



Gender and Grammar in Chinese: With Implications for Language Universals

Catherine S. Farris

Modern China, Vol. 14, No. 3. (Jul., 1988), pp. 277-308.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0097-7004%28198807%2914%3A3%3C277%3AGAGICW%3E2.0.CO%3B2-%23>

Modern China is currently published by Sage Publications, Inc..

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/journals/sage.html>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is an independent not-for-profit organization dedicated to and preserving a digital archive of scholarly journals. For more information regarding JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Gender and Grammar in Chinese

With Implications for Language Universals

CATHERINE S. FARRIS

University of Washington

The significance of the encoding of sex and gender for questions about the relationship between language and culture, and between language and thought, is just beginning to be explored systematically.¹ Language and gender research, arising within the tradition of Western feminist theory, has overrelied on examples from Indo-European languages and cultures and has, moreover, not integrated this research very well with the current discourse on the nature and meaning of language in culture and society.²

In much of the literature on language and gender there is an assumed but not well documented relation between the extent of patriarchal bias in a culture and what has become known as sexism

AUTHOR'S NOTE: Earlier drafts of this article were presented at the China Program Colloquium, Jackson School for International Studies, University of Washington, March 1987; the Association of Asian Studies meeting Individual Paper Session, Boston, April 1987; and as the winning student essay at the Puget Sound Anthropological Society meeting, University of Washington, June 1987. I am grateful for participant comments. I benefited from critical reviews of the article by Carol Eastman, Stevan Harrell, William Boltz, Eugene Hunn, Anne Yue-Hashimoto, Zhang Huiyang, Perry Link, Gary Witherspoon, Greg Guldin, Dru Gladney, Allan Barr, and an anonymous referee for Modern China.

This article is part of a larger project, my unpublished Ph.D. dissertation (Farris, 1988), which is concerned with how the meanings of gender are linguistically encoded in Chinese, and how these meanings are learned as part of the sex role socialization process. The research has been supported by the Graduate Student Research Travel Fund (University of Washington, Department of Anthropology), a Woodrow Wilson Women Studies Research Grant, a Northeast Center for Research on Women Mentor-Scholar Dissertation Fellowship (University of Washington), and a Pacific Cultural Foundation Research Grant (Taiwan, ROC). For the data examined in this article, I have relied primarily on native sources, Shih (1984), Mathews Chinese-English Dictionary, the Ci Yuan, the Xiao Shuo, and conversations with native speakers. The calligraphy of Alice Liou Hsiao-hsiun graces the tables.

MODERN CHINA, Vol. 14, No. 3, July 1988 277-308

© 1988 Sage Publications, Inc.

in language structure and language use. Whether language is merely a mirror of thought or helps structure thought, or both, it is clear that there is no one-to-one correspondence between cultural and linguistic systems. Nonetheless, research on language and gender in Indo-European languages (specifically, the Germanic and Romance branches) suggests possible universals in the linguistic marking of the feminine, setting it off as Other, and letting the masculine form serve also as the generic or sex neutral one. This phenomenon has obvious implications for person perception, that is, for the ideas and beliefs we hold about women and men, and how these values get transformed into social process. If Man equals human in the linguistic and cultural codes, then Man will always be the standard against which Woman is measured, both cognitively and socially.

Chinese culture and society is well known for its extreme patriarchal bias, which twentieth century social and economic revolutions have left remarkably intact.³ Thus the Chinese language is an obvious candidate for an examination of the linguistic encoding of sex roles. Since Chinese, like English but unlike many Indo-European languages, does not have grammatical gender, gender is a covert category in both English and Chinese. In English, gender is marked by the pronominal system. But Chinese does not inflect or vary pronouns for gender, so the marking of gender is less obvious. Cultural context can mark a generic term for the masculine gender. For example, *sunzi* literally meaning "grandchild," comes to mean specifically "grandson," and a new form *sunnu* must be introduced for "granddaughter." The previously sex-neutral term, *sunzi*, has acquired the semantic feature <+masculine> as a covert category.

Many people have wrestled with the problem of how language is related to culture and to thought. For me, the most useful way to conceptualize culture is as a learned and shared semiotic system of signs and meanings, of which language is the most significant, if not unique, subset (see Singer, 1978, for a discussion of a semiotic anthropology). As I will try to show in this article, signs acquire meaning only (1) in relation to other signs and (2) in

the process of their deployment in the communicative context. Consider, for example, the Chinese word *nu-shi*, “lady,” “gentlewoman.” To understand the underlying gender asymmetries in the address system of which it is a part, we must know that *xiansheng*, “sir,” “gentleman,” is the masculine equivalent, not just of *nu-shi*, but also of *taimai*, “Mrs.,” and *xiaojie*, “Miss.” Or consider the phrase *pei-gian-huo*, literally, a “compensate-money-commodity,” referring to a daughter, for whom expenditures are wasted, as she will leave the natal home, taking a dowry with her. It is in the common usage of this phrase to refer to women that it covertly acquires the semantic feature <+feminine>. In a semiotic chain, these linguistic signs acquire new meanings in *parole*, that is, speech, which are then appropriated by members of the speech community and used by them in the cognitive organization of social categories. Many other examples of this process are evident in the Chinese language, which points to the need to identify systematically the dynamics of gender in Chinese and to integrate that investigation with theories of linguistic and cultural universals.

The research upon which this article is based was conducted in Taipei, Taiwan, the capital city of the Republic of China (ROC). It is this northern, urban Taiwanese speech community that I seek to characterize with respect to language and gender. Since the establishment of the ROC in 1911, there has been a national language policy aimed at linguistic unification and national development. In 1932, *Guoyu* (literally the “national language,” known in the West as Mandarin) was adopted as the national language, and today it is the official language of both the ROC and the PRC (where it is known as *putonghua*, the “common language”). The Taiwanese speech community is multilingual. The majority of the population is bilingual in *Guoyu* and at least one other language. For the majority of speakers, that second language is Taiwanese or *Taiyu*, a variety of southern Min, one of the seven major branches of the Chinese language family. *Guoyu* is the official language of government, the military, and education, while *Taiyu*, a vernacular language, is spoken in the home and temple, among the generation born before World War II, and in

agriculture and petty commerce. Guoyu is much more evident in northern than in southern Taiwan, where it is the primary language used in urban areas, especially among people educated after the war. (For a more detailed look at the sociolinguistic situation in contemporary Taiwan, see Cheng, 1985, 1987; Jordan, 1969, 1973; Tse, 1982.)

In the sections below, I will first explain the three theoretical constructs utilized in the article, namely, linguistic gender, covert categories, and markedness. This explanation is followed by the presentation and analysis of 10 data sets. Sociocultural meanings of male and female in Chinese are shown to inform the linguistic and cultural codes, and motivate social behavior. I conclude with some thoughts on language, culture, and social process.

LINGUISTIC GENDER, COVERT CATEGORIES, AND THE THEORY OF MARKING

Linguistic theory distinguishes between grammatical and natural gender, regarding the former as structural or formal phenomena, and the latter as semantic or content phenomena. In an article on gender-marking in American English, Stanley (1977) explains the distinction between the two kinds of gender in linguistics. Grammatical gender refers to the three main noun classes, as recognized in Greek and Latin, namely, "feminine," "neuter" and "masculine." Classification of nouns into three genders accounts for pronominal reference and adjectival concord. Theoretically, it is independent of sex. Natural gender, in contrast, "refers to the classification of nouns on the basis of biological sex, as female or male, or animate and inanimate" (Stanley, 1977: 43). In this view, pronominal agreement in English is not a matter of gender concord, but, rather, is determined by natural or biological sex. However, Stanley (1977: 44) asserts, and I concur, that the concept of natural gender "fails to accurately describe noun classifications and reference in American English." I believe this is so because English,⁴ like Chinese, which also does not have grammatical

gender in the classical sense, nonetheless possesses covert gender, which operates on surface structure phenomena in both languages.

I have borrowed the idea of **covert categories** from Whorf (1956). According to Whorf, language does not exist in words or morphemes, but in the patterned relations between them, which he termed “rapport.” **Whorf was an early proponent of the semi-otic claim that signs (linguistic or otherwise) acquire meaning only in relation to other signs. He asserts that “any scientific grammar is necessarily a deep analysis into relations,” and he distinguishes between overt and covert classes, or phenotypes and genotypes** (Whorf, 1956: 69).

An overt category is one in which a formal mark is present, whereas a covert category is one in which the marking is present only in certain types of sentences, and not in every sentence in which a word belonging to the category occurs. Class membership is not apparent until it is referred to in one of these special sentences, then we find that the word belongs to a class requiring distinctive treatment. Whorf asserts that gender is a covert class in English. For example, in the English sentence “The nurse has an important role to play in patient care,” the class membership of “nurse” is not apparent (i.e., not overt). However, in a following sentence calling for an anaphoric pronoun, “She has more contact with the patient than the doctor does,” the covert gender category of “nurse”—<+feminine>—is manifested. English gender is a linguistic classification that has no overt mark actualized along with words of the class, but “operates through an invisible ‘central exchange’ of linkage bonds in such a way as to determine certain other words that mark the class” (Whorf, 1956: 69). A covert concept such as gender in English is as definite, from a meaning standpoint, as a lexical concept like “female.” It is not an analog of a word, however, but of a rapport system, and “awareness of it has an intuitive quality: we say that it is sensed rather than comprehended” (Whorf, 1956: 70). Both overt and covert categories are understood as conveying meaning. In English, this rapport of the covert category gender can be seen as the total pronominal linkage pressure of all the male class words, or all the female class

words, that function in meditation, and not a lexical concept like “male” or “female.”

Whorf (1956: 69) notes that in a language without sex gender (in the pronominal system), such as Chinese, thinking in terms of sex classification could not be of the same nature as in English gender; “it would presumably operate around a word, or a feeling, or a sexual image, or a symbol, or something else.” It is interesting to speculate what this rapport, or “central exchange” of linkage bonds in sex classification of Chinese, might be for native speakers. Below I hope to show that gender in Chinese is a covert category with few overt surface markings, which is nonetheless organized around a central and universal principle of “femaleness” or “maleness,” and which native speakers call upon to organize their thoughts about the sexes and to act toward and about, significant social others.

Whorf has been classified as a linguistic determinist, because of his emphasis on the formal and semantic uniqueness of individual languages, and the implications of that for our perceptions of reality. But I find in his emphasis on the deep relations of form and content in languages—which underlie and motivate surface phenomena—a systematic attempt to identify and explain what may actually turn out to be semantic universals, and their pervasive influence on all aspects of language. The concept of covert categories is a powerful tool with which to examine the phenomena of sex and gender in Chinese, and indeed in all languages.

In his discussion of markedness in natural languages, Greenberg (1966) demonstrates that the linguistic concept of marking has a high degree of generality in that it is applicable to the phonological, grammatical (morphosyntactic), and semantic aspects of language.⁵ He asserts that the tendency to take one of the members of an oppositional pair as unmarked so that it represents either the entire category or its opposite member *par excellence* is pervasive in human thinking. That is, the unmarked category is the culturally supposed “usual” case. For example, in logic we speak of the “truth value” of the set of which “truth” and “falsity” are the members. A “day” can either stand for a 24-hour period or indicate the

opposite of “night.” Similarly, the Chinese word *sunzi* has two meanings: “grandchild,” and also the meaning “grandson.” Because <+masculine> is the unmarked category, the word *sunzi* is used chiefly but not exclusively to indicate <-feminine>. Because it is polysemous, *sunzi* is an ambiguous sign.

Roman Jakobson (cited in Greenberg) said of the unmarked category that it has “zero” expression. To exemplify this, consider the phenomenon in Chinese of marking (i.e., expressing overtly) occupational terms for the feminine, for example: *yisheng* (“doctor”) versus *nu yisheng* (“woman doctor”). The process in Chinese is exactly parallel to the English gloss. That is, both doctor in English and *yisheng* in Chinese are not overtly marked for the masculine, nor are they examples of gendered nouns, that is, nouns with the semantic feature <+masculine>, as the words *boy* and *husband* are. Nonetheless, they are both covertly categorized with the *semantic feature* <+masculine>.

Because the masculine is usually the unmarked term of a correlative pair, it assumes the role of the ambiguous term of the pair. Greenberg explains that the speaker interprets this form as unmarked or general and pervasive in reference (encompassing the pair) at the lexemic level, but as marked when the context demands it (1966: 66). So, for example, doctor, or *yisheng*, means a physician of either sex, but male *par excellence*, because most doctors (in Chinese and American societies) are male, and the term evokes a male referent. That is, the semantic feature <+masculine> occupies canonical status in Chinese and English, and this fact is both a reflection of social reality and helps recreate that reality.

GENDER AND GRAMMAR IN CHINESE

SOCIAL IDENTITY TERMS

From Claude Levi-Strauss’s (1969) study, *The Elementary Structures of Kinship*, to the writings of ethnosemanticists (see

Tyler, 1969; Casson, 1981), anthropologists have viewed social identity terms, especially kin terms, as a linguistic window onto cultural forms. Thus we can usefully examine such terms in Chinese for what they may reveal about the sociocultural construction of the genders. Life-cycle words for females and males in Chinese appear symmetrical in their surface manifestations. As in English, these words are common nouns that must be marked with *nu* ("female") or *nan* ("male"). Table 1, below, provides terms for male and female statuses in Chinese. The words for "baby" and "child" are symmetrical; to indicate "girl" or "boy," one adds *nu* or *nan*. However, in usage, *haizi* ("child") is not really symmetrical, because women continue to be referred to as *nulai*, "girl-child," until marriage, while men are referred to as *nanren* ("male-person") after adolescence and regardless of marriage status. The pair *nan-de* and *nu-de* ("male" and "female") are symmetrical. However, while the word for "man" is *nanren*, the logical feminine equivalent is not *nuren* ("female-person"). That term is perceived by native speakers as having sexual connotations that *nanren* does not have. The situation is akin to the connotation "woman," until recently, is alleged to have had in English.

Women's sexuality is evidently much more problematic than men's in Chinese society, as we see from the word for virgin, *chunu*, overtly marked with the female character. The logical masculine equivalent, *chunan*, is relatively rare, and has completely different connotations from *chunu*. A woman is shamed if she is not a *chunu* upon marriage, while a man is embarrassed, and not quite a *nanren*, if he has reached social maturity and is still a *chunan*. Finally, the terms *zhongnianren*, "middle-aged person," and *laonianren*, "old person," are symmetrical in reference to men and women. However, the term *zhuangnianren*, "in one's prime," while not overtly marked masculine, is so marked covertly; the term is used only to refer to men.

Address and reference in Chinese shows gender asymmetry. Terms for women and girls inevitably encode their relative age and/or marital status, while men's status is usually unmarked for such features after puberty. Some reference terms for husband and

TABLE I
Life Cycle Words

<u>English gloss</u>	<u>Chinese</u>	<u>Character</u>
baby	yinger	嬰兒
child	haizi	孩子
youth	qingnian (green year)	青年
virgin	chunü	處女
in one's prime	zhuangnianren	壯年人
middle-aged person	zhongnianren	中年人
old (aged) person	laonianren	老年人
men	nanren	男人
women	funü	婦女
male	nan-de	男的
female	nü-de	女的

wife are complementary, while others have no masculine equivalent. The marking of the feminine is shown in Table 2 below, which lists address and reference terms for women and men in contemporary Taiwanese society.

As noted in the introduction, the presence of *xiaojie* ("Miss") and *taitai* ("Mrs.") as possible oppositions to *xiansheng* ("Mr.," "Sir," "gentleman") make it clear that *nu-shi* ("lady," "gentlewoman") is not a member of a gender-symmetrical reference term set. The multiple terms for spouses, especially "wife," are particularly interesting. The matched pair *neiren* and *waizi*, meaning literally, "inside-person" and "outside-one," refer to the two spouses' traditional spheres of influence, the so-called domestic/public domains (see Sanday, 1973). These words are the most formal terms that people use to refer to their spouses, followed by (in degree of formality) *xiansheng/taitai* ("Mr./Mrs.") and *laogong/laopo* (literally, "old husband's-father" and "old husband's mother"). The latter terms are used in casual conversation among friends to refer to one's spouse.⁶ Although concubinage and secondary wives are illegal in the ROC today, many men continue to have "little wives" (*xiao laopo*) if they can afford them. There is no linguistic need for the masculine alternative, *xiao laogong*, "little husband," since the practice does not occur. Only *waiyu*, "outside interest" (i.e., an extramarital affair) can be used to refer to either the man's or the woman's adulterous partner.

Kin terms are an important area for analysis of covert gender in Chinese. The relative value that Chinese culture places on girl and boy babies is evident from, among other things, two traditional expressions. *Nong zhang* (literally, "to play with a sceptre") means "to make jade," that is "to have a son." Whereas, *nong wa* (literally "to make earthenware") means "to have a daughter." As Perry Link (personal communication) points out, a respectful term to refer to another's daughter is *qianjin* "a thousand pieces of money," a term with positive connotations. However, the clear majority of address and reference terms mark the feminine term as the lower status one, or have negative connotations.

TABLE 2
Address and Reference Terms

<u>English Gloss</u>	<u>Chinese</u>	<u>Character</u>
Miss	xiaojie	小姐
Mrs.; wife	taitai	太太
Mr.; husband	xiansheng	先生
lady (+respect)	nǚ-shi	女士
gentleman (+respect)	xiansheng	先生
wife	qizi	妻子
husband	zhangfu	丈夫
wife (informal)	laopo	老婆
husband (informal)	laogong	老公
wife (formal)	neiren	内人
husband (formal)	waizi	外子
little wife (=mistress)	xiao laopo	小老婆
yellow-faced woman (my wife)	huanglianpo	黄脸婆
outside interest (=married person's lover)	waiyu	外遇

TABLE 3
Kin Terms, Descending Generations

<u>English Gloss</u>	<u>Chinese</u>	<u>Character</u>
daughter	nüer	女兒
son	erzi	兒子
children	zi nǚ	子女
granddaughter	sunnü	孫女
grandson, grandchild	sunzi	孫子
brother's daughter	zhinü	侄女
brother's son/child	zhizi	侄子
sister's daughter	(wai)shengnü	(外)甥女
sister's son/child	waisheng	外甥
descendants, posterity	zisun	子孫
have a son	nong zhang (make jade)	弄璋
have a daughter	nong wa (make earthenware)	弄瓦
daughter (colloquial)	pei-qian-huo (compensate-money -commodity)	賠錢貨

The terms for grandfather and grandmother, husband's father and mother, father and mother, brother and sister, aunt and uncle are all gender-symmetrical. However, in kin terms for descending generations in Chinese, the masculine form serves *par excellence* as the generic or unmarked term, as can be seen in Table 3.

Ambiguously, the unmarked form can stand either for an entire class, or, here, in the case of descending generational terms, for just the masculine half, while the feminine form can stand only for the feminine half of the pair. What has occurred to produce the asymmetrical references in these Chinese kin terms has to do with the covert coloring of a common noun, *-zi*, glossed: "seed," "off-

spring" (no longer a free morpheme) with the semantic feature <+masculine>, so that dictionaries now gloss *-zi* as "son." This covert principle can readily be seen from the forms—overtly marked with the female character—which complete the correlative pairs. In some contexts, the *-zi* forms still function as common nouns, so, for example, *zisun* can either be, generally, "posterity," or, specifically, "male descendants."

Another common form, *-er*, glossed as "child" (now a bound morpheme), combines with the common noun *-zi* to form the lexical item *erzi*, "son," while *nu* ("female") is prefixed to it to form the word "daughter," *nu-er* (the *-zi* is deleted now as redundant). The form *-er* remains a common noun in such combinations as *ertong*, glossed, "children" (in general). In certain *chengyu* or "proverbs," it also takes on the feature of <+masculine>. For example, the proverb, *er nu qing chang* (literally "male female feelings long") means "long is the love between man and woman." This also occurs in the little used compound *erma*, "male horse," "stallion" (the more common term for stallion is *gongma*).

OCCUPATIONAL TERMS

As occurs in English and other European languages,⁷ in Chinese many common nouns referring to persons in various occupations covertly bear the semantic feature <+masculine>, so that intended feminine reference must be overtly marked with the *nu* ("female") affix. In a discourse context, the "female" affix need be mentioned only initially, that is, as new information, and is then dropped in subsequent reference. Table 4 provides a partial list of such occupational terms in Chinese.

The list could be extended to all titles that refer to positions usually occupied by men must be added the feminine affix in order to produce the feminine equivalent. The glosses indicate the parallel process that occurs, to a lesser extent, in English. Notice that in Chinese, as in English, the profession usually associated with women—prostitution—must be marked for the masculine. The terms *jinu* ("prostitute-female") and *nan-ji* ("male-prostitute"),

TABLE 4
Occupational Terms

<u>English gloss</u>	<u>Chinese</u>	<u>Character</u>
(woman) mayor	(nǚ) shizhang	(女)市長
(woman) doctor	(nǚ) yisheng	(女)醫生
(woman) PhD.	(nǚ) boshi	(女)博士
(woman) department head	(nǚ) suozhang	(女)所長
boss (woman) or boss's wife	laoban (niang)	老板(娘)
prostitute	jinü	妓女
male prostitute	nan-ji	男妓
prostitutes (indefinite)	changji	娼妓

appear symmetrical, but *jinu* is a lexical item, while *nan* is prefixed to it to produce the masculine alternative (the *-nu* dropping out, being logically incompatible).⁸ In addition, the indefinite plural form *changji*, as well as the cognate that *nan-ji* and *jinu* share (i.e., *ji*), are both bound forms meaning "singing-girl prostitute." Further, in the writing system, the "woman" classifier *nu* clearly marks these words as <+feminine>.

*THE COVERT GENDER MARKING
OF REN ("PERSON")*

Like the bound forms *-zi* and *-er*, discussed above, *ren*, glossed, "person," "people," "humans," or, "others," is overtly a common noun, just as the English glosses suggest. It is a free morpheme that, combining with other nouns and verbs, forms compound words and phrases. Usually, it functions as a generic term, but in

TABLE 5
Ren as a Common or as a Gendered Noun

<u>English gloss</u>	<u>Chinese</u>	<u>Characters</u>
population	renkou (people mouth)	人口
folks, everyone	renmen	人們
artificial, man-made	renzao-de (people made)	人造的
others, "I"	renjia	人家
crowded conditions	ren shan ren hai (people mountain people sea)	人山人海
brilliant man, beautiful woman (=ideal couple)	cai zi jia ren	才子佳人
man of ability	caizi <u>or</u> cairen	才子, 才人
woman of ability	cainü	才女
(when) heroes are born, the place is glorious	ren jie di ling	人傑地靈
any man can be her husband	ren jin ke fu	人盡可夫
impotent	bu ren (not as a man)	不人
marriage go-between	meiren	媒人
beauty	mei ren	美人

some expressions it covertly acquires the semantic feature <+masculine>, or, less commonly, <+feminine>. Table 5 provides examples.

In the first cases above, *ren* functions as a generic noun, as the glosses indicate. An interesting exception is the use of *ren-*

jia (literally “person-family”), which usually means “other,” but which is also used as a first person pronoun. Chao (1968) explains how *renjia* has come to be so used. It usually means “someone other than I (or we).” Both a special usage is “someone other than you,” or “those who are other than you,” and “thus gets to be only a rhetorical way of saying ‘I’” (p. 645). Interesting for our purposes is the fact that *renjia* is a modest metaphoric distancing device used for the first person pronoun, and in this usage it is stereotypically girl-children and young women who so use it. Once again, we see that an overtly common noun has a covert gender, in this case, <+feminine>.

Remaining examples in Table 5 are all covertly marked for gender. In *cai zi jia ren*, “a brilliant man and a beautiful woman,” two common nouns (*zi* and *ren*) are covertly marked for gender, the first for <+masculine>, the second for <+feminine> (the word order is invariant, about which, see below). *Caizi* or *cairen* is glossed, “a man of ability,” “a talented *person*,” seemingly a generic or gender neutral term. However, the presence in the language of *cainu*, “a woman of ability,” forces the interpretation that, once again, *ren* and *zi* are *par excellence* <+masculine>, and only a specific context will allow them to be read as <+feminine>. In the proverb, *ren jie di ling*, “(when) the people are outstanding, the land is auspicious” (Link’s translation) or “the birth of heroes makes the place glorious” (Mathews’s translation), *ren* is once again, <+masculine>. Since women as heroines are practically absent from Chinese history, the overwhelming preponderance of heroes forces the interpretation that the *ren* in this case refers to men and not women. Another common proverb is *ren jin ke fu*, to describe a woman, meaning, “any person (*ren*) can act as her husband (*fu*),” that is, a promiscuous woman. The masculine alternative, “any woman can act as his wife,” is not possible. Finally, the classical term *bu ren*, or, in modern Guoyu, *bu neng ren*, “cannot be a man”, that is “impotent,” refers of course, only to males.

Ren can also bear the covert feature of <+feminine>, as may be seen in the last two examples in Table 5. Social roles typically associated with women allow *ren* to take a <+feminine> reading, as we

see in *mei ren* (a “marriage go-between”) and *meiren* (a “beautiful woman”).

PEJORATIVE TERMS

The tendency in English for words descriptive of women gradually to acquire pejorative connotations, with a similar process not occurring with regard to masculine descriptors, has been documented by Schulz (1975). In an article on gender-linked differences in the Chinese language, Shih Yu-hwei (1984: 216) points out that there are more pejorative or derogatory terms in Chinese referring to women than to men. Table 6 lists some of the most common gender-linked pejorative in currency in the Taiwanese speech community today.

The first pejorative term for women, *po fu*, or *po fu ma jie*, “a shrewish woman curses (in) the streets” (literally, “shrew woman curse streets”), is a common description for women that has no masculine equivalent. The terms *changshifu*, “a garrulous or overtalkative woman,” and *duozuipo*, “a big-mouthed woman,” reflect other common stereotypes about women’s speech styles. Just as researchers in English speech communities have noted, women in Chinese society are thought to chatter meaninglessly; but one of the four womanly virtues is propriety in speech.⁹ These stereotypes are closely related to *shi-san-dian* (literally, “thirteen o’clock”), “a silly acting woman,”¹⁰ usually one who laughs and giggles inappropriately. Still another stereotype about women is evident in the phrase *fu ren zhi jian*, “a woman’s perspective,” that is, narrow and subjective. This is usually used to describe women, but it can also be used for men, and then the insult is greater, similar to telling a man in American society that he “thinks like a woman.”

Two terms used to describe women overlap with masculine terms, and the differences between the contrasting pairs are informative of the stereotypes of women and men in Chinese society. *Biaozi*, literally, “a prostitute,” is no longer used as a word for that profession, instead, it is a word used to curse women. Thus a masculine pejorative, similar to the English glosses, becomes *biaozi*

TABLE 6
Pejorative Terms for Women and Men

<u>English gloss</u>	<u>Chinese</u>	<u>Character</u>
shrew, virago	pofu	潑婦
long-tongued woman: garrulous	changshefu	長舌婦
woman of loose morals	saohuo or saonüren	騷貨 騷女人
a woman who bewitches men	yaojing (supernatural spirit)	妖精
big-mouthed woman	duozuipo	多嘴婆
silly-acting, ridiculous <+feminine>	shi-san-dian	十三點
prostitute; bitch	biaozi	婊子
woman's perspective; narrow	furen-zhi-jian	婦人之見
son of a bitch	biaozi yang-de or biaozi erzi	婊子養的 婊子兒子
simpleton, blockhead <+masculine>	er-bai-wu	二百五
heartless lover; unfaithful husband	boqinglang (stingy feelings man)	薄情郎
old wolf	selang (lustful wolf)	色狼
lecher, wolf	saoleo tou	騷老頭

yang-de, "raised by a bitch," or *biaozi erzi*, "son of a bitch." This second set of terms refers to sexuality. A *saonuren* is "a woman of loose morals," "a slut," while a *saolaotou* is "a lecher," "an old wolf." The two terms, seemingly equivalent, differ from one another in much the same way the English glosses differ from each

other in the relative value society places on the unrestrained sexuality of men as opposed to women, that is, a loose, immoral woman versus a lecherous old man. Although men's sexuality may be the object of a pejorative term, as in *boqinglang*, "heartless lover," such terms for men also refer to their virility and sexual prowess, as in *selang*, "old wolf." Thus linguistic asymmetry mirrors cultural values and social mores.

Finally, we note the term *yaojing* (literally, "a supernatural spirit," a "fox-spirit"), "a woman who bewitches men." Vivien Ng (1987: 64) points out that the fox-woman is a common supernatural spirit in Chinese folk tales who "is typically extremely beautiful and seductive and loves to prey on unsuspecting young men who are novices in the matter of love and sex." She notes that "fox-possession tales are so universally known in China that, in the vernacular speech, seductresses are often referred to as 'fox-spirits'" (Ng, 1987: 64). In Taiwanese society today, the term *yaojing* is often used to curse the "other woman." Because of a sexual double standard, married men in Taiwan who can afford it often have *xiao laopo*, "little wives," with whom they usually set up a separate establishment. Or they will at least have a *waiyu*, "an outside interest."¹¹ But wives invariably blame the other woman for insinuating herself into the man's affections, and thus this woman is said to bewitch men.

WORD ORDER

Covert gender in Chinese also operates at the level of syntax. As Shih (1984: 216) points out, normal—that is, unmarked—word order always places lexemes with the semantic feature <+masculine> first, <+feminine> second. In other words, there is a semantic hierarchy to nouns that is motivated by underlying metaphysical assumptions about the sexes. Hierarchical ordering of nouns also occurs in Navajo (Witherspoon, 1977), and, I suggest, in all languages. Table 7 is a list of contrast sets and common *chengyu* that refer to gender in Chinese culture and society. The subordinate status of females in Chinese society is apparent from the

TABLE 7
Covert Gender in Words

<u>English gloss</u>	<u>Chinese</u>	<u>Characters</u>
	CONTRAST SETS	
male and female	nan nü	男女
husband and wife	fu fu	夫婦
father and mother	fu mu	父母
brothers and sisters	xiong di jie mei	兄弟姊妹
sons and daughters	zi nü; er nü	子女; 兒女
	<u>Chengyu</u>	
emphasize men; de-emphasize women	zhong nan qing nü (heavy man light woman)	重男輕女
man is respected; woman debased	nan zun nü bei	男尊女卑
man rules outside; woman rules inside	nan zhu wai nü zhu nei	男主外女主內
masculine principle hard; feminine principle soft	yang gang ying rou	陽剛陰柔
husband sings; wife follows	fu chang fu sui	夫唱婦隨
man plows woman spins	nan geng nü zhi	男耕女織

content or referent of the chengyu. Less apparent, because it appears so "natural," is the invariant male-female word order,¹² which signals, at the syntactic level—and thus reinforces at the semantic level—the symbolic subordination of the feminine.

Covert gender in word order also occurs in English, as the "naturalness" of the English glosses for the contrast sets makes clear.¹³ However, the word order constraints of covert gender in

English are probably less binding than in Chinese. Thus “mother and father” and “girls and boys” are not infelicitous, whereas the this order in Chinese always is. In fact, it simply does not occur, being so marked, for native speakers, that many perceive it as grammatically and not stylistically incorrect. Obviously, the classical injunction, *fu zhe, hou ren ye* (“women are those who come afterward”), still operates on the semantic field of Chinese language and culture today.

COVERT GENDER IN THE GENERAL LEXICON

Covert gender in Chinese also operates in common nouns, that is, words without the semantic feature <+masculine> or <+feminine>, in contrast to gendered nouns, for example “husband/wife” or “girl/boy.” The first set in this category to be discussed are words used as given names. The second set includes stative verbs (= predicate adjectives in English) and regular verbs. I will discuss each set below.

Given Names in Chinese

Unlike English, in which given names are no longer meaningful to the native speaker, people’s given names in Chinese are drawn from a subset of the content words in the lexicon. This occurs for a small number of female (but not male) names in English, for example Rose, Pearl, April, May, Daisy, and so on. The majority of given names in English have no apparent content and moreover, most are, as Whorf noted, covertly <+feminine> or <+masculine>. For example, Betty, Cathy, Donna, and Helen are all covertly <+feminine>, while Tom, Dick, Harry, and Sam are all covertly <+masculine>. Only a small subset of given names in English can be used as male or female names, for example Leslie, Sydney, Terry. It is interesting, as Stevan Harrell (personal communication) points out, that many of these gender neutral given names in English acquire “sissy” connotations, and cease to be available as boys’ names.

TABLE 8
Given Names for Boys

<u>English gloss</u>	<u>Chinese</u>	<u>Character</u>
brilliant	guang	光
ancestors	zong	宗
brave	ying	英
valient, virile (also: male birds)	xiong	雄
strong	qiang	强
benevolent	ren	仁
loyal	zhong	忠
filial	xiao	孝

SOURCE: Translated from Shih (1984).

Shih (1984: 217) notes that from the names parents in Chinese society choose for their daughters and sons we can see the hopes and expectations they have for their children, and how different these expectations are for girls and boys. Table 8 and Table 9 contain some of the common names for girls and boys in Chinese.

Many words used as given names in Chinese are not covertly gendered in other contexts of use (but *xiong*, "virile," *qiang*, "strong," *xian*, "refined," and *jiao*, "delicate," probably are). However, when used as a person's name, they are; native speakers generally know, when they hear or read a person's name, what sex that person is.

Gender-Marked Verbs

The second set of words in this last category, as shown in Table 10, overlap with the set of covertly marked given names in that many of the latter function as stative verbs. The words in

TABLE 9
Given Names for Girls

<u>English gloss</u>	<u>Chinese</u>	<u>Character</u>
refined	xian	娴
virtuous	shu	淑
quiet	jing	静
graceful, delicate	jiao	娇
jade	yu	玉
jewel	zhu	珠
beauty	mei	美

SOURCE: Translated from Shih (1984).

Table 10 are marked for gender by common usage; that is, they are commonly used to refer to or describe males or (more usually) females. This list, as all the above lists, is by no means exhaustive, but merely meant to be representative.

The first word in this set, *keai*, "adorable," "lovable," has a broader descriptive range than the English gloss, and basically seems to be appropriate to describe anything that is diminutive, the relative size alone apparently taking on endearing connotations. All children can be described as *keai*, as well as small animals and insects, and also inanimate objects. While children of both sexes are often described as *keai*, at some time in early adolescence the term becomes covertly marked for reference to females, and boys are no longer described this way. In contrast, young unmarried women are often described as *keai*, and, indeed, consciously strive to elicit such as response by their dress and deportment.

The unmarked, polite formula for asking a person's name is *nin gui xing, da ming?*, "your (polite) honorable surname (and) given name?" A young lady may also be asked merely for her *fang ming*, literally, "fragrant name," that is "your given name?" This expres-

TABLE 10
Gender-Marked Verbs in Chinese

<u>English gloss</u>	<u>Chinese</u>	<u>Characters</u>
adorable, lovable	keai	可愛
your given name?	fang ming	芳名
provocative; voluptuous	yanyao	妖豔
jealous	jidu	嫉妒
good at jealousy	shan du	善妒
petulant; coquettish	sajiao	撒嬌
pretend injury	salai	撒賴
indulge one's temper	shua piqi	耍脾氣

sion is used only to address a female. An informant explained to me that if one asked a man this question, he would think it a joke. This linguistic usage is reminiscent of the tendency in American universities (and other settings) for women professors to be referred to by their first names, while men professors are referred to by their last name (see, for example, Rubin, 1981). In both the Chinese and the American English example, the asymmetrical usage marks feminine the lower status address pattern.

As has been noted for English as well as other European languages (see Thorne et al., 1983, for references), Chinese has many terms to describe the way women look, act, dress, their body parts, and their sexuality. Related to *yaojing*, "a woman who bewitches

men,” (as noted above), there is also *yaoyan*, a stative verb meaning “provocative,” “voluptuous.” It is used to describe, for instance, a woman who dresses in a deliberately seductive manner. A *yaojing* looks *yaoyan* and lures innocent husbands away.

An obvious clue to covert gender in Chinese lies in the character or logographic writing system. In so-called phonetic compounds, the ancient Chinese developed a recursive rule for generating new characters. A classifier, drawn from a finite list, contributes a meaningful element, while the phonetic, any character, including already compounded ones, adds the phonetic element; that is, the newly coined character is homophonous, or nearly so, with it (see Kalgren, 1923/1974, for an introduction to the writing system). Shih (1984: 215) reports that the *Shuo Wen Jie Zi*, a lexicon of the Han dynasty (A.D. 100), lists over 250 characters with the productive female (*nu*) classifier. Several of the words that we have already examined (*yao*, “bewitching,” *jiao*, “delicate,” *xian*, “refined”) are written with this classifier. One other lexical item worthy of mention is *jidu* or *duji* “to be jealous”; both parts of the compound lexeme are written with the *nu* classifier. It is said that women *shan du*; they are “good at jealousy,” because of the practice of men having little wives and outside interests. This is not to imply that men are never described as *jidu*, but its unmarked usage will be <+feminine>. As for the many characters written with the *nu* classifier, it may be that when these words were standardized, the characteristics to which they referred were conceived of as typical of women.¹⁴ The fact that men generally are responsible for dictionaries is the subject of another article. (See, for example, Wolfe, 1980, for a discussion of patriarchal bias in the study of diachronic semantics of Indo-European languages.)

The final words to consider in this set are *sajiao*, *salai*, and *shua pigi*. The first two are related to each other through their cognate form, *sa*, meaning “to disperse,” “let loose,” or “exhibit,” “display.” *Sajiao* has two related meanings: (1) “to show pettiness, as a spoilt child,” and (2) “to pretend to be angry or displeased, as a coquettish young woman.” *Salai* means “to pretend to be injured.” It is closely related to *shua pigi*, meaning “to indulge one’s temper,”

“to act angry intentionally.” This contrasts with *fa pigi*, meaning “to fly into a temper,” “to become enraged.” That is, the last two verbs contrast as descriptions of affected versus genuine emotions. *Sajiao* and *salai* are conceived of by native actors as behaviors or communication styles that spoiled children of both sexes, and young (particularly unmarried) women engage in when they want to get their way from an unwilling parent/boyfriend/husband. These behaviors are at once recognized as consciously affected ones that children and women engage in for certain strategic goals, and are at the same time thought of as natural or intrinsic to the cognitive makeup of the people occupying these social identities. Thus *sajiao* and *salai* bear the semantic features <+feminine> and <+child> at a covert level, and male actors (but not women) will deny that men engage in such behavior.

CONCLUSION

The demonstrated pervasiveness of marking as a structural principle in linguistic performance suggests the possibility of underlying universals in the organization of thought. Language as a cognitive system avails itself of the marking principle as it comes into contact with social reality. Language is not some externally imposed restraint on thought; rather, it is the (primary) means through which thought is given expression in context. The evidence from the English and Chinese languages powerfully suggests that masculine is the unmarked or canonical gender in most circumstances. But it is not a cognitive imperative that marks the feminine; rather, it is the observable conditions of women and men in culture and society that so marks femininity, however it is conceptualized from culture to culture.

How are we to understand the link between language, culture, and reality? With the aid of Whorf's cogent discussion of covert categories in language, I have shown how a language such as Chinese, which makes very few semantic distinctions in gender at the level of grammar, nonetheless possesses a pervasive covert gender

system at the lexical level. It can be seen that sociocultural meanings inform *langue* (the grammars of individual languages), are appropriated by the native actors for use in *parole* (speech), which in turn allows other actors to appropriate such meanings from the social context and use them in the ongoing cognitive organization of social facts. Such is sociocultural process.

I suggest the two primordial words/characters *nan nu* constitute a rapport system in Chinese, holding the structurally diverse gendered elements together. All the meanings of masculinity and femininity, of what it means to be boy or girl, man or woman in Chinese society, are contained in these two irreducible morphemes.¹⁵ The “natural” fact of maleness and femaleness, mediated by sociocultural meanings, is encoded in language, and appropriated by actors to talk to and about, “men and women” (*nan nu*). There is sexism *in* language. As long as people have sexist beliefs that get transformed into sexist social practices, those meanings will be encoded via the lexicon in language, and transmitted to and potentially transformed by, new generations. As Witherspoon (1977: 3) notes, language and culture are symbolic codes through which messages are transmitted and interpreted. “But, more than a code, culture is a set of conceptions of and orientations to the world, embodied in symbols and symbolic forms. Through the adoption of and adherence to particular concepts of and orientations to reality, human beings actually create the worlds within which they live, think, speak, and act.” Chinese metaphysical assumptions about the nature of women and men inform their linguistic and cultural codes, and motivate their social behavior. A comprehensive examination of those underlying assumptions is in order.

NOTES

1. The literature on language and gender generated by American scholars is quite different in its focus and theoretical assumptions from the European, and particularly French, feminist tradition. See Cameron (1985) for the first critical overview of the various theoret-

ical bases for research on language and gender in the United States and France. For a recent collection of essays in the American tradition, complete with annotated bibliography of hundreds of papers, articles, books, theses, and dissertations dealing with this topic, see Thorne et al. (1983). A thorough review of the topic from a cross-cultural perspective is Philip Smith (1979).

2. An important exception to the Western language bias in language and gender studies is the research on Japanese women's language. See Shibamoto (1985) for original research on gender-linked differences in syntactic choice in Japanese, as well as a review of the literature (much of it in Japanese) on women's speech styles in Japanese. See also Penelope Brown's (1979) unpublished Ph.D. dissertation on language and sex roles in a Tzeltal Mayan speech community.

3. In labeling Chinese culture and society as "patriarchal," I refer to its male supremacist ideology, which informs and buttresses masculine supremacy in the political economy of family, state, and society. By "remarkably intact" I mean that patriarchy's persistence in China was unforeseen by feminist scholars who placed faith in the improvement of women's status through either the socialist or the modernist transformation of Chinese society. The continuing patriarchal bias in contemporary Chinese society in Taiwan—despite the industrialization and urbanization that supposedly brings the sexes into a more equitable relationship—has been documented by Nora Chiang and Ku Yenlin (1985), Diamond (1975a, 1979), Farris (1986), Gallin (1984a, 1984b), Greenhalgh (1985), and others. Chinese women under socialism have also not been "liberated" from patriarchal bias, as a growing number of scholars concerned with mainland Chinese society has noted. See, for example, Croll (1978), Diamond (1975b), Stacey (1983), Wolf (1984), and others. See also Guldin's (1986) interesting discussion of the "pseudo-emancipation" of Fujianese women in Hong Kong.

4. The English language originally possessed grammatical gender, but that system disappeared during the Middle Ages when the inflectional morphology system in English collapsed. Gender distinctions survive in the morphological system of English, for example the suffix *-ess* is added to previously gender neutral nouns to mark them for the feminine, as in *waiter-waitress*. See Baron (1986) for a fuller treatment of gender and grammar in English.

5. Greenberg explains that the concepts of marking arose in Prague school phonology, in the context of the problem of neutralization and the *archiphoneme*. It was noticed that in certain environments the contrast between correlative sets (that is, groups of phonemes differing only in a single feature) was neutralized in that both could not occur. The archiphoneme—the unit defined by the common features—occurs in these environments. The feature which appears in these instances is the unmarked feature, and the contrasting feature, which does not occur, is the marked one. The unmarked feature is described by a term itself having a negative prefix, *un-*, while the marked feature lacks it. "It is as though the marked feature is a positive something, e.g., nasality, aspiration, while the unmarked feature is merely its lack" (Greenberg, 1966: 14).

6. Terms used to refer to one's spouse in the ROC contrast with present day usage in the PRC in interesting ways. Fan Zhongying (1987) reports that *airen* ("loved one") is used to refer to both sexes, instead of *qizi* ("wife")/*zhangfu* ("husband"), or *taimai* ("Mrs.")/*xian-sheng* ("Mr."). The introduction of *airen* supposedly signals the symbolic equality of the sexes in the new China. Allan Barr (personal communication) notes, however, that impressionistic evidence suggests *airen* is going out of fashion, probably because it was an artificially imposed term. Zhang Huiying (personal communication) points out that *neiren* ("inside person") and *waizi* ("outside person") are considered archaic in the PRC. How-

ever, Fan reports that in the countryside, one's wife is referred to as *jiali-de* ("someone in the house"), even though the majority of women now work outside the home in "productive" labor. Wives are also referred to by their own children's names plus *ma* ("mother"), that is, "someone's mother" (Fan, 1987: 16). Thus the same semantic message survives in the PRC as in the ROC.

7. See Hellinger (1984) for a discussion of occupational titles in English, Dutch, Swedish, Norwegian, Italian, French, and German, from a feminist language planning perspective. Hellinger notes that planners for the first four languages advocate a "generic strategy" for feminist language change, in which a neutral or a masculine term stand for the entire category (for example, "flight attendant" [neutral] or "chairman" [$<+masculine>$]). In contrast, for the latter three languages, language planners would employ a "visibility strategy," in which productive morphological devices are used to derive feminine terms for example, Italian *professore* [$<+masculine>$] + *-essa* = *professoressa* [$<+feminine>$].

8. I am grateful to William Boltz for pointing this out.

9. During the Han dynasty (206 B.C.-200 A.D.), in which the Confucian school of political philosophy gained the ascendancy, the *Nü Jie* ("Admonishments to Women"), advocated *san cong si de*, "the three obediences and the four virtues" for women. The three obediences are: in the natal home, follow the father and brothers, in marriage follow the husband, in widowhood follow the son. The four womanly virtues are: womanly fidelity, physical charm, propriety in speech and efficiency in work (cited in Shih, 1984).

10. Zhang Huiying (personal communication) notes that *shi-san-dian* originates in the Wu dialect, where it can refer to male or female. According to Cheng (1985), Standard Chinese ("Mandarin") as spoken on Taiwan has been influenced by speakers of southern Chinese dialects, most notably speakers of Wu, including the ruling Jiang family and the Shangahi capitalists who retreated to Taiwan after 1949.

11. Married women, widows, and divorcées may also have a *waiyu* (see Arthur Wolf and Huang Chieh-shan, 1980). However, for a woman, a sexual liaison outside of matrimony definitely violates cultural ideals and social norms, whereas it is expected that men will consort with more than one woman, both before and after marriage.

12. There is an important exception to the invariant male-female word order in Chinese, namely, the *yin-yang* terminology. Although in the above example (*yang gang yin rou*), "the masculine principle is hardness, the feminine, softness," the order is consistent with the male-female order, the usual word order for this correlative set is *yin-yang*. Black (1985) examines how the masculine-feminine pair finds a place in the "metaphysical polarities associated with traditional Chinese cosmology." While the feminine and masculine principles participate in *yin-yang* cosmology, they do not define it. Black agrees with Ortner (1974) that "conceptions of gender are themselves partly shaped by other and perhaps more fundamental categories of thought and experience," and she posits that, in Chinese history "there is no warrant for assuming that gender was always present in the shaping of a cosmological system" (Black, 1985: 189-190).

13. English word order for matched pairs is often said to be phonetically motivated. That is, speakers have a cognitive preference for saving the shorter term first, so, for example: "bread and butter," "salt and pepper," "pain and suffering," "man and woman." This phonetic principle would explain "ladies and gentlemen" but not "husband and wife." It is probably the case that the word order for matched pairs with the semantic features [$<+masculine>$] and [$<+feminine>$] is both phonetically and semantically motivated. Thus, "ladies" comes first because of a linguistic and a cultural rule. "Husband and wife" is faithful to the semantic rule but not to the phonetic one, so we often get "man and wife" instead, which does not offend our aural or aesthetic sensibilities.

14. Shih (1984) asserts that the large number of characters written with the "woman" classifier (*nü*), including the character for surname (*xing*), as well as many kin terms, is evidence of a previous matriarchal society. Pejorative terms written with the "woman" classifier are taken as evidence of later encoding by the patriarchal-based society which followed (1984: 215). While I cannot speak to the archaeological evidence for a previous matriarchal Chinese social system (but see Pearson and Underhill, 1987: 815), I agree with William Bolz (personal communication) that the evidence from the writing system does not support this contention. An explanation closer at hand could be that birth is the experience most intimately connected with women, while the man's contribution to reproduction has no phenomenologically verifiable basis. Thus, when the writing system was standardized, the "woman" classifier was employed in many kin terms, when it was necessary to disambiguate them, via the writing system, from homonyms.

15. As Perry Link (personal communication) points out, the traditionalist might argue that the written character *nan*—as distinguished from the morpheme *nan*—is reducible, to *nian*, "field" plus *li*, "strength."

REFERENCES

- BARON, DENNIS (1986) *Grammar and Gender*. New Haven: Yale Univ. Press.
- BLACK, A. H. (1985) "Gender and cosmology in Chinese correlative thinking," pp. 166-195 in Caroline Bynum, Stevan Harrell, and Paula Richman (eds.) *Gender and Religion: On the Complexity of Symbols*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- BROWN, PENELOPE (1979) "Language, interaction, and sex roles in a Mayan community: a study of politeness and the position of women." Doctoral dissertation, Univ. of California, Berkeley.
- CAMERON, DEBORAH (1985) *Feminism and Linguistic Theory*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- CASSON, RONALD W. (1981) *Language, Culture, and Cognition: Anthropological Perspectives*. New York: Macmillan.
- CHAO, YUEN REN (1968) *A Grammar of Spoken Chinese*. Berkeley: Univ. of California Press.
- CHENG, L. (1985) "A comparison of Taiwanese, Taiwanese Mandarin, and Peking Mandarin." *Language* 61 (2): 352-377.
- CHENG, L. (1987) "Borrowing and internal development in lexical change—a comparison of Taiwanese words and their Mandarin equivalents." *J. Chinese Linguistics*, January: 105-131.
- CHIANG, LAN-HUN NORA and YENLIN KU (1985) *Past and Current Status of Women in Taiwan*. National Taiwan Univ., Population Studies Center, Women Research Program.
- CI YUAN [Origin of Words] (1980) *Shang wuyin shuguan*; Hong Kong: Fen Guan.
- CROLL, ELIZABETH (1978) *Feminism and Socialism in China*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- DIAMOND, NORMA (1975a) "Women under Kuomintang rule: variations in the feminine mystique." *Modern China* 1 (1): 3-45.
- DIAMOND, NORMA (1975b) "Collectivization, kinship, and the status of women in rural China," *Bulletin of Concerned Asian Scholars* 7 (1): 25-32.

- DIAMOND, N. (1979) "Women and industry in Taiwan." *Modern China* 5 (3): 317-340.
- FAN, ZHONGYING (1987) "Some observations on the recent development of the Chinese language." *US-China Review*, January-February: 15-18.
- FARRIS, CATHERINE S. (1986) "The sociocultural construction of femininity in contemporary urban Taiwan." *Women in International Development Working Paper Series*, no. 131, Michigan State Univ.
- FARRIS, CATHERINE S. (1988) "Language and sex role acquisition in a Taiwanese Kindergarten: a semiotic analysis." Doctoral dissertation, University of Washington, Seattle, Department of Anthropology.
- GALLIN, R. (1984a) "The entry of Chinese women into the rural labor force: a case study from Taiwan." *Signs* 9 (3): 383-398.
- GALLIN, R. (1984b) "Women, the family, and the political economy of Taiwan." *J. of Peasant Studies* 12 (1): 76-92.
- GREENBERG, JOSEPH (1966) *Language Universals: With Special Reference to Feature Hierarchies*. The Hague: Mouton.
- GREENHALGH, S. (1985) "Sexual stratification: the other side of 'growth with equity' in East Asia." *Population and Development Review* 11 (2): 265-314.
- GULDIN, G. E. (1986) "The persistence of patriarchy: the pseudo-emancipation of Fujanese women in Hong Kong." *Women in International Development Working Paper Series*, no. 110, Michigan State Univ.
- HELLINGER, M. (1984) "Effecting social change through group action: feminine occupational titles in transition," pp. 136-153 in Cheri Kramarae, Muriel Schultz, and William O'Barr (eds.) *Language and Power*. Beverly Hills: Sage.
- JORDAN, D. K. (1969) "The languages of Taiwan." *Monda Lingvo-Probl.* 1: 65-76.
- JORDAN, D. K. (1973) "Language choice and interethnic relations in Taiwan." *Monda Lingvo-Probl.* 5: 35-44.
- KALGREN, BERNARD (1974) *Analytic Dictionary of Chinese and Sino-Japanese*. New York: Dover. (Original work published in 1923.)
- LEVI-STRAUSS, CLAUDE (1969) *The Elementary Structures of Kinship*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Mathews Chinese English Dictionary* (1979) Rev. Am. edition. Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press. (Original work published in 1931, Shanghai.)
- NG, V. W. (1987) "Ideology and sexuality: rape laws in Qing China." *J. of Asian Studies* 46 (1): 57-70.
- ORTNER, S. (1974) "Is female to male as nature is to culture?," pp. 67-87 in M. Rosaldo and L. Lamphere (eds.) *Women, Culture, and Society*. Stanford: Stanford Univ. Press.
- PEARSON, R. and A. UNDERHILL (1987) "The Chinese neolithic: recent trends in research." *American Anthropologist* 89 (4): 807-822.
- ROSALDO, MICHELLE and LOUISE LAMPHERE [eds.] (1974) *Women, Culture, and Society*. Stanford: Stanford Univ. Press.
- RUBIN, R. (1981) "Ideal traits and terms of address for male and female college professors." *J. of Personality and Society Psychology* 41: 966-974.
- SANDAY, P. (1973) "Female status in the public domain," pp. 189-206 in M. Rosaldo and L. Lamphere (eds.) *Women, Culture, and Society*. Stanford: Stanford Univ. Press.
- SCHULZ, M. (1975) "The semantic derogation of women," pp. 64-75 in B. Thorne and N. Henley (eds.) *Language and Sex: Difference and Dominance*. Rowley: Newbury House Publishers.
- SHIBAMOTO, JANET S. (1985) *Japanese Women's Language*. New York: Academic Press.

- SHIH YU-HWEI (1984) "Cong she-hui yuyan xue guangdian tantao Zhongwen nannu liang xing yuyan de chayi" (A sociolinguistic study of male-female differences in Chinese) (pp. 207-229). Jiao xue yu yanjiu 6. College of Arts: National Taiwan Normal University.
- SINGER, M. (1978) "For a semiotic anthropology," pp. 202-231 in Thomas Sebeok (ed.) Sight, Sound, and Sense. Bloomington: Indiana Univ. Press.
- SMITH, P. M. (1979) "Sex markers in speech," pp. 109-146 in H. Giles (ed.) Social Markers in Speech. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- STACEY, JUDITH (1983) Patriarchy and the Socialist Revolution in China. Berkeley: Univ. of California Press.
- STANLEY, J. (1977) "Gender-marking in American English: usage and reference," pp. 43-74 in Nilsen et al. (eds.) Sexism and Language. National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE).
- THORNE, BARRIE, CHERIS KRAMARAE, and NANCY HENLEY [eds.] (1983) Language, Gender and Society. Rowley: Newbury House.
- TSE, JOHN KWOCK-PING (1982) "Language policy in the Republic of China," pp. 33-47 in R. Kaplan (ed.) Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 1981. Rowley: Newberry House.
- TYLER, STEPHEN A. (1969) Cognitive Anthropology. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- WHORF, BENJAMIN (1956) Language, Thought and Reality: Selected Writings of Benjamin Lee Whorf. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- WITHERSPOON, GARY (1977) Language and Art in the Navajo Universe. Ann Arbor: Univ. of Michigan Press.
- WOLF, ARTHUR and HUANG CHIEH-SHAN (1980) Marriage and Adoption in China. Stanford: Stanford Univ. Press.
- WOLF, MARGERY (1984) Revolution Postponed: Women in Contemporary China. Stanford: Stanford Univ. Press.
- WOLFE, S. J. (1980) "Constructing and reconstructing patriarchy: sexism and diachronic semantics." Papers in Linguistics: Int. J. of Human Communication 13 (2): 321-344.
- Xiao Shuo [Novels] (1964) Xiao Shuo ciyu weizi. Shanghai: Zhonghua ju chubanshe.

Catherine S. Farris has a B.A. and a M.A. in anthropology from the University of Texas at Austin, and has recently completed her dissertation in anthropology at the University of Washington, Seattle. Research interests include language and culture, gender studies and contemporary Chinese societies. She is currently Research Associate in the Department of Anthropology and in the Institute for the Study of Educational Policy, College of Education, University of Washington, where she is assisting in the development of educational exchanges with Pacific Rim countries. She hopes to return to Taiwan soon to pursue post-doctoral research on the role of language socialization in the sex role acquisition process in urban Taiwan, and eventually to do comparative work in the People's Republic of China.