

- Page R (2003). ‘“Cherie: lawyer, wife, mum”: contradictory patterns of representation in media reports of Cherie Booth/Blair.’ *Discourse and Society* 14(5), 559–580.
- Peterson S & Sisson Runyan A (1993). *Global gender issues*. Boulder/San Francisco/Oxford: Westview Press.
- Puwar N (1997). ‘Gender and political elites: women in the House of Commons.’ *Sociology Review* 7(2), 2–6.
- Romaniuk T (2004). ‘Looks like a mayor, thinks like a mayor, talks like a neighbour’: the discursive construction of David Miller. M.A. Thesis: York University, Toronto, Canada.
- Ross K & Sreby-Mohammadi A (1997). ‘Playing house – gender, politics and news media in Britain.’ *Media, Cultura and Society* 19(1), 101–109.
- Sedgemore B (1995). *The insider’s guide to parliament*. Cambridge: Icon Books Limited.
- Shaw S (2000). ‘Language, gender and floor apportionment in political debates.’ *Discourse and Society* 11(3), 401–418.
- Sreberny-Mohamadi A & Ross K (1996). ‘Women MPs and the media: representing the body politic.’ In Lovenduski J & Norris P (eds.) *Women in politics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 105–117.
- Tannen D (1996). *Talking from 9 to 5. Women and men at work: language, sex, and power*. London: Virago.
- Walsh C (2001). *Gender and discourse: women in politics, the church, and the environmental movement*. New York: Longman.
- Wodak R (2003). ‘Multiple identities: the roles of females parliamentarians in the EU Parliament.’ In Holmes J & Meyerhoff M (eds.) *The handbook of language and gender*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Gender, Grammatical

G G Corbett, University of Surrey, Surrey, UK

© 2006 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

Gender is a feature of special interest because it provides a dramatic demonstration of just how different languages can be. For many of the Indo-European languages it is an important feature that is realized in a high proportion of utterances. In most Daghestanian languages, such as Tsakhur, it is still more salient: it suffuses the syntax and morphology, appearing on some unlikely agreement targets. In almost all the languages of the Austronesian family, it is simply missing. This article first examines the definitions of gender to ensure that we are comparing like with like. There has been careful research to do this, and it will become clear that within the languages that do have gender there is a considerable variety of possible gender systems. This is particularly apparent in the ways in which speakers assign nouns to genders. Gender systems may have sex as a component, as in languages with masculine and feminine genders; but, equally, sex may be irrelevant, as in the Algonquian languages, where the distinction is between animate and inanimate. This article outlines the distribution of gender in the world’s languages, and finally considers prospects for investigating the feature further.

Terms

The word ‘gender’ derives from Latin *genus* via Old French *gendre*, originally meaning ‘kind’ or ‘sort’.

There are many kinds of noun: those with four syllables, those denoting agents, and so on. But ‘gender’ is normally reserved for kinds or classes of noun that are, as Hockett (1958: 231) put it, “reflected in the behavior of associated words.” To make valid comparisons, it is important to have this externally motivated classification. The relevant reflection in the behavior of associated words is ‘agreement’ (including for some linguists antecedent-anaphor relations). The noun inventory is divided into different kinds, or genders, according to the different agreements they take. When this is done, we find that in the more familiar languages, the different kinds or genders have a semantic core based on sex (thus, Russian nouns divide into three kinds; nouns denoting males, though not only these, group together, and those denoting females also group in another gender). In other languages the structures may be very similar, but the semantic core may not be based on sex; for instance, it may be based on human versus non-human or animate versus inanimate. Thus a language has a gender system only if noun phrases headed by nouns of different types control different agreements. No amount of marking on a noun can prove that it has gender; the evidence that nouns have gender in a given language lies in the agreement targets that show gender. An illustration of this from the Nakh-Daghestanian language Bagvalal (Kibrik, 2001: 64–65) will show this. Each noun in these examples is representative of many more:

- | | |
|---------------------------|------|
| (1) w-eša-w | waša |
| MASC.SING-plump-MASC.SING | boy |
| ‘a plump boy’ | |

- (2) j-eša-j jaš
 FEM.SING-plump-FEM.SING girl
 ‘a plump girl’
- (3) b-eša-b ţama
 NEUT.SING-plump-NEUT.SING donkey
 ‘a plump donkey’

Attributive modifiers show that the nouns of Bagvalal divide into three agreement classes. In the plural, examples like (1) and (2) fall together, and so the plural does not yield additional agreement classes. No more does changing the case. Let us try changing the type of target, by looking at a verbal predicate:

- (4) waša w-iRi
 boy MASC.SING-stop
 ‘the boy stopped’
- (5) jaš j-iRi
 girl FEM.SING-stop
 ‘the girl stopped’
- (6) ţama b-iRi
 donkey NEUT.SING-stop
 ‘the donkey stopped’

Although the morphological realization is somewhat different (prefixal only instead of being prefixal and suffixal), the verbal predicate does not provide further agreement classes. Bagvalal has three agreement classes, and each should be recognized as a gender.

For languages in the Nakh-Daghestanian family, like Bagvalal, the term used is often ‘noun classes.’ But there is no substantive difference between ‘genders’ and ‘noun classes’; the different terms arise in different linguistic traditions. For instance, Kannada (a Dravidian language) has three genders, to which nouns are assigned by rules similar to those of Bagvalal. By tradition, Kannada is said to have three genders, and Bagvalal three noun classes. We shall use the term ‘gender’ for both.

The Number of Genders

The approach to gender sketched in the first section of this article is based on the notion of ‘agreement class’ (Zaliznjak, 1964). For two nouns to be in the same agreement class, they must take the same agreements under all conditions – that is, if we hold constant other features such as case and number. (The agreements and their domains can be extremely varied; Corbett, forthcoming.) If two nouns differ in their agreements when factors such as case and number are held constant, then they belong to two different agreement classes and normally they will belong to two different genders. To take another example, in Russian, in environments where nominative singular

forms are syntactically appropriate, nouns like *otec* ‘father’ and *stol* ‘table’ take the possessive adjective *moj* ‘my’ (*moj otec* ‘my father’). Since this gender includes many nouns denoting males, it is conventionally labeled ‘masculine,’ even though the majority of nouns it includes, like *stol*, do not denote males. A second agreement class consists of nouns like *mat’* ‘mother’ and *kniga* ‘book’, which take *moja*, and make up the feminine gender. Finally, there are nouns like *pis’mo* ‘letter’, which take *moe*, and comprise the neuter gender.

For many languages there is no dispute as to the number of genders, but there are others where the question is complex. For instance, Romanian gender has provoked a lengthy debate. The analytical problem of determining the number of genders and the tests for deciding the gender of a given noun depend on separating out the sets into which nouns are divided (the ‘controller genders’) from the number of different genders marked on agreement targets (the ‘target genders’). Frequently the two match up, as in French or German, but in several languages they do not. A full treatment of the subject is not possible here; for a detailed account and extensive references see Corbett (1991).

Gender Assignment

Given that there are the analytic means to establish the genders of a language and to determine which nouns belong in which gender, we now approach the question from the opposite perspective, and ask how nouns are allotted to the genders of a given language. In other words, how does a native speaker ‘know’ what gender a noun belongs to? Models of the mechanisms by which nouns are allotted to genders are called ‘assignment systems.’ Assignment may involve two sorts of information about the noun: its meaning and its form. To illustrate these, we will take some well-established clear examples. There are others that involve more complex combinations of systems.

Strict Semantic Assignment Systems

A strict semantic assignment system is found in Bagvalal (Kibrik, 2001: 64–66), as illustrated in the earlier examples. Nouns denoting male humans (and only those) are masculine, while those denoting female humans are feminine. All remaining nouns are neuter. Thus, *waša* ‘boy’ is masculine, *jaš* ‘girl’ is feminine, and *ţama* ‘donkey’ is neuter. The meaning is sufficient, and no information about the form of a noun is needed to determine its gender. Kala Lagaw Ya, spoken on the Western Torres Straits Islands, has

a two-gender system, also with strict semantic assignment: nouns denoting males (and the moon, to which we return below) are masculine, and all others belong in the feminine gender (Bani, 1987). In Diyari (Dieri), a language of South Australia, we find the converse: there is a gender for nouns with female referents (such as women, girls, doe kangaroos), and the other gender is for all remaining nouns (Austin, 1981). Strict semantic systems are found in various parts of the world and are particularly prevalent in the Dravidian family, where there are three-gender systems (as in Kannada and Tamil) and two-gender systems (as in the Parji-Gadaba languages).

Predominantly Semantic Assignment Systems

Many languages have semantic assignment rules that are, however, less comprehensive than those of Bagvalal. Predominantly semantic assignment is found in Tsakhur, which like Bagvalal is a Nakh-Daghestanian language. Its four genders are shown in Table 1.

Assignment to genders I and II is straightforward: I is for male humans (also gods, angels, and so on), while II is for female humans (and female mythical beings). Most remaining animates are assigned to gender III, although a few belong to gender IV, along with some mythical beings. Inanimates are found in genders III and IV, and it is hard to discern a pattern (Mel'nikov and Kurbanov, 1964; Ibragimov, 1990: 54–56 and references there; Kibrik, 1999: 48–49).

Languages of this general type are widespread. For some of them, researchers have proposed that abstract semantic criteria partly miss the point, and that if we can gain a better grasp of the worldview of the speakers, we can then understand the assignment system more fully. The most discussed case is that of Dyirbal, North Queensland (Dixon, 1972), which has four

genders, primarily for male humans and non-human animates (I), female humans (II), non-flesh food (III), and the residue (IV). There are various nouns for which additional principles are required. For example, the moon is in the first (masculine) gender and the sun is in the second (feminine) gender. This recalls Kala Lagaw Ya. In Dyirbal mythology, as indeed in much of Australia, the moon is the husband of the sun. For such instances, the mythological significance of referents can determine gender assignment. Dixon's data and analysis continue to provoke debate, and there is similar debate about the role of worldview in the gender assignment system of Ojibwa (and of other Algonquian languages of North America).

In all the languages discussed so far, the meaning of the noun determines gender. In the strict assignment systems, the rules are transparent; in the predominantly semantic systems, there are exceptions, although in some cases these may be explicable once the cultural setting is taken into account. If we ask which are the semantic criteria on which semantic systems can be based, we see recurring patterns. Quite often we find animate/inanimate, human/non-human, and male/female. Sometimes there is a gender for diminutives, as in various Bantu languages. There are also less usual genders, such as that for non-flesh food (Dyirbal) and the gender for insects (found in the Rikvani dialect of the Nakh-Daghestanian language Andi). A criterion that is sufficient to define a gender in one language may be just one factor in the assignment of gender in another. Thus the Bantu language Chichewa (a dialect of Nyanja) has a gender for diminutives, while in the Omotic language Dizi, diminutives together with nouns denoting females form a gender.

Formal Assignment Systems

In many languages, the semantic rules assign many nouns to the appropriate gender, but they also simply fail to apply to many others. In Russian and in many other Indo-European languages, for sex-differentiables (those where sex is salient or of importance to humans), nouns denoting males are masculine and those denoting female are feminine. But these rules have nothing to say about the majority of the noun inventory. While in languages like Bagvalal, the nouns not assigned by the semantic rules (the 'remainder' or 'semantic residue') all belong to a single gender, in many languages they are found in more than one gender, even in all the genders (as in Russian). Here there are additional rules for assigning nouns to genders, but according to their form. Languages may use semantic rules, or semantic **and** formal rules, but not only formal assignment rules. In no language are

Table 1 Gender assignment in Tsakhur

Criterion	Gender	Examples	Glosses
Male rational	I (masculine)	<i>baba</i> <i>dak_i</i>	grandfather father
Female rational	II (feminine)	<i>jed_i</i> <i>jiš</i>	mother daughter
Animate (also some inanimates)	III (animate)	<i>aImale</i> <i>balkan</i> (<i>dama</i>) (<i>lat</i>)	donkey horse (river) (trough)
Other (including a few animates)	IV (neuter)	<i>kalle</i> <i>sen</i> (<i>kabaj</i>)	head year (butterfly)

nouns assigned to genders, as defined earlier, by purely formal rules. An example would be a language in which there were two agreement classes, and the nouns in the first all ended in a consonant cluster, and those in the second did not, and there was no semantic regularity for the distribution of nouns. I claim that this hypothetical type does not exist. Formal assignment rules may appeal to two types of information: phonological and morphological.

Phonological The clearest example of assignment depending on phonological information yet found is provided by Qafar (Afar), an East Cushitic language spoken in northeastern Ethiopia and in Djibouti (data from Parker and Hayward, 1985). Qafar has rather standard semantic assignment rules, namely, that for sex-differentiable nouns, those denoting males are masculine and those denoting females are feminine. It is the nouns that fall outside these rules – the residue – that are of interest. For them the phonological rules apply: nouns whose citation form ends in an accented vowel are feminine (for example, *catò* ‘help’), while all others are masculine (for example, *gilàl* ‘winter’, which does not end in a vowel, and *tàmu* ‘taste’, which ends in an unaccented vowel). These rules operate with few exceptions. There is an interesting twist here: nouns denoting males and females typically fit with the phonological assignment rules, too (for example, *bàqla* ‘husband’ and *barrà* ‘woman, wife’). Given the data presented so far, we might try to dispense with semantic rules for Qafar and treat it as being of a quite different type. However, there are crucial examples like *abbà* ‘father’, which is masculine, even though it ends in an accented vowel. Similarly, *gabbixeèra* ‘slender-waisted female’ is feminine, even though the accent is not final. Qafar has straightforward phonological assignment rules. When the semantic and phonological rules are both applicable, they almost always give the same result in Qafar. However, in cases of conflict, the semantic rules take precedence, as is the normal situation in gender assignment systems. There are many more examples of phonological assignment, although few if any are as clear as those of Qafar. At the other extreme we find French, often claimed to have no system to its gender assignment. Yet French has a phonological assignment system. For example, of 938 nouns ending in /ɛ/, 99 percent are masculine (*le pain* [pɛ̃] ‘the bread’) (for details see Tucker *et al.*, 1977; Hardison, 1992).

Morphological The morphological assignment system that has received the most attention is probably that of Russian. Earlier it was noted that in Russian, as in many other Indo-European languages, for

Table 2 Russian nouns belonging to the semantic residue

Masculine	Feminine	Neuter
dub ‘oak’	sosna ‘pine’	<i>derevo</i> ‘tree’
<i>stvol</i> ‘(tree) trunk’	<i>doska</i> ‘plank’	brevno ‘log’
<i>čaj</i> ‘tea’	<i>voda</i> ‘water’	<i>moloko</i> ‘milk’
<i>ogon</i> ‘fire’	<i>peč</i> ‘stove’	<i>plamja</i> ‘flame’
<i>okean</i> ‘ocean’	<i>reka</i> ‘river’	<i>more</i> ‘sea’
<i>avtomobil</i> ‘car’	<i>mašina</i> ‘car’	<i>taksi</i> ‘taxi’
<i>den</i> ‘day’	noč ‘night’	<i>utro</i> ‘morning’
<i>čas</i> ‘hour’	<i>minuta</i> ‘minute’	<i>vremja</i> ‘time’
<i>nerv</i> ‘nerve’	<i>kost</i> ‘bone’	<i>serdce</i> ‘heart’
<i>glaz</i> ‘eye’	<i>brov</i> ‘eyebrow’	<i>yeko</i> ‘eyelid’
<i>lokot</i> ‘elbow’	<i>lodyžka</i> ‘ankle’	<i>zapjast’e</i> ‘wrist’
<i>flag</i> ‘flag’	<i>emblema</i> ‘emblem’	<i>znamja</i> ‘banner’

Nouns in bold are inflected in [Table 3](#).

sex-differentiables, nouns denoting males are masculine and those denoting females are feminine. But unlike the situation in languages like Bagvalal, the nouns not covered by these rules – the semantic residue – are not simply assigned to the neuter gender. Rather, in Russian, the residue is shared between the three genders, with the neuter gender not even receiving the majority. It seems unlikely that we are failing to spot additional semantic criteria; see ([Table 2](#)).

If the morphology of the nouns is examined instead, then progress can be made. There are arguably four main inflectional classes in Russian, each with several thousands of nouns. There are six cases and two numbers (although no paradigm has 12 distinct forms because of various syncretisms). [Table 3](#) provides the singular forms.

Of course, a speaker needs to know the inflectional behavior of a noun. On the basis of that information, the assignment rules are straightforward. Nouns in inflection class I are masculine, those in classes II and III are feminine, and those in IV are neuter. As with Qafar, we might wonder whether the semantic assignment rules are superfluous, since *otec* ‘father’ is in class I, while *sestra* ‘sister’ is in class II, and *mat* ‘mother’ is in class III, and therefore many sex-differentiable nouns would be assigned correctly by the morphological assignment rules. But there are also instances where this is not so. Thus, *deduška* ‘grandfather’ denotes a male but is in class II, whose nouns are typically feminine; it is masculine. Nouns like this show, once again, that we do not find languages where formal assignment rules are sufficient. Further rules are required in Russian for indeclinable nouns (like *taksi* ‘taxi’, which is indeclinable and neuter). Morphological assignment systems are found in various other Indo-European languages. Looking further afield, in Arabic, too, gender is assignable in the main according to morphology (Cowell, 1964:

Table 3 Inflectional classes in Russian

	<i>I</i>	<i>II</i>	<i>III</i>	<i>IV</i>
Nominative	<i>dub</i>	<i>sosna</i>	<i>noč'</i>	<i>brevno</i>
Accusative	<i>dub</i>	<i>sosnu</i>	<i>noč'</i>	<i>brevno</i>
Genitive	<i>duba</i>	<i>sosny</i>	<i>noči</i>	<i>brevna</i>
Dative	<i>dubu</i>	<i>sosne</i>	<i>noči</i>	<i>brevnu</i>
Instrumental	<i>dubom</i>	<i>sosnoj</i>	<i>noč'ju</i>	<i>brevnom</i>
Locative	<i>dube</i>	<i>sosne</i>	<i>noči</i>	<i>brevne</i>
Gloss	'oak'	'pine'	'night'	'log'

372–375). In Kuot, a language isolate of New Ireland, Lindström (2002: 147–164, 176–194) suggested that there were 11 inflectional classes for nouns, and the assignment of nouns to the two genders could be predicted to a significant extent on the basis of the inflectional class (in addition to a semantic rule based on sex).

The clearest examples have been chosen here for illustration. In some languages, the different types of assignment criteria overlap and interact in complex ways. Sometimes there are small clusters of nouns subject to semantic criteria (apart from those covered by the main semantic rules), even within systems where formal rules have a major role (as shown for German by Zubin and Köpcke, 1986; Köpcke and Zubin, 1996). Even in these complex cases, whenever gender languages are analyzed in sufficient detail, the gender of the vast majority of nouns turns out to be predictable.

Distribution

Given this typology of gender systems, we can now ask how they are distributed over the world's languages. In a sample of 256 languages (Corbett, 2005), somewhat over half (144) were found to have no gender system. A gender system with at least two genders (and two-gender systems are common) existed in 50 examples in this sample. Three genders was about half as common (26 examples), and four genders was about half as common again (12 examples). Larger systems, with five or more genders, represented a substantial minority (24 languages in the sample). Fula (a Niger-Congo language) has around 20 genders, depending on the dialect. Of the languages with a gender system, the majority had an assignment system based on sex (84 examples), but 28 languages of the sample, notably in the Niger-Congo and Algonquian families, had systems based on animacy. And as for the type of assignment system, strict semantic and predominantly assignment systems together were found in just under half the languages (53 examples), while a slight majority (59 examples) had semantic and formal assignment.

Prospects

Studies on grammatical gender continue to appear regularly. There are four areas in which we can hope for progress.

Data

Studies of previously unresearched or little-researched languages continue to extend our knowledge of gender systems. For example, in Ngan 'gityemerri a Daly language spoken in northern Australia) there is a development from generic classifiers into genders (Reid, 1997); a comparable situation, but with a very large system, is found in Miraña (Boa), a Witotoan language spoken in Colombia, as described by Seifart (2004). It is possible to have gender and classifier systems co-existing, as in Tariana (Aikhenvald, 2003). Among the better known languages, some studies of gender are based on a few convenient parts, while fuller studies of the whole morphosyntax, to the extent that it is relevant to gender, and of a substantial portion of the lexicon, can contribute significantly to our understanding of gender. The incorporation of loanwords can be seen as a continuously running experiment on an assignment system, offering the possibilities for statistical analysis, as in Kilariski's (2003) account of English borrowings into Danish, Norwegian, and Swedish.

Lexicology

Gender is a key feature for lexicology, since it is crucial for understanding the nature of lexical entries. In a gendered language, the gender of a noun must be available. Yet as we have seen, it does not normally need to be specified, since the information can be derived, by assignment rules, from other information that must be stored. We still do not know the full range of information that may be relevant (for instance, the possible semantic features that may determine gender assignment). There are further surprises: it is possible for certain nouns to be of different genders according to the sex of the speaker; this is found in Garífuna, a member of the Arawak language family spoken in Belize, Honduras, Nicaragua, and Guatemala (Taylor, 1977: 60; Munro, 1998). These two points raise interesting questions as to the shape of lexical entries.

Psycholinguistics

The issues specified for lexicologists are also increasingly of concern to psycholinguists (see, for instance, van Berkum, 1996). Gender provides a feature that is moderately well described, typically has few values, and yet is pervasive in one language and absent in

another, thus providing helpful control conditions. Psycholinguists are also interested in apparently non-linguist effects of grammatical gender, as in judgments of picture similarity (see Boroditsky *et al.*, 2003). There has been some interesting work on how children acquire gender systems by Mills (1986) and Müller (2000), among others. Such studies may also help us to see how such systems change over time, as shown by the work of Polinsky and Jackson (1999) on Tsez (Dido); see also Comrie and Polinsky (1998). For further work on modeling of change in assignment systems see Polinsky and Everbroeck (2003). An account of the history of gender in Indo-European is provided by Matasović (2004).

Modeling

Modeling is being used in various ways. First, it is used to verify particular analyses. Some types of assignment system are so transparent that alternative analyses are hard to imagine. However, with morphological assignment systems, particularly when the number of genders and the number of inflectional classes are close in a given language, there are other possible analyses. Arguments in favor of the morphological approach include the following: the main claim is that in languages like Russian, the internal evidence shows that we can assign gender from inflectional class (but the inflectional class cannot be predicted from gender); second, there is the typological claim that one of the possible types of assignment system (or some combination) will always guarantee that gender is predictable for the vast majority of nouns, and so treating the Russian type system differently would create an anomaly. However, modeling allows us to take a further step. Fraser and Corbett (1995) employed the Network Morphology framework to give an account of the Russian gender and inflectional class relations. Since the analysis was implemented in the lexical knowledge representation language DATR (Evans and Gazdar, 1996), the analyses can be verified computationally. It can be demonstrated that, starting from minimal lexical entries for a wide range of nouns, this account did indeed predict the right genders.

A more complex situation is found in languages where gender is assigned according to morphological class, but where the morphological class is itself predictable. A well-studied case is Bumbita Arapesh, a language of the Toricelli family spoken on the north coast of New Guinea (Fortune, 1942; Aronoff, 1992; 1994: 89–114). In addition to semantic assignment rules based on sex, there are morphological assignment rules that determine 13 genders on the basis of

22 morphological classes, and the latter are largely predictable from phonological information. It has been demonstrated how this system can be analyzed within the Network Morphology framework, and an implementation has been provided to demonstrate that these claims are indeed valid (Fraser and Corbett, 1997). There is also a complex interaction of assignment to gender and to morphological class in Bininj Gun-Wok (previously Mayali), a non-Pama-Nyungan language of northern Australia, which has four genders and five morphological classes for nouns. This too has been successfully implemented; for details of a formal model of this system see Evans *et al.* (2002). Modeling has tended to concentrate on synchronic assignment systems. However, there is also interesting work on modeling the development of assignment systems over time, as in Polinsky and Everbroeck (2003), as noted earlier.

Conclusion

We have seen why gender continues to evoke such interest: it is a core feature in some languages, while in many others it is absent. We have the analytic tools for investigating gender systems, and new and intriguingly complex systems are still coming to light. In terms of gender assignment, the rules vary from being fully transparent, as in Bagvalal, to complex, as in French and German. It is a research area in which various different types of expertise are leading to gradual progress.

Acknowledgments

The support of the Economic and Social Research Council (UK) under grant RES051270122 is gratefully acknowledged.

See also: Number; Phonology: Overview.

Bibliography

- Aikhenvald A Y (2003). *A grammar of Tariana, from Northwest Amazonia*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Aronoff M (1992). 'Noun classes in Arapesh.' In Booij G & van Marle J (eds.) *Yearbook of morphology 1991*. Dordrecht: Kluwer. 21–32.
- Aronoff M (1994). *Linguistic inquiry monograph 22: Morphology by itself: stems and inflectional classes*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Austin P (1981). *A grammar of Diyari, South Australia*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Bani E (1987). 'Garka a ipika: masculine and feminine grammatical gender in Kala Lagaw Ya.' *Australian Journal of Linguistics* 7, 189–201.
- Boroditsky L, Schmidt L & Phillips W (2003). 'Sex, syntax and semantics.' In Gentner D & Goldin-Meadow S (eds.) *Language in mind: advances in the study of language and thought*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. 61–80.
- Comrie B & Polinsky M (1998). 'Gender in a historical perspective: radial categories meet language change.' In Justus C F & Edgar C P (eds.) *Journal of Indo-European Studies monograph 31: Language change and typological variation: in honor of Winfred P. Lehmann on the occasion of his 83rd birthday: II: grammatical universals and typology*. Washington, DC: Institute for the Study of Man. 566–589.
- Corbett G G (1991). *Gender*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Corbett G G (2005). 'The number of genders,' 'Sex-based and non-sex-based gender systems,' and 'Gender assignment systems' [three chapters and maps]. In Haspelmath M, Dryer M, Gil D & Comrie B (eds.) *World atlas of language structures*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Corbett G G (forthcoming). *Agreement*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cowell M W (1964). *Arabic series 7: A reference grammar of Syrian Arabic (based on the dialect of Damascus)*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Dixon R M W (1972). *The Dyirbal language of North Queensland*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Evans N, Brown D & Corbett G G (2002). 'The semantics of gender in Mayali: partially parallel systems and formal implementation.' *Language* 78, 111–155.
- Evans R & Gazdar G (1996). 'DATR: a language for lexical knowledge representation.' *Computational Linguistics* 22, 167–216.
- Fortune R F (1942). *Publications of the American Ethnological Society 19: Arapesh*. New York: J. J. Augustin. [Reprinted 1977, New York: AMS Press.]
- Fraser N M & Corbett G G (1995). 'Gender, animacy and declensional class assignment: a unified account for Russian.' In Geert B & van Marle J (eds.) *Yearbook of morphology 1994*. Dordrecht: Kluwer. 123–150.
- Fraser N M & Corbett G G (1997). 'Defaults in Arapesh.' *Lingua* 103, 25–57.
- Hardison D M (1992). 'Gender assignment to nonwords in French: implications for the role of the final syllable in lexical processing and organization of the mental lexicon.' In *Indiana Linguistics Club twenty-fifth anniversary volume*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Linguistics Club. 13–25.
- Hockett C F (1958). *A course in modern linguistics*. New York: Macmillan.
- Ibragimov G X (1990). *Caxurskij jazyk*. Moscow: Nauka.
- Kibrik A E (1999). *Èlementy grammatiki caxurskogo jazyka v tipologièskom osveščenii*. Moscow: Nasledie Press.
- Kibrik A E (ed.) (2001). *Bagvalinskij jazyk: grammatika: Teksty: Slovare*. Moscow: Nasledie. [co-editors Kazenin K I, Ljutikova E A & Tatevosov S G.]
- Kilarski M (2003). 'Gender assignment in Danish, Swedish and Norwegian: a comparison of the status of assignment criteria.' *NORLYD 31(2): The Proceedings of the 19th Scandinavian Conference of Linguistics*. 261–274.
- Köpcke K M & Zubin D (1996). 'Prinzipien für Genuszuweisung im Deutschen.' In Lang E & Zifonoun G (eds.) *Deutsch typologisch: Jahrbuch des Instituts für deutsche Sprache 1995*. Berlin: de Gruyter. 473–491.
- Lindström E (2002). 'Topics in the grammar of Kuot: a non-Austronesian language of New Ireland, Papua New Guinea.' Ph.D. diss., Stockholm University.
- Matasović R (2004). *Gender in Indo-European*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Mel'nikov G P & Kurbanov A I (1964). 'Logičeskie osnovanija imennoj klassifikacii v caxurskom jazyke.' In Ivanov V V (ed.) *Voprosy struktury jazyka*. Moscow: Nauka, Moscow. 157–170.
- Mills A E (1986). *The acquisition of gender: a study of English and German*. Berlin: Springer-Verlag.
- Müller N (2000). 'Gender and number in acquisition.' In Unterbeck B, Rissanen M, Nevalainen T & Saari M (eds.) *Trends in linguistics: studies and monographs 124: Gender in grammar and cognition*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 351–399.
- Munro P (1998). 'The Garifuna gender system.' In Hill J H, Mistry P J & Campbell L (eds.) *Trends in linguistics: studies and monographs 108: The life of language: papers in linguistics in honor of William Bright*. Berlin: de Gruyter. 443–461.
- Parker E M & Hayward R J (1985). *An Afar-English-French dictionary (with grammatical notes in English)*. London: School of Oriental and Asian Studies, University of London.
- Polinsky M & Jackson D (1999). 'Noun classes: language change and learning.' In Fox B A, Jurafsky D & Michaelis L (eds.) *Cognition and function in language*. Stanford: CSLI. 29–50.
- Polinsky M & Van Everbroeck E (2003). 'Development of gender classifications: modeling the historical change from Latin to French.' *Language* 79, 356–390.
- Reid N (1997). 'Class and classifier in Ngan'gityemerri.' In Harvey M & Reid N (eds.) *Studies in Language Companion Series 37: Nominal classification in Aboriginal Australia*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 165–228.
- Seifart F (2004). 'Nominal classification in Miraña, a Witotoan language of Columbia.' *Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung* 57, 228–246.
- Taylor D (1977). *Languages of the West Indies*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press. [cited from Munro, 1998.]
- Tucker G R, Lambert W E & Rigault A A (1977). *The French speaker's skill with grammatical gender: an example of rule-governed behavior*. The Hague: Mouton.
- van Berkum & Jos J A (1996). *The psycholinguistics of grammatical gender: studies in language comprehension and production*. Nijmegen: Nijmegen University Press.
- Zaliznjak A A (1964). 'K voprosu o grammatičeskix kategorijax roda i oduševlennosti v sovremennom russkom jazyke.' *Voprosy jazykoznanija* 4, 25–40.

Zubin D & Köpcke K (1986). 'Gender and folk taxonomy: the indexical relation between grammatical and lexical categorization.' In Craig C (ed.) *Typological Studies in Language 7: Noun classes and categorization: proceedings of a symposium on categorization and noun classification, Eugene, Oregon, October 1983*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 139–180.

ings of a symposium on categorization and noun classification, Eugene, Oregon, October 1983. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 139–180.

Gender, Sexuality and Language

M Bucholtz, University of California, Santa Barbara, Santa Barbara, CA, USA

K Hall, University of Colorado, Boulder, CO, USA

© 2006 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

Gender initially became a focus of linguistic interest in the first half of the 20th century when field linguists discovered what they perceived as stark differences between European languages and the indigenous languages they had begun to document in the Americas and elsewhere. Of particular interest was the finding that a number of these languages differentiated between women's and men's speech on the basis of grammar, phonology, and lexicon. These so-called 'women's languages' and 'men's languages' were characterized as vastly different and mutually exclusive, and were often held up as evidence for the rigidity of gender roles in traditional societies in contrast to the enlightened gender liberalism of Western modernity. In addition to the problematic exoticism of native languages and cultures that informs this view, such a dichotomy between traditional and modern structures of gender is empirically untenable. It has recently been shown, for instance, that it was only under the conditions of modernization that gender differentiation through the creation of 'women's language' emerged in Japan.

In these early texts, sexuality was not theoretically distinguished from gender; researchers assumed a direct mapping from one to the other and of both onto language. Thus a speaker's departure from normative speech patterns was interpreted as gender deviance as well as sexual deviance, with 'effeminate' and 'bisexual' speakers occupying the margins as linguistic exceptions to an otherwise unyielding gender dichotomy. What was missing from such a perspective was the concept of 'indexicality,' the process whereby language 'points to' the social and discursive context of its own production. Seen in this way, many instances of perceived cross-gender language use might more accurately be understood as

indexing interactional stances such as affect or force/mitigation, not gender identities.

Despite its flaws, the early anthropological research on women's and men's languages did call attention to the important relationship between gender and sexuality. However, this connection was not developed theoretically until the 1990s, in spite of the small but steady stream of linguistic publications on sexuality. In the 1970s, a number of ethnographically oriented researchers published a flurry of studies on sexualized insults and banter, focusing primarily on male speakers. Although the intention of such work was to bring underinvestigated communities and genres into linguistic scholarship, many of these studies unwittingly worked to reinscribe stereotypes of the licentious and hypersexed Other.

As linguistic anthropologists began to turn their attention to at least some aspects of sexuality, gender was gaining a more central role in linguistic scholarship due to the influence of second-wave feminism, especially in sociolinguistic research on Western languages. One of the earliest and most important contributions to this new line of feminist scholarship offered a different conceptualization of 'women's language' as primarily pragmatic rather than structural and suggested that women's speech both produced and reflected real-world powerlessness. This view was complicated by contemporary anthropological research, however, which revealed that women's speech in other cultures could be forceful and assertive, though still devalued.

Recognizing the widespread deprecation of social practices associated with women, by the 1980s many feminist social scientists, including linguistic anthropologists, were seeking to validate women as competent cultural members in their own right. Meanwhile, the concept of 'culture' was adopted by some researchers of American society to account for what were still seen as vast differences between women and men. Though inspired by anthropological work on cross-cultural communication, this body of work overlooked widespread efforts to rethink the concept of culture within anthropology in this period.