicalised expression *baardaame* (f) ‘female barkeeper’, which refers to an occupational field of ambiguous reputation.

That occupational titles were once formed with *schwöschter* (f) or *tochter* (f) (but not with *soon* (m) or *brüeder* (m)), and that these are sometimes still used today, may well be related to the fact that young women often did not aim for long-term careers and worked in poorly paid, temporary jobs before getting married.

4.3 Terms of abuse

Personal nouns that are employed for specific communicative needs like insulting or (mostly negative) evaluation cannot only be created by means of derivation (see Section 3.2), but are frequently the result of the semantic transfer processes known as metonymy and metaphor. While such expressions are often either ephemeral ad hoc formations or remain restricted to an intimate circle of users such as couples or families (cf. Leisi 1993), many such abusive and evaluative terms have become lexicalised. They are gender-specific to the extent that distinct connotations for male and female referents have become fixed, due to gender stereotypes or the different expectations society has of women and men (cf. Christen 2013; Frei 1981; Lötscher 1993; Schrambke 2002). For semantic transfer processes, inanimate nouns are sometimes used, if they relate metaphorically to the male or female genitalia or have become lexicalised terms for ‘vagina’ or ‘penis’. Nouns for containers or cavities, such as *büchs* (f) ‘tin’, *pfanne* ‘pan’ (f), *bütti* ‘kettle’ (f) have thus become derogatory terms for women (cf. Frank 1992; Frei 1981: 22–26), while *schwanz* (m) ‘tail, penis’ has been adopted in terms such as *schwanz*i (m) ‘idler’ or *schlappschwanz* ‘wimp, unassertive man’ (cf. Lötscher 1993).

Lötscher's (1993) data collection shows a clear quantitative discrepancy in the usage of such terms. Semantic transfer is used mainly for derogatory words that conceptually reduce women to their sexuality. The inventory of abusive terms for female and male referents is thus far from symmetrical. With regard to abusive terms that make reference to a person's intellectual capacities, Lötscher draws the following conclusion:

The basic vocabulary does not seem to contain specific abusive words for women which portray them as uncooperative and unfair, but shrewd. In the vernacular, such women apparently do not exist; women can be stupid and clumsy at best. (Lötscher 1993: 34; our translation)

Semantic transfer is structurally remarkable in the sense that both lexical and grammatical gender seem to be relevant: inherently gender-specific terms for animals are transferred either to women (*chue* 'cow', *huen* 'hen') or to men (*muni* 'bull', *bock* 'buck'). With the use of generic animal terms for people, grammatical gender often seems to be decisive (*esel* (m) 'donkey', *aff* (m) 'monkey', [*sau*]*hund* (m) '[dirty] dog, bastard' for men; *gans* (f) 'goose', *dröschle* (f) 'thrush' for women). This is also the case for inanimate nouns that are applied to humans (*hächle* (f) 'hackle', *trucke* (f) 'little box', *zwätschge* (f) 'plum', *täsche* (f) 'bag', used as derogatory terms for women; *chlotz* (m) 'chunk', *chnebel* (m) 'toggle', derogatory terms for men). With such transfers, neuter input words (*rääf* (n) 'carrying frame for the back, dossier', *tüpfli* (n) 'little pot', *beeri* (n) 'berry') can turn into female nouns. Reliable lexical frequency analyses have yet to be carried out in order to test the hypothesis that the neuter gender has a special status in these cases. These structural regularities lead to the very heart of the research on grammatical gender, insofar as the metaphorically used terms for containers mentioned above frequently have feminine or neuter gender and thus raise the question as to whether the German language knows a connection between gender assignment and semantic fields (cf. Köpcke & Zubin 1997).

4.4 Proper nouns

Like all nouns, proper nouns have a grammatical gender, which manifests itself syntagmatically, for example in the article, which is obligatory in most Swiss German dialects. First and last names are largely governed by the so-called "principle of natural gender" (Köpcke & Zubin 1997): *de Hans* (m), *de Hueber* (m); *d Susann* (f), *d Hueber* (f). With first names, which in German carry the semantic

value ‘female’ or ‘male’, we can assume that gender is assigned semantically. With gender-indefinite last names, on the other hand, gender is assigned referentially, based on the biological gender of the referent. In addition, for female referents, feminine forms can be derived from masculine last names by means of derivational suffixes (*d Hueber-i* for the last name *Hueber*, *d Guet-ene* for the last name *Gut*). However, these forms have a clear pejorative connotation. Furthermore, forms with *ene* also sound archaic (see Section 3.2).

In some Swiss German regions – as well as in a larger area at the western border of the German-speaking area (cf. Atlas der deutschen Alltagssprache 2014) – female first names can also be assigned neuter grammatical gender (*s Susann* (n)). In the nominative and accusative case, they are combined with the special neuter pronouns *ääs* (NEUT.NOM) ‘she’ and *ins* (NEUT.ACC) ‘her’ (both lit. ‘it’), which can only refer to humans (in all other cases, the neuter pronouns are *es* and *s*). In the Valais, diminutives of male first names and family names referring to men (*ds Toni*, *ds Anthamattji* (n) – *ääs* ‘he’), are neuter, too, while in the rest of German-speaking Switzerland, it is far more common to express male referential gender by means of masculine grammatical gender, even in cases where formal diminutives are available (*de Toni* (m)). The use of the neuter gender, especially with female first names and kinship terms with *-i* (*Vreeni* (n), *Käthi* (n), *Mami* (n) ‘mummy’, *Grosi* (n) ‘granny’), has led to the hypothesis that the origin of this phenomenon is the neuter gender of the diminutive, which subsequently may have been applied analogously also to (generally female) non-derived first names (*Susann* (n)) (cf. Christen 1998). Another hypothesis attributes the neuter gender of female first names to their closeness to neuter nouns used for women, such as *Weib* (n) or *Mädchen* (n) (cf. Nübling & Busley & Drenda, to appear).

In addition to first names with *-i*, there are also derivations with *-e* or *-le* (*Vreen-e* (f), *Käth-le* (f) for *Verena*, *Katharina*), which always have feminine gender and – like personal nouns that are derived with these suffixes – carry a pejorative connotation (cf. Hodler 1969: 17). In Sensler German, a dialect used in the German-speaking part of the Canton of Fribourg, it is also possible to derive male first names with the feminine suffix *-la* (*Mäxla* (f) for *Max*). These formations have an equally pejorative potential.

The co-existence of and competition between different grammatical gender attributions mainly in female (but marginally also in male) first names, as it is found in the Swiss German context, has not yet been researched adequately. This is true also for the phenomenon of so-called hybrid gender (cf. Corbett 1991: 225) in proper names. This is related to the fact that different gender forms may appear in different syntactic positions:

- (47) S *Susann het ir-i*
 DEF.NEUT.NOM.SG *Susann* AUX.3SG.PRES POSS.FEM.SG-ACC.PL
möbel *verchouft.*
 furniture.ACC.PL sold
 ‘Susann has sold her furniture.’

What seems to matter here is first and foremost the „principle of linear distance“, i.e. the fact that lexical gender prevails the greater the syntactic distance from the first name (cf. Köpcke & Panther & Zubin 2010). Detailed psycholinguistic insights into the possibility of a (re)semanticisation of gender and studies of the pragmatic-stylistic dimension of gender attribution in those Swiss German dialects which allow a choice between the different genders for a particular first name, are not yet available (cf. Nübling & Busley & Drenda, to appear). As part of the feminist critique of language, many Swiss Germans have, in recent years, campaigned against neuter gender attribution with female first names in everyday language. We should, however, not ignore the fact that the traditional neuter gender attribution with female first names is not per se tied to negative connotations (for the negative meaning potential of neuter nouns referring to humans, see Köpcke & Zubin 2003), but can be considered the unmarked form against which the feminine gender attribution can act as the (negatively evaluated) deviation.

Overall, it is evident that there are certain parallels between the morphological particularities of proper nouns and common nouns referring to humans. The use of neuter gender with female reference and feminine gender with male reference emerge as phenomena that stand in especially stark contrast to the German Standard and urgently require more research.

5. Language planning and non-sexist language

5.1 Swiss language planning

As a federal state, Switzerland deals with language planning on various levels, especially at the federal and the cantonal levels. Municipalities, i.e. mostly larger cities, may also have their own regulations.

The Swiss Federal Constitution⁹ caters only for the most important language-related issues, such as listing the national languages (art. 4), the official languages (art. 70) and the promotion of linguistic diversity (art. 70). Most of the matters that language planning is concerned with are handled at the cantonal level.

German is both a national language and an official language at the federal level and in 21 cantons, four of which are officially bilingual (French, German) or

trilingual (German, Italian, Romansh). A distinction between Standard German and Swiss German is not made in any of the German-speaking cantonal constitutions. It is generally expected that everybody knows the contexts in which each variety is appropriate. However, the distribution in use between Standard German and Swiss German has proved very controversial in public discussions about certain contexts that are subject to language planning, namely public schooling. While Swiss German is not a school subject per se or a language of instruction, there has been a dispute in some cantons about the role Swiss German should have in (preschool) teaching, which is mostly oral. During the later school years, classes are (supposed to be) conducted in Standard German, but the use of Swiss German at school – especially in oral and/or more private contexts – is not rare.

5.2 Non-sexist language in German-speaking Switzerland

As in the other German-speaking countries, there has been an intensive debate about language-related sexism and how to avoid it in the German-speaking part of Switzerland. This debate has given rise to a large number of official as well as non-official guidelines for non-sexist language, at the federal level as well as in many cantons, cities and institutions such as universities, schools and hospitals.¹⁰

As a rule, Swiss guidelines relate to and deal with Standard German (cf. Haeberlin et al. 1992), which is used orally in formal institutional and almost all written contexts. This means that there are no guidelines or other texts that deal with non-sexist language in dialectal use. There are only a few examples where the diglossic context in the German-speaking part of Switzerland is taken into consideration, such as the following statement in the Federal Guidelines (Schweizerische Bundeskanzlei & Zürcher Hochschule für Angewandte Wissenschaften 2009: 57):

- (48) Auch zu *Landammann*, *Gemeindeammann*, *Bezirksammann* sind entsprechende Bezeichnungen auf *-frau* möglich. Da sich im Dialekt die Lautform von *-mann* in *Ammann* [*Amme*] allerdings nicht mehr mit jener von *Mann* [*Maa*] deckt, werden hier Bildungen auf *-frau* oft nicht als direkte Entsprechungen empfunden.

‘Corresponding designations with *-frau* [i.e. ‘woman’] are possible for *Landammann*, *Gemeindeammann*, *Bezirksammann* [i.e. president of the executive at various levels] as well. However, as in the dialect the oral form *-mann* [i.e. ‘man’] in *Ammann* [*Amme*] is no longer associated with *Mann* [*Maa*], formations on *-frau* are often no longer perceived as direct correspondences.’ (our translation)

The Guidelines for the German Standard generally recommend not to use masculine nouns generically and suggest two main strategies for replacing them: making women visible (by using split forms such as *Politikerinnen und Politiker* ‘female and male politicians’) or using gender neutralisation. Thus, in SwG personal nouns may be used that are lexically gender-indefinite (even though they do have a certain grammatical gender):

- (49) *mönsch* (m) ‘human being’
persoon (f) ‘person’
indiwiiduum (n) ‘individual’

Also in SwG, nouns referring to humans may be avoided altogether by using collective nouns or abstract forms:

- (50) *verein* (m) ‘association’ *vorsitz* (m) ‘presidency’
redaktioon (f) ‘editorial office’ *leitig* (f) ‘management’
personaal (n) ‘personnel’ *presiidium* (n) ‘executive committee’

The guidelines also suggest other strategies, like the use of passive constructions (without naming a personal agent) or rephrasing (avoiding personal reference altogether).

On the other hand, all kinds of splitting are possible in Swiss German, but as the dialects are used less in writing than Standard German (certainly in official contexts, where non-sexist language is more expected), such recommendations are mainly relevant for oral use. In written communication, splitting is recommended:

- (51) *bürgerinne* (f) *und bürger* (m) ‘female citizens and (male) citizens’

Abbreviated splitting can also be found, for example in an internet forum:

- (52) *Hät's au schwizer/inne do???*
‘Are there any Swiss men and women here???’

In order to make referential gender explicit, it is possible to use nominalised adjectives and participles, where female and male referents can be distinguished with the use of differential gender in the singular (see Section 2.4). Indefinite pronouns show similar patterns. Grammatical gender is specified when the pronoun refers to a gendered person (or animal):

- (53) *jeede* (m), *jeedi* (f) ‘each’
keine (m), *keini* (f) ‘none’

The guidelines do not usually take into account the use of Swiss German in written or oral contexts. However, most of what has been said about the topic in Standard German can be transposed to Swiss German.

6. Conclusion

In the German-speaking parts of Switzerland, language planning related guidelines and regulations are formulated for the standard language, i.e. Standard German. This is not really surprising, since criteria such as formal correctness and appropriateness are imposed – and may be sanctioned – mostly for written texts. Due to numerous grammatical features that the vernacular and the standard have in common because of their close relatedness, the German-speaking Swiss can easily transfer the rules of the standard to the dialect. Recently, this has resulted, for example, in the use of the present participle, which in the dialect had been considered non-existent, for personal reference (*di schtimmende*, lit. ‘the voting (people)’, ‘the voters’). However, to date we do not know anything about the actual use or the pragmatic and social dimensions of such forms. This is unfortunate, especially in view of the fact that the conditions of uncodified varieties could clarify the question of how language-planning measures may be implemented.

Structural differences between these varieties are of special interest precisely because the Swiss German dialects are so closely intertwined with the standard. Investigations of the appearance of neuter nouns referring to female persons would undoubtedly be extremely rewarding, since they could contribute to the research on grammatical gender not only with regard to German in particular, but also to other languages. It is to be hoped that these areas of research will be paid more attention in the future and that empirically sound answers will be found for the questions that, to date, still remain open.

Notes

1. Unless otherwise specified, the dialect examples used in this article relate to the Lucerne dialect, spoken by both authors (cf. Fischer 1960). Nouns are written with lower-case letters. Where Standard German (StG) contrasts with Swiss German (SwG), both varieties are labelled; examples without a label are Swiss German. The present variants follow phonologically and morphologically the dialectal usage of the authors or represent an older stage of the dialect. They were transcribed following Dieth (1986).

2. See Dürscheid and Businger (2006) on Swiss Standard German, and Ammon (1995) and Schmidlin (2011) on the pluricentricity of the German language.

3. The entire German dialect continuum extends from *Low German* (spoken in the topographically low regions in the north of Germany) to *High German* (spoken in the higher regions in the south of the German-speaking area).
4. At the federal level, German, French and Italian are also official languages; Romansh is a “semi-official language”. Art. 70 states: “The official languages of the Confederation shall be German, French and Italian. Romansh shall also be an official language of the Confederation when communicating with persons who speak Romansh” (<http://www.admin.ch/ch/e/rs/c101.html>).
5. 83.9% of the permanent residents over 15 declare themselves to be monolingual; 15.8% speak more than one language.
6. The written form of dialects is not standardised; however, conventions for the transcription of dialects do exist, such as the ones we follow in this text: Dieth (1986). These conventions are used only by professional writers and scholars (e.g. in dialectology). Most writers of Swiss German use spelling which is both close to their oral forms and not too different from spelling in Standard German.
7. In the print media as well as in books (except dialect literature), the use of Swiss German is rare.
8. *De jung* (m) ‘the son’, *di jung* (f) ‘the daughter’ and *di junge* (pl.) ‘the younger generation’ also have a lexicalised meaning that differs from Standard German, where *der Junge* means ‘the boy’ and *die Jungen* ‘the young people’ or ‘the boys’.
9. <http://www.admin.ch/ch/e/rs/c101.html>
10. See Peyer and Wyss (1998) for a general overview of official positions and grassroots movements. The first guidelines were non-official (cf. Haeblerlin et al. 1992, first published in 1988). For the federal level, see the guidelines of the Schweizerische Bundeskanzlei (2009). For an overview of the situation at the cantonal level, see Elmiger (2008); more generally on the *Language law*, which stipulates that federal texts must be formulated in a gender-equal fashion, see Elmiger (2009), and for a comparison of language use in the four official languages, see Elmiger (2013).

References

- Ammon, Ulrich, ed. 1995. *Die deutsche Sprache in Deutschland, Österreich und der Schweiz. Das Problem der nationalen Varietäten*. Berlin: de Gruyter. DOI: 10.1515/9783110872170
- Atlas der deutschen Alltagssprache. 2014. *Artikelform vor weibl. Vornamen*. <http://www.atlas-alltagssprache.de/artikelform> (last access: 26 December 2014).
- Becker, Thomas. 2008. “Zum generischen Maskulinum: Bedeutung und Gebrauch der nicht-movierten Personenbezeichnungen im Deutschen.” *Linguistische Berichte* 213: 65–75.
- Berthele, Raphael. 2004. “Vor lauter Linguisten die Sprache nicht mehr sehen – Diglossie und Ideologie in der deutschsprachigen Schweiz.” In *Dialekt, Regiolekt und Standardsprache im sozialen und zeitlichen Raum*, ed. Helen Christen. Wien: Edition Praesens, 111–136.
- Bundesamt für Statistik. 2012. *Medienmitteilung. 1 Bevölkerung. Strukturhebung der eidgenössischen Volkszählung 2010*. 19. Juni 2012.

- Bußmann, Hadumod & Marlis Hellinger. 2003. "Engendering female visibility in German." In *Gender across languages. The linguistic representation of women and men*, vol. 3, eds. Marlis Hellinger & Hadumod Bußmann. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 141–174.
DOI: 10.1075/impact.11.10bus
- Christen, Helen. 1998. "Die Mutti oder das Mutti, die Rita oder das Rita? Über Besonderheiten der Genuszuweisung bei Personen- und Verwandtschaftsnamen in schweizerdeutschen Dialekten." In *Ist mir getroumet min leben? Vom Träumen und vom Anderssein*, eds. André Schnyder & Claudia Bartholemy-Teusch & Barbara Fleith & René Wetzler. Göppingen: Kümmerle, 267–281.
- Christen, Helen. 2006. "Comutter", "Papi" und "Lebensabschnittsgefährte". *Untersuchungen zum Sprachgebrauch im Kontext heutiger Formen des Zusammenlebens*. Hildesheim: Georg Olms.
- Christen, Helen. 2007. "Familiennamen: Lokale Identitätsmarker oder besondere Wörter?" *Beiträge zur Namenforschung* 42: 419–439.
- Christen, Helen. 2013. "Tüppi, Cheib und Obsi^{ch}schnörrö": Das Idiotikon als Schlüssel zum Deutschschweizer Menschenbild." In *150 Jahre Schweizerisches Idiotikon. Beiträge zum Jubiläumskolloquium in Bern, 15. Juni 2012*, ed. Schweizerische Akademie der Geistes- und Sozialwissenschaften. Bern: Schweizerische Akademie für Geistes- und Sozialwissenschaften, 81–99.
- Christen, Helen & Manuela Guntern & Ingrid Hove & Marina Petkova. 2010. *Hochdeutsch in aller Munde. Eine empirische Untersuchung zur gesprochenen Standardsprache in der Deutschschweiz*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner.
- Corbett, Greville. 1991. *Gender*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
DOI: 10.1017/CBO9781139166119
- Dieth, Eugen. 1986. *Schwyzertütschi Dialäktschrift*. Aarau: Sauerländer.
- Dürscheid, Christa & Martin Businger, eds. 2006. *Schweizer Standarddeutsch. Beiträge zur Varietätenlinguistik*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr.
- Elmiger, Daniel. 2008. *La féminisation de la langue en français et en allemand. Querelle entre spécialistes et réception par le grand public*. Paris: Honoré Champion.
- Elmiger, Daniel. 2009. "Féminisation de par la loi: La nouvelle «Loi sur les langues» suisse et la formulation non sexiste." *LeGes* 20: 57–70.
- Elmiger, Daniel. 2013. "The government in contact with its citizens: Translations of federal information in multilingual Swiss administration." *Gender & Language* 7: 59–74.
DOI: 10.1558/genl.v7i1.59
- Ferguson, Charles. 1959. "Diglossia." *Word* 15: 325–340.
- Fischer, Ludwig. 1960. *Luzernerdeutsche Grammatik*. Zürich: Schweizer Spiegel Verlag.
- Frank, Karsta. 1992. *Sprachgewalt: Die sprachliche Reproduktion der Geschlechterhierarchie. Elemente einer feministischen Linguistik*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer.
DOI: 10.1515/9783111709109
- Frei, Luise. 1981. *Die Frau: Scherz-, Schimpf- und Spottnamen*. Frauenfeld: Huber.
- Haas, Walter. 2000. "Die deutschsprachige Schweiz." In *Die viersprachige Schweiz*, ed. Robert Schläpfer & Hans Bickel. Aarau: Sauerländer, 57–108.
- Haas, Walter. 2004. "Die Sprachsituation in der deutschen Schweiz und das Konzept der Diglossie." In *Dialekt, Regiolekt und Standardsprache im sozialen und zeitlichen Raum*, ed. Helen Christen. Wien: Edition Praesens, 81–110.

- Haerberlin, Susanna & Rachel Schmid & Eva Lia Wyss. 1992. *Übung macht die Meisterin: Ratschläge für einen nichtsexistischen Sprachgebrauch*. München: Verlag Frauenoffensive.
- Henzen, Walter. 1965. *Deutsche Wortbildung*. 3rd revised and extended edition. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer.
- Hodler, Werner. 1969. *Berndeutsche Syntax*. Bern: Francke.
- Hotzenköcherle, Rudolf. 1984. *Die Sprachlandschaften der deutschen Schweiz*, eds. Niklaus Bigler & Robert Schläpfer. Aarau: Sauerländer.
- Hudson, Alan. 2002. "Outline of a theory of diglossia." *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 157: 1–48. DOI: 10.1515/ijsl.2002.039
- Koch, Peter & Wulf Oesterreicher. 2001. "Gesprochene Sprache und geschriebene Sprache/ Langage parlé et langage écrit." *Lexikon der Romanistischen Linguistik*, Vol. 1.2, eds. Günther Holtus & Michael Metzeltin & Christian Schmitt. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 584–628.
- Köpcke, Klaus-Michael & Klaus-Uwe Panther & David Zubin. 2010. "Motivating grammatical and conceptual gender agreement in German." In *Cognitive foundations of linguistic usage patterns*, eds. Hans-Jörg Schmid & Susanne Handl. Berlin: de Gruyter, 171–194.
- Köpcke, Klaus-Michael & David Zubin. 1997. "Sechs Prinzipien für die Genuszuweisung im Deutschen: Ein Beitrag zur natürlichen Klassifikation." In *Sprache – Genus/Sexus*, ed. Heinz Sieburg. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 86–115.
- Köpcke, Klaus-Michael & David Zubin. 2003. "Metonymic pathways to neuter-gender human nominals in German." In *Metonymy and pragmatic inferencing*, eds. Klaus-Uwe Panther & Linda L. Thornburg. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 149–166. DOI: 10.1075/pbns.113.11kop
- Leisi, Ernst. 1993. *Paar und Sprache. Linguistische Aspekte der Zweierbeziehung*. 4th revised edition. Heidelberg: Quelle & Meyer.
- Lötscher, Andreas. 1983. *Schweizerdeutsch: Geschichte, Dialekte, Gebrauch*. Frauenfeld: Huber.
- Lötscher, Andreas. 1993. *Lappi, Lööli, blöode Siech*. Aarau: Sauerländer.
- Marti, Werner. 1985. *Berndeutsch-Grammatik*. Bern: Francke.
- Nübling, Damaris & Simone Busley & Juliane Drenda (to appear). "Dat Anna und s Eva – Neutrale Frauenrufnamen in deutschen Dialekten und im Luxemburgischen zwischen pragmatischer und semantischer Genuszuweisung." *Zeitschrift für Dialektologie und Linguistik*.
- Odermatt, Esther. 1904. *Die Deminution in der Nidwaldner Mundart*. Zürich: Zürcher & Furrer.
- Peyer, Ann & Eva Lia Wyss. 1998. "'JazzmusikerInnen – weder Asketen noch Müsli-Fifis' – Feministische Sprachkritik in der Schweiz, ein Überblick." *Germanistische Linguistik* 139–140: 117–154.
- Schmidlin, Regula. 2011. *Die Vielfalt des Deutschen: Standard und Variation. Gebrauch, Einschätzung und Kodifizierung einer plurizentrischen Sprache*. Berlin: de Gruyter. DOI: 10.1515/9783110251258
- Schrambke, Renate. 2002. "Dupp und Dottel, Lusch und Lottel. Geschlechtsbezogene sprachliche Varianz bei Schimpfwörtern des südwestdeutschen Sprachraums." In *Geschlechterkonstruktion in Sprache, Literatur und Gesellschaft*, eds. Elisabeth Cheauré & Ortrud Gutjahr & Claudia Schmidt. Freiburg im Breisgau: Rombach, 247–279.
- Schweizerische Bundeskanzlei & Zürcher Hochschule für Angewandte Wissenschaften. 2009. *Geschlechtergerechte Sprache. Leitfaden zum geschlechtergerechten Formulieren im Deutschen*. 2nd completely revised edition. Bern: Schweizerische Bundeskanzlei.
- Schweizerisches Idiotikon. *Wörterbuch der schweizerdeutschen Sprache*. 1881. Frauenfeld: Huber.

-
- Seibicke, Wilfried. 2008. *Die Personennamen im Deutschen*. 2nd ed. Berlin: de Gruyter. DOI: 10.1515/9783110973228
- Szadowski, Manfred. 1918. *Nomina agentis des Schweizerdeutschen in ihrer Bedeutungsentfaltung*. Frauenfeld: Huber.
- Werlen, Iwar. 2004. "Zur Sprachsituation der Schweiz mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Diglossie in der Deutschschweiz." *Bulletin suisse de linguistique appliquée (Bulletin VALS/ASLA)* 79: 1–30.
- Werner, Martina. 2012. *Genus, Derivation und Quantifikation. Zur Funktion der Suffigierung und verwandter Phänomene im Deutschen*. Berlin: de Gruyter. DOI: 10.1515/9783110291902

HUNGARIAN

Gender trouble in a grammatically genderless language: Hungarian

Louise O. Vasvári

Stony Brook University, New York, USA

1. Introduction
2. Categories of gender
 - 2.1 Lexical and referential gender
 - 2.2 Social gender
 - 2.3 Male-specific and generic *ember* 'man'
3. Gender-related structures
 - 3.1 Compounding
 - 3.2 Pronominalization
4. Usage of personal reference forms
 - 4.1 Naming conventions and courtesy titles
 - 4.2 Address terms
 - 4.3 Idioms, proverbs and obscene expressions
5. Language change and language reform
6. Conclusion

References

1. Introduction

The aim of this article is to discuss the apparent genderlessness of Hungarian. The term *gender* is used in linguistics to refer both to a grammatical category – which is often, but not necessarily, connected to femaleness and maleness – and to the lexico-semantic, textual and pragmatic expression of (social) gender and/or (biological) sex. Although many languages in different parts of the world and in various language families do not possess grammatical gender, there is no such thing as a genderless language in the latter sense. Speakers of grammatically genderless languages often believe that their languages are exceptional or even superior compared to grammatical gender languages, as their supposedly genderless

character is seen as an expression of gender equality. However, a lack of grammatical gender does not automatically reflect a (more) gender-neutral society, as already illustrated in earlier volumes of *Gender Across Languages*; cf. Turkish (Braun 2001), Finnish (Engelberg 2002), Chinese (Zhang 2002), and Japanese (Shibamoto-Smith 2003).

Hungarian is a Finno-Ugric language. It is distantly related to the two other Finno-Ugric national languages on European soil, Finnish and Estonian (cf. Hasselblatt, this volume), and to a number of minority languages spoken in Northern Eurasia (e.g. Livonian, Saami). It is the most widely spoken non-Indo-European language in Europe, with approximately thirteen to fourteen million native speakers, of whom about 9.9 million live inside the borders of present-day Hungary, while most of the rest live in adjacent countries, especially in Slovakia, Serbia, and Romania.

Hungarian, and other Uralic languages like Estonian, Finnish and Saami, lack the grammatical and pronominal gender that historically all Indo-European languages in their geographic surrounding possess, or possessed at an earlier stage. Furthermore, Hungarian is a typical Uralic language in other respects besides the lack of grammatical gender. It has word-initial stress and a fairly complex case system. The number of cases specified in Hungarian grammars varies, depending on the criteria for case status. Hungarian has postpositions instead of prepositions and a rich, largely agglutinative morphology (i.e. inflection and derivation, mainly by suffixation). The basic word order is subject-object-verb (SOV) but conditioned by information structure. Personal pronouns are not frequently used in spoken and written Hungarian, which makes Hungarian a pro-drop language. Subject and partly even object personal pronouns can be left out, as these functions are marked on the verb. The definite conjugation is typically used to refer to a third-person object, while the indefinite conjugation is used to refer to a second- or first-person object. For the combination of first-person subject and second-person object, there is a specific suffix as in *szeret-lek* 'I love you' (cf. Abondolo 1998; Kenyesei & Vago & Fenyvesi 1998; Kiss & Tolcsvai-Nagy 1999).

2. Categories of gender

Due to the absence of grammatical gender in Hungarian, femaleness and maleness can only be expressed semantically, mainly through lexically and socially gendered forms (Fazekas 1989; Horvath 2011; Huszár 2011; Kegyes 2008; Kegyesné Szekeres 2007; Kerékjártó & Szili 2005; Laakso 2005; Nagy & Patti 2006; Pete 2000; Puskás-Juhász 1998; Vasvári 2011). As will be shown below, semantically and morphologically gender-neutral human nouns, although they can be

used generically, often carry a hidden cultural gender bias (covert social gender). Moreover, female nouns are often derived from morphologically unmarked male nouns (rather than vice versa).

2.1 Lexical and referential gender

Hungarian has some lexically gendered nouns, namely animal terms (*csődör* ‘stallion’, *kanca* ‘mare’; *gúnár* ‘gander’, *lúd* ‘goose’; *kan* ‘male dog’, *szuka* ‘bitch’; *kakas* ‘rooster’, *tyúk* ‘hen’) and terms for male and female human beings (*férfi* ‘man’, *nő* ‘woman’, *asszony* ‘woman’; *úr* ‘gentleman’, *hölgy* ‘lady’; *fiú* ‘boy, son’, *legény* ‘young man’, *lány* ‘girl, young woman, daughter, virgin’; and the colloquial Roma loans *csávó* ‘guy’, *csaj* ‘gal’, which formerly carried demeaning connotations but are now widely used by younger speakers).

Lexically gendered kinship terminology includes the usual terms for close blood relatives, in-laws and godparents. Within the pair *férj* ‘husband’, *feleség* ‘wife’, the latter term literally means ‘half’. While a husband may refer to his wife as *feleségem* ‘my wife’, a wife may choose the (old-fashioned) form *uram* ‘my lord’ to refer to her husband.

Hungarian originally had no terms denoting ‘brother’ and ‘sister’ but more specific terms, namely *öcs* ‘younger brother’, *báty* ‘older brother, elder relative’, *hug* ‘younger sister’, *nővér* ‘older sister’ (also ‘nurse, nun’). As these are all relational terms and also traditionally used as address terms, they are typically used with possessive suffixes, as in *öcs-ém* ‘my younger brother’. The relatively late formation *testvér* (attested in 1650), which originally meant ‘blood relative’ (lit. ‘body-blood’), underwent semantic narrowing which resulted in the meaning ‘sibling’. The gender-specific compounds *fiútestvér* ‘brother’ (lit. ‘boy sibling’) and *lánytestvér* ‘sister’ (lit. ‘girl sibling’) are marked and are only used when referential gender is emphasized. In the early nineteenth century, when the Hungarian language was standardized and its vocabulary systematically expanded through numerous neologisms, the gender-specific terms *fivér* ‘brother’ (lit. ‘boy blood’) and *leányvér* ‘sister’ (lit. ‘girl blood’) were created on the model of gender-neutral *testvér*, but the female form did not become established. While today the (somewhat archaic) phrase *két fivér* ‘two brothers’ may still be used, Chekov’s play *The Three Sisters* can only be translated as *három nővér* ‘three [older] sisters’.

Like *testvér*, *unoka* ‘grandchild’ is gender-neutral, although *fiúunoka* ‘grandson’ (lit. ‘boy grandchild’) and *lányunoka* ‘granddaughter’ (lit. ‘girl grandchild’) can be used for clarification. Lexically gender-neutral *gyerek* ‘child’ carries male connotations. For example, if one asks *Hány gyereke van?* ‘How many children do you have?’ the answer might be *két gyerek és egy lány* ‘two [male] children and a

girl'. Similarly, *iffú* 'youth, youngster' is socially male, while for a young female the expression *iffú lány* (lit. 'girl youngster') is used.

Hungarian has a handful of Latinate human nouns that form (originally) masculine-feminine pairs ending in *-us* and *-a*, respectively. These are lexicalized, that is, their morphological relationship is not based on a productive word-formation process in Hungarian. Such pairs include *novícius/novícia* 'male/female novice', *komikus/komika* 'male/female comedian', *patrónus/patrona* 'male/female patron', *medikus/medika* 'male/female doctor, physician', *doktorandusz/doktoranda* 'male/female doctoral candidate'. The female form *doktoranda* seems to be gaining ground lately, and *medika* is often found in sexist collocations, such as *a csinos kis medika* 'the cute little female doctor'. While derogatory *hiszterika* 'female hysteric' has no male equivalent, prestigious *akadémikus* 'male academic' has no female corresponding form. There are a few pairs borrowed from English, like *steward/stewardess* (often in Hungarian spelling: *sztevardesz*), in which the female term is used much more frequently and with female-specific collocates, as in *csinos volt a sztevardesz kisasszony* 'the stewardess-miss was cute'.

Lexically male nouns have two referential functions: a male-specific and a generic function. Personal nouns, except for some occupational terms (see 3.1), are mostly gender-neutral: for example, *tanú* 'witness', *polgár* 'citizen', *alkalmazott* 'employee', *jelölt* 'candidate' and *látogató* 'visitor'. Forms like *alkalmazott*, *jelölt*, *látogató* represent nominalized participles or other deverbal nominalizations, which are lexically gender-neutral. In contexts where gender specification is relevant, for example, when seeking a female roommate, the expression *lány szobatárs* (lit. 'girl roommate') may be used. Among the few personal nouns besides occupational terms, which regularly have a female variant is *barát* '(male) friend' > *barátnő* 'girlfriend', but the pair is asymmetrical in its meaning. A man cannot introduce a female friend as *barátnőm* 'my girlfriend', because the assumption then would be that he has a romantic interest in her. To avoid this interpretation, he would have to create a mismatch with the referent's female gender and use the pseudo-generic, male form *barát* together with a de-sexualizing adjectival modifier, saying something like *ez itt egy jó/kedves barátom* 'this here is my good/dear friend'.

Gender stereotyping, collocational restrictions and semantic derogation all function in Hungarian very much as they do in other languages. For example, in the course of the twentieth century, a rich array of humorous and/or derogatory male terms emerged, which all mean 'guy, jock, dude, bloke, sod', and the like. These terms have playful connotations, but none of them classifies men according to their sexual morals or even their age: *alak* lit. 'figure', *ember* 'man', *koma* lit. 'relative by marriage', *pacák* 'fella', *pasas/pasi* 'guy, sod', *pali* lit. 'Paul (diminutive)',

muki ‘toff’, *ipse* lit. ‘self’ (borrowed from Latin), *krapek* ‘bloke’, *tag* lit. ‘member’, *ürge* lit. ‘gopher’, *kan* lit. ‘male (of animals)’, *muksó* lit. ‘cat’, *fickó* fellow’, *manus* lit. ‘(unfortunate) man, victim’, *hapek* ‘guy’, *arc* lit. ‘face’, *fószér* ‘jock’, *fazon* lit. ‘type’, *csóka* lit. ‘jackdaw’, *csákó* lit. ‘busby’, *hap(s)i* ‘dude’, *srác* ‘lad’, *pofa* lit. ‘snout’, *személy* lit. ‘person’, *illető* lit. ‘(person) in question’, *mandró* ‘jock’, *faszi* ‘bloke, cock’. Terms for women, on the other hand, show a preoccupation with their age, marital status, social standing, and/or sexuality: *kishölgy* ‘little lady’, *fiatalasszony*, *menyecske* both ‘young married woman’, *kardos menyecske* ‘bossy young married woman (lit. ‘young woman with sword’), *szépasszony* ‘sexually desirable married/adult woman’, *hölgyemény* ‘young woman who pretends to be a lady but is really a slut’, and many more, including highly insulting ones like *két lábon járó takarítógép* lit. ‘walking cleaning machine’ and *mosogatórongy* lit. ‘dish rag’ (cf. Kegyesné Szekeres 2007).

2.2 Social gender

Social or covert gender describes the fact that lexically gender-neutral personal nouns may be judged to be male or female based on their stereotypical and historical association. For some lexical items, such as *president* and *nurse*, this bias is highly entrenched, while for others, like *doctor* or *teacher*, it has become weakened or, in some cases, even switched from male to female or vice versa (Motschenbacher 2010: 87). Although almost half of the medical doctors in Hungary are female, the lexically gender-neutral terms *orvos* and *doktor* ‘doctor’ are perceived as stereotypically male. The same is true for many nouns denoting experts in a specific medical field such as *onkológus* ‘oncologist’. Female forms of these terms do not exist.

Lexically gender-neutral nouns that are stereotypically female in their association often carry negative connotations (e.g. *locsifecs* ‘chatterbox, gossip’, *pletykafészek* lit. ‘gossip nest’) or denote low-prestige occupations (e.g. *dajka* ‘nanny, nurse’, *dúla* ‘midwife’, or sexually disreputable ones, such as *kurva* ‘prostitute’, and its many synonyms (e.g. *ringyó* ‘tart’, *szuka* ‘bitch’, *szajha* ‘whore’, *ribanc*, *céda*, *cemenda* all ‘slut’, (*vén*) *spiné* ‘whore, madam’). Since *kurva* and its derogatory diminutives *kurvinc* and *kis kurva* (both ‘slut’), are socially female, a male prostitute is a *kan kurva* lit. ‘male (of an animal) prostitute’, or if homosexual, a *köcsög kan kurva* lit. ‘fag male prostitute’. Besides the socially female loan *bébiszitter* ‘babysitter’, there is now a gender-neutral form *gyermekfelügyelő* ‘child supervisor’.

2.3 Male-specific and generic *ember* ‘man’

Related to the problem of the androcentricity of linguistic forms is the male-as-norm bias documented for the attribution of personhood (Hellinger & Bierbach 1993: 3). In Hungarian, this is illustrated, for example, by the noun *ember* ‘man, human being’, which is used similarly to generic *man* in English (see also Braun 1997 on Finnish). Hungarian uses this noun as a pseudo-generic term, sometimes with a clearly male-specific meaning and at other times to denote the human species in general. The latter meaning can be found, for example, in the following collocations: *neandervölgyi ember* ‘Neanderthal man’, *ősember* ‘primitive man’, *átlagember* ‘average man’, *emberi test* ‘man’s body’, *emberáldozat* ‘man sacrifice’, and *emberré válás* ‘man evolution’ (lit. ‘becoming man’). *Ember* is also used as a component of some occupational terms, such as *üzletember* ‘businessman’ (now besides *üzletasszony* ‘business lady’) and *tudományos ember* ‘man of science’. While a term like *szakember* ‘specialist, technician’ can in principle refer to either sex, a *Google* search using this term shows that 49 of the top fifty hits refer to males. Similarly, an image search on *Google* retrieves exclusively male pictures. Both positively connotated *nagydarab ember* ‘strapping fellow’ and negatively connotated *gazember* ‘scoundrel’ (lit. ‘weed man’) are male-specific, and so are the age-related terms *fiatalember* ‘young man’, *özvegyember* ‘widower’, *öregember* ‘old man’. The verb *megemberesedik*, which contains *ember* as its root, means ‘to become a man’ and not ‘to become human’. Other male-specific forms include *tanult ember* ‘learned man’, *tisztességes ember* ‘honorable man’, and *magyar ember* ‘Hungarian man’, all of which have corresponding female forms in which *nő* ‘woman’ is used instead of *ember*. While *jó ember* ‘good man’ most often refers to a male person, but occasionally also to a woman, the female corresponding form *jó nő* lit. ‘good woman’ means a ‘sexually desirable woman’.

Hungarian has two ways to express the impersonal: a third person plural construction (e.g. *azt mondják, hogy* ‘they say that’) or a construction with *ember*, as in *az ember nem gondolná, hogy* ‘one would not think that’. The latter is a grammaticalized form of *ember*, its meaning being that of an indefinite pronoun (‘one’). Such a grammaticalization process which turns lexically male nouns into indefinite pronouns is common across European languages (cf. German *Mann* ‘man’ < *man* ‘one’ or French *homme* ‘man’ < *on* ‘one’).

According to etymological dictionaries (for example, Benkö 1967), *ember* is originally a compound consisting of two lexically gendered roots, Finno-Ugric **emä* ‘mother’ and *-ber* ‘man’. Two further gender-specific compounds containing *ember* have evolved. The compound *jámbor* consists of *jó* ‘good’ and *ember*. Originally, it meant ‘decent man’, but today it denotes a ‘guileless, pious man’. The

form *néember* (containing *nő* and *ember*, lit. ‘woman man’) originally meant ‘adult woman’ and has acquired sexual connotations, meaning ‘wench’.

3. Gender-related structures

In Hungarian gender is mainly expressed lexically, but also morphologically, primarily in female occupational terms, although the productivity of such forms has been in flux, both since the Soviet takeover and the post-1989 change to a market economy, as will be illustrated below.

3.1 Compounding

Since in Hungarian many lexically gender-neutral nouns are socially male, normally there is no need to specifically mark them as male. There are no derivational suffixes to do so, but one occasionally finds lexically male elements as part of compounds, for example, *-ember* ‘man’ (see 2.3), *-férfi* ‘man’, and, more rarely, *-bácsi* ‘uncle, older male’ (e.g. *takarítóember* ‘cleaning man’, *tanítóbácsi* ‘male elementary school teacher’, lit. ‘teacher uncle’). Such compounds are often male forms corresponding to low-prestige female occupational terms, which are more common, such as *takarítónő* ‘cleaning woman’ and *tanítónéni* ‘female elementary school teacher’ (lit. ‘teacher aunt’), but may also occur in the lexical field of more prestigious professions (e.g. *államférfi*, *államember*, both ‘statesman’, without any female equivalent).

Female occupational terms are generally created through compounding, i.e. by adding *-nő* ‘woman’ or, more rarely, *-asszony* ‘woman’ or *-lány* ‘girl’. Their acceptability may depend on the context, for example, on the specific community of practice in which they are used. Some but not all occupational terms allow for female forms (e.g. *orvos* ‘doctor, physician’, *orvosnő* ‘female physician’, lit. ‘doctor woman’; *tanár* ‘teacher’, *tanárnő* ‘female teacher’, lit. ‘teacher woman’). The morphologically marked female forms are generally used for female reference, while the unmarked forms are used for generic reference. In this respect, Hungarian does not significantly differ from grammatically gendered languages such as Polish (Koniuszaniec & Błaszowska 2003).

There are three forms that can historically be traced back to the noun *nő* ‘woman’: (1) the compound-element *-nő* (see examples above), (2) the relational suffix *-né*, as in *Kovácsné* ‘the [wife] of Kovács’, a form further discussed under naming conventions (Section 4.1), and (3) the adjective *női* ‘female’ which can be placed before a noun, as in *női vadász* ‘female hunter’, *női esztergályos* ‘female

wood turner'. The adjectival construction is mainly used with occupational terms denoting professions in which women are unusual, which rules out forms like **esztergályosnő*. With some lexemes, several *nő*-related formations are possible. For example, the noun *doktor* can be turned into *doktornő* 'female doctor' (lit. 'doctor woman') and *nődoktor* 'gynecologist' (lit. 'woman doctor'). When the context necessitates talking about a female gynecologist, *nődoktor* cannot be feminized, i.e. in this case an alternative noun is used and premodified by an adjective: *nő[i] nőgyógyász* 'female gynecologist'.

Compounding with *-nő* cannot be considered productive, although it occurs with many non-prestige terms, for which a male-specific corresponding form often does not exist. However, compounds with *-nő* are usually marked. They may be perceived as "too political" (cf. *írónő* 'female writer'), sound downright bizarre (*költőnő* 'female poet', lit. 'poet woman') or may be unacceptable (as in **tolmácsnő* 'female interpreter'). Examples of low-prestige female occupational terms with *-nő* for which no gender-neutral form exists are *fejőnő* 'milking woman', *mosónő* 'laundress', and *bejárónő* 'female daily help (in a private home)', with no equivalent **fejő*, **mosó* or **bejáró*. For the job of a 'housekeeper', both a lexically gender-neutral noun (*házvezető*) and a female compound *házvezetőnő* are available, but neither is used to refer to male housekeepers. A 'female nurse' can be called *nővér* (lit. 'older sister') or *ápolónő* (lit. 'nurse woman'), while for a male referent one could use the lexically gender-neutral *ápoló* 'nurse', but *férfi ápoló* 'male nurse' is more common. Moreover, one finds humorous phrases denoting 'male nurse' which represent combinations of lexically male and female forms (e.g. *bajszos nővér* lit. 'moustached nurse', *Peti nővér* lit. 'Pete nurse'). Male forms corresponding to *óvónő* 'female kindergarten teacher' do not exist. Forms like **óvóférfi* or **óvóember* 'male kindergarten teacher' are unacceptable, and the term *óvóbácsi* 'male kindergarten teacher' (lit. 'kindergarten uncle') has a specific, pseudo-intimate connotation. Both genders can be referred to with the alternative term *óvopedagógus* lit. 'kindergarten pedagogue', but de facto this term is in the singular far more often applied to males and, in the plural, to the profession as a whole.

For titles of nobility, there are no lexically female roots, but *-nő* is added to the male form, hence *király* 'king', *királynő* 'queen' (lit. 'king woman') or *báró* 'baron', *bárónő* 'baroness' (lit. 'baron woman'). Kálmán (2013), who has suggested that female occupational terms with *-nő* may have been modelled on titles like *királynő*, found the first attestations of *színésznő* 'actress' and *takarítónő* 'cleaning woman' in the nineteenth century but conjectures that such compounds originated earlier. There is a difference between *királynő* '(ruling) queen' and *királyné* 'wife of a king', the first category being almost unknown in the history of Hungary, as the ruling queens in Hungarian history, Mary of the House of Anjou and Maria Theresia,

were designated with a masculine Latin noun as *rex Hungariae* (as opposed to feminine *regina*).

Although occupational terms are generally feminized with *-nő*, once we consider high-status professions, complications arise. For example, the form *tanárnő* ‘female teacher’ is restricted to secondary school teachers. At higher educational levels, female specification is clearly less common. Women working in tertiary education are mostly referred to with lexically gender-neutral (but socially male) nouns like *egyetemi tanár* ‘university teacher’ or *professzor* ‘professor’. If a female-specific form is needed, *tanárnő* may be used in informal contexts, while in more formal situations a phrase like *professzor asszony* lit. ‘professor woman’ is more likely to be used (see also Koniuszaniec & Błaszczowska 2003: 168 on Polish).

As has just been indicated, some nouns do not add *-nő*, but *-asszony* ‘woman, lady’, a form that is primarily used for prestige professions and in direct address (*professzor asszony*), but also occasionally to euphemistically refer to low-level positions, often those that are stereotypically associated with older women (e.g. *takarító asszony* ‘cleaning lady’ instead of the more common form *takarítónő* ‘cleaning woman’; *parasztasszony* ‘peasant woman’, *bábaasszony* ‘midwife’). Compare also the traditional form *szakácsnő* ‘female cook’ versus the newer prestige coinage *séf asszony* lit. ‘chef lady’. Other female compounds contain the component *-hölgy* ‘lady’, as in *rendőr hölgy* ‘police lady’ (instead of *rendőrnő* ‘police woman’) or *ügyintézőhölgy* ‘clerk lady’. The noun *hölgy* is considered just as much a demeaning genteelism by Hungarian feminists as its English equivalent (Cameron 1995: 46). On the other hand, Dede (2008) shows that women advertising for romantic partners often euphemistically prefer to call themselves *hölgy* rather than *nő*. Some non-prestige occupational terms contain *-lány* ‘girl’, as in *traktoroslány* (lit. ‘tractor driver girl’), *(ki)szolgálólány* (lit. ‘servant girl’), *utcalány* (lit. ‘street girl’) or *katonalány* (lit. ‘soldier girl’). The now old-fashioned form *kisasszony* ‘Miss, young lady’, as in *gépirókisasszony* (lit. ‘typist miss’), *tanítókisasszony* (lit. ‘teacher miss’) or *postáskisasszony* (lit. ‘post office clerk miss’), is used for occupations in which women were first employed outside the household or sex work.

We can see the complexity of the feminization of occupational terms by reading the text of a fashion ad in which a female fashion designer, Anikó Németh, uses seven female occupational terms to highlight that she is designing for all types of women: *business women* (borrowed from English), *traktoroslányok* (lit. ‘tractor operator girls’, an ironic reference to socialist gender ideologies), *titkárnők* (lit. ‘secretary women’), *brókernők* (lit. ‘broker women’), *orvosok* ‘doctors’ (a lexically gender-neutral, even though the female form with *-nő* is also available), *országgyűlési képviselők* (‘members of parliament’, lexically gender-neutral), and *Magyarország első miniszterelnökasszonya* (lit. ‘Hungary’s first prime minister lady’, a form that so far has not had a real-life referent).

The list above contains two compounds with the most common and hence unmarked component *-nő*, one with *-lány* ‘girl’, used to refer jocularly to a female tractor driver, one with *-asszony* ‘woman, lady’, a form used honorifically with high-level professions, in this case for a non-existent female prime minister. Among the two compounds with *-nő*, *titkárnő* ‘female secretary’ must obligatorily be marked as female to distinguish it from socially male *titkár* ‘state secretary’, and that unmarked form would also have to be used for a female state secretary. The form *bróker* ‘broker’ has. Of the two lexically gender-neutral occupational terms, the first one, *orvos* ‘doctor’, could theoretically be feminized by adding *-nő*, while the second, *képviselő* ‘representative’, could theoretically be feminized by adding *-asszony*. However, in this context there is no need to feminize them, and, in fact, a Hungarian reader would probably find such a list with each and every item feminized bizarre.

Similarly, preceded by a female name, female professional terms would also seem redundant and are therefore avoided, as in *Hosszu Katinka sportoló* ‘Katinka Hosszu athlete’, *az ex-miniszter Lévai Katalin* ‘the former minister, Katalin Levai’, or *Szabo Ildiko fodrász* ‘Ildiko Szabo hairdresser’ (although the great majority of hairdressers is female). With some prestigious, socially male professions, feminization is also impossible, as in *Pandi Ildikó kutatómérnök-biológus* ‘Ildiko Pandi research engineer-biologist’.

Hungarian female terms for ‘author’ are particularly problematic. When referring to a female author, any of the following forms can be used: *író**nő* (lit. ‘writer woman’), *nőíró* (lit. ‘woman writer’), *női író* (lit. ‘female writer’, which is ambiguous and may also mean ‘writer who writes about women’), and *író* (lit. ‘writer’, lexically gender-neutral). For a female poet, by contrast, only the lexically gender-neutral noun *költő* ‘poet’ is available, as the potential female forms *költő**nő* (lit. ‘poet woman’) and *női költő* (lit. ‘female poet’) would sound bizarre and potentially demeaning. Recently, the feminist writer and activist Anna Lovas Nagy referred to herself in an interview as both *író**nő* and *női szerző* ‘female author’. Another feminist writer, Noémi Kiss, was recently referred to as *író, két gyermek anyukája* ‘writer, the mommy of two children’. Finally, when asked about the meaning of the title of a recent book by Anna Borgos and Judit Szilágyi, *Nőírók és írónők* (lit. ‘woman writers and writer women’; Borgos & Szilágyi 2011), Borgos replied that for her the female first component in the first compound places more emphasis on femaleness, while in the second compound the focus is more on *író* ‘writer’. Borgos added that other writers using these terms have sometimes understood these distinctions in the opposite way. What is evident from these usage

examples is that each of the variants is connected to different values and attitudes and none of them can be employed in a value-neutral fashion.

3.2 Pronominalization

As discussed above, Hungarian is a pro-drop language. Personal pronouns are not widely used and occur mainly in contexts of emphasis and in direct address. Unlike in English, which has gender-specific third person singular pronouns, Hungarian shows no pronominal gender distinction whatsoever, that is, even in the third person there are only gender-neutral pronouns: *ő* 's/he', *ők* 'they'. The idea of gendered pronouns is so alien to Hungarian that even highly proficient speakers of English are likely to confuse *he* and *she* (see also Irmen & Knoll 1999 for a study on German-speaking Finns).

The advantage of having only gender-neutral third person pronouns is that there is no male generic pronoun (such as generic *he* in English). On the other hand, the lack of gendered third person pronouns also means that, in the case of pronominal reference, inverted appellation practices for purposes of gender deconstruction are not possible in Hungarian (Motschenbacher 2010: 81).

Kegyés (2008: 76) discusses an interesting example of the challenges involved in translating English gendered third person pronouns into Hungarian: The title of the book *He says, she says* cannot be meaningfully translated in a gender-neutral fashion as **Ő mondja, ő mondja* 'S/he says, s/he says' and has to be extended to *A férfi ezt mondja, a nő meg azt mondja* 'The man says this, the woman says that', which adds an antagonistic meaning that in the English version is only implied. On the other hand, the Hungarian poet András Gerevich claims that the genderless pronoun *ő* allowed him to write with playful ambiguity, but when his homoerotic love poetry was translated into English, the translator, George Szirtes, had to ask him how to translate some of the third person pronouns (András Gerevich, personal communication; cf. Vasvári 2006: 7).

A fascinating historical anecdote about Hungarian third person pronouns and language ideology is that during the Hungarian language reform, whose most intense period was between 1790 and the 1820s, there were reformers who sought to create a female third person pronoun to make up for what they felt was a lack of the Hungarian language vis-à-vis German. Ferencz Kazinczy (1795–1831), a cultural policymaker and the leading figure of the Hungarian language reform, referred to this proposal as the 'feminization' (*nőstényítés*) of the Hungarian language for purposes of "elevating" it to the level of European models (Dömötör 2006).

4. Usage of personal reference forms

4.1 Naming conventions and courtesy titles

Because proper names, as part of the linguistic inventory of a society, provide a lot of information on political and gender ideologies, it is worthwhile to look at Hungarian naming conventions, and particularly at the complex and changing system of last names for married women (Domonkosi 2002; Fercsik 2010; Raátz 2008). Hungarian is the only national language in Europe to use the order of last name before first name. As late as in the nineteenth century, it was customary for married women to be called by their original family name, but from the introduction of naming laws in 1895 under the Habsburg rule to 1951, all women, with the exception of some artists, had to use their husband's last name and optionally his first name, with *-né* 'wife of' appended to it (e.g. *Kis (János)né* 'Mrs (John) Kis'). In such a relational naming system the wife becomes invisible, her first name being known only to her intimates, and there is also no clear way to address her directly. Women who were wives of functionaries or professionals could be referred to or publicly addressed using a term denoting the husband's profession and *-né* (e.g. *mérnökne* 'Mrs engineer'), while wives of men with lower-status jobs were only occasionally addressed in this way (as in *házmesterné* 'Mrs concierge'), but such relational address titles are now disappearing. Until their use was forbidden under state socialism, there also existed a complex system of honorific address terms for gentlemen and ladies of higher rank, such as *méltóságos asszony/úr* 'your ladyship/lordship' or *nagyságos asszony/úr* 'honorable lady/gentleman'. The honorific naming of the wife of an important functionary can sound highly pretentious, as in *a profeszorné asszony* (lit. 'the Mrs professor lady') versus *a professzor asszony* (lit. 'the professor lady'), if she is a professor herself.

Should a wife become widowed, she is referred to as *özvegy Kis Jánosné* 'widowed Mrs John Kis'. Although *özvegy* 'widow(er)' is lexically gender-neutral, a widowed male cannot become **özvegy Kis János* (lit. 'widow(er) John Kis'). From 1953 onwards, under state socialism, women could choose to append their maiden name to their marital name (*Kisné Nagy Mária*) or to keep their maiden name, but few did so. In 1973, another option was added, namely to use the husband's last name but the woman's own first name (*Kis Mária*). This naming practice made women's marital status non-transparent, since such a marital name is formally indistinguishable from a maiden name. In spite of all these options, today more than half of Hungarian women still choose to use the traditional *-né* system and only 14% use either of the two more modern forms (Fercsik 2010). A study of female teachers showed that almost half of them chose the form *Kisné (Dr.)*

Nagy Mária, which is not surprising since the more educated and the more urban a woman is, the more likely she is to retain her own surname instead of or in addition to her husband's name. A woman with a professional title like *Dr.* can only put *Dr.* in front of her own name, given that in front of her husband's last name (*Dr. Kis Jánosné*) the title would be taken to be his, while she is perceived as the wife of Dr. Kis (although there is also the less common option *Kiss Jánosné dr.*, where the placement of the title after the woman's relational name indicates that it belongs to her). For ethnically Hungarian women living in Slovakia, the situation is even more complicated, as they have been obliged to use a family names derived from male names with the suffix *-ova*, a situation that is only gradually changing (Misad 2012). Since 2004 men have also been legally allowed to take on their wife's last name or a hyphenated combination of the spouses' last names. Couples must declare in their marriage application which names they and their potential children will use. Same-sex couples cannot marry in Hungary and so have none of these options.

Hungarian given names are equally interesting. There is a rich group of female first names, many derived from male names. In Hungary, given names must be chosen from official lists, although parents can apply for an approval of other names. Since the nineteenth century, both real and fictitious old Hungarian personal names have been revived, such as male *Ákos*, *Árpád*, *Attila*, *Béla*, *Géza*, *Gyula*, *Zoltán*, *Zsolt* (names of historical or mythical heroes) and female *Etelka*, *Csilla*, *Tünde* (lit. 'Fairy'), *Gyöngyi* (lit. 'Little Pearl'). Such names are generally not gender transparent to non-Hungarians. For example, many male Hungarian names ending in *-a* may be mistaken for female names.

Names given to children used to be inherited from parents or godparents, with the boys' names following this tradition far more often than girls' names. Due to an increasingly liberal naming legislation, many new names have entered the language, but both the number and diversity of female names is far greater, including newly created names (*Tavaszk(a)*, lit. '(Little) Spring'), originally plant names (*Boglárka* 'Buttercup'), diminutives (*Katica* 'Little Katie'), French diminutives (*Zsüliett*), and especially Western-sounding names like *Szandra*, *Kimberli*, *Dzsesszika*, all of which must be written with Hungarian spelling. While for the last few decades, there has been a greater variety of new names for women, only two main categories exist for new male names: English names like *Brendon* and *Szkott*, and (pseudo-)Hungarian historical names.

Raátz (2011) studied the motivations of self-attributed Hungarian e-mail nicknames and found that, although nicknames are created by users to hide their real names, they still tend to reflect such characteristic features as their gender identity. Many men keep their names or a variant of it or choose a nickname that

conveys some aspect of stereotypical masculinity (*motorlaci* ‘motor Laci’, *Laci* being the typical hypocoristic form of the ever-popular male given name *László*), while women tend to express stereotypically female characteristics such as beauty, kindness, niceness and goodness in their nicknames. References to sexuality are very common among the young, mostly in the shape of the English adjective *sexy* (e.g. *sexyboy24*, *sexylány* ‘sexy girl’, *szexycicus* ‘sexy kitten’, *sexypasi* ‘sexy guy’). However, the expression of non-heterosexual identities (*transzveszcica* ‘transvest-kitty’) remains rare. Particularly frequent is the expression of female identity by means of the genital terms *cica* and *cicus* (both ‘pussy’), as for example in *cicanyu-szi* ‘pussybunny’ and *cicapicsa* ‘pusyscunt’.

4.2 Address terms

Asymmetry in address forms is one of the salient ways that reflect social hierarchies. Hungarian has a complex address term system with multiple levels of politeness, which shows various forms of gender asymmetry (Sólyom 2011). The formerly obligatory communist address terms *elvtárs* ‘comrade’ and *elvtársnő* lit. ‘comrade woman’ have disappeared and been replaced by the older forms *úr* ‘lord, sir’ and *úrnő* ‘lady’ (lit. ‘lordwoman’). The female term is mainly restricted to stylized writing, so while a man can be addressed, for example, as *Kis úr* (lit. ‘Kis sir’) or *Mérnök úr!* (lit. ‘engineer sir’), addressing a female person with the female equivalent address term *úrnő* is problematic. Some older people might address a woman as *asszonyom/hölgyem* ‘my lady’ (without her name) or with a relational name as *Mérnökné* ‘Mrs engineer’ (in the sense of ‘wife of engineer’), but these forms are falling out of use. If she happens to be a minister, she can be called *miniszter asszony* (lit. ‘minister lady’), but *asszony* ‘woman, lady’ can only be used with prestige professions. So, ultimately, *Kisné Nagy Éva* cannot be addressed appropriately: *Kisné* is too rude, as it has no honorific; *Éva* is both condescending and too intimate; and *asszonyom* is too old-fashioned.

Male speakers also have a greater repertoire of non-reciprocal address forms for females. Particularly condescending and patronizing is men’s practice of habitually using endearing forms to address women (and even professional female colleagues), such as the diminutive form of a woman’s first name in combination with a possessive (e.g. *Évikém* ‘my little Eva’). Even more condescending is the exclusively male-to-female address with *magácska* ‘little you’, in which the diminutive clashes with the formal address form *maga*.

4.3 Idioms, proverbs and obscene expressions

In Hungarian one of the most common idioms is *azt se tudtam fiú vagyok-e, vagy lány* ‘I didn’t even know if I was a boy or a girl’, which is used to express that one was absolutely confused. Another proverb, related to the discussion of *ember* ‘man, human being’ in Section 2.3, is *a sör nem alkohol, a tészta/krumpli nem étel, az asszony nem ember* ‘beer is not alcohol, pasta/potatoes is not a meal, and a woman is not human’ (with another variant ending in *a tót nem ember* ‘Slovaks are not human’). In addition, there are various verbal expressions denoting ‘to marry’, but their literal meanings differ, depending on who the subject is. For couples, the verb *összeházasodni* lit. ‘to get housed together’ is used. When a woman marries, she lit. ‘goes to the husband’ (*férjhez megy*), whereas a man lit. ‘takes [the woman] for his half’ (*feleségül veszi*).

Hungarian proverbs in general express the same negative evaluations of women from a stereotypically male point of view as documented for many other European languages (for additional proverbs, see Kegyes 2004):

- (1) *Higgy az asszonynépnek, mint az áprilisi időjárásnak.*
‘Believe womenfolk as [you would] April weather.’
- (2) *Vénlány az ősz.*
‘Autumn is an old maid.’
- (3) *Hosszú haj, rövid ész.*
‘Long hair, short brains.’
- (4) *A nőnek hallgass a neve.*
‘A woman’s name is shut up.’
- (5) *Lónak, asszonynak hinni nem lehet.*
‘A horse or a woman cannot be believed.’
- (6) *KöszönjeteK ludak, én is asszony vagyok.*
‘Say hello, geese, I, too, am a woman.’ (with a play on *lúd* ‘goose’ also meaning ‘silly/loose woman’)
- (7) *Egy lúd, két asszony egész vásár.*
‘One goose and two women make a market.’
- (8) *Három asszony egy vásár.*
‘Three women make a market.’
- (9) *Hogy minden nő kurva, aligha szorul bizonyításra.*
‘That every woman is a whore hardly needs to be proven.’

- (10) *Legjobb főzelék a hús, a legfinomabb gyümölcs a pálinka, legszebb bútor az asszony.*
 ‘The best vegetable stew is meat, the tastiest fruit is brandy, the nicest piece of furniture is a woman.’

Some proverbs even convey misogynist messages by explicitly promoting the taming of women through beating:

- (11) *A pénz számolva/olvasva, az asszony verve jó.*
 ‘Money is best counted and a woman is best beaten.’
- (12) *A dió törve, az asszony verve jó.*
 ‘Nuts are best cracked and women are best beaten.’
- (13) *Diófának, számárnak, asszonyemberek verve veszik hasznát.*
 ‘Nut trees, donkeys and womenfolk are most useful when beaten.’

Particularly interesting are proverbs, always sexual in nature, in which, because of the lack of a gendered third person pronoun in Hungarian, the gender of the social actor is not evident, even though it is obvious that the proverb can only refer to women, as in:

- (14) *Viszket a talpa.*
 ‘The soles of [her] feet are itching.’ (an indirect way of expressing that a woman is ready for sexual intercourse; cf. also the more vulgar expression *viszket a puncija/picsája* ‘her pussy/cunt is itching’)
- (15) *Eltört a kisbögere.*
 ‘The little jug broke.’ (an indirect way of saying that a girl lost her virginity)

In Hungarian, mothers are the only women who may be seen in a more positive light:

- (16) *Jó asszony a háznak a koronája.*
 ‘A good woman is the crown of the home.’
- (17) *Egy anya el tud tartan tíz gyermeket, de tíz gyermek nem tud eltartani egy anyát.*
 ‘One mother can support ten children but ten children cannot support one mother.’

On the other hand, misogynist mother-related insults, also attested in many other languages, are extremely common in Hungarian. These vulgarisms employ various forms of obscenity and sacrilege, as in (*baszd meg*) *a (kurva) anyádat* ‘(fuck) your (whore) mother’ and its numerous variants (e.g. *baszd meg az anyád kurva istenét* lit. ‘fuck your mother’s whore god’; *kurva isten* ‘whore god’ is a common expletive).

5. Language change and language reform

While in 2005 linguistic feminization as part of the gender mainstreaming initiative promoted by UNESCO, the United Nations, and the European Union was well under way in a number of European countries, Kegyesné Szekeres (2005) reports that in Hungary, which had joined the European Union in 2004, the establishment of feminization practices was only beginning (see also Soukup 2009). Kegyesné Szekeres questioned that languages with very different linguistic systems can follow the same set of EU Guidelines to achieve greater linguistic visibility of women and suggested the following strategies as far as the usage of Hungarian address terms is concerned: (1) use of the wife's first name in combination with the husband's last name, or maiden name retention (chosen only by a small minority of women); (2) feminization of occupational titles, which is deemed preferable to the use of lexically gender-neutral, but socially male titles such as *képviselő* 'representative' or *miniszter* 'minister'; (3) splitting of address terms, which is common for polite address forms like *hölgyeim és uraim* 'ladies and gentlemen', but should be expanded, as in the following examples, which are common in official documents:

- (18) *kedves kolléganő, kedves kolléga*
(lit. 'dear colleague woman, dear colleague')
- (19) *tisztelt igazgató úr/asszony*
(lit. 'dear director sir/lady')
- (20) *tisztelt képviselő úr/asszony*
(lit. 'dear representative sir/lady')
- (21) *tisztelt elnök úr/asszony*
(lit. 'dear president sir/lady');

(4) abbreviated splitting in writing, modelled on German forms such as *ProfessorInnen* 'female and male professors' but still highly uncommon (e.g. *kedves kollégaNő* 'dear female or male colleague', or *tisztelt képviselőúrNő* 'honored female or male representative'), and (5) extension of the use of forms like *Edit asszony* (lit. 'Edith lady'), which were formerly used only for high-status women, to reference to ordinary women (a practice which is so far not well established). All of these strategies are so marginally used in Hungarian that they have not provoked hostile reactions against language reform (as has been the case with German).

In 2009, the Hungarian version of the *European Parliament's Guidelines on Linguistic Gender Equality* was published (European Parliament 2009). The recommendations in these guidelines remain far behind those of Kegyesné Szekeres

four years earlier. The anonymous authors, apparently unaware of covert gender bias in grammatically genderless languages, start by declaring that achieving linguistic gender equality in Hungarian is much easier than in languages with grammatical gender because words like *ember* ‘man, human being’ or *polgár* ‘citizen’ apply to everyone, and therefore female forms should only be used when reference is made to a specific female person, as in *az Európai Unió első női elnöke* ‘the first female president of the European Union’. Moreover, the guidelines suggest avoiding gender-split forms in Hungarian, because splitting is repetitive and the lexically gender-neutral terms apply to both genders.

Today job advertisements may use one of the following lexically gender-neutral alternatives in order to avoid the gendering of low-status occupations: *üzemi takarító* (lit. ‘works cleaner’), *takarító állást kínál* (‘offers cleaning job’), *tisztaságért felelős munkatárs* (‘colleague responsible for cleaning’) or *keresünk takarító munkaerő munkatársakat* (‘we seek colleagues for the cleaning labor force’). When looking at several hundred job ads online, one finds that almost all use gender-neutral expressions, which are generally understood as socially male, with few exceptions such as *szobalány* ‘parlor maid’, *dajka* ‘baby nurse’ and the English loans *hostess* and *babysitter*.

In general, there are two main remedial strategies: degendering (or gender neutralization) and engendering (or feminization). The first is generally preferred for languages without a grammatical masculine-feminine distinction such as English. For languages that have such a distinction, like the Romance languages and German, feminization is generally preferred. As Hungarian lacks grammatical gender, it might be expected that neutralization is the preferred strategy for this language, as in the striking example *Kiss Noémi, író es két kisgyerek anyukája* ‘Noémi Kiss, writer and mommy of two kids’, in which a lexically gender-neutral but strongly socially male noun (*író*) is combined with a lexically female form. This was dramatically highlighted in the Hungarian Parliament, when a law relating to doctors specializing in family care was being discussed and several speakers pointed out that the sentence *az orvos terhessége esetén* ‘in the case of the doctor being pregnant’ in fact contains a gender mismatch due to the strong male social bias of *orvos* ‘doctor’. Therefore, what a linguistic study of such a grammatically genderless language as Hungarian shows is, as Laakso (2005:161) stated it for Finno-Ugric languages more broadly, “how covert gender works in an overtly genderless language.”

6. Conclusion

Since cultures associated with languages that lack grammatical gender are not automatically less androcentric, it is surprising to read that Mühlhäusler and Harré, authors of a linguistic account of pronominal gender in English, lament that they

[...] have not been able to find any work devoted to the question of whether there are sexist assumptions built into languages that do not have grammatical, and hence neither natural nor conventional gender, such as Hungarian. [...] we can only deplore the lack of research into the psycho-linguistics of sex-marking in a culture as close to ours as Hungary. (Mühlhäusler & Harré 1990: 238)

More research on grammatically genderless languages is indeed needed, especially because language and gender research arising from Western feminist theory has concentrated on Indo-European languages. But for linguists to expect to find less androcentricity in such languages is too optimistic. Even in languages possessing grammatical gender, much gender trouble can be found on the level of lexical gender, for example, when dictionaries, newspapers, etc. perpetuate linguistic sexism by not accepting female forms of many occupational terms (Gervais-le-Garff 2002; Hampares 1976). Even in languages as closely related to one another as the Romance languages, there are enormous differences both in the manifestations of linguistic sexism and linguistic reforms. Compare, for example, linguistically tradition-bound France with more innovative Belgium, Switzerland, and especially Québec, where authorities have been proactive in advocating feminization since the mid-seventies, or conservative Hungary with relatively gender-equal Finland (Engelberg 2002: 2; Tainio 2006). In other words, the differences are not exclusively caused by language typology but partly also by varying local language ideologies.

In a recent study which compared the status of gender equality in 111 countries, Prewitt-Freilino et al. (2011; cf. also Everett 2011) concluded that countries associated with grammatical gender languages on average exhibit the lowest levels of gender equality, while countries associated with pronominal gender languages showed the highest level. Countries in which languages without grammatical and pronominal gender distinctions are used fell in the middle range, maybe because they do not provide gender-symmetrical split (but rather lexically gender-neutral) forms. On the other hand, numerous gender association tests using terms denoting specific occupations and social roles have led to similar results for grammatically gendered and genderless languages (e.g. Heise 2000; Hellinger 1990: 105–115; Hellinger & Bußmann 2001: 10; Irmen & Kurovskaia 2010; Tóth 2007). While socially male bias in lexically gender-neutral personal nouns can

be said to be a reflection of originally male-dominated fields, the tenacity of this bias can only be explained by a tendency to perceive male human beings as the prototype of humanity.

Whether languages without grammatical gender might provide more possibilities for egalitarian and gender-neutral expression is a question that Hellinger and Bußmann (2001:20) raise in the Introduction to *Gender across languages*, while Braun (2001) states in her contribution on Turkish that in grammatically genderless languages it is more difficult to challenge covert male bias. On the basis of my own finding that the lack of grammatical gender does not make Hungarian a more gender-neutral language, I strongly support Braun's conclusion.

References

- Abondolo, Daniel. 1998. "Hungarian." In *The Uralic languages*, ed. Daniel Abondolo. London: Routledge, 428–456.
- Benkő, Loránd. 1967. *A magyar nyelv történeti-etimológiai szótára* [The historical Hungarian etymological dictionary], Vol. 1. Budapest: Akadémia Kiadó.
- Borgos, Anna & Judit Szilágyi. 2011. *Női írók és írónők: Irodalmi szerepek a Nyugatban* [Female writers and writer women: Literary roles in 'Nyugat' (The West)]. Budapest: Norán.
- Braun, Friederike. 1997. "Making men out of people. The MAN principle in translating genderless forms." In *Communicating gender in context*, eds. Helga Kotthoff & Ruth Wodak. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 3–29. DOI: 10.1075/pbns.42.03bra
- Braun, Friederike. 2001. "Turkish: The communication of gender in Turkish." In *Gender across languages. The linguistic representation of women and men*, vol. 1, eds. Marlis Hellinger & Hadumod Bußmann. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 283–310. DOI: 10.1075/impact.9.17bra
- Cameron, Deborah. 1995. *Verbal hygiene*. New York: Routledge.
- Dede, Éva. 2008. "Wie verwandelt sich die Frau in Dame? Selbstbezeichnung der Frauen in ungarischen Partnerschaftsanzeigen." In *Genderbilder aus Ungarn. Ergebnisse der ungarischen Genderforschung*, eds. Erika Kegyes & Ágnes Huszar. Hamburg: Dr. Kovač, 91–106.
- Domonkosi, Ágnes. 2002. *Megszólítások és beszédpartnerre utaló elemek nyelvhasználatunkban* [Address forms and other elements in our linguistic usage]. Debrecen: Debreceni Nyelvtudományi Intézet.
- Dömötör, Adrienne. 2006. "A nyelvújítás [Language reform]." In *Magyar nyelv*, ed. Ferenc Kiefer. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 385–400.
- Engelberg, Mila. 2002. "The communication of gender in Finnish." In *Gender across languages. The linguistic representation of women and men*, vol. 2, eds. Marlis Hellinger & Hadumod Bußmann. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 109–132. DOI: 10.1075/impact.10.11eng
- European Parliament. 2009. *A nemek szempontjából semleges nyelvhasználat az Európai Parlamentben* [The gender-neutral language use in the European Parliament]. http://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/publications/2009/0001/P6_PUB%282009%290001_HU.pdf [13 August 2014].

- Everett, Caleb. 2011. "Gendered pronouns and thought: The ligature between epicene pronouns and a more neutral gender perception." *Gender and Language* 5(1): 133–152.
DOI: 10.1558/genl.v5i1.133
- Fazekas, Tiborc. 1989. "Sexusbezogenheit in einer Sprache, die kein Genus kennt (Ungarisch)." In *Semiotik der Geschlechter. Akten des 6. Symposiums der Österreichischen Gesellschaft für Semiotik*, eds. Jeff Bernard & Theresia Klugsberger. Stuttgart: Dieter Heinz, 243–248.
- Fercsik, Erzsébet. 2010. "Traditional and modern forms of naming of Hungarian women." *Atti del XII Congresso Internazionale di Scienze Onomastiche, Pisa, 28 agosto–4 settembre 2005*. Vol. 4, eds. Maria Giovanna Arcamone & Donatella Bremer & Davide de Camilli & Bruno Porcelli. Pisa: Edizioni ETS, 131–140.
- Gervais-le-Gaff, Marie Marthe. 2002. "Liberté, égalité, sororité: A new linguistic order in France." *Women and Language* 25(2): 1–7.
- Hampares, Katherine J. 1976. "Sexism in Spanish lexicography?" *Hispania* 59: 100–109.
DOI: 10.2307/339381
- Heise, Elke. 2000. "Sind Frauen mitgemeint? Eine empirische Untersuchung zum Verständnis des generischen Maskulinums und seiner Alternativen." *Sprache und Kognition* 19(1/2): 3–13. DOI: 10.1024//0253-4533.19.12.3
- Hellinger, Marlis. 1990. *Kontrastive feministische Linguistik. Mechanismen sprachlicher Diskriminierung im Deutschen und Englischen*. Ismaning: Max Hueber.
- Hellinger, Marlis & Christine Bierbach. 1993. *Eine Sprache für beide Geschlechter: Richtlinien für einen nicht-sexistischen Sprachgebrauch*. Bonn: Deutsche UNESCO-Kommission.
- Hellinger, Marlis & Hadumod Bußmann. 2001. "Gender across languages: The linguistic representation of women and men." In *Gender across languages. The linguistic representation of women and men*, vol. 1, eds. Marlis Hellinger & Hadumod Bußmann. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1–25. DOI: 10.1075/impact.9.05hel
- Horváth, Péter Iván. 2011. "Szónemesítés [Word amelioration]." *Nyelvi kérdések* 54. www.e-nyelvmagazin.hu [13 May 2014].
- Huszár, Ágnes. 2011. *A nő terei* [Women's spaces]. Budapest: L'Harmattan Kiadó.
- Irmen, Lisa & Jochen Knoll. 1999. "On the use of the grammatical gender in anaphoric pronouns in German. A comparison between Finns and Germans." *Sprache und Kognition* 18: 123–135. DOI: 10.1024//0253-4533.18.34.123
- Irmen, Lisa & Julia Kurovskaja. 2010. "On the semantic content of grammatical gender and its impact on the representation of human referents." *Experimental Psycholinguistics* 57(5): 367–375. DOI: 10.1027/1618-3169/a000044
- Kálmán, László. 2013. "Az olvasónők és nyelvésznők dilemmája [The dilemma of reading women and women linguists]." *Nyelv és tudomány*. <http://www.nyest.hu/hirek/az-olvaso-nok-es-a-nyelvezszo-k-dilemmaja> [10 May 2014].
- Kegyés, Erika. 2004. "Wahrheitsgehalt der Geschlechterstereotype am Beispiel ungarischer Sprichwörter." In *Publicationes universitatis miskolciensis. Sectio philosophica. Tomus IX, fasciculus 2*, ed. Ferenc Lendvai. Miskolc: Typographia Universitatis, 137–164.
- Kegyés, Erika. 2008. "Sexusgrammatik und Gendersemantik. Ausdrucksformen des Geschlechts im Ungarischen." In *Genderbilder aus Ungarn. Ergebnisse der ungarischen Genderforschung*, eds. Erika Kegyés & Ágnes Hussar. Hamburg: Dr. Kovač, 73–90.
- Kegyésné Szekeres, Erika. 2005. "Sprachlicher Sexismus und sprachliches Gender Mainstreaming im Fokus der europäischen Sprachpolitik." *European Integration Studies* 4(2): 24–44.

- Kegyese, Erika. 2007. "Nyelvi szekizmus és szexista nyelvhasználat a magyar nyelvben [Institutional language activism and sexist language in Hungarian]." In *Sokszínű nyelvészet. Alkalmazott nyelvészeti gender-kutatás* [Varied linguistics. Applied linguistics and gender research], eds. Erika Kegyese, Simigné Sarolta Fenyő. Miskolc: Miskolci Egyetem Alkalmazott Nyelvészeti Tanszék, 91–100.
- Kenyesei, István & Robert M. Vago & Anna Fenyvesi. 1998. *Hungarian*. London: Psychology Press. DOI: 10.4324/9780203192238
- Keréjkártó, Ágnes & Katalin Szili. 2005. "Graceful women and stalwart men. The concept of masculinity and femininity in the Hungarian language." In *Bouquet hongrois*, ed. Maria Cibere. Groningen: Rijksuniversiteit Groningen, 91–99.
- Kiss, Jenő & Gábor Tolcsvai-Nagy. 1999. "Hungarian as a Finno-Ugric language." In *A companion to Hungarian studies*, ed. László Kosa. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 35–105.
- Koniuszaniec, Gabriela & Hanka Błaszowska. 2003. "Language and gender in Polish." In *Gender across languages. The linguistic representation of women and men*, vol. 3, eds. Marlis Hellinger & Hadumod Bußmann. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 259–285. DOI: 10.1075/impact.11.15kon
- Laakso, Johanna. 2005. *Our otherness. Finno-Ugrian approaches to women's studies, or vice versa*. Vienna: LIT.
- Misad, Katalin. 2012. "The characteristics of women's names in Slovakia." *AHEA: E-Journal of the American Hungarian Educators Association* 5. <http://ahea.net/e-journal/volume-5-2012> [14 May 2014].
- Motschenbacher, Heiko. 2010. *Language, gender and sexual identity*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. DOI: 10.1075/impact.29
- Mühlhäusler, Peter & Rom Harré. 1990. "He, she, or it: The enigma of grammar and gender." In *Pronouns and people: The linguistic construction of social and personal identity*, eds. Peter Mühlhäusler & Rom Harré. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 228–247.
- Nagy, Marcell & Viviana Patti. 2006. "Lexical gender in Hungarian: Reflections of social structures in an electronic corpus." In *Gender, language and new literacy: A multilingual analysis*, eds. Eva Maria Thüne & Simona Leonardi & Carla Bazzanella. London: Continuum, 182–195.
- Pete, István. 2000. "Férfinyelv-e a magyar? [Is Hungarian a men's language?]" *Magyar nyelvőr* 124: 198–115.
- Prewitt-Freilino, Jennifer L. & T. Andrew Caswell & Emmi K. Laakso. 2012. "The gendering of language: A comparison of gender equality in countries with gendered, natural gender, and genderless languages." *Sex Roles* 66: 268–281. DOI: 10.1007/s11199-011-0083-5
- Puskás-Juhász, Maria-Csilla. 1998. "En hongrois." In *La feminization des noms de métiers. En français et dans d'autres langues*, ed. Anne-Marie Houdebine-Gravaud. Paris: L'Harmattan, 103–112.
- Raátz, Judit. 2008. "Geschlechtsstereotype im ungarischen Vornamenschatz." In *Genderbilder aus Ungarn. Ergebnisse der ungarischen Genderforschung*, eds. Erika Kegyese & Ágnes Hussar. Hamburg: Dr. Kovač, 117–130.
- Raátz, Judit. 2011. "Nick as self-attributed name." *Nouvelle Revue d'Onomastique* 53: 181–207.
- Shibamoto-Smith, Janet S. 2003. "Gendered structures in Japanese." In *Gender across languages. The linguistic representation of women and men*, vol. 3, eds. Marlis Hellinger & Hadumod Bußmann. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 201–225. DOI: 10.1075/impact.11.12shi

- Sólyom, Erika. 2011. "Linguistic address systems in post-1989 Hungarian urban discourse." *Comparative Hungarian cultural studies*, eds. Steven Tötösy de Zepetnek & Louise O. Vasvári. West Lafayette: Purdue University Press, 284–295.
- Soukup, Ilona. 2009. "Die europäische Sprachpolitik und ihre Wirkung auf Ungarn. Grundlagen – Anforderungen – Umsetzung." *WEBFU: Wiener Elektronische Beiträge des Instituts für Finno-Ugristik* 8: 1–22.
- Tainio, Liisa. 2006. "Gender in Finnish language use: Equal, unequal and/or queer." *WEBFU: Wiener elektronische Beiträge des Instituts für Finno-Ugristik* 5: 1–19.
- Tóth, Edina. 2007. "A társadalmi nem megjelenési formái a magyar nyelvben [The appearance of gender in Hungarian]." Conference paper, University of Szeged.
- Vasvári, Louise O. 2006. "Queer theory and discourses of desire." *CLCWeb* 8(1). <http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1290&context=clcweb> [13 May 2014].
- Vasvári, Louise O. 2011. "Grammatical gender trouble and Hungarian gender[lessness]: Part I. Comparative linguistic gender." *AHEA E-Journal* 4. http://ahea.net/sitefiles/file/journals/201111/Vasvari_L_O.pdf [13 May 2014].
- Zhang, Hong Z. 2002. "Reality and representation: Social control and gender relations in Mandarin Chinese proverbs." In *Gender across languages. The linguistic representation of women and men*, vol. 2, eds. Marlis Hellinger & Hadumod Bußmann. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 73–80. DOI: 10.1075/impact.10.09zha

IGBO

The linguistic representation and communication of gender in Igbo*

Arua E. Arua

University of Botswana, Botswana

1. Introduction
2. Categories of gender
 - 2.1 Lexical gender
 - 2.2 Male generics
3. Gender-related structures
 - 3.1 Compounding
 - 3.2 Pronominalization
 - 3.3 Coordination
4. Usage of personal reference forms
 - 4.1 Address terms
 - 4.1.1 Kinship terms
 - 4.1.2 Honorifics
 - 4.1.3 Chieftaincy titles
 - 4.2 Names
 - 4.2.1 Child naming
 - 4.2.2 Marital naming
 - 4.2.3 Maiden name retention
 - 4.3 Proverbs
5. Language change and reform
6. Conclusion

Note

References

1. Introduction

Igbo, a member of the Benue-Congo family (Williamson 1989), is one of the three major indigenous languages in Nigeria. Emenanjo et al. (2012) distinguish between Igbo and the Igbo Language Cluster (Igboid). The former refers to the

varieties spoken in the southeastern states of Abia, Anambra, Ebonyi, Enugu and Imo, and the latter to the spoken varieties already specified and those in parts of Akwa Ibom, Benue, Delta, Edo and Rivers, with which they have, according to Emenanjo et al. (2012), an intelligibility rate of 70% and more. Ikeekonwu (1987) had already anticipated the language cluster by identifying five Igbo dialects: Niger, Inland West, Inland East, Riverine and Waawa or Northern. For this reason, the label Igbo is retained here, but it covers all those speech varieties that are in the Igbo language cluster. From this broad perspective, Igbo is spoken by about 35 million people in ten of the thirty-six states of Nigeria (Emenanjo et al. 2012).

Igbo is an isolating, right-branching language with modifiers following syntactic heads and subject-verb-object (SVO) as the unmarked word order. It has a complex phonology, with tonology playing a very important role in making phonemic distinctions (Alexandre 1967: 56). As will become apparent later, tonology is not used in making gender distinctions in Igbo.

Other than in proverb and onomastic studies, gender is not a topical subject in Igbo linguistics. Rather, Igbo linguistic studies have concentrated on few salient issues: the description of its grammar, lexis, morphology and phonology; the demarcation of dialects, as mentioned earlier; the development of an appropriate orthography; and the identification of a standard dialect, currently thought to be represented by “a generalized Owerri/Umuahia Igbo” and “a generalized Onitsha Igbo” (Emenanjo 1978). This dialect, now known as *Igbo Izugbe* ‘Common/General Igbo’, is “gaining currency in educational institutions, the mass media, as well as in popular publications” (Echeruo 2001: xiii).

The present article on gender in Igbo revisits some of the questions and concerns already voiced by Amadiume (1987: 93), for example: Are Igbo personal nouns and pronouns gender-neutral or do they show gender distinctions or asymmetrical usage conditions? To what extent do the gender-related structures of the Igbo language reflect social realities in Igbo society and its cultural system? Not only does this article review Amadiume’s discussion of these questions, it provides new insights into areas that she did not study in all of the southern states of Nigeria. The article proceeds by discussing categories of gender, gender-related structures, usage of personal reference forms and language change and reform.

2. Categories of gender

Igbo lacks grammatical gender. It is neither a classifier language nor a noun class language (cf. Hellinger & Bußmann 2001). Rather, it is similar to languages without nominal classification such as English, Finnish and Turkish, and to languages such as Nupe, Yoruba and Edo, with which it has the greatest typological affinity.

2.1 Lexical gender

Igbo possesses lexically gendered nouns, i.e. words that denote females or males. The following pairs of words, taken from Okonkwo (1977:81), represent such examples. The first word in each pair is male and the second female: *di* ‘husband’, *nwunye* ‘wife’; *okpara* ‘first son’, *ada* ‘first daughter’; *eze* ‘king’, *anasi* ‘king’s wife’; *ikom* ‘male’ (sg/pl), *inyom* ‘female’ (sg/pl); *nna* ‘father’, *nne* ‘mother’; *dede* ‘term of respect for a man older than oneself’, *dada* ‘term of respect for a woman older than oneself’. The members of each pair, including *nna/nne* and *dede/dada*, are morphologically unrelated. It is clear that the female words, especially in the first four pairs are not derived from the male words as *heroine*, for example, is derived from *hero* in English. The suspicion that the female words in the last two male-female pairs are derived from their male counterparts is unfounded. The changes, especially in the first words in the pairs, though phonemic, are not gender related. In any case, there is the contradiction of the /a/ in *nna* being replaced by the /e/ in *nne* and the /e/ in *dede* being replaced by the /a/ in *dada*. With respect to the pair *ikom/inyom*, Echeruo (2001:72) notes that in the Ngwa area of Abia State, *ikom* also refers to women. And Okonkwo (1977:81) adds that *inyom* has restricted reference, being available only as the label of a titled woman.

The nouns *mmadu* ‘person’, *onye* ‘person’ and *oha* ‘people’ (lit. ‘community, public’) are gender-indefinite and gender-inclusive. Similar words, such as *amadi* ‘free-born adult’ and *agadi* ‘old person’ are also gender-indefinite. However, unlike the first three, they refer to a specific group of people. Some Igbo scholars, notably Achebe (1958), have habitually translated *mmadu* and *onye* with the English male generic *man*, as the translations of the following examples show:

- (1) *Chukwu ke-re mmadu na udi ya.*
 god create-PAST person in image 3.SG.POSS
 ‘God created man in his image.’
- (2) *Egbu-la onye ekwu-ghi okwu obula.*
 kill-NEG person say-NEG word any
 ‘Do not kill a man who does not say anything.’

Such translations have been interpreted as linguistic evidence for the widely held view that Igbo society is androcentric. However, it has to be noted that the Igbo personal nouns involved are lexically gender-neutral.

Gender-indefiniteness is the norm in the Igbo personal lexicon. This is clearly demonstrated by the labels used to describe certain professions: *oka iwu* ‘lawyer’ (lit. ‘greatest in law’), *onye uwe ojii* ‘police person’ (lit. ‘person of black dress’), *oka akwukwo* ‘professor’ (lit. ‘book expert’), *okwa nka* ‘carver’ (lit. ‘art maker’), *okwa*

odu ‘trumpet player’ (lit. ‘trumpet blower’), *di nta* ‘hunter’ (lit. ‘hunt master’). These gender-neutral labels show that the professions they describe can be performed by both females and males. In modern Igbo society, there are now male and female lawyers, professors, hunters and so on. While *okwa odu*, in practice, is restricted to males, nothing prevents a female from becoming a trumpet player, especially as music has become a major source of income for many women and men. In view of this, the gender-indefiniteness of the Igbo lexicon makes it possible, as Amadiume (1987: 90) has noted, for both men and women to aspire to and indeed play the roles specified in the professions listed above.

2.2 Male generics

As noted earlier, one of the topical issues in the discussion of gender in English is the use of *man* as a male generic in contexts where a gender-neutral phrasing is required. As the Igbo nominal lexicon is generally gender-indefinite, one may expect that male generics which “treat males linguistically as the norm and females as the deviation” (Braun 2001: 295–296) would not occur in Igbo. Surprisingly, however, *nnaa* ‘this man’, a combination of *nna* ‘father, man’ and the demonstrative *a* ‘this’ (Williamson 1972), is sometimes used as a male generic. The form, which is not found in any Igbo dictionary, seems to have been created through a process similar to the formation of *nkaa* ‘this one’ from *nke* ‘one’ and *a* ‘this’ (Williamson 1972).

Nnaa is a label used for indexing group identity and solidarity by young males during informal social gatherings. The label was soon adopted by young girls for a similar purpose. Smith (2003: 514) correctly observes that all areas of Igbo cultural life “tend to be sex-segregated, with the exception of events like ‘disco’ dances or public cultural performances that are enjoyed by men and women together.” It is thought that the use of *nnaa* as a male generic may have arisen from mixed-sex interactions involving young males and females during events of the type described by Smith. Especially with respect to sexual banter, men (or boys) dominate and control such interactions (Smith 2003).

Nnaa is similar to *you guys* as a male generic in English (Eckert & McConnell-Ginet 2003: 69), except that *you guys* is plural and, therefore, used when more than one person is being addressed, while *nnaa* can be used in singular and plural contexts, as the following examples show:

- (3) *Nnaa, kedu ka i mere?*
 this man how that 2SG.SUBJ do?
 ‘Man, how are you(sg.)?’

- (4) *Nnaa, kedu ka unu mere?*
 this man how that 2PL.SUBJ do?
 ‘Man, how are you(pl.)?’

Nnaa sometimes co-occurs with the English word *man* to form an Igbo-English hybrid male generic, *nnaa man* in Igbo. English is widely spoken in Igbo society. This probably accounts for why *nnaa man* has been coined as a synonym for *nnaa*. The use of *nnaa man* is noticeable in some Nollywood (Nigerian) movies, in which the characters constantly code-switch between Igbo and English.

Eckert & McConnell-Ginet (2003:69) observe that while “*you guys* can be used to address a group of males and/or females [...] *you gals* cannot”. In the same manner, *nne* ‘mother’ is not available as a female generic in Igbo. This situation is not surprising, as female generics do not exist in many languages. Igbo is no exception to this trend.

3. Gender-related structures

3.1 Compounding

Female-specific and male-specific reference in Igbo is achieved through compounding. That is not to say that derivational morphemes do not exist in the language. However, they play no part in the formation of female words and the specification of female and male reference. Echeruo (2001), for example, lists 42 suffixes and enclitics, none of which is gender-specific. For compounds, it is pertinent, first, to identify the elements that are used to specify gender in Igbo, and then to indicate how these are used to form female and male compounds.

The main male and female gender markers are *oke* and *nne*. *Oke* ‘man’ and its variants *oko* and *okoro* (both ‘male youth’) are free forms which may function as (parts of) proper names or common nouns. *Nwoke* ‘man’ can also be used to achieve male-specific reference. Similarly, *nne* ‘mother’ is also a free form. However, other female gender markers such as *anyi* ‘woman’, *ami* lit. ‘female genitals’, *mgbe/mgbo* ‘young woman’ or ‘maiden’, *nwunye* ‘wife’ and *nwaami* ‘girl’ or ‘woman’ can also be used to specify the female gender. There are thus many male and female elements that specify gender in Igbo (see Echeruo 2001 for many of the definitions used in this section).

In order to achieve either female- or male-specific reference, the female or male free morphemes *oke* and *nne*, or their variants, are combined with gender-indefinite personal reference forms. Accordingly, there are such symmetrical male and female pairs as: *okoro obia* ‘young man’, *agbogho obia* ‘young woman’;

nna di ‘father in law’ (lit. ‘father of husband’), *nne di* ‘mother in law’ (lit. ‘mother of husband’); *ulu okpara* ‘second son’, *ulu ada* ‘second daughter’; *oke ekpe* ‘widower’ (lit. ‘man who has lost his marriage partner’), *nwanyi ekpe* ‘widow’ (lit. ‘woman who has lost her marriage partner’); *nwoke uwe ojii* ‘policeman’ (lit. ‘man of black dress’), *nwanyi uwe ojii* ‘policewoman’ (lit. ‘woman of black dress’); and *oka mgba nwoke* lit. ‘expert male wrestler’, *oka mgba nwanyi* lit. ‘expert female wrestler’. There are, of course, exceptions to the gender symmetry exhibited by these compounds. For example, Echeruo (2001) shows that *oke okporo* ‘bachelor’ has the male gender marker *oke* and that *okporo* ‘unmarried woman’ cannot be combined with a female identity marker. However, examples such as this are rare. Generally, then, unlike in the system of gender marking of some highly inflected languages, female personal nouns are not derived from male ones. Rather, female and male nouns are compounded with gender-indefinite personal nouns to create gender-symmetrical pairs of forms.

3.2 Pronominalization

The gender-indefiniteness of the nominal lexicon is also reflected in the Igbo personal pronoun system. The third person pronoun system in languages such as English is usually the site where gender distinctions are most apparent. Unlike English, however, Igbo third person pronouns are gender-neutral. The English *he*, *she* and *it*, and their objective forms *him*, *her* and *it* are all represented by one gender-neutral Igbo pronoun, *o* or *o* and *ya* respectively:

- (5) *O ga bia echi.*
 3SG.SUBJ will come tomorrow
 ‘He/she/it will come tomorrow.’
- (6) *Nwata ahu hu-ru ya na ulo.*
 child DEM see-PAST 3SG.OBJ in house
 ‘That child saw him/her/it in the house.’

Therefore, like in Igala and Yoruba (Lamidi 2009; Yusuf 2002), Igbo pronouns mirror personal nouns in terms of their gender-indefiniteness.

It should be noted that one of the negative effects of the disparity in the English and Igbo third person pronoun systems is that the English pronouns *he*, *she* and *it* are a source of considerable difficulty for many Igbo learners of English who use them interchangeably, often in generic contexts (Amadiume 1987: 89; Arua & Yusuf 2010). Moreover, in many English-language textbooks, including those that describe Igbo grammar, Igbo *o* or *o* is translated with male forms in

contexts where a gender-indefinite phrasing would be more appropriate. Here is an example that illustrates this phenomenon:

- (7) *Nwata kwo aka, o soro ndi eze rie nri.*
 child wash hand 3SG.SUBJ follow PL king eat food.
 ‘If a child washes his hands, he eats with kings.’

The gender-neutral *o* in the Igbo sentence is rendered as *he* in the English translation, thereby imposing a meaning which depicts the Igbo world as androcentric.

3.3 Coordination

The purpose of this section is to show how *na* ‘and’ and *ma obu* ‘or’, the central additive and alternative coordinators in Igbo, are used when conjoining female and male personal reference forms. Here are six examples in which *na* is used to link male and female forms:

- (8) a. *nne na nna* ‘mother and father’
 b. *di na nwunye* ‘husband and wife’
 c. *nwoke na nwanyi* ‘man and woman’
 d. *nze na loolo ya* ‘chief and his wife’
 e. *maazi na oriaku ya* ‘mister and his wife’
 f. *ikom na inyom* ‘men and women’

All the conjoined structures are reversible except (8d) and (8e) for which reversal produces the following unidiomatic structures in Igbo: **loolo na nze ya* ‘wife and her chief’ and **oriaku na maazi ya* ‘wife and her mister.’ The general tendency is to use the conjoined structures as listed in (8a–f) because they have become fixed expressions.

One central reason for the expressions becoming fixed is that, during social gatherings in Igbo society, men are accorded more recognition than women. This recognition is clearly indicated in the arrangement of the conjoined female and male titles. With the exception of *nne na nna*, the first example on the list, all the other conjoined examples follow the expected pattern of male first, female second. Another example is the phrase *olulu di na nwunye* lit. ‘marriage of husband and wife’, which is used as a multiword expression meaning ‘marriage’ in Igbo. Within this multiword expression, *di na nwunye* maintains the order of male first, female second. In other words, regardless of co-text and context, the male first, female second arrangement is predictable. It is interesting to note that *nne na nna* has the same female first, male second pattern as the English phrases *ladies and*

gentlemen and *mothers and fathers* and, therefore, forms an exception to the more common male first, female second pattern.

As noted in Section 3.2, the Igbo pronoun system, including the third person singular pronoun, is gender-indefinite. This gender-indefiniteness is also reflected in the pronominalization of mixed-gender coordinated nouns. Instead of split pronouns (as in English *he or she*), a gender-indefinite alternative construction would be used in Igbo:

- (9) *Otu n'ime ha ga abata echi.*
 'He or she (lit. 'one of them') will arrive tomorrow.'

It is obvious from this example that while English has separate pronouns for replacing each noun in mixed-gender coordinated noun phrases, Igbo uses an alternative, gender-neutral formulation, *otu n'ime ha* 'one of them'.

4. Usage of personal reference forms

4.1 Address terms

Address forms are an important aspect of the discussion on Igbo and gender. Three types – kinship terms, honorifics and chieftaincy titles are discussed in this section.

4.1.1 Kinship terms

Some of the kinship terms in Igbo are listed in Table 1. A couple of observations are pertinent at this point. While *nnanna* 'paternal grandfather', *nnenna* 'paternal grandmother' and *nnenne* 'maternal grandmother' exist in Igbo, **nnanne* 'maternal grandfather' does not. *Nnadi* is used as a male generic for half-brother and half-sister and paternal male and female cousins. *Nna di* lit. 'father of husband' and *nne di* lit. 'mother of husband' are used for both paternal and maternal fathers- and mothers-in-law. Labels such as **nna nwunye* 'father of wife' and **nne nwunye* 'mother of wife' are missing in the language, and so are not used to describe a wife's father- and mother-in-law. It is thus easy to see that terms related to husbands are readily available in Igbo while those related to wives are not.

4.1.2 Honorifics

There are many honorifics for men and very few for women in Igbo. Examples of male honorifics include: *nna* 'patriarch', *amadi* 'noble person', *ichie* 'wise old person', *okenwa* 'important person' (lit. 'big child'), *ogaranya* 'a person of means/substance', *dike* 'brave, powerful person', *ogbuefi* 'a titled person – somebody who

Table 1. Igbo kinship terms

Male term	Female term
<i>nna</i> 'father'	<i>nne</i> 'mother'
<i>nnanna</i> 'paternal grandfather'	<i>nnenna</i> 'paternal grandmother'
–	<i>nnenne</i> 'maternal grandmother'
<i>okpara</i> 'first son'	<i>ada</i> 'first daughter'
<i>ulu okpara</i> 'second son'	<i>ulu mma</i> 'second daughter'
<i>odu nwa</i> 'male last born child'	<i>odu nwa</i> 'female last born child'
<i>oko nna</i> 'paternal uncle'	<i>oko nne</i> 'maternal uncle'
<i>ibe nna</i> 'paternal cousin'	<i>ibe nne</i> 'maternal cousin'
<i>nnadi</i> 'half-brother, paternal cousin'	–
<i>nna di</i> 'father-in-law'	<i>nne di</i> 'mother-in-law'

has killed a cow', *okosisi* lit. 'large tree' (used as a male praise name), *okite* lit. 'giant pot' (used as a male praise name), *nze* 'noble person, rank below that of chief or king' and *okenye* 'an elderly and respected person.' Most of these honorifics (except *nna*) are lexically gender-indefinite but, at the same time, restricted to male referents. However, Amadiume (1987) notes that *ogbuefi* is the title for both females and males who have killed a cow for the goddess Idemili. In some parts of Igbo society, though, the title is restricted to males. Each of the honorifics listed shows that a man has achieved something substantial and that his status thus demands recognition and respect.

For women, as already indicated, there are very few honorifics. One example of such a honorific in Onitsha, Anambra State, is *agbala* 'a well-to-do woman.' This label, however, is also used for a man who has no title, that is, an ordinary male member of the society (Echeruo 2001). This shows the inequality in the status of women and men in that part of the Igbo society; the well-to-do woman has a lower status than the well-to-do man. Other female honorifics such as *oke nwanyi* 'important/prominent woman', *eze nwanyi* (lit. 'woman king') and *agu nwanyi* (lit. 'female leopard') show similar patterns as *agbala*. *Nwanyi* is used to modify male-specific labels in the same way that the English word *female* modifies professional titles such as 'doctor' (cf. *female doctor*).

4.1.3 Chieftaincy titles

Unlike honorifics, chieftaincy titles are those that traditional rulers confer on citizens that they believe have helped their communities achieve set economic and social goals. As Arua (1997) shows, the chieftaincy title conferment institution is not native to Igbo society; it is imported by the Igbo from their compatriots in the northern and western regions of Nigeria. The Igbo chieftaincy titles discussed in Arua (1997: 53) include: *Agadachiriuzo* 'one that has the final say' lit. 'chair that

covers the road', *Ojemba* 'traveller', *Ogbatuluenyi* 'problem solver, somebody who has acquired wealth' (lit. 'somebody who shot down an elephant'), *Ugochinyere Igbo 1* 'blessing given, favor done to the Igbo by God, the first', *Igwe of Orumba* 'Chief of Orumba', *Ogbueshi Nnanyelugo* lit. 'killer of cows/grace given by the father', *Eze Ohazurume* 'king crowned by all', *Onwa/Onwanetilia* 'benefactor' (lit. 'moon that shines for all'), *Enyiagbaoso* 'strong, fearless person' (lit. 'elephant that does not run') and *Ochiagha* 'war general/commander'. All the titles, except *Eze Ohazurume*, are lexically gender-neutral; and all of them, except *Ogbatuluenyi*, are restricted to male referents.

Arua (1997) found that men and women were awarded chieftaincy titles on their own merit. However, he also found that many of the women were awarded the titles because of their husbands. In other words, when a man receives a chieftaincy title, his wife may also receive one, although she is not the person being honored. There were no instances of men being awarded the titles on account of their wives' achievements. It can be concluded that the manner in which chieftaincy titles are conferred on recipients favors males and disfavors females.

4.2 Names

Achebe's take on naming in Igbo society is a good starting point for a discussion of Igbo naming practices:

If you want to know how life has treated an Igbo man, a good place to look is the names his children bear. His hopes, his fears, his joys and sorrows, grievances against fellows or complaints about the way he has been treated by fortune, even straight historical records are all there [...]. (Achebe 1975:96)

The notion of naming as a patriarchal phenomenon is blatantly on display in the quote above. The names given to both males and females transmit messages not only about men's superiority and importance, but also about women's invisibility in Igbo society. Three aspects – child naming, marital naming and maiden name retention – are particularly relevant in this respect.

4.2.1 *Child naming*

As Onukawa (2000: 117) observes, personal names "reflect preferences in semantic hierarchy and deeply ingrained gender biases." These two factors are clearly indicated in the sources of female and male names he lists. The list of male names includes such sources as:

deities, e.g. *Ala* (earth deity), *Kamalu* (thunder deity), *Anyanwu* (sun deity), etc.; religious objects, e.g. *Ofo*, *Ogu* (symbols of innocence); mysterious phenomena,

e.g. *Onwu* (death); concepts of greatness, e.g. *Duru* (Greatman of Utility), *Osu* (devotee), *Eze* (king), *Nze/Ozo* (revered titles), etc.; natural physical objects, e.g. *Ugwu* (hill), *Mmiri* (water), *Oku* (fire), etc.; animals, e.g. *Agu* (leopard), *Enwe* (monkey), *Mgbada* (antelope), etc.; significant social entities, *Oha* (the people), *Ibe* (peer group), *Uke* (age grade), *Mba* (the people), etc. (Onukawa 2000: 107)

The sources of female names include “*Mma* ‘goodness/moral acceptability’, *Uru* ‘usefulness’, *Aku* ‘wealth’, *Uju* ‘abundance’, *Anuri* ‘happiness’, *Ure* ‘conduct that deserves attention’, *Ola* ‘ornament’” (Onukawa 2000: 107f.). A clear gender asymmetry is thus established according to which men’s names have more to do with power, strength and authority and women’s names with “dainty issues, more virtuous qualities, and more positive phenomena” (Onukawa 2000: 108).

Onukawa (2000: 111) also discusses *Chi* names in Igbo, which exhibit gender distinctions as illustrated in Table 2.

Chi has been described variously as each individual’s personal god, guardian angel, creator, companion or individual providence (see, for example, Achebe 1975; Echeruo 1979; Nwoga 1984). In Igbo society, a person’s success or failure is attributed to the strength or weakness of his or her *Chi*. It is, therefore, a very important philosophical concept which featured prominently in the names that parents gave to their female and male children in the pre-Christian Igbo society. Names such as *Chiakolam* ‘may I never lack my own Chi’, *Chinedum* ‘*Chi* leads me’, *Chibuzo* ‘*Chi* comes first’, *Chimdi* ‘my *Chi* exists’ and *Chimka* ‘my *Chi* is greater’ show that each person’s *Chi* has the responsibility of guiding them through life.

As shown in Table 2, female names generally contain *Chi*, while male names contain *Chukwu* ‘big god’ which is a compound form of *Chi* ‘god’ or ‘creator’ and *ukwu* ‘big’. Historical forces, including the advent of Christianity, led to the elevation of the Aro Oracle, *Ibini Ukpabi*, referred to as *Chukwu* ‘the last arbiter’ by the Aro and conceptualized as male, to the status of the Supreme Being,

Table 2. *Chi* and *Chukwu* names

Female name	Male name	Meaning
<i>Akuchi</i>	<i>Akuchukwu</i>	‘wealth of God’
<i>Amarachi</i>	<i>Amarachukwu</i>	‘favor of God’
<i>Eberechi</i>	<i>Eberechukwu</i>	‘mercy of God’
<i>Nkachi</i>	<i>Nkachukwu</i>	‘skill of God’
<i>Nwachi</i>	<i>Nwachukwu</i>	‘child of God’
<i>Ogechi</i>	<i>Ogechukwu</i>	‘time of God’
<i>Okechi</i>	<i>Okechukwu</i>	‘lot of God’
<i>Oluchi</i>	<i>Oluchukwu</i>	‘work of God’
<i>Uchechi</i>	<i>Uchechukwu</i>	‘wish of God’
<i>Ugochi</i>	<i>Ugochukwu</i>	‘honor of God’

equivalent to the Christian God. Simultaneously, it led to the downgrading of *Chi* to the status of a small god (see Azuonye 1987; Nwoga 1984; Onukawa 2000). The downgrading of *Chi* led to its conceptualization as female, as opposed to *Chukwu*, which is male. It appeared logical, therefore, in the androcentric Igbo society to assign *Chukwu* names to males and *Chi* names to females. Because of the tendency to shorten or abbreviate names, many of the *Chukwu* names have also been conflated with *Chi* names, thus ensuring that *Chi* names are available to both genders. Female *Chukwu* names, however, are rare. This is because *Chukwu* is conceptualized as socially male. Females are, therefore, largely excluded from having *Chukwu* names, while males may receive both *Chukwu* and *Chi* names.

The gender bias in personal naming in Igbo society also favors males in other ways. First, gender-indefinite names that should be available to both genders are given mainly to males. Of the 136 gender-neutral names in Nwaefuna's (2008: 45) study of 160 names, 94 (69%) denoting such important categories as power and authority, deities/spirits, occupation, physical strength and social significance were given to males. Very few of these names were given to women. Conversely, and in conformity with Onukawa's demarcation of sources for female and male names, the names given to females were mainly in the categories of morality and beauty. There were no examples of male names for these two categories. This is not to imply that men are discriminated against. As beauty is conceptualized in socially female terms in Igbo society, no male names are expected from this category of gender-neutral names. For wealth, some of the male names are *Egobudike* 'money makes a person', *Akuebue* 'wealth multiplies' and *Akuerika* 'wealth is too much', and some of the female names are *Akunna* 'father's wealth', *Uloaku* 'house of wealth', *Ite ego* 'pot of money' and *Ogbenyealu* 'not to be married by the poor'. It is clear from these 'wealth-names' that men are seen in terms of creating and increasing wealth and making investments, while women are seen as 'places' where money is stored, and as profits or savings for their families.

There are names that show that male children are preferred, mainly because they perpetuate their fathers' names and lineages. One of the most prominent gender-neutral names, given to male children, *Afa m efula* 'my name will not be lost', according to Echeruo (1979), ensures that the identity of the father will never be lost, and his lineage will never end. Similar names that are given to males include *Iloba* 'my household has multiplied', *Iloechina*, *Mbanaechina*, *Obiechina*, *Obodoechina* or *Uzoechina* 'may my compound, house, country or road never end, cease or close'. These and male-specific names such as *Okeibuno* 'male child sustains the home' show that, as with other Nigerian ethnic groups such as the Yoruba, the place of the male child in the Igbo family is far more important than that of the female child. The major cause of broken marriages in Igbo society is the inability to conceive offspring or the lack of a male child to perpetuate the family

name. So the issue of bearing male children is one of the most important factors in successful marriages. Some female names such as *Nwanyibunwa* 'a female is a child', *Nwanyibuiife* 'a girl child is worth something', *Izuwanyibuizujiaka* 'to train a girl is to fracture a hand' (Nwaefuna 2008) further support the view that the male child is more important than the female child.

Finally, there are names associated with the Igbo four-day market week – *Eke* 'first market day', *Orie* 'second market day', *Afor* 'third market day' and *Nkwo* 'fourth market day.' Such names are formed by compounding any of the market days with either female-specific *Mgbo* or male-specific *Oke* or *Oko*. The following are examples of such symmetrically formed male and female names: *Okeke*, *Mgbeke* 'male, female born on *Eke*'; *Okorie*, *Mgborie* 'male, female born on *Orie*'; *Okafor*, *Mgbafor* 'male, female born on *Afor*'; and *Okonkwo*, *Mgbonkwo* 'male, female born on *Nkwo*'. These names, also discussed by Onukawa (2000), are important because they demonstrate that children can also be named in a gender-symmetrical way.

4.2.2 Marital naming

The subordinate position of women relative to men in Igbo society is further shown in the marital naming practices of the so-called Cross River Igbo. It is the tradition, especially among the Ohafia Igbo, that a marital name is chosen for a wife by the husband as part of the marriage rites. A list of the names, most of which are taken from Arua (1992), includes:

- (10) a. *Ahudiya* 'possessing a body like her husband'
- b. *Enyidiya* 'friend of her husband'
- c. *Ifudiya* 'her husband's first choice'
- d. *Ikodiya* 'her husband's lover'
- e. *Nnekwudiya* 'her husband's senior/first wife'
- f. *Nwadiya* 'her husband's relative from the same compound'
- g. *Nwannadiya* 'woman related to her husband's father'
- h. *Nwannediya* 'woman/wife related to her husband's mother'
- i. *Obidiya* 'her husband's desire/choice/heart/mind'
- j. *Okwerenkediya* 'somebody who is in agreement/harmony with her husband'
- k. *Omasiridiya* 'somebody who is liked/loved by her husband'
- l. *Onudiya* 'her husband's mouth piece/voice'
- m. *Oyidiya/Oyiridiya* 'somebody who resembles her husband'

The names are statements of the relationships that exist or are likely to exist between spouses. However, it is the prerogative of the husband to name his bride and he is constrained to choose from a finite list of names. The main objections to

this naming system are that women are the party to be named, that there is no reciprocal naming of men, and that many of the names depict women as biological appendages (e.g. *ahu* 'body', *ifu* 'face', *obi* 'heart', *onu* 'mouth') of their husbands.

Arua (1992) argues that *diya* (which consists of *di* 'husband' and the third person singular possessive *ya*) is the sociolinguistic equivalent of *Mrs* in English. There was a need in traditional Igbo society to identify which women were married, and the only way to do this effectively was to show through additional labelling that a woman is a wife, just as *Mrs* is still used to label married women in the English-speaking world.

Marital naming as described above has diminished somewhat. The first reason for this is the conflation of marital naming and child naming practices. The conflation is seen when a child named after an older woman acquires all the names of that woman. For example, a child named after a woman whose first name is *Ugonma* and whose marital name is *Enyidiya* acquires both of these names. There are thus many unmarried women who now have these marital names. The second reason for the diminishing use of marital names is the adoption and adaptation of *lolo* to show marital status. According to Echeruo (2001), *lolo* is the title of a head wife or of the wife of a titled person. However, it is now also used as the equivalent of the English *Mrs*. This resulted from the need to find a female label for *maazi*, again according to Echeruo (2001), the general title of deference for men, which is equivalent to the English *Mr*. In other words, marital naming is now being replaced by newer Igbo modes of labelling which are equivalent to English labels that feminists have criticized because they obscure the identities of women, lower their status and subordinate them to men.

4.2.3 Maiden name retention

The Cross River Igbo also practice maiden name retention, a system which enables women to keep their maiden names (consisting of their first names plus their fathers' first names) and thus preserve their identities after marriage (see Arua 1992 for an extensive discussion). The loss of identity, as Penfield (1987) has shown, is one of the major problems that feminists have taken issue with. Maiden names are retained according to the age grade system. An age grade consists of a group of men and women of approximately equal ages. While men (single or married) are admitted into age groups when they are deemed to have come of age, women are admitted into them only after marriage.

Two reasons have been adduced in favor of maiden name retention. The first is that maiden names cannot be changed throughout the duration of a woman's life. The names, therefore, appear to be a solution to androcentric naming traditions which are likely to arise from the marriage institution. In a society in which divorce rules are liberal, maiden name retention enables a woman to get divorced,

to marry and remarry many times without changing her name. Even more important is the second reason. Age grades deal with individuals independently of their relationships. It seems reasonable that the names with which individuals have always been associated should be the same names by which they should be known for the rest of their lives. However, as Bagwasi (2007) has noted, maiden name retention, marital naming and other naming practices may lead to a range of potential identifications. Therefore, maiden name retention, in spite of its advantages, adds to women's naming problems rather than solves them.

4.3 Proverbs

This section discusses Igbo proverbs in relation to gender, a subject to which Igbo scholars have paid considerable attention (Nwachukwu-Agbada 2002; Oha 1998). The Igbo conceptualize proverbs as *mmanu eji eri okwu* 'palm oil with which words are eaten' (Achebe 1958). They touch on all aspects of Igbo political and social life and are considered to be the main factor in the construction of the Igbo indigenous knowledge system and world view. To know how to use proverbs in Igbo is to demonstrate an excellent command of Igbo rhetorical skills and conversational style. It is because of their centrality in Igbo political and social life that various aspects of proverbs have been studied to date, including the exclusion of women from the use of Igbo proverbs and the negative portrayal of women in proverbs.

Women are generally excluded from proverb creation and use in Igbo society. This is why Oha (1998:94) rightly claims that in Igbo culture "proverb use is a male art, and men [...] have tried to make proverb a sex-specific speech form, and by so doing consolidate their superior cultural and ontological position." The Igbo saying *nwaami anaghi atu ilu* 'a woman does not create/utter/use proverbs' summarizes this view. The exclusion of women from the proverb making enterprise is also indicated in the restriction of lexically gender-neutral proverb framing devices (Arua & Yusuf 2010) or rhetorical markers (Echeruo 2001), such as *ndi okenye na-asi na* 'our elders usually say that' and *ndi be anyi na-asi na* 'our people usually say that' to male referents. A good example containing such a framing device is given below:

- (11) *Ndi okenye na-ekwu si na otu mkpisi aka ruta mmanu o zuo oha*
 'Our elders say that if one finger brings oil it soils the others.'
 (Achebe 1958:89)

Ndi okenye 'our elders' and *ndi be anyi* 'our people' are lexically gender-neutral, but only used for male reference (Arua & Yusuf 2010). Related to this is the use of

the gender-specific phrase *nna anyi ha* ‘our fathers,’ as opposed to *nne anyi ha* ‘our mothers,’ as a proverb framing device. Arua and Yusuf (2010:251) show that *nna anyi ha* is contextually synonymous with *ndi okenye* and *ndi ichie* (both ‘elders’), which are only used for male reference. This provides further evidence for the exclusion of women in proverb making and use.

Oha (1998) also reports that women do not have ample opportunities in Igbo culture to learn and use proverbs. They are generally not “allowed to be present in contexts where proverbs are used in rhetoric [...] except where the issues at stake affect them, for instance in judicial situations” (Oha 1998:94). However, the data presented in Oha (1998) contains many examples of women’s use of proverbs. Therefore, while men claim proverb making and use as a male enterprise, women still participate in defining, creating, constructing and/or forming the indigenous knowledge system or world view of the Igbo that is inherent in the proverbs.

Some Igbo proverbs convey misogynous messages. They portray women in negative, inferior terms, or as a group lacking the good qualities that men are thought to possess. The proverbs in (12) and (13) are from Oha (1998):

- (12) *A na-echere ogeri, o na-echere okwa uri ya.*
 ‘One would be thinking of a woman’s good but she would be thinking of her make-up platter.’
- (13) *Mma nwanyi bu akwa, mma nwoke bu ego.*
 ‘A woman’s beauty is (her) cloth, a man’s beauty is (his) money.’

Both proverbs imply that women are vain and do not think about weightier issues than making themselves look good. To be fair, there are proverbs such as *Okokporo na enweghi nwunye bu ofeke* ‘A man without a wife is irresponsible/worthless’, but those portraying women in negative terms far outnumber these. Oha (1998:94) describes the positive and negative portrayals of males and females respectively as ‘strong’ and ‘weak,’ ‘noble’ and ‘depraved,’ ‘rational’ and ‘irrational,’ ‘brave’ and ‘fearful/cowardly,’ etc.

Lastly, the portrayal of women as inferior and men as superior is especially noticeable in proverbs related to sex or the sexual act. Consider the following proverb:

- (14) *A anaghi aso ikpu ukwu anya, o naghi a raa onwe ya.*
 ‘One should not be fearful of a big vagina, it does not fuck with itself.’

This proverb and others similar to it seem to exhort all men, particularly feeble men, to act manly and subjugate supposedly superior, powerful or prominent women. In other words, no woman, no matter how highly placed, can ever be superior to any man, no matter how low, in Igbo society.

5. Language change and reform

There is very little evidence that the Igbo are interested in reforming Igbo in order to enhance the status of women in their society. The lack of female-specific terms in certain fields of the personal lexicon has not been addressed. The focus has rather been on the development of technical vocabulary for the linguistic description of Igbo and for the advancement of science education (Echeruo 2001). This is, of course, a legitimate concern, but the equitable representation of women in Igbo is no less urgent.

There is also a clear indication of language reform in women's rejection of their exclusion from titles such as *Omeaku* 'maker of wealth' and *Omego* 'maker of money'. There is no reason why women who are also creators of wealth (as traders, farmers, civil servants, investors) should not be so described. They also reject the labels *Oriaku* 'somebody who consumes money' and *Odoziaku* 'somebody who keeps/manages (their husbands') wealth well' which are used exclusively to describe married women. While in Igbo traditional society, it is the responsibility of husbands to provide for their wives, the titles depict women in derogatory terms as those who spend, consume (and sometimes squander) or manage their husbands' wealth without contributing to the creation of wealth in the family. Consequently, women appear to be happier with the alternative labels *Okpataaku* 'somebody who makes wealth' and *Osodiakpataaku* 'somebody who partners with her husband in making wealth'. In other words, women are becoming aware of the need for gender-related Igbo language reform.

6. Conclusion

A number of salient conclusions can be drawn at this stage. First, most items in the Igbo personal lexicon are gender-indefinite and used as labels referring to both males and females. Second, the formation of nouns requiring specific female and male reference follows the strict rule of adding gender-specific male and female free forms to gender-indefinite personal nouns and names. The commonness of lexical gender neutrality in Igbo is clearly not matched by the socio-cultural realities of both traditional and modern Igbo society.

The reality is that the use of personal reference forms and gender-related structures in Igbo communicates gendered messages of male superiority and female inferiority. Women are usually the affected party when lexical gaps related to gender occur. There are many honorifics and chieftaincy titles for men and very few for women. Women are the party to be named in communities in which marital naming exists in Igbo society. Women are virtually excluded and/

or prevented from learning and/or participating in important aspects of Igbo cultural life, especially in the use of idioms and proverbs. Indeed, the main use of gender-related proverbs is to exhort or encourage men to uphold their superior status and to subjugate women. It is clear then that the use of personal reference forms has the effect of promoting male power and dominance over women in Igbo society.

Finally, it was shown that, while there are ongoing language reform efforts, Igbo gender representation is so far not on the agenda of language planners. Whatever the reason for this lack of attention, it seems now necessary to start countering stereotypes and degrading linguistic usage, not only in literary texts, which have received a fair amount of attention, but also in everyday language use.

Note

* This paper has benefited greatly from the assistance I received from a number of people. I am grateful to Patience M. Onyeukwu, Alfred Ogbonnaya and Ngozi Kanu, who are Igbo teachers at the Federal Government Girls' College, Umuahia, Abia State, Nigeria, and to Florence Nwaefuna and Celine Nwaigwe, both of whom are resident in Botswana, for checking the authenticity of some of the data used in this paper. I am equally grateful to Michael Ochu, Ngozi Umunnakwe and Lekan Oyegoke, all of the Department of English, University of Botswana, for reading drafts of the paper and making useful comments. Finally, I am grateful to Heiko Motschenbacher and Marlis Hellinger, first, for inviting me to participate in this book project from which I have learnt a lot and, second, for their extensive and very helpful critical comments.

References

- Achebe, Chinua. 1958. *Things fall apart*. Oxford: Heinemann.
- Achebe, Chinua. 1975. "Chi in Igbo cosmology." In *Morning yet on creation day*. London: Heinemann.
- Alexandre, Pierre. 1967. *An introduction to languages and language in Africa*. London: Heinemann.
- Amadiume, Ifi. 1987. *Male daughters, female husbands: Gender and sex in an African society*. London: Bath Press.
- Arua, Arua E. 1992. "Marital naming in Ohafia Igbo society." *Women and Language* 15(2): 8–10.
- Arua, Arua E. 1997. "Gender, meaning and conferment patterns of Yoruba and Igbo honorary chieftaincy titles." *Language, Gender and Sexism* 7: 47–62.
- Arua, Arua E. & Yisa K. Yusuf. 2010. "Sexism and the English translation of Igbo proverbs in Chinua Achebe's *Things fall apart*." In *Mapping Africa in the English speaking world*, eds. Kemoye C. Monaka & Owen Seda & Sibonile E. Ellece & John McAllister. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Press, 238–257.

- Azuonye, Chukwuma. 1987. "Igbo folk tale and the evolution of Chukwu as the supreme God of Igbo religion." *Nsukka Journal of Linguistics and African Languages* 1: 43–62.
- Bagwasi, Mopoloki M. 2007. "The effect of christianity and English on the naming patterns of Bakalanga." Paper presented at the *4th International Conference on Language and Literature held at the University of Botswana*, Gaborone, June 2007.
- Braun, Friederike. 2001. "The communication of gender in Turkish." In *Gender across languages: The linguistic representation of women and men*, vol. 1, eds. Marlis Hellinger & Hadumod Bußmann. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 283–310. DOI: 10.1075/impact.9.17bra
- Eckert, Penelope & Sally McConnell-Ginet. 2003. *Language and gender*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. DOI: 10.1017/CBO9780511791147
- Echeruo, Michael J. C. 1979. *A matter of identity: Aha m efula*. Owerri: Ministry of Information and Culture.
- Echeruo, Michael J. C. 2001. *Igbo-English dictionary*. Lagos: LearnAfrica.
- Emenanjo, E. Nolue. 1978. *Elements of Igbo grammar*. Ibadan: Oxford University Press.
- Emenanjo, E. Nolue & Ozo-Mekuri Ndimele & Chinyere Ohiri-Aniche & Justina Ogbonna & Anthony C. Onwumah & Ndidì Aimenwauu & Charles Ujah & Roseline Alerechi & C. Eme & Franca Okumo. 2012. *A unified standard orthography for the Igbo language cluster*. Cape Town: CASAS & CBAAC. DOI: 10.9790/0837-0463642
- Hellinger, Marlis & Hadumod Bußmann. 2001. "Gender across languages: The linguistic representation of women and men." In *Gender across languages: The linguistic representation of women and men*, vol. 1, eds. Marlis Hellinger & Hadumod Bußmann. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1–25. DOI: 10.1075/impact.9.05hel
- Ikeekonwu, C. I. 1987. "Igbo dialect cluster: A classification." Paper presented at a *seminar on Igbo language planning*. University of Nigeria, Nsukka.
- Lamidi, M. Tayo. 2009. "Gender neutral pronoun usage among selected second language users of English in Nigeria." In *Language, gender and politics*, eds. Akin Odeunmi & Arua E. Arua & Sailal Arimi. Lagos: Centre for Black and African Arts and Civilization.
- Nwachukwu-Agbada, J. Obii J. 2002. *The Igbo proverb: A study of its context, performance and functions*. Enugu: John Jacob's Classic Publishers Ltd.
- Nwaefuna, Florence. 2008. *A study of Ibusa names: Gender, meaning and attitude*. Unpublished MA Thesis, University of Botswana.
- Nwoga, Donatus I. 1984. *The supreme God as a stranger in Igbo religious thought*. Ahiazu Mbaise: Hawks Press.
- Oha, Obododinma. 1998. "The semantics of female devaluation in Igbo proverbs." *African Study Monographs* 19(2): 87–102.
- Okonkwo, M. N. 1977. *A complete course in Igbo grammar*. 3rd edition. Lagos: Macmillan.
- Onukawa, M. C. 2000. "The chi concept in Igbo gender naming." *Journal of the International African Institute* 70(1): 107–117.
- Penfield, Joyce. 1987. "Surnaming: The struggle for personal identity." In *Women and language in transition*, ed. Joyce Penfield. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 117–129.
- Smith, Daniel J. 2003. "Igbo." In *Encyclopedia of sex and gender: Men and women in the world's cultures. Vol. 1: Topics and cultures A-K*, eds. Carol R. Ember & Melvin Ember. New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers, 509–517.
- Williamson, Kay. 1972. *Dictionary of Onicha Igbo*. 2nd edition. Benin: Ethiope Press.
- Williamson, Kay. 1989. "Benue-Congo overview." In *The Niger-Congo languages*, ed. John Bendor-Samuel. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 246–274.
- Yusuf, Yisa K. 2002. "Sexism, English and Yoruba." *Linguistik Online* 11(2): 7–23.

KURDISH

Gender in Kurdish: Structural and socio-cultural dimensions

Geoffrey Haig

University of Bamberg, Germany

Ergin Öpengin

University of Bamberg, Germany

1. Introduction
2. Categories of gender
 - 2.1 Grammatical gender
 - 2.1.1 Grammatical gender in the case system
 - 2.1.2 Grammatical gender in linking elements
 - 2.1.3 The assignment of grammatical gender to nouns
 - 2.2 Lexical gender
 - 2.3 Referential gender
 - 2.4 Generic masculines
3. Gender-related structures
 - 3.1 Word-formation
 - 3.2 Anaphora and pronominalization
 - 3.3 Coordination
4. Usage of personal reference forms
 - 4.1 Address terms
 - 4.2 Occupational terms
 - 4.3 Idioms and proverbs
5. Language change: Public discourse on gender in language
6. Conclusion

Notes

References

1. Introduction

Kurdish is a cover term for a group of Northwest Iranian languages and dialects spoken by 20 to 30 million speakers in a contiguous area of West Iran, North Iraq, Eastern Turkey and Eastern Syria. There are also scattered enclaves of Kurdish speakers in Central Anatolia, the Caucasus, North-Eastern Iran (Khorasan) and Central Asia, besides a large European diaspora population. The three most important varieties of Kurdish are: (i) Southern Kurdish, spoken under various names near the city of Kermanshah in Iran and across the border in Iraq; (ii) Central Kurdish (also known as Sorani), one of the official languages of the Kurdish Autonomous Region in Iraq, also spoken by a large population in West Iran along the Iraqi border; (iii) Northern Kurdish (also known as *Kurmanji*, which we use interchangeably in this article), spoken by the Kurds of Turkey, Syria and the northwest perimeter of North Iraq, in pockets of Armenia and around lake Urmiye in Iran (cf. Öpengin & Haig 2014 for a detailed discussion on defining “Kurdish”). Of these three, the largest group in terms of speaker numbers is Northern Kurdish.

Central Kurdish and Northern Kurdish have, each in a distinct sociopolitical setting, developed independent “standard” varieties over the last century. Central Kurdish in its standard Sorani variety is now the principal language used in education and the mass media in the autonomous region of Kurdistan in Iraq (see Haig 2013; Hassanpour 2012), where it is written in the Arabic script. Northern (Kurmanji) Kurdish, on the other hand, developed written standards using the Cyrillic script in the ex-Soviet Union (particularly in Armenia), while the Kurds of Turkey adopted an adapted version of the Roman alphabet, which has become the dominant medium for Kurmanji in Turkey, Syria and the diaspora. Central and Northern Kurdish differ not only in terms of the scripts used. There are also considerable differences in morphology, leading to restricted levels of mutual intelligibility, particularly among speakers lacking regular exposure to the other dialects (cf. Haig & Öpengin, forthcoming, on differences between Central and Northern Kurdish, and Öpengin & Haig 2014 on dialectal differences within Kurmanji).

The earliest attested Iranian languages exhibited three grammatical gender classes as is typical of ancient Indo-European, but grammatical gender has largely been lost in Central and Southern Kurdish, where now even pronouns do not show any gender distinctions. In Northern Kurdish, on the other hand, grammatical gender is retained on nouns and pronouns, which show a two-way distinction between masculine and feminine. We therefore concentrate on Northern Kurdish, though for the discussion of social and referential gender we will also make reference to Central Kurdish at some points. With the exception of a brief synopsis in Haig (2004), a historical treatment of gender in MacKenzie (1954),

and some notes on the loss of grammatical gender in one dialect in Akin (2001), there is no previous published research on most of the issues tackled in this article. Our treatment is thus not just a summary of available research, but presents novel analyses based on original material. The main source used here for contemporary Kurmanji written language is a corpus of texts from the newspaper *Azadiya Welat*, outlined in Haig (2001), and the codes accompanying the examples below refer to the numbering in that corpus. We have also conducted structured interviews and consulted native speakers to obtain a more balanced cross-section of judgements, in particular for the section on occupational titles (Section 4.2). In order to simplify the description, we provide examples based on the most widely accepted written standard variety of Kurmanji Kurdish. Given the lack of previous research, it is inevitable that some of our analyses remain tentative, but we consider a detailed and accessible discussion of gender-related issues in Kurdish to be long overdue, and we trust it will contribute to generating increased research in the field.

2. Categories of gender

In Kurmanji, nouns can be assigned to one of two grammatical genders, traditionally labelled masculine and feminine. While such a two-gender system appears at first sight to be reminiscent of the well-known gender systems of the Romance languages, grammatical gender in Kurdish works somewhat differently. First, Kurdish has no productive derivational morphology for deriving personal nouns to specify referential gender (such as *-a* in Spanish *profesor-a* ‘female professor/teacher’ or *-in* in German *Fahrer-in* ‘female driver’). Instead, nouns that contextually refer to male or female persons are inflected like masculine or feminine nouns respectively. We discuss these issues in Sections 2.3 and 4.2 below. Second, gender distinctions in pronouns are only visible in the third person singular, and only in the oblique case of these pronouns. The linguistic expression of social and referential gender of course manifests itself in other ways, which are discussed in Sections 2.3 and 2.4.

2.1 Grammatical gender

Grammatical gender manifests itself in two types of inflectional morphology: the forms of case markers on nouns and pronouns, and on linking elements within the noun phrase, discussed in Sections 2.1.1 and 2.1.2 respectively. Grammatical gender is only relevant in the singular. In the plural, grammatical gender distinctions are completely neutralized, and all nouns take the same set of plural inflections.

2.1.1 Grammatical gender in the case system

Kurmanji Kurdish has a two-way case opposition in nouns and pronouns, between an unmarked case, generally referred to as the “direct” case in Kurdish linguistics, and a marked “oblique” case. In its case marking of subjects and direct objects, Kurdish has split alignment (sometimes called “split ergativity”): In the present tenses, the subjects of transitive verbs are in the direct case, but in the past tenses, they are in the oblique case. Objects of transitive verbs, on the other hand, show the reverse pattern, being oblique in the present, and direct in the past. These issues are not at stake here, but it nevertheless needs to be borne in mind that the terms ‘direct’ and ‘oblique’ cannot simply be equated with ‘nominative’ and ‘accusative’ (cf. Haig 2008: ch. 5–6 and references therein).

In the case system, grammatical gender is manifest solely in the form of the oblique case suffix. This suffix has two forms, depending on the grammatical gender of the noun: *-ê* for feminine and *-î* for masculine. This is illustrated in (1), where both the nouns and their qualifying demonstratives are in the oblique case:

- (1) a. *Vê jin-ê di-bîn-î?*
 this.OBL.FEM¹ woman-OBL.SG.FEM IND-see.PRES-2SG
 ‘Do you see this woman?’
- b. *Wî mêrik-î di-bîn-î?*
 that.OBL.MASC man-OBL.SG.MASC IND-see.PRES-2SG
 ‘Do you see that man?’

Exactly the same applies to pronouns of the third person (which are basically identical with the distal demonstratives): in the oblique case, there is a differentiation between a masculine singular *wî* (3SG.OBL.MASC) and a feminine singular *wê* (3SG.OBL.FEM). There are no gender distinctions on first or second person pronouns, and none in the plural. Nouns may also carry the indefinite suffix *-ek*, to which the same oblique case markers can be added: *li jin-ek-ê* ‘at a woman-INDEF-OBL.FEM’ and *li kur-ek-î* ‘at a boy-INDEF-OBL.MASC’.

Finally, when Kurdish nouns are used as terms of address, they may take what is termed the vocative case, which distinguishes the gender of the addressee: *-(y)ê* is used for feminine singular (as in *da-yê* ‘oh mother!’), while *-o* is used for masculine singular (as in *bav-o* ‘oh father!’).

2.1.2 Grammatical gender in linking elements

In Kurdish, constituents of the noun phrase that follow the head noun are linked to it via a particle, traditionally termed “*ezafe*” in Iranian linguistics (cf. Haig 2011 for a recent discussion). We use the neutral term ‘linker’ here, and gloss it as LNK. Depending on the gender and the definiteness of the modified noun, the linker either has the feminine form *-a* (definite) or *-e* (indefinite), or the masculine form *-ê*

(definite) or *-î* (indefinite). Example (2) illustrates feminine and masculine forms of the linker, each with an indefinite head noun.²

- (2) a. *kebanî-yek-e* *baş*
 woman-INDEF-LNK.SG.FEM good
 ‘a competent housewife’
- b. *şivan-ek-î* *baş*
 shepherd-INDEF-LNK.SG.MASC good
 ‘a competent shepherd’

The syntactic status of the linker is a matter of some controversy. It could be considered as a form of gender/number agreement between the head noun and its satellite, for example, the adjective *baş* ‘good’ in (2). However, unlike more prototypical examples of gender agreement, the linker is prosodically associated with its controller (the head noun) rather than its target. For the largely descriptive purposes of this section, the term “agreement” is nevertheless adequate, and we defer a more critical discussion of these issues to Section 2.3 below.³

When a head noun has multiple modifiers, a linking element may occur separated from the head, between the dependent elements. However, it still exhibits agreement in grammatical gender with the head noun, as illustrated in (3):

- (3) a. *keç-a* *min a* *mezin*
 girl-LNK.SG.FEM my LNK.SG.FEM big
 ‘my elder daughter’
- b. *kur-ê* *min ê* *mezin*
 boy-LNK.SG.MASC my LNK.SG.MASC big
 ‘my elder son’

With plural nouns, invariable forms of the linker are used, *-ên* (definite) and *-ine* (indefinite), regardless of the grammatical gender of the head noun. Note that in Central Kurdish, where grammatical gender has been lost (with the exception of relic forms in certain dialects), the linker has a single invariable form *-î*, used with all nouns, regardless of gender, number or definiteness.

To sum up, grammatical gender is manifested in the singular forms of the oblique case marker and the linker. Nouns that are not in the oblique case, or do not have any post-nominal modifiers, therefore, do not show any overt sign of grammatical gender. Grammatical gender thus only surfaces in certain morpho-syntactic configurations. In (4a) and (4b), for example, the two nouns are in the direct (unmarked) case and have no post-nominal modifiers. In contexts like this, the different grammatical genders of the two nouns are not morphosyntactically distinguished in any way:

- (4) a. *Ew keçik na-ç-e mekteb-ê.*
 that girl NEG-go.PRES-3SG school-OBL
 ‘That girl does not go to school.’
- b. *Ew kurik na-ç-e mekteb-ê.*
 that boy NEG-go.PRES-3SG school-OBL
 ‘That boy does not go to school.’

Table 1 provides the paradigms for marking grammatical gender in Kurmanji Kurdish that have been discussed so far.

Table 1. Inflectional marking of grammatical gender in Kurmanji Kurdish

	Singular				Plural	
	Feminine		Masculine		Def.	Indef.
	Def.	Indef.	Def.	Indef.		
Linker (<i>ezafe</i>)	-a	-e	-ê	-î	-ên	-ine
Oblique case	-ê		-î		-an	
Vocative	-ê		-o		-în/-ino	

2.1.3 *The assignment of grammatical gender to nouns*

Given that all nouns are assigned to either the masculine or feminine grammatical gender, the question arises what the criteria for gender assignment are. For nouns denoting inanimate objects, the principles of gender assignment are fairly opaque. There are no obvious phonological gender cues, so the gender of these nouns is not predictable from the phonological form alone (cf. *şîr* ‘garlic.FEM’, but *şîr* ‘milk.MASC’). There are, however, some reliable morphological criteria. For example, nouns derived with *-î* or *-tî* are invariably feminine (e.g. *bedew-î* ‘beauty’, *kurd-î* ‘Kurdish (language)’, *cîran-tî* ‘neighborliness’), as are nominalized infinitives derived with *-in* (e.g. *hat-in* ‘coming, arrival’, *mir-in* ‘death’). A number of semantic principles underlying gender assignment have also been proposed, though most admit many exceptions. Given the focus of this article on personal reference forms, we only note two of the more reliable semantic criteria in connection with inanimates here (see Bedir-Khan & Lescot (1991: 66–70) for a more detailed discussion): Toponyms are generally feminine (e.g. *Kurdistan* ‘Kurdistan’, *Dicle* ‘Tigris’, or *Mezopotamya* ‘Mesopotamia’). Food products from domestic animals are generally masculine, as in *şîr* ‘milk’, *penîr* ‘cheese’, *mast* ‘yoghurt’, *nivîşk* ‘unmelted butter’, *dew* ‘ayran’, *sertû* or *to* ‘cream’, and *goşt* ‘meat’.

The assignment of grammatical gender to nouns denoting animate beings is semantically motivated: Grammatical gender generally corresponds to lexical gender. Thus nouns such as *xal* ‘maternal uncle’, *bav* ‘father’, *bira* ‘brother’, *kur*

‘son, boy’, or *pismam* ‘male cousin’ are all grammatically masculine, while *met* ‘paternal aunt’, *dê* ‘mother’, *xwişk* ‘sister’, *keç* ‘girl, daughter’, *dotmam* ‘female cousin’ are all grammatically feminine. However, many personal nouns do not have a fixed grammatical gender value and may be used to refer to persons of either gender (e.g. *heval* ‘friend’). A number of complications arise in this connection, to which we return in Section 2.3 below.

2.2 Lexical gender

There are certain semantic fields within the nominal lexicon that commonly contain lexically gendered nouns. Typically, we find pairs of lexical items that differ primarily in this feature (though of course semantic connotations of various kinds will generally accompany each member of the pair). The most obvious such field is that of kinship terminology. Kurdish kinship is organized along patrilinear lines. Although traditionally the household is the basic domestic unit, consisting of husband, wife, children, and possibly the husband’s parents, some villages also recognize groups of closely related households known as *bavik* (from *bav* ‘father’; cf. van Bruinessen 1989:68). Kinship terminology varies extensively from one region to another. Table 2 gives an overview of the most widespread terms.

There is a fundamental asymmetry in that kinship terms for male persons are often basic, i.e. mono-morphemic, while terms for female kin (beyond siblings

Table 2. Kinship terms in Kurmanji Kurdish

Female nouns		Male nouns	
<i>jin/pîrek</i>	‘wife’	<i>mêr</i>	‘husband’
<i>xêzan</i>	‘wife’	<i>zêlam</i>	‘husband’
<i>dayik/dê</i>	‘mother’	<i>bab</i>	‘father’
<i>dapîr</i>	‘grandmother’	<i>bapîr</i>	‘grandfather’
<i>keç/qîz</i>	‘daughter’	<i>kur/law</i>	‘son’
<i>xwişk</i>	‘sister’	<i>bira</i>	‘brother’
<i>met</i>	‘paternal aunt’	<i>ap/mam</i>	‘paternal uncle’
<i>xalet</i>	‘maternal aunt’	<i>xal</i>	‘maternal uncle’
<i>dotmam</i>	‘paternal female cousin’	<i>pismam</i>	‘paternal male cousin’
<i>keçxal</i>	‘maternal female cousin’	<i>pisxal</i>	‘maternal male cousin’
<i>jinxal</i>	‘maternal uncle’s wife’	–	–
<i>jinmam</i>	‘paternal uncle’s wife’	–	–
<i>diş</i>	‘husband’s sister’	<i>tî</i>	‘husband’s brother’
<i>diş</i>	‘wife’s sister’	<i>bûra</i>	‘wife’s brother’
<i>bûk</i>	‘bride’	<i>zava</i>	‘groom’
<i>jintî</i>	‘wife of the husband’s brother’	<i>hevling</i>	‘husband of wife’s sister’
<i>hewî</i>	‘husband’s (other) wife’	–	–

and parents) are formed via compounding with the word *jin* ‘wife, woman’ (e.g. *jinxal* ‘wife of mother’s brother’, *jintî* ‘wife of husband’s brother’). There are no examples of the reverse pattern, i.e. that a male kinship term is formed through compounding with a basic female kinship term. Accordingly, there are no terms for the husband of the mother’s sister or the husband of the father’s sister, who would generally be addressed as ‘uncle’.

The grammatical gender of these words is predictable, i.e. there is a systematic correspondence between the lexical gender of the term and the grammatical gender as expressed through linker, case suffixes and anaphoric pronouns. The terms *xwarza* ‘sister’s child’ and *brazâ* ‘brother’s child’, on the other hand, do not specify the gender of the referent (the child can be of either sex), but of the referent’s parent.

Lexical gender is often not formally marked (i.e. there are no gender-indicating suffixes as part of the word), except for the few cases of compound kinship terms discussed above. There are, however, two gender-indicating adjectives that tend to form compounds with animal names to create gender-specific reference: *mê* ‘female’ (e.g. *kew* ‘partridge’ > *mêkew* ‘female partridge’) and *nêr* ‘male’ (e.g. *ker* ‘donkey’ > *nêreker* ‘male donkey’). This pattern is generally not extended to personal nouns (except for swear words). Instead, the word for ‘woman’ *jin* may be used to specify gender (see Section 4 below). In the realm of occupational titles, the lexicon tends to reflect the traditional division of labor between men and women in the shape of social gender bias: Certain occupational terms, such as *hedad* ‘blacksmith’, are traditionally considered male, while others, such as *bêrivan* ‘milkmaid’, are traditionally female in their association. There are no conventionalized items for members of the opposite gender in these occupations. Such terms are discussed in Section 4.2 below.

2.3 Referential gender

Above we have suggested that Kurdish is a language with grammatical gender, implying that the grammatical gender of each and every noun is rigidly fixed in the lexicon. However, there are a considerable number of nouns in Kurdish for which the concept of a lexically specified, inherent grammatical gender makes little sense. These nouns belong to a broad semantic category involving words that refer to human beings, but which in principle can refer to either males or females. A typical example is the word *heval* ‘friend’, which may be used to refer to either a male or a female person. Crucially, the inflection of this word (i.e. the choice of masculine or feminine forms of linkers or the oblique case markers) switches according to the intended reference in a particular context. For example, *heval-ê*

min (friend-LNK.MASC my; hence ‘my male friend’) contrasts with *heval-a min* (friend-LNK.FEM my; hence ‘my female friend’). The word *heval* itself undergoes no derivational or compounding process to effect female reference and is simply combined with the feminine form of the linker.

Comparable phenomena in other languages are discussed in Corbett (1991: 181f.) under the rubric of “double gender nouns”. Notably, the examples given there come from essentially the same semantic group as the Kurdish ones (for example, ‘doctor’ or ‘poor person’). However, the Kurdish case is unusual in that basically all words that are semantically compatible with both female and male reference can take the appropriate agreement forms for either grammatical gender. Therefore, this is not a matter of a few lexical oddities, but a basic principle of the gender system in the language. Accordingly, loan words or neologisms (some of the items in the second column below) that satisfy the semantic criteria are also treated like double-gender nouns. A selection of such double-gender nouns in Kurdish is given in Table 3.

Table 3. Kurdish double-gender nouns

<i>feqîr</i>	‘poor person’	<i>mamoste</i> ⁴	‘teacher’
<i>girtî</i>	‘prisoner’	<i>xwendekar</i>	‘student’
<i>mirov</i>	‘human being’	<i>endam</i>	‘member’
<i>dost</i>	‘fellow’	<i>serok</i>	‘head’
<i>heval</i>	‘friend’	<i>memûr</i>	‘state officer’
<i>gundi</i>	‘villager’	<i>nivîskar</i>	‘writer’
<i>deyndar</i>	‘indebted person’	<i>duxtor</i>	‘doctor’
<i>cîran</i>	‘neighbor’	<i>gerok</i>	‘traveler’
<i>kes</i>	‘person’	<i>qude/qure</i>	‘proud person’

There are clear usage preferences for one gender over the other with these words. In part these reflect real-world asymmetries, but in part they also reflect the tendency for mixed-sex or generic reference to be effected through a masculine form (see Section 2.4). This becomes evident when one considers the figures for masculine and feminine forms of four personal nouns in the *Azadiya Welat Corpus* (cf. Haig 2001). Note that many tokens of these lexemes show no overt gender inflection (e.g. plural forms). The figures in Table 4 are based on only those tokens which show an overt signal of grammatical gender.

The scarcity of feminine forms for *serok* ‘head, leader’ may actually reflect the under-representation of women in leadership, and the same may apply to the noun *nûner* ‘representative’. But the figures for *kes* ‘person’ and *mirov* ‘human being’ can hardly be attributed to a lack of female persons in the real world. We return to this issue in the next section, and in the discussion of occupational

Table 4. Frequencies of gender-inflected double-gender nouns in the *Azadiya Welat Corpus*

	Masculine inflection	Feminine inflection
<i>serok</i> 'head, leader'	213	3
<i>nûner</i> 'representative'	15	2
<i>kes</i> 'person'	33	0
<i>mirov</i> 'human being'	21	0

terms in Section 4.2. We have not found a clear example of a feminine-dominated double-gender noun in our data, though we do not exclude this possibility.

We began our analysis of grammatical gender by reiterating the traditional view, according to which Kurmanji is a language in which each noun belongs to one of two grammatical genders, masculine and feminine (cf. Bedir Khan & Lescot 1991), and that the genders are defined in terms of agreement classes (following the approach of Corbett 1991). However, the extent of double-gender nouns in Kurdish suggests that the assumption of gender classes defined by agreement phenomena, and of the lexically specified membership to one (and only one) gender class, requires revision. First, the notion of agreement as a unilateral relationship between a controller and a target is problematic for Kurdish, because the main exponents of grammatical gender are in fact located on the controller (the noun) itself. Second, we find that a significant part of the personal lexicon is apparently compatible with both masculine and feminine inflections, with the choice determined by contextually intended reference rather than by a fixed grammatical gender. In other words, with these words what appears to be “agreement morphology” is actually the sole bearer of semantic information relating to referential gender, a fact which is problematic for an analysis in terms of agreement.

Our assumption is that double-gender nouns are lexically underspecified for gender, and hence receive a gender feature from the context rather than at the lexical level. This is, however, not the only possible analysis. One might also consider Kurdish to have a rampant form of “zero conversion” of masculine nouns into feminine ones (or vice versa), but we find this approach less convincing. While these theoretical issues of analysis go beyond the aims of this article, we articulate them here because an analysis of the use of gendered expressions (see Section 4) is only possible when the system of morphological and lexical oppositions that transport gender-related messages in the language is understood.

2.4 Generic masculines

In generic contexts, the masculine singular form is the default form for pronominal expressions. Note that there are special forms of the linkers that occur as free forms in the sense of ‘the one which’ (illustrated in 5), and that are here treated as pronominal:

- (5) a. *yê ku bawer na-k-e*
 LNK.MASC that belief NEG-do.PRES-3SG
 ‘anyone (m) who does not believe’ (Zinar 1992:24)
- b. *Yê sîr-ê ne-xw-e bêhn jê*
 LNK.MASC garlic-OBL NEG-eat.PRES-3SG smell from.3SG
na-y-ê.
 NEG-come.PRES-3SG
 ‘Anyone (m) who does not eat garlic will not stink.’ (i.e. ‘There is no smoke without fire’) (AW78D1)

Similarly, when double-gender personal nouns are used generically, they are usually treated as masculine. This is illustrated with the noun *nivîskar* ‘author’ in (6), the heading of a journalistic report, in which the noun *nivîskar* is intended to refer to authors in general, including female authors. By contrast, the feminine-inflected form of the noun is only used for a specific female referent.

- (6) *Nivîskar-ê kurd ni-kar-e*
 author-LNK.SG.MASC Kurdish NEG-be.able.PRES-3SG
xwe ji kurdayeti-yê rizgar bi-k-e.
 REFL from Kurdishness-OBL emancipated SUBJ-do.PRES-3SG
 ‘A Kurdish author (m) is not able to emancipate himself of Kurdishness.’⁵

The generic use of the masculine form can also be seen in connection with coordinated double-gender nouns (as in 7a), while (7b) shows how the word *alîgir* ‘supporter’, when used as a predicate complement to *partiya me* ‘our political party’, takes the masculine form:

- (7) a. *Em dost û dijmin-ê xwe di-nas-in.*
 we friend and enemy-LNK.SG.MASC REFL IND-recognize.PRES-1PL
 ‘We know our friend and enemy.’ (AW79A4)
- b. *Parti-ya me alîgir-ê*
 party-LNK.SG.FEM our supporter-LNK.SG.MASC
çareseri-ya kêşe-ya Kurd e.
 solution-LNK.SG.FEM question-LNK.SG.FEM Kurdish is
 ‘Our party is a defendant of the solution of the Kurdish question.’
 (AW69A2)

An anaphoric pronoun with a generic antecedent is also generally third person singular masculine. In example (8), the masculine third person singular pronoun *wî* refers generically to a ‘Kurdish child’. Surprisingly, the antecedent itself, *zarok* ‘child’, carries the feminine form of the linker.⁶ This example shows that anaphoric pronouns with generic antecedents are masculine, even if the antecedent itself is grammatically feminine:

- (8) *Zarok-a kurd, kurd e. Diya wî*
 child-LNK.SG.FEM Kurdish Kurdish is mother.of 3SG.MASC
kurd e, bapîr-ê wî kurd e.
 Kurdish is grandfather-of 3SG.MASC Kurdish is
 ‘A Kurdish child is Kurdish. His mother is Kurdish, his grandfather is Kurdish.’⁷

As discussed above, the personal nouns *kes* ‘person’ and *mîrov* ‘human being, man’ are double-gender nouns, with feminine or masculine satellite forms depending on context. They often serve as a kind of indefinite pronoun, meaning ‘anyone, no one, whosoever, the person who’. In their generic uses, they may be plural and thus neutralized in terms of grammatical gender, but in the singular they are almost always in the masculine form. The sentences in (9) illustrate the generic use of such masculine forms:

- (9) a. *Diltenik: kes-ê hestiyar*
 soft-heart: person-LNK.SG.MASC sensitive
 ‘Soft-hearted: a sensitive person’ (AW70C2)
- b. *Her kes-ê kurdistanî (...) li hemberî*
 each person-LNK.SG.MASC Kurdistani in regard
qanûn-an hevmaf e.
 law-OBL.PL equal.rights is
 ‘Every Kurdistani person possesses the same legal rights.’ (AW74A1)
- c. *Mîrov-ê ku ni-zani-be bi*
 human-LNK.SG.MASC that NEG-know.PRES-SUBJ with
zimanê xwe yê neteweyî bi-peyiv-e (...)
 language REFL LNK.SG.MASC national SUBJ-speak.PRES-3SG
 ‘The person who cannot speak his national language (...)’ (AW79C4)

The use of feminine inflections to express generic senses is not attested in the sources available to us. However, there are some conscious efforts towards a more gender-inclusive language usage, involving avoidance of the masculine inflection in generic functions (see Section 5).

3. Gender-related structures

3.1 Word-formation

In this section, we investigate word-formation processes in Kurmanji as they relate to personal reference forms. Two main processes are available for this purpose, namely derivation via suffixation and compounding.

One means of creating agent nouns, including many occupational terms, is compounding based on the present-tense stems of action verbs. For instance, the agent noun *nanpêj* ‘baker’ is formed by attaching the present-tense stem of the verb *patin* ‘to bake, to cook’ (*pêj-*) to the noun *nan* ‘bread’. The resulting form is a double-gender noun, as bakers may be male or female.

Agent nouns may also be derived by a small number of suffixes. What is striking is that these derivational suffixes are not specified for a particular grammatical gender. Instead, if the output of a derivational process is a personal reference form, the latter complies with the same principles of gender assignment as simplex words: If a word can, by virtue of its meaning, be applied to both female and male persons, then it is treated as a double-gender noun. Thus, also in word-formation, gender assignment is a matter of semantics. Compounding and derivation are illustrated in Table 5.

Table 5. Compounding and derivation of Kurdish agent nouns

Compounding	Morphological components	Agent noun	
Noun + present-tense verb stem	<i>nan</i> ‘bread’ + <i>pêj-</i> ‘cook’	<i>nanpêj</i>	‘baker’
	<i>cigare</i> ‘cigarette’ + <i>kêş-</i> ‘smoke’	<i>cigarekêş</i>	‘smoker’
	<i>stran</i> ‘song’ + <i>bêj-</i> ‘say’	<i>stranbêj</i>	‘singer’
	<i>wêne</i> ‘photo’ + <i>gir-</i> ‘keep’	<i>wênegir</i>	‘photographer’
	<i>kitêb</i> ‘book’ + <i>firoş-</i> ‘sell’	<i>kitêbfiroş</i>	‘book-seller’
Derivation			
Verb stem + <i>-er</i>	<i>xwîn-</i> ‘read’ + <i>-er</i>	<i>xwîner</i>	‘reader’
	<i>kuj-</i> ‘kill’ + <i>-er</i>	<i>kujer</i>	‘killer’
	<i>parêz-</i> ‘defend’ + <i>-er</i>	<i>parêzer</i>	‘lawyer’
Noun + <i>-van</i>	<i>rojname</i> ‘newspaper’ + <i>-van</i>	<i>rojnamevan</i>	‘journalist’
	<i>bêrî</i> ‘milking’ + <i>-van</i>	<i>bêrivan</i>	‘milker’
	<i>ga</i> ‘ox’ + <i>-van</i>	<i>gavan</i>	‘cow-herd’
Noun + <i>-dar</i>	<i>pez</i> ‘sheep’ + <i>-dar</i>	<i>pezdar</i>	‘stockbreeder’
	<i>guh</i> ‘ear’ + <i>-dar</i>	<i>guhdar</i>	‘listener’
	<i>dukan</i> ‘shop’ + <i>-dar</i>	<i>dukandar</i>	‘shopkeeper’

The derivational suffixes illustrated in Table 5 yield agentive nouns denoting persons engaged in a particular activity, or characterized by a particular occupation. The grammatical gender of these derived nouns, however, is not determined by the derivational suffix itself, but by the social gender that is associated with the respective activity or occupation. Milking, for example, is traditionally a female occupation, hence the word *berivan* ‘milker’ is exclusively feminine. Herding cattle, on the other hand, is traditionally the occupation of males, hence *gavan* ‘cow-herd’ is invariably grammatically masculine. The other nouns in this group display gender biases of varying strengths in one direction or the other, and hence have a default reading (mostly masculine). But in a given context, these default gender assignments could be overridden, and the word could be treated as grammatically feminine. For example, shopkeepers are generally men and the word *dukandar* is inflected as masculine in most contexts. But if a specific female person was introduced as a shopkeeper, it would be possible to inflect the noun *dukandar* with feminine forms. We therefore consider the words in this group, with the exception of *berivan* ‘milker’ and *gavan* ‘cow-herd’, to be double-gender nouns which may refer to both female and male persons. The interpretative issues here are quite complex, with variation from lexeme to lexeme and often from speaker to speaker. We return to them in connection with occupational titles in Section 4.2.

There are also other types of compounding that are used to form personal nouns and that are not illustrated in Table 5. For instance, the word *serokwezîr* ‘prime minister’ is composed of *serok* ‘head’ and *wezîr* ‘minister’. This word is also a double-gender noun and can be inflected either as feminine (e.g. *serokwezîr-a Elmanyayê* ‘the prime minister-LNK.SG.FEM of Germany’) or masculine (e.g. *serokwezîr-ê Kurdistanê* ‘the prime minister-LNK.SG.MASC of Kurdistan’), depending on the context.

3.2 Anaphora and pronominalization

The only form of gender agreement in Kurmanji Kurdish is the linker that occurs with post-head modifiers in the noun phrase. There is no gender agreement between a predicate and its arguments. However, as discussed in Section 2.1.2, the relationship between a noun and its linker is difficult to account for in terms of a target which agrees with a controller noun, because the linker itself is prosodically attached to the controller rather than to a target external to the noun. The second problem with applying the notion of agreement to the linker is the fact that linkers occur as independent anaphoric elements, in the sense of ‘the one who, whoever’

(cf. example (5) above). In some contexts, such independent linkers have antecedents, and the linker will then reflect the gender of its antecedent. However, these cases are best described in terms of anaphora, which we discuss in this section.

Among the pronouns, the two-way gender distinction is available only in the third person singular of the oblique pronouns: *wê* for feminine and *wî* for masculine. Accordingly, a feminine noun such as *Tirkiye* ‘Turkey’ in (10) is pronominalized by the feminine pronoun *wê* (glossing slightly simplified here):

- (10) *Tirkiye van gotinan ciddî bigire*
 Turkey.FEM these words serious takes
wê ji bo faydeya wê be.
 FUT for benefit of 3.SG.OBL.FEM be
 ‘If Turkey takes these words seriously, this will be for her own benefit.’
 (CTV23)

With inanimates such as the word *Tirkiye* ‘Turkey’, grammatical agreement with the antecedent is common. However, there is also a notable tendency to take the feminine form of the pronoun as the default for anaphoric reference to inanimates (in some dialects, such as those of the Şemdinli (Kurdish: Şemzînan) region of Turkish Kurdistan, this is in fact the rule). An example of this tendency in the written language is given in (11), where an inanimate noun with masculine gender (*cewher* ‘essence’) is pronominalized with a feminine form (*wê*).

- (11) *Dagirker-an ev cewher diziye*
 invader-PL.OBL this essence.MASC stolen
naverok-a wê vala kiriye.
 content-LNK.SG.FEM 3SG.FEM empty made
 ‘The invaders have usurped this essence (of Kurdish conduct) and ripped it off its contents.’ (AW79C3)

Although these issues have never been systematically investigated, the evidence available provides further support to the view that the gender system works quite differently with personal nouns when compared to inanimate nouns. With the latter, there is an over-generalization of the feminine form in some dialects, at least in anaphoric pronouns, while for the former, in generic contexts and indeed in all contexts which do not unambiguously involve reference to a specific female person, it is clearly the masculine forms which are preferred. Finally, we should mention that in some dialects, particularly the Serhed dialects of Central Anatolia, gender distinctions are lost entirely in the third person pronouns, leading to a situation comparable to the contact language Turkish (cf. Braun 2000).

3.3 Coordination

When two or more nouns of different grammatical gender are coordinated in a single noun phrase, the entire phrase is inflected according to the gender of the second (or last) conjunct. The gender conflict is thus resolved in terms of “vicinity” (Corbett 1991), that is, the gender of the closer conjunct determines the outcome. This is illustrated for personal nouns in (12a), where only the gender of the second conjunct is overtly marked, and for inanimate nouns in (12b), where, again, the gender specification of the first conjunct is not expressed in the coordination.

- (12) a. *Bapîr û dapîr-a wî*
 grandfather.MASC and grandmother-LNK.SG.FEM 3SG.MASC
li gund dijîn.
 in village live
 ‘His grandfather and grandmother live in the village.’
- b. *Wê bi erk û karîn-a*
 will with responsibility.MASC and ability-LNK.SG.FEM
kurdan pêk-were.
 Kurds happen
 ‘It will happen with the efforts and ability of the Kurds themselves.’
 (AW79A5)

Another common way of resolving such gender conflicts is using the plural form of the linker, as in *dayik û bab-ên min* (lit. ‘mother and father-LNK.PL my’). Although the individual conjuncts have divergent genders in the singular, treating the entire phrase as plural avoids the problem of opting for one gender over another.

4. Usage of personal reference forms

4.1 Address terms

The only study on address terms in Kurdish to date has been conducted by Asadpour et al. (2012), who regrettably do not touch on gender issues. Our comments here are thus based on observation and therefore tentative. The most commonly used address forms in Kurdish are kinship terms (cf. Section 2.2). Other (non-kinship) address terms are *kek* for addressing elder males and *xatûn*, *stî* (more literary) and *xanim* for addressing married, particularly older women, though their use compared to the kinship terms is very restricted. Kinship terms

are also widely used as forms of address for non-kin. For example, young people may address male peers they are unacquainted with as *pismam* ‘cousin’ and female peers as *xwişkê* ‘sister.VOC’.

In traditional Kurdish society, religious terms indicating position or lineage are also used as address forms. Terms such as *mamosta* ‘teacher’, *mela* ‘mullah, imam’, or *feqî* ‘student of a religious school’, are used only for males, either coupled with the first name of the addressee or alone. The inapplicability of these terms to women stems from the fact that the domains they denote are male-dominated, i.e. traditional religious education has been reserved for men. Often the wife of a *mela* is referred to in relation to her husband as *melajin* ‘wife of the priest’. On the other hand, terms such as *hecî* ‘person who has made the pilgrimage to Mecca’ and *seyîd* ‘sayered’ (a lineage term traditionally denoting a descendant of the prophet Mohammed, but also used in religious fraternities for senior members) can be used to address both females and males.

Terms reflecting the referent’s social and political position or office show a clear male bias. Thus, terms such as *mîr* ‘prince, emir’, *axa* ‘gha, lord, landowner’, or *reîs* ‘mayor’ can only be used to address males, while *muxtar* ‘the elected leader of a village’ are also used for addressing females. Within modern Kurdish politics, however, a set of more gender-neutral address terms has been developed: *heval* ‘comrade’, *rêber* ‘leader’ and *serok* ‘head’ are used for both women and men.

There are also traditional self-deprecating address forms used by men only (e.g. *ez xulam*), by women only (e.g. *ez xudam*), or by both genders (e.g. *ez benî*; all three literally meaning ‘to whom I am a servant’). They are generally used when addressing persons with political power, or by young people when addressing persons who are significantly older than themselves. However, our observation is that this type of address is used more frequently by women than men, though we lack empirical evidence for this issue. Moreover, endearment expressions such as *ez gorî* (lit. ‘to whom I shall be sacrificed’) or *ez heyran* (lit. ‘to whom I am an admirer’) are commonly considered to be restricted to female speakers.

4.2 Occupational terms

Kurdish has a rich lexicon of terms denoting persons characterized by a particular activity or occupational position. In most cases, such activities or occupations are conventionally associated with male or female persons, while some are performed by both males and females. The differences, however, are subtle and do not readily lend themselves to water-tight classification. We investigated a sub-set of such terms and tested their acceptability in different contexts.⁸ First, we checked whether they could receive both masculine and feminine inflections, i.e. whether

they were treated as double-gender nouns, as described in Section 2.3 above. If they did not occur with the feminine form of the linker, we asked native speakers how one would refer to a female/male representative of that occupation. What emerged was that these nouns can provisionally be grouped into two classes.

First, some occupational terms can be characterized as double-gender nouns. They take either masculine or feminine forms of the linker and the oblique case marker, depending on referential gender. An example is the term *şivan* 'shepherd'. This occupation is traditionally associated with male persons, but it appears that it can occur with feminine forms of the linker (as in *şivan-a berxa* 'shepherd-LNK.FEM.SG of lambs'), if reference to a female shepherd is intended. Note, however, that the default interpretation is male and that these nouns would be inflected as grammatically masculine in a generic context. Nouns of this type may also be modified through the addition of the word *jin(ik)* 'woman', either as part of a compound or linked to the occupational term via the linker. For example, *memûr* 'civil servant' would generally be interpreted as referring to a male person. To refer to a female civil servant, one would say *jinika memûr* (lit. 'woman civil servant') or *memûra jin* (lit. 'civil servant woman'). Interestingly, both the word for 'woman' *jin(ik)* and the occupational term itself can be the head of such a construction. We are unable to discern an obvious tendency here, nor can we identify a clear semantic difference between the two options.

The second group includes terms denoting occupations for which the male or female association is apparently so deeply entrenched in the lexical semantics of the word that no form for a person of the opposite gender can be created. We conveniently refer to these as gender-exclusive terms. This is notably often the case for occupations with strong female connotations. For instance, traditionally, the term *kabanî* refers to a 'person who prepares the food at social events' (be it as a profession or as part of one's social responsibilities).⁹ Traditionally, this term is strictly reserved for women, who are the people usually involved in this activity. But in recent decades, catering services are increasingly hired for social events such as weddings, and the persons entrusted with the cooking are often male. For these men, the term *kabanî* is not used, although they do essentially the same kind of work. Instead, they can be referred to as *risqçêker*, literally 'food-maker', by means of the Turkish borrowing *aşçı* 'cook', or by means of the neologism *aşpêj* 'cook'. Table 6 shows the occupational terms that we have studied, and the tentative classification obtained.

Ongoing changes in occupational patterns and social gender roles would be expected to impact on the way these terms are perceived, and consequently may, in the long run, impact on the grammatical expression of gender. For example, Kurdish women are increasingly politically active and have been elected to the office of mayor in some constituencies in Turkish Kurdistan. To refer to these

Table 6. The referential gender of Kurdish occupational terms

Double-gender nouns		Gender-exclusive terms			
		Female-exclusive		Male-exclusive	
<i>xeyat</i>	'tailor'	<i>bêrî</i>	'milker'	<i>hosta</i>	'mason'
<i>tucar</i>	'trader'	<i>kabani</i>	'cook at events'	<i>rêncber</i>	'farmer'
<i>mamosta</i>	'teacher'	<i>pîrik</i>	'midwife'	<i>hedad</i>	'blacksmith'
<i>şifêr</i>	'driver'	<i>xudam</i>	'servant'	<i>sepan</i>	'laborer' ¹⁰
<i>memûr</i>	'civil servant'	<i>nanpêj</i>	'domestic bread maker'	<i>qesab</i>	'butcher'
<i>şuwan</i>	'shepherd'			<i>tehmîrcî</i>	'mechanic'
<i>lawjebêj</i>	'singer'			<i>reyîs</i>	'mayor'
<i>dukandar</i>	'shopkeeper'			<i>mela</i>	'imam'
				<i>feqî</i>	'student of Islam'
				<i>nêçîrvan</i>	'hunter'

women, the neologism *şaredar* would be used, rather than the traditional term for 'mayor' *reyîs*, which up until now has been reserved for males. But it is quite possible that in the future new expressions based on *reyîs*, but marked for female reference, may be coined. Similarly, the word *nanpêj* 'baker' traditionally referred to a female person in a household who produced bread, but has now been extended to become a general term for people involved in bread-making as an occupation (usually males). When used in this latter sense, the noun may be inflected with masculine forms.

Few domains of the lexicon (if any) reflect the complex interplay of social conventions and role constructions with language structure more faithfully than the field of occupational terms. Given the variation and uncertainties which emerged in our discussions with native speakers on these issues, we stress the tentative nature of the analyses carried out here. There is obviously a need for closely monitored quantitative investigations of Kurdish personal nouns, such as those pioneered in Braun (2000) for occupational titles in Turkish.

4.3 Idioms and proverbs

Gender as a referential and social category is transported not only through grammatical formatives and individual lexemes, but is tightly enshrined into the semantics of idiomatic expressions and proverbs. This realm provides some access to the conventionalized gender-related social stereotypes and belief systems underlying the manifestations of gender in the Kurdish speech community. Two previous studies have dealt with related issues: Hassanpour (2001) traces male bias in Sorani Kurdish, as it is reflected in dictionary entries and oral literature,

while Alakom (1994) specifically investigates the representation of women in Kurmanji folklore.¹¹

The words *jin* ‘woman’ and *pyaw* ‘man’ in Sorani (*mêr* ‘man’ in Kurmanji) are associated with a set of mostly opposing qualities, values, and emotional connotations, which are reconstructed and reinforced particularly in proverbs and popular sayings. The Sorani word *pyaw* is also used as a male generic in the sense of ‘human being’, as in (13).

- (13) *xûşk-im le hemû pyaw-an be namûs-tir-e.*
 sister-POSS.1SG from every man-PL with honour-more-COP.3SG
 ‘My sister is more endowed with honor than every person (lit. ‘man’).’
 (Öpengin 2013: 103)

Hassanpour (2001:236) states that the word *pyaw* is often associated with qualities such as zeal and bravery. In a similar vein, Öpengin (2013:102) points out that *pyaw* is also frequently used as an adjective meaning ‘courageous, reliable’, for example, in the fixed expression *pyawî zor pyaw* lit. ‘a man (who is) very man(ly)’, i.e. ‘a very courageous and reliable man’. The adjectival meanings associated with the forms *jin* or *afret* (both ‘woman’) are diametrically opposed to those of *pyaw*, including ‘weak, cowardly’. One of the meanings provided for *afret* in *Henbane Borine*, one of the most important Kurdish dictionaries, is ‘weakling’ (Hassanpour 2001:236).

Words derived from *pyaw* and *jin* often express the same qualities. The abstract noun *pyaw-etî* means ‘manliness, greatness, big favor’. The adjective and adverb *pyaw-ane* means ‘manly or for men’ (for example, of shoes), but it is extended to express the adverbial meaning ‘bravely’, whereas the form *jin-anî* ‘womanly’ is often used to express the negative characteristics of a man. The word *camêr* (from *ciwan* ‘young, good’ and *mêr* ‘man’) is used as a general expression of positive personal attributes (meaning ‘fine, upright’) and can be used for both men and women.

A man is called *serjin* (*ser* ‘head’ + *jin* ‘woman’) ‘lit. woman-headed’ if he listens to what his wife says (which is interpreted as a sign of being dominated by the wife). The lexical expression of manly characteristics such as ‘brave’ when applied to a woman, on the other hand, requires the combination of lexically female with lexically male morphemes, such as in *nêrejin* (*nêr* ‘male’ + *jin* ‘woman’) or *keçebav* (*keç* ‘girl’ + *bav* ‘father’; lit. ‘girl of her father’), both meaning ‘a brave and strong woman’, with positive connotations.

The social construction of the man as outgoing and dominant versus the woman as submissive and shy is also represented in commonly used proverbs, as seen in the examples in (14a) from Kurmanji, and (14b) from Sorani:

- (14) a. *Jina şermîn bi gundekê mêtê şermîn bi kundekê.*
 ‘The shy woman (is) worth a village, the shy man (is) worth an owl.’
- b. *Le segî dirr, le jinî dimşirr bitirse.*
 ‘Beware of ravenous dogs and abusive women.’

In traditional Kurmanji Kurdish households, direct reference to one’s spouse with the terms *mêr* ‘man, husband’ and *jin* ‘woman, wife’ is considered a taboo. Thus, a husband will not refer to his wife as *jin-a min* ‘my wife’. Instead, men often use terms like *xêzan* ‘family’ and *biçûk* ‘children’ in the Badini dialect, or *kulfet* lit. ‘burden’ and *zaro(k)* ‘children’ in the other areas of Kurmanji Kurdish. Women, on the other hand, use terms such as *malxwê* ‘head of the family’, *zêlam* ‘man’, *babê biçûkan* ‘father of the children’, etc., to refer to their husbands. It is not clear to us at this point how these avoidance strategies are to be interpreted, and we are not aware of any research on these issues. However, restrictions on address terms and forms used to refer to spouses or in-laws are a very well attested phenomenon cross-linguistically (e.g. Salami 2004), and the Kurdish data are in line with many of the observed tendencies.

In the traditional Kurdish lineage system, it is the father’s family and/or tribe to which the children automatically belong. Probably as a reflection of this well-established shared value, reference to one’s heritage in various public domains (for example, poetry or politics) is established through the phrase *bav û kalên me* ‘our ancestors’ (lit. ‘our father and grandfathers’), as in the phrases *zimanê bav û kalên me* ‘the language of our ancestors’ or *warê bav û kalên me* ‘the land of our ancestors’.

Social gender asymmetries are also reflected in the traditional Kurdish marriage terminology. The verb *xwastin* (lit. ‘to want, to request’) is, in the context of match-making, the conventionalized expression for ‘to send intermediaries to the parents of a girl to ask for her in marriage’, with the woman passively undergoing the whole process. A gender-neutral native expression for ‘to marry’ is not available, even though the Arabic borrowing *zewicîn* ‘to marry’ is used in some parts of Kurdistan. In the native component of the Kurdish lexicon, for males ‘to marry’ is expressed by the phrase *jin înan* lit. ‘to bring (a) woman’, whereas for women marrying, it is *şû kirin* or *mêr kirin* lit. ‘to do/make (a) husband/man’. The literal meanings of these phrases are interesting. For males, marriage is conceptualized as an act of ‘obtaining’ a woman, while for women, the conceptualization is ‘to make a man’, i.e. ‘to make a man complete’. Two phrases which do not include the words for man and woman, *mare/mehr kirin* (‘to officially espouse’) and *dawet kirin* (lit. ‘to do a wedding’) in fact replicate the asymmetric view of marriage, since in both the subject of the verb can only be a man, and never a woman. In

the same vein, divorce is expressed in terms of male activity and female acquiescence: The verb *telaq dan* (lit. 'to give divorce') requires a male subject, while the corresponding expression for women is *telaq wergirtin* (lit. 'to receive divorce'). Thus the marriage-related terminology systematically reflects – and hence reinforces – a conceptualization of marriage in which men are the active instigators and controllers of this process, while women are the party affected by this process (but cf. Section 5 below for some recent attempts to counteract these tendencies in contemporary written Kurdish). The word *maldamayî* (lit. 'remained at home') describes a woman who has never married and evokes negative connotations as to the physical appearance of the woman. There is no such corresponding term for men.¹²

Another marriage-related dimension is the high esteem attributed to women as bearers of children and caretakers of family and home. Words such as *kabanî* (cf. Section 4.2 above), *bermalî* and *xanûman* all refer to the woman in the role of the person who takes charge of all domestic affairs. Again many proverbs and idiomatic expressions celebrate women in this role, as in (15), taken from Alakom (1994: 44).

- (15) a. *Avaya malê destê jinan e.*
 'The flourishing of the home depends on the woman.'
 b. *Jin kela mêra ye.*
 'The woman is the man's castle.'
 c. *maka nodik nod canûyî*
 'the mother of ninety nine foals' (i.e. 'a woman who bears many children')

While we have drawn attention to role asymmetries as manifest in socially gendered nouns, we should also note the existence of a number of well-known proverbs which explicitly affirm male-female complementarity (cf. 16a), whereas a very popular proverb (16b) asserts and reinforces gender equality with respect to the attributes of courage and strength, represented here metaphorically through the concept 'lion'.

- (16) a. *Jin û mên weke tevr û bêr.*
 'Woman and man, like shovel and pickaxe.'
 b. *Şêr şêr e çi jin e çi mên e.*
 'A lion is a lion, whether it is male or female.'

In fixed expressions involving paired words, it is notable that the most frequent order is female-male, as in *xwişk û bira* 'sister and brother' (the same order is preserved in addressing a larger mixed-sex group), *keç û kur* 'daughter and son', *keç/qîz û xort* 'young girls and boys', *dê û bav* 'mother and father', *dapîr û bapîr* 'grandmother and grandfather', *jin û mên* 'woman and man'.

To the extent that Kurdish idioms and proverbs reflect traditional belief systems which stem from a largely pre-industrial era, one may reasonably question the degree to which they reflect current attitudes and practices among contemporary urban Kurds. However, they are still part of the collective cultural memory, and it is undeniable that the values they transport continue to stabilize gender stereotypes in the community. More recently, with increasing political awareness particularly among urban Kurds in all regions of Kurdistan, important changes in gender perception can be observed. The following slogans have been extremely widespread in the public sphere among Kurds in Turkey, where gender issues have figured prominently on the agenda of the Kurdish political movements over the last two decades.

- (17) a. *Jin jîyan azadî!*
 ‘Woman, life, freedom!’ (i.e. the three are inseparable)
- b. *Heta jin azad nebe civak azad nabe!*
 ‘Society will not be emancipated as long as women are not free!’

Over the past 30 years, left-wing elements have been very influential among the Kurds of Turkey, and gender-inclusive policies continue to be prominent within these movements.¹³ The gender-equality components of left-wing ideologies have carried over into the recent political arena, most clearly in the agenda of the *Bariş ve Demokrasi Partisi* (BDP, ‘Peace and Democracy Party’), Turkey’s most important pro-Kurdish political party. The BDP is the only political party in Turkey to pursue a 40% quota for women, and the number of female mayors and parliament members in the BDP is higher than in any other political party in Turkey. There is little doubt that the early promotion of gender equality in Kurdish politics has had a lasting impact on the self-perception of Kurdish women in Turkey, and can be expected to have implications for policies on gendered language.¹⁴

5. Language change: Public discourse on gender in language

As mentioned, Kurmanji Kurdish is not the official language of any nation state, and there are no institutions charged with formulating guidelines for language usage or executive bodies with the authority to implement such guidelines. Instead, various partially competing television, internet and print media platforms engage in an ongoing metalinguistic discourse, each pursuing its own agenda. Within the Kurdish context, the term “language reform” is thus not particularly appropriate, as the concept was developed primarily with reference to state-sanctioned and institutionalized measures. Nevertheless, quite recently some Kurdish writers and journalists of left-wing and progressive inclinations attempted to change the

structure and lexicon of the language with the aim of counteracting a perceived male bias. Many of these initiatives replicate current practices in a number of European languages, where strategies have been developed for avoiding, among other things, the use of generic masculines (see, for example, Braun et al. 2007).

As discussed in Section 2.4, the generic personal nouns *mirov* ‘human being’ and *kes* ‘person’, as well as the indefinite pronoun *yek* ‘one’, are often inflected as masculine when used generically. But in the last two decades, more and more authors have started to add the feminine inflection by means of a slash, as in *mirovê/a ku nizanibe (...)* ‘a person.LNK.MASC/LNK.FEM who does not know (...)’. The following example illustrates this practice with the word *yek* ‘one’ in the oblique case, which is repeated in both the masculine and feminine form:

- (18) *Her gotin-ek-e pêşî-ya yekten ji dev-ê*
 each word-INDEF-LNK front-OBL at.once from mouth-LNK
yek-î/yek-ê ji nişka ve derneketî-ye.
 one-OBL.MASC/one-OBL.FEM suddenly NEG.come.out-3SG
 ‘It is not the case that every proverb has been uttered by someone (m/f) all of a sudden.’ (Alakom 1994)

The same strategy may be applied to double-gender nouns (cf. Section 2.3 and 4.2), as in *perspektîfa kedkarekî/e kurd* ‘the perspective of a Kurdish laborer.LNK.MASC/LNK.FEM’, where *kedkar* ‘worker, labourer’ is overtly marked for both masculine and feminine gender. Similar double-marking strategies may be applied to anaphoric pronouns, when their antecedents are double-gender nouns or generics. Consider (19), where the double-marking strategy is deployed within an idiom. The sentence is about people who cannot speak, and the pronoun in this example refers back to the noun *mirov* ‘person’ in the preceding text passages:

- (19) *Tu dibêjî qey kuliyan ziman-ê wî/wê*
 as if grasshopper tongue-LNK 3SG.OBL.MASC/FEM
xwari-ye.
 eat.PAST.PART-3SG
 ‘It is as if the grasshoppers have eaten his/her tongue.’ (AW79C4)

Some authors reverse the order of such form-pairs, writing the feminine form first, as in the examples in (20), taken from a recent Kurdish textbook; Dirêz 2011:226).

- (20) a. *şagirt-ek-e/î min*
 student-INDEF-LNK.FEM/MASC POSS.1SG
 ‘a student (f/m) of mine’

- b. *gor-a wê/wî*
 tomb-LNK POSS.3SG.FEM/MASC
 ‘the tomb of her/him’
- c. *kategori-ya ku di berhem-ên wê/wî de (...)*
 category-LNK.FEM that in work-LNK.PL POSS.3SG.FEM/MASC in
 ‘The category (of authors) in the work of whose (f/m) (...)’ (AW69D3)

The double-marking strategy just illustrated is typographically cumbersome and scarcely practicable for the spoken language. For these reasons, Öpengin (2011: 218) suggests “alternating masculine/feminine forms” as a more reader- and listener-friendly form of gender-inclusive language. For instance, when referring several times generically to a ‘bilingual speaker’ within the same text, one could alternate between the feminine phrase *axêver-a duzimanî* (lit. ‘speaker-LNK.FEM bilingual’) and the masculine phrase *axêver-ê duzimanî* (lit. ‘speaker-LNK.MASC bilingual’). Another possible strategy for avoiding generic masculines would be the consistent use of gender-neutral plural forms in generic contexts, as in *axêver-ên duzimanî* (lit. ‘speaker-LNK.PL bilingual’). However, this has to our knowledge never been explicitly proposed as a strategy of avoiding generic masculines.

Attempts have also been made to create new lexical items, or to shift the reference of existing ones, with the aim of counteracting what some perceive as a male bias in the language. We saw above (Section 4.3) that the terminology associated with marriage is infused with fundamental gender asymmetry. Recently, in some progressive publications (for example, the Kurmanji newspaper *Azadiya Welat* or the Sorani newspaper *Rûdaw*), the neologisms *hevser/hawser* (lit. ‘co-head’) and/or *hevjin* (lit. ‘co-life’) have gained widespread currency as gender-neutral terms for ‘spouse’, potentially applicable to both ‘wife’ and ‘husband’. The verb *zewicîn* ‘to marry’, combinable with either a male or female subject, is promoted as a replacement for the traditional gender-specific verbs in contemporary written Kurmanji. In Sorani, a complex verb phrase *prosey hawsergirî encam dan* ‘to marry’ (lit. ‘to effectuate the spouse-getting process’) is likewise promoted in the media, both in the conservative (for example, *Payam* newspaper¹⁵) and the progressive ones (such as *Radio Nawa*). In Sorani, the word *pyaw* (originally ‘man’), which has traditionally been used as a (male) generic term in the sense of ‘person’, has mostly been replaced by Kurmanji *mirov* ‘human being, person’. Other, more sporadic attempts to counteract the male bias in the lexicon include the following: The traditional adjective *mêrxas* ‘brave’, which consists of *mêr* ‘man’ and *xas* ‘genuine’, may be used to refer to both males and females, as in *keçeke jêhatî û mêrxas* ‘a competent and brave girl’ (Alakom 1994: 50). The word was considered objectionable by the author of a recent book review (Bajar 2013), presumably on the

grounds that a woman should be able to be depicted as 'brave' without relying on a reference to maleness. The suggested replacement is an adjective *jinxas* 'courageous', which consists of *jin* 'woman' and *xas* 'genuine'. Similarly, a female version of the double-gender noun *camêr* 'fine, upright person' (which contains the noun *mêr* 'man') has been devised: *canik* (the word *ciwan* 'young', reduced to *can*, to which the diminutive suffix *-ik* is added), which occurs, for example, in the fixed expression *canik û camêrên hêja* 'the fine men and women'.

In the emergent written standard(s) of contemporary Kurdish, there is thus a considerable degree of awareness of gendered language and related issues, much of it inspired by the relevant debates in European languages. However, as mentioned at the outset of this section, the metalinguistic discussion is conducted outside a nation-state framework, and it is currently not possible to identify which of the initiatives mentioned here will have a long-term impact on the course of the development of written Kurdish, which ones will remain isolated measures, characterizing the language of one media platform or political movement, and which ones will disappear entirely.

6. Conclusion

This article began with an outline of grammatical gender in Kurdish, drawing on the framework of Corbett (1991). In this view, grammatical gender is defined in terms of the existence of agreement phenomena reflecting the gender of nouns. Within Kurdish, the only variety that exhibits any form of gender-based agreement in its morphosyntax is Kurmanji, and we therefore focused on this variety of Kurdish. As a point of departure, we reiterated the traditional view, according to which Kurmanji is a language in which each noun belongs to one of two grammatical genders, masculine and feminine (cf. Bedir Khan & Lescot 1991), and the relevant morphology may be considered to exhibit gender agreement.

However, our investigation of the gender of personal nouns suggests that the assumption of gender classes defined formally by agreement phenomena, and of the lexically specified membership to one (and only one) gender class, requires revision. As we have been at pains to point out, the traditional approach to Kurdish as a language with "two grammatical genders" belies the subtleties of the system, and leads to the expectation of greater parallels with more familiar gender languages than is actually warranted. Thus from the perspective of the typology of gender systems, Kurdish appears to exhibit a hybrid system, with grammatical gender dominant in the lexicon for inanimates, while mainly referential gender determines the forms of words referring to human beings.

We noted, however, that in actual usage, Kurdish, like most of the other languages treated in this series, exhibits generic masculines. Likewise, we noted the prevalence for referential gender to override grammatical gender in anaphoric pronouns, a tendency well-known in the literature (cf. Braun & Haig 2010 for German). We also found a pervasive male bias in two areas of the lexicon, namely kinship terminology and proverbs and idiomatic expressions, where the traditional arrangement of gender roles is rather clearly reflected. The realm of occupational terms, which likewise reflect conventionalized social divisions of labor, nicely illustrates the flexible nature of gender associations. In the rapidly changing and increasingly urbanized Kurdish speech communities, traditional occupational titles are re-semanticized following extensions to novel contexts, or new terms are coined with shifted gender associations. Speakers' intuitions on such words are correspondingly variant, and elucidating the relevant facts requires a more representative and tightly controlled investigation than we can offer at this stage. This is surely one of the most urgent topics for future research.

Within the emergent written standard, we found an increasing awareness of gender issues as manifest in the metalinguistic discourse and pointed out a number of initiatives for counteracting the generic masculine, besides attempts to coin more gender-neutral lexical items in the realm of marriage terminology and evaluative terms. Within these currents, the effects of parallel developments in the major languages of Europe are clearly discernible, particularly given that many actors involved in Kurdish media stem from the large European diaspora community. However, we also note that changes within the social and political organization of Kurdistan itself are leaving their imprint on the language.

Notes

1. Additional abbreviation used in the glosses that is not specified in the general list of abbreviations: LNK = linker.
2. In some dialects (particularly northern Iraqi Badini), definiteness of the head noun plays no role and the linker is always *-a* or *-ê*, depending on gender.
3. For a summary of different views on the *ezafe* in Iranian linguistics, see Haig (2011). Arguments in favor of the agreement analysis are put forward in Franco et al. (2013), while problematic aspects of the agreement analysis are discussed in Section 2.3 of this article.
4. This term is particularly interesting due to the etymology of one of its components, *mam-*, meaning 'uncle'.
5. From the transcription of a radio report available on: <http://www.dengeamerika.com/content/article/1705731.html> [15 October 2013].

6. The noun *zarok* 'child' patterns like *bebik/pitik* 'baby' in taking feminine grammatical gender. In the emergent written standard, however, it can be found with masculine inflections as well, particularly when referring to an older child.
7. From *Zimanê kurdi dîsa sêwî ma* ['The Kurdish language is again an orphan'], a column by Abdulkadir Bîngol, published on the news outlet www.nefel.org on 23.09.2013 [9 October 2013].
8. This section was initially based on the intuitive insights of one of the authors, a native speaker of Kurmanji. These intuitions were continuously modified in discussions with other native speakers, and the resulting set of occupational terms was tested in an interview conducted with a native speaker of Kurmanji from Şemdinli, Southeast Turkey. The speaker is a 55-year old woman with no formal education and only passive competence in Turkish. Given the high levels of regional variation in Kurmanji, the lack of binding norms, and the absence of any previous research on the topic, we emphasize the tentative nature of our analysis at this stage.
9. Etymologically, the term *kabani* is probably related to *key* 'house' (found in several Northwest Iranian languages) and *banû* 'girl'.
10. The term *sepan* 'laborer' denotes a person who works on someone else's land, takes care of the animals and receives as remuneration a part of the annual profit from the land and stock-breeding (often half of the harvest and/or profit).
11. The only work on the gendered use of Kurdish to date is Hêdi Housainpoor (1999), a study of women's speech behaviour in the Mukriyan region (Iranian Kurdistan).
12. There is also the term *qeyre* to denote a middle-aged person (man or woman) who has not married. It may occur in a pejorative sense in the form of *qeyre-kîç* 'old girl' (cf. Alina 2013:39).
13. Wolf (2004) notes that the PKK (*Partiya Karkerên Kurdistan* 'The Workers' Party of Kurdistan') was probably the only major actor among the Kurdish political movements that overtly pursued such a policy.
14. Very recently, the news agency *JINHA* was established, entirely managed by politically active women in the Kurdish movement. One of their mottos is "we will change the [male-dominant] language of the press" (cf. <http://www.jinha.com.tr/ku/> [9 December 2013]).
15. A publication of the Union of Kurdish Religious Personalities. Compare the widespread use in an interview with a religious authority: http://zanayan.org/to_print.php?id=1956§ion=1 [12 December 2013].

References

- Akin, Salih. 2001. "Motivations phonologiques de la neutralisation d'une catégorie grammaticale dans un parler du kurde." *Linx* 451: 47–154.
- Alakom, Rohat. 1994. *Di folklorê Kurdi da serdestiyeke jinan*. Stockholm: Nûdem.
- Alina, Mino. 2013. *Honor and violence against the women in Iraqi Kurdistan*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Asadpour, Hiva & Jahanbakhs Louragi-Pour & Mehdi Safaie Qalati. 2012. "Sorani Kurdish address forms: Case of Northwest Iran." *International Journal of Linguistics* 4(4): 421–449. DOI: 10.5296/ijl.v4i4.2252

- Bajar, Kejo. 2013. "Meryema' Sebri Silêvani." *Le Monde Diplomatique Kurdi* 46: 23.
- Bedir Khan, Emir Djeladet & Roger Lescot. 1991. *Grammaire Kurde (Dialecte kurmandji)*. Paris: Jean Maisonneuve.
- Braun, Friederike. 2000. *Geschlecht im Türkischen: Untersuchungen zum sprachlichen Umgang mit einer sozialen Kategorie*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Braun, Friederike & Susanne Oelkers & Karin Rogalski & Janine Bosak & Sabine Sczesny. 2007. "Aus Gründen der Verständlichkeit ...: Der Einfluss generisch maskuliner und alternativer Personenbezeichnungen auf die kognitive Verarbeitung von Texten." *Psychologische Rundschau* 58(3): 183–189. DOI: 10.1026/0033-3042.58.3.183
- Braun, Friederike & Geoffrey Haig. 2010. "When are German 'girls' feminine? How the semantics of age influences the grammar of gender agreement." In *Language in its socio-cultural context: New explorations in gendered, global and media uses*, eds. Markus Bieswanger & Heiko Motschenbacher & Susanne Mühleisen. Tübingen: Narr, 69–84.
- Corbett, Greville. 1991. *Gender*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. DOI: 10.1017/CBO9781139166119
- Dirêj, Evdila. 2011. *Kurdi Kurmanci II*. Berlin: Dilop.
- Franco, Ludovico & Rita Manzini & Leonarda Savoia. 2013. "Some call it article, some ezafe: 'Linkers' as 'agreement.'" http://www.academia.edu/4393956/Some_call_it_article_some_ezafe_Linkers_as_agreement [14 October 2013].
- Haig, Geoffrey. 2001. "The Corpus of Contemporary Kurdish Newspaper Texts (CCKNT) – a pilot project in corpus linguistics for Kurdish." *Kurdische Studien* 1(2): 109–122.
- Haig, Geoffrey. 2004. "Das Genusssystem in der kurdischen Sprache: Strukturelle und soziolinguistische Aspekte." In *Gender in Kurdistan und der Diaspora*, eds. Siamend Hajo & Carsten Borck & Eva Savelsberg & Şukriye Doğan. Münster: Unrast Verlag, 33–58.
- Haig, Geoffrey. 2008. *Alignment change in Iranian languages: A construction grammar approach*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. DOI: 10.1515/9783110198614
- Haig, Geoffrey. 2011. "Linker, relativizer, nominalizer, tense-particle: On the Ezafe in West Iranian." In *Nominalization in Asian languages: Diachronic and typological perspectives*, vol. 1, eds. Foong Ha Yap & Karen Grunow-Hårsta & Janick Wrona. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 363–390. DOI: 10.1075/tsl.96.13hai
- Haig, Geoffrey. 2013. "Quelques remarques sur la politique linguistique au Kurdistan d'Irak et ses répercussions l'unité culturelle des Kurdes." *Études Kurdes* 11: 123–127.
- Haig, Geoffrey & Ergin Öpengin. 2014. Kurdish: A critical research overview. *Journal of Kurdish Studies* 3: 99–122.
- Haig, Geoffrey & Ergin Öpengin. forthcoming. "Kurmanji Kurdish in Turkey: Structure, varieties and status." In *The minority languages in Turkey*, ed. Christiane Bulut. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Hassanpour, Amir. 2001. "The (re)production of patriarchy in Kurdish language." In *The women of a non-state country: The Kurds*, ed. Sherzad Mojab. Costa Mesa: Mazda, 227–263.
- Hassanpour, Amir. 2012. "The indivisibility of the nation and its linguistic divisions." *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 217: 49–73.
- Hêdî Hosainpoor, Jafar. 1999. *Destebuxçe: Zarawey jinani Mukriyan* [Destebuxçe: The idioms of the women of Mukriyan]. Jönköping: Kitab-i Arzan.
- MacKenzie, David N. 1954. "Gender in Kurdish." *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 16(3): 528–541. DOI: 10.1017/S0041977X00086833

- Öpengin, Ergin. 2011. *Rewşa kurdî ya sosyolenguîstîk li Tirkîyeyê* [The sociolinguistic situation of Kurdish in Turkey]. Istanbul: Avesta.
- Öpengin, Ergin. 2013. *Clitic/affix interactions: A corpus-based study of the person marking in the Mukri variety of Central Kurdish*. PhD thesis. Université Sorbonne Nouvelle & Universität Bamberg.
- Öpengin, Ergin & Geoffrey Haig. 2014. "Regional variation in Kurmanji Kurdish: A preliminary classification of dialects." *Journal of Kurdish Studies* 3: 143–176.
- Salami, L. Oladipo. 2004. "Deference and subordination: Gender roles and other variables in addressing and referring to husbands by Yoruba women." *Linguistik Online* 21(4): 65–80.
- van Bruinessen, Martin. 1989. *Agha, Scheich und Staat: Politik und Gesellschaft Kurdistans*. Berlin: Edition Parabolis.
- Wolf, Judith. 2004. "Aspekte des Geschlechterverhältnisses in der Guerilla der PKK/KADEK unter besonderer Berücksichtigung des Ehrbegriffs." In *Gender in Kurdistan und der Diaspora*, eds. Siamend Hajo & Carsten Borck & Eva Savelsberg & Şukriye Doğan. Münster: Unrast Verlag, 183–216.
- Zinar, Zeynelabidin. 1992. *Siyabend û Xecê* [Siyabend and Xecê]. Stockholm: Pencinar.

ONEIDA

Gender in Oneida*

Karin Michelson

University at Buffalo, The State University of New York, USA

1. Introduction
2. Person, number and gender prefixes on verbs and nouns
3. Categories of gender in Oneida
 - 3.1 Lexical gender
 - 3.2 Referential gender
 - 3.3 Indefinite reference and male generics
4. The feminine-zoic
 - 4.1 Reference to female persons: Feminine-indefinite versus feminine-zoic
 - 4.2 Reference to animals: Feminine-zoic versus masculine
 - 4.3 Reference to nonsingular inanimates with the feminine-zoic
 - 4.4 Feminine-zoic as the default for inanimates
5. Conclusion

Notes

References

1. Introduction

Oneida (Northern Iroquoian) is a polysynthetic language with a particularly rich verbal morphology.¹ Semantic arguments are marked on the verb by obligatory pronominal prefixes that reference up to two animate semantic arguments of the verb and provide information about the person, number, gender, and role of the arguments. The pronominal system is very rich, including a total of fifty-eight prefixes. External noun phrases, when they occur, are adjoined to the verb, and thus there is no grammatical agreement between a verb and any external expression of the arguments. Oneida, like other Northern Iroquoian languages, has three phenomena which should be of particular interest to scholars who study gender: The first is that there are two genders that are used for single female referents, the feminine-indefinite and the feminine-zoic; the second is that one of these, the feminine-indefinite, is used also for nonspecific reference; and the third is that the

neuter is a formally covert gender. Against these rather unusual characteristics, Oneida, like many languages, typically uses the masculine gender for groups that include at least one male member.

The data on which the observations in this article are based come from the author's fieldwork from 1979 onwards at the Oneida Nation of the Thames settlement, which is located outside of London, Ontario, Canada. At present, the number of fluent speakers is estimated to be just about one hundred, all of whom are bilingual with English. There are no longer any native speakers among the Oneida Tribe of Indians of Wisconsin or at the Oneida Indian Nation located not far from Syracuse, New York. Section 2 of the paper provides a basic description of the semantic categories distinguished by the pronominal prefixes, as well as an overview of the distribution of the prefixes. Section 3 is about categories of gender in Oneida. It includes a necessarily brief mention of the few instances of lexical gender in Section 3.1, and then in Section 3.2 Oneida is shown to have primarily a referential gender system. Section 3.3 is devoted to the interesting feminine-indefinite gender, and contrasts the use of the feminine-indefinite with the use of the masculine dual and plural as a male generic. Section 4 focuses on the feminine-zoic, and describes the distribution of the feminine-indefinite versus the feminine-zoic, the two genders that are used for single female referents. Section 5 concludes the paper. It may be noted that discussion of specific gendered language is restricted to a comparison between the feminine-indefinite and the feminine-zoic; otherwise there appear to be no established expressions (e.g. sayings and the like) which reflect a demeaning or disparaging attitude depending on the sex of the referent.

2. Person, number and gender prefixes on verbs and nouns

In Oneida and other Iroquoian languages, verbs and nouns are built on stems (which can be internally complex). Verb stems are followed by one of three aspect suffixes and nouns stems are followed by a noun suffix. Every verb stem, and many noun stems, are preceded by a pronominal prefix, as described below; verbs can also have one or more prepronominal prefixes. (In examples, prepronominal prefixes are identified but their function is not explained here, as it is not relevant to issues of gender.) The pronominal prefixes that occur on verbs are the most complex, referencing the person, number, gender, and role of up to two animate semantic arguments of the verb. An example of a verb that has two semantic arguments is given in (1) and in (2).² The prefix *lak-* in (1) references a third person masculine singular actor and a first person singular undergoer, and *li-* in (2)

references the same arguments but with the roles reversed. (The kinship term ‘my father’ also has a prefix that references two arguments; see Section 3.1.)

- (1) *lak-hlo-lí-he?* *lake-ʔníha*
 3MASC.SG>1SG-tell-HAB 3MASC.SG>1SG-father
 ‘My father tells me.’
- (2) *li-hlo-lí-he?* *lake-ʔníha*
 1SG>3MASC.SG-tell-HAB 3MASC.SG>1SG-father
 ‘I tell my father.’

Pronominal prefixes distinguish person (first, second, third; as well as inclusive versus exclusive); number (singular, dual, plural) and gender (masculine, feminine-indefinite, feminine-zoic, neuter). The person and number values should be straightforward, and so the focus here will be on the gender distinctions. The masculine gender is used for males and, in the dual and plural, for groups that include at least one male. The feminine-indefinite is used for single female persons; it is also used for a referent which is nonspecific or indefinite. The feminine-zoic includes reference to single females, to groups of females in the dual and plural, and to animals. The neuter gender comprises inanimates. The existence of two possibilities for referring to single females is a particularly interesting feature of Oneida, as is the systematic combination in one form of a single female referent and an indefinite referent.

There are a total of 58 pronominal prefixes that occur on verbs. These can be seen to be organized into three general categories: transitive, agent, and patient. Transitive prefixes mark two semantic arguments, while agent and patient prefixes mark just one semantic argument. We have seen examples of transitive prefixes in (1) and (2). The examples in (3) and (4) exemplify verbs with an agent and a patient prefix, respectively.³ In these examples the semantic motivation for the selection of agent or patient is clear. Verbs whose single semantic argument has more agent-like properties take the agent category of prefix, while verbs whose single semantic argument has more patient-like properties take patient prefixes. In many cases, however, the semantic motivation is (no longer) evident, and generally Iroquoianists consider the distribution of agent and patient prefixes to be a lexical property of verb stems.

- (3) *wa-h-ahtΛ-tí.*
 FACT-3MASC.SG.AG-leave:PUNCT
 ‘He left, he set out.’
- (4) *wa-ho-nuhwáktΛ-ʔ*
 FACT-3MASC.SG.PAT-become.sick-PUNCT
 ‘He got sick.’

One final aspect of the distribution of the prefixes is that neuter (inanimate) arguments are not referenced. This is shown in the examples in (5) and (6). The verb in (5) has only one semantic argument. It is a verb that selects agent prefixes, and the particular prefix that occurs in this example is the third person feminine-indefinite agent prefix *-u-*. The verb *-atuni-* ‘make’ in (6) has two semantic arguments, but only one of them, *aksótha* ‘my grandmother’, is animate. Therefore, the verb is treated as if it had only one semantic argument; the verb in this case also selects agent prefixes, and the prefix that occurs in this example is the same as the one that occurs in (5). (For verbs that have only neuter or inanimate arguments, see Section 4.4.)

(5) *waʔ-u-tkétsko-ʔ*

FACT-3FEM.INDEF.AG-get.up-PUNCT

‘She got up.’

(6) *Kháleʔ n aksótha né· thiká owistóhsliz kʌs kwí·*
and my.grandmother assertion that butter customarily
né· waʔ-u-tu-ní·.

assertion FACT-3FEM.INDEF.AG-make:PUNCT

‘And my grandmother usually made butter.’

As we have seen, verbal prefixes vary depending on who the participant(s) are in the event or situation expressed by the verb. Nouns that are possessed (other than kinship terms, which are discussed in Section 3.1) have nominal prefixes that are similar in form to the patient category of verbal prefixes and that vary according to the possessor. A possessed noun is exemplified in (7). In this case, the possessor is third person masculine singular, marked by the possessive prefix *lao-* on the noun for ‘axe’.

(7) *ʌ-ha-hyoʔthi-yát-eʔ*

lao-to-ká·

FUT-3MASC.SG.AG-sharpen-PUNCT 3MASC.SG.POSS-axe:N

‘He will sharpen his axe.’

The prefixes found on non-possessed nouns are similar in form to the feminine-zoic agent and patient prefixes that occur on verbs, but for the most part prefixes found on non-possessed nouns are lexicalized as part of the noun and do not vary. An example that includes the non-possessed noun *ohwístaʔ* ‘money’ is given in (8). As mentioned above, neuter (inanimate) arguments are not referenced on verbs, so there is no reference to *laoto-ká·* ‘axe’ on the verb ‘sharpen’ in (7) or to *ohwístaʔ* ‘money’ on the verb ‘give’ in (8).

- (8) *Swatyelá kAs kiʔ né· o-hwíst-aʔ*
 sometimes customarily in fact assertion N-money-N
t-a-yuta·t-ú·.
 CIS-FACT-3FEM.INDEF>3FEM.INDEF-give:PUNCT
 ‘Sometimes they just gave her money.’

Each of the 58 verbal prefixes, as well as the related prefixes that occur on nouns, has from two to five allomorphs, selected according to the following stem-initial sound. (Some prefixes have additional allomorphs depending on whether they occur word-initially or word-medially.) Tables 1–4 give the forms of the verbal prefixes that occur (word-initially) with consonant-initial stems. The tables

Table 1. Oneida pronominal prefixes: First or second person acting on first or second person

Agent	Patient					
	1SG	1DU	1PL	2SG	2DU	2PL
1SG				<i>ku-</i>	<i>kni-</i>	<i>kwa-</i>
1EXCL.DU						
1EXCL.PL						
2SG	<i>sk-</i>	<i>skni-</i>	<i>skwa-</i>			
2DU						
2PL						

Table 2. Oneida pronominal prefixes: First or second person acting on third person

Agent	Patient					
	3MASC SG	3FEM-ZOIC SG	NO PATIENT	3FEM INDEF	3MASC DP	3FEM-ZOIC DP
1SG	<i>li-</i>	<i>k-</i>		<i>khe-</i>		
1EXCL.DU	<i>shakni-</i>	<i>yakni-</i>		<i>yakhi-</i>		
1EXCL.PL	<i>shakwa-</i>	<i>yakwa-</i>				
1INCL.DU	<i>ethni-</i>	<i>tni-</i>		<i>yethi-</i>		
1INCL.PL	<i>ethwa-</i>	<i>twa-</i>				
2SG	<i>etsh-</i>	<i>s-</i>		<i>she-</i>		
2DU	<i>etsni-</i>	<i>sni-</i>		<i>yetshi-</i>		
2PL	<i>etswa-</i>	<i>swa-</i>				

Table 3. Oneida pronominal prefixes: Third person acting on first or second person

Agent	Patient					
	1SG	1DU	1PL	2SG	2DU	2PL
3MASC.SG	<i>lak-</i>	<i>shukni-</i>	<i>shukwa-</i>	<i>ya-</i>	<i>etsni-</i>	<i>etswa-</i>
3FEM-ZOIC.SG	<i>wak-</i>	<i>yukni-</i>	<i>yukwa-</i>	<i>sa-</i>	<i>sni-</i>	<i>swa-</i>
NO AGENT						
3FEM.INDEF	<i>yuk-</i>	<i>yukhi-</i>		<i>yesa-</i>	<i>yetshi-</i>	
3MASC.DU						
3MASC.PL						
3FEM-ZOIC.DU						
3FEM-ZOIC.PL						

Table 4. Oneida pronominal prefixes: Third person acting on third person

Agent	Patient					
	3MASC SG	3FEM-ZOIC SG	NO PATIENT	3FEM INDEF	3MASC DP	3FEM-ZOIC DP
3MASC.SG	<i>lo-</i>	<i>la-</i>		<i>shako-</i>		
3FEM-ZOIC.SG		<i>yo-</i>	<i>ka-</i>	<i>yako-</i>		
NO AGENT					<i>loti-</i>	<i>yoti-</i>
3FEM.INDEF	<i>luwa-</i>	<i>kuwa-</i>	<i>ye-</i>	<i>yutat-</i>	<i>luwati-</i>	<i>kuwati-</i>
3MASC.DU			<i>ni-</i>	<i>shakoti-</i>		
3MASC.PL			<i>lati-</i>			
3FEM-ZOIC.DU			<i>kni-</i>	<i>yakoti-</i>		
3FEM-ZOIC.PL			<i>kuti-</i>			

are organized according to whether the participants are speech act participants (first and second person) versus third person. See Lounsbury (1953, Table 6) or Michelson and Doxtator (2002) for a complete listing of allomorphs. Note that Iroquoianists generally assume that the prefixes are not (synchronically) analyzable into components that map in a straightforward way onto person, number, gender, and role categories. There is considerable syncretism in the paradigm (see Koenig & Michelson, in press).

3. Categories of gender in Oneida

Lexical gender is restricted for the most part to a few kinship terms. The expression of gender in Oneida is overwhelmingly as referential gender, as will become evident from the discussion in Sections 3.1 and 3.2. A particularly interesting category for students of gender cross-linguistically is the so-called feminine-indefinite; the use of this gender is described in Section 3.3, which also describes the use of male generics.

3.1 Lexical gender

Designations for human beings, including kinship terms, human status terms, terms denoting occupations and nationalities, and expressions for other-worldly beings such as ghosts and witches, are all built on stems that have pronominal prefixes that identify the person in terms of the number and gender categories described in Section 2. The meaning of the stem is not gender-specific; rather it is the obligatory pronominal prefix that specifies the gender. For example, the stem for ‘child’ is *-ksá/-ksaʔ-*. The word *laksá* ‘boy’ (lit. ‘male child’) has the masculine singular prefix *la-*, the word *yeksá* ‘girl’ (lit. ‘female child’) has the feminine-indefinite prefix *ye-*, and the word *latiksaʔshúha* ‘children’ has the masculine plural prefix *lati-*. The stem for ‘skeleton’ is *-skAN*. A ‘female skeleton’ is *yéskAN*, with the feminine-indefinite *ye-*, while a ‘male skeleton’ is *láskAN*, with the masculine singular *la-*.

Many terms for occupations, nationalities, and the like, are built on stems that have become lexicalized (i.e. they have taken on a meaning that is distinct from their components). Examples of names of religious orders and of a particular position in the sport of hockey are given in examples (9) to (11).

- (9) *shakotí--skoʔ-s*
 3>3FEM.INDEF-drown-HAB
 ‘Baptists’
- (10) *te-hoti-ʔkhá-l-út*
 DUA-3MASC.DP.PAT-skirt-attach-STAT
 ‘Anglicans’
- (11) *te-h-atenhohót-haʔ*
 DUA-3MASC.SG.AG-stand.at.a.door-HAB
 ‘goalie’

As with nouns like ‘child’ or ‘skeleton’ cited above, one and the same lexicalized verb stem can occur with different prefixes to convey different categories of persons: *tehatiyahsútha?* is the word for ‘Catholics’, lit. ‘they make a cross’, with the masculine plural prefix *-hati-*. *Tehayahsútha?* ‘priest’ has the masculine singular prefix *-ha-*, and *tekutiyahsútha?* ‘nuns’ has the feminine-zoic plural prefix *-kuti-*. Very few stems do have lexical gender; examples are *-yaʔtaseʔtsl-* ‘girlfriend’ and *-nikʌhtlʌhtsl-* ‘boyfriend’, and perhaps *-eluzuske?* ‘witch’. An example with a possessed form for ‘girlfriend’ is given in (12).

- (12) *nʌ kwí· shakon-athlolí*
 so then 3>3FEM.ZOIC.DP-talk.about[STAT]
laoti-yaʔtaseʔtsl-iz-o-kú·
 3MASC.DP.POSS-girlfriend-N-DISTR.PL
 ‘So then they were talking about their girlfriends.’

Kinship terms have transitive prefixes that otherwise occur on verbs with two semantic arguments and that, in kinship terms, identify the members in the relation. For example, the kinship term *lakeʔniha* ‘my father’, given in (1) above, has the transitive prefix *lak-/lake-*, which was also found on the verb in (1). The reader may recall that *lak-/lake-* references a third person masculine singular agent (or agent-like) argument and a first person singular patient (or patient-like) argument. If we were talking about your father, then the appropriate form would be *yaʔniha* with the prefix *ya-* referencing a third person masculine singular agent (or agent-like) argument and a second person singular patient (or patient-like) argument. See Koenig and Michelson (2010) for the selection of appropriate transitive prefixes by kinship stems in Oneida.

A few kinship stems have specifically a male or female index, such as *-ʔniha* ‘father’ (discussed above) and *-nulhá·* ‘mother’ (exemplified below). But most kinship stems, including for example *-hsotha* ‘grandparent’, *-yʌha* ‘child’, *-atleha* ‘grandchild’, *-ʔkʌha* ‘sibling’, or *-yuhwataʌha* ‘aunt, uncle, niece, nephew’, do not distinguish between male and female. However, it is the case that some kinship stems, when applied to a female relation, require prefixes that include the feminine-zoic while other kinship stems require the feminine-indefinite.⁴ For example, the lexically female stem *-nulhá·* ‘mother’ requires the feminine-zoic. The same is true for the stem *-hsotha* ‘grandparent’ when used for female reference, as in (13a), while the stems *-yʌha* ‘child’ and *-atleha* ‘grandchild’ require the feminine-indefinite, as in (13b). (The reader is referred again to Koenig and Michelson (2010) for the distribution of pronominal prefixes on kinship terms.) Similarly, Oneida names mostly have the feminine-zoic rather than the feminine-indefinite. An example is *Kanhotúkwas* (lit. ‘she opens doors’) with the feminine-zoic singular prefix *ka-*.

- (13) a. *ak-sótha*
 3FEM.ZOIC.SG>1SG-grandparent
 ‘my grandmother’
- b. *shako-yáha*
 3MASC.SG>3FEM.INDEF-child
 ‘his daughter’

3.2 Referential gender

The relation between a verb and a noun in Oneida is not the usual one of syntactic selection, and there is no grammatical agreement between a verb and a noun, or between a noun and any other element that can be said to belong to a noun phrase. The verb, via the pronominal prefixes, references the semantic arguments of the verb stem, and so the verb itself encodes the semantic properties of its arguments. Nouns identify participants more specifically, but when they occur, they are syntactically adjoined to the verb, and as such do not induce agreement. That the pronominal prefix on a verb references properties of participants, independently of any prefixes on a noun that co-occurs with the verb, can be shown by two types of examples: (1) the pronominal prefix on a verb and the pronominal prefix on a nominal do not necessarily have the same gender, and (2) the same nominal can occur with verbs that have different pronominal prefixes.

An example of the first type, the lack of a strict match between pronominal prefixes on a verb and a nominal word, is given by the pair of examples in (14) and (15). The kinship terms for ‘mother’ and for ‘grandmother’ include transitive pronominal prefixes that express a relation between a mother or grandmother, marked by the feminine-zoic (as just explained in Section 3.1), and the other member in the relation, who is the first person in (14) (thus ‘my grandmother’) and a single male referent in (15) (thus ‘his mother’). The verbs that reference mothers and grandmothers, however, always reference them with the third person feminine-indefinite prefix. So, while the kinship term for ‘grandmother’ in (14) has the feminine-zoic prefix, the verb referring to the grandmother (‘marry’) has the feminine-indefinite prefix. If the relation between the verb and the noun were one of grammatical agreement, then both nominal and verb should have the feminine-zoic or both should have the feminine-indefinite. In (15) the speaker is telling us that a male referent’s mother (‘his mother’) died, and she died when ‘he’ was just a small baby. But the word that is used to express that the male referent was a small baby has the feminine-zoic prefix, not the masculine.

- (14) *ThoʔnÁ kÁh né· nukwá· yako-nyák-uʔ*
 and then over here 3FEM.INDEF.PAT-marry-STAT
ak-sóthá.
 3FEM.ZOIC.SG>1SG-grandparent
 ‘And then my grandmother married over here.’
- (15) *KÁʔ kiʔ ok tshi-ka-papísl-a-ʔ*
 small only COIN-3FEM.ZOIC.SG.AG-baby-size-STAT
tsh-aʔ-ya-íhey-eʔ
 COIN-FACT-3FEM.INDEF.SG.AG-die-PUNCT
lo-nulhaʔ-kÁ.
 3FEM.ZOIC.SG>3MASC.SG-mother-deceased
 ‘He was only a small baby when his mother died.’

The second type of case, where the same noun is referenced by different prefixes on the verb, is shown by the examples in (16) to (19). In (16) and (17), the external noun is the first person possessed form of ‘pet’, marked by the possessive prefix *ak-*. In (16) the speaker referenced her pet dog, a male dog, with the third person masculine singular prefix on the verb. In (17) the speaker was talking about another pet, and in this case she decided to use the feminine-zoic singular prefix. (Both the masculine and the feminine-zoic gender are appropriate for animals; see Section 4.2.) Likewise in the examples in (18) and (19), the external noun *awéluʔuskeʔ* ‘witch’ has the feminine-zoic prefix. In (18) the speaker chose to use the feminine-zoic on the verb to refer to the witch, but in (19) the speaker chose instead the feminine-indefinite.⁵

- (16) *KwahikÁ waʔ-t-h-ashÁtho-ʔ* *ak-itshe·nÁ.*
 just really FACT-DUA-3MASC.SG.AG-cry-PUNCT 1SG.POSS-pet:N
 ‘My pet really [started to] cry.’
- (17) *KwahikÁ waʔ-t-w-ashÁtho-ʔ* *ak-itshe·nÁ.*
 just really FACT-DUA-3FEM.ZOIC.SG.AG-cry-PUNCT 1SG.POSS-pet:N
 ‘My pet really [started to] cry.’
- (18) *Tahnú· kÁs tho nú· tsikaha-wí· aw-éluʔuskeʔ*
 and then customarily in those times 3FEM.ZOIC.SG.PAT-witch
kÁs kuw-athloli.
 customarily 3>3FEM.ZOIC.SG-tell.about[STAT]
 ‘And in those times they used to talk about a witch.’

- (19) *Waʔ-shako-zshΛ-ní. kiʔ sλhaʔ*
 FACT-3>3FEM.INDEF-overpower:PUNCT actually more
la-zshátste-ʔ tsiʔ né. ni-yót
 3MASC.SG.AG-strong-STAT as assertion how it is
kaʔiká aw-éluʔuskeʔ.
 this 3FEM.ZOIC.SG.PAT-witch
 ‘He overpowered her, he was stronger than this witch.’

In these cases, what determines the pronominal prefix on the verb are extralinguistic, rather than formal, properties of the nominal.

3.3 Indefinite reference and male generics

The feminine-indefinite gender in Oneida includes reference to a single human female, and to a person whose identity as specifically male or female, or even as singular or plural, is not known or is not seen as relevant (cf. the “indefinite” in Lounsbury 1953 and “nonspecific” in Chafe 1977). Consequently, an example like the one in (20) is ambiguous: Depending on context, the referent can be a female person (‘she’) or an unspecified person (‘someone, people’).

- (20) *tho ye-nákle-ʔ*
 there 3FEM.INDEF.AG-reside-STAT
 ‘She/someone resides there.’

An example where the referent is understood to be indefinite is given in (21). In this case, as in most cases of indefinite or nonspecific reference, the independent indefinite expression *úhkaʔ ok* ‘someone’ also occurs, although it is not obligatory.⁶ Lounsbury (1953: 52) reports that the indefinite is used sometimes even when the identity of the referent is known to be male but the maleness is not deemed relevant: “It may be used even when the person referred to is male provided it is not a specific male, but *some* male.”⁷

- (21) *Úhkaʔ ok t-a-ye-nhohayaʔákhú-ʔ.*
 someone CIS-FACT-3FEM.INDEF.AG-knock.on.a.door-PUNCT
 ‘Someone knocked on the door.’

It is intriguing that the same gender that is used to refer to a female person is used also for indefinite or nonspecific referents, and because of this the feminine gender has been considered to be the unmarked gender (e.g. Frank & Anshen 1983). The association of the feminine gender with nonspecific reference is an ancient

One final point about the distribution of the feminine-indefinite and the masculine is that while there is a relatively greater number of distinctions in the masculine singular agent and patient paradigm, this is not so for the masculine nonsingular paradigm. More specifically, there are eighteen pronominal prefixes that include the masculine dual or plural, and fourteen of these eighteen do not distinguish feminine-indefinite from masculine dual or plural (or from feminine-zoic dual or plural). In the example in (22) the prefix *yesa-* is designated 3>2SG. The “3” is used in the morpheme identification for those prefixes that do not distinguish between third person feminine-indefinite, third person masculine dual and plural, and third person feminine-zoic dual and plural. For transitive prefixes that have the categories covered by “3” as one of the two arguments, it necessarily remains unclear whether the argument should be understood as nonspecific or indefinite (i.e. feminine-indefinite) or as a male generic (i.e. masculine plural). Examples such as (23) are often translated into English with the passive voice.

- (23) *Na se? kwáh ok thi-yesa-hwist-a-wi-he?*
 then too just only CONTR-3>2SG-money-give-HAB
 ‘And then they just give you money, you just get money given to you.’

Before leaving the discussion of the feminine-indefinite and male generics, one additional type of example is introduced. The feminine-indefinite and masculine (and to some extent the feminine-zoic) occur on a substantial number of verbs which have become lexicalized to refer to entities: household objects, tools, instruments, and the like. The verb typically describes the function of the object, so the word for ‘tablecloth’ in (24) may be translated more literally as ‘that which someone uses to cover a table’ (and the stem for ‘table’ is actually itself complex, lit. ‘that which one sets food on’).

- (24) *Khále? wa?-ako-ya-tá-ne? sá.*
 and FACT-3FEM.INDEF.PAT-obtain-PUNCT too
yu-tekhwahla?tsl-ohlók-t-a?
 3FEM.INDEF.AG-table-cover-CAUS-HAB
 ‘And she got a tablecloth too.’

Although these are not personal nouns per se (the verbs are not lexicalized to refer to kinds of humans), the distribution of the masculine and feminine-indefinite is interesting enough to mention briefly. The masculine tends to be used for designations of events, where the verb literally describes an action performed by the male or by a mixed group of males and females. An example is the word for ‘Easter’ in (25). These lexicalized expressions for events represent additional examples of male generics.

- (25) *te-hati-ʔnhúhs-yaʔk-s*
 DUA-3MASC.PL.AG-egg-break-HAB
 ‘Easter’ (lit. ‘they break eggs’)

On the other hand, names of tools and instruments almost always have the feminine-indefinite prefix, even though many of the tools are more widely used by men. The word for ‘pliers’, which is probably typically used by men, is given in (26).

- (26) *te-ye-luwal-yá-k-t-aʔ*
 DUA-3FEM.INDEF.AG-wire-sever-CAUS-HAB
 ‘pliers’ (lit. ‘one/people sever(s) nails/wires’)

Since the feminine-indefinite is ambiguous, referring either to a single female person (‘she’) or a nonspecific or indefinite referent (‘one, someone, people, they’), it is instructive to see how fluent speakers of the contemporary language treat this ambiguity. The fluent speakers this author has most contact with have a deep interest in understanding the structure of their language and they have participated in teaching programs for some years. To them, the feminine is basic, in that their explanation for the use of the feminine-indefinite for nonspecific or indefinite referents is that when you do not know who exactly a person is, you use the “female” form: “the identification of feminine with nonspecific reference has sometimes been taken to express an association of women with mankind as a whole” (Chafe 1977: 515).¹⁰

Evidence that speakers take the feminine to be basic is that, occasionally, in situations that call for a nonspecific referent, speakers use a masculine form in addition to the feminine-indefinite form, thereby making sure the hearer understands that the unidentified referent can be either female or male. Excerpts that illustrate this are given in (27) and (28). (The verb root *-e-* ‘walk’ in the form *ta-yá-* is obscured by regular morphophonological changes.) In this type of example, then, instead of thinking of the indefinite as the default, the speaker apparently thinks of the feminine as the default.

- (27) *Kátshaʔ katiʔ né. nú. t-a-yá.*
 where then CIS-FACT-3FEM.INDEF.AG:walk:PUNCT
tá-thuniʔ kátshaʔ katiʔ né. nú. t-á-l-e-ʔ
 or else where then CIS-FACT-3MASC.SG.AG-walk-PUNCT
tho niwahsutó-ta.
 that kind of night
 ‘Where then did someone/she come from or where then did he come from on such a night?’

- (28) *Ayóhane? né. oná a-yu-hta-tí. tá-thuni?*
 tomorrow assertion then FUT-3FEM.INDEF.AG-leave:PUNCT or else
a-h-ahta-tí. s-ho-tukóht-u.
 FUT-3MASC.SG.AG-leave:PUNCT REP-3MASC.SG.PAT-continue.on-STAT
 ‘Tomorrow someone/she will leave or else he will leave, he who has passed on.’

To summarize, in Oneida nonspecific reference is achieved with forms that otherwise reference single female persons, i.e. with the feminine-indefinite, but mixed groups of males and females are referenced with masculine (nonsingular) forms. The association of feminine reference with nonspecific or indefinite reference has been traced to the different positions of men and women in Iroquois society. For contemporary Oneida speakers who are interested in the structure of their languages, the feminine part of the feminine-indefinite is in some sense primary.

4. The feminine-zoic

In certain respects, the feminine-zoic is the most challenging gender to describe. It is used in a number of situations: Both it and the feminine-indefinite are used to refer to female persons; it is the unmarked gender for animals (although this might be called into question, as discussed in this section); it can be used for inanimate objects that acquire the animate property of locomotion; and it occurs as the default with verbs that have only a single semantically inanimate argument. These uses will be taken up in turn in the following subsections.

4.1 Reference to female persons: Feminine-indefinite versus feminine-zoic

Two genders are used for single female referents. One is the feminine-indefinite, discussed in Section 3.3; the other is the feminine-zoic. Note that nonsingular females are referred to with the feminine-zoic dual and plural prefixes, as the feminine-indefinite can be used to refer only to single females. Lounsbury (1953) comments that, in the singular, the feminine-zoic tends to be restricted to “adult, active” females (i.e. those of a reproductive age). Abbott (1984) provides a more elaborated analysis of the feminine-indefinite and feminine-zoic categories in Oneida. The factors that Abbott found are relevant when it comes to the selection of the feminine-indefinite versus feminine-zoic for female persons are the size and gracefulness of the person, her age, and the nature of the speaker’s relationship to her. Characteristics of female persons referenced with the feminine-indefinite are, on the whole, more positive: “small, graceful, dainty or petite.” On the other hand,

persons who impart a “large, awkward, or aggressive” manner have a tendency to be referenced with the feminine-zoic. However, more important than these impressions is the relationship between the speaker and the referent. As pointed out also in Michelson (1982), the feminine-indefinite tends to be used for referents with whom the speaker has a more intimate relation, such as their mother and grandmother. Feminine-zoic, in contrast, tends to be used for those females who have a more remote relation to the speaker, and perhaps for those who have some authority over the speaker.

However, it would be a mistake to conclude that the feminine-zoic is exclusively, or even generally, associated with negative qualities. Abbott (1984:129) notes that speakers “insist there is nothing rude or disrespectful in the use of FZ [feminine-zoic, K.M.]” Indeed the expression for the (British) queen is *Yonutiyó*, lit. ‘great mountain’, with the feminine-zoic prefix *yo-*. In the corpus of texts that the current description is based on, the feminine-zoic references characters who, from the context, are clearly viewed very positively. In one text, the storyteller worked together with another young woman at handing tobacco leaves to someone whose job it was to tie the tobacco leaves into a bundle. The job required teamwork, and the speaker mentions more than once how she and her teammate were a good team and that they learned a lot. In the following excerpt, she expresses the opinion that her teammate, like herself, had just recently learned how to hand tobacco leaves. She refers to her teammate (*Annabelle*) with the feminine-zoic.

- (29) *Elhúwa? kyuhte wí· né· kuwa-lihunyní*
 right then supposedly assertion 3>3FEM.ZOIC.SG-teach[STAT]
au-lhá· Annabelle uta-yako-nláht-u-ʔ.
 3FEM.ZOIC.SG-self Annabelle CIS:OPT-3FEM.ZOIC.SG>3-leaf-give-PUNCT
 ‘I guess Annabelle herself was just recently taught how to hand leaves to someone.’

Another telling example is from a Cinderella-like story, told by a masterful Oneida storyteller, Georgina Nicholas, and published in Michelson (1981). In this story, a young girl is mistreated by her stepmother and two stepsisters. Indeed, the mean stepmother is referred to with the feminine-zoic, as may perhaps be expected. Then at some point, there appears a beautiful lady who gives luck to people and she informs the girl’s father about how his daughter has been abused. To reward the industriousness of his young daughter, she gives her good luck (every time she takes a step she will find a gold coin). The two stepsisters get bad luck (every time they talk a snake will come out of the mouth of one of them, and a frog out of the mouth of the other). The following excerpts describe when the luck-giver first appears. The expression for ‘luck-giver’ is a verb that functions as an entity

expression (see Section 3.1). This expression, as well as all of the verb forms that reference the luck-giver, have the feminine-zoic prefix.

- (30) *Né· kwí· kaʔiká yako-tlaʔsw-a-wí-heʔ*
 assertion this 3FEM.ZOIC.SG>3-luck-give-HAB
te-yako-ká-nle-ʔ.
 DUA-3FEM.ZOIC.SG>3-watch-STAT
 ‘The luck-giver was watching them.’
- (31) *Yah thyeʔ-yo-yel-á* *nΛ*
 not CONTR-3FEM.ZOIC.SG.PAT-do-STAT then
u-totáhsi-ʔ *kaʔiká tho kwí·*
 FACT:3FEM.ZOIC.SG.AG-emerge-PUNCT this there
waʔ-t-ka-tá-neʔ.
 FACT-DUA-3FEM.ZOIC.SG.AG-stand-PUNCT
 ‘She couldn’t help herself, then she suddenly appeared and she stood there.’
- (32) *waʔ-ká-lu-ʔ* *kaʔiká yako-tlaʔsw-a-wí-heʔ*
 FACT-3FEM.ZOIC.SG.AG-say-PUNCT this 3FEM.ZOIC.SG>3-luck-give-HAB
 ‘this luck-giver said’

A final example showing that the feminine-zoic can be used for sympathetic, gentle, “maiden”-like referents is a traditional song called “Red Wing.” The first verse is given in (33). All of the verbs referring to the young girl are feminine-zoic.

- (33) *Yotlátstu* *y-ukwehuwé*
 once upon a time 3FEM.ZOIC.SG.PAT-Indian
úska ni-ka-yá-tase-ʔ
 one PARTT-3FEM.ZOIC.SG.AG-pretty.girl-STAT
te-yo-lihwákw-Λ *kanoluhkwáhslaʔ*
 DUA-3FEM.ZOIC.SG.PAT-sing-STAT love
kahΛ-táyΛʔ né· tho ka-nákele-ʔ.
 on the meadow assertion there 3FEM.ZOIC.SG.AG-reside-STAT
 ‘Once upon a time, an Indian girl, one really pretty girl, was singing about love. She lived on the meadow.’

There are additional reasons for assuming that the use of the feminine-zoic does not, overall, reflect a derogatory view of a particular female referent. First, most female names have the feminine-zoic prefix. For example, *Kanhotúkwas* ‘she opens doors’, or *Katsí-tsyawaks* ‘she shakes flowers’, have the feminine-zoic singular prefix *ka-*.¹¹ Second, as has already been pointed out (Section 3.1), female kinship terms that involve senior female relatives, such as the terms for ‘mother’ and ‘grandmother’, have transitive prefixes that designate a relation between

a female, feminine-zoic, referent and someone else. And a few expressions with the feminine-zoic can be used for male referents, even exclusively male referents. Three such expressions are given in (34) to (36). It might just be possible to read into one or the other of these expressions the idea that the referent is less than the man he is supposed to be, but certainly that is not true for the expression in (36), which is often used for someone's child ('my handsome, dapper little man').

(34) *Yah thyeʔ-ka-ye-lí·* *thiká Sawátis.*
not CONTR-3FEM.ZOIC.SG.AG-right:STAT that John
'John is not serious, he is being silly.'

(35) *Kátshaʔ ye-kΛ-ʔtehslútye-hseʔ.*
where TRA-3FEM.ZOIC.SG.AG-flirt-HAB
'Where is that (male) flirt flirting?'

(36) *yo-tsinaʔtol-ú*
3FEM.ZOIC.SG.PAT-look.dapper-STAT
'He looks smart/dapper/handsome.'

Ghosts, or strange and mysterious beings, are a frequent topic in the corpus on which this study is based. Witches are normally female, but other ghosts can be male or female and their sex is generally determined from their clothing since their face is usually skeletal. Female ghosts and witches, in the corpus at hand, were referred to either with the feminine-indefinite or with the feminine-zoic, and the same witch in the very same story sometimes has one gender and sometimes the other. Two excerpts from a story about a witch named *Waniʔkyáhtes* are given in (37) and (38). In the first excerpt, the word for 'witch' has the feminine-indefinite prefix and in the second excerpt, which comes just two sentences after the first, the word for 'witch' has the feminine-zoic. Interestingly, the *verb* in both excerpts has a prefix with '3' that includes the feminine-indefinite (showing again that, as described in Section 3.2, the gender on the verb and the noun do not have to be the same).

(37) *Waʔ-shako-hnúʔtla-neʔ* *kaziká akaw-éluʔuskeʔ.*
FACT-3MASC.SG>3-follow-PUNCT this 3FEM.INDEF.PAT-witch
'He followed this witch.'

(38) *Waʔ-shako-ʔshΛ-ní·* *kiʔ sáhaʔ*
FACT-3MASC.SG>3-overpower:PUNCT actually more
la-ʔshátste-ʔ *tsiʔ né· ni-yót kaziká*
3MASC.SG.AG-strong-STAT as assertion how it is this
aw-éluʔuskeʔ.
3FEM.ZOIC.SG.PAT-witch
'He overpowered her because he was stronger than this witch.'

To summarize, single female persons can be referenced with either the feminine-indefinite gender or the feminine-zoic gender. The feminine-zoic has been equated with some less-than-positive characteristics, both physical and social. However, the feminine-zoic is regularly attested, relatively frequently in fact, with females who are viewed positively, such as a beautiful fairy godmother type, and verbs with the feminine-zoic can even be used to designate males. Abbott (1984), in a review of texts collected as part of a Works Project Administration project headed by Floyd Lounsbury in 1939–40, noted that of approximately eighty female characters roughly 59% were referenced with the feminine-indefinite and the others with the feminine-zoic. In the current corpus of texts, ninety different (single) female persons were referred to in the third person, including nine female ghosts and witches. Seventy-six of them (or 84%) were referred to with the feminine-indefinite, eleven (or 12%) were referred to with the feminine-zoic, and three (or 4%) were referred to with both the feminine-indefinite and feminine-zoic. Clearly the majority of females were referred to with the feminine-indefinite. A large number of the feminine-indefinite references were kinship terms. Of the ninety female persons referred to, forty (or almost 45%) were kin relations (and all but one of the kin relations were referred to with the feminine-indefinite). Of the forty-nine other female persons, thirty-six (just over 73%) were referred to with the feminine-indefinite, ten (just over 20%) were referred to with the feminine-zoic, and 3 (i.e. 7%) with both. There was also one self-reference with the feminine-indefinite.

4.2 Reference to animals: Feminine-zoic versus masculine

The feminine-zoic is used also for animals, and one might view it as the regular or normal gender for animals. Certainly nouns that designate animal species and verbs that are lexicalized as referring to species of animals mostly have feminine-zoic prefixes. (Two animal species that have a masculine prefix are *kít-kit lá-tsin* ‘rooster’, lit. ‘cocky chicken’, and *tehalutawe?ésta?* ‘wasp’, lit. ‘he pierces logs.’) However, animals are frequently anthropomorphized so that the verbs that describe a particular animal’s activities, or verbs that specify how a particular animal is acted upon, more often than not take masculine prefixes, so that it would almost be correct to view the masculine as the unmarked gender for animals. In the current corpus, about thirty-seven animals, or groups of animals, were mentioned and about twenty-two or almost 60% were referenced with the masculine. The masculine gender was used for animals even when they were not given human characteristics. Thus in (39) the speaker is talking about a raccoon that his brothers found in the woods and that their dog killed.

- (39) *Kháleʔ lake-zníha* *wa-ho-γΛ·sél-eʔ*
 and 3MASC.SG>1SG-father FACT-3MASC.SG>3MASC.SG-skin-PUNCT
thiká *ʔtilú.*
 that raccoon
 ‘And my father skinned that raccoon.’

Just about any animal can be referred to with the masculine, even otherwise insignificant ones, such as mosquitoes. A little song about a mosquito in (40) illustrates this. The noun meaning ‘mosquito’, *okalyahtá·neʔ*, has the prefix *o-*, which is the nominal form of the feminine-zoic singular verbal pronominal prefix *yo-*. The verbs describing the actions of the mosquito, though, have the masculine singular prefix.

- (40) *Okalyahtá·neʔ t-a-ho-thalátye-ʔ*
 mosquito CIS-FACT-3MASC.SG.PAT-move.along.talking-PUNCT
s-a-h-athlolyá·n-aʔ *tsiʔ niskahneki·luʔ.*
 REP-FACT-3MASC.SG.AG-go.to.tell-PUNCT that you have been drinking
 ‘A mosquito is coming buzzing, he’s going to tell that you have been drinking.’

Snakes and serpents were the one category of animal which were consistently referred to with the feminine-zoic, as in the excerpt in (41). Interestingly, snakes and serpents are also often mythical creatures, endowed with frightening power.

- (41) *Waʔ-t-ha-yá·tahkw-eʔ* *thiká ótkuʔ,*
 FACT-DUA-3MASC.SG>3FEM.ZOIC.SG-body-pick.up-PUNCT that snake
né·n tho né· wa-ho-ka·lí. *thiká.*
 assertion FACT-3FEM.ZOIC.SG>3MASC.SG-bite:PUNCT that
 ‘He picked up that snake, and there it [she] bit him.’

4.3 Reference to nonsingular inanimates with the feminine-zoic

The feminine-zoic is used occasionally for inanimate arguments. Lounsbury (1953:51) states: “in the dual and plural ... it [feminine-zoic gender, K.M.] includes also reference to inanimate dual and plural subjects which are in motion.” In the recordings here, birch trees, tobacco leaves, splints used for making baskets, husk mats, and even crackerjacks (a kind of snack that children like to eat), occur with verbs that have the feminine-zoic plural prefix. The excerpt in (42) relates how husk mats took off all over. In the excerpt in (43), the speaker is talking about bringing in the tobacco leaves from the fields so that the leaves can be tied into bundles and dried. In such examples, the inanimate concepts are imbued with the otherwise animate property of movement. So while animals are

anthropomorphized and then referenced with the masculine gender, inanimates acquire animate properties when they are referenced with the feminine-zoic gender.

- (42) *Ukw-ateʔslehtakalhátho-ʔ* *kháleʔ thiká ono-lá, kwáh*
 FACT:1SG.PAT-turn.over.in.a.vehicle-PUNCT and that mat just
tsyoʔk n-y-aʔ-kuti-takhenúti-ʔ.
 every[where] PARTT-TRA-FACT-3FEM.ZOIC.PL.AG-run.along-PUNCT
 ‘We turned over in the vehicle and the mats went just everywhere.’
- (43) *Wáto-lé. kwí. uta-ku-táyaht-eʔ* *oyú-kwaʔ,*
 it’s hard CIS:FACT-3FEM.ZOIC.PL.AG-enter-PUNCT tobacco
oskanáha t-a-yon-atayaʔtuháti-ʔ.
 slowly CIS-FACT-3FEM.ZOIC.DR.PAT-come.entering-PUNCT
 ‘It’s hard for the tobacco to come in, the tobacco is coming in slowly.’

A nice example that illustrates the use of the feminine-zoic with inanimate objects that are moving is the lexicalized verb meaning ‘bus’, lit. ‘it transports people back and forth’:

- (44) *yako-yaʔt-akalénye-hseʔ*
 3FEM-ZOIC.SG>3-body-transport.back.and.forth-HAB
 ‘bus’

4.4 Feminine-zoic as the default for inanimates

As mentioned in Section 2, only animate arguments are referenced by pronominal prefixes. However, all verbs *must* have a pronominal prefix. A verb that has only one semantic argument, when that argument is inanimate, takes a feminine-zoic singular prefix by default. For example, the feminine-zoic singular agent prefix *ka-* occurs on the verb *ka-tás* ‘it is thick’ and the feminine-zoic singular patient prefix *yo-* occurs on the verb *yotho-lé* ‘it is cold’. Animate (masculine, feminine-indefinite, and feminine-zoic) arguments must be distinguished semantically from inanimate (neuter) arguments for other reasons. Only animate arguments can occur in the *nonsingular* (dual or plural), while the default prefix when there are no animate arguments is the feminine-zoic *singular*.¹² For example in the same story about snakes that the excerpt in (41) is from, the storyteller at one point talks about what her husband does when he picks up snakes. She uses the verb *waʔte-shako-yá-tahkweʔ* ‘he picked them up’. The prefix *-shako-* in this form specifies a relation between a masculine singular argument and the categories abbreviated by the bare numeral “3”, namely feminine-indefinite, masculine

dual and plural, and feminine-zoic dual and plural, but not neuter. In addition, a fair number of verb stems have two allomorphs: one for animate arguments and one for inanimate or neuter arguments. For example, the stem for 'pick up' has the two variants *-yaʔtahkw-* for animates and *-hkw-* for inanimates. (The variant that occurs with animate stems includes the incorporated noun root *-yaʔt-* 'body'.) In (41), and in the example *waʔteshakoyá-tahkweʔ* cited above, the verb stem that occurs is the animate variant.

5. Conclusion

The complex and elaborate formal system of pronominal prefixes in Oneida affords speakers a relatively substantial degree of precision in identifying referents. Because a great many expressions that are personal nouns in other languages are, in Oneida, built on verb stems, the same range of possibilities for categorizing human beings extends to expressions for professions, occupations, nationalities, classifications according to age, and so on. This means that if one wishes to talk about a male nurse rather than a female nurse, it is possible to select the appropriate prefix. Of course, certain occupations are more widely associated with one or the other sex, and then the first form given will have masculine or feminine-indefinite prefixes.

Throughout the pronominal system, the same prefix refers both to a single female person and to a nonspecific or indefinite person. For at least some contemporary speakers, however, it appears that the feminine is basic, and linguistically knowledgeable speakers sometimes reinforce this by using both a feminine-indefinite and a masculine form when talking about nonspecific referents. Otherwise, Oneida is typical in that it uses the masculine for any argument that consists of a group that has at least one male in it. In addition, animals, more often than not, are referenced with masculine prefixes.

To some extent, the feminine-indefinite occurs with verbs that describe female persons who are regarded with respect and who are seen as having a certain grace, while the feminine-zoic occurs with verbs that describe female persons who have a more feisty, aggressive manner and who give the impression of being more outspoken. However, these descriptions really emerge only when the feminine-indefinite and feminine-zoic are directly compared. Generally, use of one or the other gender is established for a particular referent and the prefixes are not manipulated to reflect attitudes of the speaker towards the referent.

Notes

* I have studied the Oneida language since 1979, and I am fortunate, and very grateful, to have been able to work with Oneida speakers whose abundant observations and knowledge have informed my study. Excerpts from texts come from a compilation of approximately 70 recorded texts of varying lengths, told by 14 different speakers between 1980 and 2012. Excerpts cited in this paper are from recordings by the late Clifford Cornelius, the late Hazel Cornelius, Pearl Cornelius, Verland Cornelius, the late Mercy Doxtator, Olive Elm, Norma Kennedy, and the late Georgina Nicholas. Thanks to Cliff Abbott and the editors of this volume for a careful reading of a previous version, and ensuing discussion, which undoubtedly improved the paper. I am also grateful to Wally Chafe, Jean-Pierre Koenig and Hanni Woodbury for valuable comments.

1. Lounsbury (1953) is the seminal description of Oneida. For resources on Oneida and other Iroquoian languages, see Michelson (2011).

2. Abbreviations other than those in the list at the beginning of this volume are: AG(ent), CIS-(locative), COIN(cident), CONTR(astive), DISTR.PL distributive plural, DP dual-plural or nonsingular, DUA(lic), EXCL(usive), FACT(ual), INCL(usive), OPT(ative), PAT(ient), PUNCT(ual aspect), REP(etitive), TRA(nslocative), STAT(ive aspect). A bare numeral 3, without number or gender marking, is an abbreviation for a prefix that does not distinguish feminine-indefinite, masculine dual and plural, and feminine-zoic dual and plural. The symbols Λ and u are mid central nasalized and mid-high to high back nasalized vowels, respectively. The symbol ? is a glottal stop. The raised period represents vowel length, and the acute mark over a vowel indicates accent. Voicing is not contrastive. Underlining indicates utterance-final devoicing. A colon in the morpheme identification line of examples separates morphemes which would be represented as distinct morphemes in a slightly more abstract representation. Transitive pronominal prefixes realize two animate semantic arguments in a single portmanteau-like prefix; the symbol $>$ is used between agent and patient. On the use of other punctuation marks in the glosses, see, for example, the Leipzig Glossing Rules (2008).

3. In Lounsbury (1953) the terms ‘subjective’ and ‘objective’ were used, but these have been replaced in the Iroquoian literature to acknowledge the frequent semantic motivation underlying the distribution of the prefixes.

4. Cf. Abbott (2006:91) “Grammatical gender in Oneida is more complicated than in English because Oneida has two feminine genders.” Note, however, that the reference to grammatical gender should not be understood in the same way as the term “grammatical” gender is used in this volume. As suggested by Abbott’s description, the reference to the two feminine genders is in the context of a *choice* (of pronominal prefixes on verbs), not in terms of *grammatical agreement* between a noun (class) and a verb: “An Oneida speaker who wants to refer to a female has to decide which of the two genders to use.”

5. The word for ‘witch’ is also attested (elsewhere) with the feminine-indefinite prefix, *aka-wéluzuske?*. See the examples (37) and (38).

6. *Ūhka? ok* consists of *ŭhka?* ‘anyone, who’ and a particle *ok*, whose function is not completely understood. Interestingly *ŭhka? ok* occurs most often with the feminine-indefinite, but it does not require the feminine-indefinite. In fact, not infrequently, when a male referent is suspected, *ŭhka? ok* occurs with the masculine singular. In other cases, the speaker varies between the feminine-indefinite and the masculine.

7. An example of this is the word for ‘barber shop’, *tsiʔ tyutatnuhkalá-thaʔ* (lit. ‘where someone cuts someone’s hair’), which has the transitive prefix *-yutat-* signifying a feminine-indefinite acting on a feminine-indefinite, even though generally barbers are male and those who get their hair cut at barber shops are also male.
8. This is true for all the Northern Iroquoian languages except Cayuga, which is unique in Northern Iroquoian for having developed a feminine-indefinite plural prefix, and it is this prefix, rather than the masculine plural, that is used for groups of males and females.
9. It should be noted that the “neuter” gender in Chafe (2004) corresponds in Oneida to the ‘feminine-zoic’. Neuter is a semantic, but not morphological, gender, at least in Oneida, as will be explained in Section 4.4.
10. The speakers with whom the author has explicitly discussed the use of the feminine-indefinite have all been female and so it may well be that this is a folk analysis. Jean-Pierre Koenig points out that frequency could play a role: Speakers may view the feminine as more basic if the feminine-indefinite is used more often to refer to female referents than to indefinite or nonspecific referents, and this seems to be the case.
11. Even males can have a name that has the feminine-zoic prefix. One of the storytellers in the corpus had the Oneida name *Kaluhyáti*, lit. ‘sky going by’, with the feminine-zoic singular prefix *ka-*. However, the feminine-zoic in this name may refer to the (inanimate or neuter) sky, and not to a person. In that case, it could be an example of the default use of the feminine-zoic described in Section 4.4.
12. There are a few Oneida verbs where the default is the feminine-zoic nonsingular (dual or plural). This is when the meaning of the verb requires nonsingular participants. An example is *Tsiʔ naʔte-ky-átleʔ yenʔstalihaʔtákhwaʔ kháleʔ kakhwawistóthaʔ*. ‘between the stove and the fridge’, lit. ‘where the two are apart stove and fridge’. Here the prefix *-ky-* is the feminine-zoic dual. Other verbs that require nonsingular arguments are *-attiha-* ‘be uneven’ and *-neka-* ‘be next to’.

References

- Abbott, Clifford. 1984. “Two feminine genders in Oneida.” *Anthropological Linguistics* 26: 125–137.
- Abbott, Clifford. 2006. *Oneida teaching grammar*. Green Bay, WI: University of Wisconsin.
- Chafe, Wallace L. 1977. “The evolution of third person verb agreement in the Iroquoian languages.” In *Mechanisms of syntactic change*, ed. Charles Li. Austin: University of Texas Press, 493–524.
- Chafe, Wallace L. 2004. “Masculine and feminine in the Northern Iroquoian languages.” In *Ethnosyntax: Explorations in grammar and culture*, ed. Nicholas J. Enfield. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 99–109.
- Frank, Francine & Frank Anshen. 1983. *Language and the sexes*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Koenig, Jean-Pierre & Karin Michelson. 2010. “Argument structure of Oneida kinship terms.” *International Journal of American Linguistics* 76: 169–205. DOI: 10.1086/652265

- Koenig, Jean-Pierre & Karin Michelson. in press. "Morphological complexity à la Oneida." In *Understanding and measuring morphological complexity*, eds. Matthew Baerman & Dunstan Brown & Greville G. Corbett. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 69–92.
- Leipzig Glossing Rules. 2008. *The Leipzig Glossing Rules: Conventions for interlinear morpheme-by-morpheme glosses*. <https://www.eva.mpg.de/lingua/pdf/LGR08.02.05.pdf> [26 August 2014]
- Lounsbury, Floyd G. 1953. *Oneida verb morphology*. New Haven: Yale University.
- Michelson, Karin. 1981. *Three stories in Oneida, told and translated by Georgina Nicholas*. Ottawa: National Museum of Man.
- Michelson, Karin. 1982. "Two feminine pronominal prefixes in Oneida." Paper read before the *Association for the Anthropological Study of Play*. London, Ontario: University of Western Ontario.
- Michelson, Karin. 2011. "Iroquoian Languages." In *Oxford bibliographies online: Linguistics*, ed. Mark Aronoff. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Michelson, Karin & Mercy Doxtator. 2002. *Oneida–English/English–Oneida dictionary*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

PORTUGUESE

Gender in Portuguese

Annette Endruschat

University of Regensburg, Germany

1. Introduction
2. Categories of gender
 - 2.1 Grammatical gender
 - 2.1.1 Morphological constraints
 - 2.1.2 Onomasiological constraints
 - 2.1.3 Semasiological constraints
 - 2.2 Lexical gender
 - 2.3 Referential gender
 - 2.3.1 Double-gender nouns
 - 2.3.2 Epicenes
 - 2.4 Generic masculines
3. Gender-related structures
 - 3.1 Word-formation
 - 3.1.1 Derivation
 - 3.1.2 Compounding
 - 3.2 Agreement
 - 3.3 Pronominalization
 - 3.4 Coordination
4. Usage of personal reference forms
 - 4.1 Address terms
 - 4.2 Occupational terms
 - 4.3 Semantic derogation
 - 4.4 Idioms and proverbs
5. Language change and language reform
 - 5.1 Debates on professional terms
 - 5.2 Guidelines for non-sexist language use
 - 5.3 Gender-neutral forms in writing
6. Conclusion

Notes

References

1. Introduction

Portuguese is a West Romance language spoken on four continents (Europe: Portugal, South America: Brazil, Africa: Angola, Mozambique, Cap Verde, Guinea-Bissau, São Tomé and Príncipe, Asia: East Timor, Macao) by 215 million native speakers. It is one of the most spoken languages in the world.¹ Portuguese has been the national language of Portugal since the 12th century. Later it received official language status in Brazil and in the African ex-colonies where the independent nations decided to preserve the language of the former colonial government. In the Asian Lusophone countries, Portuguese has a co-official language status. Portuguese is also partly spoken in Goa, Damão and Diu in India, and in Malacca, Malaysia. The present article focuses on European standard Portuguese. Whenever necessary or important, the Brazilian variety will also be discussed.

Portuguese is a mainly synthetic language that is rich in morphological properties. Inflection is shown on nouns, determiners, adjectives, pronouns and verbs. Verbs are highly inflected: they do not just vary in terms of three main tenses (past, present and future), three moods (indicative, subjunctive, imperative), and two aspects (perfective and imperfective), but there is also an inflected infinitive which allows the referential disambiguation of infinite constructions:

- (1) *É melhor voltares.*
 is better return.INF.2SG
 ‘It is better for you to return.’

There is hardly any case inflection in Portuguese. Only in the pronominal system do we find vestiges of the Latin accusative and dative, which are restricted to the third person (see Section 3.3). Nouns and their satellites inflect for number and gender. As is typical with Romance languages, Portuguese nouns have only two gender classes, feminine and masculine. The Latin neuter has vanished, but there are still traces of it in some pronominal forms: *isto, isso, aquilo* (n) ‘this here/this there/that’. Morphologically, descendants from Latin neuter have become mostly masculine in Portuguese (Lat. *animal* (n) > Port. *animal* (m) ‘animal’; Lat. *mare* (n) > Port. *mar* (m) ‘sea’). Neuter plural forms (ending in *-a*) have probably led in a few cases to attribute the idea of plurality, collectivity or largeness to feminine nouns ending in *-a*, in contrast to masculine nouns.

In the case of inanimate entities, grammatical gender in Portuguese cannot be correlated with lexical or referential gender, but in the case of animate nouns (designating persons or animals), in general, there is a correspondence between the feminine and masculine gender class and the lexical specification of a noun as female or male. Therefore we can establish the following basic rules: The feminine

gender is used for nouns denoting female persons or animals, as in *mulher* (f) ‘woman’, *galinha* (f) ‘hen’; the masculine gender is used for nouns denoting male persons or animals, as in *homem* (m) ‘man’, *galo* (m) ‘cock’. However, these rules do not hold for all cases and we have to make a clear distinction between grammatical, lexical and referential gender (cf. Section 2).

Nouns do not necessarily carry markers of gender class membership if considered in isolation, but within a syntactic context, there is obligatory agreement with other word classes, both inside and outside the noun phrase (cf. Section 3.2). From a syntactic point of view, the gender of nouns controls agreement with syntactically associated constituents.

2. Categories of gender

In studies on linguistic gender (see the collections edited by Hellinger & Bußmann 2001, 2002, 2003), a distinction is made between grammatical, lexical, referential and social gender. I will follow this categorization, even though these categories often intersect in complex ways, as will become clear throughout the article. Social gender does not normally surface linguistically in Portuguese and, therefore, will not be discussed separately in this article. There are two main reasons for this: first, in most cases, social gender is overridden by grammatical gender in agreement and pronominalization. Second, as will be shown in Section 4.2, even socially gendered occupations are generally associated with corresponding masculine and feminine occupational titles, thanks to the rich morphological inventory of Portuguese.

2.1 Grammatical gender

In Portuguese, grammatical gender is marked on the following word categories:

- nouns (common nouns and proper nouns)
- pronouns
- definite and indefinite articles and other determiners (demonstratives, possessives, numerals and quantifiers)
- adjectives (in both attributive and predicative function)
- past participles (used as adjectives or as parts of periphrastic verbal tense forms)
- nominalized gerundives (*doutoranda* (f) ‘feminine doctoral student’ vs. *doutorando* (m) ‘male doctoral student’).

Except for human and animate entities with clear lexical gender, grammatical gender is mainly distributed randomly. But there are morphological constraints on grammatical gender assignment or – in a more learner-based view – semantic aspects that allow prediction of grammatical gender. The gender-typical endings – more or less the same for nouns and adjectives – are mentioned in most grammars of Portuguese and will be provided here as an overview.

2.1.1 *Morphological constraints*

The following endings are typical of the feminine gender:

- (2) *-a, -ã, -iz*
rapariga (f) ‘girl’; *alemã* (f) ‘female German’; *atriz* (f) ‘actress’

Typically masculine endings are:

- (3) *-o, -eu, -oi, -im, -or*
galo (m) ‘cock’; *hebreu* (m) ‘Hebrew’; *herói* (m) ‘hero’, *mandarim* (m) ‘Mandarin’; *cantor* (m) ‘singer’

These rules are not without exceptions. For example, there are a few feminine nouns ending in *-o* and also some masculine nouns ending in *-a/-ã/-á* (cf. 4a/b). A special case are words ending in *-ista*, which may be masculine or feminine (cf. (4c); see double-gender nouns in Section 2.3.1). Finally, there are also a few nouns with oscillating grammatical gender, as illustrated in (4d).

- (4) a. *tribo* (f) ‘tribe’
 b. *Papa* (m) ‘Pope’; *imã* (m) ‘imam’; *xá* (m) ‘Shah’
 c. *fadista* (f/m) ‘fado singer’
 d. *antilope* (f/m) ‘antelope’; *soprano* (f/m) ‘soprano’; *clã* (f/m) ‘clan’

2.1.2 *Onomasiological constraints*

There are also several correlations between semantic fields and grammatical gender. The following gender-related semantic fields are described in Portuguese grammars.

Many botanical terms like nouns denoting trees and fruits are feminine: *maçã* (f) ‘apple’; *laranjeira* (f) ‘orange tree’.² Many collective names are feminine: *ordem* (f) ‘order (of doctors, architects)’; *caravana* (f) ‘caravan (of camels, pellegrins, merchants)’; *alcateia* (f) ‘pack (of wolves, lions)’; *manada* (f) ‘herd’; *tripulação* (f) ‘crew’; *quadrilha* (f) ‘gang’; *multidão* (f) ‘crowd’; *tribo* (f) ‘tribe’.³

Geographical terms like names of rivers, lakes, mountains and directions are masculine: *Danúbio* (m) ‘Danube’; *Báltico* (m) ‘Baltic Sea’; *Evereste* (m) ‘Mount Everest’; *sul* (m) ‘South’.

Nouns denoting sounds and letters are always feminine, due to the feminine gender of the terms *vogal* (f) ‘vowel’, *consoante* (f) ‘consonant’ and *letra* (f) ‘letter’: *a ‘o’* (f) ‘the o’; *a ‘erre’* (f) ‘the r’.

As has already been indicated, there is a correlation between nouns ending in *-a* and the semantic feature ‘plurality’ (like in *fruta*⁴ (f) ‘fruits’) or ‘largeness’ as in the pair *mosca* (f) ‘fly’ vs. *mosco* (m) ‘mosquito’.

Onomasiological constraints hold only in some cases and there are many exceptions. Nevertheless, due to the relatively strong correlation between grammatical and lexical/referential gender in the case of animate nouns in Portuguese, Ramos & Roberson (2010) argue that this fact may lead people to assign female and male features to inanimate nouns. For example, through manipulated task instructions (pictures, stimulus materials, etc.), they showed that Portuguese speakers were strongly influenced by grammatical gender when assigning male or female voices to inanimate objects (see also Sera et al. 1994, 2002).⁵

2.1.3 *Semasiological constraints*

Some Portuguese nouns may occur as feminine or masculine, depending on their meaning: *capital* (f) ‘capital of a country’ vs. *capital* (m) ‘financial capital’. Such pairs are often the result of metonymical or metaphorical meaning extension. There are also some examples involving personal nouns:

- (5) *cura* (f) ‘cure’ – *cura* (m) ‘priest’
cabeça (f) ‘head’ – *cabeça* (m) ‘leader, head’
caixa (f) ‘cash desk’ – *caixa* (m) ‘cashier’
guia (f) ‘permit’ – *guia* (m) ‘guide’
guarda (f) ‘surveillance’ – *guarda* (m) ‘guardian’

In all these examples, only the masculine lexemes denote persons and are used to refer to both female and male persons. It is not possible to assign feminine gender to these personal nouns even when referring to a female person, as the feminine lexemes have non-personal denotations.

2.2 Lexical gender

In Portuguese, a considerable number of personal nouns are lexically specified as carrying the semantic property [female] or [male]. This holds most consistently in the field of kinship terms (and animal names), but also in the case of professional terms (*professora* (f) ‘female teacher’ vs. *professor* (m) ‘teacher’) and nobility titles (*duquesa* (f) ‘duchess’ vs. *duque* (m) ‘duke’), address terms (*Senhora Alves* (f) ‘Mrs Alves’ vs. *Senhor Alves* (m) ‘Mr Alves’), and nouns denoting female/male

people in general. In these cases, a considerable correspondence can be observed between a noun's grammatical gender class and its lexical specification as female or male.

From a morphological point of view, lexical gender may be marked by a suffix as in (6):

- (6) *sobrinha* (f) 'niece' – *sobrinho* (m) 'nephew'
irmã (f) 'sister' – *irmão* (m) 'brother'
pintora (f) 'female painter' – *pintor* (m) 'painter'
esposa (f) 'wife' – *esposo* (m) 'husband'

Or it may be marked using different stems:

- (7) *mãe* (f) 'mother' – *pai* (m) 'father'
madrasta (f) 'stepmother' – *padrasto* (m) 'stepfather'
freira (f) 'sister' – *frade* (m) 'friar'
mulher (f) 'woman' – *homem* (m) 'man'

Apart from this, many personal nouns in Portuguese are lexically gender-indefinite, as we will see in the next section.

2.3 Referential gender

Referential gender identifies a referent as female, male or gender-indefinite, independently of a noun's grammatical or lexical gender. Nouns like *representante* (f/m) 'representative' or *artista* (f/m) 'artist' may refer either to female or male individuals as well as representatives or artists in general. When viewed in isolation, they seem to be neutral with respect to lexical and grammatical gender. It is only in context that referential gender becomes evident. In other words, the satellite forms (in particular the determiners which in Portuguese are almost always obligatory) carry gender markers that help identify the gender of the referent.

As in other languages (for instance in French; cf. Schafroth 2003:98), there are some Portuguese nouns that show a mismatch between grammatical and referential gender:

- (8) feminine nouns with male reference: *Sua Santidade* (f) 'His Holiness'
 (addressed to the Pope)
 masculine nouns with female reference: *mulherão* (m) 'big woman'
 feminine epicene nouns: *pessoa* (f) 'person'
 masculine epicene nouns: *ídolo* (m) 'idol'

In Portuguese, gender-invariable nouns like *representante* (f/m) are called *uniformes* ('formally invariable nouns'). They can be subdivided into two groups: *comuns de dois gêneros* (double-gender nouns) and *sobrecomuns* (epicenes).⁶ While the double-gender nouns can occur with feminine or masculine satellites, depending on referential gender, this is not possible in the case of epicenes (such as *criança* (f) 'child'), which are also lexically gender-neutral but have a fixed grammatical gender value that triggers agreement in the satellites. These two phenomena will be described in more detail in Sections 2.3.1 and 2.3.2.

2.3.1 Double-gender nouns

Double-gender nouns can occur with feminine and masculine satellites: *vigia* (f/m) 'guardian'; *gângster* (f/m) 'gangster'; *vigarista* (f/m) 'cheat'. In generic contexts, these nouns trigger masculine agreement, as in the following example:

- (9) *No Brasil, um dos apelidos do vigarista é 171,*
 in.DEF Brazil one of.DEF names of.DEF.MASC.SG swindler is 171
referência ao artigo do Código Penal.
 reference at.DEF article of.DEF code penal
 'In Brazil, one of the names for the cheat is 171, referring to the article of the Penal Code.'
 (<http://www.hsw.uol.com.br/vigaristas.htm> [11 May 2014])

Female-specific and male-specific reference is achieved through the satellite forms. In the following examples, double-gender nouns like *gângster* (f/m) 'gangster' and *agente* (f/m) 'police officer' become female-specific in their reference by means of the feminine indefinite article *uma* (f) 'a':⁷

- (10) *Então você sempre sonhou em ser uma gângster?*
 so you always dreamed in be INDEF.FEM.SG gangster
 'So you have always dreamt of being a female gangster?'
 (www.animespirit.com.br [30 January 2014])
- (11) *Uma agente da Polícia Federal morreu [...]*
 INDEF.FEM.SG police officer of.DEF police federal died
em um grave acidente.
 in a serious accident
 'A female agent of the *Polícia Federal* died in a serious accident.'
 (www.copaemcuritiba.com [30 January 2014])

Another possibility to achieve gender-specific reference is pronominalization, as the following example shows: *estudante* (f/m) 'student' first co-occurs with masculine satellite forms for generic reference and then the female gender is specified by the direct object pronoun *a* (f) 'her':

- (12) *Ontem falei com um estudante meu.*
 yesterday spoke.1SG with INDEF.MASC.SG student my.MASC.SG
Chama-se Maria e encontrei-a na biblioteca.
 calls-REFL Maria and met.1SG-3SG.FEM.ACC in.DEF library
 ‘Yesterday, I spoke with a student of mine. She is called Maria and I met her
 in the library.’

As we can see, as soon as the double-gender nouns are inserted in a context, one has to choose a grammatical gender and therefore, in generic contexts, the masculine will be chosen by default (cf. Section 2.4). Only in contexts of female-specific reference do the satellites appear in the feminine form.

Although there is no empirical study testing the frequency of female and male reference in double-gender nouns, an initial search in a Portuguese text corpus (*Corpus de Referência do Português Contemporâneo*) and on the internet clearly shows two tendencies: Female-specific reference is the marked case and occurs more seldom.⁸ And female-specific reference occurs more often in Brazilian Portuguese than in European Portuguese.

2.3.2 *Epicenes*

In the case of epicenes (cf. 13), referential gender cannot be expressed by the satellites. Articles and adjectives invariably agree with the grammatical gender of the controller noun.

- (13) *estrela, vedeta* (f) both ‘star’
testemunha (f) ‘witness’
criança (f) ‘child’
vítima (f) ‘victim’
homem (m) ‘human being’
ídolo (m) ‘idol’

This fact may lead to incongruences between grammatical and referential gender (cf. 14):

- (14) *O ator Gérard Dépardieu é uma estrela.*
 DEF.MASC actor.MASC Gérard Depardieu is INDEF.FEM star.FEM
 ‘The actor Gérard Dépardieu is a star.’

Referential gender can be established by other grammatical means like pronominalization. Thus, *a pessoa* (f) ‘the person’ would be pronominalized by *ele* ‘he’ if the referent is male, as in (15), and by *ela* ‘she’ if the referent is female:

- (15) *Como saber se ele é a pessoa certa?*
 how know if 3SG.MASC is DEF.FEM person.FEM right.FEM
 ‘How to know if he is the right person?’
 (<http://casamento.kazulo.pt/11726/9-formas-de-saber-se-esta-com-a-pessoa-certa.htm> [30 January 2014])

But this holds only if the gender of the referent is known or important enough to be marked. If this is not the case, *pessoa* remains gender-indefinite:

- (16) *Como entrar no pc de uma pessoa sem ela saber?*
 how enter into.DEF PC of INDEF.FEM person without 3SG.FEM know
 ‘How to enter the PC of someone without him/her noticing it?’
 (<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ubaem6oDV-8> [30 January 2014])

Referential gender specification by means of pronouns is also commonly employed with disrespectful personal nouns and terms of abuse:

- (17) a. *Ela é um diabo.*
 3SG.FEM is INDEF.MASC devil
 ‘She is a devil.’
 b. *Ele é uma chaga.*
 3SG.MASC is INDEF.FEM open wound
 ‘He is a problem.’

However, as subject pro-dropping is typical of Portuguese, referential gender often remains unspecified in such cases:

- (18) *É uma canalha.*
 is INDEF.FEM pig
 ‘She/he is a pig.’

2.4 Generic masculines

As in the other Romance languages, masculine generics are a common phenomenon in Portuguese as well:

- (19) *Pedro e a sua mulher são trabalhadores.*
 Pedro and DEF.FEM POSS.FEM wife are worker.MASC.PL
 ‘Pedro and his wife are workers.’

As we can see in the above example, *trabalhadores* (m.pl) ‘workers’ may not only refer to males but can also have a generic function. Similarly, family names when used to refer to the whole family are masculine: *os* (m.pl) *Da Silva* ‘the Da Silvas.’⁹

The critical point is that generic masculines may evoke male images and can, therefore, be interpreted as androcentric. Some scholars have argued that this phenomenon illustrates the discriminating face of the language. They argue that the generic use of the masculine gender reinforces the patriarchal domination in the real world (Carboni & Maestri 2003: 55). Such a point of view is related to the discussion whether the masculine gender should be considered as the unmarked case or not (Hellinger 1990: 92ff.).

The reverse, i.e. the use of feminine nouns with gender-indefinite reference, is the rare exception in the world's languages. Seen from a morphological point of view, feminines are often marked by adding a suffix to a (usually masculine) base, as in *cantor* 'singer' – *cantora* 'female singer' (see Section 3.1).

Feminines are marked semantically as well. They have a restricted distribution as they tend to be female-specific. By contrast, masculine nouns have a wider lexical and referential potential and may be used to refer to males, to groups of people whose gender is unknown or unimportant, or even to female referents. Thus, *irmãos* (m.pl) 'brothers' may include brothers and sisters (or even only sisters) but *irmãs* (f.pl) 'sisters' includes only sisters but no brothers, and *vendedor* (m.sg) 'salesperson' can refer to a male or a female salesperson but *vendedora* (f.sg) 'female salesperson' can only refer to a woman:

- (20) *Tenho três irmãos: duas irmãs e um irmão.*
 have.1SG three brother.MASC.PL two.FEM.PL sister.FEM.PL and
 one.MASC.SG brother.MASC.SG
 'I have three siblings: two sisters and one brother.'

Generic masculines are nouns (or pronouns) for which, in most cases, feminine alternative forms also exist. In French (Schafroth 2003: 101), masculine expressions like *maire* 'mayor', *écrivain* 'writer', *auteur* 'author', *professeur* 'professor', etc. may also refer to a female person, as in *Elle est l'auteur (m) de deux romans* 'She is the author of two novels'. By contrast, in Portuguese, the feminine form is used in most cases:

- (21) *Ela é a autora de dois romances.*
 3SG.FEM is DEF.FEM.SG author.FEM.SG of two novels
 'She is the author of two novels.'

Nevertheless, particularly in formal contexts and in academic circles, women are often addressed with generic masculine forms, as in the introductory formula of business letters: *caro* (m.sg.) *colega* 'dear colleague' (see also Caldas-Coulthard 2007 on generic masculines in Brazilian Portuguese).

Finally, indefinite pronouns in Portuguese often function as generic masculines, for example in greeting formulas such as:

- (22) *Boa tarde a todos*
 good evening to all.MASC.PL
 ‘Good evening to all’

Todos can refer to a mixed-sex group of people, even if the majority are women or if there is only one man among one hundred women. Similarly, in a sentence such as (23), *eles* (m.pl) may include females and males:

- (23) *Eles estão contentes.*
 3PL.MASC are happy.PL
 ‘They are happy.’

3. Gender-related structures

3.1 Word formation

3.1.1 Derivation

Gender-specification by derivation has often been related to the concept of markedness, with the masculine being considered almost always as the unmarked form, while feminine forms are, in general, morphologically marked.

Mattoso Câmara (1975), one of the first authors to systematically describe gender in Portuguese, points out that gender inflection on nouns does not exist in Portuguese:

O caráter masculino ou feminino da palavra está imanente na palavra e é de natureza lexical, não flexional.

[‘The masculine or feminine character of the word is an immanent part of the word and has lexical, not inflectional character.’]

(Mattoso Câmara 1975:77; my translation)

Other authors such as Kehdi (1996) argue that gender is a matter of inflection in Portuguese, which shows in various types of formal correspondence. The gender-related morphological alternation *-a/-o* is considered the most typical example of such a formal correspondence:

- (24) *menina* (f) ‘girl’ – *menino* (m) ‘boy’
tia (f) ‘aunt’ – *tio* (m) ‘uncle’

Other such formal correspondences are:

- (25) *-oa/-ão*
patroa (f) ‘female owner’ – *patrão* (m) ‘owner’
-a/-Ø
embaixadora (f) ‘ambadress’ – *embaixador* (m) ‘ambassador’¹⁰
-triz/-tor
atriz (f) ‘actress’ – *actor* (m) ‘actor’
-essa/-e
abadessa (f) ‘abbess’ – *abade* (m) ‘abbot’
-isa/-o
diaconisa (f) ‘deaconess’ – *diácono* (m) ‘deacon’

Some words ending in *-e*, which are normally double-gender nouns, can have the feminine ending *-a* in some informal contexts, mainly in Brazilian Portuguese:

- (26) *chefa* (f) ‘female boss’ – *chefe* (m) ‘boss’
clienta (f) ‘female client’ – *cliente* (m) ‘client’
regenta (f) ‘female ruler’ – *regente* (m) ‘ruler’¹¹

Nouns ending in *-ista*, such as *dentista*, *ciclista*, *turista*, *especialista*, are actually double-gender nouns (cf. Section 2.3.1), although there seems to be a tendency in Brazilian Portuguese to perceive *-ista* as a feminine ending because of *-a* and to create new masculine forms like *dentisto* (m) ‘male dentist’, which do not conform to the (European) standard. Speakers (particularly in Brazil) spontaneously also create masculine forms from feminine nouns, like *crianço* (m) from *criança* (f) ‘child’, *madrasto* (m) from *madrasta* (f) ‘stepmother’,¹² *caixo* (m) from *caixa* (m) ‘cashier’. These formations show that Portuguese, which is a morphologically rich language, tends to extend the morphological gender patterns to originally invariable nouns (Nascimento 2003: 3). These phenomena may provide an argument in favor of Kehdi’s (1996) position that Portuguese nouns are gender-inflected.

A final remark should be made on diminutive and augmentative suffixes, which are common in Portuguese. These suffixes do not normally change the grammatical gender of the base noun:

- (27) *homem* (m) ‘man’ > *homenzinho* (m) ‘small man’
avó (f) ‘grandmother’ > *avózinha* (f) ‘little grandma’ (hypocoristic)
mulher (f) ‘woman’ > *mulherona* (f) ‘big woman’

However, there is an interesting exception with a gender change: *mulherão* (m) ‘big woman’, derived from *mulher* (f) ‘woman’.

3.1.2 Compounding

In Portuguese, compounding is a highly productive word-formation process. The internal structure of Portuguese noun-plus-noun compounds normally follows the order *determinatum-determinans* (i.e. the head of the compound stands in initial position). In such cases, the first element controls grammatical gender, as in *homem-rã* (m) ‘frogman’ or *mulher-homem* (f) ‘masculine woman’. But we can find several compounds which follow the Anglo-Germanic model of compounding where the *determinans* precedes the *determinatum*. This order of elements also corresponds to formations using Greek or Latin elements. In these compounds, the second element controls grammatical gender: *gentil-homem* (m) ‘gentleman’, *motociclista* (f/m) ‘biker’.

Inanimate verb-plus-noun compound nouns are generally masculine, but when they denote a person, they behave like double-gender nouns:

- (28) *porta-voz* (f/m) ‘speaker’
limpa-chaminés (f/m) ‘chimney sweep’
guarda-freio (f/m) ‘railway-engineer’

Regarding personal nouns, syntagmatic compounding is more productive than asyndetic noun-plus-noun or verb-plus-noun compounding. Thus, one finds some professional titles with the structures noun-adjective or noun-preposition-noun: *engenheiro ambiental* (m) ‘environmental engineer’, *engenheira de construção civil* (f) ‘female civil engineer’. In all these compounds, grammatical gender is determined by the personal noun.

3.2 Agreement

Due to the rich inflectional morphology of Portuguese, gender is marked on many parts of speech, and as a result, gender-inflection is highly redundant:

- (29) *Todas aquelas lindas meninas são*
 all.FEM.PL this.FEM.PL nice.FEM.PL girl.FEM.PL are
alunas francesas.
 pupil.FEM.PL French.FEM.PL
 ‘All these nice girls are French pupils.’
- (30) *Todos aqueles lindos meninos são*
 all.MASC.PL this.MASC.PL nice.MASC.PL boy.MASC.PL are
alunos franceses.
 pupil.MASC.PL French.MASC.PL
 ‘All these nice boys are French pupils.’

Generally speaking, the gender of a noun controls obligatory agreement with syntactically associated constituents inside and outside the noun phrase. This

is the case for determiners and attributive adjectives (*a linda rapariga* ‘the.FEM good-looking.FEM girl.FEM’, *o lindo rapaz* ‘the.MASC good-looking.MASC boy.MASC’), as well as predicative adjectives (see 31).

- (31) a. A *rapariga é linda.*
 DEF.FEM girl.FEM is good-looking.FEM
 ‘The girl is good-looking.’
 b. O *rapaz é lindo.*
 DEF.MASC boy.MASC is good-looking.MASC
 ‘The boy is good-looking.’

This holds even if nouns follow the adjective:

- (32) *Ficaram sozinhas em casa a Paula*
 stayed.3PL alone.FEM.PL in home DEF.FEM Paula
e a Maria.
 and DEF.FEM Maria
 ‘Paula and Maria stayed alone at home.’

Adjectives also agree in passive constructions:

- (33) a. A *Maria foi surpreendida pela tempestade.*
 DEF.FEM Maria was surprised.FEM by.DEF storm
 ‘Maria was surprised by the storm.’
 b. O *Pedro foi surpreendido pela tempestade.*
 DEF.MASC Pedro was surprised.MASC by.DEF storm
 ‘Pedro was surprised by the storm.’

3.3 Pronominalization

For pronouns, gender is only distinguished in third person subject and direct object forms (singular and plural). There are no gender distinctions in the first and second person pronouns (see Table 1).

As we can see in the table, the indirect object pronouns, which inherit their gender-neutrality in the third person from Latin, are only marked for number but not for gender. But normally, the context disambiguates the referential gender of indirect object pronouns.

Portuguese is a subject pro-drop language and subject pronouns are only used to avoid ambiguity or for reasons of emphasis. In a sentence like (34), the referential gender of the subject remains unclear.

- (34) *Está a chegar a Lisboa.*
 is at arrive at Lisbon
 ‘She/he is arriving at Lisbon.’

Table 1. Portuguese personal pronouns

	Nominative (subject)	Dative (indirect object)	Accusative (direct object)
1SG	<i>eu</i>	<i>me</i>	<i>me</i>
2SG	<i>tu</i>	<i>te</i>	<i>te</i>
3SG.FEM	<i>ela</i>	<i>lhe</i>	<i>a</i>
3SG.MASC	<i>ele</i>	<i>lhe</i>	<i>o</i>
1PL	<i>nós</i>	<i>nos</i>	<i>nos</i>
2PL	<i>vós</i>	<i>vos</i>	<i>vos</i>
3PL.FEM	<i>elas</i>	<i>lhes</i>	<i>as</i>
3PL.MASC	<i>eles</i>	<i>lhes</i>	<i>os</i>

When there are satellites outside the subject noun phrase, gender is assigned to them in accordance with referential gender if the referent is known, as in (35):

- (35) *Durante o dia ficaram sozinhas.*
 during DEF day stayed.3PL alone.FEM.PL
 ‘During the day, they (f) stayed alone.’

Otherwise, a generic masculine is used. Thus, we find gender inflection on the adjective, even when the subject is only implicit.

Possessive pronouns agree in gender and number with the noun denoting the possessed entity. Consequently, they do not reflect the possessor’s gender and behave like adjectives:

- (36) a. *Este é o seu amigo.*
 this.MASC is DEF.MASC POSS.MASC friend.MASC
 ‘This is her/his/their friend.’
 b. *Estas são as suas filhas.*
 this.FEM.PL are DEF.FEM.PL POSS.FEM.PL daughter.FEM.PL
 ‘These are her/his/their daughters.’

Possessive pronouns of the third person plural are ambiguous, they can refer to one (female or male) possessor or to more than one possessor (37a). To avoid this ambiguity, the use of a periphrastic construction is preferred for the plural (37b).

- (37) a. *O seu carro fica avariado.*
 DEF.MASC.SG POSS.MASC.SG car.MASC is damaged.MASC.SG
 ‘Her/his/their car is damaged.’
 b. *O carro deles fica avariado.*
 DEF.MASC.SG car.MASC of.3PL.MASC is damaged.MASC.SG
 ‘Their car is damaged.’

Relative pronouns (like *que* ‘who’) show no gender distinctions. However, gender agreement holds for other satellites in the relative clause:

- (38) *As duas meninas que durante o dia*
 DEF.FEM.PL two.FEM.PL girl.FEM.PL REL during DEF day
ficaram sozinhas [...].
 stayed.3PL alone.FEM.PL
 ‘The two girls who stayed alone during the day [...].’

When direct and indirect object pronouns of the third person occur together, they are contracted to one single form. In such cases, gender is distinguished only by the direct object pronoun (since indirect object pronouns are always gender-neutral):

Table 2. Portuguese contractions of direct and indirect object pronouns

Indirect object	Direct object			
	3SG.FEM	3PL.FEM	3SG.MASC	3PL.MASC
3SG	<i>lha</i>	<i>lhas</i>	<i>lho</i>	<i>lhos</i>
3PL	<i>lhas</i>	<i>lhas</i>	<i>lhos</i>	<i>lhos</i>

As we can observe, there are some ambiguous forms, but in a given context it is possible to disambiguate referential gender (and number) as the following sentence demonstrates:

- (39) *Mandei-lhos por SMS e ela*
 sent.1SG-3SG.DAT.3PL.MASC.ACC via sms and 3SG.FEM
depois disse-me que pensou [...].
 after told.3SG-1SG.DAT that thought.3SG
 ‘I sent them to her via sms and later she told me that she thought [...].’
 (<http://nemequittespas.blogs.sapo.pt/33585.html> [30 January 2014])

3.4 Coordination

Regarding nominal and adjectival agreement, there are some interesting patterns with coordinated nouns, especially when they have different grammatical genders.

Preposed adjectives agree mostly with the nearest noun:

- (40) a. *muitos* *homens* *e* *mulheres*
 many.MASC.PL man.MASC.PL and woman.FEM.PL
 ‘many men and women’
- b. *estimada* *senhora* *e* *senhor*
 valued.FEM.SG Mrs.FEM.SG and Mr.MASC.SG
 ‘dear madam and sir’

The agreement of adjectives in postposition depends on the gender and number of the coordinated nouns. There are several possibilities, as can be seen in the following examples (note that the second options after the slashes are considered less desirable by prescriptive grammars):

- (41) a. *o* *aluno* *e* *o*
 DEF.MASC.SG student.MASC.SG and DEF.MASC.SG
professor *portugueses / português*
 professor.MASC.SG Portuguese.MASC.PL / SG
 ‘the Portuguese student and the Portuguese professor’
- b. *o* *homem* *e* *a* *mulher*
 DEF.MASC.SG man and DEF.FEM.SG woman
portugueses / portuguesa
 Portuguese.MASC.PL / FEM.SG
 ‘the Portuguese man and the Portuguese woman’
- c. *os* *alunos* *e* *o*
 DEF.MASC.PL student.MASC.PL and DEF.MASC.SG
professor *portugueses / português*
 professor.MASC.SG Portuguese.MASC.PL / SG
 ‘the Portuguese students and the Portuguese professor’
- d. *os* *alunos* *e* *as*
 DEF.MASC.PL student.MASC.PL and DEF.FEM.PL
professoras *portuguesas / portuguesas*
 professor.FEM.PL Portuguese.FEM.PL / MASC.PL
 ‘the Portuguese students and the Portuguese female professors’

- e. *os alunos e a professora*
 DEF.MASC.PL student.MASC.PL and DEF.FEM.SG
professora *portugueses / portuguesa*
 PROFESSOR.FEM.SG Portuguese.MASC.PL / FEM.SG
 ‘the Portuguese students and the Portuguese female professor’
- f. *o aluno e as professoras*
 DEF.MASC.SG student.MASC.SG and DEF.FEM.PL
professoras *portuguesas*
 PROFESSOR.FEM.PL Portuguese.FEM.PL
 ‘the Portuguese student and the Portuguese female professors’

In summary, gender (and number) agreement in coordination is mostly controlled by the last noun. Therefore, the default status of the masculine in mixed-gender agreement is less absolute in Portuguese than in other grammatical gender languages.

4. Usage of personal reference forms

4.1 Address terms

Portuguese has a highly differentiated system of address terms, which is further complicated by complex regional and social variation. Address terms are employed according to the degree of formality between speaker and addressee. In informal situations, with family, friends, and minors, *tu* is the pronoun used in European Portuguese to address a person. In more formal contexts, it is usual to choose *você*. This form tends to be used between people who are social equals but not intimates. It has an interesting etymology, as it derives from the complex address form *vossa mercê* ‘your mercy’. Originally a grammatically feminine and referentially male form (used to address the King or the Emperor), it has become gender-neutral and is today used for both female and male addressees. To address more than one person in informal situations, the plural form *vocês* is used. None of these address forms (*tu*, *você*, *vocês*) is gender-variable.

In formal contexts, nominal address forms like *a senhora* (f.sg) ‘Mrs’, *o senhor* (m.sg) ‘Mr’, or, when more than one person is addressed, the plural forms *as senhoras* (f.pl) and *os senhores* (m.pl) are used.¹³ Often these terms are used in combination with nouns denoting a profession, social rank or function of the addressee.

- (42) A *senhora professora* *está boa?*
 DEF.FEM Mrs professor.FEM is well.FEM.SG
 ‘How are you?’ (formal)

There is an interesting difference between formally addressing women and men. In formal situations, women are mainly addressed by their first name: *a (Senhora) Dona Isabel* ‘Mrs Isabel’, while family names are commonly used to address men: *o Senhor da Silva* ‘Mr da Silva’.

In colloquial contexts, *a gente* (f) ‘the people’ is used as an alternative to the first-person plural pronoun *nós* ‘we’. This noun triggers third person singular verbal agreement and is used to address a mixed-sex group of persons including the speaker (see 43a).¹⁴ However, *a gente* is also used to address a single (female or male) person (see 43b):

- (43) a. A *gente* *vai à* *praia?*
 DEF.FEM people.FEM goes to.DEF beach
 ‘Do we go to the beach?’
 b. *Como está a* *gente?*
 how is DEF.FEM people
 ‘How are you?’

4.2 Occupational terms

Stereotypical assumptions about the social roles of women and men may be reflected in the lexicon of a language, for example by the inventory of professional and ceremonial terms. The existence of particular feminine terms does not necessarily indicate whether or not such stereotypical assumptions exist in the society. Nevertheless, in societies where social and professional roles are strictly divided between women and men, we often do not find corresponding feminine and masculine professional terms. It is frequently the case that only either the feminine or the masculine term exists or is used.

In Portugal, where feminist emancipation in professional life has a long tradition (see Albrecht 1997; Matias 1994), and where the number of women among the working population rose to 48% in 2011 (Instituto Nacional de Estatística 2012:23), such a strict division does no longer exist. Women actively participate in highly qualified professional domains such as medicine, law, education including higher education, and engineering. Today more than 50% of the university teaching staff, medical doctors and scholars in the field of science and medicine are women.

This situation is reflected in the lexicon, as new feminine occupational titles have been created and used. Compared to French (see Schafroth 2003: 99ff.) and Spanish (Nissen 2003: 262), the creation of such new terms seems to be more productive and more accepted. For example, in Portuguese the form *doutora* (f) 'female doctor' is common, while in French such a feminine form is missing (there is only a double-gender noun *docteur*).

There are quite a few pairs of feminine and masculine occupational titles ending in *-a/-o*:

- (44) *advogada* (f) 'female lawyer' – *advogado* (m) 'lawyer'
médica (f) 'female doctor' – *médico* (m) 'doctor'
engenheira (f) 'female engineer' – *engenheiro* (m) 'engineer'
cozinheira (f) 'female cook' – *cozinheiro* (m) 'cook'
antropóloga (f) 'female anthropologist' – *antropólogo* (m) 'anthropologist'
astrónoma (f) 'female astronomer' – *astrónomo* (m) 'astronomer'
veterinária (f) 'female veterinarian' – *veterinário* (m) 'veterinarian'

The *Tabela de Títulos Profissionais*, an official list of occupational terms, provides many professional titles, always in feminine and masculine form, for instance:

- (45) *tecnóloga* (f) 'female technologist' – *tecnólogo* 'technologist' (m)
geógrafa (f) 'female geographer' – *geógrafo* (m) 'geographer'
geóloga (f) 'female geologist' – *geólogo* (m) 'geologist'
técnica (f) 'female technician' – *técnico* (m) 'technician'

The last term, being homonymous with the inanimate noun *técnica* (f) 'technique', is ambiguous. However, it is mostly used with modifiers specifying professional fields such as in *técnica em desenho de projetos* 'female technician in project design'. In such cases, the context determines the actual meaning of the word as an occupational title and as a consequence, there will be no confusion in spite of the formal identity.

Despite the rich inventory of feminine occupational titles, the *Comissão para a Igualdade no Trabalho e no Emprego* (CITE, 'Equal Employment Opportunity Commission') pointed out that 48% of job advertisements discriminate against women and do not conform to the official recommendations (see Section 5.1). CITE discusses some cases in which only males were sought or only masculine terms were used. Also Albrecht (1997: 356) pointed out that in her corpus, despite the existence of feminine forms, only 43% of the job advertisements used feminine job titles.

4.3 Semantic derogation

As shown in Section 2.2, the lexical gender of a personal noun mostly corresponds to its grammatical gender. However, when we analyze lexemes or idiomatic expressions in which lexical gender is involved, we observe that female lexemes are often used in an ironic or negative sense, while this is not the case for male lexemes. More specifically, we find a lot of female/male pairs where the feminine form is used with a misogynist connotation. For example, *tipa* (f) denotes a 'strange, ridiculous woman', while *tipo* (m) 'guy' is a rather positive term. Feminine nouns like *gaja* (f) 'young girl' or *velha* (f) 'old woman' are often used with a derisive connotation. *Gajo* (m) means 'type' and *velho* (m) 'old man', without any negative connotations. *Bruxa* (f) 'witch' can refer to an old woman in a negative sense, while *bruxo* (m) means 'clairvoyant', which is more highly esteemed.

There are also some examples of semantic derogation in occupational terms. *Governanta* (f) 'housekeeper' is a woman employed in a household, while a *governante* (m) 'sovereign' denotes the ruler of a country. *Secretária* (f) 'female secretary' is an office assistant or a typist, while *secretário* (m) 'male secretary' is a high-ranking position, as in *secretário-geral do partido* 'leader of the party'. *Rapariga* (f) means 'prostitute' (in Brazilian Portuguese). There are no similarly sexualized uses of *rapaz* (m) 'boy'.

4.4 Idioms and proverbs

Gendered asymmetries often become apparent when personal nouns occur within idiomatic expressions. In European Portuguese, *rapariga* (f) means 'girl' in a value-neutral sense, but there are expressions like *rapariga fácil* 'easy girl' or *rapariga da vida* 'girl of life', which are used to refer to a female prostitute.

There are some other examples where female nouns carry a derisive or depreciative meaning when accompanied by attributive complements. *Viúva alegre* 'happy widow' has an ironic connotation. *Moça loura* (f) (lit. 'blond girl') 'bimbo' and *moça da rua* (f) (lit. 'girl of the street') 'prostitute' have clearly sexualized meanings. There is a notable difference between *mulher pública* (m) 'female prostitute' and *homem público* (m) 'public man, politician'.

Finally, there are also some male terms of abuse with a misogynist meaning. This becomes evident in the well-known expression *filho de puta* 'son of a bitch', which contains the noun *puta* (f) 'whore', or in the following sentence (Brazilian Portuguese):

- (46) *És um maricas.*
 are.2SG INDEF.MASC effeminate.MASC
 ‘You are a poof.’

In this expression, the adjective *maricas*, which means ‘effeminate’, attributes feminine traits to a male person and has a clearly negative connotation. Conversely, the attribution of male traits to a woman largely has positive connotations. Matias (1994: 333) mentions expressions used when conventional gender roles are challenged, like in the following example in which the noun *homem* ‘man’ is used to positively evaluate the leadership of a woman at home:

- (47) *Ela é o homem da casa.*
 3SG.FEM is DEF.MASC man.MASC of.DEF house
 ‘She is the man in the house.’

Proverbs reflect socio-historical stereotypes and often preserve a long history of concepts and words. In Portuguese, we find many proverbs that contain lexically gendered nouns. The image of women transmitted by these proverbs can be either negative or positive and refers to expectations about their social roles and behavior. Central themes are marriage, household, children, kitchen, church, widowhood, but also kindness, beauty, tenderness and wisdom. As Marinovi (2012) points out, proverbs reflect the high attention attributed to women in society. Women are seen as models in the family and in religious and social contexts. Negative traits for which women are often stigmatized include gossiping, anxiety, fragility, revenge and weakness. Also having no children and being a widow are seen as rather negative. We can also find some Portuguese proverbs that transmit misogynist images, such as clichés about the stepmother:¹⁵

- (48) a. *Madrasta – o nome lhe basta.*
 ‘Stepmother – the word alone is enough for her.’
 b. *A mulher e a gata é de quem a bem trata.*
 ‘The woman and the female cat belong to the person who treats them well.’

Other proverbs conveying negative messages about women focus on a range of aspects.

Physical defects:

- Mulher barbuda, Deus nos acuda!*
 ‘Woman with beard, God help us!’

Mulher feia é casta por natureza.
 ‘An ugly woman is chaste by nature.’

Negative behavior:

Mulher é como abelhas, ou dá mel, ou ferroadada.
 ‘A woman is like bees, either she gives honey or stings.’

Mulher e mula, o pau as cura.
 ‘Woman and mule, the stick cures them.’

Mulher honrada deve ser calada.
 ‘An honorable woman should not speak.’

Mulheres há como as serpentes, formosas, mas venenosas, insignificantes, mas traiçoeiras.
 ‘There are women like snakes, beautiful but poisonous, insignificant but disloyal.’

Household and marriage:

Mulher de janela não cuida da panela.
 ‘A woman staying at the window does not look after the pans in the kitchen.’

Mulher sem marido, barco sem leme.
 ‘A woman without a husband is like a boat without a helm.’

Depreciation:

Mulher, vento e ventura são de pouca dura.
 ‘Woman, wind and adventure do not last.’

Mulheres, mulas e muletas, todas se escrevem com as primeiras três letras.
 ‘Women, mules and crutches start with the same three letters.’

There are also some proverbs emphasizing the beauty, virtue and value of women, but these occur less frequently:

Mulher virtuosa, boa prata é que muito soa.
 ‘A virtuous woman is good silver which sounds much.’

Mulher, cavalo e cão, nem se emprestam, nem se dão.
 ‘Woman, horse and dog should neither be borrowed nor given to others.’

But in these proverbs, women are at the same time degraded by comparing them with objects (silver) or animals (horse, dog).

5. Language change and language reform

5.1 Debates on professional terms

Non-sexist language debates have influenced the Portuguese language in that many feminine forms for professional terms have been created, like *chefa* (f) ‘female boss’, *juíza* (f) ‘female judge’. The creation of these feminine forms often happens spontaneously. However, as has been shown, there are some morphological, semantic and lexical constraints on the creation of such forms. For example, the noun *cura* (m) ‘priest’ cannot be feminized (even in contexts where female priests exist), because *cura* (f) means ‘cure’.

But language change may also produce new morphological structures. For double-gender nouns ending in *-nte*, the creation of a feminine form is not normally possible. Nevertheless, nowadays we find nouns like *clienta* (f) ‘female client’. Even though some linguists are still discussing whether such creations are acceptable or not, other grammarians like Evanildo Bechara and João Ribeiro consider feminine formations ending in *-nta* a current phenomenon, although less common.¹⁶ A prominent example is the noun *presidenta* (f) ‘female president’. On the web, a public debate about this form is taking place, perhaps due to the fact that since 2011 Brazil has been governed by a female president (Dilma Rousseff). But a closer look at dictionaries shows that the lexeme *presidenta* has already existed since the 19th century, not only meaning ‘wife of the president’ but also as ‘woman who presides’ (*Dicionário Houaiss* 2001).¹⁷

5.2 Guidelines for non-sexist language use

There are some guidelines for non-sexist language use in Portuguese, the purpose of which is to explore lexical, morphological and syntactic possibilities to achieve gender equality by linguistic means. Rather than providing an overview of the whole spectrum of existing guidelines, I will present two extreme examples here: the guidelines of the European Parliament *Linguagem neutra do ponto de vista do género no Parlamento Europeu* (‘Neutral language in terms of gender in the European Parliament’), which affect formal contexts in which European Portuguese is used, and the *Manual para o uso não sexista da linguagem* (‘Manual for non-sexist language use’, henceforth: *Manual*), developed for educational purposes in Brazil. As will be seen below, the latter is more non-conformist and makes many innovative proposals.

The guidelines published by the European Parliament in 2008 contain many general proposals against discriminatory and depreciative language use which

could imply the superiority of one gender, suggesting gender neutralization in most contexts. The commission points out that guidelines must be implemented specifically for each language and that avant-gardist solutions like generic feminines should be avoided. More specifically, the following suggestions are proposed:

- avoidance of masculine generics whenever possible
- use of generic terms to denominate functions or positions, in combination with the abbreviation “m/f”
- use of gender-specific terms for specific persons
- no specification of a person’s marital status.

In general, it is assumed that inclusive and neutral terms are more accepted by users than gendered ones.

In contrast to common guidelines for non-sexist language use, the European Parliament guidelines recommend the use of generic masculines whenever members of both genders are referred to:

- (49) *os antigos primeiros-ministros Maria*
 DEF.MASC.PL old.MASC.PL prime-minister.MASC.PL Maria
Pintassilgo, Mário Soares, Margaret Thatcher e Tony Blair
 Pintassilgo, Mário Soares, Margaret Thatcher and Tony Blair
 ‘the former prime ministers Maria Pintassilgo, Mário Soares, Margaret Thatcher and Tony Blair’

But if exclusively female persons are involved, the use of feminine terms is recommended:

- (50) *as antigas primeiras-ministras Maria*
 DEF.FEM.PL old.FEM.PL prime-minister.FEM.PL Maria
Pintassilgo e Margaret Thatcher
 Pintassilgo and Margaret Thatcher
 ‘the former female prime ministers Maria Pintassilgo and Margaret Thatcher’

Unfortunately, the guidelines of the European Parliament do not consider recent developments, as they do not suggest using more feminine terms (for example, in gender-split constructions).

The *Manual* is much more precise and progressive regarding feminine professional titles. For example, the authors propose the use of epicenes or feminine collective nouns instead of generic masculines (*Manual*: 32):

- (51) a. *crianças* instead of *meninos* (m.pl) ‘children, boys’
 child.FEM.PL
 ‘children’

- b. *população* instead of *homens* (m.pl) ‘people, men’
population.FEM.SG
‘population’
- c. *cidadania* instead of *cidadãos* (m.pl) ‘citizens’
citizenship.FEM.SG
‘citizenship’
- d. *descendência* instead of *filhos* (m.pl) ‘children, sons’
descendance.FEM.SG
‘descendance’
- e. *juventude* instead of *jovens* (m.pl) ‘young people’
youth.FEM.SG
‘youth’
- f. *humanidade* instead of *homens* (m.pl) ‘people, men’
humanity.FEM.SG
‘humanity’

The *Manual* (43–44) also proposes the use of the gerund as a means of avoiding gender-specification (for example, 52a instead of 52b):

- (52) a. *Votando por esse partido ganharemos pouco.*
vote.GER for that party gain.FUT.1PL little
‘Voting for this party, we will gain only little.’
- b. *Se os eleitores optarem por esse partido ganharemos pouco.*
if DEF.MASC.PL voter.MASC.PL opt.SUB.FUT.3PL for
this party gain.FUT.1PL little
‘If the voters opt for this party, we will gain only little.’

Another possibility to achieve a gender-neutral language is through the use of impersonal *há* ‘there is/are’ constructions (cf. 53a instead of 53b):

- (53) a. *Em São Paulo há muita-s plantações de café.*
in São Paulo has many.FEM.PL plantations of coffee
‘In São Paulo there are several coffee plantations.’
- b. *Os paulistas têm muitas plantações de café.*
DEF.MASC.PL people of São Paulo have.3PL many
plantations of coffee
‘The people of São Paulo have many coffee plantations.’

Also reflexive or passive constructions can be used to avoid generic masculines, cf. (54a)/(55a) instead of (54b)/(55b):

- (54) a. *Na costa se come muito peixe.*
 at.DEF coast REFL eats much fish
 ‘On the coast, one eats much fish.’
- b. *Os caiçaras comem muito peixe.*
 DEF.MASC.PL coastal-residents.MASC.PL eat.3PL much fish
 ‘The coastal residents eat much fish.’
- (55) a. *Será decidido na mesa diretiva [...].*
 be.FUT.3SG decided in.DEF.FEM table.FEM directive.FEM
 ‘It will be decided by the board of directors [...].’
- b. *Os integrantes da mesa diretiva*
 DEF.MASC.PL member.PL of.DEF.FEM table.FEM directive.FEM
decidirão [...]
 decide.FUT.3PL
 ‘The members of the board of directors will decide [...].’

5.3 Gender-neutral forms in writing

For Portuguese, proposals have been made to reduce androcentric language and the use of generic masculine forms in writing. As demonstrated in Section 2.4, it is normal to use masculine plural forms of nouns and pronouns when referring to a mixed-sex group. This practice is considered androcentric and there are some new proposals made by the *Português com Inclusão de Gênero* (‘Portuguese with Gender Inclusion’, PCIG) on how to spell such plural forms in a gender-neutral way. The following alternatives have been suggested:

- at-sign: *escritor@s* (f/m.pl) ‘female/male writers’
 slash: *escritoras/es* (f/m.pl) or *escritores/as* (m/f.pl) ‘female/male writers’
 ligature: *escritoræs* (f/m.pl) ‘female/male writers’

It is interesting to note that *Sourceforge* already developed an alpha-version of a PC keyboard catering for these spellings in 2013.¹⁸

According to the PCIG proposals, speakers may pronounce the at-sign as [ɔ] and the ligature as [ɛ]. In terms of vowel quality, [ɔ] is between the [a] of feminine nouns ending in *-a* and the [o] characteristic of masculine nouns ending in *-o*. Similarly, [ɛ] is in between the feminine *-a* [a] and the masculine *-e* [e].

6. Conclusion

Gender representation in Portuguese is associated with an interesting and under-explored set of phenomena, not only from a linguistic perspective, but also from a socio-cultural perspective. The field lacks more detailed empirical studies. In the present article, I concentrated on linguistic aspects but in the course of my analysis, it became evident that a more comprehensive approach, integrating insights from text linguistics, sociolinguistics and psycholinguistics, is needed to draw a complete picture of linguistic gender representation and to verify androcentricity and misogyny in language use.

The present article also pointed to a difference between European and Brazilian Portuguese. In the Brazilian variety, there is a greater correspondence between lexical, referential and grammatical gender. It would be interesting to study this aspect not only across geographical but also across diastratic varieties of Portuguese in greater detail.

I conclude with a general observation concerning the various gender categories. In Portuguese, grammatical gender is assigned mainly randomly as far as inanimate nouns are concerned. For animate nouns, and in particular for personal nouns, grammatical and lexical/referential gender often correlate with each other. In the case of generic masculines or epicene nouns, mismatches between grammatical and referential gender are frequent. In most cases, Portuguese provides the linguistic means to express referential gender through satellite forms. But, despite the rich inventory of feminine terms, these are often avoided in formal contexts. So, we can conclude that Portuguese has all the structural (especially morphological) prerequisites to express both the female and male gender, but they are not (yet?) systematically used.

Notes

1. Ethnologue lists Portuguese as the sixth largest world language by number of first language speakers (<http://www.ethnologue.com/statistics/size> [11 May 2014]).
2. There are a few exceptions, like *figo* (m) 'fig', *limão* (m) 'lemon', *castanheiro* (m) 'chestnut tree'.
3. However, we also find masculine collectives like *grupo* (m) 'group', *conjunto* (m) 'ensemble', *colectivo* (m) 'collective', *bandonão* (m) 'band'.
4. Probably inherited from the Latin neuter plural ending *-a* as in *corpora* 'bodies'.
5. The influence of gender was significantly reduced without overt reference to gender and without pictorial stimuli. A comparison to English demonstrated that the effects were clearly higher in Portuguese.

6. This term is related to the category that used to be called *communis* in Latin Grammar. It describes nouns that can be used for female, male and gender-indefinite reference. As Burr (2001: 19) points out, Donatus described it as a grammatical gender class in his *Ars Minor*, but later, the earliest Romance Grammarians like Nebrija or De Barros conceived *comunes de dos / comuns de dois* rather as a neutral 'biological' gender.
7. Both sentences taken from Brazilian Portuguese.
8. See Sections 2.4 and 3.1.1, where the question of (un)markedness is dealt with in more detail.
9. Compare with *a Da Silva* (f) when referring to one single female member of the family.
10. The feminine form *embaixatriz*, which in the past was only used to designate the ambassador's wife, also exists. Nowadays, it seems to be used more frequently than *embaixadora*; see the discussion on <http://www.ciberduvidas.com/pergunta.php?id=5117> [30 January 2014].
11. Because the forms ending in *-nte* can etymologically be traced back to Latin gender-invariable present participles, no fixed gender value can be assigned.
12. *Padrasto* (m) 'stepfather' also exists.
13. Originally, *senhora* was used to refer to married women. To address unmarried women, the term *menina* 'young woman' (originally an address term for servants) can be used with the first name: *a menina Ana* 'Miss Ana'. Nowadays, *senhora* refers to all women, independently of their marital status, as Hammermüller (1997: 26) points out.
14. Historically, the feminine noun *a gente* 'people' has been grammaticalized to a gender-indifferent pronominal form.
15. There are many websites quoting Portuguese proverbs on the two sexes. For example, on http://www.felipex.com.br/proverb_m5.htm [30 January 2014] one finds 120 proverbs about women but only 70 about men, the latter focussing mainly on male virtues like richness, seriousness, honor. See also Funk and Funk (2008) and the classical collection of Vasconcellos (1905), where 70 proverbs about women are listed.
16. The discussion can be followed in part on the following website: <http://www.portugues.com.br/gramatica/a-presidente-ou-presidenta-qual-das-formas-devemos-utilizar.html> [30 January 2014].
17. <http://observatorio-lp.sapo.pt/pt/ligacoes/legislacao-e-efemerides-lista/a-presidenta-foi-estudanta> [30 January 2014].
18. *SourceForge* is a web-based source code repository. It acts as a centralized location for software developers to control and manage free and open source software development. See <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/SourceForge> [18 May 2014] and www.sourceforge.net/projects/tecladopcig [30 January 2014].

References

- Albrecht, Sabine. 1997. "Die Stellung der Frau im Spiegel der portugiesischen Sprache." In *Sprache und Geschlecht in der Romania. Romanistisches Kolloquium X*, eds. Wolfgang Dahmen & Günter Holtus & Johannes Kramer & Michael Metzeltin & Wolfgang Schweickard & Otto Winkelmann. Tübingen: Gunter Narr, 345–374.

- Burr, Elisabeth. 2001. "Grammatikalisierung und Normierung in frühen Grammatiken des Französischen, Italienischen, Portugiesischen und Spanischen. Genus und Kongruenz." *Zeitschrift für Romanische Philologie* 117(2): 189–221. DOI: 10.1515/zrph.2001.117.2.189
- Caldas-Coulthard, Carmen Rosa. 2007. "Caro colega: Exclusão lingüística e invisibilidade." *Discurso & Sociedad* 1(2): 230–246.
- Carboni, Florence & Mário Maestri. 2003. "A linguagem escravizada." In *A linguagem escravizada: Língua, história, poder e luta de classes*, eds. Carboni Florence & Mário Maestri. São Paulo: Expressão Popular, 51–89.
- Comissão para a Igualdade no Trabalho e no Emprego. 2012. "Relatório sobre o progresso da igualdade entre mulheres e homens no trabalho, no emprego e na formação profissional – 2012." http://www.cite.gov.pt/asstscite/downloads/_Relat_iguald_homens_mulheres_12.pdf [30 January 2014].
- Corpus de Referência do Português Contemporâneo. 2012. <http://www.clul.ul.pt/en/research-teams/183-reference-corpus-of-contemporary-portuguese-crpc> [30 January 2014].
- Dicionário Houaiss. Dicionário da Língua Portuguesa*. 2001. Rio de Janeiro: Editora Objetiva.
- European Parliament. 2008. *Linguagem neutra do ponto de vista do género no Parlamento Europeu*. http://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegistreWeb/search/simple.htm?language=EN&fulltext=gender+language+neutral&year=2009&aut_inst=%23%23NAME%23%23PE%23%23VALUE%23%23P6&code_type_docu=PUBLI [30 January 2014].
- Funk, Gabriela & Mattias Funk. 2008. *Dicionário prático de provérbios portugueses*. Chamusca: Ediciones Cosmos.
- Hammermüller, Gunther. 1997. "‘Fräulein’ oder ‘Frau’ – ‘Menina’ depois de casar?" In *Linguística contrastiva. Deutsch versus Portugiesisch – Spanisch – Französisch*, eds. Helmut Lüdtke & Jürgen Schmidt-Radefeldt. Tübingen: Gunter Narr, 25–36.
- Hellinger, Marlis. 1990. *Kontrastive feministische Linguistik. Mechanismen sprachlicher Diskriminierung im Englischen und Deutschen*. Ismaning: Max Hueber.
- Hellinger, Marlis & Hadumod Bußmann, eds. 2001/2002/2003. *Gender across languages: The linguistic representation of women and men*, vols. 1–3, Amsterdam: John Benjamins. DOI: 10.1075/impact.9
- Instituto Nacional de Estatística. 2012. *Estatísticas no feminino: Ser mulher em Portugal, 2001–2011*. http://www.google.de/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=9&ved=0CG8QFjAI&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.ine.pt%2Fngt_server%2Fattachfileu.jsp%3Fflook_parentBoui%3D136503383%26att_display%3Dn%26att_download%3Dy&ei=2W0jUq7G14rBtAbK14BQ&usq=AFQjCNHrzPbhHNkOSoXKMDLV-vSehazYSw&sig2=UzZJukBEot915qtJ4mFfAQ&bvm=bv.51495398,d.Yms [30 January 2014].
- Kehdi, Valter. 1996. *Morfemas do português*. São Paulo: Ática.
- Manual para o uso não sexista da linguagem*. <http://www.observatoriodegenero.gov.br/menu/publicacoes/outros-artigos-e-publicacoes/manual-para-o-uso-nao-sexista-da-linguagem> [30 January 2014].
- Marinovi, Anamarija. 2012. *Provérbios e a mulher: O lugar da mulher nos provérbios portugueses e sérvios*. <http://www.webartigos.com/artigos/proverbios-e-a-mulher-o-lugar-da-mulher-nos-proverbios-portugueses-e-servios/94755/#ixzz2cRxuvhHI> [30 January 2014].
- Matias, Maria de Fátima de Rezende. 1994. "Língua e sexos (Sprache und Geschlechter)." In *Lexikon der romanistischen Linguistik (LRL) VI/2*, eds. Christian Schmitt & Michael Metzeltin & Günther Holtus. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 332–339.

- Mattoso Câmara Jr., Joaquim. 1975. "Considerações sobre o gênero em português." In *Dispersos*, ed. Joaquim Mattoso Câmara Jr. Rio de Janeiro: Fundação Getúlio Vargas, 115–129.
- Nascimento, Mauro José Rocha do. 2003. "O gênero do português e suas relações morfo-semânticas." *Revista Eletrônica do Instituto de Humanidades, Unigranrio* 2(4). <http://publicacoes.unigranrio.com.br/index.php/reihm/article/viewFile/423/415> [30 January 2014].
- Nissen, Kjaer Uwe. 2003. "Gender in Spanish. Tradition and innovation." In *Gender across languages: The linguistic representation of women and men*, vol. 3, eds. Marlis Hellinger & Hadumod Bußmann. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 251–279.
DOI: 10.1075/impact.10.16nis
- Ramos, Sara & Debi Roberson. 2010. "What constrains grammatical gender effects on semantic judgements? Evidence from Portuguese." *Journal of Cognitive Psychology* 23(1): 102–111.
DOI: 10.1080/20445911.2011.466795
- Schafroth, Elmar. 2003. "Gender in French. Structural properties, incongruences and asymmetries." In *Gender across languages: The linguistic representation of women and men*, vol. 3, eds. Marlis Hellinger & Hadumod Bußmann. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 87–117.
DOI: 10.1075/impact.11.08sch
- Sera, Maria D. & Christian A. H. Berge & Juan Castillo del Pintado. 1994. "Grammatical and conceptual forces in the attribution of gender by English and Spanish speakers." *Cognitive Development* 9: 261–292. DOI: 10.1016/0885-2014(94)90007-8
- Sera, María D. & Chryle Elieff & James Forbes & Melissa C. Burch & Wanda Rodriguez. 2002. "When language affects cognition and when it does not: An analysis of grammatical gender and classification." *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General* 131: 377–397.
DOI: 10.1037/0096-3445.131.3.377
- Tabela de Títulos Profissionais. *Resolução 473/02*. 2013. http://normativos.confea.org.br/downloads/anexo/Tabela%20de%20t%EDtulos_05Jul2012.pdf [30 January 2014].
- Vasconcellos, Carolina Michaëlis de. 1905. "Tausend portugiesische Sprichwörter." In *Festschrift Adolf Tobler zum siebzigsten Geburtstag*, ed. Gustav Gröber. Braunschweig: Westermann, 13–49.

SLOVENIAN

Gender in Slovenian*

Ursula Doleschal

University of Klagenfurt, Austria

1. Introduction
2. Categories of gender
 - 2.1 Lexical gender
 - 2.2 Grammatical gender
 - 2.3 Social gender
 - 2.4 Referential gender
 - 2.5 Masculine generics
3. Gender-related structures
 - 3.1 Word-formation
 - 3.1.1 Derivation
 - 3.1.2 Compounding
 - 3.2 Agreement
 - 3.3 Pronominalization
 - 3.4 Coordination
4. Usage of personal reference forms
 - 4.1 Usage patterns in Slovenian dictionaries
 - 4.2 Address terms and other personal nouns in other text genres
5. Language change and language reform
6. Conclusion

Notes

References

1. Introduction¹

Slovenian is the official language of the Republic of Slovenia. It is the first language of approximately 1.85 million inhabitants of Slovenia and is also spoken in adjacent territories in Austria, Italy and Hungary, where it is officially acknowledged as a minority language and not only acquired as a first language, but also learned as a second and foreign language. An additional 400,000 speakers of Slovenian use the language in diaspora communities in the United States, Canada,

Argentina, Australia, Germany and France. In total, some 2.5 million people speak Slovenian.

Slovenian belongs to the Slavic group of the Indo-European language family. Its closest relatives are Croatian, Bosnian and Serbian, which, together with Slovenian as well as Bulgarian and Macedonian, form the subgroup of South Slavic languages.

While the first written documents date back as far as the 9th century, Slovenian became a literary language in the 16th century in the course of the Reformation and reached the status of a standard language in the modern sense after World War I, in the “first Yugoslavia” (1918–1941).

Modern Slovenian developed on the basis of several dialects but is mainly based on the geographically central dialects of Upper and Lower Carniola, with the capital city of Ljubljana situated close to the border between the two dialect areas. It is regulated by the Slovenian Academy of Sciences, which publishes authoritative dictionaries and orthography guides. The modern standard language is known as *Slovenski knjižni jezik* ‘Slovenian literary language’.

Structurally, Slovenian is an inflecting language, characterized by both affixational and fusional morphology and a productive system of word-formation. The verb is inflected for tense (past, present, future), person (first, second, third), number (singular, plural, dual), mood (indicative, conditional, imperative), voice (active, passive) and aspect (perfective, imperfective) as well as (grammatical) gender (in the past and future tense and in the conditional). The inflectional categories of nouns, adjectives and some numerals comprise case (nominative, genitive, dative, accusative, locative, instrumental), number (singular, dual – denoting duality, i.e. two extralinguistic objects, plural – denoting plurality, i.e. more than two extralinguistic objects), gender (masculine, feminine, neuter) and animacy (animate, inanimate). Pronouns are inflected for the same categories as the word classes they substitute. Slovenian is a pro-drop language, i.e. the pronominal subject of a clause need not be overt. Pronouns are used mainly when the subject is emphasized.

2. Categories of gender

2.1 Lexical gender

Lexical gender refers to the lexical specification of nouns “carrying the semantic property [female] or [male]” (Hellinger & Bußmann 2001:7). Table 1 lists examples of such gender-specific personal nouns in Slovenian.

Table 1. Slovenian lexically female and male nouns

Female		Male	
<i>ženska</i>	‘woman’	<i>moški</i>	‘man’
<i>žena</i>	‘wife’	<i>mož</i>	‘husband’
<i>dekle</i>	‘girl’	<i>fant</i>	‘boy, guy’
<i>punca</i>	‘girl’		
<i>deklica</i>	‘little girl’	<i>deček</i>	‘little boy’
<i>mati</i>	‘mother’	<i>oče</i>	‘father’
<i>hči</i>	‘daughter’	<i>sin</i>	‘son’
<i>sestra</i>	‘sister’	<i>brat</i>	‘brother’
<i>babica</i>	‘grandmother’	<i>dedek</i>	‘grandfather’
<i>teta</i>	‘aunt’	<i>stric</i>	‘uncle’
<i>vnukinja</i>	‘granddaughter’	<i>vnuk</i>	‘grandson’
<i>nečakinja</i>	‘niece’	<i>nečak</i>	‘nephew’
<i>gospa</i>	‘Mrs, lady’	<i>gospod</i>	‘Mr, gentleman’
<i>gospodična</i>	‘Miss, young lady’	<i>gospodič</i>	‘young man, young sir’

As in other languages, these nouns belong to specific lexical subfields (cf. Motschenbacher & Weikert, this volume), such as general nouns denoting female and male persons (*ženska* ‘woman’ – *moški* ‘man’), kinship terms (*mati* ‘mother’ – *oče* ‘father’), address terms (*gospa* ‘Mrs, lady’ – *gospod* ‘Mr, gentleman’), titles of nobility (*grof* ‘count’ – *grofica* ‘countess’) as well as nouns denoting romantic partners (*nevesta* ‘bride’ – *ženin* ‘bridegroom’) and sexual roles (*ljubček* ‘male lover’ – *ljubica* ‘female lover’, *kurba* ‘whore’ – *kurbir* ‘womanizer, horny bastard’).

As can be seen in Table 1, the field of general terms for male and female persons is quite varied in Slovenian. There are few lexically gender-neutral lexemes for naming persons in general. *Oseba* ‘person’, *osebnost* ‘personality’, *bitje* ‘being’ as well as *ljudje* ‘people’ are cases in point. The same is true for kinship terms, where we find the lexically gender-neutral *otrok* ‘child’, *sorojenec* ‘sibling’, *zakonec* ‘spouse’ and *starsi* ‘parents’. Note that all of the latter are of masculine grammatical gender (Section 2.2).

Človek (m) ‘human being, man’, which in principle also belongs to this class, is not truly gender-neutral, since, according to the *Slovar slovenskega knjižnega jezika* (Bajec 1994), it has the meanings ‘person of male gender’ and ‘husband’, and thus belongs to the class of masculine generics (Section 2.5). Its suppletive plural *ljudje* (m) ‘people’ is normally used and understood as a gender-indefinite form.

The parallel presentation of lexically male and female personal nouns suggests a semantic parallelism which is, however, not necessarily the case, as both denotation and connotation may differ. One example is the pair *dekle* ‘girl’ and *fant* ‘boy’. The two nouns share the meaning ‘young person’ and differ in lexical

gender. But apart from this, *dekle* also has the meaning ‘prostitute’ (in *poceni dekle* ‘cheap girl’), while *fant* also means ‘jack’ (as in a game of cards). Moreover, *fant* is used as an interjection expressing surprise, meaning ‘gosh’ (Bajec 1994).

2.2 Grammatical gender

Slovenian nouns are divided into three grammatical gender classes: feminine, masculine and neuter.² Nouns denoting persons normally belong to the masculine or feminine grammatical gender, i.e. nouns denoting male human beings are generally masculine, and nouns denoting female human beings are generally feminine. Thus, lexical gender is usually reflected by grammatical gender.

Table 2. Correspondence of grammatical and lexical gender in Slovenian personal nouns

Feminine/female		Masculine/male	
<i>mati</i>	‘mother’	<i>oče</i>	‘father’
<i>hči</i>	‘daughter’	<i>sin</i>	‘son’
<i>ženska</i>	‘woman’	<i>moški</i>	‘man’
<i>deklica</i>	‘little girl’	<i>deček</i>	‘little boy’

The word for ‘girl’, *dekle* (n), is one of the few cases in which lexical and grammatical gender do not correspond: In spite of denoting a female being, *dekle* has neuter grammatical gender. Interestingly, there is also the expressive derivation *deklič* ‘lass’ and its endearing diminutive *dekliček* ‘little girl’, both of which are masculine (cf. Doleschal & Schmid 2001: 265 for a similar example in Russian). Another case in point is a small group of expressive (mostly derogatory) nouns, such as *cmera* (f) ‘crybaby’, with feminine grammatical gender. Most of these nouns are lexically gender-neutral, with the exception of *baraba* (f) ‘male scoundrel’, *mevža* (f) ‘male coward’ and *pijandura* (f) ‘male drunkard’. Grammatical and lexical gender also do not coincide in epicene nouns that are lexically gender-neutral but grammatically feminine or masculine, such as *oseba* (f) ‘person’, *individuum* (m) ‘individual’, *priča* (f) ‘witness’.

Double-gender nouns do not usually occur in Slovenian (Toporišič 1981), i.e. there are no personal nouns that trigger feminine or masculine agreement depending on referential gender – with the exception of the noun *vodja* ‘leader’:³

- (1) a. *Alenka Marinič je trenutn-a umetnišk-a vodja.*
 Alenka Marinič is current-FEM.SG artistic-FEM.SG leader
 ‘Alenka Marinič is the current artistic leader.’ (Gigafida Corpus)

- b. *umetnišk-i vodja Tomaž Lorenz*
 artistic-MASC.SG leader Tomaž Lorenz
 ‘the artistic leader Tomaž Lorenz’ (Gigafida Corpus)

As in most gender languages, there is no separate gender class for reference to human beings in general. The neuter gender, which in principle could fulfill such a function, is not used for gender-neutral personal reference, except for one type of generalized personal construction (Section 2.4). Historically, the neuter gender was used for the designation of young beings as can still be seen in *dete* (n) ‘small child’ (literary), *dojenče* (n) ‘baby’ (archaic), *dekle* ‘girl’ (cf. Mečkovska 1980: 208 and Tominc 2007 on Slovenian; Čmejrková 2003: 37 on Czech; Hentschel 2003: 289f. on Serbian). However, this meaning, while still present in the designation of young animals (cf. *tele* (n) ‘calf’), has been abandoned for personal nouns, so that the stylistically unmarked lexemes for small children are now the masculine *otrok* (m) ‘child’ and *dojenček* (m) ‘baby’. (Note that there are also *dojenec* (m), *dojenka* (f) ‘infant’, which differ from each other in lexical and grammatical gender.) Neuter gender in personal nouns is nowadays used to convey pejorative meanings as in *revše* (n) ‘poor fellow, wretch’, *ženšče* (n) ‘puny old woman’ (cf. Bešter 1997: 9; Herrity 2000: 30f.; Toporišič 2000: 277), but in regional colloquial use such nouns may also carry connotations of pity and affection (Tominc 2007).

Grammatical gender and declensional class coincide to a great extent and thus the declensions are also called “masculine”, “feminine” and “neuter” in the grammatical tradition of Slovenian (see Toporišič 2000: 278–301):

Table 3. Masculine, feminine and neuter Slovenian noun declensions⁴

	Nominative	Genitive	Dative	Accusative	Locative	Instrumental
Masculine declension (animate)⁵						
Singular	<i>vnuk</i> ‘grandson’	-a	-u	-a	-u	-om
Dual ⁶	<i>vnuk-a</i>	-ov	-oma	-a	-ih	-oma
Plural	<i>vnuk-i</i>	-ov	-om	-e	-ih	-i
Feminine declension						
Singular	<i>vnukinj-a</i> ‘grand-daughter’	-e	-i	-o	-i	-o
Dual	<i>vnukinj-i</i>	-ø	-ama	-i	-ah	-ama
Plural	<i>vnukinj-e</i>	-ø	-am	-e	-ah	-ami
Neuter declension						
Singular	<i>dekl-e⁷</i> ‘girl’	-a	-u	-e	-u	-om
Dual	<i>deklet-i</i>	-ø	-oma	-i	-ih	-oma
Plural	<i>deklet-a</i>	-ø	-om	-a	-ih	-i

The only exception to the patterns in Table 3 are nouns ending in *-a*: These are mostly grammatically feminine (e.g. *žen-a* (f) ‘woman’), but there are also masculine animate nouns with the same ending (e.g. the proper name *Matij-a* (m) ‘Matthew’ or the common noun *kolega* (m) ‘colleague’). These nouns decline either according to the feminine declension or according to the masculine declension:

Table 4. Declension of masculine animate nouns ending in *-a* (singular)

	Nominative	Genitive	Dative	Accusative	Locative	Instrumental
Feminine declension	<i>koleg-a</i>	<i>-e</i>	<i>-i</i>	<i>-o</i>	<i>-i</i>	<i>-o</i>
Masculine declension	<i>koleg-a</i>	<i>-a</i>	<i>-u</i>	<i>-a</i>	<i>-u</i>	<i>-om</i>

2.3 Social gender

Social gender refers to the connotational value of a personal noun, which points to either a male or female interpretation, although the noun is lexically gender-indefinite. For example, *top-model* ‘top model’ is in non-specific contexts usually interpreted as female, although *model* (m) ‘model’ may also refer to a man (as attested in the Gigafida Corpus and in the Dictionary of Neologisms, Bizjak Končar & Snoj 2013), while the earlier feminine form *modelka* ‘female model’ continues to exist as well (attested already in Bajec 1994). Since female personal nouns in Slovenian are easily formed and do not carry negative connotations (cf. Section 3.1.2), social gender is expected to coincide with the grammatical gender of a personal noun. This phenomenon has, however, so far not been investigated for Slovenian and therefore no definite statements can be made at this point.

2.4 Referential gender

Referential gender is a matter of the extralinguistic gender of the referent of a linguistic expression in a concrete context. One can distinguish between male, female, mixed-sex or gender-indefinite (if the gender of the referent is unknown or irrelevant) reference.

Referential gender comes into play in sentences without an overt subject (pro-drop) in the past tense, future tense or conditional, and in sentences with a predicative adjective. In such cases, gender is signaled by the agreement targets exclusively. If the semantics of the predicate suggests an animate subject, grammatical gender is interpreted as a cue to referential gender with masculine, feminine and neuter forms implicating male referential gender (2a), female referential gender (2b) and an inanimate referent (2c), respectively:

- (2) a. *Ali je prišel?*
 PRT is come.PART.MASC
 ‘Has he arrived?’
 b. *Ali je prišl-a?*
 PRT is come.PART-FEM
 ‘Has she arrived?’
 c. *Ali je prišl-o?*
 PRT is come.PART-NEUT
 ‘Has it arrived?’

This general implicature applies to the singular. In the dual and plural, it holds only for the feminine (3a) and neuter, while the masculine gender can be interpreted as male-specific, mixed-gender or gender-indefinite (3b):

- (3) a. *Ali so lačn-e?*
 PRT be.3PL hungry-FEM.PL
 ‘Are they hungry?’ (of a female group)
 b. *Ali so lačn-i?*
 PRT be.3PL hungry-MASC.PL
 ‘Are they hungry?’ (of a male, mixed-gender or gender-indefinite group)

In sentences with a first or second person subject, the form of the predicate is triggered by the referential gender of the speaker or addressee respectively:

- (4) a. *Lačen sem.*
 hungry.MASC am
 ‘I am hungry.’ (uttered by a male person)
 b. *Lačn-a sem.*
 hungry-FEM am
 ‘I am hungry.’ (uttered by a female person)

However, the masculine gender can also be used in the case of an unknown (and thus referentially gender-indefinite) addressee, as in the following example (5a) from a school textbook. Such use has been criticized by Kunst-Gnamuš in her analysis of gender in Slovenian as androcentric and discriminating (1995: 259), but we still find it, along with the parallel use of masculine and feminine form in combination (5b):⁸

- (5) a. *Katero osebo bi v pismu nagovoril*
 which person would.2SG in letter address.PART.MASC
s Spoštovani gospod ali Spoštovana gospa?
 with dear sir or dear madam
 ‘Which person would you address with dear sir or dear madam in a letter?’ (Drusany et al. 2008: 8)

- b. *V katerem delu besedila si to izvedel/a (...)*
 in which part text.GEN be.2SG that find.out.PART.MASC/FEM (...)
 'In which part of the text did you (m/f) get to know about that (...)?'
 (Čuden & Košak & Vogel 2006:9)

The same rule applies to generalized personal reference. Like other Slavic languages, Slovenian has several syntactic constructions in the active voice that do not allow for an overt subject. They all imply generalized (non-specific) personal referents as their agents and are therefore different from impersonal constructions.

Generalized personal reference can be achieved with the predicate in the second person singular. If a gender-indefinite referent is intended, masculine grammatical gender is used (6a). A feminine variant is also possible (6b), but it indexes the gender identity of the speaker as female (Kunst-Gnamuš 1995: 259):

- (6) a. *Misliš, da boš ustregel, pa je ravno narobe.*
 think.2SG that will.2SG comply.PART.MASC but is just opposite
 'You think you will comply, but it is just the opposite.' (Toporišič 2000)
 b. *Misliš, da boš ustregl-a, pa je ravno narobe.*
 think.2SG that will.2SG comply.PART-FEM but is just opposite
 'You think you will comply, but it is just the opposite.' (uttered by a woman)

The most common generalized personal construction is the use of the third person plural (with a zero subject). Here, masculine gender is the only possible choice and always implies gender-indefiniteness:

- (7) a. *Novi zakon o šolstvu so sprejel-i v sobotu.*
 new law about school be.3PL accept.PART-MASC.PL on Saturday
 'They accepted the new school law on Saturday.' (Vikend Magazin, issue 284; 9 May 1998)
 b. *Govoril-i so to in ono.*
 speak.PART-MASC.PL be.3PL this and that
 'People said this and that.' (Toporišič 2000)

However, there is also one generalized personal construction in which gender-indefinite reference is signaled by the neuter form of the predicate, so that referential and grammatical gender are aligned:

- (8) *Govori se to in ono. Vs-emu se ne bo verjel-o.*
 speak.3SG REFL this and that all-DAT.SG REFL not will.3SG
 believe.PART-NEUT.SG
 'People say this and that. Not everything will be believed.' (Toporišič 2000)

The masculine gender is also the only choice with the honorific form of address (second person plural) in Standard Slovenian when referring to an individual person of either gender or to a mixed-gender group of people:

- (9) *A boste kaj jedl-i (gospa)?*
 PRT will.2PL something eat.PART-MASC.PL (Ms)
 ‘Will you eat something (madam)?’

In colloquial language, the singular form of the participle is also possible here (Herrity 2000: 159f.), matching referential and grammatical gender:

- (10) *A boste kaj jedl-a, gospa?*
 PRT will.2PL something eat.PART-FEM.SG madam
 ‘Will you eat something, madam?’

2.5 Masculine generics

As we have seen in Section 2.4, the masculine grammatical gender can be used for gender-indefinite reference in sentences without an overt subject. This rule also pertains to the gender-indefinite use of personal nouns: For reference to mixed-gender pairs and groups or to persons whose gender is unknown or does not matter, masculine nouns and pronouns are used consistently in all grammatical numbers:

- (11) a. *Italijani in Francozi raje rabijo*
 Italian.MASC.PL and French.MASC.PL rather use.3PL
izraz kič.
 expression kitsch
 ‘The Italians and the French prefer the expression kitsch.’ (Hladnik 1983)
- b. *Bralec prebere po novem knjigo le enkrat.*
 reader.MASC read.3SG of late book only once
 ‘Today’s reader reads a book only once.’ (Hladnik 1983)

In such cases, the use of masculine and feminine forms in combination is possible, but usually does not occur in written texts:

- (12) *Bralec oz. bralka prebere po novem knjigo*
 reader.MASC resp. female.reader.FEM read.3SG of late book
le enkrat.
 only once
 ‘Today’s reader – male or female – reads a book only once.’

In the spoken language, however, especially in the media, the specification of both genders can be observed, especially when addressing a mixed-sex audience:

- (13) *Spoštovan-e gledalke, spoštovan-i gledalci!*
 dear-FEM.PL female.viewer.FEM.PL dear-MASC.PL viewer.MASC.PL
 ‘Dear female and male viewers!’

This can also be observed in contexts where the gendered composition of the audience is important, for example, in the language use of politicians (cf. Čmejrková 2003 on Czech and Section 4 below).

Masculine personal nouns can also be used for female reference, especially in the predicate, but today such use is no longer widespread. The data I looked at (both written and spoken) contains no such cases. Kunst-Gnamuš (1995:260) points out that masculine forms are also used for female reference with nouns denoting prestigious jobs and positions, as in the following example:

- (14) *Predsednik mladinsk-e organizacij-e je*
 president.MASC juvenile-GEN organization-GEN be.3SG
postal-a Meta Držaj.
 become.PART-FEM Meta Držaj
 ‘Meta Držaj became president of the youth organization.’

Umek (2008) shows how this use which was quite common directly after World War II and steadily declined afterwards in newspaper language. She also cites Pogorelec (1997), who contends that the use of masculine personal nouns with reference to women (when denoting their profession or function) was due to Soviet influence (via Serbo-Croatian) and is not typical of Slovenian. According to Pogorelec, the use of masculine forms for female referents was common in the language use of the administration during the first two post-war decades but never found its way into the media, let alone the spoken language. Today, female forms of titles and occupational terms are the norm both in the media and in official texts according to my data (see Section 4.2). Kranjc & Ožbot (2013:236) and Šribar (2012:132), on the other hand, state that “[r]egarding the titles of women, the feminine form [...] still is a subject for negotiation”.

A rare phenomenon that occurs in certain Slovenian dialects should also be mentioned here. It is known under the label *govorjenje na fanta*, lit. ‘speaking in the manner of a guy’, and refers to a form of gender levelling. In these dialects, women and girls use masculine agreement forms when speaking of themselves and when addressing other women, as in the following example:

- (15) *Sem povedal.*
 be.1SG told.PART.MASC
 'I said.' (uttered by a woman) (Bešter 1998)

This usage occurs only in informal contexts but is the unmarked way of speaking in such cases (Bešter 1998).

3. Gender-related structures

3.1 Word-formation

Word-formation is perhaps the most important means of gender marking in Slovenian. Derivation is used much more frequently than compounding for this purpose.

3.1.1 *Derivation*

The derivation of personal nouns is highly productive in Slovenian. This holds for both masculine and feminine personal nouns: In contrast to many other languages, feminine-female personal nouns can be derived without restrictions (Kozmik & Jeram 1995: 20; Mečkovska 1980: 212; Umek 2008: 20).⁹ This has not always been the case: Toporišič (1981: 92) excludes the feminization of a number of masculine personal nouns, for example, of *govorec* (m) 'speaker', for which *govorka* (f) has become a completely natural equivalent today. The fact that feminine-female personal nouns are seen as normal today is understood as the consequence of Slovenian language policy (Bajić 2012; Section 4). Contrary to other Slavic languages, female personal nouns are not stylistically marked in Slovenian, nor do they carry pejorative connotations relating to femaleness.

Personal nouns are formed by suffixes which are added to the stems of verbs, adjectives or nouns. Zero-derivation also occurs, though less frequently (see below). Slovenian comprises a large variety of suffixes for the derivation of personal nouns. These suffixes create nouns of a particular grammatical gender. Feminine gender in such derived forms implies female lexical gender, while suffixes that create masculine nouns allow for the usual double interpretation: 'male' or 'gender-neutral'. On the one hand, masculine(-male) and feminine-female nouns may be derived from the same base. On the other hand, female personal nouns may be formed by attaching a feminine-female suffix to a masculine(-male) base. Let us consider some examples given in Tables 5 and 6.

Table 5. Derivation of masculine Slovenian personal nouns

-ar (m)	deverbal: <i>kuh-ar</i> '(male) cook' (< <i>kuhati</i> 'to cook') denominal: <i>lekarn-ar</i> '(male) chemist' (< <i>lekarna</i> 'pharmacy') deadjectival: <i>električ-ar</i> '(male) electrician' (< <i>električen</i> 'electrical')
-ec (m)	deverbal: <i>govor-ec</i> '(male) speaker' (< <i>govoriti</i> 'to speak') deadjectival: <i>star-ec</i> 'old man/person' (< <i>star</i> 'old')
-ič (m)	denominal: <i>Avstrij-ec</i> '(male) Austrian' (< <i>Avstrija</i> 'Austria')
-ik (m)	deadjectival: <i>boln-ik</i> '(male) patient' (< <i>bolan</i> 'sick')
-nik (m)	deverbal: <i>sod-nik</i> '(male) judge' (< <i>soditi</i> 'to judge')
-telj (m)	deverbal: <i>uči-telj</i> '(male) teacher' (< <i>učiti</i> 'to teach')

Table 6. Derivation of feminine Slovenian personal nouns

-ka (f)	deverbal: <i>govor-ka</i> 'female speaker' (< <i>govoriti</i> 'to speak') deadjectival: <i>star-ka</i> 'old woman' (< <i>star</i> 'old') denominal: <i>Avstrij-ka</i> 'female Austrian' (< <i>Avstrija</i> 'Austria')
	from masculine personal nouns: <i>električar-ka</i> 'female electrician' (< <i>električar</i> '(male) electrician') <i>ribič-ka</i> 'fisherwoman' (< <i>ribič</i> 'fisher(man)')
-(e)nica (f)	deverbal: <i>sod-nica</i> 'female judge' (< <i>soditi</i> 'to judge')
-ica (f)	deadjectival: <i>boln-ica</i> 'female patient' (< <i>bolan</i> 'ill')
	from masculine personal nouns: <i>kuhar-ica</i> 'female cook' (< <i>kuhar</i> '(male) cook') <i>lekarnar-ica</i> 'female chemist' (< <i>lekarnar</i> '(male) chemist')
	<i>učitelj-ica</i> 'female teacher' (< <i>učitelj</i> '(male) teacher')
-inja (f)	from masculine personal nouns: <i>filolog-inja</i> 'female philologist' (< <i>filolog</i> '(male) philologist')

Since the formation of both masculine and feminine personal nouns is highly productive, we usually find parallel forms, as exemplified in Tables 7 and 8.

The difference between Tables 7 and 8 is that in the former feminine and masculine nouns are morphologically equally complex and the feminine forms are not derived from masculine forms. In the latter, the feminine nouns are dependent on the masculine base.

Some feminizing suffixes are associated with certain base types. For example, *-inja* is added to stems ending in a velar consonant and *-nica* is invariably the counterpart of *-nik*. Others, such as *-ka*, combine with various base types. In principle, however, a feminine counterpart can be formed for every masculine personal noun, with the exception of nouns derived with the deadjectival masculine suffix *-ko* (e.g. *debel-ko* (m) 'fat person/man') and masculine epicenes (e.g. *individuum*

Table 7. Masculine and feminine personal nouns derived from the same root

<i>govor-ec</i> '(male) speaker'	<i>govor-ka</i> 'female speaker'
<i>sod-nik</i> '(male) judge'	<i>sod-nica</i> 'female judge'
<i>boln-ik</i> '(male) patient'	<i>boln-ica</i> 'female patient'

Table 8. Feminine-female nouns derived from masculine(-male) nouns

<i>uči-telj</i> '(male) teacher'	<i>učitelj-ica</i> 'female teacher'
<i>rib-ič</i> 'fisher(man)'	<i>ribič-ka</i> 'fisherwoman'
<i>električ-ar</i> '(male) electrician'	<i>električar-ka</i> 'female electrician'
<i>filolog</i> '(male) philologist'	<i>filolog-inja</i> 'female philologist'

(m) 'individual'). The opposite – the formation of masculine nouns parallel to feminine ones – seems to be viable, too, from a morphological point of view, although in reality some feminine personal nouns lack a masculine counterpart, mostly for semantic reasons (e.g. *nosečica* 'pregnant woman', *uršulinka* 'Ursuline').

This observation is corroborated by data from the Slovenian Standard Classification of Professions (*Statistični urad Republike Slovenije* 2008), first issued in a gender-fair version by the Slovenian authorities in 1997, when professional titles were first given in both the masculine and feminine form. The document contains over 2,000 professional titles, of which merely about two dozen are given in only one gender form. These exceptions include the following personal nouns: *vodja* (m/f) 'leader', *letalski strojnik* (m) 'flight engineer', *model* (m) 'model', *postrešček* (m) 'luggage porter', *medicinska sestra* (f) 'nurse', *prostitutka* (f) 'prostitute'. For all of these, however, female or male equivalents exist, except for the double-gender noun *vodja*, *postrešček* and *medicinska sestra*. *Letališka strojničarka* (f) is found on the ESCO homepage of the European Commission (2014); *modelka* is attested in the *Slovar slovenskega knjižnega jezika* (Bajec 1994) and the Gigafida Corpus, and *prostitut* (m) is cited in the Dictionary of Neologisms (Bizjak Končar & Snoj 2013). Another case in point is Korošec's (1977) *Vojaški slovar* 'Military dictionary', which contains all personal nouns also in the feminine form. Korošec explains this as a deliberate step of language planning, since women were expected to enter this field of profession more and more frequently (Kozmik & Jeram 1995: 28).

In some cases, feminine nouns are derived from masculine ones by means of a change in declensional class (e.g. *sosed-ø* (m) '(male) neighbor' – *sosed-a* (f) 'female neighbor', *boter-ø* (m) 'godfather' – *botr-a* (f) 'godmother'). The derivation is here indicated only by inflectional suffixes and can therefore be considered as zero-derivation or gender conversion (cf. Doleschal 2015). Further cases of zero-derivation are nominalized adjectives or participles that remain gender

inflected and therefore distinguish masculine and feminine forms. Such cases of differential gender are not very common in Slovenian (e.g. *dežurn-i* (m) ‘(male) person on duty’ – *dežurn-a* (f) ‘female person on duty’, *prizadet-i* (m) ‘handicapped person/man’ – *prizadet-a* (f) ‘handicapped woman’, *odrasl-i* (m) ‘(male) adult’ – *odrasl-a* (f) ‘female adult’).

A special case of derivational gender marking is found in the formation of personal names, both first names and surnames. Here, the directionality of the word formation process is clear: Female names are derived from male ones, but never vice versa: *Franc* (m) > *Franc-a* (f), *Andrej-ø* (m) > *Andrej-a* (f), *Jožef-ø* > *Jožef-a*. As far as surnames are concerned, men and women bear the same names (e.g. *Svet*, *Maze*). When referring to a man, such names are case-inflected; when referring to a woman, they remain uninflected. Feminine forms can be derived (e.g. *Svet-ova*, *Maze-jeva*), but need not be. The use of derived names is obligatory when the female referent is referred to exclusively by her surname:¹⁰

- (16) a. *Maze-jev-a* *potuje v Garmisch-Partenkirchen*.
 Maze-POSS-FEM travels to Garmisch-Partenkirchen
 ‘Maze travels to Garmisch-Partenkirchen.’ (Gigafida Corpus)
- b. *Merkl-ov-a* *pri Bushu*
 Merkel-POSS-FEM with Bush
 ‘Merkel with Bush’ (Gigafida Corpus)

This use is criticized by feminists, since the suffix *-ova*, which etymologically coincides with the suffix forming possessive adjectives, is felt to indicate possession – with respect to either the father or the husband (Šribar 2010 & 2012; Zupanc 2009).¹¹

If the surname is adjectival in form, it declines according to the masculine or feminine paradigm of the adjectival declension and represents a case of differential gender (e.g. *Matičetov* – *Matičetov-a*).

3.1.2 Compounding

Personal compounds take personal nouns as their heads. This may also be a metaphorical one, such as *zvezda* (f) ‘star’ in *popzvezda* (f) ‘pop star’. Note that such metaphorical formations are used generically. Their referential gender is usually not determined by their grammatical gender: *zvezda* can easily refer to a woman or a man.

More usual, however, is the use of a suffixed (and thus gender-specific) personal noun as a head, for example, *zvezdnik* (m) ‘male star’ – *zvezdnica* ‘female star’. In these forms, a gender-specific suffix has been added to the stem *zvezda* ‘star’, causing grammatical, lexical and referential gender to coincide.

Compounds with nouns such as *žena* ‘woman’ or *mož* ‘man’ as their head are rare and appear to be calques (e.g. *superpunca* ‘supergirl’). Nouns with the meaning ‘man’ and ‘woman’ never occur as modifiers in compounds.

3.2 Agreement

The constitutive feature of the grammatical category of gender is agreement. Although there is a strong correspondence between inflectional class and grammatical gender in Slovenian, the grammatical gender of a noun can unambiguously be determined only on the basis of agreement with words that are syntactically dependent on it. In Slovenian, gender is marked by distinct agreement patterns in all three numbers. Compare the agreement between attributive adjectives and their head nouns:

- (17) a. *lep* *moški*
 beautiful.MASC man.MASC
 ‘a beautiful man’
 b. *lep-a* *ženska*
 beautiful-FEM woman.FEM
 ‘a beautiful woman’
 c. *lep-o* *dekle*
 beautiful-NEUT girl.NEUT
 ‘a beautiful girl’
- (18) a. *Vidim lep-ega* *mošk-ega*.
 see.1SG beautiful-MASC.SG.ACC man-MASC.SG.ACC
 ‘I see a beautiful man.’
 b. *Vidim lep-o* *žensk-o*.
 see.1SG beautiful-FEM.SG.ACC woman-FEM.SG.ACC
 ‘I see a beautiful woman.’
 c. *Vidim lep-o* *dekl-e*.
 see.1SG beautiful-NEUT.SG.ACC girl-NEUT.SG.ACC
 ‘I see a beautiful girl.’

Table 9 gives the forms of the adjective *lep* ‘beautiful’ for all genders, numbers and cases.

As can be seen from Table 9, certain inflections occur in more than one gender class (cf. Doleschal 2003 for a detailed analysis, and Mečkovska 1980; Toporišič 1981), but there are distinct patterns for each gender class.

Table 9. Gender agreement in Slovenian adjectives: *lep* 'beautiful'

	Masculine	Neuter	Feminine
Singular			
Nominative	<i>lep/lep-i</i> ¹²	<i>lep-o</i>	<i>lep-a</i>
Genitive	<i>lep-ega</i>		<i>lep-e</i>
Dative	<i>lep-emu</i>		<i>lep-i</i>
Accusative	<i>lep-ega</i> ¹³ <i>lep/lep-i</i>	<i>lep-o</i>	
Locative	<i>lep-em</i>		<i>lep-i</i>
Instrumental	<i>lep-im</i>		<i>lep-o</i>
Dual			
Nominative	<i>lep-a</i>	<i>lep-i</i>	
Genitive	<i>lep-ih</i>		
Dative	<i>lep-ima</i>		
Accusative	<i>lep-a</i>	<i>lep-i</i>	
Locative	<i>lep-ih</i>		
Instrumental	<i>lep-ima</i>		
Plural			
Nominative	<i>lep-i</i>	<i>lep-a</i>	<i>lep-e</i>
Genitive	<i>lep-ih</i>		
Dative	<i>lep-im</i>		
Accusative	<i>lep-e</i>	<i>lep-a</i>	<i>lep-e</i>
Locative	<i>lep-ih</i>		
Instrumental	<i>lep-imi</i>		

The following syntactic targets show gender agreement with the head noun:

- noun-phrase internally: attributive adjectives, pronouns and numerals ('one' through 'four'), relative pronouns
- noun-phrase externally: predicative adjectives, pronouns and numerals ('one' through 'four'), past tense, future tense and conditional forms of the verb, anaphoric pronouns

In (19a), we see that the attributive adjectives and the relative pronoun agree noun-phrase internally with the feminine head noun *hčer* 'daughter'. In (19b), the

personal pronoun *on* agrees noun-phrase externally with its masculine antecedent *grof Miloš* ‘earl Miloš’:

- (19) a. *Grof Miloš sreča (...) nedolžn-o, pošten-o in prijazn-o hčer (...), s kater-o sta se v otroštvu skupaj igral-a.*
 earl.MASC Miloš.MASC meets innocent-FEM honest-FEM and kind-FEM daughter.FEM with REL-FEM be.3DU REFL in childhood together play.PART-MASC.DU
 ‘Earl Miloš meets the innocent, honest and kind daughter (...), with whom he played in childhood days.’ (adapted from Hladnik 1981)
- b. *Zaljubita se. On ji obljubi poroko.*
 fall.in.love.3DU REFL 3SG.MASC.NOM 3.SG.FEM.DAT promise.3SG marriage
 ‘They fall in love. He promises to marry her.’

The pervasive obligatory gender agreement of satellites with their antecedents means that grammatical gender (and therefore often referential gender) is expressed many times throughout a text. This is also true for the dual and plural, leading to different types of gender resolution (see Section 3.4).

As indicated above, in case of a mismatch between the grammatical and referential gender of a noun, referential gender may prevail over the grammatical gender of the antecedent:¹⁴

- (20) a. *A če si ga zares močno želite, boste moral-i dekle presenetiti z darilom, ki jo bo prepričal-o.*
 and if REFL it really strongly wish.2PL will.2PL have.to.PART-MASC.PL girl.NEUT.ACC surprise.INF with gift which 3SG.FEM.ACC will.3SG convince.PART-NEUT
 ‘And if you wish it really strongly, you will have to surprise your girl with a gift that will convince her.’
- b. *Tako je, mami. Zmagal-a bova, in tist-a baraba bo ušel kazni.*
 so be.3SG mom win.PART-MASC.DU will.1DU and this-FEM scoundrel.FEM will.3SG escape.PART.MASC punishment
 ‘So it is, mom. We will win and this scoundrel will escape punishment.’
 (Gigafida Corpus)

Data from the Gigafida Corpus show that in written Standard Slovenian in the case of *dekle* (n), semantically motivated feminine agreement occurs only across

clause boundaries, whereas with *baraba* (f) ‘scoundrel’ it is also possible within a clause (cf. Herrity 2000:29). As to (non-standard) colloquial language, it seems that semantic agreement may occur in all positions of the agreement hierarchy (Corbett 1979; cf. also Motschenbacher & Weikert, this volume, on Croatian) with *dekle* (cf. Mečkovska 1980:208 and the experiment reported by Tominc 2007:191f.), as shown by traditional folk songs:

- (21) *Moj-a dekle je še mlad-a.*
 my-FEM girl.NEUT be.3SG still young-FEM
 ‘My girlfriend is still young.’

3.3 Pronominalization

In the nominative, first and second person pronouns only show gender distinctions in the dual and plural, not in the singular. In these functions, masculine and feminine forms are distinct. The neuter pronominal forms are homonymous with the masculine forms in the dual and with the feminine forms in the plural (see Table 10a). The third person pronouns show gender distinctions in all three grammatical numbers (see Table 10b).

Table 10a. Slovenian 1st and 2nd person pronouns (nominative case)

Grammatical gender	Masculine	Feminine	Neuter
Singular			
1st	<i>jaz</i>	<i>jaz</i>	<i>jaz</i>
2nd	<i>ti</i>	<i>ti</i>	<i>ti</i>
Dual			
1st	<i>midva</i>	<i>medve</i> ¹⁵	<i>medve</i>
2nd	<i>vidva</i>	<i>vedve</i>	<i>vedve</i>
Plural			
1st	<i>mi</i>	<i>me</i>	<i>me</i>
2nd	<i>vi</i>	<i>ve</i>	<i>ve</i>

Table 10b. Slovenian 3rd person pronouns (nominative case)

Grammatical gender	Masculine	Feminine	Neuter
Singular	<i>on</i>	<i>ona</i>	<i>ono</i>
Dual	<i>onadva</i>	<i>onidve</i>	<i>onidve</i>
Plural	<i>oni</i>	<i>one</i>	<i>ona</i>

As in other contexts, the feminine forms are used for female referents (cf. 22a/b), whereas a masculine pronoun may be used for male-specific (cf. 22a/b), gender-indefinite and gender-inclusive (cf. 22c/d) reference:

- (22) a. *Eva in Mateja Petr-u in Janez-u: "Medve greva*
 Eva and Mateja Peter-DAT and Janez-DAT 1DU.FEM go.1DU
domov, vidva pa počakajta!"
 home 2DU.MASC PRT wait.IMP
 'Eva and Mateja to Peter and Janez: "We go home, and you wait!"'
- b. *Peter in Janez Ev-i in Matej-i: "Midva greva*
 Peter and Janez Eva-DAT and Mateja-DAT: 1DU.MASC go.1DU
domov, vedve pa počakajta!"
 home 2DU.FEM PRT wait.IMP
 'Peter and Janez to Eva and Mateja: "We go home, and you wait!"'
- c. *Eva in Peter Janezu in Mateji: "Midva greva*
 Eva and Peter Janez-DAT and Mateja-DAT: 1DU.MASC go.1DU
domov, vidva pa počakajta!"
 home 2DU.MASC PRT wait.IMP
 'Eva and Peter to Janez and Mateja: "We go home, and you wait!"'
- d. *Eva, Peter in Mateja: "Mi gremo domov,*
 Eva, Peter and Mateja: 1PL.MASC go.1PL home
vi pa počakajte!"
 2PL.MASC PRT wait.IMP
 'Eva, Peter and Mateja: "We go home, and you wait!"'

The interrogative pronoun *kdo* (m) 'who' allows only for masculine satellites, even if the intended referent is clearly female (as in 23b):

- (23) a. *Kdo je to napisal? Eva ali Janez?*
 who be.3SG that write.PART.MASC Eva or Janez
 'Who wrote that? Eva or Janez?'
- b. *Ni pomembno, (...) kdo je na novo zaljubljen,*
 NEG.be.3SG important who be.3SG newly in.love.MASC
kdo noseč, kdo na novo zaročen (...)
 who pregnant.MASC who newly engaged.MASC
 'It is not important who is newly in love, who is pregnant, who is newly engaged (...)' (adapted from Gigafida Corpus)

The same is true for other pronouns derived from the interrogative ones, for example, the indefinite pronouns *nekdo* 'someone' and *vsakdo* 'anyone', and the relative pronouns *kdor* 'who' and *kdorkoli* 'whoever'.

3.4 Coordination

In coordination, the feminine gender is used in the satellites only if all the coordinated nouns are feminine. In all other cases the masculine gender is used both in the dual and the plural (cf. also Hentschel 2003 on Serbian):

- (24) a. *Mojca in Marina bosta prišl-i*
 Mojca.FEM and Marina.FEM will.3DU come.PART-FEM.DU
 ‘Mojca and Marina will come.’ (Corbett 1983)
- b. *Mojca, Marina in njun-a mama*
 Mojca.FEM Marina.FEM and 3DU.POSS-FEM mom.FEM
bodo prišl-e.
 will.3PL come.PART-FEM.PL
 ‘Mojca, Marina and their mom will come.’ (Corbett 1983)
- c. *Mojca in Peter bosta prišl-a.*
 Mojca.FEM and Peter.MASC will.3DU come.PART-MASC.DU
 ‘Mojca and Peter will come.’ (Corbett 1983)
- d. *Mojca, Peter in njun-a mama*
 Mojca.FEM Peter.MASC and 3DU.POSS-FEM mom.FEM.SG
bodo prišl-i.
 will.3PL come.PART-MASC.PL
 ‘Mojca, Peter and their mom will come.’ (Corbett 1983)

Nevertheless, agreement is also possible with the nearest noun, as in the following example:

- (25) *drag-e študentke in študenti!*
 dear-FEM.PL female.student.FEM.PL and student.MASC.PL
 ‘Dear female and male students!’ (Corbett 1983)

The use of feminine or neuter satellites in agreement with conjoined noun phrases may also occur with special types of word order, for example, if the predicate precedes the subject (for details, see Herrity 2000: 179; cf. also Lenček 1972: 59).

4. Usage of personal reference forms

The current state of research on the usage of Slovenian personal reference forms is fragmentary. There are very few publications on gender in Slovenian linguistics and these are for the most part short articles or diploma theses. Moreover, the data used have often not been collected systematically. There are virtually no publications offering a quantification of data. The following sections give a comprehensive overview of the available studies.

4.1 Usage patterns in Slovenian dictionaries

A question that has been pursued by several authors is the representation of men and women in dictionaries. Humar (2011) conducted a study on the representation of feminine personal nouns in modern dictionaries of Slovenian (especially terminological ones). Starting from the general dictionary of Slovenian, the *Slovar slovenskega knjižnega jezika* (SSKJ, Bajec 1994), she notes that feminine personal nouns are lemmata on their own, but the explication is more often than not “feminine form of ...”, referring to a masculine noun that is given a detailed semantic explanation.¹⁶ Beyond that, the SSKJ lacks many feminine nouns that are included in later dictionaries, especially the *Slovenski Pravopis* (‘Slovenian Orthographic Dictionary’; Toporišič 2001), where they are, however, treated as subentries of the corresponding masculine forms. Humar then proceeds with an analysis of 15 terminological dictionaries published between 1990 and 2007. Her study shows that masculine personal nouns are prevalent and that feminine personal nouns are usually not consistently represented. The presence of feminine nouns is related to several factors: whether the field is a characteristically male domain or not; the scope of the dictionary; and the gender of the lexicographers. It is remarkable that, in the majority of the cases, the feminine personal nouns are given as independent lemmata.

Other studies on dictionaries focus on the description of male and female persons in terms of stereotypes: Kržišnik (1997) investigated the representation of ways of speaking in the SSKJ. The hypothesis was that the stereotype of women’s talkativeness would be reflected by dictionary and discourse data. She wanted to find out if certain ways of speaking were represented in a gendered way and thus examined phraseologisms with the meaning ‘to speak’ (e.g. *naglas misliti* ‘to think aloud’). She studied the expressions in subject position of the phraseologisms as well as the grammatical gender inflections of the verbs. At the same time, she also collected a sample of sentences from journalistic and literary texts. The results did not correspond to the stereotype that women speak a lot. The overall results showed about 48% male subjects in the examined items, 40% gender-indefinite subjects and 12% female subjects. In the dictionary (Bajec 1994), by contrast, even 65% of the tokens were gender-indefinite, 29% clearly male and only about 6% showed a female subject. Thus, the dictionary does not reflect the frequency of use at the textual level. The analysis of the feminine and masculine examples, however, shows that the phraseologisms with a female agent mostly characterize the agent (e.g. *govoriti kot dež* ‘to talk nineteen to the dozen’, lit. ‘to speak like rain’), while a focus on interpersonal verbal behavior is rarely found with a female subject (as would be the case in *najti skupni jezik* ‘find a common language’).

Bednarska (2013) studied 32 lemmata of the SSKJ (Bajec 1994) which are traditionally linked to gender stereotypes, such as the verb *pečī* 'to bake' or the noun *pogum* 'courage'. An analysis of the example sentences in the dictionary definitions showed that among the stereotypically female lemmata, 68% of the examples had a female agent, and 90% among the male lemmata had a male agent, so that in this case the expected stereotypicality was backed by the data.

A further analysis of dictionary data was conducted by Gorjanc (2007). He compared the cooccurrence of adjectives and verbs with the nouns *dekle* 'girl' and *fant* 'boy' in the examples of the SSKJ and discovered an interesting pattern: Adjectives collocating with *dekle* usually describe physical characteristics (such as hair or eye color), while the attributes of *fant* more often characterize the person from a behavioral point of view. Most interestingly, the noun *dekle* is often described in sexual terms, both by adjectives and verbs, while *fant* never cooccurs with words bearing sexual meanings.

Gorjanc (2007) also looked at the adjectival collocations of the nouns *ženska* 'woman' and *moški* 'man' in two corpora of the Slovenian language (FIDA and FIDApplus), comparing two time spans: 1997–1999 and 2001–2004. The majority of texts in both corpora come from newspapers. In the first time span, most of the frequent adjectival collocates were the same for *moški* and *ženska*: They related to age, nationality and marital status. As to moral characterization, *dobra* 'good' occurred only with *ženska* and *šovinističen* 'chauvinistic' with *moški*. Moreover, only *ženska* was characterized as *zaposlena* 'employed', which according to Gorjanc indicates that in the 1990s this was still not seen as 'normal' for women.

In the second time span, the number of adjectives used to characterize a woman (*ženska*) in her reproductive function (e.g. *noseča* 'pregnant') had risen, while the noun *moški* was increasingly defined in sexual terms (e.g. *potenten* 'potent'). At the same time, more frequent mention is made of violence against women, and emancipation as well as discrimination against women had become more frequent topics of public discourse.

These studies indicate that dictionaries (and journalistic texts) in Slovenian both produce and reproduce stereotypical pictures of women and men, but only to a certain extent. Further research is needed in order to evaluate these findings in a more comprehensive way.

4.2 Address terms and other personal nouns in other text genres

Another topic that has been investigated is the use of masculine and feminine personal reference forms in various genres of public (and private) discourse.

The only study of the use of address terms seems to be Šribar (2012). Its aim was to understand addressing practices in former Yugoslavia and contemporary

Slovenia from a sociological perspective. To this end, Šribar designed a questionnaire which was sent to 27 persons and contained questions on former and contemporary practices of addressing men and women in different social roles and circumstances. The questionnaire was answered by 18 persons. The overall result was that during Socialist times two distinct forms of nominal address were used in formal contexts: *tovariš/tovarišica* ('comrade' m./f.) and *gospod/gospa* ('Sir, Mr'/'Madam, Mrs'), whereas today only *gospod/gospa* remain in use. The address terms are combined with job titles, as in *gospod profesor* 'Mr professor' or *gospa učiteljica* 'Mrs teacher' or used on their own. The phrases *gospa profesor* 'Mrs professor' and *profesor Tiholetova*, in which the masculine title *profesor* is combined with a female noun or name, are still used, but the tendency is towards a congruent use of grammatical and referential gender, as in *gospa profesorica* (lit. 'Mrs female professor'), *doktor Tihole* ('Doctor Tihole'). Note that in *doktor Tiholetova*, female referential gender is indicated by the derived form of the surname, which is not considered politically correct today, because it is derived either from the husband's or the father's surname and indicates dependency (cf. Section 3.1). Informants state that addressing women by their husband's profession is "very unusual" and completely unacceptable today.

As to informal addressing, Šribar asked how a domestic aid was addressed formerly and would be addressed currently. According to the majority of the informants, this was done by first name, but two of them also allowed for *gospod/gospa* + first name (e.g. *gospod Tone* 'Mr Tone', *gospa Marija* 'Mrs Marija'). Today, *gospod/gospa* + surname is a possible choice, representing the most formal variant. The combination *gospod/gospa* + first name, which marks a combination of formal and informal forms, is widely used today, in public as well as in some professional environments.

The most interesting finding, it would seem, is that *gospodična* 'Miss' did not occur at all in the answers. A check of the Gigafida Corpus, which covers the years 1990–2011 and contains 1,200 million words, shows that *gospodična* is still in use in written texts, both as a form of address and as a form of naming a third person – although its overall frequency is about seven times lower than the one of *gospa* 'Mrs'. In the GOS Corpus, the corpus of spoken Slovenian (covering the years 2004–2010 and containing 1 million words), by contrast, *gospodična* occurs eight times (and only once as a form of address), while *gospa* is attested 176 times. This indicates that *gospodična* is no longer common as an address term.

Kranjc and Ožbot (2013:234) state that, in comparison to other European countries, in Slovenia the debate about sexist language use started with a delay of 20 years (cf. also Bešter 1997: 11) and by the mid-1990s had led to a change in the perception of the generic masculine as unmarked. This coincides with the observation by Pogorelec (1997, cf. Section 2.5). Humar (2011:243), likewise, notes

that, before the independence of Slovenia in 1990, the generic masculine was used throughout for gender-indefinite reference and that the use of feminine and masculine forms in combination evolved only later in the spoken language as a sign of political correctness. She also notes that in official texts (such as public job advertisements) the masculine generics continue to be used, although it is often stated that both women and men are intended. In newspaper texts, however, the masculine generic prevails until today. And although there are currently more feminine neologisms than masculine ones (as shown by Kustec 2009 for the period 2008–2009), masculine personal nouns occur more frequently in text corpora (Humar 2011: 424).

An investigation of job advertisements was published in Kozmik and Jeram (1995).¹⁷ The researchers collected a sample containing all advertisements in the newspaper *Delo* between January 1 and June 30 of the years 1988, 1991, 1992 and 1993, totalling 3787 items. 279 (7.3%) jobs of the sample were advertised in the feminine form. The number of job advertisements showing both forms or a gender-neutral expression (usually the 2nd person plural as the honorific form) was 155 (4.1%). All others (3344 or 88.4%) were written in the masculine form only. Advertisements for positions in management exhibited only the masculine form in 98.8% (664 items), with the small minority containing a feminine form targeting nurses. Generally, feminine forms were used only for advertising positions in traditionally female occupations and mostly on lower levels.

A cursory glance at job advertisements in *Delo* in 2013 and 2014 reveals that this pattern has not changed much: Most advertisements are still written in the masculine form only, but this is usually accompanied by the abbreviation (*m/ž*), indicating male/female, in order to conform to the legal prerequisites of gender-fair language use. Needless to say, this issue calls for further and systematic investigation.

Bešter (1997) examined various genres of official texts, more precisely official announcements and invitations as well as administrative forms. For announcements and invitations she found the following pattern: If a specific person is addressed, the gender of the address form is in accordance with referential gender:

- (26) *vrhovn-a sodnica Ljiljana Friedel*
 supreme-FEM female.judge.FEM Ljiljana Friedel
 ‘the supreme judge Ljiljana Friedel’

The same is true for the signing of letters, i.e. feminine forms are used by women:

- (27) *direktorica finančnega sektorja*
 female.director.FEM financial.GEN sector.GEN
 ‘director of the financial sector (a woman)’

If, by contrast, a group of people is addressed, both the generic masculine and paired forms are common:

- (28) a. *spoštovan-i udeleženci*
 dear-MASC.PL participant.MASC.PL
 ‘dear participants’
- b. *spoštovan-e članice in člani*
 dear-FEM.PL female.member.FEM.PL and member.MASC.PL
 ‘dear female and male members’

The patterns found by Bešter (1997) for administrative forms are more varied. Bešter examined administrative forms issued by courts, the ministry of internal affairs, universities, medical and postal institutions, banks and political parties. Masculine and feminine forms are often used in combination to address the person who fills in the form, though not always (for example, never on forms of postal and seldom on forms of financial institutions). If both genders are specified, the feminine form is often given in brackets or divided from the base by a hyphen (e.g. *obsojenec(ka)* ‘convict’, *državljan-ka* ‘citizen’). The designation of the official signing the form, however, is always given as a masculine personal noun. Only political parties use parallel masculine and feminine nouns.

The finding that functions are often used in the masculine form is corroborated by Kunst-Gnamuš (1995: 260). However, she also notes that political parties are more inclined to gender-fair use, as in (29):

- (29) *Statut daje večja pooblastila*
 statute give.3SG greater authorizations
predsednici/predsedniku *stranke.*
 female.president.FEM.DAT/president.MASC.DAT party.GEN
 ‘The statute gives greater authorizations to the female/male president of the party.’

This finding supports the hypothesis that the use of masculine and feminine forms for gender-inclusive reference is related to politics in a broad sense. The issue was further studied by Umek (2008), who wanted to determine whether feminization in Slovenian was a social or a linguistic problem. To this end, she investigated the language use of a Slovenian newspaper (*Slovenski poročevalec*, later *Delo*), examining four numbers of three different years: 1945, 1969 and 2000. Umek (2008: 71–72) was interested in the following research questions:

- How often and when are masculine designations used for female persons?
- How often and when are feminine designations used for female persons?

- How often and when are both feminine and masculine designations used compared to masculine generic forms alone?
- How often and when are female persons designated with a feminized surname?

Her results can be briefly summarized as follows: In 1945, masculine personal nouns were used with reference to women if the activities and functions they denoted were traditionally male (e.g. *minister* ‘minister’, *oficir* ‘officer’). These nouns were always accompanied by the name of the person in question (clarifying referential gender). Female personal nouns were used with reference to individual women or to exclusively female groups. Given the political situation in Yugoslavia in 1945, groups of politically active women were quite prominent and therefore mentioned rather often in the newspaper texts.

For the same reason, the parallel use of masculine and feminine personal nouns to refer to groups of people was also quite common in 1945. Umek (2008:75–78) isolates three relevant contexts: (1) captions of pictures showing women and men, (2) the beginnings of notices, appeals, announcements and the like, especially if the public is directly addressed, (3) job advertisements (except gender-specific ones). In reports or accounts, by contrast, masculine forms were used for gender-indefinite reference, although there were quite a few female politicians at that time. As to the surnames, they were often found in the feminized form with the suffix *-ova*.

By 1969 the pattern had changed: Masculine designations for specific reference to individual women hardly ever occurred (twice in total). Instead feminine personal nouns were used also for such influential positions as *ministrica* ‘female secretary of state’ or *predsednica odbora* ‘female president of the committee’. The occurrence of *elektromehaničarka* ‘female electromechanical engineer’ shows that female designations were easily available for traditionally male professions as well. The overall frequency of feminine personal nouns, however, was low, owing to the low representation of women in the public domain at that time. On the other hand, the parallel use of masculine and feminine personal nouns for gender-inclusive or gender-indefinite reference had almost completely disappeared. According to Umek (2008:83), this was due to the mostly informative character of the newspaper as compared to its propagandistic make-up in 1945. Job advertisements were either in the masculine or the feminine form, suggesting that they were always gender-specific. Surnames were used with or without feminization.

In 2000, reference to women was made exclusively by feminine personal nouns, the frequency of which had risen compared to 1969, although they were still outnumbered by masculine personal nouns. All-female groups were referred to by feminine nouns in the plural. In all other cases of group reference, masculine nouns were used generically both in the singular and the plural for

gender-inclusive and gender-indefinite reference. As to surnames, both the feminized and non-feminized forms occurred, as in 1969.

The pattern described by Umek still holds for the language use of the press as well as official publications, as a cursory study of *Delo* and diverse magazines from 2013 and 2014 as well as official accounts by governmental and national research institutions confirms, and is also reflected in the spoken language on television. In order to examine the forms used for female and male reference, I recorded seven broadcasts of the programme *Ob desetih* 'At ten o'clock' on the private TV station *Golica TV* during February 2014. This TV show features people of different professions and different degrees of fame who present themselves and their activities in an informal talk with a journalist. The program lasts 90 minutes (interspersed with numerous commercials) and usually hosts three guests.

The recorded shows were moderated by two different journalists in turn – a man and a woman. There were 23 guests in total, 12 men and 11 women, sometimes appearing in pairs. The verbal behavior of the journalists was very consistent: They always used female and male personal nouns in combination when addressing or referring to the public (*gledalke in gledalci* 'female and male viewers' or the gender-neutral *draga družba* 'dear society'). When addressing the guests, they used different strategies: either the first name and the familiar form of pronominal address *ti* (only with four guests; *Albert, Mateja – ti*), the first name and the distant form of pronominal address *Vi* (*Albert, Mateja – Vi*), or first name accompanied by a general form of address and the distant form of pronominal address (*gospod Albert* 'Mr Albert', *gospa Mateja* 'Mrs Mateja' – *Vi*). Only once is a man addressed by his last name and consequently with the distant form of address (*gospod Majcen* 'Mr Majcen'). Table 11 gives an overview of the forms used. Note that Šribar's observation about the growing frequency of the combination general term of address + first name is backed by the data, but Šribar's opinion that it is used for men and women alike is not. The most frequent form in this sample is, however, the address by first name.

Regarding reference to third persons, the journalists consistently used feminine personal nouns for reference to individual women and masculine ones for reference to individual men. For gender-indefinite reference, they used the generic masculine.

The guests behaved in a very similar way, although exceptions could be observed: For example, an elderly woman, a known folk singer, used the masculine form only (*gledalci* 'viewers') to address and refer to the public. In contrast, the mayor of a village used masculine and feminine forms in combination to refer to other politicians and even gave a metalinguistic comment on this use: *brez tega danes ne gre* 'without that it's a no go today'.

Table 11. Frequency of forms of address on the Slovenian TV show *Ob desetih*

<i>draga družba</i> ‘dear society’	38
<i>gledalke in gledalci</i> ‘female and male viewers’	6
male first name	41
Mr + first name	19
Mr + last name	6
female first name	50
Mrs + first name	14
Mrs + last name	3

The recorded programs illustrate all other uses of the generic masculine in Slovenian as described in Sections 2 and 3 above: the honorific form of address in the second person plural, generalized personal reference in the third person plural and masculine agreement with coordinated nouns.

We can thus conclude that both the structure and language use of Slovenian allow for a broad use of gender-specific forms of reference, and these possibilities are also used to a certain, seemingly growing, extent. At the same time, the generic use of the masculine gender is also very prominent and can in certain contexts not be avoided without resulting in ungrammaticality.

5. Language change and language reform

As has been noted above, a change in the perception of the generic masculine was noticed in the Slovenian language community in the mid-1990s. This fact is certainly related to the public discussion of non-sexist language initiated by the Office for Women’s Politics (*Urad za žensko politiko*), following the Council of Europe’s (1990) recommendation on the abolition of sexist language usage, and other recommendations for non-sexist language use in Slovenian.¹⁸

These recommendations propagate the use of paired gender forms, such as *dijak oz. dijakinja* ‘male or female pupil resp.’, *dijak/djakinja* ‘male/female pupil’, *dijak/inja* ‘male/female pupil’ (Žagar & Milharčič Hladnik 1995: 10–12), and the use of gender-neutral expressions such as *oseba, ki je nosilka pravice* ‘the person, who is the bearer of the right’. They also allow for the possibility of a “legal provision” stating that a given text addresses both men and women, although it does not mention both genders explicitly, but qualify this solution as “unsatisfactory”. The recommendations also plead for the non-stereotypical description of men and women and for equal treatment both in description and forms of address. For example, instead of *Janez Marolt in gospodična Sonja* ‘Janez Marolt and Miss

Sonja' or *g. Marolt in Sonja* 'Mr Marolt and Sonja', parallel use of expressions is recommended: *Janez Marolt in Sonja Horvat, gpd. Horvat in g. Marolt* 'Miss Horvat and Mr Marolt'. Note that *gospodična* 'Miss' is not ruled out as a form of address, but its male equivalent *gospodič* 'young man' is not recommended as an address term.

The authors presented their recommendations to Slovenian linguists and other scholars in April 1995. The recommendations were heavily criticized by most linguists as uneconomic and inapplicable (see Kozmik & Jeram 1995, where the whole debate is published along with the recommendations).

Nevertheless, one of the critics, Marko Stabej, shortly afterwards undertook an attempt at reformulating two legal texts in accordance with these guidelines (cf. Stabej 1997). The law texts, although published for discussion in the gazette of the parliament of the Republic of Slovenia, were, however, accepted in the form of the generic masculine. So far, no further attempts have been made at reformulating legal texts in a gender-fair way. Nor has the issue been discussed any further within the Slovenian linguistic community. Some attempts, however, have been made by sociologists to promote a gender-fair usage (Šribar 2010; Zupanc 2009).

Two further important legal steps were undertaken by the Slovenian government, initiated by the Office for Women's Politics: the publication of the legally compulsory Standard Classification of Professions in a two-gender format (*Statistični Urad Republike Slovenije* 2008, first published 1997 in the official gazette of the Republic of Slovenia), providing a masculine-feminine pair for almost every profession, and the publication of guidelines for the formulation of legal regulations, the *Nomotehnične Smernice* 'Nomotechnical Guidelines' (*Služba Vlade Republike Slovenije za Zakonodajo* 2008). The latter contain some examples of parallel feminine and masculine forms, but also explain why the generic masculine has its role in legal texts. They also refer to guidelines of the Slovenian parliament, which prescribe that parallel use of masculine and feminine forms is obligatory for the first paragraphs of legal texts. The *Nomotehnične Smernice* can be assessed as a consciousness-raising promotion of gender-fair usage.

6. Conclusion

In Slovenian, it is easy to make referential, grammatical, lexical and social gender conform to each other when referring to individuals or groups of people of the same gender, due to the available possibilities of word-formation. It is, however, quite complicated to achieve a gender-fair use with gender-indefinite reference. This is due to the great number of satellite forms in which gender agreement is obligatory.

So far, linguists dealing with Slovenian have not been particularly interested in gender linguistics. As a consequence, many questions and issues have yet to be addressed and there is no doubt that much remains to be discovered. The following topics are arguably the most urgent and should be treated systematically:

- the formation of female nouns in terms of word-formation rules and their productivity
- the social gender of personal nouns
- the ways of addressing women and men
- the use of feminine and masculine forms with reference to women (including *govorjenje na fanta*)
- the representation of men and women on the textual and discourse levels (for example, job advertisements)
- the psycholinguistic effects of masculine generics
- the development of naming and addressing women and men in Slovenian, focussing in particular on the comparison between Socialist and post-Socialist times.

Notes

* I would like to thank Saška Štumberger, Nataša Pirih Svetina, Tatjana Vučajnk, Anna M. Thornton, Markus Rheindorf, the editors, and an anonymous reviewer for their valuable remarks, critique and support.

1. The following paragraphs rely heavily on Grdina & Stabej (1999), Herrity (2000: 1), and Statistical Office of the Republic of Slovenia (2010).
2. The masculine gender has an animate and an inanimate subgender. However, this will not be discussed here, as it is irrelevant to the present topic.
3. *Vodja* 'leader, manager' is a difficult case, because in some compounds it is lexically male and has a derived female counterpart as *poslovodja* – *poslovodkinja*, while in others it is lexically gender-neutral and behaves like a double-gender noun: *vlakovodja* (m/f) 'train driver'.
4. There is more than one masculine, feminine and neuter declension, and these are consequently called "first", "second" etc. masculine/feminine/neuter declension. As this fact is irrelevant for our discussion, it will not be pursued further here.
5. In masculine inanimate nouns the form of the accusative singular is identical to the nominative singular.
6. The dual is used when two extralinguistic objects are referred to: *moja vnuka* 'my two grandchildren'.
7. In the noun *dekle* 'girl', the stem is modified by the extension *-t-* in oblique cases (except in the accusative singular).
8. I am obliged to Nataša Pirih Svetina for these examples.

9. This is confirmed by an experiment described by Bajić (2012), who asked students of Slovenian to form feminine nouns from masculine personal nouns and to rate them according to their familiarity and the degree of difficulty of their formation.
10. For details, cf. Herrity (2000: 32f.) and Toporišič et al. (1994: 126f.).
11. Thus, Šribar, for example, does not use such forms when citing female authors in her publications. In colloquial language, the feminized form is not always used, either.
12. The form *lep-i* is the definite form, roughly corresponding in function to the use of the definite article in other languages. It is only distinct in the nominative and accusative singular masculine.
13. The form *lep-ega* is used with animate referents, *lep/lep-i* with inanimate ones.
14. As in Croatian, “semantic agreement” of this sort follows the agreement hierarchy (Corbett 1979) in Slovenian (see Motschenbacher & Weikert, this volume).
15. In colloquial Slovenian the form *midve* is used.
16. The SSKJ was compiled from 1970 to 1991 and has remained the only explanatory dictionary of the Slovenian language until today. The SSKJ has not been expanded to date. Instead, a dictionary of the most recent lexical items was published in 2012 in an attempt to fill the obvious gap.
17. It remains unclear who the authors of this research are.
18. The Office for Women’s Politics was an institution of the Slovenian government. In 1999 its name was changed to *Urad za enake možnosti* (‘Office for Equal Opportunities’). The institution ceased to exist in 2013, when it was integrated into the Ministry of Social Affairs (<http://www.arhiv.uem.gov.si/si/index.html>).

References

- Bajec, Anton, ed. 1994. *Slovar slovenskega knjižnega jezika* [Dictionary of the Slovenian Standard Language]. Ljubljana: DZS.
- Bajić, Nikola. 2012. “Spolno (ne)občutljiva raba jezika v Srbiji in Sloveniji v teoriji in praksi [Gender (non)sensitive use of language in Serbia and Slovenia in theory and practice].” In 48. *Seminar slovenskega jezika, literature in kulture. Ideologije v slovenskem jeziku, literaturi in kulturi* [48th Seminar on Slovenian language, literature and culture. Ideologies in Slovenian language, literature and culture], ed. Aleksander Bjelčevič. Ljubljana: Znanstvena Založba Filozofske Fakultete, 124–128.
- Bednarska, Katarzyna. 2013. “Kdo naj dela, kdo pa skrbi za otroke? Spolni stereotipi v slovarjih [Who should work, and who should take care of children? Gender stereotypes in dictionaries].” In *Obdobja 32. Družbena funkcijskost jezika (vidiki, merila, opredelitve)* [The social functionality of language (aspects, criteria, definitions)], ed. Andreja Žele. Ljubljana: Znanstvena Založba Filozofske Fakultete, 35–42.
- Bešter, Marija. 1997. “Raba poimenovanj za ženske osebe v uradovnih besedilih [The use of designations for female persons in official texts].” In 33. *Seminar slovenskega jezika, literature in kulture* [33rd Seminar on Slovenian language, literature and culture], ed. Aleksandra Derganc. Ljubljana, Znanstvena Založba Filozofske Fakultete, 9–23.

- Bešter, Marija. 1998. "Govorjenje na fanta' v gorenjskem narečju [Speaking as a boy in a dialect of Gorenjska]." In 34. *Seminar slovenskega jezika, literature in culture* [34th Seminar on Slovenian language, literature and culture], ed. Erika Kržišnik. Ljubljana, Znanstvena Založba Filozofske Fakultete, 71–82.
- Bizjak Končar, Aleksandra & Marko Snoj. 2013. *Slovar novejšega besedja slovenskega jezika* [Dictionary of recent words of the Slovenian language]. Ljubljana: Založba ZRC SAZU.
- Čmejrková, Světa. 2003. "Communicating gender in Czech." In *Gender across languages: The linguistic representation of women and men*, vol. 3, eds. Marlis Hellinger & Hadumod Bußmann. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 27–57. DOI: 10.1075/impact.11.06cme
- Corbett, Greville. 1979. "The agreement hierarchy." *Journal of Linguistics* 15: 203–224. DOI: 10.1017/S0022226700016352
- Corbett, Greville. 1983. *Hierarchies, targets and controllers: Agreement patterns in Slavic*. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania University Press.
- Čuden, Milena & Tatjana Košak & Jerica Vogel. 2006. *Slovenščina 8, učbenik za slovenski jezik v osmem razredu osnovne šole* [Slovenian 8, textbook for the Slovenian language in the 8th grade]. Ljubljana: Mladinska Knjiga.
- Doleschal, Ursula. 2003. "Sprachstruktur und Geschlecht: Russisch und Slowenisch." In *Beiträge des Gender-Blocks zum XIII. Internationalen Slawistenkongress in Ljubljana*, 15–21. August 2003, eds. Jiřina van Leeuwen-Turnovcová & Uta Röhrborn. München: Otto Sagner, 75–111.
- Doleschal, Ursula. 2015. "Gender marking." In *Handbook of word-formation*, eds. Peter O. Müller & Ingeborg Ohnheiser & Susan Olsen & Franz Rainer. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 1115–1127.
- Doleschal, Ursula & Sonja Schmid. 2001. "Doing gender in Russian: Structure and perspective." In *Gender across languages: The linguistic representation of women and men*, vol. 1, eds. Marlis Hellinger & Hadumod Bußmann. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 253–282. DOI: 10.1075/impact.9.16dol
- Drusany, Nevenka & Nana Cajhen & Dragica Kapko & Martina Križaj Ortar & Marija Bešter. 2008. *Slovenščina za vsak dan* [Slovenian for every day]. Ljubljana: Rokus Klett.
- European Commission 2014. *ESCO. European skills, competencies, qualifications and occupations*. <https://ec.europa.eu/esco/home> [9 July 2014].
- Gigafida Corpus. <http://www.gigafida.net/> [15 March 2014].
- Gorjanc, Vojko. 2007. "Kontekstualizacija oseb ženskega in moškega spola v slovenskih tiskanih medijih [The contextualization of persons of female and male gender in Slovenian print media]." In 43. *Seminar slovenskega jezika, literature in culture. Stereotipi v slovenskem jeziku, literaturi in kulturi* [43rd Seminar of Slovenian language, literature and culture. Stereotypes in Slovenian language, literature and culture], ed. Irena Novak Popov. Ljubljana: Center za Slovenščino kot Drugi/Tuji Jezik pri Oddelku za Slovenistiko Filozofske Fakultete Univerze v Ljubljani, 173–180.
- GOS Corpus. *Korpus Govorjene Slovenščine* [Corpus of Spoken Slovenian]. <http://www.korpus-gos.net/> [10 March 2014].
- Grdina, Igor & Marko Stabej. 1999. "Slowenisch." In *Wieser Enzyklopädie des europäischen Ostens*, ed. Lojze Wieser. Klagenfurt: Wieser, 495–508.
- Hellinger, Marlis & Hadumod Bußmann. 2001. "Gender across languages: The linguistic representation of women and men." In *Gender across languages: The linguistic representation of women and men*, vol. 1, eds. Marlis Hellinger & Hadumod Bußmann. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1–25. DOI: 10.1075/impact.9.05hel

- Hentschel, Elke. 2003. "The expression of gender in Serbian." In *Gender across languages: The linguistic representation of women and men*, vol. 3, eds. Marlis Hellinger & Hadumod Bußmann. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 287–309. DOI: 10.1075/impact.11.16hen
- Herrity, Peter. 2000. *Slovenian: A comprehensive grammar*. London: Routledge.
- Hladnik, Miran. 1981. "Slovenski ženski roman v 19. stoletju [The Slovenian women's novel in the 19th century]." *Slavistična Revija* 29: 259–296. <http://www.ijs.si/lit/zenskir.html-l2> [17 March 2014].
- Hladnik, Miran. 1983. "Trivialna literatura [Trivial literature]." <http://lit.ijs.si/trivlit1.html> [17 March 2014].
- Humar, Marjeta. 2011. "Poimenovanja za moške in ženske v novejših slovenskih terminoloških slovarjih [Designations for men and women in the latest Slovenian terminological dictionaries]." In *Izzivi sodobnega slovenskega slovaropisja* [Challenges of contemporary lexicography], ed. Marko Jesenšek. Maribor: Zora, 422–440.
- Korošec, Tomo. 1977. *Vojaški slovar* [Military dictionary]. Ljubljana: Partizanska Knjiga.
- Kozmik, Vera & Jasna Jeram, eds. 1995. *Neseksistična raba jezika* [Non-sexist language use]. Ljubljana: Vlada Republika Slovenije, Urad za Žensko Politiko.
- Kranjc, Simona & Martina Ožbot. 2013. "Vloga spolno občutljivega jezika v Slovenščini, Italjanščini in Angleščini [The role of a gender-sensitive language in Slovenian, Italian and English]." In *Obdobja 32. Družbena funkcijskost jezika (vidiki, merila, opredelitve)* [The social functionality of language (aspects, criteria, definitions)], ed. Andreja Žele. Ljubljana: Znanstvena Založba Filozofske Fakultete, 233–239.
- Kržišnik, Erika. 1997. "Kdo govori kako [Who speaks how]." In 33. *Seminar slovenskega jezika, literature in culture* [33rd Seminar on Slovenian language, literature and culture], ed. Aleksandra Derganc. Ljubljana, Znanstvena Založba Filozofske Fakultete: 45–56.
- Kunst-Gnamuš, Olga. 1995. "Razmerje med spolom kot potezo reference in spolom kot slovnično kategorijo [The relation between gender as a feature of reference and gender as a grammatical category]." *Jezik in Slovtvo* 40(7): 255–261.
- Kustec, Katja. 2009. *Novotvorjenke za poimenovanje oseb v slovenskem jeziku* [Neologisms for the designation of persons in the Slovenian language]. Maribor: University of Maribor. <http://dkum.uni-mb.si/Dokument.php?id=12253> [2 January 2014]
- Lenček, Rado. 1972. "O zaznamovanosti in neutralizaciji slovnične kategorije spola v slovenskem knjižnem jeziku [On the markedness and neutralization of the grammatical category of gender in the Slovenian standard language]." *Slavistična Revija* 20(1): 55–64.
- Mečkovska, Nina. 1980. "Samostalniški spol v slovenskem in vzhodnoslovanskih jezikih [Nominal gender in Slovenian and the East Slavic languages]." *Slavistična Revija* 28(2): 199–218.
- Motschenbacher, Heiko & Marija Weikert. this volume. "Structural gender trouble in Croatian." In *Gender across languages: The linguistic representation of women and men*, vol. 4, eds. Marlis Hellinger & Heiko Motschenbacher. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 49–96.
- Pogorelec, Breda. 1997. "Slovenska skladnja in poimenovanja ženskih oseb. Dodatek k 33. seminarju slovenskega jezika, literature in kulture [Slovenian syntax and the designations of female persons. Supplement to the 33rd Seminar on Slovenian language, literature and culture]." (Unpublished article)
- Služba Vlade Republike Slovenije za Zakonodajo. 2008. *Nomotehnične smernice* [Nomotechnical guidelines]. Ljubljana: Uradni List. http://www.svz.gov.si/fileadmin/svz.gov.si/pageuploads/Dokumenti/Nomotehnicne_smer.pdf [14 December 2013]

- Stabej, Marko. 1997. "Seksizem kot jezikovnopolitični problem [Sexism as a problem of language policy]." In 33. *Seminar slovenskega jezika, literature in culture* [33rd Seminar on Slovenian language, literature and culture], ed. Aleksandra Derganc. Ljubljana: Znanstvena Založba Filozofske Fakultete, 57–68.
- Statistični Urad Republike Slovenije. 2008. *Standardna klasifikacija poklicev* [Standard classification of professions]. <http://www.stat.si/klasje/tabela.aspx?cvn=5334> [14 February 2014]
- Statistical Office of the Republic of Slovenia. 2010. "International Mother Language Day 2010." http://www.stat.si/eng/novica_prikazi.aspx?id=2957 [14 March 2014]
- Šribar, Renata. 2010. *Interne smernice za spolno občutljivo rabo jezika* [Internal guidelines for a gender-sensitive use of language]. http://www.arhiv.mvzt.gov.si/fileadmin/mvzt.gov.si/pageuploads/pdf/znanost/Zenske_v_znanosti/interne_jezikovne_smernice_za_komisijo_final.pdf [17 March 2014]
- Šribar, Renata. 2012. "Performing – women' and the socio-political regime: Addressing in socialist Slovenia compared to today." In *Doing gender – doing the Balkans: Dynamics and persistence of gender relations in Yugoslavia and the Yugoslav successor states*, eds. Roswitha Kersten-Pejanić & Simone Rajilić & Christian Voß. München: Otto Sagner, 127–145.
- Tominc, Ana. 2007. "O samostalnikih srednjega spola za osebe v slovenskem jeziku [On nouns with neuter gender for persons in the Slovenian language]." *Annales: Series Historia et Sociologia* 17(1): 187–196.
- Toporišič, Jože. 1981. "K teoriji spola v slovenskem knjižnem jeziku [On the theory of gender in the Slovenian standard language]." *Slavistična Revija* 29(1): 80–94.
- Toporišič, Jože. 2000. *Slovenska slovnica. Četrta, prenovljena in razširjena izdaja* [Slovenian grammar. Fourth, renewed and extended edition]. Maribor: Obzorja.
- Toporišič, Jože. 2001. *Slovenski pravopis 1. Pravila. Slovar* [Slovenian orthography 1. Rules. Dictionary]. Ljubljana: SAZU.
- Toporišič, Jože et al., eds. 1994. *Slovenski pravopis 1. Pravila. Tretja, pregledana izdaja* [Slovenian orthography 1. Rules. Third, revised edition]. Ljubljana: DZS.
- Umek, Neža. 2008. *Feminizacija v slovenščini in francoščini: Družbeni in/ali jezikovni problem?* [Feminization in Slovenian and French: A social and/or linguistic problem?] Ljubljana: University of Ljubljana. <http://dk.fdv.uni-lj.si/diplomska/pdfs/Umek-Neza.PDF> [2 January 2014]
- Žagar, Igor Ž. & Mirijam Milharčič Hladnik. 1995. "Temeljna izhodišča za odpravo seksistične rabe jezika [Basic starting point for the elimination of sexist language use]." In *Neseksistična raba jezika* [Nonsexist language use], eds. Vera Kozmik & Jasna Jeram. Ljubljana: Vlada Republika Slovenije, Urad za Žensko Politico, 7–18.
- Zupanc, Paula. 2009. "Nesimetrije izraza spolov v slovenskem jeziku in v govorih [Asymmetries of expression of gender in the Slovenian language and in speech]." *Dialogi* 45(11–12): 123–135.

THAI

The linguistic representation of gender in Thai

Korakoch Attaviriyapanap

Silpakorn University, Nakhon Pathom, Thailand

1. Introduction
2. Categories of gender
 - 2.1 Lexical gender
 - 2.2 Referential gender
 - 2.3 Social gender
 - 2.4 Male and female generics
3. Gender-related structures
 - 3.1 Derivation
 - 3.2 Compounding
 - 3.3 Pronominalization
 - 3.4 Coordination
4. Usage of personal reference forms
 - 4.1 Personal pronouns
 - 4.2 Address terms
 - 4.3 Occupational terms
 - 4.4 Personal names
5. Particles and interjections
6. The linguistic representation of the third gender
7. Conclusion

Notes

References

1. Introduction

Thai is the national language of Thailand. It is a member of the Tai subgroup of the Tai-Kadai language family, which also includes Lao, Shan and Zhuang (cf. Campbell & King 2011:718) in Southwest China, where the Tai languages are thought to have originated (cf. Comrie et al. 2003:62). “Thai” as described here refers to “Standard Thai” or the language used by the educated, middle-class

population in the central region of Thailand, particularly in Bangkok (cf. Iwasaki & Ingkaphirom 2005: 1). Although there are different regional dialects of Thai spoken in the north, northeast and the south of the country, the language of the central region has become the standard and is used for official purposes throughout the country.

In terms of phonological characteristics, the basic syllable structure in Thai is (C) (C) V^T (C). This means, the only obligatory element in a Thai syllable is a vowel with a tone. A vowel may be short, long or a diphthong. While all consonant phonemes can appear in initial position, only a limited number of initial consonant clusters and final consonants is allowed. As Thai is a tonal language, the meaning of each syllable is determined by the pitch with which it is pronounced. There are five phonologically contrasting tones: mid, low (˘), falling (ˆ), high (ˊ) and rising (ˇ), which can lead to five different meanings or more, as for example in *kha*: ‘to be stuck’, *khà*: ‘galingale’, *khâ*: ‘to kill, I, value’, *khá*: ‘to trade’, *khǎ*: ‘leg’. Some of these words may have homonyms with either the same or different spelling.

Thai is an SVO language. Modifiers always stand after the noun. A subject can never appear after a transitive verb. Since there are no case markers in Thai, a noun can function as subject, object or any other syntactic role without changing its form. Word order is the most important linguistic mechanism to determine the syntactic functions of constituents.

Another typological characteristic of Thai is that it is an isolating language. Originally, Thai words are monosyllabic. Polysyllabic words are foreign borrowings, particularly from the classical Indian languages Sanskrit and Pali. It is difficult to classify Thai words on morphological grounds into traditional word classes as is usually done for Indo-European languages. Some words have to be listed in two or more such categories according to the context in which they appear. In a recent research project on word classes, Thai words are divided according to the Lexicase Dependency Grammar into eight main parts of speech: verb, noun, adjective, adverb, preposition, quantifier, conjunction and particle (cf. Prasitrathasint 2010). According to this classification, it is remarkable that pronouns are not considered as a major part of speech at all. This can be explained by the overlapping forms and functions of nouns and pronouns in Thai. Since pronouns, especially personal pronouns, are gendered in many languages and also form a component of gender representation in Thai, they will be discussed in detail in this article (see Section 4.1). Among the particles, there are also some gender-specific and gender-preferential forms which are commonly referred to as “polite particles” in Thai. Another word class not mentioned in Prasitrathasint (2010), but which does contribute to the linguistic representation of gender in Thai, is interjections.

Thai does not show any grammatical agreement between different word classes. In other words, relationships between words are not determined by shared grammatical properties. Thai is a classifier language. Numerals cannot be combined directly with nouns but require the additional use of classifiers. There are different classifiers used for counting different types of entities, such as humans, animals, or inanimate objects. Various features such as social position and attitude of the speaker can play an important role in the choice of classifiers for human beings, which are very limited in number. Most classifiers are used for categorizing objects according to their shape (e.g. *phèn* ‘sheet’ for flat objects, as in *si:di: sǎŋ phèn*, lit. ‘CD’ + ‘two’ + ‘sheet.CL’ < ‘two CDs’).

The data discussed in this paper come from various sources, such as the linguistic literature, research papers, reference grammars as well as some websites. This is complemented by personal observations and consultations with several Thai colleagues, both linguists and non-linguists.

2. Categories of gender

2.1 Lexical gender

Like in most languages, certain subfields of the Thai lexicon are particularly likely to contain lexically gendered field members. Thai personal nouns such as *cha:j* ‘man’ or *jǐŋ* ‘woman’ and their variants, *phú:cha:j* ‘man’ and *phú:jǐŋ* ‘woman’, or loan words such as *ra:cha:* ‘king’ and *ra:chini:* ‘queen’, are gender-specific, since they carry the semantic property [male] or [female] in contrast to nouns such as *khon* ‘human being’ or *khru:* ‘teacher’, which are lexically gender-neutral. However, there is only a small number of lexically gendered nouns in Thai. Such nouns are also commonly used as parts of compounds to specify human referents as male or female (e.g. *nákrian-cha:j* lit. ‘pupil-man’ < ‘male pupil’; *nákrian-jǐŋ* lit. ‘pupil-woman’ < ‘female pupil’).

Lexical gender is an important parameter structuring Thai kinship terms. However, not all generations are equally affected, as shown in Table 1.

With only one exception (the word *lú:k-phí:-lú:k-nǎ:ŋ* ‘cousin’, which is a compound of *lú:k* ‘offspring’, *phí:* ‘older sibling’ and *nǎ:ŋ* ‘younger sibling’), all kinship terms listed in Table 1 consist of only one morpheme and are monosyllabic. Some of them are gender-specific.

In contrast to most Indo-European languages, in modern Thai there is no gender-neutral lexeme such as *parent* in English and *Eltern* ‘parents’ in German. To express this meaning, the word *phâ:* ‘father’ and *mê:* ‘mother’ are combined to *phâ:-mê:*, forming a copulative compound. Since this form always denotes two

Table 1. Thai kinship terms

Generation	Kinship terms			
3rd generation above speaker	<i>thúat</i> 'great-grandfather'/'great-grandmother'			
2nd generation above speaker	<i>pù:</i> 'grandfather' ('father's father', 'father's uncle')	<i>jâ:</i> 'grandmother' ('father's mother', 'father's aunt')	<i>ta:</i> 'grandfather' ('mother's father', 'mother's uncle')	<i>ja:j</i> 'grandmother' ('mother's mother', 'mother's aunt')
1st generation above speaker	<i>phô:</i> 'father' <i>luη</i> 'uncle' ('father's elder brother/male cousin')	<i>pâ:</i> 'aunt' ('father's elder sister/female cousin')	<i>mê:</i> 'mother' <i>luη</i> 'uncle' ('mother's elder brother/male cousin')	<i>pâ:</i> 'aunt' ('mother's elder sister/female cousin')
	<i>ʔa:</i> 'uncle/aunt' ('father's younger sibling/cousin')		<i>ná:</i> 'uncle/aunt' ('mother's younger sibling/cousin')	
speaker's generation	<i>phî:</i> 'older sibling' <i>nó:η</i> 'younger sibling' <i>lú:k-phî:-lú:k-nó:η</i> 'cousin'			
1st generation below speaker	<i>lú:k</i> 'child, offspring' <i>lă:n</i> 'nephew/niece'			
2nd generation below speaker	<i>lă:n</i> 'grandchild'			
3rd generation below speaker	<i>lě:n</i> 'great-grandchild'			

persons and is neither gender-specific nor gender-indefinite, it is not listed in Table 1. There are no gender-specific kinship terms from the speaker's generation downwards. It is thus remarkable that there are no basic gender-specific forms for one's siblings and children like *brother*, *sister*, *son* and *daughter* in many European languages. A few gendered forms, which are considered highly formal, can be found in the written language, mostly in literary works dating from earlier periods or in stories depicting royalty, but they do no longer belong to the common kinship terms used in modern Thai. In everyday use, they may appear only as names of Thai people (e.g. *chê:thă:* 'elder brother' is used as a male name, while *kaníthă:* 'younger sister' is a female name).

It is notable that the kinship categories of the two generations above the speaker are much more complex than in most European languages in terms of gender and the distinction between paternal or maternal kinship relations, which plays an important role in Thai society. The most specific distinctions are made in the parental generation, where the parent's older siblings are differentiated

by gender, while the differentiation between paternal or maternal kin relation is more important than gender when specifying the parent's younger siblings.

Table 1 also points out that seniority plays a greater role in Thai than in most European languages or cultures. Lexical gender applies only to the older generations. From the speaker's generation downwards, there is not a single gender-specific term. If gender needs to be specified, a compound must be formed (see Section 3.2). Besides, there are no specific terms for non-direct blood relations. While there are more specific terms like English *nephew* and *niece* in many Western cultures, the gender-neutral kinship term *lā:n* in Thai has a broader meaning covering *grandchild*, *nephew* and *niece*.

In the formation of gender-specific compounds, a difference between the older and younger generation can be observed. For compound nouns denoting the generation of the grandparents, gender as well as blood relation are specified. The same pattern is found in the great-grandparents' generation, for which the following forms are used:

- (1) *phù:-thúat*
lit. 'father's father' + 'great grandparent'; 'father's grandfather'
- jâ:-thúat*
lit. 'father's mother' + 'great grandparent'; 'father's grandmother'
- ta:-thúat*
lit. 'mother's father' + 'great grandparent'; 'mother's grandfather'
- ja:j-thúat*
lit. 'mother's mother' + 'great grandparent'; 'mother's grandmother'

By contrast, for the speaker's and the younger generations, *cha:j* 'man' or *sǎ:w* 'young woman' can generally be added to specify the gender of the referent.

This pattern is also found for forms denoting people who have become one's relatives through marriage. In general, either the word *khÿ:j* 'husband of one's relatives', mostly interpreted as 'son-in-law', or *sapháj* 'wife of one's relatives', mostly interpreted as 'daughter-in-law', is added to the kinship terms, such as in *ná-khÿ:j* 'husband of the mother's younger sister' and *ná:sapháj* 'wife of the mother's younger brother'. Remarkably, this pair of words is not used to refer to father-in-law and mother-in-law, for whom there is another set of compounds:

- (2) *phô:-ta* lit. 'father' + 'mother's father'; 'wife's father'
- mê:-ja:j* lit. 'mother' + 'mother's mother'; 'wife's mother'
- phô:-phúa* lit. 'father' + 'husband'; 'husband's father'
- mê:-phúa* lit. 'mother' + 'husband'; 'husband's mother'

2.2 Referential gender

Female-specific, male-specific and gender-indefinite reference is achieved in Thai through several linguistic mechanisms, such as compounding (Section 3.2), the use of particles and interjections (Section 5) as well as the usage of personal pronouns (Section 4.1), especially in self-reference. In informal contexts, there may be some complications in the choice of personal reference forms, especially with regard to the third gender. This aspect will be discussed separately in Section 6.

2.3 Social gender

As far as social gender is concerned, one can find gender bias in some lexically gender-neutral personal reference forms and pronouns. For example, one's nickname and the self-referential personal pronoun *chǎn* 'I' are gender-indefinite, but without any usage context these forms may be taken to refer to a female rather than a male speaker (Sections 4.1 and 4.4). Occupational terms and some address forms, though gender-indefinite, are also strongly gender-biased. Stereotypical gender assumptions may thus lead to different frequencies of female- and male-specific adjectival modification or in the formation of female and male compounds for some occupational terms (e.g. *thahǎ:n* 'soldier' and *phaja:ba:n* 'nurse').¹ Socially gendered person reference forms will be further discussed in the section on occupational terms (Section 4.3).

2.4 Male and female generics

Since most Thai personal nouns are gender-neutral, male or female generics are quite rare. However, there are some special cases, in which male forms are also used to refer to both males and females, for example, the word *sè:thǐ*, which means 'male millionaire' (see examples 3 and 4). However, if a specific female millionaire is referred to, the derived female form *sè:thǐ:-ni*: 'female millionaire' has to be used instead, as shown in (5):

- (3) *na:j dít sè:thǐ: màj húacaj n̂:k na:*
 Mr Deed millionaire new heart outside field
 'Mr Deed, New Millionaire with a Heart of a Country Man'
 (Thai translation of the film title "Mr Deed, New Country Millionaire")
- (4) *sè:thǐ: camnuan mà:k khâwrûam kro:ŋka:n ní:*
 millionaire amount a lot participate project this
 'A lot of millionaires participate in this project'

- (5) *khon-rá:j* *bùk* *pi:n* *bâ:n* *sè:thĩ:-ni:* *kla:ŋ* *amphy:*
 human-bad invade climb house millionaire-female middle district
 ‘Criminal(s) invaded the house of a female millionaire in the middle of the district.’

Derived female nouns (see Section 3.1) are very rare in Thai and only seldom used. Moreover, if they are in active use, they are used only in female-specific contexts, while the unmarked base forms can be used for female, male and generic reference. If there is no need to emphasize the femaleness of a referent, the use of *sè:thĩ:-ni:* may sound strange, although acceptable. A similar case is the word pair *bùt* ‘son, child’ and *bùtri:* ‘daughter’. In official contexts, the term *bùt* is used instead of *lú:k* ‘child’ (see Table 1). It was originally male-specific but has now largely become gender-indifferent. Its female counterpart *bùtri:* is not in daily use anymore but can still be found in literary texts or as a person’s name.

3. Gender-related structures

3.1 Derivation

Some Thai personal nouns can be gender-specified through derivation. There are a few pairs of lexically gendered nouns, mostly loan words from the grammatical gender languages Pali and Sanskrit. The female forms are typically derived from male forms (except for the symmetrical pair *the:-wáʔ* ‘male angel’, *the:-wi:* ‘female angel’) and end with the vowel [i:].

- | | |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| (6) <i>ra:cha:</i> ‘king’ | <i>ra:chi-ni:</i> ‘queen’ |
| <i>píksù</i> ‘monk’ | <i>píksù-ni:</i> ‘female monk’ |
| <i>sè:thĩ:</i> ‘male millionaire’ | <i>sè:thĩ:-ni:</i> ‘female millionaire’ |
| <i>the:-wáʔ</i> ‘male angel’ | <i>the:-wi:</i> ‘female angel’ |

Derived female nouns are mostly used in the written language, especially in traditional Thai literature. The process of derivation to specify femaleness is no longer productive.

3.2 Compounding

Thai personal nouns are typically lexically gender-neutral, and male or female specification is usually achieved by compounding. With regard to personal and animal terms, gender is indicated only where necessary, by adding a lexically gendered noun.

For animals, the compound *tua-phû*: lit. ‘body-male’ is added for male reference and the compound *tua-mia* lit. ‘body-wife’ for female reference. In the case of human nouns, mostly the word *cha:j* ‘man’ is added to refer to a male person, while the word *jîŋ* ‘woman’ is used to refer to a female person:

- (7) *wua-tua-phû*: lit. ‘cattle’ + ‘body’ + ‘male’ < ‘ox’
wua-tua-mia lit. ‘cattle’ + ‘body’ + ‘wife’ < ‘cow’
náksùksă:-cha:j lit. ‘student’ + ‘man’ < ‘male student’
náksùksă:-jîŋ lit. ‘student’ + ‘woman’ < ‘female student’

However, with human nouns, gender-specific compounds can also be formed using other lexically gendered nouns, as illustrated in Table 2. Moreover, the form added can stand either before or after the base noun it modifies.

Table 2. Gender-specific Thai compounds

Base	Male noun	Compound	Female noun	Compound
<i>náksùksă:</i> ‘student’	<i>cha:j</i> ‘man’	<i>náksùksă:-cha:j</i> ‘male student’	<i>jîŋ</i> ‘woman’	<i>náksùksă:-jîŋ</i> ‘female student’
<i>khru:</i> ‘teacher’	<i>nùm</i> ‘young man’	<i>khru:-nùm</i> ‘young male teacher’	<i>să:w</i> ‘young woman’	<i>khru:-să:w</i> ‘young female teacher’
<i>mâ:j</i> ‘widowed person’	<i>phô:</i> ‘father’	<i>phô:-mâ:j</i> ‘widower’	<i>mê:</i> ‘mother’	<i>mê:-mâ:j</i> ‘widow’
<i>bè:p</i> ‘model’	<i>na:j</i> ‘Mr’, ‘master’	<i>na:j-bè:p</i> ‘male model’	<i>na:ŋ</i> ‘Mrs’, ‘woman’	<i>na:ŋ-bè:p</i> ‘female model’
<i>sùphâ:p</i> ‘polite’	<i>bùrùt</i> ‘man’	<i>sùphâ:p-bùrùt</i> ‘gentleman’	<i>satri:</i> ‘woman’	<i>sùphâ:p-satri:</i> ‘lady’

The noun *mê*: ‘mother’ is also used as an element in many compounds that emphasize the importance of females in the realm of animate beings and gods. There are a number of goddesses in Thai culture, such as *mê:-pho:sòp* (lit. ‘mother-rice’) ‘goddess of rice’ and *phrá-mê:-thorani:* (lit. ‘god-mother-earth’) ‘goddess of earth’, to name but a few. The compound *mê:-já:-na:ŋ* (lit. ‘mother’-father’s mother-woman’) ‘goddess protecting a vehicle’ even contains three female nouns. Such formations highlight matriarchal elements in Thai culture.

3.3 Pronominalization

Gender-specific pronominalization does not occur in Thai. To refer to animals, the use of pronouns is mostly limited to the pronoun *man*, which can be translated as *it* in English. When affectionately talking to pets, speakers may also apply the human pronominal forms.

With regard to human reference, Thai has a complex pronominal system, especially for self-reference. There are more personal pronouns than in most other languages. Age, social status, gender, the relationship between interactants, the formality of the situation, and individual personality all play a part in helping Thai speakers to choose the most appropriate form to refer to him- or herself, or to address and refer to other persons (Smyth 2002: 39). Therefore, this aspect will be discussed separately in Section 4.

3.4 Coordination

When referring to a mixed-sex group of people in Thai, gender-neutral forms are preferred to combinations of a male- and a female-specific compound. As a consequence, expressions such as English *ladies and gentlemen* or German *liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen* ‘dear female and male colleagues’ do not occur in Thai. When addressing a mixed-sex audience, a gender-neutral construction like *thân-phû:-mi:-kiat* ‘distinguished guests’ (lit. ‘you-polite’ + ‘human’ + ‘to have’ + ‘honour’) is normally used.

Female and male specification within the same phrase occurs rarely in Thai. When emphasis is to be placed on the fact that both males and females are concerned, and both nouns are conjoined within a noun phrase, the order male form before female form is the more frequent structure. However, there has never been a discussion on the gender-asymmetry of such structures, and it is in general also acceptable to refer to males and females in the reverse order.

4. Usage of personal reference forms

4.1 Personal pronouns

A very important characteristic of personal pronouns in Thai is their extremely large inventory (Iwasaki & Ingkaphirom 2005: 49). Cooke (1968), for example, lists 27 first-person, 22 second-person and 8 third-person pronouns and uses the term “pronominal reference” for all forms functioning like personal pronouns

in Thai, since many of these forms are not “real” pronouns but common nouns which can be used in the same way as personal pronouns. Apart from personal pronouns, personal names, kinship terms, occupational terms and titles can also be used as pronominals in Thai. What should be highlighted is the fact that these forms can function deictically, no matter whether they are “real” personal pronouns or not. Moreover, they can be polyfunctional, as shown in the following example:

- (8) *Wan-ní khru: mâj saba:j nàž.*
 day-this teacher NEG well PRT
 ‘I am/you are/he or she (the teacher) is not well today.’

The word *khru*: ‘teacher’ in (8) can refer to the speaker, an addressee or a third party, depending on the context. If a teacher says this to his or her students, the form must be translated as *I*. If a student or a colleague says this sentence to a teacher, the noun is functionally equivalent to a second person reference. The third variant is the prototypical use of a noun, i.e. to refer to someone who is not present, and thus can be translated as *he* or *she* (depending on referential gender). Nouns which can function as personal pronouns in Thai include kinship terms, occupational terms, titles, and personal first and nicknames.

Thai “real” personal pronouns, which can be divided into first-, second- and third-person forms (like in most other languages), are defined as words which substitute common nouns and names which refer to speaker, addressee or a third party, even though they may have been grammaticalized from lexical items with which they may still be homonymous.

While personal pronouns are normally categorized as a “closed class” (Schachter 1985: 4), the number of personal pronouns in Thai is not strictly limited as in most languages. Thai native speakers may always add more personal pronouns to their repertoire. New pronominal forms may, for example, be loan words from foreign languages or dialectal forms.² Therefore, there can be no complete list of Thai personal pronouns. In most Thai grammars (e.g. Iwasaki & Ingkaphirom 2005; Phanthumetha 2008; Thonglor 2002), textbooks (e.g. Smyth 2002) and Thai-related research (e.g. Cooke 1968; Palakornkul 1972), only the most frequently used or most relevant pronouns are listed.

When speaking to monks or royalty, still other complex sets of personal pronouns are used, which vary according to the rank of the individual. Gender specification can be found here in two aspects. Firstly, since all Buddhist monks are male, the term of self-reference (first-person pronoun) restricted to monks, *žà:tama*: ‘I’, is male-specific.³ Secondly, for speaking to royalty, there are two sets of first-person pronouns and sentence-final particles used either by male or female speakers. The forms used in communication with monks and royalty will

not be further discussed here, since they have a special status compared to personal pronouns used in the daily life of Thai native speakers.

One important characteristic of Thai personal pronouns is that they may not relate to only one specific person. Some of them are used in two functions, for example, the first and third person or the second and third person. However, unlike the common nouns used in the function of personal pronouns, none of the personal pronouns is used for all three grammatical persons. In most cases, the intended person can be identified only within a context:

(9) *Kháw ma: lé:w.*
I/he/she come already
'I am/he or she is already here.'

(10) *Thy: cà? ma: máj.*
you/he/she FUT come PRT
'Will you/he/she come?'

Whereas personal pronouns are normally presented in the order of their functions (first, second and third person), the gendering of Thai pronouns generally increases from the third-person to the first-person pronouns. For this reason, they will be discussed here in reverse order. All personal pronouns are number-indefinite and there are no real plural forms in Modern Thai. If more than one person is referred to, the forms *phúak* 'group' or *tháy-lǎ:j* 'various, numerous' (lit. 'all-many') will usually be added to denote the plural meaning.

Across languages, gendered personal pronouns are most commonly found in the third person singular (compare *he/she/it* in English, *er/sie/es* in German) and sometimes in the third person plural (as in French or Modern Greek). In Thai, most third-person pronouns are gender-neutral. Table 3 lists some frequently used Thai third-person pronouns with information on referential gender.

Table 3. Frequently used Thai third-person pronouns

	Referent		Status of speaker
	male	female	
<i>khǎw/khǎw</i>	✓	(✓)	superior, equal, (inferior) ⁴
<i>thy:</i>	(✓)	✓	superior, equal, inferior
<i>lǎn</i>		✓	superior, equal
<i>man</i>	✓	✓	superior, equal
<i>ke:</i>	✓	✓	superior, equal
<i>thân</i>	✓	✓	inferior
<i>khun-thân</i>	✓	✓	inferior

In contrast to English, where gender is an important factor in the choice of third-person pronouns, gender specification is not that important in Thai when referring to persons who are neither the speaker nor the addressee. Even though the above list may not be complete, the number of third-person pronouns is obviously smaller than that of the first- and second-person pronouns, as will be shown below.

The only gender-specific third-person pronoun is *lòn*, which is restricted to female reference. However, it is not common to use this third-person pronoun in everyday conversations. It is mostly found in written texts, especially in literary language. In its written form, the pronoun *khǎw* tends to be interpreted as referring to a male person, especially if used as a counterpart to a female-specific form, as seen in the following sentence:

- (11) *Khǎw sǎnja: cà? plù:k bà:n hâj lòn.*
 3.PERS promise FUT plant house give 3.PERS.female
 ‘He promises to build her a house.’

In colloquial conversation, *khǎw* is mostly pronounced with a high tone as *kháw*. By contrast, speakers using the variant *khǎw* may be described as people who speak with a regional accent. The variant *kháw* can be used to refer to both males and females, while *khǎw*, which is more frequently used in the written language, tends to be interpreted as male as explained above.

When referring to a superior in an informal context, it is impossible to refer to him or her with the gender-neutral personal pronoun *kɛ:*. If that person has a much higher status, is in a higher position, much older, or highly honoured by the speaker, the term *thân* is more appropriate. In some households, servants may refer to their master by adding the form *khun*, a polite address term which is also used as a second-person pronoun in Thai. This results in the form *khun-thân*, which expresses the higher status of the referent. Since status sometimes plays a more important role than gender, the pronoun *thy:*, which is originally female-specific and more polite than *lòn*, may also be applied to males who are of much higher status, for example when servants refer to their master who is an aristocrat or has royal ancestry.

While most of the third-person pronouns listed in Table 3 also have homonyms which function as first- or second-person pronouns, the personal pronoun *man* functions exclusively as a third-person pronoun. It can only be used in informal situations. Since it is the same pronoun that is also used to refer to animals, it is usually considered unrefined and is sometimes used to refer to people in a derogatory or intimate fashion (Smyth 2002: 43). Thus, this pronoun is an impolite form and should be avoided, especially when the speaker has a lower status than

the person referred to. However, intimacy also plays an important role. Among close friends, the use of this pronoun may not be considered impolite at all.

While some languages possess only one gender-neutral second-person pronoun (e.g. *you* in English) and others have a politeness-related T/V-distinction (e.g. *du/Sie* in German), there are many more second-person pronouns in Thai, some of which are gender-specific. Table 4 shows the most frequently used forms. Some of them are homonymous with third- or first-person pronouns.

Table 4. Frequently used second-person pronouns in Thai

Form	Person addressed		Status of speaker
	male	female	
<i>raw</i>	✓	✓	superior
<i>lɔ̀n</i>		✓	superior, equal
<i>thy:</i>	✓	✓	superior, equal
<i>na:j</i>	✓		superior, equal
<i>zeŋ</i>	✓	(✓)	superior, equal
<i>ke:</i>	✓	✓	superior, equal
<i>lu:</i>	✓	(✓)	superior, equal, (inferior)
<i>ju:</i>	✓	✓	superior, equal, (inferior)
<i>muŋ</i>	✓	✓	superior, equal
<i>tua</i>	✓	✓	equal
<i>tuaʔe:ŋ</i>	✓	✓	equal
<i>nǔ:</i>	(✓)	✓	superior
<i>khun</i>	✓	✓	superior, equal, inferior
<i>thân</i>	✓	✓	inferior
<i>khun-thân</i>	✓	✓	inferior

The pronoun *raw* was originally a first-person plural pronoun. However, nowadays, the functional range of this form is much wider and it can be used as a singular first- or second-person pronoun. Mostly, this personal pronoun is used for talking with a younger person or a person of lower status or rank. For example, a teacher may say the following sentence to his/her student:

- (12) *Raw khí:kiat jà:ŋ ní: dǎaw kɔ̀: sɔ̀:p tòk rɔ̀k.*
 2.PERS lazy like this moment subsequently exam fall PRT
 ‘If you are lazy like this, you will fail the exam.’

The second-person pronoun *lɔ̀n*, which also functions as a third-person singular pronoun, is the only female-specific second-person pronoun. The form is encountered only rarely, mostly in writing and in informal contexts when speaking with very close female friends. Male speakers seldom use this pronoun. They may

use *thy:* instead when addressing or talking to female friends. This second-person pronoun is never used among male speakers. In an informal conversation, male speakers will use *na:j* instead as a half-polite form to talk with other male friends. This form is gender-specific, since it is not used to address women.

Another informal pronoun which is also widely used by male speakers is *ɛeŋ*. It is more impolite than *na:j* and not normally used to address a female, unless she is of lower status. Thus, this pronoun can also be regarded as gender-biased. Another characteristic of *ɛeŋ* is that it is more widely used by people living in more rural areas or by persons of lower social classes.

The form *ke:* is a second-person intimate pronoun which is used when speaking to (male and female) people with equal or lower status. However, it is more frequently used among females. It functions almost like the female-biased *thy:*, but is less polite.

The pronoun *luú:* is a loanword from Chaozhou, a Chinese dialect spoken by most Chinese immigrants in Thailand. In Thai society, this pronoun is mainly used by male speakers, mostly among those who are of Chinese origin. It would be impolite to use *luú:* to address someone of a higher status. Another borrowed second-person pronoun is *ju:*, which is gender-neutral. Since it has been adopted from English, its usage is restricted to educated or urban people, and it is seldom used to address superiors.

The pronoun *muuŋ* is the oldest second-person pronoun still in active use. It was, and still is, lexically gender-neutral, but there were times when it had male connotations. Although *muuŋ* is the most informal and impolite second-person pronoun, the view that it has male connotations and that using this pronoun for female referents is impolite has changed substantially, since its usage is much wider than 20 years ago. At school or on a university campus, this form can be heard everywhere among young people.

The formally related pronouns *tua* and *tuaɛe:ŋ* represent cases of grammaticalization of noun to personal pronouns, their meaning being 'self'. Thus, it is remarkable that these forms are used to refer to an addressee. These pronouns are more recent than the other pronouns in Table 4 and are only used in special contexts, namely among intimates, most frequently among close female friends. They are affectionate terms and thus also commonly used by young couples, where *tuaɛe:ŋ* is often paired with *kháw:*

- (13) *Kháw sú: khanǒm ma: fâ:k tuaɛe:ŋ dùaj.*
 1.PERS buy sweets come deposit 2.PERS also
 'I have also bought some sweets for you.'

Without any context, (13) can be interpreted in three possible ways: A female speaks to her female friend; a female speaks to her boyfriend or husband; or a male speaks to his girlfriend or wife. Among male speakers, this sentence would not be used.

The personal pronoun *nǔ:* (lit. ‘rat’) also shows a gendered usage pattern. It is used when speaking to little children regardless of gender. However, superiors addressing a much younger (adult) female in an informal context may also use this form. It is not possible to address a male adult with this form. If the speaker knows the addressee by name, the name or nickname of that person is usually added (e.g. *nǔ:-riŋ* ‘rat’ + nickname).

In formal situations or when the speaker wants to be polite, gender does not affect the choice of second-person pronouns at all. The pronoun *khun* is the most neutral form among the polite second-person pronouns, since its referential potential ranges from strangers to intimates such as one’s spouse. The other two pronouns *thân* and *khun-thân* function in the same way as their homonyms of the third person, i.e. they are used to address an older person with higher social status, such as the master of the household (mostly in very traditional and rich families).

As for the pronouns of the third and second person, the usage of the most common first-person pronouns can be described according to social factors and the context in which they are used. With regard to gender, the first-person pronoun is more complex. According to Chirasombutti & Diller (1999: 115) the first-person pronominal usage in Thai shows a salient gender distinction and can thus be described as the expression of a “gendered self”. The most commonly used first-person pronouns are listed in Table 5.

The oldest and most traditional first-person pronoun in Thai is *ku:*. It is as old as the language itself, as documented by a stone inscription from around 750 years ago. The use of this pronoun shows intimacy and is incompatible with official contexts. It is most frequently used among close male friends. Although its use among females is regarded as rude and inappropriate, nowadays the use of this pronoun by females is increasing among the younger generation, just in the same way as the usage of its second-person counterpart *muŋ* (discussed above). The pronoun pair *ku:* and *muŋ* is, therefore, currently becoming gender-neutral again.

Sometimes, the form *ku:* may be replaced by *tu:*, especially when one is speaking to oneself. The form *tu:* used to be an inclusive first-person plural pronoun. In ancient Thai, there were many more personal pronouns, categorized by person (first, second, third), number (singular, dual, plural), and politeness. Today *tu:* has lost its original meaning and is used as a more polite substitute for *ku:*, for example in curses.

Table 5. Frequently used Thai first-person pronouns

Form	Speaker		Status of speaker
	male	female	
<i>ku:</i>	✓	✓	superior, equal
<i>tu:</i>	✓	✓	equal
<i>raw</i>	✓	✓	superior, equal
<i>ʔaj</i>	✓	✓	superior, equal
<i>khâphacâw</i>	✓	✓	superior, equal, inferior
<i>phôm</i>	✓		superior, equal, inferior
<i>kraphôm</i>	✓		inferior
<i>kan</i>	✓		equal
<i>dichán</i> ⁵		✓	superior, equal, (inferior)
<i>dían</i>		✓	superior, equal
<i>tuaʔe:ŋ</i>		✓	superior, equal, inferior
<i>khâ:</i>	✓	(✓)	superior, equal, inferior
<i>ʔúa</i>	✓	(✓)	superior, equal, (inferior)
<i>chán</i>	(✓)	✓	superior, equal, inferior
<i>kháw</i>	(✓)	✓	equal
<i>nũ:</i>	(✓)	✓	inferior

The pronouns *raw* and *aj* are both gender-neutral and used in informal contexts. They cannot be used when the speaker is of lower status or younger than the addressee. The form *raw* was originally a first-person plural pronoun and is therefore considered as impolite when speakers use it to refer to themselves in a conversation with superiors. Since plural pronouns are generally associated with higher status or power, it is impolite to use this personal pronoun when talking to people of a higher social status. The form *aj*, which is borrowed from the English personal pronoun *I*, is used likewise in modern Thai society, especially among educated urban speakers. It is paired with the second-person pronoun *ju:*.

The first person pronoun *khâphacâw* is neutral, both in terms of gender and speaker status. It is almost restricted to the written language, but may also be used in formal public speech. However, such use is becoming rare (Iwasaki & Ingkaphirom 2005: 50). As the members of the royal family often use this form when speaking, most Thai native speakers try to avoid it as a form of self-reference.

The other first-person pronouns listed in Table 5 can be divided into two groups: a gender-specific group (*phôm*, *kraphôm*, *kan*, *dichán*, *dían*, *tuaʔe:ŋ*) and a gender-preferential group (*chán*, *úa*, *kháw*, *nũ:*).

The male-specific pronoun *phôm* can be described as a default form, because it is the most general polite term used by male speakers in almost all contexts. It is

used when speaking to superiors or equals in formal settings and also to inferiors to show distance. However, it is scarcely used when speaking with little children. Using it among close friends who are all male may also sound odd and be interpreted as over-polite, though still acceptable. The pronoun *kraphǒm* is derived from *phǒm*. It is used exclusively by male speakers when addressing high-ranking (non-royal) individuals or in highly formal situations. It is also commonly used in public contexts in which formality or modesty is required, such as in a political speech. The pronoun *kan* is male-specific, since it is only used by male speakers talking to intimate male friends. However, this form seems outdated and is not used by the younger generation nowadays.

The female-specific pronoun *dichán* was originally used by royal and high-class male speakers, but has become restricted to female use since the beginning of the 20th century. However, while an adult male speaker may always use *phǒm* in daily life, since this form indexes no power or status distinction between the speaker and the hearer, the use of *dichán*, its female counterpart, is much more restricted. An essential difference is that *dichán* seems to be associated with a higher degree of formality and creates some social distance between the speaker and the addressee (Hunchamlong 1992 cited by Chirasombutti & Diller 1999: 116). Consequently, this pronoun is avoided in contexts that are not formal enough. As a result of avoidance strategies, it may be pronounced in a reduced form, causing the emergence of a few more female-specific variants which are not all included in Table 5 (e.g. *dían*, *ichán*, *hán* etc.). They are, however, not as formal as *dichán* and cannot replace the latter in highly formal contexts such as in a public speech. Chirasombutti and Diller (1999: 126) report that the use of *dichán* as a female self-reference form is gaining acceptance among urban professional women, but its usage is not yet as widespread as that of *phǒm* among professional men. The educational background and social position of female speakers also plays an important role in selecting this self-reference form, since these factors correlate with their opportunities to speak in public.

The personal pronoun *tuaʔe:ŋ* can be used as a first- and second-person pronoun (but not paired together). As a first-person pronoun, *tuaʔe:ŋ* is used by younger female speakers, mostly in statements or when giving short pieces of information about themselves. Its use is rare and thus a list containing this form as a first-person pronoun is scarcely found (e.g. in Iwasaki & Ingkaphirom 2005: 50). In contrast to the second-person form *tuaʔe:ŋ*, which is always stressed, the first-person form *tuaʔe:ŋ* is unstressed. It is obvious that the usage of this form is generally discussed more in terms of the second person. However, its use as a first-person pronoun can still be found, especially when female speakers do not feel comfortable with the form *dichán* because of its high formality.

The remaining first-person pronouns are used in contexts ranging from mid-level formality down to close intimacy. All of them can be used by both men and women. However, the contexts in which they are used and the emotional or communicative effects of each form may vary, depending on the gender of the speaker.

The pronoun *khâ*: is paired with the second-person pronoun *Ɂeŋ*. It is used mainly among close male friends as an informal pronoun. The form *chán* is the most frequently used form of personal reference for female speakers in informal contexts, such as in a conversation between friends, relatives or colleagues, mostly of the same age. It can therefore be paired with various second-person pronouns depending on gender, the addressee's status and the relationship between speaker and addressee (for example, *thy*:, *ke*:, *na:j* and other nouns used as pronouns such as kinship terms or nicknames). According to its written form, this pronoun must be pronounced as *chǎn*. However, in a conversation, this variant is produced more frequently by rural people. For the standard language, the high tone variant *chán* is more natural. Although *chán* can be used by both male and female speakers, this pronoun is female-biased, since its usage among male speakers is quite rare. In an urban context, *chán* is used only when speaking to persons of equal or lower status. The use of *chán* when speaking with superiors is only possible with highly familiar persons, such as among siblings or among Thai people living in more rural areas.

The first-person pronoun *úa* co-occurs with *lú:*. It is a loan word from the Chinese dialect Chaozhou. Like its second-person counterpart, it is not used when talking to superiors. The pronoun is male-biased, since it is only used for female reference by families of Chinese ancestry.

The form *kháw* is used as a female first-person pronoun and has emotional connotations (Iwasaki & Ingkaphirom 2005:50). It is a gender-biased personal pronoun, since male speakers will use this form only when speaking to their girlfriend or wife, while a female speaker may generally use it among close friends, no matter whether male or female. It mostly co-occurs with the second-person pronouns *tua* and *tuaɁeŋ*. Due to their emotional connotations, the use of *kháw* and *tuaɁe:ŋ* is restricted to young people.

As a first-person pronoun, *nǔ:* is commonly used by children and female adults as a self-reference form when speaking to superiors in informal contexts, for example, daughters to parents and older relatives, female students to teachers or female speakers to much older strangers. The use of this pronoun can be explained in terms of its lexical meaning 'rat', which reflects the speaker's lower status compared to the addressee. The use of *nǔ:* as a self-reference term by adult male speakers is rare. The form is mostly used by traditional Thai families

and does not occur with families of other ethnic backgrounds (Chirasombutti & Diller 1999: 128).

The use of one's nickname as a self-reference instead of *nǐ*: is also common in informal everyday conversation and is more frequent among female speakers (see Section 4.4). It is also possible to combine *nǐ*: with one's own nickname. However, this special form may usually only be used by children or when a female adult is talking to older relatives (if she has used this form since her childhood).

The mood or emotions of a speaker can also influence the use of personal reference forms in informal contexts. For example, otherwise impolite personal pronouns can be applied when the speaker is angry or wants to curse someone. On the website *jeban.com*, numerous forms were given in response to the question “Which self-reference and addressing terms do you use when talking with your boyfriend or girlfriend?”⁶ Here is an interesting response posted as an answer to this question:

normal contexts: *kháw* ‘I’ and *tuazə:n* ‘you’
 when having a small argument: *chán* ‘I’ and *ke*: ‘you’
 when joking: *râj:rúan* ‘I’ and *ri:rúan* ‘you’ (impolite address form + ‘fat’)
 when having a big argument: *ku*: ‘I’ and *mun* ‘you’
 (my translation, K.A.)

The diversity and complexity of personal reference forms in Thai, especially in the first person and in informal contexts, is a reason why Thai linguists are very interested in this topic, even though there are not many studies which directly look at gender as a factor. Normally, all Thai native speakers have their own repertoires of personal reference forms. How many variants a person uses in daily life cannot be specified, since it depends on the social life and family background of that particular person. In informal contexts, it is also possible that two persons may use different forms to speak to each other or switch to other pairs of first- and second-person pronouns, for example, when siblings and cousins are grown up, or when old friends meet again after a long period of not communicating with each other. While speaking to a mixed-sex group of people of various kinds of status, speakers may have to switch between different forms. This is a mechanism that affects female speakers more often.

In her study on the similarities and differences in the use of first-person pronouns among different occupational groups Loerlertyutitham (2010) found that the gender-specific first-person forms *phǒm* (m) and *dichán* (f) are used more frequently in the higher occupational classes. However, it is remarkable that for the middle class, the use of the male first-person pronoun is reduced from 87.5 percent in the upper class to 80 percent, while the use of the equivalent

female form *dichán* is reduced to a much lower percentage, namely from 80 percent to only 12.5 percent. The researcher does not discuss these figures in terms of gender. However, based on these results, it is quite clear that females do not use the formal, female-specific pronoun *dichán* as frequently as males use *phǒm*, its male-specific counterpart, and they seem to avoid this form if they do not belong to a higher social class.

In many contexts, especially in informal situations, Thai native speakers omit the subject of a sentence. This phenomenon is somewhat different from the omission of pronouns in pro-drop languages that show grammatical agreement. In these languages, subject pronouns can systematically be omitted because the verb forms carry the grammatical person information. As such agreement is not found in Thai, it is not always possible for Thai speakers to avoid subject pronouns. Rather, they are forced to choose an appropriate form for each communicative situation.

Female Thai speakers are typically confronted with a more complex set of selectional possibilities than men and self-reference selection can cause practical problems, anxiety or even communicative breakdown for them (Chirasombutti & Diller 1999: 132). The complex personal reference system can also be seen in a positive light, namely as an effective resource that allows for the expression of situational and emotive switches. The social group that benefits most from this linguistic complexity is the so-called “third gender” (see Section 6).

4.2 Address terms

In Thailand, people are generally called by their first names. To address or refer to someone in a polite way, for example in written correspondence or in an official speech, the form *khun*, which is also a polite second-person pronoun, is usually added in front of the first name of the addressee. In more informal contexts, a combination of *khun* and the addressee’s nickname is also possible. Another interesting address term in Thai is *khun-na:j* ‘madam’, which consists of the gender-neutral form *khun* ‘you’ and *na:j*, which means ‘Mr’ or ‘master’. This form, used either alone as a second-person pronoun or in combination with the addressee’s name, is used to refer to women, even though this compound does not contain a single female element.

The pronoun *thân* is mostly used as an address term in combination with certain titles or terms denoting high-status positions, such as *ʔàthíʔka:nbɔ̀di:* ‘rector’ or *ʔathíʔbɔ̀di:* ‘director general’, and less frequently with a name. This term of address can be applied, as a default, to everybody, even to an unknown person.

As opposed to the polite, gender-neutral forms *khun* and *thân*, the forms *ɔ̀áj* and *ɔ̀i:* are used to address someone in an impolite way or in an angry tone. The latter forms are originally designations used as abusive terms together with the name of a male (*ɔ̀áj*) or female (*ɔ̀i:*) person or animal and are, accordingly, (largely) male- and female-specific in their reference. The form *ɔ̀áj* may also occasionally be used for female referents. The term *ɔ̀i:* can be described as more impolite and more restricted in its use. Using this form to refer to a man is associated with a higher level of impoliteness. In most contexts, this is not possible at all, unless the referent is a feminine male (cf. Section 6). In this case, *ɔ̀i:* is even more frequently used than *ɔ̀áj*.

Another pair of address terms is *na:j* ‘Mr, master’ and *na:ŋ* ‘Mrs, woman’, which can be used in combination with a male or female first name respectively. These two forms, however, can either be official and neutral, or unofficial and impolite. In official contexts, the terms are used in the same manner as *Mr* and *Mrs* in English, and there is also a third form *na:ŋ-sǎ:w* ‘Miss’ (lit. ‘woman’ + ‘young woman’), which is used for unmarried women. These three address terms are neutral with respect to (im)politeness and are conventionally used, especially in official contexts. In an unofficial situation, it is rather impolite to address someone with *na:j* (m) or *na:ŋ* (f). The difference between the male-specific variants *na:j* and *ɔ̀áj* is that *na:j* is not as impolite as *ɔ̀áj*, but its usage is restricted to male addressees. A variant of the impolite female address form *na:ŋ* is pronounced with a short vowel as *naŋ*. The impolite female address terms *ɔ̀i:*, *na:ŋ* and *naŋ* are regarded as more impolite than their male-specific counterparts.

As personal reference forms, kinship terms can be combined with the name of the speaker, the addressee or a third person. This phenomenon is also found in other languages (cf. *Uncle John* in English). However, another important characteristic in the usage of Thai kinship terms is that they can also be used to address people whom the speaker does not know well or even strangers. It is also remarkable that in such a case the kinship terms of the mother’s (as opposed to the father’s) relatives, are more widely used. An unknown old man or woman may be addressed as *ta:* ‘father of one’s mother’ or *ja:j* ‘mother of one’s mother’ respectively, not as *pù:* ‘father of one’s father’ or *já:* ‘mother of one’s father’. Likewise, it is more common to use *ná:* ‘mother’s younger sibling’ than *ɔ̀a:* ‘father’s younger sibling’ to address an unknown person who might be as old as a younger brother or sister of one’s parents. This phenomenon again represents evidence for certain matriarchal aspects in Thai society.

4.3 Occupational terms

In Thai, kinship terms and some occupational terms can also be used as personal pronouns in first-, second- or third-person function. However, their number is limited. The most widely used occupational terms used as pronouns are *khru:* ‘teacher’ and *mǎ:* ‘doctor’. Both of them are lexically gender-neutral.

Some occupational terms are strongly socially male or female. Without any further specification such as the name of the person or a context which provides information on the gender of the referent, this person could be male or female according to the stereotypical associations of that occupation. For example, when the terms *thahǎ:n* ‘soldier’ or *tamrùat* ‘police officer’ are used without a clear context, the referent will automatically be perceived as male, while the noun *phaja:ba:n* ‘nurse’ is more likely to be perceived as female.

The lexeme *phaja:ba:n* ‘nurse’ actually has two meanings: (1) a person educated and trained to take care of the sick or disabled (gender-neutral), and (2) a woman employed to take care of a child (gender-specific). The meaning of this occupational term has widened to become gender-neutral, though still socially female. The following two examples illustrate the use of socially gendered personal nouns (here by a male speaker):

- (14) *Phǐ:* *phǎm* *pen thahǎ:n.*
 older sibling 1.PERS.male be soldier
 ‘My older sibling is a soldier.’
- (15) *Phǐ:* *phǎm* *pen phajaba:n.*
 older sibling 1.PERS.male be nurse
 ‘My older sibling is a nurse.’

Without further specification, sentence (14) will normally be understood as ‘my elder brother is a soldier’, and sentence (15) as ‘my elder sister is a nurse’, even though an interpretation as ‘my elder sister is a soldier’ and ‘my elder brother is a nurse’ is possible. If clear gender disambiguation is required, a lexically gendered component needs to be added to these socially gendered occupational terms. However, gender specification through compounding varies in frequency. For example, *bùrùt-phaja:ba:n* ‘male nurse’ (lit. ‘man-nurse’) and *thahǎ:n-jǐj* ‘female soldier’ (lit. ‘soldier-woman’) are more frequent than *phaja:ba:n-jǐj* ‘female nurse’ (lit. ‘nurse-woman’) and *thahǎ:n-cha:j* ‘male soldier’ (lit. ‘soldier-man’), i.e. gender specification occurs more often when social gender needs to be overcome. By contrast, in a given context a male nurse will use the male-specific forms to refer to himself, whereas a female soldier will use the gender-neutral form, which is socially male, as shown in the following examples:

- (16) *Phôm pen bûrût-phaja:ba:n khráp.*
 1.PERS.male be male nurse PRT.male
 ‘I am a male nurse’
- (17) *Khanà:t dichán pen phû:jǐn dichán*
 even though 1.PERS.female be woman 1.PERS.female
jan jà:k pen thahǎ:n lý:j.
 still want be soldier PRT
 ‘Even though I am a woman, I still want to be a soldier.’

A compound occupational term may consist of both female and male components. The compound noun *bûrût-prajsani*: ‘postman’, for example, is lexically male, since it consists of *bûrût* ‘man’ and *prajsani*: ‘mail, post office’. In Thai culture, women used to work only inside the post office and were not expected or even allowed to work outside and deliver mail to households. Even today, this job is still considered to be too hard and too risky for women. The word *jǐn* ‘woman, female’ must be added if female referential gender is to be made explicit, as in this news headline:

- (18) *Mâ:p ra:ŋwan bûrût-prajsani:-jǐn lèk.*
 give award man-post-woman steel
 ‘A strong female postman was awarded.’

The compound *bûrût-prajsani:-jǐn* in (18) contains both a male and a female element: *bûrût* ‘man’ and *jǐn* ‘woman’.

4.4 Personal names

Most Thai people have three names: a family name, a first name and a nickname. Thai family names are mostly long and never used alone. Only in very formal situations or when two individuals with the same first name have to be identified will the family name be added. In formal situations, the first name is used together with a polite address form (as discussed in Section 4.2).

In most cultures, first names can be considered as a resource for the linguistic representation of gender, since they usually indicate whether a person is male or female. This phenomenon can also be found in Thai. What is special in Thai culture is that first names are usually chosen in consultation with a monk or other people knowledgeable in the elaborate vocabulary of Sanskrit and Pali (Iwasaki & Ingkaphirom 2005: 56). The name selection is usually based on the astrological configuration of the new-born child.

All Thais have at least one name referred to as a nickname, basically an informal given name. Nicknames can be given by parents, relatives, or close friends.

They are usually monosyllabic, but may contain up to four syllables (Charunrochana 2009: 36). They can either be shortened forms of (formal) first names or totally independent forms. They can denote certain characteristics, numbers, colours, animals, inanimate objects, or be onomatopoeically motivated (e.g. *lĕk* 'small', *sĕaj* 'beautiful', *nĭn* 'one', *dĕ:n* 'red', *kĭat* 'bottle', *chĕ:n* 'elephant', *ĭ:t* 'pig's grunt'). Foreign words, characters, and names have also become popular (e.g. *Ice*, *Ink*, *Champ*, *A*, *Jinny*, *Jack*). Thai nicknames have a wider meaning range and thus can denote more gender-indefinite characteristics than first names. According to a study on Thai nicknames, however, there are many more female nicknames denoting plants, love and happiness, while more male nicknames denote knowledge and ability (Charunrochana 2009: 84).

In contrast to European languages, Thai first names, especially nicknames, are commonly used in the same function as personal pronouns. Like kinship and occupational terms, they can be used as first-, second-, or third-person pronouns. Their usage is gendered in the sense that it is more common for female speakers to use their nickname for self-reference, as equivalent to the male-specific form *phĕm* (used in less formal contexts when speaking to a hearer of higher status). The use of nicknames can be compared to that of the form *nĭ:* (lit. 'mouse'), which is usually used by children or female speakers. Although adult men nowadays use nicknames for self reference, too (Chirasombutti & Diller 1999: 132), the use of a nickname instead of *phĕm* among male speakers is less frequent, compared to its use by female speakers.

5. Particles and interjections

In Thai, there are two other parts of speech which may be gender-specific: final particles and interjections. Since they do not belong to the personal reference forms, they are described separately in this section.

There are different kinds of particles in Thai. Phanthumetha (2008: 116) divides them up into three subgroups: modal particles, question particles and status particles. Sometimes, they may be termed differently, for example mood particles, question particles and polite particles respectively, as found in Smyth (2002: 126–137). The last group is a special category of particles which is related to gender. Since these particles are added at the end of an utterance to show respect to the addressee, they can be defined syntactically as sentence-final particles and socially as polite or status-related particles.

The choice of final particles in Thai depends on two important factors: firstly, the formality of the context, and secondly, the gender of the speaker. In terms of politeness and formality, these particles also index the age, status and attitude of

Table 6. Thai final particles

Context	Used by male speakers only	Used by female speakers only	Used by both male and female speakers
formal / polite	<i>khráp</i> <i>khráp-phǒm</i> (‘PRT-1.PERS.male’)	<i>khá?</i> <i>khâ?</i> <i>khâ:</i>	
informal / polite	<i>há?</i> (stressed)	<i>há?</i> (unstressed) <i>hâ?</i>	<i>câ:</i> <i>cá?</i> <i>câ?</i> <i>câ:</i>
informal / impolite		<i>já?</i> <i>jâ?</i>	<i>wá?</i> <i>wâ?</i> <i>wó:j</i>

the speaker towards the person(s) addressed. The most frequently used particles are listed in Table 6 (cf. Phanthumetha 2008: 137; Smyth 2002: 128).

The most common male-specific particle that is used to express politeness at the end of statements or questions is *khráp*. Particles used only by women are *khâ?* (at the end of statements) and *khá?* (at the end of questions). *Khráp* and *khá?* can also be used as vocative markers added to an addressee’s name when calling him or her or when responding to a call. To express more politeness, male speakers may use the gender-specific final particle *khráp-phǒm*. Neither *khráp-phǒm* nor *khâ?* is used as a vocative marker.

Another interesting phenomenon is the use of *há?* and *hâ?*. The first form is used by male speakers as an informal substitute for *khráp*, while the second is used by female speakers as an informal substitute for *khâ?*. The variant with the falling tone, *hâ?*, is female-specific. Females also sometimes use the unstressed particle *há?*. Both *há?* and *hâ?* are also used by small children in general (Phanthumetha 2008: 137). However, while the use of *há?* among male speakers can still be heard on an everyday basis, the use of *há?* and *hâ?* among female speakers is quite rare. Nowadays *hâ?* seems to be reserved for feminine males. The particles *cá?* and *câ?* are used by both male and female speakers, mostly when talking to women to show intimacy or kindness. They can still be classified as polite particles, and thus can be used in conversations with older persons or persons of higher status, but in this case, the context must be informal. Even though *cá?*, *câ?*, *câ:* and *câ:* are not gender-specific, they are more frequently used among female speakers and do not occur in all-male conversations.

By contrast, *já?*, *jâ?*, *wá?*, *wâ?* and *wó:j* are classified as impolite or informal particles. They are used to index rudeness, anger and aggressiveness. The final particles *já?* and *jâ?* are similar to *wá?* and *wâ?*, but they are restricted in usage to

female speakers, while *wó:j* is more common in male speech but can also be used by females. The level of impoliteness also correlates with the intimacy between the interactants. If they are good friends, the final particles listed in the second row of Table 6 are not considered impolite.

The gender of the addressee can also cause the use of other gender-specific pronouns, especially when one is talking to children. When speaking with girls, male speakers may use the (otherwise female) particles *kháʔ* and *khâʔ*. Likewise, female speakers may use the (otherwise male) particle *kháp* when speaking to little boys.

Interjections are used to express emotions in Thai. Apart from describing the different functions and meanings of each group of interjections, Thai grammars generally declare some of them to be gender-specific because they are restricted to female speakers. For example, *ʔúj*, *tá:j*, *ʔújta:j*, *tá:jta:j* are used to express surprise by female speakers (cf. e.g. Phanthumetha 2008: 140). Notably, these forms are mostly pitched with a high tone.

6. The linguistic representation of the third gender

A description of linguistic gender representation in Thai is incomplete if the language use of the third gender is neglected. The term “third gender” refers to the Thai identity category known as *krathy:j*. The word originally denoted a person who exhibits hermaphroditic or intersex features or shows behavioral patterns considered inappropriate for his or her sex. Such people have long been called *phê:t-thî:-sǎ:m* ‘third sex’ in both popular and academic discourse. Historically, three main gender categories were recognized in Thai public discourse: normatively masculine men, normatively feminine women and the intermediate category *kathoej* (with Buddhist monks belonging to a fourth category called *samaná-phê:t* ‘priesthood’, which is classified as asexual).

Over time, various terms have been used to classify different groups of homosexual people, some of which are English-based (although they may not always be used in the same manner in native English). Well established categories are, for example, *súua-baj* ‘bisexual man’ (lit. ‘tiger-bi’), *ke:-khin* ‘masculine homosexual man’ (lit. ‘gay-king’), *ke:-kwi:n* ‘feminine partner of a homosexual man’ (lit. ‘gay-queen’), *krathy:j sǎ:w* ‘feminine partner of a homosexual man’ (lit. ‘hermaphrodite-young woman’), *thəm* ‘masculine female homosexual’ (abbreviated form of *tomboy*) and *dî:* ‘feminine partner of a masculine female tomboy’ (abbreviated form of *lady*). The term *kathy:j* has also lost its broad meaning covering all kinds of hermaphrodites and refers nowadays rather to transsexual males and transgender or feminine males.

Apart from the interesting genealogy of contemporary Thai terms denoting gender and sexual categories, as described in detail by Jackson (2004), the language use of the “third gender”, especially the use of personal reference forms by the group of “feminine males”, shows interesting phenomena.

As outlined in Section 4, all personal reference forms in Thai can be divided into three groups:

gender-neutral forms	(e.g. <i>raw</i> ‘you’, <i>ɹaj</i> ‘I’, <i>khâ:phacâw</i> ‘I’)
gender-specific forms	(e.g. <i>phǒm</i> ‘I.male’, <i>dichán</i> ‘I.female’, <i>lǝn</i> ‘she, you, female’)
socially gendered forms	(e.g. socially female: <i>chán</i> ‘I’, <i>nǝ:</i> ‘I’, <i>tuaʔe:ŋ</i> ‘you’, <i>kháw</i> ‘I’)

The choice of the right personal pronoun is influenced by gender, no matter whether directly by the speaker’s own gender or indirectly by the gender of the person one is talking or referring to. The socially gendered forms may be called “pseudo-gender-neutral” (Attaviriyānupap 2004: 12). This group of forms allows members of the third gender (mainly feminine males), to broaden their repertoire of first- and second-person reference forms in informal contexts. Among themselves, feminine males may use the female-specific forms *chán* ‘I’ as well as the pair *kháw* ‘I’ and *tuaʔe:ŋ* ‘you’, or the female-specific pronoun *lǝn* ‘you, she’ when addressing each other or referring to female friends. They also tend to use female-preferential final particles like *cáʔ*, *cáʔ*, *cá:* and *cǎ:* more frequently than non-feminine men. The frequent use of the female-specific particles *hàʔ* and *há:* as well as *jáʔ* and *já:* in informal contexts seems to be a typical characteristic of the third gender’s linguistic practices. In certain contexts, the use of the self-reference term *nǝ:* among feminine male students can increasingly be heard, often when they cross-dress.

The Thai language may be considered complex and problematic for female speakers, especially in terms of first-person pronoun choice. On the other hand, it offers Thai feminine males the freedom to choose female forms which suit their identities better, at least in informal conversations. An example can be found in a study by Attaviriyānupap (2004), in which the use of first-person references of seven characters (one man, one woman and five feminine males) in a Thai film was analyzed. There were 11 forms in total used by the feminine males. The most frequently used forms were *chán* (among friends) and *nǝ:* (when speaking to a coach), both of which are socially female. The study shows that the use of personal reference forms depends not only on the biological femaleness or the maleness of the speakers, but also on their social gender identities. (For other studies on the language use of Thai feminine males, see, for example, Kongtrakool 1996 and Soontornchai 2011.)

In fact, a development in the opposite direction, i.e. female speakers' use of male-specific personal reference forms also occurs. However, among masculine females, regular use of the term *phǒm*, even among close friends, is rarely heard. The more frequently used form is *ku:*, which is nowadays not male-biased any longer, as discussed in Section 4.1. Since more female- than male-biased forms exist and the language use of masculine females in Thailand is not as conspicuous as that of feminine males, it has not been studied to the same extent.

To study the linguistic representation of the third gender among Thai native speakers, various corpora have been analyzed in previous research. For example, Kongtrakool (1996) studied the influence of gender on the use of first-person pronouns and polite particles by students. For the purposes of a questionnaire study, the student informants were divided into three groups: males, females and feminine males. It was found that the three groups used different pronouns and particles. Feminine males used gender-indifferent pronouns and particles when speaking to parents or intimates with greater frequency than when talking to teachers or non-intimates.

Winter (2003, 2008) found that some male-to-female transgender individuals started using the female first-person pronouns *chán* and *dichán* very early and were, therefore, perceived as rather feminine. In a study of 190 *kathy:j*, Winter found that some respondents had started using the female pronouns almost as soon as they could talk. In other words the use of female linguistic forms constitutes one of the earliest forms of cross-gender expression for this social group.

In Soontornchai's (2011) study of self-address forms in monologues, the data were divided into four groups: male speakers, female speakers, feminine male speakers, and masculine female speakers. The analysis of the data from monologues in informal situations found that speakers of all groups mostly avoided self-address terms. A first-person pronoun that was used by all groups was the gender-neutral form *raw*. The first-person pronoun *phǒm* occurred only in male speakers' monologues. The first-person pronoun *chán* and certain kinship terms were used both by female speakers and feminine male speakers, while masculine female speakers used the first-person pronouns *ku:*, *kháw* and their nicknames instead. The results therefore illustrate that feminine male speakers have greater freedom in choosing terms for self-reference (including forms associated with females) than masculine female speakers, who cannot select self-address forms associated with males.

7. Conclusion

A discussion of the representation of gender in the Thai language involves many aspects. Gender is only one of several social dimensions influencing the language use of Thai native speakers. Focusing on personal reference forms, one finds that the use of self-reference forms among female speakers is a quite complex business.

It is remarkable that in the most formal and most impolite contexts, gender-specification is straightforward. This can be observed in the use of gender-specific pronouns, address terms and final particles or in the use of gender-specific compound nouns in the news media. By contrast, in informal everyday contexts, Thai native speakers, and especially women, have more personal reference forms to choose from. However, this can also be regarded as a disadvantage for female speakers. In each situation, females are forced to take many aspects into account before choosing the most appropriate form. An inappropriate choice can have negative effects. For example, the use of the female-specific first-person form *dichán* can occasionally be regarded as arrogant when used in a conversation with senior colleagues, especially among female speakers.

The empirical study of Loerlertyutitham (2010) discussed earlier shows that a young female who is new in a high-ranking position may find it hard to use the formal female-specific form *dichán* in self-reference. The case of Yingluck Shinawatra, Thailand's first female prime minister, is a telling example in this respect. Her inappropriate choice of personal reference forms was at length discussed in the news media, because she identified herself with her nickname *pu*: in a public speech, and not with the expected formal female-specific pronoun *dichán*. She was accused by some people of mixing up private life with state affairs, or in other words, the status of a normal citizen and woman with that of a government's leader.

When discussing gender issues in Thai, it is essential to include the linguistic representation of the third gender, or, to be more precise, of feminine males. While Thai females may face difficulties in choosing the right forms of self-reference both in formal and informal contexts, feminine males enjoy the freedom to express themselves in any way they prefer, at least in informal contexts. They have a much wider repertoire of gender-related forms at their disposal, since they can use both male- and female-specific terms, besides the neutral ones.

Sociolinguistics, and more specifically the field of language and gender, is a fertile area of research in Thai linguistics. As a grammatically genderless language, Thai provides many possibilities for gender-neutral and/or gender-indefinite expression. However, this does not mean that in terms of language system and usage, Thai women and men are treated equally. Gendered linguistic asymmetries are commonly found in Thai and can be increased by the social context.

Notes

1. The Thai forms *cha:j* ‘male’ and *jij* ‘female’ can function as both adjectives and nouns, just like the English forms *male* and *female*. However, their status as adjectives is not as clear as in English, where syntactic position and inflections help identify the part of speech of these forms, e.g. *male soldiers* (adjective) vs. *among males* (noun). As there is no morphological marking and attributes always follow the nouns they modify, it is difficult to decide whether *thahǎn-jij* lit. ‘soldier-female’, for example, is a compound consisting of two nouns or a noun phrase consisting of a noun and its adjectival modification.
2. Jiapong’s (2011) study compares personal pronoun systems in Central, Southern, Northern, and North-Eastern Thai dialects, analyzing the social and cultural factors reflected in such forms. The results show that the Central Thai dialect has the largest number of personal pronoun forms. These can be used with a larger range of socially relevant meanings than the pronouns in other dialects.
3. Monks may also use other self-reference forms, for example, when they communicate with each other, with their relatives, or with children. The form *ɔ̀:tama*: is the term monks use officially as a self-reference form when talking to laypeople.
4. Usages and meanings that are given in brackets in Tables 3 to 5 occur only rarely. The status information in these tables either refers to a person’s official social status (for example, as high-ranking official, teacher, etc.) or to the speaker’s feeling about the relationship with the person spoken to or mentioned (for example, acquaintances or friends).
5. In its written form, this pronoun must be pronounced with a low tone on the first and a rising tone on the second syllable (*dìtchǎn*). However, in spoken use it is pronounced *dichán*, with a normal and a high tone, respectively.
6. In fact, there are no gender-specific Thai forms that are equivalent to English *boyfriend* and *girlfriend*. The form used in this forum was the gender-neutral noun *fɛ:n*, a loan word from English *fan*. The synonymous Thai form *khú:-rák* (lit. ‘pair-love’) is rarely used.

References

- Attaviriyanupap, Korakoch. 2004. “Wie ‘Haar’ zu ‘Maus’ wird: Geschlechtsbezogene pronominale Referenz im Thailändischen.” *Linguistik online* 21(4): 3–22.
- Campbell, George L. & Gareth King. 2011. *The Routledge concise compendium of the world’s languages*. 2nd edition. London: Routledge.
- Charunrochana, Jaranvilai. 2009. *Pha:sa: lé: phá:psathǎn khǎ:ŋ watthanátham cà:k chúlèn khǎ:ŋ khonthaj* [Language and reflection of culture in Thai nicknames]. <http://pirun.ku.ac.th/~fhumjvc/papers/nickname.pdf> [18 August 2014].
- Chirasombutti, Voravudhi & Anthony Diller. 1999. “Who am ‘I’ in Thai? The Thai first person: Self-reference or gendered self?” In *Genders and sexualities in modern Thailand*, eds. Peter A. Jackson & Nerida M. Cook. Chiang Mai: Silkworm Books, 114–133.
- Comrie, Bernard & Stephen Matthews & Maria Polinsky, eds. 2003. *The atlas of languages. The origin and development of languages throughout the world*. Revised edition. New York: Facts On File Inc.

- Cooke, Joseph R. 1968. *Pronominal reference in Thai, Burmese and Vietnamese*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Hunchamlong, Yuphaphann. 1992. "Some observations on *phom* and *dichan*, male and female first-person pronouns in Thai." In *Papers on Tai languages, linguistics and literatures in honour of William J. Gedney on his 77th birthday*, eds. Carol J. Compton & John F. Hartmann. DeKalb, IL: Northern Illinois University, Center for Southeast Asian Studies, 186–204.
- Iwasaki, Shoichi & Preeya Ingkaphirom. 2005. *A reference grammar of Thai*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jackson, Peter A. 2004. "Gay adaptation, tom-dee resistance, and kathoey indifference: Thailand's gender/sex minorities and the episodic allure of queer English." In *Speaking in queer tongues. Globalization and gay language*, eds. William L. Leap & Tom Boellstorff. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 202–230.
- Jiapong, Suchada. 2011. "Sǎnkhom lé? wathanátham cà:k ka:ncháj khambùrùtsàphana:m ka:n:sùksǎ: Priaphthiáp khambùrùtsàphana:m thaj sì: thìn [Society and culture through the use of personal pronouns: A comparison of four Thai regional dialects]." *Journal of Humanities. Naraesuan University* 8(3): 66–89.
- Kongtrakool, Sompittaya. 1996. *Sex differentiation in the use of first person personal pronouns and polite final particles by Chulalongkorn University Arts students*. Unpublished M.A. thesis, Chulalongkorn University.
- Loerlertyutitham, Panadda. 2010. "Occupational classes and first-person pronominals." In *Proceedings of the pan-dialectal grammar of Thai symposium on diversity of languages in Thai society, standard Thai, Thai regional and social dialects: Issues and new discoveries*, eds. Amara Prasithrathsint & Sorabud Rungrojsuwan & Sarawanee Sankaburanurak. Chiang Rai: Chorb Karnphim, 235–247.
- Palakornkul, Angkab. 1972. *A socio-linguistic study of pronominal strategy in spoken Bangkok Thai*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Texas at Austin.
- Phanthumetha, Nawawan. 2008. *Wajjak:nthaj* [Thai Grammar]. Bangkok: Academic Publications Project, Faculty of Arts, Chulalongkorn University.
- Prasithrathsint, Amara. 2010. "Lǎksámkhan naj ka:n:camnê:k chanít khǝ:ŋ kham naj pha:sǎ:thaj [Main principles of word classification in Thai]." In *Proceedings of the pan-dialectal grammar of Thai symposium on diversity of languages in Thai society, standard Thai, Thai regional and social dialects: Issues and new discoveries*, eds. Amara Prasithrathsint & Sorabud Rungrojsuwan & Sarawanee Sankaburanurak. Chiang Rai: Chorb Karnphim, 428–444.
- Schachter, Paul. 1985. "Parts-of-speech systems." In *Language typology and syntactic description, Vol. 1: Clause structure*, ed. Timothy Shopen. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 3–61.
- Smyth, David. 2002. *Thai. An essential grammar*. London: Routledge.
- Soontornchai, Aporn. 2011. "Khamthe:n tua phù:phù:t naj bòtphù:tdiaw khǝ:ŋ phù:phù:t tàt phê:t [Self-address terms in monologues of speakers from different genders]." Paper presented at the *National Conference of Sripatum University 2011*, Bangkok.
- Thonglor, Kamchai. 2002. *Lǎkpha:sǎ:thaj* [Principles of the Thai language]. Bangkok: Ruamsarn.
- Winter, Sam. 2003. *Language and identity in transgender: Gender wars and the case of Thai kathoey*. Research and discussion paper presented at the Hawaii Conference on Social Science. http://www.transgenderasia.org/paper_language_and_identity.htm [18 August 2014]
- Winter, Sam. 2008. "Language and identity in transgender: Gender wars, anatomania, and the Thai kathoey." In *Problematizing identity. Everyday struggles in languages, culture, and education*, ed. Angel M. Y. Lin. New York: Routledge, 119–153.

Notes on contributors

Arua E. Arua, born in Ibadan, Nigeria. He received his doctoral degree in English Language from Obafemi Awolowo University in Ile Ife, Nigeria. He is Associate Professor of English Linguistics at the Department of English at the University of Botswana, Gaborone. His main areas of research are: Applied linguistics, language and gender, literacy and reading, literary stylistics, and sociolinguistics.

- (2003) with Joanne Umolu & Timothy Oyetunji & Chukwuemka Eze Onukaogu, eds. *Reading for all in Africa: Building communities where literacy thrives*. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- (2004) "English in Botswana: Some syntactic and lexical features." *English World-Wide* 25(2): 255–272.
- (2009) with Akin Odebunmi & Sailal Arimi, eds. *Language, gender and politics*. Lagos: Centre for Black and African Arts and Civilisation.

Korakoch Attaviriyapap, born in Bangkok, Thailand. She received her doctoral degree in German Linguistics from the University of Bern, Switzerland. She is Associate Professor of German at the Department of German at Silpakorn University, Thailand. Her main areas of research are: Contrastive linguistics, language and gender, second language acquisition, and translation.

- (2011a) "Die Modalverben im Deutschen und ihre thailändischen Entsprechungen. Eine kontrastive Analyse." *Zeitschrift für Angewandte Linguistik* 55: 91–119.
- (2011b) "Der Gebrauch des Perfekts – Ein Erklärungsmodell aus thailändischer Perspektive." *Linguistik Online* 49(5): 47–60.
- (2014) "Kreatives Schreiben zwischen zwei Sprachen und Kulturen. Ein interkultureller Aspekt des DaF-Unterrichts im thailändischen Kontext." *Zeitschrift für Interkulturelle Germanistik* 5(1): 9–27.

Hadumod Bußmann, born in Frankfurt am Main, Germany. She received her doctoral degree in German Medieval Studies from the University of Munich, Germany. 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.

- (2005) with Renate Hof, eds. *Genus. Geschlechterforschung/Gender Studies in den Kultur- und Sozialwissenschaften*. Stuttgart: Kröner.
- (2008) *Lexikon der Sprachwissenschaft*. 4th ed. Stuttgart: Kröner. (English edition: *Routledge dictionary of language and linguistics*. London: Routledge, 1996).
- (2013) *“Ich habe mich vor nichts im Leben gefürchtet”*: Die ungewöhnliche Geschichte der Prinzessin Therese von Bayern. 5th ed. München: Beck.

Helen Christen, born in Sursee/Lucerne, Switzerland. She received her doctoral degree in German Linguistics from the University of Fribourg, Switzerland, where she is Professor of German Linguistics at the Department of Languages and Literatures. Her main areas of research are: Dialectology, language change, sociolinguistics, and folk linguistics.

- (1988) *Sprachliche Variation in der deutschsprachigen Schweiz. Dargestellt am Beispiel der l-Vokalisierung in der Gemeinde Knutwil und in der Stadt Luzern*. Stuttgart: Steiner.
- (1998) *Dialekt im Alltag. Eine empirische Untersuchung zur lokalen Komponente heutiger schweizerdeutscher Varietäten*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- (2010) with Manuela Guntern & Ingrid Hove & Marina Petkova. *Hochdeutsch in aller Munde. Eine empirische Untersuchung zur gesprochenen Standardsprache in der Deutschschweiz*. Stuttgart: Steiner.

Ursula Doleschal, born in Vienna, Austria. She received her doctoral degree in Slavic Linguistics from the University of Vienna, Austria. She is Professor of Slavic Linguistics at the Department of Slavonic Studies at the University of Klagenfurt, Austria. Her main areas of research are: Multilingualism, language and gender, and writing.

- (1992) *Movierung im Deutschen. Eine Darstellung der Bildung und Verwendung weiblicher Personenbezeichnungen*. München: LINCOM Europa.
- (2004) *Genus als grammatische und textlinguistische Kategorie. Eine kognitiv-funktionalistische Untersuchung des Russischen*. München: LINCOM Europa.
- (2013) with Carmen Mertlitsch & Markus Rheindorf & Karin Wetschanow, eds. *Writing across the curriculum at work*. Wien: LIT.

Daniel Elmiger, born in Lucerne, Switzerland. He received his doctoral degree in Linguistics from the University of Neuchâtel, Switzerland. He is Research and Teaching Associate at the University of Geneva, Switzerland. His main areas of research are: Language and gender, sociolinguistics, language learning and language teaching, and language policies.

- (2008) *La féminisation de la langue en français et en allemand. Querelle entre spécialistes et réception par le grand public*. Paris: Honoré Champion.
- (2010) with Anton Näf & Natacha Oudot Reynaud & Gabriela Steffen. *Die zweisprachige Maturität. Eine bildungspolitische Innovation in der Schweiz*. Bern: h.e.p.-Verlag.

- (2012) with Fabienne H. Baidier, eds. *Intersexion. Langues romanes, langues et genre*. München: Lincom.

Annette Endruschat, born in Leipzig, Germany. She received her doctoral degree in Portuguese Linguistics from the University of Leipzig, Germany. She is Professor of Romance Linguistics at the Department of Romance Studies at the University of Regensburg, Germany. Her main areas of research are: Language documentation, sociolinguistics, and Portuguese linguistics.

- (1990) *Studien zur portugiesischen Sprache in Angola unter besonderer Berücksichtigung lexikalischer und soziolinguistischer Aspekte*. Frankfurt am Main: TFM.
- (2007) *Durch 'mit' eingeleitete präpositionale Objekte in den romanischen Sprachen*. Bochum: Brockmeyer.
- (2014) with Jürgen Schmidt-Radefeldt. *Einführung in die portugiesische Sprachwissenschaft*. Tübingen: Narr.

Sabine Fiedler, born in Gorndorf, Germany. She received her doctoral degree in English Linguistics from the University of Leipzig, Germany. She is Professor of English Linguistics at the Institute of British Studies at the University of Leipzig, Germany. Her main areas of research are: Phraseology, interlinguistics/Esperanto studies, humour research, and lingua franca communication.

- (1999) *Plansprache und Phraseologie. Empirische Untersuchungen zu reproduziertem Sprachmaterial im Esperanto*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- (2007) *English Phraseology. A Coursebook*. Tübingen: Narr.
- (2014) *Gläserne Decke und Elefant im Raum – Phraseologische Anglizismen im Deutschen*. Berlin: Logos.

Geoffrey Haig, born near Exeter in England. He was awarded his PhD in General Linguistics from the University of Kiel, Germany, in 1997, and is currently chair of the Department of Linguistics at the Institute of Oriental Studies at the University of Bamberg, Germany. His research focuses on the languages of the Middle East, in particular Kurdish, and on language typology, areal linguistics, language documentation, and language change.

- (2001) "Linguistic diffusion in present-day East Anatolia: From top to bottom." In *Areal diffusion and genetic inheritance. Problems in comparative linguistics*, eds. Alexandra Aikhenvald & Robert M. W. Dixon. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 195–224.
- (2008) *Alignment change in Iranian languages. A construction grammar approach*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- (2011) with Stefan Schnell & Claudia Wegener & Nicole Nau, eds. *Documenting endangered languages. Achievements and perspectives*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

Cornelius Hasselblatt, born in Hildesheim, Germany. He received his doctoral degree in Finno-Ugric Linguistics from the University of Hamburg, Germany. He was Professor of Finno-Ugric Languages and Cultures at the University of Groningen, the Netherlands. His main areas of research are: Contact linguistics and Estonian language, literature and culture.

- (2006) *Geschichte der estnischen Literatur. Von den Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- (2008) *Grammatisches Wörterbuch des Estnischen*. 3rd edition. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- (2010) with Muriel Norde & Bob de Jonge, eds. *Language contact. New perspectives*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Marlis Hellinger, born in Pirna/Dresden, Germany. She received her doctoral degree in English Linguistics from the University of Hamburg, Germany. She was Professor of English Linguistics at the Universities of Marburg, Hannover, Bayreuth and Frankfurt am Main. Her main areas of research are: Contrastive linguistics, sociolinguistics, language and gender, and creole linguistics.

- (1990) *Kontrastive feministische Linguistik: Mechanismen sprachlicher Diskriminierung im Englischen und Deutschen*. München: Hueber.
- (1996) with Ulrich Ammon, eds. *Contrastive sociolinguistics*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- (2007) with Anne Pauwels, eds. *Handbook of language and communication: Diversity and change*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Benedicta Adokarley Lomotey, born in Accra, Ghana. She is a Spanish lecturer at the Department of Modern Languages at the University of Ghana. She is presently pursuing her doctoral degree in Spanish Linguistics at the Universidad Nacional de Educación a Distancia (UNED), Madrid. Her main areas of research are: Critical discourse analysis, sociolinguistics, and language and gender.

- (forthc.) "Language reform: A critical look at its chances of success in the Spanish context." *Gender and Language*.
- (forthc.) "On sexism in language and language change – The case of Peninsular Spanish." *Linguistik Online*.

Karin Michelson, born in Montréal, Canada. She received her doctoral degree in Linguistics from Harvard University, USA. She is Professor of Linguistics at the Department of Linguistics at the University at Buffalo, The State University of New York. Her research is focused on the Iroquoian languages, especially in the area of morphology, syntax and semantics of Oneida.

- (2002) with Mercy Doxtator. *Oneida-English/English-Oneida dictionary*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

- (2002) "Emotions in Oneida." *Pragmatics and Cognition* 10: 179–200.
- (2010) with Jean-Pierre Koenig. "Argument structure of Oneida kinship terms." *International Journal of American Linguistics* 76: 169–205.

Heiko Motschenbacher, born in Bamberg, Germany. He received his doctoral degree and *venia legendi* (Habilitation) in English Linguistics from the University of Frankfurt am Main and currently holds a temporary professorship of English Linguistics at the Technical University of Braunschweig. He is founder and co-editor of the *Journal of Language and Sexuality* (John Benjamins). His main areas of research are: Language, gender and sexuality, contrastive linguistics, critical discourse analysis, English as a lingua franca, and the linguistics of Europe.

- (2010) *Language, gender and sexual identity: Poststructuralist perspectives*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- (2012) *An interdisciplinary bibliography on language, gender and sexuality (2000–2011)*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- (2013) with Martin Stegu, eds. *Queer linguistic approaches to discourse* (special issue: *Discourse & Society* 24.5). London: Sage.

Ergin Öpengin, born in Hakkari, Turkey. He received his doctoral degree in General Linguistics from the University of Paris 3 – Sorbonne Nouvelle, France, and the University of Bamberg, Germany. He is a post-doctoral researcher at the University of Bamberg, Germany, conducting a research project funded by Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft. His main areas of research are: Morphosyntax of Kurdish and Iranian varieties, language documentation, and sociolinguistics.

- (2012a) "Sociolinguistic situation of Kurdish in Turkey: Sociopolitical factors and language use patterns." *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 217: 151–180.
- (2012b) "Adpositions and argument indexing in the Mukri variety of Central Kurdish: Focus on ditransitive constructions." *Orientalia Suecana* 61: 187–198.
- (forthc.) *The Mukri variety of Central Kurdish: Grammar, texts and lexicon*. Wiesbaden: Reichert.

Louise O. Vasvári, born in Budapest, Hungary. She received her doctoral degree in Romance Philology from the University of California, Berkeley. She is Professor Emerita of Cultural Analysis and Theory at Stony Brook University, N.Y. and currently teaches language and gender in the Linguistics Department at New York University. Her main areas of research are: Textual criticism, translation theory, and historical and contrastive sociolinguistics.

- (2006) "Queer theory and discourses of desire." *CLCWeb* 8(1): <http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/clcweb/vol8/iss1/2>

- (2008) "Cunningly lingual wives in European ballad tradition." In *Spain's multicultural legacies*, eds. Adrienne Martin & Cristina Martínez Carazo. Newark, DE: Juan de la Cuesta, 297–314.
- (2013) "Gendered hate speech and political discourses in recent U.S. elections and in post-socialist Hungary." *CLCWeb* 15(4): <http://dx.doi.org/10.7771/1481-4374.2303>

Marija Weikert, born in Korčula, Croatia. She received her M.A. degree in German, English and American as well as Slavic Studies from the University of Frankfurt am Main, Germany. At present, she is lecturer of Croatian at the University of Bamberg. She is also a literary translator, mainly from Dutch to Croatian; approximately twenty books translated by her have been published.

- (2011) "Kamo su otišle Juditine kćeri? Lik žene u djelima Petra Šegedina u usporedbi s hrvatskom književnom tradicijom [Where have Judith's daughters gone? Woman characters in the writings of Petar Šegedin in comparison with the Croatian literary tradition]." In *Dani Petra Šegedina, Zbornik III*, ed. Dubravko Jelčić. Korčula: Leksikografski zavod i Grad Korčula, 101–115.
- (2012) "Velegrad kao protagonist [Metropolis as protagonist]." In *Dani Petra Šegedina, Zbornik IV*, ed. Dubravko Jelčić. Zagreb: Leksikografski zavod i Grad Korčula, 81–93.
- (2013) "Stvaralaštvo na stranom jeziku: Vijfde Jaargetijde, posljednji roman Korčulanina Vinka Prizmića na nizozemskom [Creative writing in a foreign language: Vijfde Jaargetijde, Vinko Prizmić's last novel in Dutch]." In *Književno stvaralaštvo, jezik i kultura na otoku Korčuli*, ed. Dejan Durić. Rijeka: Filozofski fakultet, 177–182.

Subject index

- A**
- abusive term 86, 165–166, 189, 191–192, 267, 311, 323, 389 *see also* insult
- activism 59, 89, 212
- address term 3, 8, 15–16, 22, 34, 42, 51–52, 58, 85–86, 89, 91, 103, 109–111, 114–115, 118–119, 127, 137–140, 143, 155, 158–159, 161, 169, 182, 189–190, 205, 211, 213–216, 219, 230–231, 233–236, 240, 243, 250, 254, 262–263, 267–268, 274, 307–308, 312, 319–321, 331, 337, 341, 343–344, 356–364, 374, 376–377, 380–383, 385, 387–389, 391, 393, 395–397
- addressee 13, 57–58, 250, 263, 320, 341, 378, 380, 382–386, 388–389, 392–394
- adjective 13, 34–35, 50, 53, 57–58, 65–67, 69–71, 73–74, 76, 78, 81, 84, 87–89, 91, 100, 106, 114, 142, 154, 163–165, 168, 178, 180–182, 185, 196, 206, 209–210, 216, 251, 254, 266, 271–272, 304–306, 310, 315–317, 319, 323–324, 336, 340, 345, 347–350, 356, 370, 374, 398
- adverb 137, 154, 266, 370
- affix 53, 100, 106–107, 119, 181, 336 *see also* prefix, suffix
- Afrikaans* 37
- agency 30, 68, 87, 99–100, 118, 141, 164, 196, 264, 268, 274, 279–282, 284, 288–289, 291, 297, 299, 309, 316, 328, 336, 342, 355–356, 360, 375, 382
- agentive noun *see* noun
- agglutinating language 100, 204
- agreement 2–3, 5–7, 13–14, 21, 35, 38–40, 53, 55–57, 59–60, 66–79, 88–90, 103, 118, 178, 183, 185, 188, 239, 251, 255–256, 260–261, 272–273, 277, 285, 299, 305–310, 309, 315–321, 338, 340–341, 344, 349–352, 354, 362–363, 365, 371, 388 *see also* antecedent, pronominalization, satellite
- Akan* 154, 159, 165
- ambiguity 10, 20, 56, 60, 85, 91, 106, 129, 138, 145, 163–164, 183, 191, 212–213, 287, 290, 304, 316–318, 322, 390
- analytic language 67, 305, 317
- anaphora 7, 9, 11, 13–14, 34, 67–68, 70, 77, 254, 258, 260–261, 270, 273, 350 *see also* pronominalization
- androcentric generic 1, 7, 9, 14, 21, 27, 29, 58–60 *see also* masculine generic, male generic
- androcentricity 10, 18, 21, 28–29, 31, 37, 39, 42, 58–59, 81, 91, 208, 221, 229, 233, 238, 240, 312, 329–330, 341
- animacy 5–6, 51, 54, 65, 68, 179, 181, 252, 277–278, 280, 291, 296–299, 304, 306–307, 330, 336, 339–340, 364–365, 376 *see also* inanimacy
- animal noun *see* noun
- antecedent 7–8, 14–15, 66, 68–69, 73–75, 88–89, 138, 157, 251, 256, 258, 260–261, 268, 270, 310, 351 *see also* agreement
- appellation 30, 42, 213
- applied linguistics 17, 65–66, 70, 77, 83, 100, 106, 108, 111, 115, 138, 192–193, 210, 215, 259, 266, 270, 284, 380, 387–388
- Arabic* 5, 9, 11, 15–17, 132, 248, 267
- archaic 65, 70–71, 79, 87, 104, 106, 133, 185, 187, 190, 193, 205, 211, 216, 339
- article 7, 13, 50, 100, 178–179, 181, 192, 309–310, 365 *see also* determiner
- aspect 50, 278, 299, 304, 336
- assignment 3, 7, 21, 35, 53–55, 71, 91, 154, 161, 166–167, 177, 182, 192–193, 238, 249, 252–253, 259, 306–307, 317, 330–331
- asymmetry 2, 9–10, 12, 16, 18, 34, 51, 56, 62, 64, 78, 85–86, 118, 134–135, 138, 140–142, 146, 154, 157–159, 165, 206, 216, 228, 237, 253, 255, 267–268, 271, 323, 377, 397 *see also* bias, inequality
- attitude 2, 7, 13, 19, 31, 33, 36, 98–99, 116, 162, 183, 213, 269, 278, 298, 371, 392 *see also* ideology
- augmentation 65–66, 314
- B**
- Bantu* 6, 21
- Basque* 37
- Belizean Creole* 18
- Benue-Congo* 227
- bias 2, 10–11, 19–20, 28–29, 32–33, 34, 36, 39, 56, 129–130, 133, 136, 138–139, 145, 157–158, 161, 163, 166, 169, 187, 205, 207–208, 212, 220–222, 238, 254, 263, 265, 270–271, 273, 374, 382, 386, 396 *see also* asymmetry, discrimination, inequality, sexism

- bilingualism 33, 47, 98, 100, 103, 126, 154, 176, 194, 231, 261, 271, 278 *see also* foreign language
- binarism 8, 10, 17, 30–31, 36–39, 90, 167
- binomial *see* coordination
- biology 7, 40, 181–182, 192–193, 203, 240, 331, 395
- body 91, 161, 167, 169, 186, 238, 240, 268, 295, 324, 356 *see also* genital term
- borrowing 50, 54, 91, 99, 128, 131, 136, 164, 178, 185–186, 189, 206–207, 211, 264, 267, 325, 370, 382, 384 *see also* loanword
- Bosnian* 6–7, 41, 50, 63, 80, 85, 336 *see also* *Croatian*, *Montenegrin*, *Serbian*, *Serbo-Croatian*
- Brazilian Portuguese* 304, 309–310, 312, 314, 323, 326, 330–331
- Bulgarian* 50, 336
- C**
- case 7, 20, 50, 53–54, 64, 66, 68, 76–78, 86–87, 89, 91–92, 100, 134, 154–155, 164, 174–175, 178, 193, 204, 249–252, 254, 261, 264, 270, 304, 317, 336, 339–340, 350, 352, 364–365, 370, 393
- Catalan* 37
- chieftaincy 234–236, 243
- Chinese* 5, 17–18, 22, 108, 204, 382, 386
- classifier 4–5, 21, 37, 41, 228, 371
- clitic 51, 178, 179–180, 231
- codification 18, 80 *see also* standardization
- cognition 27, 30–34, 36, 38, 41, 77, 86–87, 154, 159, 237–238, 241, 267 *see also* metaphor, psycholinguistics
- collective noun *see* noun
- collocation 34–35, 60, 133, 159, 206, 208, 231, 233, 285, 309, 356, 386
- colloquial language 68, 131, 205, 321, 339, 343, 352, 365, 380 *see also* informality
- colonialism 157, 169, 304
- community of practice 20, 22, 209
- comparative approach *see* contrastive linguistics
- compounding 11–12, 61, 81, 119, 127, 129–130, 133–137, 139, 142, 145–146, 155, 157–159, 163–164, 168, 181, 187–191, 205, 208–213, 231–232, 237–239, 254–255, 259–260, 264, 315, 344–345, 348–349, 364, 371, 373–377, 388, 390–391, 397–398
- comprehension 3, 19, 33, 97
- conceptualization *see* cognition
- concord *see* agreement
- congruence *see* agreement
- conjunction 88, 370
- connotation 8, 12–13, 38, 51, 55, 58–59, 84, 86, 89, 133, 136, 143, 146, 158, 161–162, 166, 186, 189, 191, 193–194, 205–210, 253, 264, 266, 268, 323–324, 337, 339–340, 345, 382, 386 *see also* social gender
- contrastive linguistics 1–48, 51, 59, 73, 80, 91, 98, 109, 119, 140–141, 159, 176, 187, 203, 211, 221, 261–262, 267, 274, 283, 288, 298–299, 322, 325, 331, 349, 356, 360, 379, 386, 392, 398 *see also* typology
- controller *see* antecedent
- conversation 9, 18, 30, 53, 57, 60, 68, 88, 132, 183, 210, 241, 284, 286, 292, 295–298, 355, 361, 377, 380–382, 384–387, 393–398
- conversion 256, 345, 347
- coordination 2, 9, 13–15, 21, 34, 46, 53, 55, 74–76, 160, 233–234, 257, 262, 319–320, 354, 362, 377
- corpus 27, 31, 34–35, 41–42, 83, 85, 98, 113, 115, 118, 249, 255–256, 292, 294–295, 300, 310, 322, 330, 338–340, 347–348, 351, 353, 356–358, 396
- couple 3, 79, 87, 106, 137, 191, 215, 217, 382 *see also* marriage, partnership
- covert gender *see* social gender
- creole 4, 18
- Croatian* 6–7, 28, 37–38, 40–41, 49–95, 336, 344, 352, 365 *see also* *Bosnian*, *Montenegrin*, *Serbian*, *Serbo-Croatian*
- culture 2–3, 10–11, 16–17, 19–20, 31, 35, 41, 84, 98–99, 115–117, 143, 145, 154, 157, 159, 165–168, 205, 213, 221, 228, 230, 241–244, 269, 288, 330, 373, 391
- Czech* 5, 18, 36, 63, 339, 344
- D**
- Danish* 5, 17, 119
- declension 53–54, 64–66, 68, 71–74, 79–80, 90–91, 174, 339–340, 348, 364
- default gender *see* gender
- definiteness 50, 99, 178–179, 181, 204, 250–251, 273, 305, 340, 365
- deixis 68, 75–76, 378
- demonstrative pronoun *see* pronoun
- denotation 3, 9, 13, 39, 51–52, 54–56, 64–65, 68–69, 75–77, 86–89, 113, 127, 129–133, 138–139, 141, 146, 157–158, 164, 175, 182, 187, 205, 207–208, 210, 214, 217, 221, 229, 238, 252, 260, 263–264, 274, 283, 305–307, 315, 317, 320, 323, 336–338, 344, 360, 371, 373, 379, 388, 392, 394–395 *see also* lexical gender
- derivation 11–12, 39, 41, 53, 57, 59–66, 71, 79–81, 83–84, 87–89, 100, 103, 111, 113, 128, 131–133, 164, 177, 181–182, 184–188, 190–191, 193, 204–205, 209, 215, 229, 231–232, 249, 252, 255, 259–260, 266, 313–314, 320, 338, 345–348, 353, 357, 364, 374–375, 385 *see also* affix, prefix, suffix

- derogation 3, 8, 12, 30, 52, 57, 66, 71, 86, 139, 186, 165, 189, 191–192, 206–207, 243, 293, 323, 325–326, 338, 380
- determiner 304–305, 308, 316
see also article, demonstrative pronoun
- diachronic linguistics 3–4, 20–21, 34, 42, 204, 209, 248, 331, 339 *see also* language change
- dialect 50, 62, 71, 79–80, 92, 126–127, 133, 169, 174–176, 178–181, 184–189, 191–198, 228, 248–249, 251, 261, 267, 273–274, 320, 336, 339, 344, 370, 378, 380, 382, 386, 398 *see also* Swiss German
- dictionary 22, 100–101, 103, 113–114, 119, 130–132, 134–137, 139–144, 146, 162, 187, 208, 221, 230, 265–266, 326, 336, 340, 347, 355–356, 365
- differential gender *see* gender
- diglossia 174, 176, 195
- diminutive 55, 64–66, 79, 89, 133, 182, 185–187, 193, 206–207, 215–216, 272, 314, 338
- disambiguation *see* ambiguity
- discourse 3, 5, 13, 15–19, 22, 29–31, 34–35, 37–39, 41, 42, 46, 81, 90–91, 141, 269, 273, 355–356, 364, 394
- discrimination 3, 18, 80, 105, 107, 112, 169, 238, 312, 322, 326, 341, 356 *see also* bias, sexism
- dominance 17–18, 29, 36, 81, 244 *see also* power
- double-gender noun *see* noun
- Dravidian* 21
- Dutch* 6, 18, 32, 174
- Dyirbal* 3, 23
- E**
- Eastern Maroon Creole* 4, 12
- Edo* 228
- education 62, 82–83, 99–100, 103–104, 130–131, 139, 164, 176, 195, 209, 211, 215, 228, 243, 248, 252, 263, 274, 290, 292, 321, 326, 341–342, 346, 382, 384–385, 390
- endearment term 113, 155, 216, 263, 338 *see also* hypocoristic
- English* 4, 6–12, 14–18, 20–21, 32–36, 40, 42, 56, 68–69, 106, 108–110, 114–115, 118–119, 127, 129, 133, 137–138, 145, 154–156, 158, 161–162, 165, 168–169, 187, 189, 206, 208, 211, 213, 215–216, 220–221, 228–235, 240, 278, 289, 299, 315, 330, 371, 373, 377, 379–382, 384, 389, 394, 398
- epicene noun *see* noun
- Esperanto* 28, 37, 39, 97–123
- Estonian* 28, 37, 40–41, 125–151, 204
- ethnicity 3, 20, 99–100, 118, 153, 160, 169, 215, 238, 387
- ethnonym 61, 79, 132, 283, 298
- etymology 78–79, 127–128, 208, 273–274, 320, 331, 348
- euphemism 191, 211
- exclusion 20, 30, 33, 238, 241–243, 264
- F**
- false generic *see* androcentric generic, female generic, feminine generic, male generic, masculine generic
- family 58, 78, 106, 155, 157, 175, 188–191, 193, 205, 214–215, 220, 238, 243, 267–268, 293, 311, 320–321, 324, 331, 336, 373, 384, 386–387, 389, 391, 398 *see also* kinship term, motherhood
- female generic 9, 130, 231, 374–375
- feminine generic 33, 36–37, 46, 327
- feminine masculinity 38, 40, 389, 393–397
- feminine-indefinite 277–280, 283–295, 297–300
- feminine-zoic 277–279, 284–286, 288–289, 291–300
- femininity 98, 165
- feminism 16, 19, 29, 59, 65, 81, 88–89, 98, 107, 109, 115, 117–118, 126, 133, 142–143, 162, 183, 189, 194, 211–212, 221, 240, 321, 348
- feminization 29, 31, 56, 211–213, 219–221, 326, 345–346, 359–361, 365
- Finnish* 4, 6, 10, 17, 21–22, 33, 126–128, 131, 204, 208, 221, 228
- Finno-Ugric* 37, 126–128, 133, 204, 208, 220
- foreign language 103, 145–146, 335, 378
- formality 16–17, 58, 115, 195, 211, 216, 312, 320–321, 326, 330, 357, 372, 377, 383–386, 388, 391–393, 397
- French* 5–6, 9, 12–13, 15, 18, 21–22, 32–34, 36, 39, 100, 116, 118, 155, 174–175, 183, 187, 189, 194, 198, 208, 215, 308, 312, 315, 322, 343, 379
- G**
- Ga* 28, 37, 153–171
- gay male identities 66, 207, 394
see also homosexuality
- gender
- default gender 2, 19, 21, 23, 53, 66, 257, 260–261, 264, 290–291, 297, 300, 310, 320
- differential gender 182, 185, 187, 196, 348
- grammatical gender 2–16, 19–21, 27, 29–40, 50, 53–62, 64–92, 101, 127–128, 133, 136, 138, 145, 154–155, 177–188, 191–194, 196–197, 203–204, 206, 211, 220–222, 228, 248–265, 270–274, 277–280, 283–286, 288–291, 295–300, 304–315, 317, 319–324, 326–331, 336–365, 375 *see also* agreement, assignment
- lexical gender 2, 5–11, 13–14, 16, 27, 29–30, 32–34, 36, 38–39, 50–56, 58, 60–61, 64, 66, 69–74, 77, 79, 86, 90, 92, 99, 101–102, 127–130, 132–133, 136–138, 141–143, 155–159, 161–166, 168, 176–177, 181–182, 184,

- 187–188, 192, 194, 196, 203–212, 214, 219–221, 229–230, 235–236, 241, 243, 252–256, 264, 266, 271–273, 278–279, 283–285, 304–309, 312–313, 323–324, 326, 330, 336–340, 345, 348, 363–364, 371–376, 378, 382, 386, 390–391
- referential gender 6–10, 13–14, 19, 27, 30, 32, 38–40, 56–58, 66, 69, 72, 73, 75, 79, 85, 88, 90, 128–129, 136, 155–156, 164–165, 168, 182–183, 185, 187–188, 193, 196, 205–207, 248–249, 254–256, 264–265, 272–273, 278, 283, 285–287, 304–305, 307–311, 316–318, 320, 330, 338, 340–343, 348, 351, 357–358, 360, 374, 378–379, 391 *see also* generic reference, mixed-sex reference
- social gender 6, 10–11, 14, 27, 29, 33–34, 38–40, 51, 55–56, 61, 64, 71–72, 84, 118, 129–130, 136, 145–146, 159–161, 178, 187, 203–207, 209, 211–212, 219–221, 238, 254, 260, 264, 267–268, 278, 305, 340, 363–364, 374, 390, 395
- third gender 8, 40, 374, 388, 394–397
- gender coherence 35, 38–39, 41, 357
- gender conflict 14–15, 32, 34, 38, 58, 66, 71, 74–76, 79, 90, 92, 206, 220, 262, 308, 351
- gender crossing 21, 38–39, 42, 58–59, 86, 128, 165, 213, 395–396
- gender deconstruction 27, 30–31, 37–42, 46, 213
- gender equality 7, 18–20, 31, 33–34, 36, 39–40, 81–83, 88, 91, 107–109, 112, 116, 118, 133–134, 154, 183, 194–196, 198, 204, 219–221, 242, 268–269, 298, 323, 326–327, 347, 358–359, 362–363, 365, 397 *see also* symmetry
- gender inequality 16, 113, 133, 235 *see also* asymmetry, bias
- genderless language 20, 168, 203, 220–222, 397
- gender-neutrality 2, 7, 10–14, 20, 38–39, 51, 53, 55–57, 59–60, 64, 70–72, 90, 98, 101–111, 113–115, 118, 127–133, 136–138, 144–146, 156–164, 168–169, 180–185, 187–188, 196, 204–214, 219–222, 228–236, 238, 243, 263, 271, 308–309, 311–312, 316, 320, 326–329, 337–343, 358, 360–364, 371–375, 377, 379–384, 388–390, 395–398 *see also* epicene noun, generic reference, neutralization
- generic reference 2, 7, 9–10, 14, 19, 21, 27, 29, 31–33, 36–38, 53, 56–60, 72–73, 77, 81, 83, 87–90, 104, 130–132, 137, 140, 143–145, 157, 161–163, 175, 180, 183, 186, 192, 196, 205–206, 208–209, 213, 229–232, 234, 255, 257–258, 261, 264, 266, 270–271, 273, 277–279, 283, 287–291, 298, 300, 309–313, 317, 327–330, 337, 340, 342–343, 348, 357–364, 374–375
- generic feminine *see* feminine generic
- generic masculine *see* masculine generic
- genital term 165, 191, 216, 231, 242
- genre 16, 35, 117, 356, 358
- Georgian* 37
- German* 3, 5–10, 12–13, 15–16, 18, 21–22, 32–37, 39, 42, 59, 100, 103, 106, 116, 126, 129–132, 136–138, 142, 146, 173–201, 208, 213, 219–220, 249, 273, 371, 377, 379, 381
- Germanic* 7–8, 20, 37, 100, 126, 174, 315
- grammatical gender *see* gender
- Greek* 3, 6, 35, 113, 116, 136, 315, 379
- guidelines 18–19, 31, 36, 40, 42, 88–89, 98, 104, 106–109, 114–115, 119, 130, 143–146, 166, 195–198, 219–220, 269, 322, 326–329, 362–363
- ## H
- Hebrew* 6, 14, 19, 306
- heteronormativity 30–31, 42, 46–47, 87, 164
- heterosexuality 42, 133, 216
- Hindi* 6, 8
- historical linguistics *see* diachronic linguistics
- history 41, 50, 78–79, 81, 103, 107, 116, 118, 126, 130, 133, 135–136, 139, 142–143, 145, 169, 207, 209–210, 213, 215, 236–237, 324, 336, 344, 356, 360, 394
- homonymy 39, 65, 89, 188, 322, 352, 378, 381
- homosexuality 45, 87, 207, 213, 215, 394 *see also* gay male identities
- honorific 16, 212, 214, 216, 234–235, 243, 343, 358, 362
- Hungarian* 28, 37, 40, 109, 127, 203–225
- hybrid noun *see* noun
- hypocoristic 79, 91, 102, 113, 189, 216, 314 *see also* endearment term
- ## I
- Icelandic* 6, 15
- identity 3, 30, 85, 99, 128, 215–216, 230, 232, 238, 240, 287, 322, 342, 394–395
- ideology 126, 211, 213–214, 221, 269 *see also* attitude, discourse
- idiomatic expression 2, 8, 15–17, 97, 116, 140–141, 158, 164, 168, 217–218, 233, 244, 265–270, 273, 323–325 *see also* phraseology
- Ido* 99, 113, 118–119
- Igala* 232
- Igbo* 28, 37, 227–245
- impoliteness *see* politeness
- inanimacy 3, 14, 51, 54, 68–69, 74–75, 80, 104, 107, 113, 177, 191–192, 252, 261–262, 272,

- 277, 279–280, 291, 296–298,
300, 304, 307, 315, 322, 330,
336, 340, 364–365, 371, 392
see also animacy
- inclusion 81, 229, 257–258,
269, 271, 312–313, 327, 329, 353,
359–361
- indefinite pronoun *see* pronoun
- Indo-European* 5, 37, 39–40, 50,
100, 128, 174, 204, 221, 248,
336, 370–371
- Indonesian* 5, 12, 16
- inflection 7–8, 10–11, 13, 21, 35,
39, 50–51, 53–54, 64, 66–67,
71, 74, 76, 78–79, 89–91, 99–
100, 138, 156, 163, 175, 178–181,
188, 204, 231–232, 249, 252,
254–258, 260, 262–265, 270,
274, 299, 304, 308, 313, 315,
317, 320, 336, 345, 347–349,
355, 398 *see also* declension,
morphology, syncretism,
synthetic language
- informality 51–52, 58, 190,
211, 230, 314, 320, 345, 357,
361, 374, 380–384, 386–388,
391, 393, 395–397 *see also*
colloquial language
- Ingrian* 126
- insult 30, 145, 165–166, 191, 207,
218 *see also* abusive term
- interjection 338, 370, 374, 392,
394
- internet 88, 107, 114–116, 119,
136–137, 144, 176, 196, 208,
215, 220, 269, 310, 318, 331,
371, 387, 398
- interrogative pronoun *see*
pronoun
- Iranian* 7, 21, 37, 248, 250, 273
- Iroquoian* 9, 37, 277–279, 282,
288, 291, 299–300
- isolating language 100, 228, 370
- Italian* 6, 13, 17, 32–33, 36, 39,
174–175, 188, 195, 198, 343
- J**
- Japanese* 5, 9, 15, 17–18, 119, 204
- Javanese* 15–16
- job advertisement 81–83, 88,
220, 322, 358, 360, 364
- K**
- Karelian* 126
- Karitiāna* 36
- kinship term 7–8, 16, 39, 51–52,
101, 127, 155–157, 163, 189–191,
193, 205, 234–235, 253–254,
262, 273, 279–280, 283–285,
293, 295, 307, 337, 371–373,
378, 386, 389–390, 392, 396
see also family, motherhood
- Kurdish* 28, 37, 40–41, 247–276
- L**
- labelling 30, 66, 197, 228–230,
234–235, 240, 243, 344
- language acquisition 103, 335
see also language learning
- language change 18–19, 41, 64,
71, 79, 88–90, 142–145, 208,
219–221, 228, 243, 269–272,
326–329, 362–363, 382
see also diachronic linguistics,
neologism
- language family 9, 37, 50, 153,
227, 336, 369 *see also* typology
- language learning 100, 103–
104, 118, 232, 306, 335 *see also*
education
- language planning 16, 18, 91,
143, 146, 189, 194–197, 347
see also planned language
- language policy 21, 40–42, 50,
81, 143–144, 269, 274, 345 *see*
also national policies
- language reform 2, 14, 18–19,
29, 41, 88–90, 103, 107–116,
118–119, 131, 142–146, 154, 213,
219–221, 228, 243–244, 269,
326–329, 362–363
- Lao* 369
- Latin* 3, 100, 126, 154, 205–207,
211, 214, 282–283, 288, 299,
304, 315–316, 330–331, 343
- legislation 16, 22, 35, 79, 81–82,
108, 175, 198, 214–215, 220,
321, 358, 362–363
- lexical gender *see* gender
- lexicography *see* dictionary
- lexicology 4–5, 38–39, 51, 54,
61, 86, 100, 126, 134, 136,
143, 164, 177, 192, 205, 209,
229–230, 232, 243, 253–254,
256, 263, 265, 267, 270–273,
321–322, 371, 391
- linker 40, 249–252, 254–255,
257–258, 260–262, 264, 273
- Lithuanian* 3
- Livonian* 126, 204
- loanword 91, 116, 126, 128,
130–131, 133, 136–137, 158, 182,
185, 187, 189, 205, 207, 220,
255, 371, 375, 378, 382, 386, 398
see also borrowing
- Lude* 126
- Luxembourgish* 174
- M**
- Macedonian* 50, 336
- male generic 9–10, 19, 32,
60, 89, 104, 130–131, 137,
145, 157, 161–163, 208–209,
213, 229–231, 234, 266, 278,
283, 287–291, 374–375 *see*
also androcentric generic,
masculine generic
- markedness 8–10, 12, 22, 37,
53, 58, 61–62, 86, 106, 134,
138, 176, 194, 205, 209–210,
212, 228, 287, 291, 295, 310,
312–313, 331, 339, 345, 357 *see*
also normativity
- marriage 16, 51, 79, 86–87, 139,
141, 157–158, 169, 184, 189, 191,
206–207, 214–215, 217, 232–
233, 236, 238–241, 243, 262,
264, 267–268, 271, 273–274,
285–286, 324–325, 327, 331,
351, 356, 373 *see also* couple,
partnership
- masculine generic 1, 9–10, 21,
31–33, 38, 59, 88–89, 183–184,
257–258, 270–271, 273, 311–
313, 317, 327–330, 337, 343–345,
357–363 *see also* androcentric
generic, male generic
- masculinity 12, 119, 165–166,
216
- materialization 29, 46
- matriarchy 9, 376, 389
- media 18, 41, 79, 81, 176, 198,
228, 248, 269, 271–273, 344,

- 361, 397 *see also* internet,
newspaper, radio, television
- metalinguistic description
116, 118, 269, 272–273, 361
- metaphor 2, 3, 8, 15–16, 31, 85,
140, 191–192, 268, 307, 348
- methodology 28, 31–32, 42, 44,
46, 103
- migration 50, 125–126, 248,
273, 335, 382
- mixed-sex reference 55–58,
60, 77–78, 88, 128, 137, 183,
230, 255, 268, 313, 321, 329,
340–341, 343–344, 377, 387
- Montenegrin* 41, 50, 80 *see also*
Bosnian, Croatian, Serbian,
Serbo-Croatian
- mood 50, 304, 336, 387, 392
- morphology 3, 12, 21, 38–39,
53, 55, 59, 61–62, 64–65, 70–
73, 79–80, 83, 90–91, 98–103,
106–107, 111, 113, 119, 131–133,
135–136, 142, 146, 157–159,
177, 179, 182, 184–189, 194,
204, 206, 208, 210, 228, 231,
248–249, 251–253, 256, 259,
266, 272, 277–279, 281–285,
289–290, 298–300, 304–306,
308, 312–315, 326, 330, 336,
345–348, 359, 364, 370–371,
375–376, 398 *see also* affix,
compounding, derivation,
inflection, prefix, suffix,
word-formation
- motherhood 7, 16–17, 39, 52–53,
69, 91, 102, 104, 106, 114, 127–
128, 140, 142, 144, 154, 156–158,
165, 167–168, 177, 181, 190,
208, 218, 229, 231–235, 239,
242, 250, 253–254, 258, 262,
268, 284–286, 292–293, 308,
337–338, 371–373, 376, 389
- multilingualism *see* bilingualism
- N**
- name 3, 16, 36, 39, 42, 55, 65,
71, 78–80, 84–85, 90–92, 102,
109, 129, 134, 146, 154, 158,
160–161, 165, 169, 174–175,
179, 188–190, 192–194, 196,
209, 212, 214–217, 219, 229,
231, 235–241, 243, 248, 254,
263, 283–284, 290, 293–294,
300, 306–307, 309, 311, 321,
331, 337, 340, 348, 357, 360–
362, 364, 372, 374–376, 378,
383, 386–393, 396–397 *see also*
proper noun
- national policies 37, 41, 50,
60, 82, 94, 99, 101, 107, 118,
132, 142, 175–176, 194, 204,
214, 258, 269, 272, 278, 304,
361, 369
- natural gender *see* biology
- Navajo* 21
- neologism 130, 132, 146, 205,
255, 264–265, 271, 340, 347,
358
- neutralization 8, 31, 41–42, 89,
108–109, 164, 178, 196, 220,
249, 258, 274, 327 *see also*
gender-neutrality
- newspaper 35, 81, 82–84, 133,
184, 221, 249, 259, 271, 344,
356, 358–360
- Niger-Congo* 37, 153
- nobility 51–52, 127, 155, 210,
307, 337
- nominal classification 3–6, 21,
25, 35, 37, 41, 50, 154, 228 *see*
also classifier, grammatical
gender
- nominalization 102, 182, 184,
196, 206, 252, 305, 347
- non-sexist language use
19, 31, 88, 107, 118, 154,
194–197, 326–327, 362 *see also*
gender equality, symmetry
- normativity 9–11, 13–14, 19,
21, 30–32, 36, 38, 40, 42, 60,
72, 88–89, 98, 100–101, 116,
118, 141–142, 159, 194, 208,
229–230, 274, 319, 344, 394
see also heteronormativity,
markedness
- Norwegian* 6, 11–12, 17, 32,
36, 46
- noun *see also* abusive term,
address term, endearment
term, ethnonym,
hypocoristic, kinship term,
occupational title
- agentive noun 61, 87, 131,
136, 138, 145, 164, 259–260
- animal noun 85–86,
104–106, 113, 127, 132, 163,
181, 192, 196, 205, 207, 237,
252, 254, 274, 279, 286, 291,
295–296, 298, 304–305,
307, 325, 339, 371, 375–377,
380, 389, 392
- collective noun 17, 38,
54–55, 60, 65, 70–71,
77–78, 90, 92, 99, 105, 196,
269, 304, 306, 327, 330
- double-gender noun
255–260, 264–265, 270,
272, 306, 309–310, 314–315,
322, 326, 338, 347, 364
- epicene noun 38, 55–56, 182,
308–311, 327, 330, 338, 346
- hybrid noun 38, 69–74,
90, 193
- proper noun 158, 176, 179,
192–194, 214, 231, 305, 340
see also name
- number 10, 14, 21, 36, 42, 50,
53–55, 57–59, 64–66, 68–77,
87, 89, 91–92, 101, 104, 114,
127–128, 134, 138, 155, 162–163,
175, 178–180, 184, 196, 208,
210, 213, 230, 234, 240, 249–
252, 255, 257–258, 261–262,
271, 277–284, 286–289, 291,
293, 296–300, 304, 316–317,
319–321, 329–330, 336–337,
339–343, 349–352, 354, 358,
360, 362, 364–365, 379, 381,
383–384
- numeral 4–5, 7, 21, 38, 70,
76–78, 88, 92, 178–179, 297,
299, 305, 336, 350, 371
- Nupe* 228
- O**
- obscenity 17, 165, 217–218
see also vulgarism
- occupational title 2, 10–13,
33, 35, 55–56, 58, 61, 64, 79–85,
88–89, 98, 100, 102, 108–112,
118–119, 126, 129–131, 133,
136–137, 139–140, 143–145,
163–164, 168, 182–183, 188,

- 190–191, 198, 206–212, 214–216, 219–221, 229–230, 235, 238, 249, 254–255, 259–260, 263–265, 273–274, 283, 292, 298, 305, 307, 315, 320–323, 326–327, 344, 347, 357–358, 360–361, 363–364, 374, 378, 385, 387, 390–392
- Oneida* 9, 22, 28, 37, 39–40, 277–301
- onomastics *see* name
- Oriya* 5–6
- orthography *see* spelling
- P**
- Pali* 206, 370, 375, 391
- participle 50, 53, 55, 57, 67, 70–71, 73, 76–78, 84, 88–91, 102, 182, 184–185, 196–197, 206, 305, 331, 343, 347
- particle 17, 51, 175, 250, 299, 370, 374, 378, 392–397
- partnership 51–52, 79, 135, 164, 211, 232, 243, 337, 394 *see also* couple, marriage
- passive *see* agency
- patriarchy 39, 78–79, 128–129, 140, 157, 236, 253, 312
- pejorization *see* derogation
- perception 2, 11, 20, 32–36, 39, 41, 44, 51, 58–60, 66, 70–71, 81, 84–85, 94, 130, 134, 136, 138, 141, 146, 161, 167, 169, 183, 195, 207, 210, 215–216, 228, 243, 264, 269–271, 314, 357, 362, 383, 390, 396
- Persian* 7, 21
- personal advertisement 211
- personal pronoun *see* pronoun
- personification 295, 297
- phonology 3, 39, 53–54, 61, 83, 91, 99–100, 102, 131, 179, 185–186, 188, 190, 197, 228–229, 252, 281, 290, 299, 307, 329, 346, 370, 375, 392, 398 *see also* pronunciation, tone
- phraseology 97, 116, 355
see also idiomatic expression
- planned language 37, 97–99, 102, 116, 118–119 *see also* *Esperanto*, *Ido*
- Polish* 6, 12, 18, 33, 100, 102, 116, 131–132, 209, 211
- politeness 58, 89, 216, 219, 292, 370, 376–377, 380–385, 387–389, 391–394, 396–397
- politics 2, 18–19, 31, 36, 40, 50, 84, 88, 129, 144–146, 159, 176, 184, 210–211, 214, 219–220, 241, 248, 257, 263, 267, 269, 272–274, 304, 326–327, 344, 358–363, 365, 385, 397
- polysynthetic language 277
- Portuguese* 28, 36–37, 40, 154, 169, 303–333
- possessive pronoun *see* pronoun
- poststructuralism 29–31, 35, 38
- power 35, 91, 145, 154, 157, 166–167, 237–238, 242, 244, 263, 296, 384–385 *see also* dominance
- pragmatics 9, 164, 194, 197, 203
- prefix 39, 100, 106, 112–114, 118–119, 277–300 *see also* affix
- preposition 7, 87, 100, 174, 204, 315, 370
- prestige 13, 30, 64, 82, 85, 129, 139, 157, 165, 206–207, 209–211, 216, 344
- pro-drop 51, 67, 88, 204, 213, 311, 316, 336, 340, 388
- productivity 12, 54, 61–62, 84, 89, 119, 132–133, 146, 185–187, 189–190, 206, 209–210, 249, 315, 322, 336, 345–346, 364, 375
- pronominalization 1–2, 9, 13–14, 33, 56, 66–69, 71, 101, 104–106, 129, 137–138, 155, 213, 232–234, 260–261, 305, 309–310, 316–318, 352–353, 377 *see also* agreement
- pronoun 2, 7–11, 13–14, 21–22, 33–36, 40, 50–51, 53, 57–60, 66–70, 75–77, 87–91, 100–101, 104–105, 113–116, 118, 127, 129, 137–138, 155, 159, 162–163, 169, 174–175, 179–180, 183, 193, 196, 204, 208, 213, 221, 232–234, 248–250, 254, 257–258, 261, 270, 273, 277–279, 281–289, 296–299, 304–305, 309, 311–313, 316–318, 320–321, 329, 336, 343, 350–353, 361, 370, 374, 377–388, 390, 392, 394–398
- demonstrative pronoun 66, 70, 137, 230, 250, 305
- indefinite pronoun 59, 66, 114–115, 155, 180, 183, 188, 196, 208, 258, 270, 313, 353
- interrogative pronoun 59, 353
- personal pronoun 33–36, 40, 57–58, 68, 70, 88–89, 101, 105, 107, 113, 115, 129, 141–142, 155, 162, 169, 179, 204, 213, 218, 232, 250, 261, 316–317, 351–352, 370, 374, 377–388, 390, 392, 395–396, 398 *see also* anaphora, pronominalization
- possessive pronoun 51, 66, 69, 74, 79, 104, 137, 174, 205, 216, 240, 280, 284, 286, 305, 317, 348
- reflexive pronoun 51, 69, 87, 137, 328
- relative pronoun 66, 70, 137, 175, 318, 350, 353
- pronunciation 99–100, 188, 329, 370, 380, 385–386, 389, 398
- proper noun *see* noun
- prototype 4, 8, 40, 106, 159, 222, 251, 378
- proverb 2, 15–17, 22, 97, 116–117, 140–141, 162, 166–169, 217–218, 228, 241–242, 244, 265–270, 273, 323–325, 331
- psycholinguistics 20, 32, 51, 59, 194, 330, 364 *see also* cognition, perception
- Q**
- quantifier 305, 370
- queer theory 42, 90
- R**
- radio 99, 176, 271, 273
- redundancy 56, 212, 315
- reference *see* generic reference, mixed-sex reference, referential gender, self-reference

- referential gender *see* gender
 reflexive pronoun *see* pronoun
 regional variation *see* dialect
 relative clause 175, 318
 relative pronoun *see* pronoun
 religion 3, 20, 36, 62, 100, 102, 116, 126, 131–132, 154, 169, 218, 229, 235–238, 263, 274, 283, 324, 376
 rhetoric 20, 241–242
 Roma 205
 Romance 3, 7, 37, 100, 188, 220–221, 249, 304, 311, 331
 Romanian 6, 11, 14, 145
 Romansh 175, 195, 198
 Russian 3, 6–7, 9–10, 12–13, 15, 17, 19, 21, 64, 100–101, 116, 126, 133, 142–143, 338
- S**
- Saami 204
 Sanskrit 370, 375, 391
 satellite 6–8, 13–15, 21, 39–40, 53, 55, 58–59, 66, 69–70, 72–77, 79, 88–90, 178, 182, 251, 256, 258, 260, 304, 308–310, 317–318, 330, 340, 350–351, 353–354, 363 *see also* agreement
 self-reference 57, 295, 374, 377–378, 384–388, 392, 395–398
 semantics *see* connotation, denotation, derogation, lexical gender, social gender
 Semitic 5
 Seneca 9, 22
 Serbian 6–7, 35, 41, 50–51, 55, 62, 64, 80–81, 83–85, 87–89, 336, 339, 354 *see also* Bosnian, Croatian, Montenegrin, Serbo-Croatian
 Serbo-Croatian 50, 80, 344 *see also* Bosnian, Croatian, Montenegrin, Serbian
 sexism 4, 10, 17–19, 30–31, 33, 36, 44–45, 47, 88, 107–108, 118, 154, 165, 168, 194–196, 206, 218, 221, 244, 323–324, 326–327, 357, 362 *see also* bias, discrimination
 sexuality 16, 28, 35, 42, 51–52, 105, 154, 165–166, 192, 206–207, 209, 216, 218, 230, 242, 323, 337, 356, 395
 Shan 369
 slang 51
 Slavic 8, 37, 50, 79, 100, 126, 336, 342, 345
 Slovak 46
 Slovenian 28, 37, 40, 50, 335–368
 social class 20, 140, 369, 382, 387–388
 social constructionism 29
 social gender *see* gender
 socialism 146, 211, 214, 216, 357, 364
 sociolinguistics 19–20, 42, 240, 330, 397
 sociology 99, 116, 357, 363
 Spanish 6, 18, 32, 36, 39, 161–162, 165, 168, 249, 322
 speech community 40, 98–99, 106, 109, 114, 116–118, 265, 273
 spelling 99, 134, 146, 154, 169, 198, 206, 215, 228, 248, 271, 329, 336, 355, 370
 splitting 19, 29, 31, 33, 88, 118, 126, 183, 189, 196, 219–221, 234, 250, 327
 standard 50, 55, 71–72, 89, 100, 115–116, 118, 142, 174–185, 187–191, 194–198, 228, 248–249, 272–274, 304, 314, 336, 343, 347, 351–352, 363, 370, 386
 standardization 174, 198, 205 *see also* codification
 stereotype 2–3, 11, 17, 20, 33, 35, 55–56, 61, 81, 87, 117–118, 140, 142, 159, 165, 167–168, 191, 206–207, 211, 216–217, 244, 265, 269, 321, 324, 355–356, 362, 374, 390 *see also* social gender
 stress 51, 68, 180, 204, 299, 385, 393
 structural gender linguistics 27–48
 style 4, 12, 16, 19–20, 98, 131, 158, 194, 216, 241, 339, 345
 subgender 54, 364
 subversion 42–43, 58 *see also* gender crossing
 suffix 39, 54–55, 61–66, 79–80, 83–84, 89, 91, 98, 100, 102–104, 106, 108–109, 112–114, 116, 118–119, 129–133, 136, 142, 145–146, 164, 177, 184–188, 193, 204–205, 209, 215, 231, 250, 254, 259–260, 272, 278, 308, 312, 314, 345–348, 360 *see also* affix
 suppletion 55, 337
 Swahili 5–6, 21
 swearword 218, 254, 383, 387
 Swedish 6, 119
 Swiss German 37, 173–201
 symmetry 16, 18, 39, 62, 87–88, 113–114, 134, 136, 156–158, 192, 221, 231–232, 239, 375 *see also* equality
 syncretism 178, 282, 288
 syntax 4–5, 13–15, 34, 40, 50–51, 57, 66–70, 72–74, 77, 83, 88, 90, 92, 99, 141–142, 154, 169, 175, 188–189, 193–194, 204, 217, 228, 234, 249–251, 257, 260, 262, 267–268, 271, 277, 285, 300, 305, 309, 311, 316–318, 323, 326, 336, 340–343, 349–352, 354–355, 370, 388, 392, 398 *see also* agreement, word order
 synthetic language 68, 304
- T**
- taboo 267
 Tai-Kadai 37, 369
 target *see* agreement, satellite
 television 176, 189, 269, 361–362
 tense 50–51, 67–68, 70, 76, 175, 182, 197, 250, 259, 304–305, 331, 336, 340, 350
 textbook 98, 101, 103, 117, 130, 162, 232, 270, 341, 378
 Thai 28, 37, 40, 369–399
 third gender *see* gender
 tone 165, 228, 357, 370, 380, 386, 389, 393–394, 398
 transgender 394, 396
 transitivity 250, 279, 284–285, 289, 293, 299–300, 370

- translation 4, 36, 40, 62, 100,
108, 115–116, 126, 128–130, 133,
137–138, 142, 157–158, 161–163,
169, 183, 205, 213, 229, 232–
233, 289, 374, 377–378
- transsexuality 394
- Turkish* 6, 10–11, 16–17, 21, 50,
204, 222, 228, 261, 264–265, 274
- T/V distinction 22, 58, 381
- typology 6, 9, 20, 27, 35–37, 41,
50, 100, 221, 228, 272, 370 *see*
also contrastive linguistics,
language family
- U
- Uralic* 126–128, 204 *see also*
Finno-Ugric
- V
- variation 2, 4, 18, 28, 37, 41–42,
50, 71, 80–81, 91–92, 98, 106,
110, 114, 126, 174, 178, 181,
190–191, 195, 197, 213, 228,
248–249, 260, 265, 272, 274,
299, 304, 320, 330, 342, 357,
378, 380, 385–387, 389, 393
- Veps* 126
- verb 7, 13, 39, 50–51, 65, 67–68,
70–71, 76–77, 87–89, 131,
136–137, 141, 154, 186–187, 204,
208, 217, 228, 250, 259, 267–
268, 271, 277–282, 284–287,
289–300, 304–305, 315, 321,
336, 345, 350, 355–356, 370,
388 *see also* participle
- Vietnamese* 5, 15, 21–22
- visibility 8, 10, 12, 15, 19–20, 31,
37, 40–41, 61, 88, 98, 111, 196,
214, 219, 236, 249
- Vote* 126
- vulgarism 66, 218 *see also*
obscurity
- W
- Welsh* 6, 12
- word-formation 2, 11–13,
61–66, 79–80, 87, 89, 91, 99,
101, 103, 106–107, 119, 131, 133,
176, 181–182, 186–187, 206,
259–260, 313–315, 336, 345–
349, 363–364 *see also* affix,
compounding, conversion,
derivation, morphology,
prefix, suffix
- word order 15, 20, 51, 154, 204,
214, 228, 233, 268, 270, 315,
354, 370, 377 *see also* syntax
- Y
- Yoruba* 228, 232, 238
- Z
- Zhuang* 369