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What are genderlects?

- distinctions based on the gender of the speaker and/or addressee
- pragmatic phenomenon, distinct from grammatical gender
- can be categorical (exclusive) or statistical (tendencies)
- can be found in various domains (phonology, lexicon, morphology)

- $s$ ♀ ~ $ts$ ♂ $oso$ / $otso$
  '(s)he is gone' ♀ / ♂
  Guarayo (Höller 1932, Crowhurst p.c.)

- $tsa$, $etse$ ♀ $ta$ ♂
  $penu$ ♀ $tana$ ♂
  $ay$ ♀ $uri$ ♂
  $inu$ ♀ $rana$ ♂
  1SG
  1EXCL
  3SG
  3PL
  Kokama (Vallejos 2015)

- $siracha$ ♀ ~ $tendi$ ♂ ‘Venezuelan red howler’
- $isaa$ ♀ ~ $ngi$ ♂ ‘black-capped squirrel monkey’
- $kiaá$ ♀ ~ $kíeí$ ♂ ‘tufted capuchin’
  Siriono (Gasparini 2015)
Categorical genderlects in the world’s languages

100 cases worldwide (Rose and Bakker 2016)
53 cases in South America (Fleming 2012, Rose 2015)
How do genderlects emerge?

Very few diachronic studies

- Only one comparative study at family-level (Li 1982 on Atayalic dialects)
- Never reconstructed at the proto-stage of a family
- Dunn (2014) posits that genderlects are diachronically unstable.

How have these systems developed?

- Internal change (Alberdi 1995 on Basque; Dunn 2000 on Chukchi; Ribeiro 2012 on Karajá)
- Language mixing (Taylor 1956 on Island Carib)
- Diffusion (Kroskrity 1983 on Pueblo Southwest)
- Through taboo words or secret languages (Li 1983 on Atayal)
Goals and framework

- survey genderlect distinctions within the Tupi family
- investigate the emergence and evolution of these distinctions

- diachronic pragmatics (Jucker 2006):
  - function-to-form mapping
  - form-to-function mapping
- phylogenetic method: parsimony ancestral state reconstructions
Tupi languages

- South America
- 64 languages
- 10 groups (Rodrigues & Cabral 2012) now 8 (Meira & Drude 2015)
- Tupi-Guarani = major group with 40 languages
- Phylogenetic tree combined from Galucio et al (2015) and Michael et al. (2015)
- added Nheengatu and Old Guarani
Tupi languages

- throughout Greater Amazonia
- in contact with various families
Data collection

Data collected on 41 languages (29 Tupi-Guarani + 12 of other branches)

Gender-indexing forms & non-gender-indexing cognates of these forms

Sources:

- a few studies specifically on the topic: Aweti (Drude 2002), Kokama (Faust 1959, Pottier 1972, Vallejos 2015)
- dictionaries and grammars
- unpublished data from collaborators (Crowhurst, O’Hagan)
- data often fragmentary, no discussion on origin
A LINGUAGEM DOS HOMENS E A DAS MULHERES

1068. Já nos referimos à existência de palavras que são empregadas só pelos homens, ao lado de outras que só pelas mulheres.

Cabe aqui uma resenha dessas partículas e interjeições:

pá: sim (só de h.) (n. 44)  eé (h. e principalmente m.)
aan: não (h. e m.) (n. 44)  eam, eama, eamaé (só de m.)
tréal: part. afirm. (h.) (n. 1074)  ré (m.)
rirá: em verdade (afetiva) (h.)  raré (m.)

e-ra-só kë raré! (VLB 316): olha, te digo, que o leves

é: deve de ser (afirm. dív.) (h.)  ri (m.)

abá-p' ahó é? (VLB 319): quem seria aquele?

a-só-p' iñé-ne ri? (VLB 319): não sei se me vé

emona reu-pe é (VLB 190): assim deve de ser

akat: oh!; ai! (dó, dor, medo, zombaria) (h.)  aké, aky (m.)

kwe, ahê: oh! upa! (espanto) (h.)  tó (m.)

gúé, gúé, gúey: ó (vocat., n. 448) (h.)  iú ou îó (m.)

hê!: olá! oh! (só de h. para h.)  iú ou îó (m.)
hê gúé ou hê gúi: oh! olá (h.)

CURSO DE TUPI ANTIGO

ahê! ou gúé } veja isso! (espanto
seguí, tê, eti } ou zombaria) (h.) eá (m.)

apá gúé ou apá gúi: ui! (coitado!) (h.)  édê (escarnece) (m.)

akn!: oh! (dó ou dor) (m.)  enmaê! (dó) (m.)

aki!: oh! (perda, esquecimento) (h.)  enmaê! amae üì! (m.)

Acrecentem-se pá (h.) e maê (m.) (VLB 175), cujo sentido não é claro.

Page of Barbosa (1953) on Tupinambá genderlects - one of the best documented cases...
Survey results
Genderlects in the Tupi family

11 Tupi languages with genderlects in Rose (2015)

4 more detected since

→ 15 Tupi languages where the phenomenon is attested

→ highest known proportion of genderlects within a large family
Distribution of genderlects within the Tupi family

- in 2 higher level groups: Maweti-Guarani and Juruna
- 12 in Tupi-Guarani subgroup
- seems like an inherited feature
Geographical distribution of Tupi genderlects
Typological results
Genderlect types

Type 1 (speaker gender)
Type 2 (addressee gender)
Type 3 (speaker and addressee gender)
Type 1+3
Domains

- phonology: 1 language
- morphology (person markers and demonstratives): 4 languages
- lexicon: 4 languages
- various discourse markers (yes, no, interjections, vocatives etc): 14 languages
- some languages have genderlects in multiple domains: e.g. Aweti, Kokama, Omagua
Scope

rather marginal in general, affects only a few elements within a domain

- 7 lexical meanings in Siriono
- 5 discourse-marking functions in Tembé
- 3 pronominal categories in Kayabi

However, the affected elements can be more or less salient
Variation within domains

- In general, similar meanings/functions are affected across languages
- 1st and 3rd person pronouns
- Among discourse markers, the most commonly affected are:
  - vocatives
  - words for “yes”
  - pain interjections
  - fear interjections
  - surprise interjections
- Some words/functions are only affected in one or two language(s), e.g.
  - monkey species names (Siriono, Yuki)
  - plural marker (Omagua, Kokama)
- However, for particular meanings/functions, the forms generally do not appear to be cognate across languages
Relationship between the members of a pair

The forms of a gender-indexing pair can be:

- suppletive (most common)
  - Kokama (Vallejos 2015): 1 exclusive pronoun *penu*♀/ *tana*♂
  - Kamaiurá (Seki 2000): particle for self-evidence (he) *kyn*♀/ *ja*♂

- phonetically different
  - Juruna (Fargetti 2001) interjection of pity “poor him/her” *himã*♀/ *hiba*♂

- morphologically different
  - Aweti deictics (Reiter 2011)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>♀</td>
<td>♂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>uja</em></td>
<td><em>jatã</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>akyj</em></td>
<td><em>kitã</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>akoj</em></td>
<td><em>kujtã</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tupi genderlects in a typological perspective

Within the family, there is diversity in
- type (speech act participant(s) whose gender is indexed)
- domain affected (phonology, pronominal morphology, lexicon, discourse markers - or several of them)
- functions/meanings affected within a domain
- scope and saliency of genderlect distinction
- type of relationship between the forms of a pair

Genderlects in the Tupi family are
- not a homogeneous phenomenon
- not very favorable to a hypothesis in terms of inherited patterns
Comparative results
Pronouns

4 languages with genderlect distinction in pronouns

3 independent developments:

- Omagua and Kokama: distinction reconstructable to Proto-Omagua-Kokama, male speech forms are innovations (O’Hagan 2011)
- Aweti: male speech forms are innovations
- Kayabi: relatively “heavy” 3rd person system for a TG language, including singular-plural distinction, masculine-feminine distinction (only in singular), and genderlect distinction
### 3rd person pronouns in Kayabi

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>3sg masculine</th>
<th>3sg feminine</th>
<th>3pl</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kayabi</td>
<td>♀  kíã</td>
<td>♀  kyna</td>
<td>♀  wã</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>♂  ’gã</td>
<td>♂  ēẽ</td>
<td>♂  ’gã</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parintintin</td>
<td>ga</td>
<td>hẽ</td>
<td>ga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xingu Asurini</td>
<td>ga</td>
<td>ē</td>
<td>gy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Innovation of masculine-feminine distinction in Proto-Parintintin-Kayabi
- Genderlects are a subsequent development in Kayabi
- Female forms are innovations
- Parallel innovation in Asurini do Xingu (contact?)
Monkey names in Siriono

- **3:1 gain:loss cost parsimony reconstruction**
- Female forms have cognates in other TG languages
- Male forms are innovations

### Kiracha ♀
- *Howler monkey*

### Tendi ♂
- *Howler monkey*

### Isaa ♀
- *Black-capped squirrel monkey*

### Ngî ♀
- *Black-capped squirrel monkey*

### Tufted capuchin

#### Genetic relations

- **Ache**
- **Tapiete**
- **Chiriguano**
- **Kaiowa**
- **ParaguayanGuarani**
- **Mbya**
- **GuaraniAntigo**
- **Guarayu**
- **Siriono**
- **Yuki**
- **Kokama**
- **Omagua**
- **Nheengatu**
- **Tupinamba**
- **Tembe**
“Yes” gender-indexing forms

- “yes” genderlect distinction common in Tupi languages - 7 cases
- 6 of them have eʔe as the female genderlect form
- corresponding male forms: ta, pa, ũba
- eʔe is the word for “yes” in many TG languages
- pragmatic usage coded as an ordered character
- no information on relative use by women and men, when more than one word for yes are recorded, with the exception of Tupinamba
reconstruction of presence of eʔe “yes”
6 equally parsimonious scenarios
eʔe has specialized as a female speech form 3 times
eʔe used mostly by women at the Proto-GroupIII-Southern node and at least mostly by women at the Proto-Southern node
"ta "yes" becomes at least mostly used by men at the Proto-GroupIII-Southern node"
Conclusions
Summary

- Tupi: language family with most genderlects attested
- Typological diversity in the realization of genderlects
- Genderlect distinctions cannot be reconstructed except for shallow nodes (such as Proto-Omagua-Kokama), but
- genderlect distinction for “yes” (eʔe ♀/ ta ♂) reconstructable to the Proto-GroupIII-Southern node
- lots of data about interjections and other discourse markers that we need to explore more!
Thank you!

...and thanks to

Zachary O’Hagan for comments on cognacy judgements

Christian Fressard for the maps
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