DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 211 978 CS 206 693

AUTHOR Wade, Barbara
TITLE Non-Sexist Language for Pedagogues.
PUB DATE Nov 81
NOTE 26p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Council of Teachers of English (71st, Boston. MA, November 20-25, 1981).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Change Agents; *Change Strategies; *Diachronic Linguistics; English Instruction; *Language Research; *Language Usage; *Sex Bias; *Sex Fairness; Teachers

ABSTRACT

This paper presents three strategies for convincing English teachers that eliminating sexist language is a serious priority in their profession. The first section of the paper examines the historical evolution of definitions of gender specific words and of pronoun usage, noting both the recency of sexually biased language styles and the myth of a "pure" and static language. The second section of the paper cites research into audience responses to sexist language, noting the harmful effects of a masculine bias in language and how this bias alienates and offends women. The final section of the paper stresses the stylistic importance of parallel usage and the rhetorical power of accurate, unambiguous, rhythmic language. (RL)

Barbara Wade
C.P.O. Box 2091
Berea College
Berea, Ky. 40404

# Non-sexist Language for Pedagogues

"Words are magical in the way they affect the minds of those who use them . . . they have an almost miraculous effect on human behavior." - Aldous Huxley in Words and their Meanings (1940:9).

"Attempts to change sexist usage meet not merely with resistance, but with ridicule. It is odd that such ridicule often comes from the very people who profess their faith in the power of the word - linguists, literary critics, members of the MLA." - Deborah Rosenfelt and Florence Howe in "Language and Sexism" (Modern Language Association Newsletter, December 1973).

Despite a strong stand by N.C.T.E. that sexist language should be eliminated from its publications, many English professors still vigorously defend sexist language as "correct" and "pure," while others consider the issue trivial. How can we convince our recalcitrant colleagues that eliminating sexist language is a serious priority? This paper presents three strategies: 1) examining the historical evolution of definitions of gender specific words and of pronoun usage, 2) discussing audience response to sexist language as a critical element in communication, and 3) stressing the stylistic importance of parallel usage and the rhetorical power of accurate, unambiguous, rhythmic language.

## Historical Evolution of Definitions of Gender Specific Words

An examination of the historical evolution of gender specific words should both answer the charge that the issue of sexist language is trivial and disarm those who insist that we English teachers are defenders of the language and should resist change. Indeed, language is continuously changing, and to examine the changes of meaning in female gender specific language soon reveals the extent to which women are denigrated in the English language.

Muriel Schultz observes that language referring to women tends to become derogatory. Thus, masculine words such as lord, baronet, governor, courtier, and sir or master continue to retain their aura of prestige while their counterparts lady, dame, governess, courtesan, and madam or mistress not only designate a lower position in society but many even have sexual overtones.[1] Who would ever think of searching for a "cleaning lord" or fail to hesitate before addressing an acquaintance as "mistress," or even "madam"? Julia P. Stanley notes this masculine bias of our language in the abundance of terms that apply to a sexually promiscuous woman (she discontinued her search after finding 220) versus the paucity of parallel masculine terms (she found only 22).[2] In addition, the terms that apply to women are primarily negative while those that apply to men are primarily positive, stressing conquest or success in pursuit. For example, a promiscuous man may be referred to as

a stud, Casanova, whorehopper, ass man, Don Juan, good old boy, sport, or snowman while a woman is called a hussy, harlot, slut, whore, bitch, tramp or even a sweat-hog, slopjar, or pisspallet. When a woman, on the other hand, does not engage freely in sexual encounters, she is called frigid or cold or referred to as a cocktease or pricktease. Whether or not a woman is sexually active, she does not escape pejorative sexual language; she is sometimes described as but a recepticle for the male sexual organ (nutcracker, meatgrinder, cockeye, goldmine) or as merely a sexual organ (cunt, piece, tail).[3]

The denigration of woman can easily be seen in this development of terms to refer to her sexuality or to define her only in terms of sexuality, but perhaps a more telling example of the pervasiveness of the masculine bias of the English language comes from examining the derivation of the two words emasculate and effeminate.[4] Each has the prefix e or ex meaning out of, from plus the root word for male or female. Yet consider the difference in meaning. According to Webster's Third New International Dictionary, emasculate means to deprive "of virile or procreative power . . . of masculine vigor or spirit." Does effeminate then mean to deprive one of womanly virtues? Indeed not. Instead, it means "lacking manly strength and purpose; exhibiting or proceeding from delicacy, weakness, emotionalism." Masculine traits, then, are positive and to be embraced; feminine, to be avoided.

Perhaps even such a brief comparison of female and male gender specific words can counter the argument that the issue of sexist language is trivial. An examination of the history of the word man can dispell the myth of a "pure" static language.

When man (as mann or monn) was first used in English, it was truly generic; it meant human being. At that time, English had the words wer and carl for males and wif for females. Combining these with mann created the words waepman and carl-man for an adult male person and wifman for an adult female person. Wifman later became woman, and wif changed in meaning to become wife. Wer and carl became supplanted by man except in the specialized usage werewolf.[5] Thus, prior to 1000 A.D. man began to be used to designate a male human being.[6] Since then it has served a double function as gender specific and as generic, but we are now experiencing another shift in meaning. The OED cites the explicit generic use of the word man as obsolete. The entry reads: "In many OE instances, and in a few of later date, used explicitly as a designation equally applicable to either sex -- Obs." The OED continues to state that "the gradual use of the unambiguous synonyms body, person, one, and (for the plural) folk(s), people, has greatly narrowed the currency of man in this sense [generic]." As the OED notes, there are numerous substitutes available without changing the language -- unambiguous words such as humanity, people, persons, and human beings. Many words which contain man are now being changed to reflect the understanding and usage of man more as

a gender specific word rather than as a generic term. Thus fireman becomes fire fighter, mailman becomes mail carrier, manpower becomes labor force or work force, manhole becomes workhole, and chairman becomes chair. If these changing usages ring strangely to the ear at first, we need only to consider how rapidly our language has absorbed new words such as astronaut, sputnik, x-ray, and radar.

## Pronoun Usage

Many of our colleagues who may become interested in the changing meanings of gender specific words will still pale at the thought of using they as a singular pronoun or of coining a new third person singular generic pronoun. Yet both of these proposals can be supported after a study of the history of pronoun usage.

Stanley notes, for example, that "they has been in use as a replacement for indefinite pronouns at least since Chaucer," and she concludes that "only the influence of traditional male grammarians has kept it out of so-called Formal English."[7] Ann Bodine's extensive study of the singular usage of they/their/them leads her to the same conclusion that such a usage, rather than a corruption of the language, is merely a continuation of a pattern that has been in the language for centuries and which prescriptive grammarians since the seventeenth century have been unable to eradicate. She provides examples of that common usage:

(1) Anyone can do it if they try hard enough. (mixed-sex, distributive)

(2) Who dropped their ticket? (sex unknown)

(3) Either Mary or John should bring a schedule with them. (mixed sex, disjunctive)[8]

Bodine then examines the reason for prescriptive grammarians' insistence upon the use of the masculine singular as generic and finds it to be blatantly sexist. She quotes Poole as saying in 1646 that "'The Relative shall agree in gender with the Antecedent of the more worthy gender. . . . The Masculine gender is more worthy than the Feminine.'"[9] Lest we placidly think that this presumption of superiority is passe, Bodine provides a quotation from The Roberts English Series of 1967 that "'grammatically, men are more important than women.'"[10] She notes the irony in the condemnation by a majority of school grammars of "both 'he or she' and singular 'they,' the former because it is clumsy and the latter because it is inaccurate" while "pupils are taught to achieve both elegance of expression and accuracy by referring to women as 'he.'"[11] She also notes that while textbook writers Tressler, Christ and Starkey condemned the sentence "'Everyone in the class worried about the mid-year history examination, but they all passed,'" that they could not bring themselves to "correct" the <u>they</u> to <u>he</u> but instead suggested rewording the sentence. Finally Bodine argues that even if they is considered plural that "disagreement of number,

as in the proscribed singular 'they' is no more 'inaccurate' than disagreement of gender, as in the unproscribed sex-indefinite 'he.'"[12]

Again, we can turn to the OED for confirmation of Stanley's and Bodine's conclusions. The entry under they indicates that the word is "often used in reference to a singular noun made universal by every, any, no, etc., or applicable to one of either sex (='he or she')." It then provides citations from 1526 onwards, including Fielding's "Every Body fell a laughing, as how could they help it" (1749) and Chesterfield's "If a person is born of a gloomy temper . . . they cannot help it" (1759). Those who feel as William F. Buckley, Jr. that anyone who uses they in this manner "should not be hired as a professional writer"[13] --or even more drastically should not pass freshman composition -- need information about the usage history of they, their, them.

While many English teachers armed with red pens continue in their futile attempts to eradicate this singular usage of they/their/them, yet another proposal for pronoun usage has been gaining credibility. Nearly a century ago (1884), the lawyer Charles Crozat Converse in his article "A New Pronoun" proposed the coined word thon (derived from "that one") to replace the generic he in order to achieve accuracy of language.[14] Since then, a number of people have proposed new third person singular generic pronouns. Lenora A. Timm, in her article, "Not Mere Tongue-in-Cheek: The Case for a Common Gender Pronoun

in English," traces the history of English pronoun usage to dispute the argument that language is most reluctant to change in pronoun references. She reports that when Middle English singular and plural third person pronouns began overlapping in form, speakers of Middle English began using the Scandanavian pronouns they, their, and them for the nominative and accusative plural, the genitive plural, and the dative plural. "In this way hie again referred unambiguously to the nominative and accusative third singular feminine, hire to the genitive third singular feminine; and him to the dative third singular masculine."[15] This shift was rather rapid despite a lack of the communication technology that we have today. Chaucer used both the older hire and hem and the new Scandanavian they during his lifetime, but by a generation after his death, their and them were firmly established in London English.[16] Timm also provides a number of examples of newly proposed pronouns and discusses the merits and shortcomings of each.[17] While these proposed pronouns might strike the ear oddly for a while and even prove distracting, wide-enough usage would soon cure our discomfort.

Again, the charge of triviality might arise. To counter this argument one might consider Wendy Martyna's observation that male teachers have recently lobbied for the use of male pronouns instead of female ones because they feel that the use of female pronouns has been partly responsible for the "poor public image and low salaries" of their positions.[18] In the

minds of these male teachers, then, the issue of pronoun usage is not trivial; indeed, these men were claiming serious ramifications.

As English teachers, ~~then,~~ we need to be aware of the evolution of meanings of gender specific words and of pronoun usage so that we can communicate the seriousness of the issue of sexist language and debunk the myth of a static "correct" language that should not be changed. An awareness of audience response to sexist language - both intellectual and emotional - can strengthen our case for the use of non-sexist language.

## Audience Response to Sexist Language

The idea that the "generic" masculine is not perceived as generic is becoming better and better substantiated. Miller and Swift report that Aileen Pace Nilsen, in her 1973 study at the University of Iowa of a hundred children ranging from nursury school to grade seven, found by using a picture technique and such sentences as "'Man must work in order to eat'" and "'Around the world man is happy'" that a majority of children interpret these statements as referring to male, not female, people.[19] This find is hardly surprising when one considers that in a study by Alma Graham of a large sample of children's books that "97% of the masculine references had actual or implied male antecedents" - only 3% were generic.[20] In another study, 500 junior high students in Michigan were asked to draw pictures of primitive people as they were described in a number of activities

and to give their characters modern names. Students in one group were given statements with the words early man, primitive man, mankind and he. Statements for students in the second group contained the words early people, primitive humans, and they. Finally, a third group was given statements with men and women and they. Perhaps it is no surprise that the third group had the largest number of females in their drawings or that the first had the least. And if one considers the pervasiveness of masculine language used to describe human evolution, perhaps it is not surprising either that a majority of students of both sexes apparently did not conceive of women as being involved either in agriculture or in making tools.[21] As Miller and Swift comment in discussing this study of Linda Harrison's, "Whatever may be known of the contributions females made to early human culture, an effective linguistic barrier prevents the assimilation of that knowledge in our present culture."[22] Women in history have become invisible through the masculine bias of our language.

This lack of perception of the "generic" masculine as generic is not limited to children. Moulton, Robinson, and Elias from Bowling Green University have concluded that "a male term used as a gender neutral term leads one to assume that a male is referred to even in explicitly gender neutral contexts."[23] In their study, 264 female and 226 male students were randomly assigned to one of six groups. Each group was given one of the following two statements with either his, his or her, or their

in the blank space, unmarked so that no attention would be called to the pronouns: "'In a large coeducational institution the average student will feel isolated in _____ introductory courses'" or "'Most people are concerned with their appearance. Each person knows when _____ appearance is unattractive.'" Students were given instructions to write a story to illustrate the idea and to give their main character a name. When the pronoun his was in the statement, 35% of the story characters were female; when their was used, 46% were female; and when his or her was used, 56% of the characters were female, approximately the percentage of females in the group. Even when the subject matter draws upon personal experience, these researchers conclude, people tend to think of males when the generic masculine is used.[24] A 1972 study made by Joseph W. Schneider and Sally L. Hacher also indicates that neither men nor women make the generic leap. In their study, help in collecting pictures for a sociology text was solicited on several campuses. Half of the college students were given chapter titles including the word man, and half were given titles with the word people. When the word man was used, a significantly larger number of pictures submitted included males only or primarily males.[25]

Because of audience response to the "generic" masculine, then, not as generic but rather as masculine, women and their accomplishments are rendered invisible by its usage. In addition, many women are beginning to respond negatively to sexist language and comments which stereotype women. Thus, speakers or writers

using sexist language and stereotyping are likely to alienate a portion of their audiences.

Sexist comments that indicate stereotyped preconceptions of a woman's role or abilities or that patronize are surely the most offensive to women, and academia is sadly not free of such comments. In a study of female clerical workers at the University of Michigan, Betsy Stevens found that 73.5% of the respondents remembered statements that offended them as women. Several of these comments follow:

"You are a hard worker - you can endure as much as a man."

"You just need a man to show you."

"A woman doesn't have to have a career."

"You're much too young and pretty to be making such decisions on your own."

"Be a good girl and do this for me."

"Office girls"

"Office gals" [26]

The very fact that an explanation of why these comments are sexist was published in the Personnel Journal in 1977 is a telling comment on the need for consciousness-raising among our colleagues. Such consciousness-raising can perhaps be more effective if it is gentle than if it is harsh. I recall responding with incredulity and then anger when the Chair of the Business Department at Berea College introduced a new colleague at a faculty meeting with the comment, "One thing I will say for her is that she certainly has improved the looks of our

department." Polite laughter followed as I glanced about the room and exchanged indignant expressions with a few others. I spent the remainder of the meeting penning an angry letter asking if a male would have been introduced with a mention of his physical attributes rather than his professional accomplishments, but instead of sending this angry epistle, I decided upon another tactic. I drew a cartoon of an older man introducing a younger man with a restatement of the faculty introduction but using a masculine name and pronouns. On the young man's face is a look of incredulity and above the cartoon is the caption "Say that again???" I sent the signed cartoon to the offending faculty member and in a few days heard from a student that the cartoon was on this faculty member's door. Soon after I received a note thanking me for calling the sexist remark to h ttention, and sin e then this professor has become a strong proponent for non-sexist language usage. Of course someone else might have been offended by the cartoon, but I have found humor to be an effective technique in consciousness-raising about sexist language without alienating the offender. And we do want to gain allies, not enemies.

That women would be offended by blatant sexism in language is hardly surprising, but many are also feeling increasingly alienated by the use of the "generic" masculine. Again, I draw from personal experience to illustrate this point. At a recent faculty meeting at Berea College, a new goals statement for the college was presented. The term "brotherhood of all

men" was challenged as sexist, and a motion was carried for the committee that had written the statement of goals to remove all sexist language from the statement. This motion was the only proposed change that passed unanimously, although I suspect that there were silent but intimidated dissenters. At the following meeting the statement reappeared with the term "brotherhood of all men" intact. The indignant anger of the women in the room was a felt presence, and the retention of the term was challenged. When the chair of the committee defended it as important to the tradition of the college, especially since it followed the traditional language of the Bible, a highly respected professor who is also a deeply religious woman answered that tradition was precisely the issue - that the exclusion of women from significant roles in the church and in society was a part of the same tradition that excluded women in language usage. She also spoke of her continued embarrassment when friends from other places asked her why Berea College persisted in its male dominant usage of language. In the ensuing discussion approximately a third of the faculty - female and male alike - spoke for the change to non-sexist language, some quite movingly. This time when a more specific motion to reword the offending passage to read "the kinship of all peoples" received unanimous approval, it was with a spirit of victory and a sense that it might be a while before another document came to the floor for a vote without a prior proofreading for sexist language. And in subsequent faculty meetings, there seems to

have been a clear attempt to use non-sexist substitutes for the generic masculine even in spoken language.

Another tactic, then, for persuading our colleagues to avoid sexist language is by making them aware of audience response to it, both by being able to cite research that suggests that the "generic" masculine is not perceived as gender-free and by challenging sexist language whenever it appears. Perhaps our most persuasive argument in doing the latter is pointing out our shared belief in the power of language. When women are referred to in demeaning or disparaging terms or when language renders them invisible, this usage not only reflects their status in society but also constantly reinforces negative attitudes towards them. It is also this shared love of language that can persuade English professors to become advocates of non-sexist language that follows the dictates of parallel usage and that is accurate, unambiguous, and rhythmic.

## Parallel Usage and Accurate, Unambiguous, Rhythmic Language

Parallel usage (using comparable terms for men and women) differs from parallel structure in form but not in intent; the purpose of both is to make clear relationships of equal value. When either is violated, the effect is to obscure the relationship of equality and, in the case of the former, usually to trivialize women and their accomplishments. Thus one should not make references to a female secretary as a "Girl Friday" or "my girl" unless one is prepared to call a

male secretary or clerk a "Boy Thursday" or "my boy." (Surely Americans are still familiar enough with the Black Civil Rights Movement of the 1960's to understand how demeaning it can be to be called "boy" - or "girl.") Although Edwin Miller in his "Critique of the New Feminist Grammar" comments that he does "not know what to suggest about the girls in the office problem,"[27] one wonders what is so difficult about calling them women or business managers or tyrists or any number of more accurate terms. Miller further says that "obviously consciousness has been raised only selectively if the fellow/girl pair has not been noticed and the casual assumption is made that a man/girl pair is implied when it is not."[28] His contention that girl is parallel to fellow and therefore acceptable, rather than parallel to boy and therefore not, seems weak. The phrase "going out with the girls" is certainly parallel to "going out with the boys," both acceptable references made to sexually exclusive outings similar to those of early adolescence. But to refer to a grown woman as a girl in a situation in which a man would not be referred to as a boy is patronizing, even if unconscious. This need for parallel usage cannot be overemphasized. Consider, for example, the substitution of career woman for career girl. Even this change causes difficulties since it implies that a woman with a career or job is an exception, when in fact a majority of American women now work outside the home. Again, the parallel should be considered. Would one say career man?

Other needs for parallel usage to avoid trivialization of women and their work or accomplishments involve the use of titles. The touchiest problem here is the Ms./Miss/Mrs. designation. Although the term Ms. was coined to parallel Mr. as a term which does not designate marital status, it has been used inaccurately to refer only to a woman whose marital status is unknown (as in bulk mailings of advertisements) or to a feminist rather than to all women. I even attended a recorder concert in the 1970's in which performers were erroneously labelled Ms. with their husbands' names following; of course the parallel would be to refer to the men as Mr. with their wives' names following. In addition to using Ms. accurately as a parallel to Mr., these titles can be omitted in many instances and full names used. After the first full name reference, a woman's first name should not be used alone in subsequent references unless a man's first name would similarly be used alone, since the use of first names usually suggests familiarity, informality, or inferior status. Thus one might write of Taylor and Burton but not of Liz and Burton. If academic, professional, or honorary titles are to be used, they should be used equitably. Thus if both partners in a marriage have PhD's or MD's, the title should be used either with both or with neither; to say "Dr. and Mrs. Bill Sawyers" subordinates the woman. Consider, for example, two entries in the "Notes of Contributers" to a collection of papers entitled Semantic Syntax and published in 1974. George Lakoff is described as "Professor of Linguistics

at the University of California at Berkeley" while Robin Lakoff is described as "George Lakoff's wife, and also a Professor of Linguistics at Berkeley."[29] Even had her name preceeded his alphabetically, one doubts that he would have been described first as "Robin Lakoff's husband." Simply pointing out the absurdity of such unparallel usages in reverse should have persuasive power.

The desirability of clarity in language usage is not a point that many English teachers would dispute. The only task here, then, is to point out the inaccuracy and ambiguity of sexist language and the clarity of non-sexist substitutes. The lack of clarity of the "generic" masculine has already been pointed out in the discussion on audience response, but an excerpt from Martyna's article "Beyond the 'He/Man' Approach: The Case for Nonsexist Language" points specifically to the problem of accuracy:

> Startled laughter often greets such sentences as, "Menstral pain accounts for an enormous loss of man power hours," or "Man, being a mammal, breast-feeds his young." We do a double take when hearing of the gynecologist who was awarded a medical award for "service to his fellowman." C.S. Lewis captures the importance of these reactions: "In ordinary language the sense of a word . . . normally excludes all others from the mind. . . . The proof of this is that the sudden intrusion of an irrelevant sense is funny. It is funny because it is unexpected. There is a

semantic explosion because the two meanings rush together from a great distance; one of them was not in our consciousness at all till that moment. If it had been, there would be no detonation."[30]

The quotation from C.S. Lewis also brings to mind the problem of ambiguity that sexist language creates. This ambiguity is perhaps most serious legally. The issue of the Equal Rights Amendment would not exist if Supreme Court justices had consistently included women in their interpretation of what is meant by man in the Constitution. Martyna provides numerous other examples of legal controversies in the United States over the ambiguity of the generic masculine, including the "administration of a scholarship fund set up for 'worthy and ambitious young men'" and "the appeal of a murder conviction in which the self-defense instructions to the jury were phrased in the generic masculine, thus 'leaving the jury with the impression that the objective standard to be applied is that applicable to an altercation between two men.'"[31] Also, Marguerite Ritchie, after a study of 200 years of Canadian law in which she found that Canadian judges included or excluded women in their interpretation of laws according to their own bias or that of the time, concluded that "'Wherever any statute or regulation is drafted in terms of the male, a woman has no guarantee that it confers on her any rights at all.'"[32] Those in power, then, can use the ambiguity of the generic masculine to retain that power and to deny equality under the law to women.

A less serious problem caused by the ambiguity of the generic masculine, but one certainly of concern to English teachers since it creates confusion rather than clarity, is the way in which the meaning can shift - because of context - within a single passage. Stanley provides numerous examples of these shifts in her essay "Gender Marking in American English," among which is the following:

> And what is one to think of our fellow citizens and their passivity? They will take anything! It's enough to make you wonder whether someone has relieved them of their manly attributes.
>
> Attributes of which she, on the other hand, clearly had plenty, despite her sex. (Robert Merle, Malevil, p. 340)[33]

Martyna also provides an example of this shift from a context that seems generic to one that can only be considered masculine in her quoting Paul Meehl's description of a "hypothetical researcher": "'He' produces a long list of publications but little contribution to the enduring body of knowledge, and 'his true position is that of the potent-but-sterile intellectual rake, who leaves in his merry wake a long train of ravished maidens, but no viable scientific offspring.'"[34] Surely women researchers would have difficulty identifying with his imagery, and it is unclear whether he meant to include them or not.

We can, then, argue for non-sexist language to increase clarity by being accurate and unambiguous. But we must reassure our colleagues that this is possible without sacrificing a

pleasing rhythmic quality. Probably few who have tried to substitute non-sexist alternatives for the generic masculine have not been frustrated by the awkwardness of overusing the she/he, his/her or the she or he, his or her approaches. The simplest solution for most sentences is to recast into the plural. Thus "every student should bring his book" becomes "all students should bring their books." A defense has also been made for the use of the singular they/their/them and for the adoption of a new singular generic pronoun, neither of which disrupts the rhythmic flow of the language.

Whatever courses we adopt, the first step is convincing our colleagues that the issue is important and that there are reasonable solutions to the problems created by sexist language. A knowledge of the history of gender specific words and of pronoun usage and an awareness of current research on audience response to sexist language can begin to prepare us for this task. We can then become sensitive to our audiences in deciding how to approach the issue - whether through humor, through citing research, or through providing examples of the inaccuracy and ambiguity created by sexist language. I believe that we have the love of language and an understanding of its importance on our side.

Endnotes

[1]Muriel Schultz, "The Semantic Derogation of Woman," Language and Sex: Differences and Dominance, ed. Barrie Thorne and Nancy Henley (Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House, 1975), pp.65-66. Discussed by Susan J. Wolfe in Patriarchal Paradigms for Language Change (ERIC, Ed 175 257, 1978), pp. 5-6.

[2] Julia P. Stanley, "Paradigmatic Woman: The Prostitute," Papers in Language Variation: SAMLA-ADS Collection, ed. David L.Shores and Carole P. Hines (University, Alabama: University of Alabama Press, 1977), pp. 305, 310.

[3]Ibid., pp. 305-16.

[4] Susan Wolfe calls attention to these two terms in her article Patriarchal Paradigms, p. 9.

[5] Casey Miller and Kate Swift, Words and Women (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1976), pp. 27-28.

[6] Julia P. Stanley, "Gender Marking in American English: Usage and Reference," Sexism and Language (Urbana, Ill.: N.C.T.E., 1977), p. 52.

[7] Ibid., p. 74.

[8] Ann Bodine, "Androcentrism in Prescriptive Grammar: Singular 'They,' Sex-Indefinite 'He,' and 'He or She,' Language in Society 4(1975), 131.

[9] Ibid., p. 134.

[10] Ibid., p. 140.

[11] Ibid., p. 138.

[12] Ibid., p. 139.

[13] William F. Buckley, Jr., "Unsex Me Now," National Review, 28 May 1976, p. 583.

[14] Charles Crozat Converse, "A New Pronoun," The Critic and Good Literature 5(1884), p. 79. Discussed by Wendy Martyna in "What Does 'He' Mean?: Use of the Generic Masculine," Journal of Communication 28(1978), 131.

[15] Lenora A. Timm, "Not Mere Tongue-in-Cheek: The Case for a Common Gender Pronoun in English," International Journal of Women's Studies 1(1978), 559.

[16] Ibid., pp. 559-60.

[17] Ibid., p. 561.

[18] Wendy Martyna, "Beyond the 'He/Man' Approach: The Case for Nonsexist Language," Signs 5(1980), 484-85.

[19] Miller and Swift, pp. 24-25.

[20] Peg Downey, "The Invisible Woman - Where Is He [She]?" Graduate Woman 73(1979), 9. Downey refers the reader to Alma Graham's article "The Making of a Non-sexist Dictionary," Ms., December 1973.

[21] Miller and Swift, pp. 24-25.

[22] Ibid., p. 25.

[23] Janice Moulton, George Robinson, and Cherin Elias, "Psychology in Action: Sex Bias in Language Use: Neutral Pronouns that Aren't," American Psychologist 33(1978), 1033.

[24] Ibid., p. 1034

[25] Joseph W. Schneider and Sally L. Hatcher, "Sex Role Imagery and Use of the Generic 'Man' in Introductory Texts: A Case in the Sociology of Sociology," The American Sociologist 8(Feg. 1973), 12-18.

[26] Betsy Stevens, "Improving Communication with Clerical Workers: The Non-Sexist Directive," Personnel Journal 56(April 1977), 171-72.

[27] Edwin Miller, A Critique of Feminist Grammar (ERIC, Ed 177 603, April 1979), p. 14.

[28] Ibid.

[29] H. Lee Gershuny, "Sexism in Dictionaries and Texts: Omissions and Commissions," Sexism and Language, p. 158.

[30] Martyna, "Beyond the 'He/Man' Approach," p. 489.

[31] Ibid., p. 490.

[32] Marguerite Ritchie, "Alice through the Statutes," McGill Law Journal 21(1975), 702. Quoted by Martyna, ibid.

[33] Stanley, "Gender Marking," p. 40.

[34] Martyna, "Beyond the 'He/Man' Approach," p. 488.