AARHUS UNIVERSITY

Cover sheet

This is the accepted manuscript (post-print version) of the article.

The content in the accepted manuscript version is identical to the final published version, although typography and layout may differ.

How to cite this publication

Please cite the final published version:

Bakker, P. (2019). Intentional language change and the connection between mixed languages and genderlects. *Language Dynamics and Change*, 9(2), 135-161. <https://doi.org/10.1163/22105832-00902001>

Publication metadata

Title:	Intentional language change and the connection between mixed languages and genderlects
Author(s):	Peter Bakker
Journal:	Language Dynamics and Change
DOI/Link:	10.1163/22105832-00902001
Document version:	Accepted manuscript (post-print)

General Rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognize and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

If the document is published under a Creative Commons license, this applies instead of the general rights.

Abstract

This paper links genderlects and mixed languages. Both may have their roots in a gender dichotomy, where two distinct populations come together and blend into a new one, with different linguistic consequences. Mixed languages are generally assumed to be the result of deliberate or conscious language change and often come about as the result of an act of identity, connected to the birth of a new social or ethnic group. Societies or ethnic groups that are the result of mixed marriages may develop a mixed language or a genderlect. I show that there is a connection between the two, in one specific case: a mixed language developed into a genderlect over several centuries. Typically, mixed languages combine elements from two languages with results that are so unusual that they are clearly not the result of normal language change, i.e. they are not outcomes of regular transmission between generations. Certain combinations found in genderlects show parallel patterns, for example in having personal pronouns or deictic elements that derive from other languages. Comparative evidence based on structural parallels suggests that some such genderlects (though not necessarily all) derive from deliberate changes by earlier generations. In this paper, I also investigate whether there is a link between societies with socially quite different roles for men and women, and societies with a genderlect, and find that such a link does not seem to exist.

1. Introduction.

A genderlect constitutes a way of speaking that is limited to one of the sexes. In other words, it refers to a situation in which societies have men and women speak different languages, or, more often, different varieties of the same language. A genderlect refers to systematic and categorical differences between speech BY men and women, or TO men or women. It was for a long time assumed to be extremely rare, limited to a dozen or so cases worldwide, but our database (Rose & Bakker, 2018) now contains around a hundred cases.

(1) is an example from the Arawakan language Mojeño in Bolivia. The gender-marked elements in bold all signal that a woman is speaking.¹

(1) ene ta-nii-k-wore-pu-iji	ñ -omuire	eñi	ñi	‘pona ‘chane
and 3NH-eat-ACT-REP-PF-RPT	3M♀-also	PRO3M♀	ART3M♀	other person
ñi -nos-pu-iji	ñi	éto-na-rine		
3m♀-stay-PF-RPT	ART3M♀	one-CLF-nomore		

'And he (a giant serpent) reportedly ate him also, the other man. No more than one man was left.' ♀
(Rose 2013b: 123)

A male speaker would have used *ema* ♂ instead of *eñi* ♀ (pronouns) and *ma* ♂ instead of *ñi* ♀ in inflectional forms.

There is a clear geographical bias as to where genderlects are found. A large majority of the cases are reported from the Americas, whereas only one case (Bradley, 1988) is reported from the 250 languages of Australia and less than a handful from the thousands of languages of Africa. However, there may be a reporting bias in that Americanists are more aware of the phenomenon and deal with it as part of the language, whereas dialectologists working on European dialects do not identify a given variety as a genderlect because they have tended to relegate observed gender differences between the speech of older women and men to conservatism among women, rather than considering these as manifestations of a genderlect. Probably also dialectologists have seen it as something transitory, whereas Americanists may have documented it as a special phenomenon, an integral part of the language, and considered the observed non-stability as non-significant.

The term “genderlect” as used here refers to the phenomenon whereby women and men speak in ways systematically different from one another. I only consider languages which display categorical differences, not just relative differences in frequency. The differences in the speech between men and women may be limited to a handful of conspicuous lexical items, to just a

¹ Abbreviations: ACT = active; ART = article; CLF = classifier; M = masculine; NH = nonhuman animate; PF = perfective; PRO = pronoun; REP = repetitive; RPT = reportative; ♂ = male speaker; ♀ = female speaker

few phonemes, or to some grammatical elements or particles. In all cases, the populations are very much aware of these differences, and when people use the forms of the other gender, they may be ridiculed or judged on the basis of their sexual identity (Trechter, 1995). The gender-distinct elements may be few, but they are almost always items of high frequency and salience.

The term “genderlect” may suggest that men and women speak completely different languages, but that is very rarely the case. In many cases, fewer than a handful of roots/phonemes are systematically distinct between the speech of the sexes. As these differences tend to be frequent in languages (e.g. pronouns or speech sounds), they form a conspicuous aspect of these languages, and speakers are aware of them. In most cases, the differences are only found in a small domain of the language. They are typically found in phonology (different phonemes), pragmatic markers (different particles for different speech acts), pronominal markers for person (including possession), or in a number of lexical items (often frequent ones). Usually only one of these domains is affected in a particular language (see e.g. Rose, 2015).

Before I proceed, it is also necessary to say something about sex and gender. Sometimes sex is considered a biological given with a dichotomy between males and females, whereas gender is considered a social construct. On the other hand, at times even biological sex is considered a social construct. I take a realistic rather than postfactual approach to sex and gender: a large majority of humans have a gender identity associated with physical differences and different roles in sexual reproduction. That is a biological norm. However, both (social) gender and (biological) sex are in a sense continua that will necessarily involve cultural choices. For instance, cross-culturally, individuals commonly have gender identities that differ from their biological sex. These non-binary- or trans-gender identities may manifest themselves in transvestism, playing roles of the ‘other’ genders in gender-divided societies (e.g., tomboys, ladyboys, berdache, fa’afafine), or even in body-modification.

Thus, when we take the male-female dichotomy as a point of departure, we are aware that this is a simplification and that there are persons who fall in between or outside the boundaries. In most cases, these in-between groups are too insignificant to be reported upon in the literature, as the societies are often small. The main exception is homosexuality. The public acceptance and awareness of all these phenomena are also widely different between societies, and through time.

In linguistics, genderlects have not had the attention they deserve. Even though a few comparative studies have been published in recent years (Fleming, 2012, 2015; Rose, 2013a, 2015; Dunn, 2014; Antonov, 2015; Aikhenvald, 2016), the phenomenon is understudied. The remark that

Paul Li made 35 years ago is as true today as it was in 1982: “Distinction between men’s and women’s speech has not been brought up as a mechanism of linguistic change in historical linguistics” (Li, 1982: 294).

There is no uniform terminology. A number of terms have been proposed in the literature for the phenomenon. In earlier days, it was sometimes called “Women’s languages”. This is an unfortunate term – why are the women considered the exceptional group? If women deviate from men in their speech, then men’s speech also deviates from women’s speech. It is better to take a realistic and unbiased view and report that both genders speak differently from one another. More recently the terms “Gender indexicality” (Fleming, 2012) and “Anti-allocutivity” (Antonov, 2015) have been proposed. Gender indexicality means that a gender difference of speaker or hearer manifests itself in elements that do not directly refer to the speaker or hearer, but it is manifested somewhere else in the language.

The phenomenon is known mostly from sporadic mention of cases between the 1500s and today. It is best known and described for societies in the Americas, but the exotic nature of the phenomenon may have led researchers in western societies to relegate gender differences in speech to something transitional or just an isolated dialectal curiosum.

My interest in the phenomenon started when I was working on the Michif language in Canada, a mixed language based on the Amerindian language Cree and on French (Bakker, 1997). The language combines, roughly, French nouns with Cree verbs. The speakers descend from male speakers of French and female speakers of Cree. Since then I have been interested in gender dichotomies of different kinds, especially when they have an impact on the language. Michif is not the only language that is spoken in communities where male ancestors spoke one language and females another one. At the time, Michif seemed unique in its Noun-Verb dichotomy (now categorized as a V-N mixed language). Most mixed languages have a dichotomy in which all lexical items from one language were embedded in a grammatical frame of another – and therefore called G-L mixed languages.

In the case of Michif and several other new languages spoken by people of mixed descent, the community is biologically mixed, as is the language, but the community is linguistically homogenous (with variation, of course). In the cases of a genderlect, however, the opposite is the case: the speech community is not linguistically homogenous, and the language is not mixed, but there are two distinct varieties.

In this paper, I argue for a link between two types of mixed languages and genderlects of the same type. I do this, first, by documenting the historical development from one G-L mixed language to a fairly typical genderlect, and, second, by showing grammatical parallels between certain structural distributions in mixed languages with parallel introduced elements in genderlects. As both phenomena are exceedingly rare in the languages of the world, it is obvious to assume a link.

2. Some examples of gender indexicality

Rose and Bakker (2018) have collected around 100 examples of genderlects from the literature. They can be roughly classified as having a locus in phonetic/phonological, pronominal, deictic, illocutionary/pragmatic, and/or lexical domains. Most of them do not seem to be the result of a conscious process of change, but awareness of the presence of these differences is high. However, some types are likely connected structurally with mixed languages, about which there seems to be a consensus that these are often the result of a conscious process (Sasse, 1992; Boretzky & Igla, 1994; Thomason, 2001: 150, 204; Golovko, 2003; Mous, 2003).

Following the convention introduced by Falkinger (2002) and systematized by Rose, we will not use M and F for male and female speech, as there is a potential confusion with masculine and feminine grammatical gender. Therefore we use the symbol ♀ for female forms and ♂ for male forms in genderlects. Some languages, such as Garifuna (Central America), have both referential and indexical gender markers.

2.1. Phonology

Cases where men and women use different phones are relatively common among the genderlects. One example is of the Inuit of Baffin Island and formerly also of West Greenland, where the men used final stops and the women nasal consonants with the same articulation place: men used ♂ /p#, t#, k#, q#/ and women used ♀ /m#, n#, ŋ#, N#/ (Boas, 1911: 79; see also Kalmar, 1979).

Two possible explanations come to mind for such cases. There could have been a sound change from stops to nasals or the other way around which, for some reason, only affected one of the genders (see e.g. Haas, 1944 for Muskogean languages, or Taylor, 1982 for Atsina, Plains Algonquian). This is also known from dialect studies where one of the sexes is more conservative than the other, and preserved the older phones. These observations could be connected to a gendered division of labor involving male dispersal in nomadic pastoralism or seasonal wage labor, for example, or societies where contact with speakers of other languages or dialects is sex-specific.

The other explanation could be that two dialects coexisted, where one had undergone a sound change and the other had not. Because of certain marriage patterns, quite common in the world, where males from one group marry females from another community, but not the other way around, both sexes could have preserved their own modes of pronunciation.

In the genderlect of the Chukchis, several sound changes can be identified, and for some of these, the men seem to be the innovators, while for others it must have been the women. Women merged *d and *c to /c/ and men merged *d and *r to /r/ (Dunn, 2000, 2014). Such cases suggest intermarriage as the cause rather than one gender not being affected by certain sound changes.

As for the Inuit genderlect, it is certain that it existed for a period of 300 years at least, as can be deduced from documentary sources. It may go back even further, as the same phenomenon was present in 18th century Greenlandic as well (perhaps also in the 17th century), which would mean that it would go back to the period before West Greenlanders and Baffin Island Inuit split up, which has been suggested to have taken place around 1200 A.D. Such historic depth underscores the possibility of diachronic stability of at least some gender indexical phonological variants.

2.2. *Speech act enclitics*

Most dialects of Lakota (Siouan) use speech act enclitics, indicating whether an utterance is a question, a fact, an order, or emphatic. Men use *hųwo*, *yet^{ho}*, *kšt*, *yelo* for questions, orders, emphasis and facts respectively, whereas women use *hųwe*, *nit^{ho}*, *kšto* and *ye(le)*. The particles are quite frequent, and speakers are very much aware of them (Trechter, 1995).

Here, an explanation for the genesis of the gender difference is not obvious, thinking purely in terms of a linguistic development. This type is quite rare.

2.3. *Pronominal markers*

A number of genderlects show differences in the pronominal markers, often both the independent pronouns and the pronominal markers in verbs and possessed nouns. Here is an example from Kukama, a language spoken in Peru by around 1000 people. The gender-distinct elements are printed bold (Vallejos, 2016: 31):

(2a) (male speaker)

uri	tsenu	ikian	yawara= kana =ui	tana	ku=kuara
3SG.L.♂	hear	DEM♂	dog=PL♂=PAS1	1PL♂	farm=INE

(2b) (female speaker)

ai tsenu **ajan** yawara=**nu**=ui **penu** ku=kuara
 3SG.L.♀ hear DEM♀ dog=PL♀=PAS1 1PL♀ farm=INE
 “She heard the dogs in our farm”

The gender-distinct forms in this example are the third person singular pronouns (♂ *uri*, ♀ *ai*), the demonstratives (♂ *ikian*, ♀ *ajan*), the plural markers (♂ *kana*, ♀ *nu*) and the first person plural possessives (♂ *tana*, ♀ *penu*). There are other gender-distinct forms in this language as well. The forms do not seem to be cognates. One possible explanation for these differences is that one set of pronominal markers survives as a remnant of a different language, dating from a period in which the women came from a group that was different from the men, in a situation of exogamy.

2.4. Lexicon

In most genderlects, only a few or a few dozen words differ between the sexes. Mayrinax Atayal and Island Carib (to be discussed later) appear to be the most extreme. The number of distinct lexical items can range from a handful to most of the lexicon.

In the Mayrinax dialect of Atayal, an Austronesian language of Taiwan, the documented lexicon covers around 1000-1500 roots, of which around 100-120 are different for women and men, which is ca. 10 % (Li, 1982: 266).

Sometimes the words are clearly cognates and minimally different, as ♀ *sbil* and ♂ *sibil-iq* “lunchbox”, ♀ *ca-caqis* and ♂ *ca-ca-?iη* “thread”. One cannot point to regular sound changes, as the patterns are sometimes the opposite, as in ♀ *iluk* ♂ *ihuk* “strawberry” but ♀ *hbuq* and ♂ *lbuq* “sprout”. In a few cases, the forms differ so much that they are not likely cognates, as in ♀ *?ibubuh* and ♂ *bauwak* “pig” or ♀ *nuhan tikay!* and ♂ *qalaa tikay!* “wait a second!” (Li, 1982).

2.5. Morphology

In Nambikwara (Kroeker, 2001: 66), a few bound morphemes differ in gender. When addressing males, the imperfective aspectual suffix *-wa2* is used, and when addressing females, the suffix *xa2* is used. For example, “I will come” is *wxã³na¹tu¹wa²* for masculine addressees and *wxã³na¹tu¹xa²* for female addressees.

(3a) *wxã³na¹tu¹wa²* (♂)

(3b) *wxã³na¹tu¹xa²* (♀)

come-1SG-FUT-IMPF

« I will come » (Kroeker, 2001: 65-66)

Most genderlects with a locus in the morphological domain show only differences in the pronominal markers.

2.6. Outlook

The above listing is not an exhaustive summary, but an illustration of some of the more frequent types of phenomena. In the next sections, we discuss mixed languages and their connection with two types of genderlects, as well as social aspects of small societies that could be relevant for differences in speech between men and women.

3. Mixed languages

The comparative study of mixed languages is relatively young, and it probably started with a workshop in 1994 in which a dozen or so cases were dealt with (Bakker & Mous, 1994). Since then, the availability of an increasing number of cases also facilitated the study of mixed languages. Yet, only a few dozen examples of mixed languages have been documented, to varying degrees. A number of these mixed languages are spoken by descendants of mixed marriages, where men spoke language A and women language B. Most researchers seem to agree that these mixed languages were created consciously, as an act of identity (Golovko, 2003; Thomason, 2003; Bakker, 2003; Meakins, 2013).

In a recent overview of mixed languages (Bakker, 2017), the following types are distinguished: languages with the grammatical system from one language and the lexicon from another (G-L mixed languages), languages with the structural frame from one language and the shapes of the morphemes from another (F-R mixed languages), languages with nouns from one language and verbs from another (V-N mixed languages), languages with verbs from one language and nouns from two languages (V-NN mixed languages), languages with verbal inflection and possessive pronouns from a different language than the rest (L-INFL mixed languages), and finally languages with roughly equal amounts of vocabulary from two or more languages (LL mixed languages).

Most of these types are so dissimilar from what we find in the documented genderlects, that they need not concern us. But a few types show intriguing similarities with some types of genderlects. Thus, the genesis of genderlects may be connected with the genesis of these

mixed languages. The acts of identity that gave rise to these mixed languages could have been relevant for the types most frequently encountered in the literature.

There are several processes that have been suggested for the genesis of mixed languages. First, people may have been shifting from language A to language B, until they realize that they are losing their ancestral language A. There is no way back, except through incorporating as many retrievable words from A into the grammatical frame of B. Thus, speakers of Romani in Britain may have developed Angloromani by using Romani words in a framework of English. This idea is called the U-turn hypothesis (Sasse, 1992; Boretzky & Igla, 1994).

A different act of identity may have been the development of a new language connected with the genesis of a new ethnicity (ethnogenesis). Most of the cases of such mixed languages have to do with mixed marriages, where fathers and mothers in a community were speakers of different languages. If the children identified with neither of the parents but rather with each other, the identity of the new group may be expressed by the creation of a new language with a new ethnicity. Thus, Michif (Cree verbs, French nouns, a V-N language) was created by a newly emerged mestizo population in Canada, the Métis (Bakker, 1997). Bakker (2012) is a comparative ethnographic study of such mixed languages. Similarly, a language combining the grammatical structure of Javanese and the lexicon of Dutch was created by people in Indonesia with Dutch paternal roots and maternal roots in the Javanese population (a G-L mixed language), called Javindo (de Gruiter, 1994). Another mixed language (but of a different structural type) that emerged as an act of identity can be exemplified with the rather unusual mixed language of Copper Island. It is roughly a dialect of the Aleut language but with pronouns and verbal inflection from Russian (L-INFL mixed language). (Vakhtin, 1998; Golovko, 2003). This is spoken by descendants of Russian speaking men and Aleut women.

For two of these structural types discussed above, we have documentation for both mixed languages and genderlects. The language historically used by Island Carib men was similar to a G-L mixed language, and its descendant Garifuna has genderlect distinctions (Haurholm-Larsen, 2016; de Pury, 2003). The genderlect in Kukama (Peru) in example (3) above shows some intriguing similarities with Mednyj Aleut, an L-INFL mixed language discussed below.

Thus, the genesis of genderlects may be connected with the genesis of mixed languages. There are three arguments for a link between the two, one structural, one social and one historical. One argument is based on some striking similarities between the range of structural combinations of two languages in both genderlects and mixed languages, both of which are globally

rare. There are mixed languages with a dichotomy between INFL and the rest of the language (Hubner Mischsprache and Copper Island Aleut), and there are some genderlects with roughly the same pattern (similar to Kukama discussed briefly above). There may also be (historical) genderlects structurally similar to G-L mixed languages, where pre-Island Carib would have been one (see section 5).

The second argument is that a sizable number of the reported mixed languages have their roots in a male-female dichotomy, in that, according to their oral history, men and women spoke different languages, and the children created a new, mixed one. Genderlects likewise are obviously connected to men-women language diversity in the past. This is an argument based on documented social processes and oral traditions about men and women of originally different ethnic origins in many cases of genderlects and mixed languages, to be discussed below.

In addition, the diachronic developments of the mixed language Island Carib of the Lower Caribbean Islands in the mid-1600s to the quite modest genderlect in its descendant language Garifuna spoken today in Central America, suggest that a current genderlect can be a descendant of a mixed language. If one can link the two historically in one case, other genderlects may also descend from mixed languages. This will be explored in the next section.

4. From the Island Carib mixed language to the Garifuna genderlect

Garifuna is an Amerindian language spoken by some 150,000 people of primarily African descent in South America. They are also known under the name “Black Carib” because of their Amerindian identity (Carib) and their black skin. Despite the fact that the name of the ethnic group and their language are derived from the tribal name “Carib”, the grammatical system and much of its lexicon are Arawakan. A number of rather unusual historical events can explain the rather intriguing facts that Black people speak an Amerindian language and that the name of the group does not match with the language.

The Caribbean islands were inhabited by Arawakan people, but several centuries before the arrival of the Europeans, Carib warriors from the mainland had invaded the islands of the Lower Antilles, perhaps as far north as the Virgin Islands (Dreyfus, 1983-1984). Oral history, documented in several sources from the 17th century (Auroux & Queixalos, 1984), relates that the local indigenous Arawak men were killed by these Carib newcomers and new unions between Carib men and Arawak women came about on the southernmost islands, probably ranging from Grenada and Saint Vincent in the south to Guadeloupe in the north, if not further. The language situation of

the islands around the time of the arrival of the Europeans was that women spoke an Arawak language, and the men an Arawak language with predominantly Cariban vocabulary, and in rare cases the men also spoke another language, among themselves only, presumably Carib (Hoff, 1994, 1995). The earliest and rather detailed description of the language of the so-called “Island Carib” from the mid-1650s unveils an Arawakan language, with much of the lexicon from Carib in the men’s speech. When the roots were different for men and women, almost always, an etymologically Carib word was used by the men in their speech, and an Arawak word by women (as first revealed by Adam, 1879). Thus, the language of the men was similar to a G-L mixed language. This was presumably created as an act of identity by children with Carib fathers and Arawak mothers, parallel to the cases discussed in section 3. The lexicon is from the language of the men, and the grammatical system from the women’s language system.

The first person to systematically investigate the origin of the words used by men and by women was the French linguist Lucien Adam in 1897. He went through the 2000 to 3000 words in the Breton’s French-Island Carib dictionary, and identified 400 meanings where men use a form that differs from the women, e.g. *embatali* ♂ and *ichibou* ♀ ‘face’ and *i-oumân* ♂ and *acou* ♀ ‘eye’. Of the 160 words that he identified as Carib (Kalina), 36 were used by both sexes, 110 were only used by men, 9 by women only and five were indeterminate. Of the 79 Arawak words, 11 were common to both sexes, 60 were used by women only, five by men only and three were doubtful. Thus, he showed that the male words were overwhelmingly Carib, and female words mostly Arawak. Also in the domain of pronominal possession and negation, different forms were used depending on the sex of the speakers, whereas the grammar (e.g. verbal inflection) was otherwise Arawakan.

Later students of the etymological origin of Island Carib words came to the same conclusions. Taylor (1954) also undertook a calculation of the Carib and Arawak contribution to the lexicon, and reached very similar results. He did a calculation of the etymological origin of Island Carib basic vocabulary of 197 items. In 1650, 56 of the words used by the men were Arawakan, and 100 were Carib, that is 28% and 51% respectively. For the women, 137 of the words were Arawakan and 26 were Cariban, and, i.e. 70% and 13 % respectively. He also calculated gender-distinct vocabulary for its descendant language Garifuna, with a 300 year interval, showing clearly the significant decrease of the proportion of Carib words in the men’s language, from 51 % in 1650 to 18 % in 1950 (see Table 1; see also Taylor, 1977: 76). In fact, Taylor (1961: 30) reports that he found only five words, of the 50 that he tested, with distinct male and female forms in use in 1950

in a Central American variety of Garifuna. This shows that the Carib component had diminished over the years, possibly due to influence from the Arawakan-speaking mothers and their dominant role in child-raising. These 18 % constitute the remainder of an earlier full set of Carib words, as used by the men, and may include both integrated Carib words (those used by both men and women), and words with gender-distinct forms. Clearly, the proportion of Carib words decreased through time in the period of documentation. One reason may be that Carib was no longer used by the men, and it is not very economic to have a large number of words with two gender-dependent synonyms.

Table 1: Taylor's calculation of the decrease of Carib vocabulary through time (1954: 53)

Etymology	Dominica 1650		Central America 1950	
	Men's speech	Women's speech	Men's speech	Women's speech
Arawak	56	137	122	130
Carib	100	26	36	28
Uncertain	39	31	32	32
other	2	3	7	7

Similar numbers were obtained independently by de Goeje (1935-1936), who investigated the etymology of the complete available documented lexicon of Garifuna of Honduras, based on published Bible translations. 810 words were identifiable as Carib (Kaliña) and 710 as Arawakan (Iñeri). Most of these words were common to men and women, but 370 of the Carib words were used by the men only and 20 by the women only, whereas the proportions were the opposite for the Arawak words: 30 Arawak words were used by men only, and 250 by women only.

He investigated 247 grammatical morphemes and 2567 words in all.

De Goeje (1935-1936) explains the Arawak-Carib dichotomy in the language as a conscious choice, thus anticipating the U-turn hypothesis later formulated by e.g. Boretzky & Igla (1994). The women, according to de Goeje, played a major role in the formation and transmission of the mixed language, even though the men imposed a Carib identity on the population, including in the names of the men's language (Kalinago) and the women's language (Kaliponam).

In a later article, de Goeje (1939) provides more details on his ideas of the development:

"One can imagine that the Kaliña only knew their own language at the beginning, and that they demanded from these [Iñeri, Arawak] women that they learn Kaliña. But when these women conversed with one another, they naturally used the language that was familiar to them, that is to say, Iñeri (or Arawak or Taino). The children learned Iñeri from their mothers. Then the sons went with their fathers and often met Kaliñas from the mainland, and tried to speak the language of their fathers, and by national pride demanded that the women would address them as much as possible using Kaliña words and grammatical forms. This bilingualism then became a habit. (...). Little by little certain Kaliña or Iñeri words have fallen into disuse, so that in Breton's time [1650s] there was a Carib language which was none other than the Iñeri language in which several words had been replaced by words of Kaliña origin." ² (de Goeje 1939: 3-4; my translation)

At the time, de Goeje was not aware of other such cases where men spoke different languages from their partners, and where a new population group emerged with a new ethnic identity – and a new language. In Bakker (1997) several cases are discussed where such socio-historical events have led to a new, mixed language, and since then a few additional ones have come to the fore (see also Bakker, 2017).

We saw in de Goeje's and Taylor's calculations of the Arawak and Carib contributions to the Garifuna lexicon that both Carib and Arawak words are part of the language, and that the Carib component of Garifuna (a clear descendant of Island Carib) has decreased over time. However, they did not study the genderlect, i.e. the meanings for which men and women use different words. Most modern fieldworkers suggest the existence of a few dozen words at most that differ for the sexes in Garifuna (e.g. Steffen Haurholm-Larsen, 2016: 290-297).

As an example, here are all the entries marked "m.s." (male speech) or f.s. (female speech) in Cayetano's Garifuna dictionary (Garifuna-English only) from Belize (Cayetano, 1993). Derivations and compounds with these roots are not given separately. Here we find no more than two dozen words, and the limited overlap with the genderlect lexical items in de Pury (2003), who

² "On peut se figurer qu'au commencement les Kaliña ne connaissant que leur langue à eux, ont exigé de ces femmes qu'elles apprennent le Kaliña. Mais quand ces femmes s'entretenaient entre elles, elles se servaient naturellement de la langue qui leur était familière, c'est-à-dire de l'Iñeri (ou de l'Arawak ou du Taino, ou d'un mélange). Les enfants ont appris l'Iñeri de leurs mères ; puis les fils allant avec leurs pères et rencontrant souvent des Kaliña de la terre ferme, se sont efforcés de parler la langue de leurs pères et par orgueil national exigeaient que les femmes en s'adressant à eux se servissent aussi autant que possible de mots et de formes grammaticales kaliña. Ce bilinguisme est ensuite devenu chose d'étiquette. (...). Peu à peu certains mots kaliña ou iñeri sont tombés en désuétude, de sorte qu'au temps de Breton il y avait une langue caribe qui n'était autre que la langue iñeri dans laquelle plusieurs mots avaient été remplacés par des mots d'origine kaliña."

mentions 30 gender-distinct words and mentions 16 meanings, is striking: only seven out of the sixteen meanings given in de Pury are also found in Cayetano as gender-distinct.

Table 2: Gender-distinct words in one variety of Garifuna of Belize

MALE SPEECH	FEMALE SPEECH	English	pages
ahü ye	higabu nun	come here	18, 105
amürü	buguya	you	20, 33, 161
amuleñei	ibiri	younger brother	102
au	[nuguya]	I	28
guentó	guenlé	now, immediately	50, 122, 132
gúñarü	würinouga	yesterday	46, 89
guñou buga	áriebuga	last night	131
ibamu	uguñouni	brother-in-law	56, 102
íbugañaü	ati	older brother	102
ímenidi	ág r	mother-in-law	16, 130
itu	íbugana , íbugaña	sister	145
tibidiouniga	libidiouniga	foolishness	116
tugurabuga	ligirabuga	recently	64, 83, 138
tumachu áu	lumachu au	ignorance	83, 122
tumamurabu		before day; after midnight	83
túteme	lítame	future, time to come,	83, 117
uguñouni	igatu	sister-in-law	145
unuhein dan	inihein dan; anihein dan	sometimes, there are times	59, 85, 147
wayumu	hürü	land crab	55, 87, 1107
wügüri	eyeri	man, male	43, 88, 95, 101, 111, 128, 147
würi	hianru	woman, female	30, 54, 88, 89, 95, 109, 110, 113, 118, 123, 138, 160
yagane	nugunerugu	my boat, my vehicle	75, 89, 93

Note that no verbs are found here; only nouns, pronouns and deictic/temporal adverbs. Kinship terms are especially frequent in the list. There is no doubt that this set of 22 words constitutes a subset of the originally much bigger Carib component of the speech of the men. Thus we have documented the transition from what was once a mixed language in Pre-Columbian times, via a men's variety with a considerable number of genderlect items, to a fairly typical genderlect, with a few more or less arbitrary lexical items, kinship terms, pronouns and other deictic terms. In many cases of genderlects, inflectional markers such as possessive and plural marking, are different depending on their etymologies.

This was a case of a G-L mixed language. Genderlects may also be connected to one other type of mixed language, the L-INFL type.

5. Two L-INFL mixed languages

There also seems to be a connection between L-INFL mixed languages and some types of genderlects. Unfortunately, we have no diachronic evidence here, but I will present enough circumstantial evidence to make a link between the two unusual phenomena likely.

There are only two well-documented cases of languages in which the inflectional system, including some pronouns, have a different origin from the bulk of the language, and those are the rather famous Mednyj Aleut language, also called Copper Island Aleut (Russian verbal inflection, otherwise mostly Aleut) and the hitherto unknown Hubner Mischsprache (Slovenian verbal inflection, otherwise mostly German).

Here are two examples from both mixed languages, with the seemingly borrowed (or preserved?) Slavonic elements in bold:

- (4) cwã nāj-e hājz-r drrixt-**a moj** prō(ə)dr **tam** hintr **nāfme** gôrte (Mischsprache; Slovenian bold)
 two new-PL house-PL build-3 **my**.M brother **there** behind **our** garden
 “**my** brother built two new houses **there** behind **our** garden” (Lessiak, 1959: 219)

- (5) **segodnja** taanga-x **bud-ut** su-la-xčĭ-t' (Mednyj Island Aleut; Russian bold)
today spirits-SG **AUXFUT-3PL** take-MULT-CAUSE-INF
 “**Today they will** sell spirits.” (Golovko, 1996: 96)

We observe in (4) that person inflection, possessive pronouns and deictic elements are from Slovenian, the rest from German. In (5) we notice a deictic time reference, an auxiliary with person inflection and other verbal inflection are from Russian, and the rest from Aleut.

A closer inspection of these two languages shows that in both cases the language dichotomy goes further than just the verbal inflection. In fact, the two mixed languages show patterns that are strikingly alike (see Table 3).

Table 3: Distribution of elements in two L/INFL mixed languages

	Mednyj Aleut	Hubner Mischsprache
<i>lexicon</i>	Aleut	German
<i>Nominal inflection</i>	Aleut	German
<i>Verbal inflection</i>	Russian (not all paradigms)	Slovenian
<i>Personal pronouns</i>	Russian	Slovenian
<i>Conjunctions</i>	Russian	Slovenian
<i>Negative particle</i>	Russian	German
<i>Adverbs of time, degree, quality</i>	Many Russian	Some Slovenian adverbs of time and mostly place

Table 3 shows that the two languages are noticeably similar in their distribution. It must be said that the published corpus of Hubner Mischsprache is very small, only 14 sentences with all in all 92 words (types; among which 8/9 adjectives, 21 nouns, 13 verbal roots of which two from Slovenian, two modal auxiliaries, 2/3 copulas). Despite its modest size, the distribution of categories is quite consistent in the material. There is only some leakage in the possessive pronouns (both Slovenian and German). It must be emphasized that it is clearly not codeswitching, as both the German and the Slovenian elements differ significantly from the local Slovenian and German dialects, which have also been documented. The basic sources for Hubner Mischsprache are Lessiak (1959) and Pohl (1995), the latter being the only secondary source I am aware of that discusses this variety.

The distribution of the source languages is at first quite noteworthy in these two languages (Golovko, 1994). On the one hand, the nature of the mixture is remarkably similar; on the other hand these two languages differ considerably from other mixed languages, and the

distribution at first seems arbitrary, or at least not along a grammar/lexicon line. Golovko (2003) believes that the Mednyj Aleut language is a result of conscious language mixing by bilingual speakers that has become conventionalized. Matras (2000, 2003), in his communicative-functional model of language contact, finds a functional reason for the presence of Russian inflection, pronouns and deictic elements in an otherwise Aleut frame, as all three categories involve “language processing operations that are the essence of message structure: the initiation of the predication and so the anchoring of propositional content is achieved in Russian.” (Matras, 2000: 93). In this way speakers preserve the integrity of the predication, while allowing the replacement of deictic/anaphoric and core elements (Matras, 2000: 93, 2003). In other words, “The crucial historical development in the Copper Island community was the shift to Russian as the language of the predication, triggering with it the use of Russian clause-organisation grammar” (Matras, 2009: 300). Still, it is not easy to conceive of a conscious choice to take complementizers, personal pronouns, verbal inflections and possessive pronouns for a communicative and deliberate act.

An alternative explanation is possible, however, in that the origin of the phenomenon described for these two mixed languages could be related to the origin of some of the genderlects.

6. Socio-historical links between mixed languages and genderlects

In examples (1) and (2), we encountered examples from Mojeño with person deixis, and Kukama, in which personal pronouns, demonstratives and deictic elements were from different languages, dependent on whether the speaker is a man or a woman. This is structurally quite similar to what we find in Mednyj Aleut and Hubner Mischsprache. In the language of one of the sexes, etymologically foreign deictic markers are used in Mojeño, whereas there is no choice in the two mixed languages. In theory, the foreign markers could have been gender-distinct in the past, and the markers for only one gender were preserved in the two mixed languages. Let us look at some genderlects with a locus in the pronoun system.

Rose (2015: 518; see also Rose 2013a) lists ten languages in South America in which a genderlect distinction is found in the pronominal system: Awetí, Bésiro, Garifuna, Iatê, Island Carib, Kadiwéu, Kayabí, Kokama, Mojeño, Omagua and Tsafiki. In Kukama and Omagua, not only pronominals display a speaker-gender distinction, but also the demonstratives, deictic pronouns,

and plural markers (which could possibly be cognate with the demonstratives), quite comparable with the two mixed languages.

Medny Aleut is spoken by a population locally called “Creoles”, which is in this case characterized by descendants of male Russian-speaking immigrants with their female Aleut partners. For the Hubner Mischsprache the historical gender dichotomy is less clear. Reports of language mixture in the area go back to the 17th century (Lessiak, 1959: 25-27). Germans (mostly males?) were already present in the region in the Middle ages (Lessiak, 1959: 22), so the German-Slovenian contacts have a long history.

Back to South America, in Awetí, a Tupi language of Brazil, there are sex-related differences in the pronouns, pronominal markers, deictic terms and some lexical items. Whereas the pronouns that do not have gender-distinct forms (second singular, second plural and first person exclusive) are clearly Tupi, the others do not seem to be Tupi, neither the male nor the female forms (Drude, 2002).

In Bésiro, Iatê, Kadiwéu, Kayabí, and Tsafiki, only (a subset of) personal pronouns are affected by genderlect differences, but not other deictic elements. In the most extreme case, only one word, a personal pronoun for the first person, is different, and that is the case for Tengerese on Java (Kohlbrugge, 1901: 93-94). According to their oral history, this is because they descend from immigrant men and local women.

This leaves us with the following languages with pronominal markers as well as deictic elements (and perhaps more) from other languages: Mednyj Aleut, Hubner Mischsprache, Awetí, Island Carib/Garifuna, and Kukama/Omagua.

These examples lead one to raise the question of the origin of the genderlects. Are there certain socio-historical situations in which one can expect the sexes to develop different linguistic behavior? And here I mean more significant differences than an increased use of some words (e.g. color terms) or a statistically higher number of certain constructions (e.g. tag questions; see Lakoff, 1975, 2004). In genderlects, the differences are categorical and systematic. There can of course be marked situations in which one can break or bend the rules, but such exceptions confirm the rules (but see e.g. Trechter, 1995, who emphasizes the exceptions to the rule to the extent that she questions the gender connection).

Could it be the case that genderlects are found in societies where men and women socialize separately, or live lives largely apart from the other sex? In some societies, men and women spend much of their time being separated from the other sex (see e.g. papers in Rosaldo and

Lamphere, 1974). For instance in hunter-gather societies, fishermen societies or societies with warrior traditions, the men – who typically are the hunters, fishermen, soldiers and warriors – spend much time away from the community. In socially less stratified societies, as in many hunter-gather societies, gender, together with age, may be the only social factor of difference, as level of education, wealth and social status play no role. There is, however, one clear case of a genderlect that emerged as a consequence of separate socialization of boys and girls, but it is special because there probably was no pre-existing language. Deaf children in Ireland went to gender-segregated schools, and the sign languages that emerged in the schools turned out to be mutually unintelligible. The languages have since developed into one, with a few women-only signs left (LeMaster, 1993, 1997, 2006).

Hunting languages, if not in a separate modality (whistled, signed), tend to be cases of the everyday language in which special terms are inserted. These special terms tend to be limited to the animals hunted and the tools used. If only men hunt (which is quite widespread; Testart, 1986; Gurven & Hill, 2009), the use or knowledge of the special words and registers is limited to males. For discussion of special hunters' languages or jargons, see e.g. Divale and Zipin (1977); Khiba (1980); Fehn (2011); O'Neill (2014); and Mohr (2015). The languages or lects were conscious creations, but it is unlikely that they would lead to a genderlect. At least, judging from the choice of the lexical items that are gender-distinct in genderlects, none of the cases seem to relate to exclusively or predominantly hunting terminology. For instance Rat (1898) mentioned that the following meanings had distinct word forms for men and women in Island Carib of Dominica in the Caribbean: *moon, rain, fish-hook, cassava-root, son, daughter, pepper, fowl, sea*. The forms are radically different, as the women's words are from Arawak, and the men's words from Carib, two different language families. These meanings do not relate to hunting, and none of the terms is typical for men's or women's tasks in Carib society. Similarly, the meaning range of the gender-distinct words of the Awetí in the Amazon does not suggest a hunting origin or a gender-role origin (Drude 2002): "bird species, parrot", "type of drinking vessel", "plant material used for roofing" (e.g. *takānyt* (♂) vs. *takári* (♀) "parrot-like bird"; *y'a'j t* (♂) vs. *mopo'j t* (♀) "drinking vessel"). Finally, in Kalmyk (Mongolian, Central Asia), the following meanings have gender-distinct forms – which are clearly not cognates: "son, boy", "green, a kind of grass", "bread, yellow", "dark", "white, bright", "black", "axe", "branch", "silver coin", "thief, theft", "young wolf", "dog", "dog for hunting" (Aalto, 1959). A few of these could indeed be hunting terms, but many of them are not. Note the number of color terms among them, and that Aalto considered the women's terms to be

deviant (“Frauensprache”).

These were languages with few gender-distinct words. Similarly, the range of meanings of gender-distinct words in 17th century Island Carib (Taylor; de Goeje) or in Mayrinax Atayal make it unlikely that any of these was based on a hunting jargon, even though Thomason, citing Stanley Starosta (Thomason, 2007: 53), mentioned hunting terminology as a source for the male speech of the Atayal. The Atayal range of meanings render this unlikely. The Kalmyk meanings probably constitute the only genderlect with a proportionally significant number (two or three out of 13) of hunting terms. But even in that case, the meanings are not limited to hunting or other specific semantic domains. A quick survey of other cases of genderlects with lexical differences, does not reveal a single case with predominantly hunting terminology. Apparently, such hunting languages have not led to the emergence of genderlects, with only Kalmyk Mongolian as a possible but quite unconvincing exception.

In some societies, there are separate houses or dwelling places for the men and the women, leading to much less daily interaction between the sexes. Societies with separate schools for boys and girls are a variation of this. If these schools are boarding schools, contact between the sexes may be quite minimal during formative years. Menstruation houses for women would constitute a temporary separation. Male initiation rites may also imply absence of males from the community for recurring time periods. But there appears to be no connection with genderlects: there is no ostensible correlation between societies with a genderlect and any of these societal types.

Further, we may think of societies where men or women choose their marriage partners from communities where different languages or dialects are spoken. Linguistic exogamy—where linguistic difference is a diacritic of marriageability—is the most institutionalized form of this process, and is found in e.g. Northwest Amazon (Fleming, 2016), in Sui in South East Asia (Stanford, 2006), and in Northern Australia (Heath, 1978). If there is also a form of matrilocality or patrilocality (i.e. when spouses always move to the residence village/community of the women resp. men), the locals, who are of the same sex, may have a dominant language or mother tongue that is different from those of all of the spouses.

Sometimes this exogamy is a law-like custom, as in the Vaupés region in Colombia where the indigenous people are expected to have spouses who speak a different language (see e.g. Sorensen, 1967; Gomez-Imbert, 1991; Aikhenvald, 1999; Stenzel, 2005; Fleming, 2016). One of the spouses thus ends up in a community where his or her mother tongue is not spoken.

In other cases where there is a situation of exogamy, the reason can be that there is a

folk belief that spouses from a neighboring group are believed to be more attractive as partners, for whatever reason, than spouses from the own group, leading to high proportions of asymmetrical intermarriage. In such situations, hypergamy and hypogamy, men from group A can marry women from group B, but it is not acceptable that women from group A marry men from group B. This may mean that children grow up with a mother and a father speaking different varieties, dialects or languages.

In addition, we can think of situations of migration where all the migrants are of the same gender, usually males, who find local spouses, and stay there. In the latter case, if there are many of them, the children of the last group may form a new ethnic group, identifying as new and mixed (Bakker, 1997, 2012).

In all of these cases of exogamy, at least in some stage, there are periods of different levels of access to the languages of men and women. First, all women or all men may be speakers of the same language (depending on whether the community is matrilocal or patrilocal), whereas all their spouses are speakers of (a range of) different languages, namely all the languages of the newcomers to the community. Speakers are typically multilingual or multidialectal, but they have an identity tied with one language/ethnicity (Sorensen, 1967; Aikhenvald, 1999; Fleming, 2016). In the second case, there may be communities where men speak one variety and women another, and that would be the same pair of languages or dialects for basically the whole community. In the last case, men and women may speak different languages or different dialects, so that the children are confronted with both varieties. In that case, a new identity of mixed people may develop. In principle, the development of genderlects is conceivable in such situations. But it does not seem to have been the case.

In short, hunting languages, separate socialization and linguistic exogamy do not seem to lead to genderlects. New languages or new varieties can be thought of as acts of identity. A separate identity (which could be along gender lines) could lead to the development of gender differences in speech.

7. Conclusions

In this paper, I have argued for a link between genderlects and mixed languages. Both phenomena are rare and unusual, and connected to specific socio-historical situations. Mixed languages are the result of deliberate processes of change, and genderlects may have started off as mixed languages. There are strong diachronic indications for one of them. Some authors have also suggested that

certain genderlects may be the result of an “act of identity”, e.g. Dunn (2000), who suggested that women consciously made their speech sound like foreigners of in-married Alutors/Palana Koryaks.

I have shown that the mixed language spoken by the Island Caribs evolved into a language with a genderlect, Garifuna. That is a strong piece of evidence for the diachronic connection of a G-L mixed language developing into a genderlect. For other cases, the evidence is more indirect, owing to lack of historical language documents. Also in a number of other cases, the presence of the genderlect is attributed by the ethnic groups to different origins of the female ancestors and male ancestors (e.g. Aweti, Tenggerese). These are also exactly the socio-historical circumstances that we know have led to the genesis of mixed languages of the G-L type, the L-INFL type and the V-N type. Even though we are not aware of a genderlect with a Verb-Noun dichotomy, it should be a theoretical possibility. The fact that most genderlects with lexical differences do not have verbs among the gender-distinct items, should not be taken as a symptom of an N-V mixed language, as the gender-differentiated lexicon in these languages is usually too small to judge.

Both mixed languages and genderlects are rare phenomena. Both cannot be attributed to normal genetic transmission in the sense of Thomason and Kaufman (1988). I have presented some indications that they could be attributable to a unitary sociohistorical phenomenon. The distribution of the two languages in the relevant types of mixed languages and similar distributions in some of the genderlects, are intriguing, especially since both have to do with an original gender dichotomy.

Speakers in societies with a genderlect are very conscious of the differences between male and female speech, and they have theories about their genesis. This awareness may go back to the conscious creation of a mixed language by their ancestors, of which only remnants remained by the time of documentation. More comparative research may shed more light on the links between these rare but fascinating phenomena.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank the editors and the referees for their support. Special thanks to Luke Fleming, whose exceptionally detailed comments are gratefully acknowledged. If I did not follow his suggestions all the time, I hope to follow up on his suggestions in future work. I also thank Françoise Rose for inspiration and DDL-CNRS Lyon for their hospitality.

References

- Aalto, Pertti. 1959. Über die kalmückische Frauensprache. *Studia Mongolica. Instituti Linguae et Litterarum Comitetti Scientiarum et Educationis Altae Reipublicae Populi Mongoli* I, Fasc. 3: 1-18.
- Adam, Lucien. 1879. Du parler des hommes et du parler des femmes dans la langue Caraïbe. *Mémoires de l'Académie de Stanislas*, Série IV, Tome 11: 145-176.
- Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. 1999. Areal diffusion and language contact in the Içana-Vaupés basin, North West Amazonia. In R. M. W. Dixon & A. Y. Aikhenvald (eds.), *The Amazonian Languages*, 385-415. Cambridge: CUP.
- Aikhenvald, Alexandra. 2016. *How Gender Shapes the World*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Antonov, Anton. 2015. Verbal allocutivity in a crosslinguistic perspective. *Linguistic Typology* 19: 55-85.
- Auroux, Sylvie & Francisco Queixalos. 1984. Le Caraïbe et la langue des femmes. Théorie et données en linguistique. *Matériaux pour une histoire des théories linguistiques (Actes de ICHOLS II, 1981)*, Université de Lille III, 525-544.
- Bakker, Peter. 1997. "A Language of our Own". *The Genesis of Michif - the Mixed Cree-French language of the Canadian Métis*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Bakker, Peter. 2003. Mixed languages as autonomous systems. In Y. Matras & P. Bakker (eds.), *The Mixed Language Debate*, 107-150. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Bakker, Peter. 2012. Ethnogenesis, language and identity: the genesis of Michif and other mixed languages. In Carol Podruchny, Nicole Saint Onge and Brenda McDougall (eds.), *Contours of Metis Landscapes: Family, Mobility, and History in Northwestern North America*, 169-193. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.

- Bakker, Peter. 2017. Typology of mixed languages. In A. Y. Aikhenvald and R. M.W. Dixon (eds.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Linguistic Typology*, 217-253. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bakker, Peter & Yaron Matras (eds.). 2013. *Contact languages: A comprehensive guide*. Berlin/New York: de Gruyter.
- Bakker, Peter and Maarten Mous (eds.). 1994. *Mixed languages: 15 case studies in language intertwining*. Amsterdam: IFOTT.
- Boas, Franz. 1911. Introduction. In: *Handbook of American Indian Languages*, Vol. 1, 1-83. *Bureau of American Ethnology, Bulletin 40*. Washington: Government Print Office. (Smithsonian Institution, Bureau of American Ethnology).
- Boretzky, Norbert, and Birgit Igla. 1994. Romani mixed dialects. In Bakker and Mous (eds.) 36–68.
- Bradley, John. 1988. Yanyuwa: ‘Men speak one way, women speak another.’ *Aboriginal Linguistics* 1: 126–34.
- Cayetano, E. Roy. 1993. *The People's Garifuna Dictionary. Dimureiagei Garifuna*. Dangriga: National Garifuna Council of Belize.
- Divale, William T. and Clifford Zipin. 1977. Hunting and the development of sign language: A cross-cultural test. *Journal of Anthropological Research* 33: 185-201.
- Drude, Sebastian. 2002. Fala masculina e feminina em Awet . In Ana Suelly Cabral and Aryon Rodrigues (eds.), *Línguas Indígenas Brasileiras: Fonologia, Gramática e História. Atas do I Encontro Internacional do GTLI da ANPOLL*, 177–90. Belem: Editoria Universitária U.F.P.A.
- Dunn, Michael. 2000. Chukchi women’s language: A historical-comparative perspective. *Anthropological Linguistics* 42: 305–28.

Dunn, Michael. 2014. Gender determined dialect variation. In G. G. Corbett (ed.), *The Expression of Gender*, 39-68. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Falkinger, Sieglinde. 2002. Diferencias entre el lenguaje de hombres y mujeres en Chiquitano (Besiro). In: Mily Crevels, Simon van de Kerke, Sérgio Meira & Hein van der Voort (eds.), *Current Studies on South American Languages [Indigenous Languages of Latin America, 3]*, 43-55. Leiden: Research School of Asian, African, and Amerindian Studies (CNWS).

Fehn, A.-M. 2011. Some notes on traditional Ts'ixa gesture inventories. In: G. Sommer & C. Vierke (eds.) *Speech acts and speech events in African languages*, 145-168. Köln: Rüdiger Köppe.

Fleming, Luke. 2012. Gender indexicality in the Native Americas: Contributions to the typology of social indexicality. *Language in Society* 41: 295–320.

Fleming, Luke. 2015. Speaker-referent gender indexicality. *Language in Society*, 44(3): 425-434.

Fleming, Luke. 2016. Linguistic exogamy and language shift in the Northwest Amazon. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 240: 9-27.

Goeje, C.H. de. 1935-1936. Het merkwaardige eiland-Karaïbisch. *De West-Indische Gids* 17: 241-249.

de Goeje, C.H. 1939. Nouvel examen des langues des Antilles. *Journal de la Société des Américanistes* 31: 1-120.

Golovko, E. V. 1994. Copper Island Aleut. In Peter Bakker and Maarten Mous (eds.), 113-121. *Mixed languages: 15 case studies in language intertwining*. Amsterdam: IFOTT.

Golovko, E. V. 1996. A case of nongenetic development in the Arctic area: The contribution of Aleut and Russian to the formation of Copper Island Aleut. In Ingvild Broch & Ernst Håkon Jahr (eds.) *Language Contact in the Arctic: Northern Pidgins and Contact Languages*, 63-77. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

- Golovko, Evgeniy V. 2003. Language contact and group identity: The role of “folk” linguistic engineering. In Yaron Matras and Peter Bakker (eds.) *The mixed language debate: Theoretical and empirical advances*, 177–208. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Gomez-Imbert, Elsa. 1991. Force des langues vernaculaires en situation d'exogamie linguistique: le cas du Vaupés colombien, Nord-Ouest amazonien. *Cahiers des Sciences Humaines* 27: 535-559.
- de Gruiter, M. (1994). Javindo, a contact language in prewar Semarang. In Peter Bakker and Maarten Mous (eds.), *Mixed languages: 15 case studies in language intertwining*, 151-159. Amsterdam: IFOTT.
- Gurven, Michael and Kim Hill. 2009. Why do men hunt?: A Reevaluation of “Man the Hunter” and the sexual division of labor. *Current Anthropology* 50(1): 51-74.
- Haas, Mary R. 1944. Men’s and women’s speech in Koasati. *Language*, 20(3): 142-149.
- Haurholm-Larsen, Steffen. 2016. A Grammar of Garifuna. Dissertation, University of Bern.
- Heath, Jeffrey. 1978. *Linguistic diffusion in Arnhem Land*. Canberra: Australian Institute of Aboriginal Studies.
- Hoff, Berend J. 1994. Island Carib, an Arawakan language which incorporated a Lexical register of Cariban origin, used to address men. In Peter Bakker and Maarten Mous (ed.). *Mixed Languages: Fifteen case studies in language intertwining*. 161–168. Amsterdam: Institute for Functional Research into Language and Language Use (IFOTT).
- Hoff, Berend J. 1995. Language, contact, war, and Amerindian historical tradition: The special case of the Island Carib. In Neil L. Whitehead (ed.), *Wolves from the sea: Readings in the archaeology and anthropology of the Island Carib*, 37-60. Leiden: KITLV Press.

Kalmar, Ivan. 1979. *Case and context in Inuktitut*. National Museum of Man, Mercury Series, Canadian Ethnology Service.

Khiba, Z.K. 1980. A contribution to Abkhaz lexicography: The secret language of the hunters. *Bedi Kartlisa/Revue de Kartvelologie* 38: 269-277.

Kohlbrugge, J.F.H. 1901. Die T ngg resen. Ein Alter Javanischer Volksstamm. Ethnologische Studie. *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde van Nederlandsch-Indië* 53: 81-147 [6e Volgreeks, 9e Deel].

Kroeker, Menno. 2001. A descriptive grammar of Nambikuara. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 67:1–87.

Lakoff, Robin. 1975. Language and woman 's place. *Language in Society* 2(1): 45-80.

Lakoff, Robin. 2004. *Language and woman 's place. Text and commentaries*, edited by Mary Bucholtz. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

LeMaster, B. 1993. When women and men talk differently: Language and policy in the Dublin deaf community. In T. Wilson, H. Donnan, C. Curtin (eds.), *For Irish Towns and Cities: Anthropological Perspectives on Urban Life*. Belfast: The Queen's University of Belfast.

LeMaster, B. 1997. Sex differences in Irish sign language. In Jane H. Hill, P.J. Mistry & Lyle Campbell (eds.), *The Life of Language: Papers in linguistics in honor of William Bright*, 67-85. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

LeMaster, B. 2006. Language contraction, revitalization, and Irish women. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 16: 211–228.

Lessiak, P. 1959. *Die deutsche Mundart von Zarz in Oberkrain. A. Grammatik*. Marburg: N.G. Elwet Verlag.

Li, Paul Jen-kuei. 1982. Male and female forms of speech in the Atayalic group. *Bulletin of the Institute of History and Philology* 53: 265-304.

Matras, Yaron. 2000. Mixed languages: A functional-communicative approach. *Bilingualism, Language & Cognition*. 3(2): 79-99.

Matras, Yaron. 2003. with Peter Bakker. Mixed languages: Re-examining the structural prototype. In: Bakker, P. & Matras, Y. eds. *The Mixed Language Debate*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton. 151-176.

Matras, Yaron, 2009. *Language Contact*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Meakins, Felicity. 2013. Mixed languages. In Peter Bakker and Yaron Matras (eds.). 2013. *Contact languages: A comprehensive guide*. 159-228. Berlin/New York: de Gruyter.

Mohr, Susanne. 2015. Tshaukak'ui – hunting signs of the Ts'ixa in Northern Botswana. In Julie Bakken Jepsen, Goedele De Clerck, Sam Lutalo-Kiingi, William B McGregor (eds.) *Sign Languages of the World: A Comparative Handbook*, 933–954. Berlin: De Gruyter.

O'Neill, Gareth. 2014. Humming, whistling, singing, and yelling In Pirahã. Context and channels of communication In FDG. *Pragmatics* 24: 349-375.

Ortner, .Sherry B. and Harriet Whitehead (eds.). 1981 *Sexual Meanings: The Cultural Construction of Gender and Sexuality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pohl, H.D. 1995. Slowenisch-deutscher Sprachkontakt in Krain. Bemerkungen zur „Hubner Mischsprache“, in K. Sornig et al. (eds.), *Festschrift für Norman Denison*, (*Grazer Linguistische Monographien* 10), 315-322. Graz: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft. [new version: http://members.chello.at/heinz.pohl/Sprachkontakt_Zarz.pdf]

de Pury, Sybille. 2003. “Vice-versa”. Le genre en garifuna. *Faits de Langues* 21(2): 155–162.

Rat, Joseph Numa. 1898. The Carib [Karifuna] language as now spoken in Dominica, West Indies. *Journal of the Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland* 27 : 293-315.

Rosaldo, Michelle Zimbalist, Louise Lamphere, Joan Bamberger. 1974. *Woman, Culture, and Society*. Stanford University Press.

Rose, Françoise. 2013a. Le genre du locuteur et de l'allocutaire dans les systèmes pronominaux: genre grammatical et indexicalité du genre. *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 108: 381-417.

Rose, Françoise. 2013b. Los generolectos del mojeño. *Liames* 13: 115-134.

Rose, Françoise. 2015. On male and female speech and more: categorical gender indexicality in indigenous South American languages. *International Journal of American Linguistics*, 81(4): 495-537.

Rose, Françoise and Peter Bakker. 2018. Genderlects. Map and survey. ms.

Sasse, Hans Jürgen. 1992. Theory of language death. In M. Brenzinger (ed.) *Language Death: Factual and Theoretical Explorations with Special References to East Africa*, 7–30. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Stanford, James N. 2006. When your mother tongue is not your mother's tongue: Linguistic reflexes of Sui exogamy. *University of Pennsylvania Working Papers in Linguistics* 12(2): 217-229.

Stenzel, Kristine. 2005. Multilingualism in the Northwest Amazon, Revisited. In: *Memorias del Congreso de Idiomas Indígenas de Latinoamérica-II 27 – 29 de octubre de 2005*, University of Texas at Austin.

Sorensen, Arthur P. Jr. 1967. Multilingualism in the Northwest Amazon. *American Anthropologist* 69: 670-684.

- Taylor, Douglas. 1954. Diachronic Note on the Carib contribution to Island-Carib. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 20: 28-33.
- Taylor, Douglas. 1961. Some particular problems in the application of the 100-Item Lexicostatistic Test List. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 27: 30-41.
- Taylor, Douglas. 1977. *Language in the West Indies*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Taylor, Allan R. 1982. "Male" and "Female" Speech in Gros Ventre. *Anthropological Linguistics* 24 (3): 301-307.
- Testart, Alain. 1986. Essai sur les fondements de la division sexuelle du travail chez les chasseurs-cueilleurs. Paris : EHESS (Cahiers de l'Homme).
- Thomason, Sarah G. 2001. *Language Contact. An Introduction*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Thomason, Sarah G. 2003. Social factors and linguistic processes in the emergence of stable mixed languages. In Yaron Matras and Peter Bakker (eds.), *The mixed language debate: Theoretical and empirical advances*, 21-40. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Thomason, Sarah G. 2007. Language contact and deliberate change. *Journal of Language Contact* 1: 41-62.
- Thomason, Sarah Grey & Terrence Kaufman. 1988. *Language Contact, Creolization and Genetic Linguistics*. Berkeley, Cal.: University of California Press.
- Trechter, Sara. 1995. Categorical gender myths in Native America: Gender deictics in Lakota. *Issues in Applied Linguistics* 6: 5-22.
- Vakhtin, Nikolai. 1998. Copper Island Aleut; a case of language endangerment. In L.A. Grenoble

and L.J. Whaley (eds.), *Endangered Languages: Language loss and community response*, 317-327. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Vallejos, Rosa. 2016. *A Grammar of Kukama-Kukamiria: A Language from the Amazon*. [Brill's *Studies in the Indigenous Languages of the Americas*, vol. 13]. Leiden and Boston: Brill.