

LEXICON AND CONTEXT IN FEMINIZATION IN RUSSIAN*

1. INTRODUCTION

Many nouns in Russian identify people in terms of membership in groups, defined by activity, role, beliefs, attributes, or origins. Many of these nouns are derived with native Russian suffixes (*учи-тель, добровол-ец, сторон-ник, гардероб-щик, прыг-ун*); the occasional noun is unsuffixed (*врач*). Some nouns identifying group membership are borrowings, with or without an etymological suffix in the source language (*диктор, корректор, педагог, президент*). Most of these masculine nouns of the first declension can form corresponding feminine derivatives of the second declension by adding a suffix, either a modified or expanded form of the masculine suffix, for example *-ник/-ница (сторон-ник/сторон-ница), -щик/-щица (гардероб-щик/гардероб-щица), -ун/-унья (бегун/бегунья)* or an additional suffix, *-иха (врач/врач-иха), -ша (редактор/редактор-ша), -ка (солист/солист-ка)*. As is well-known, there is an asymmetry in the usage of these first-declension nouns and their second-declension correlates. The second-declension nouns can refer only to women, but the first-declension nouns can be used in reference to women as well as to men. As a consequence, a man can only be named with a masculine noun, but a woman can in principle be identified by either kind of noun: as *врач* or *врачиха*, as *руководитель* or *руководительница*, as *писатель* or *писательница*, as *сторонник* or *сторонница*. It is then natural to ask how, in referring to a woman, speakers make the choice between the correlative masculine and feminine nouns.

The modest literature treating these correlative noun pairs has emphasized the social status of women in various occupations and the stylistic properties of the feminine noun. R. Rothstein (1973), observing that “the relative liberation of women in 1917 produced a need for new terminology to refer to women occupying certain jobs or professions”, analyzed the changes in language that came in the wake of this social upheaval by appealing to the markedness of gender: nouns of the masculine gender, unmarked with respect to the feminine, can be used broadly to refer to women.¹ Krysin (Крысин 1974, 277–296) differentiated lexical items according to the stylistic value of the feminine derivative and constructed two tests that were submitted to approximately three thousand speakers for self-reporting. In one test, speakers were given a list

of masculine and feminine pairs and asked to choose one or the other and fill in the blank in the frame *Он редкостный каверзник, и она тоже _____*. Representative scores for the use of the masculine noun in this test were *доброволец* 86%, *эксплуатационник* 64%, and *прыгун* 26%. In another test, speakers were asked how they would describe a woman fulfilling a certain role; the masculine noun was chosen (in both formal and colloquial registers) for *лифтер* by 12% of respondents, for *парикмахер* by 27%, for *корректор* by 49%, and for *диктор* by 50%. The study provides clear evidence that lexical items differ in how likely the feminine derivative is to be used, but by its design this study could not examine how context affects usage. B. Comrie, G. Stone, and M. Polinsky (1996, 231–242), who summarize and interpret prior work on this and other areas of variation in Russian grammar, maintain the tacit assumption that the choice of masculine or feminine noun in reference to women depends on prestige and add a demographic consideration: “in certain cases, of course, the relevant factor seems to be not so much the prestige attached to the occupation as the expectation, at least from a relatively traditional viewpoint, that the occupation is primarily male” (237–238).

The most extended and focused study of these nouns is that of B. Mozdierz (1999), who used the term “feminization” to refer to the process of forming and using feminine forms. Mozdierz suggested the following general principle governing the use of feminine forms:

[T]he non-use of feminine forms reflects the traditional social stratification of men and women in the workplace and in society at large. Masculine forms prevail when addressing women in influential, highly-paid or prestigious positions typically occupied by men [...], while feminine forms are fairly consistently used for women in traditional women’s jobs. [...] In fields in which women occupy the predominant sector, [...] masculine agentives are favored over feminine forms in official and honorific contexts. (Mozdierz 1999, 177)

Mozdierz’s analysis blends considerations of demographics and status and addresses the question of context at least insofar as context relates to status.

In the following we ask how speakers choose between a masculine and feminine noun to refer to a woman in spontaneous written usage on the worldwide web. We present both statistical data about usage gathered from searches and a series of case studies illustrating the usage of certain nouns in specific contexts.² We hope to demonstrate that the choice of feminine versus masculine form depends both on the lexical properties of words and on context, where “context” includes considerations of reference as well as issues of evaluation and status.³

2. LEXICON

The nouns we examined can be divided into a number of classes, defined primarily by semantics and secondarily by the morphological suffix used to form the noun.⁴ Each class has a characteristic pattern of usage of the masculine and feminine forms, at least in a gross sense; however, there is no reason to expect that the behavior would be exactly the same for all nouns within a class.

<a> UNPAIRED nouns – those lacking correlative feminine forms: *теоретик танца, хореограф* (*Наталья Широкова работала с 1990 по 1999 годы как танцовщица и **хореограф** в Екатеринбургском театре “Провинциальные танцы”*), *вице-президент*.

 Nouns with a correlative feminine form in *-иха* or *-иша*, which produce derivatives that are stylistically marked as belonging to a conversational register and semantically marked as less-than-canonical performance of a role. Here belong such nouns as: *врач/врачиха, режиссер/режиссериша, редактор/редакториша, банкир/банкириша*. Obviously the boundary between this class and the previous class is permeable. For example, *педагог* used to belong to Class <a> – unpaired nouns – yet a small number of tokens of *педагогиха* can be found on the web, in conversational style (*Помнится, **педагогиха** наша на курсах говорила сидеть в растяжке больше минуты ...*). New names for roles in information technology begin as unpaired, such as *баннермэйкер, дизайнер, программмер*. Yet feminine forms have started to appear, albeit with strong stylistic overtones: *И порешили меж собой, что крута их **программериша** Ада*. It remains to be seen what will happen over time – whether these stylistically marked forms will remain stylistically marked or become more mainstream – but there is no question that the process of forming new, stylistically colored feminine forms (especially with *-иша*) is quite productive.

<c> The unique pair *инвалид/инвалидка* describes an official social STATUS, one which however is based on a gender-neutral characteristic (see §12 below).

<d> For certain professions, the canonical representative is assumed to be female, and the feminized derivatives (formed with *-иша*) lack the stylistic coloring of other derivatives with this suffix. To this class of canonically FEMALE PROFESSIONS belong *секретарь/секретариша, кассир/кассириша, продавец/продавищица, лифтер/лифтериша, парикмахер/парикмахериша, билетер/билетериша*.⁵

<e> Nouns defining VOCATIONS, whose feminine forms are made with stylistically neutral suffixes, for example *-(тель)ница*. This class includes familiar nouns such as *учитель/учительница, преподаватель/преподавательница*.

<f> *Писатель/писательница* and *художник/художница*, while they might seem to name professions and therefore belong to Class <e>, presuppose an

element of personal expression and individual identity, and therefore have some affinity with nouns describing performers. We might term these nouns of AVOCATION.

<g> Nouns such as *читатель/читательница* and *владелец/владелица* describe not professions but occasional or restricted ROLES.

<h> Some nouns name ADVOCATES of beliefs or attitudes, such as *сторонник/сторонница* or *любитель/любительница*. Adhering to a belief presupposes a certain degree of activity; the advocacy is relativized to some specific issue; and there is a possibility of change.

<i> Some nouns describe the individuals in terms of a salient DISPOSITION of personality: *каверзник/каверзница*, *оптимист/оптимистка*. These nouns are close to the previous group, but with these, the disposition is static and general for a given individual rather than actively manifested relative to some specific issue or problem.

<j> Related are MEMBERS of organizations, for example *коммунист/коммунистка*, *комсомолец/комсомолка*.

<k> PERFORMERS in sports and music and theatre: *теннисист/теннисистка*, *чемпион/чемпионка*, *бегун/бегунья*, *скрипач/скрипачка*, *артист/артистка*, *солист/солистка*. With these nouns the performance is linked to individual identity and to gender; there are different expectations about how men and women should perform these roles.

The classification offered above could be adjusted or refined – one could propose fewer or more classes – but the overall picture would remain effectively the same. As above, the classes of nouns can be arranged in an approximate gradation. Nouns that describe an impersonal role or vocation are at one extreme; with these nouns, the feminized derivative is stylistically colored. At the opposite end of the spectrum are nouns that describe individuals in terms of personal qualities. Intermediate is a broad array of classes that allow both views of people in terms of roles and as individuals. We did not consider nouns that identify individuals in terms of ethnicity or geographical origin, which belong at the far end of the spectrum with performer nouns. We also did not consider nominalized adjectives such as *вожатый/вожатая*, *рабочий/рабочая*, or *заведующий/заведующая*.

3. CONTEXT

We propose to describe the contextual use of nouns in terms of a constellation of two contextual parameters, reference and evaluation.

In reference, the basic question is the relative importance of two modes of reference.⁶ Under what might be termed DEFINITIONAL reference, the speaker uses the noun to define a possible individual; the speaker is concerned primarily

with the fact that the person under discussion belongs to the type named by the noun. For example, in *она стала писателем*, the primary concern is with the fact of becoming the kind of entity that fits the definition of a writer (or equivalently, is a token of the type of writer). In contrast, in INDIVIDUATED reference, the speaker is interested in the individual *qua* individual who has unique properties that distinguish that individual from other members of the type. For example, *она стала писательницей* will be said of an individual with established identity whose unique biography is at issue. A related question is how well the person under discussion fits the definition. The masculine indicates that the person under discussion instantiates the type in a CANONICAL fashion.⁷ The feminine form suggests that the person under discussion has properties that do not match the canonical type. There are additional discourse considerations involved in reference. In a discourse situation involving multiple referents, the feminine noun can indicate that the individual is SALIENT in the narrative, whereas a masculine noun would indicate a person of ancillary importance. Prior mention of person as a woman means the feminine form is likely to be used, by PRIMING.

A second domain is evaluation: the speaker can use the choice between masculine and feminine nouns to express a subjective EVALUATION. Evaluation is complex and polyvalent in context. The evaluation can be an evaluation of a specific person or of the role in general. In formulating an evaluation, the speaker can speak his/her own mind or can report the universal evaluation of society. (The question of who the speaker is and what point of view the speaker represents will come up in the case study of *учитель/учительница* below.) Yet there is a consistent value to the choice of masculine and feminine nouns. In simplified terms, the masculine reflects an attitude to the referent that is neutral or detached. Accordingly, the masculine is appropriate to the neutral or formal register of language and will be used in public genres of language (journalism, administrative documents). In contrast, the feminine indicates a personal engagement in the process of reference, or what we might term PROXIMITY – an absence of boundaries between speaker and referent; in context, proximity may take various forms, from affectionate to (not infrequently) derogatory. The feminine noun is consistent with the informal register of speech and is likely to occur in in-group genres of language use, including conversation and (in written form on the web) chatrooms and forums; this is especially true of the stylistically charged nouns derived by means of the suffixes *-уха* and *-уа*. Status (or prestige) – the consideration emphasized in the literature – is a kind of evaluation, an evaluation by the whole society of the role in general.

We have then suggested two broad domains: reference and evaluation. In reference, the basic question is different degrees and forms of individuation: the feminine signals individuated reference, the masculine, definitional reference. In evaluation, feminine forms signal a proximate, personal involvement in the process

Table 1. Constellation of factors for feminization

Domain	Favoring masculine	Favoring feminine
local reference (individual vs. type)	definitional	individuating
local reference (individual relative to archetype)	canonical	non-canonical
textual reference (continuity)	no priming	priming (prior mention as female)
textual reference (relative salience)	ancillary participant	salient participant
evaluation	neutral to detached	proximate
style	neutral to formal	informal
genre of speech activity	public	in-group

of reference, the masculine, detachment. The constellation of considerations involved in the choice of gender is summarized in Table 1.

We should emphasize that the concepts identified above are not discrete: they blend into each other and often line up. Notably, a detached evaluation is natural when using the noun in a definitional (that is, abstract, canonical, non-individuated) sense, and is natural in formal register and public discourse. A proximate evaluation is natural when using the noun to refer to a specific individual, especially one who fulfills a role in a less than canonical fashion, and fits with informal register and in-group genres of language.

4. SEARCHING THE WEB

The corpus used for the studies was any and all Russian-language internet sites accessible through the Google search engine in December 2003. As a corpus, the internet is extremely varied; it includes newspaper articles, fiction, discussion forums, institutional sites, personal sites and web journals, translated detective fiction, to name a few of the genres. This array of sources assures a variety of styles and registers.

There are of course negative aspects to the use of the web as a source for linguistic data. Websites are not stable over time. There is no control over the proportion of genres that are represented. The search engine Google requires contexts to be defined precisely and narrowly, without variables. The search results had to be scrutinized in order to eliminate tokens that were problematic in one or another way, such as duplications or false hits. For instance, in investigating the use of *секретарь/секретарша*, we eliminated secretaries of state; in investigating *чемпионка*, we removed uses of the term to refer to a team or country. (Even so, the number of hits in the context ... *стала чемпионом/чемпионкой* was so large it was impossible to examine each example individually.) We also eliminated compounds with *женщина* or

девушка from consideration (*женщина-режиссер*), as these present a separate issue for study, which, although intriguing, is beyond our present task.

5. RESULTS OF SEARCHING THE WEB

We searched for the masculine and corresponding feminine derivative in four syntactic contexts. These contexts, which emerged through a certain amount of experimentation, have two advantages: they can be searched and they have clear properties with respect to reference. Of the four contexts, two are individuating in reference and two are definitional, in the sense in which these concepts were defined above. No doubt other contexts for searches could be formulated. We would predict, however, that other contexts would behave in a fashion analogous to these contexts, according as the context is individuating or definitional.

Usage for individual nouns is recorded in Table 2. Each context, labeled by an index number from “1” through “4”, consists of three columns, which record the number of masculine tokens (“M”), the number of feminine tokens (“F”), and the percentage of feminine forms (“%F”). In Table 3, the numbers for individual lexical items are added together, giving an aggregate picture for each class.

The first syntactic context (СХТ1) was as subject of one of five verbs (*сказала, была, дала, не могла, хотела*). (The verbs were chosen on the presumption that they would occur frequently. We assume that usage is comparable with other verbs.) We considered only instances in which the noun immediately preceded the verb (SV word order), without intervening material; thus we included the strings *учитель сказала* and *учительница сказала*, but not strings such as *учитель уже сказала*, *учительница уже сказала* or *сказала учитель*, *сказала учительница*. We did in fact carry out exploratory searches for collocations in which the subject follows the verb (*сказала учитель*, *сказала учительница*), and while there occasionally seemed to be some effect, no clear pattern emerged. The case study of *секретарь/секретарша* below does comment on word order.

It is reasonable to assume that nouns used as subject will be individuated in reference: as a rule, subject nouns refer to specific individuals rather than define possible individuals. Thus СХТ1, in which the noun is used as a subject, is a context of individuating reference. With noun pairs whose feminine form is stylistically marked (Class), the masculine was used predominantly, though not exclusively. The use of the masculine decreases for other classes of nouns, in a mostly monotonic fashion, following the gradation of classes outlined above. The three vocation nouns (Class <e>) use both forms, though they differ somewhat from each other. Use of the masculine for subjects was rare with advocate nouns (Class <g>), and almost non-existent with performer nouns (Class <k>). Highly descriptive nouns (disposition nouns of Class <i>, membership nouns of

Table 2. Feminization in four syntactic contexts (individual lexical items)

Noun	Class	СХТ1: subject of <i>сказала</i> , <i>была</i> , <i>дала</i> , <i>не могла</i> , <i>хотела</i>			СХТ2: dative or locative antecedent of relative pronoun <i>которая</i>			СХТ3: predicative complement of <i>стала</i>			СХТ4: apposition to patronymics (<i>Петровну</i> , <i>Ивановну</i> , <i>Николаевну</i> , <i>Михайловну</i> , <i>Васильевну</i> , <i>Алексеевну</i>)		
		M	F	%F	M	F	%F	M	F	%F	M	F	%F
<i>врачи-ца</i>		568	116	17%	64	7	10%	209	0	0%	51	0	0%
<i>директор/-ша</i>		135	56	29%	13	1	7%	394	0	0%	148	0	0%
<i>режиссер/-ша</i>		58	2	3%	5	0	0%	257	1	0%	9	0	0%
<i>редактор/-ша</i>		43	8	16%	9	5	36%	122	0	0%	0	0	—
<i>инвалид/-ка</i>	<с>	1	2	67%	2	0	0%	390	3	1%	1	0	—
<i>кассир/-ша</i>		45	75	63%	2	18	90%	3	0	0%	0	0	—
<i>секретарь/-ша</i>		107	225	68%	14	57	80%	139	18	11%	7	1	88%
<i>преподаватель/-ница</i>	<с>	63	85	57%	7	13	65%	119	13	10%	50	1	2%
<i>учитель/-ница</i>	<с>	16	773	98%	96	110	53%	172	164	49%	79	34	30%
<i>руководитель/-ница</i>	<с>	61	55	47%	4	4	50%	135	10	7%	45	1	2%
<i>писатель/-ница</i>		1	145	99%	0	21	100%	38	56	60%	0	0	—
<i>художник/-ница</i>		2	332	99%	0	26	100%	62	60	49%	1	1	50%
<i>читатель/-ница</i>	<с>	0	25	100%	0	9	100%	9	16	64%	0	0	—
<i>владелец/-ица</i>	<с>	0	20	100%	0	5	100%	9	146	94%	0	1	100%
<i>пассажир/-ка</i>	<с>	4	34	89%	0	12	100%	3	1	25%	0	0	—
<i>сторонник/-ница</i>		0	0	—	0	0	—	11	15	58%	0	0	—
<i>любитель/-ница</i>		1	6	86%	0	0	—	3	6	67%	0	1	100%
<i>противник/-ница</i>		0	9	100%	0	0	—	3	5	63%	0	0	—
<i>оптимист/-ка</i>		0	0	—	0	0	—	1	10	91%	0	0	—
<i>коммунист/-ка</i>		0	0	—	0	5	100%	3	18	86%	0	0	—
<i>солист/-ка</i>		0	13	100%	0	1	100%	2	235	99%	0	0	—
<i>скрипач/-ка</i>		0	13	100%	0	2	100%	1	9	90%	0	0	—
<i>чемпион/-ка</i>		1	31	97%	1	1	50%	na	na	na	1	0	0%
<i>артист/-ка</i>		0	64	100%	1	22	96%	2	84	98%	0	18	100%

na = not applicable; examples too numerous (tens of thousands) to scrutinize.

Table 3. Feminization in four syntactic contexts (aggregate)

Class	СХТ1: subject of <i>сказала</i> , <i>была, дала, не могла,</i> <i>хотела</i>			СХТ2: dative or locative antecedent of relative pronoun <i>которая</i>			СХТ3: predicative complement of <i>стала</i>			СХТ4: apposition to patronymics (<i>Петрову,</i> <i>Иванову, Николаеву,</i> <i>Михайлову, Васильеву,</i> <i>Алексееву</i>)		
	M	F	%F	M	F	%F	M	F	%F	M	F	%F
	804	182	18%	91	13	13%	982	1	0%	208	0	0%
<c>	1	2	67%	2	0	0%	390	3	1%	1	0	0%
<d>	152	300	66%	16	75	82%	142	18	11%	0	1	100%
<e>	140	913	87%	107	127	54%	426	187	31%	174	36	17%
<f>	3	477	99%	0	47	100%	100	116	54%	1	1	50%
<g>	4	79	95%	0	26	100%	21	163	89%	0	1	100%
<h>	1	15	94%	0	0	–	17	26	60%	0	0	–
<i>	0	0	–	0	0	–	1	10	91%	0	0	–
<j>	0	0	–	0	5	100%	3	18	86%	0	0	–
<k>	1	121	99%	2	26	93%	5	328	98%	1	18	95%

Class <j>), did not occur in СХТ1, presumably because they describe possible types of individuals (definitional reference) rather than select a known individual (individuating reference).

The second syntactic context (“СХТ2”) was as the antecedent in the locative or dative case of a feminine relative pronoun in the nominative case (e. g., ... *руководителю/руководительнице, которая ...* or *руководителе/руководительнице, которая ...*). A noun that supports a relative pronoun is very likely to be individuating in reference (*Я все думаю, почему мы не потерялись друг с другом? ... А может, благодаря нашей **классной** **руководительнице, которая** вовлекла наш класс в школьную драматическую студию?* – a unique individual), though definitional reference is not inconceivable (*Такой результат может получить каждый **преподаватель, который** будет заниматься с ребятами по книгам отца Иоанна* – any possible individual of the type). The feminine form of the pronoun *которая* of course guarantees that the antecedent refers to a woman.

The results for this context are similar to those of the subject context. Nouns whose feminine form is stylistically colored use the masculine predominantly (Class). Vocation nouns (Class <e>) hover around fifty percent. Nouns from classes further down on the gradation are quite unlikely to use the masculine form. Indeed, many are unlikely to occur in this collocation at all, again for the reason that they define types rather than select known individuals. For this reason, the utility of this context is limited. Still, this context does provide confirmation of the investigation of the subject context (СХТ1), by showing that there is another individuating context that favors the use of the masculine noun.

The third syntactic context (“СХТ3”) is as a predicative noun in the instrumental case following the verb *стала* (e. g., ... *стала инвалидом/инвалидкой*). Nouns used as predicative complements are necessarily definitional, not individuating, in reference.⁸

It is instructive to compare usage in the predicative context (СХТ3) with usage in the subject context (СХТ1). As a rule, for any given noun pair, the feminine form is more frequent in the subject context СХТ1 than in the predicative context СХТ3. For example, as the subject, nouns of Class use the feminine form infrequently, in 18% of the tokens of these nouns. This rate of usage, while modest, is nevertheless more frequent than in the predicative context СХТ3, in which the feminine form is not used at all (only one token among almost one thousand). Evidently, a form such as *врачиха* or *режиссерша* can be used to select a concrete person (as subject), but cannot be used to define what someone has become (as predicative). Next, among nouns of Class <e>, which name practitioners of vocations, there is a clear and consistent difference in context. The feminine form is more frequent in the subject context (СХТ1) than in the predicative context (СХТ3): *преподавательница* 57% as subject in СХТ1

as opposed to only 10% as predicative in СХТ3, *руководительница* 47% as subject (СХТ1) but 7% as predicative (СХТ3), and *учительница* 98% as subject (СХТ1) as opposed to 49% as predicative (СХТ3). With nouns further down the hierarchy, the feminine form is used consistently as subject (СХТ1) but less frequently as predicative (СХТ3); for example, 99% *художница* as subject (СХТ1) but 49% *художница* as predicative (СХТ3). Thus throughout the hierarchy of noun classes, the feminine noun is used much more (in relative terms) in the subject context than it is in the predicative context. The subject context is individuating, the predicative context definitional. We conclude that individuating contexts favor (in relative terms) the use of the feminine derivative, while definitional contexts favor the masculine noun.

Almost accidentally we run across the fourth syntactic context (СХТ4), collocations such as ... *наградить Почетной Грамотой Андрееву Елену Анатольевну – учителя/учительницу начальных классов*. Here the noun, used as an appositive, states the vocation of an individual who is introduced for the first time into the text. In such constructions, the noun used in apposition, because it names the vocation of the individual ('someone who can be defined as a teacher'), has definitional reference. Many nouns do not occur naturally in this context, and so cannot be evaluated. Moreover, we could search for appositions only by combining specific patronymics with professions nouns, a highly specific search that yielded few results. Still, for the nouns which allow a comparison, some results emerge: the masculine is used for obligatorily for nouns of Class , predominantly for Class <e> (usually *учитель*, sometimes *учительница*), but the feminine is used predominantly for the performer noun *артист/артистка* (Class <k>). For the three lexical classes that have sufficient tokens, then, there is a gradation that is analogous to that found in the predicative context (СХТ3).

In summary, there is a difference in the usage of masculine and feminine forms as subject (СХТ1) – a context of individuating reference – as opposed to the predicative context (СХТ3) – a context of definitional reference. The comparison of these two contexts, which are the contexts that occur with the most consistency, confirms that context has a significant effect on usage. The other two syntactic contexts, relative clauses (СХТ2) and appositions (СХТ4), provide less extensive information, but to the extent that they can be documented, these contexts confirm that there is a difference in the choice of the gender of nouns that is correlated with the difference between individuating and definitional functions of nouns. Individuated reference favors feminine nouns; definitional reference favors masculine nouns.

6. CASE STUDIES, IN GENERAL

The data reported in Tables 2–3 give clear evidence that lexicon and context play a role in the use of masculine and feminine nouns. The statistical data of Tables 2–3 generalize over many individual examples, and they can provide evidence only for those considerations that can be counted. The choice of gender is ultimately linked to how nouns are used in context in more elusive, less quantifiable ways. To refine our analysis, we will now present a series of case studies. In each case study, we collected the examples of one noun in a narrow context and examined the usage in each instance. We found that, in every set of examples we collected (on the order of thirty to a hundred), about half to two thirds of the examples of a given set would fall into one or two patterns of usage; the remaining examples would be heterogeneous. In the case studies below we focus attention on those patterns of usage that seemed recurrent and significant. Accordingly, the studies represent our interpretation of which factors were important, for a given noun and context, and can make no claim to statistical rigor.

7. CASE STUDY: *руководитель/руководительница*

Both *руководитель* and the corresponding feminine *руководительница* are used frequently as the subject of verbs. As recorded in Table 2, the feminine was used 47% of the time as subject of five verbs, and no doubt the use of the feminine noun would be comparable with other verbs as well. To determine what further considerations influence the choice, we investigated the usage with one of the five verbs, the specific context *руководитель/руководительница сказала*. Usage of this pair was complicated by the fact that *руководитель/руководительница* is often preceded by *классный/классная*. When the modifier was used, the feminine *руководительница* was more frequent than the masculine *руководитель* (only 41% masculine), while the masculine was relatively more frequent when the modifier was absent (58% masculine). For this reason, the contexts *руководитель/руководительница сказала* and *классный руководитель/классная руководительница сказала* are distinguished below.

In the collocation *руководитель/руководительница сказала* without modifier, the masculine is used when the individual fulfills a canonical role. Mozdierz (1999, 166) suggests the preference of a masculine form is due to the fact that “these expressions indicate someone’s status as an archetype, a character usually associated with and expressed by the masculine agentive”. A modifier such as *научный* indicates such a status:

- (1) Я долго думал, но **мой научный руководитель** сказала тогда: “Неважно, где учишься, важно, где потом будешь работать”.

But if a leader is presented as individual with idiosyncratic properties, *руководительница* is used. In (2), the leader is an individual who expresses anger, thereby going well beyond the canonical type of a leader:

- (2) Я говорю: “Подходил ко мне мужчина, который когда-то меня лечил”. **Наша руководительница сказала:** “Не слушай никого! Ходят тут всякие да расстраивают. Брось все и успокойся ...”

In the one instance of this context that did not follow this distribution, the speaker is discussing two different leaders. The feminine *руководительница* differentiates the second leader, a woman in a prestigious role, from the first, male leader.

- (3) Вдруг в понедельник мне звонит **руководитель программы** и говорит: “Ты знаешь, что все информационные агентства сообщают о том, что ты отстранен от эфира?” Я сказал: “Мне ничего никто не говорил, и поэтому буду готовиться к эфиру во вторник”. На что мне **руководитель говорит:** “Тогда приезжай в мэрию”. (Мы же программа правительства Москвы.) Я не представляю, как раскручивались механизмы и как Корзун принял решение. Я просто приехал, и **руководительница сказала:** “Ты завтра работаешь”. После этого Корзун ушел с канала.

With the modifier present, the choice between *классный руководитель* and *классная руководительница* depends on the reference of the individual in discourse. The feminine focuses on the teacher as individual, with unique properties. With *классный руководитель*, the teacher is not the focus of the utterance; the teacher is viewed as secondary in relation to another, more salient individual, and the teacher is then viewed as a canonical teacher rather than as a distinct individual. There are many ways in which the role can be ancillary in discourse. To mention some specific instances, the teacher may be: a source of posthumous praise for the focus of the utterance ((4)):

- (4) Алексею Тиенарю, память о котором увековечена в День знаний в его родной школе, не было еще и 19 лет, когда он погиб в феврале 1996 года в селе Ханкале под Грозным. Вспоминая о нем, **классный руководитель сказала:** “Он очень любил жизнь, был душой класса, хорошо играл на гитаре. Мы будем помнить о нем всегда”.

A source of information for the salient individual ((5)):

- (5) Мой сын собирается закончить среднюю школу экстерном. Возможна ли такая форма получения общего образования? Спрашивала в школе, где он учится, и педагог – **классный руководитель сказала**, что есть соответствующее постановление. Не могли бы вы подсказать мне, что это за официальный документ?

An enforcer of rules that apply to the salient individual ((6)):

- (6) Я в школе. Единственное, что помню с первого класса, так это избивание старших. Нам **классный руководитель сказала** следить за старшими классами, чтобы они не курили в младшем блоке. Мы с одноклассниками, а у нас из 32 человек в классе было 3 девчонки, караулили старшиков и всем скопом налетали на них. Через неделю у нас в блоке никто не курил.

Overall, in the usage of the pairs *руководитель/руководительница сказала* and *классный руководитель/классная руководительница сказала*, what is important is whether the person is treated as an individual with idiosyncratic properties (implying feminine (*классная*) *руководительница*), or whether she is fulfilling a canonical role (implying masculine (*классный*) *руководитель*).

8. CASE STUDY: *учитель/учительница*

As noted above in Table 2, the distribution of the masculine *учитель* and feminine *учительница* was split almost evenly as the predicative complement: *стала учителем* 51%, *стала учительницей* 49%. The even distribution of these forms makes this a useful context for investigating further contextual factors.

A factor that frequently influenced the choice of form in this context was the gender of the speaker and, more than that, the way in which the speaker responds to characteristic attitudes of men and women.⁹ Male speakers often express the dominant patronizing attitude of society to women professionals and use *учительница* in reference to women, as in (7).

- (7) Некоторые родители любят давать своим дочерям вместо полной формы имени его уменьшительную форму. Иногда в загсах так и записывают: Люся, Ира, Ина, Рита, Ната и т. д. Пока носители имени еще дети, это звучит неплохо. Но вот Ната окончила вуз и **стала учительницей**, Ага стала врачом, Рита – инженером. И как нелепо будет звучать: учительница Ната Петровна, знаменитый хирург Лена. [male speaker]

Female speakers, in contrast, are likely to use the masculine noun in reference to women ((8)), especially in reference to themselves ((9)).

- (8) Территория спорта Елены Ивановны раздвинула свои границы, когда она **стала учителем** физкультуры в Наволокской школе. [female speaker]
- (9) Я понимала, что учителя, как и медики, недостаточно ценятся. Сейчас, возможно, ситуация меняется, появляются частные школы и так далее. Если бы я **стала учителем**, наверное, я что-то бы нашла. [female speaker]

By using the feminine form, women speakers differentiate their evaluation of themselves from the dominant evaluation of women professionals and assert the right to be identified as canonical teachers, in this way valorizing their status.

The choice between *учитель* and *учительница* is also sensitive to the way in which the individual is presented in context. The feminine form is appropriate when the individual's profession is part of a complete description of a person.

- (10) Софа не давала мне спуска. Следила, помогала, она ведь успела закончить (тоже заочно) пединститут, **стала учительницей** и не переставала учительствовать даже после того, как родила второго ребенка, дочурку Беллочку.

(10) is concerned with Sofa as individual, all of whose personal details are of interest; her role as teacher is only one of her attributes. In contrast, the masculine noun is appropriate when the role of teacher, and the change to that status, is the focal information, as in (11):

- (11) Затем был переезд в Мехико, куда был назначен Р. Серратос директором музыкальной школы, которую и закончила Консуело Веласкес. В 15 лет она **стала учителем** фортепиано. Ее первые композиции родились из импровизаций и, тем не менее, впоследствии она стала известным композитором.

(11) is concerned with the musical career of this woman. The fact that she has become a teacher at a comparatively young age is the significant information here; this change in her status is what allows her to become a composer as well. By focusing on the change in status, example (11) presents the role of teacher in its canonical form. The combination of definitional, canonical reference seems common when teachers hold prestigious positions in more than one field of endeavor. Thus the masculine is found in *curricula vitae*, tributes, and lists of accolades.

The feminine form is used when the discourse emphasizes the identity of the referent as a woman. In (12), the prior discourse establishes the identity of the referent as a woman (note *девушка, приданое, выйти замуж*) and primes the subsequent use of *учительница*:

- (12) В то время как я ее помню молоденькой девушкой, около года убийства царя Александра II, у нее было приданое, тысяч десять, и такая она была хорошенькая, образованная, а вот не досталось замуж выйти, истратила деньги и построила школу и сама **стала учительницей** . . .

Учительница tends to be used specifically in reference to elementary school teachers, especially in the phrase *учительница начальных классов*, for the demographic reason that women have historically held this position. Example (13) presents a list of candidates for the award “Учитель года”. As a discourse context, a list imposes a definitional sense, and often leads to the use of masculine nouns, as in the second and fourth tokens in (13). The feminine form in the first token in (13) reflects this presumption about elementary school teachers.

- (13) Наталья Тютчева и Ирина Кузнецова – **учительницы** начальных классов, Мария Крайко – **учитель** математики, Леонид Логинов – **учитель** физики и Татьяна Федорова – **учитель** русского языка и литературы.

One could suggest that there are two lexical items, ‘teacher (in general, at an advanced level)’ and ‘teacher (at the elementary level)’. And yet the rule that the feminine noun is used in reference to elementary school teachers can be overridden if the speaker is a woman:

- (14) Дорогая Марина Георгиевна, здравствуйте! [. . .] Я недавно узнала то, что Яна живет совсем недалеко от меня. Настя **стала учителем** начальных классов. Она живет в Москве. У нее уже тройняшки! Их она назвала Валерой, Галей и Яной [. . .] [female speaker]

Example (14) is an excerpt from a letter to a teacher from a former student. As in (9), the masculine noun can be used by female speakers to valorize the role of women as teachers.

In this case study, the choice between *учитель* and *учительница* in the predicative context depends on the lexical sense of the noun (elementary education as opposed to other levels), the nature of reference in discourse (if the individual is presented as individual – and specifically as a woman – *учительница* is used), and gender of the speaker (male speakers tend to use the feminine, women use the masculine as well as the feminine).

9. CASE STUDY: *писатель/писательница*

In the context *стала писателем/писательницей*, both masculine and feminine forms are frequent; as noted in Table 2, *стала писательницей* was used in 60% of the tokens. The basic principle governing the choice of masculine vs. feminine form appears to be the degree to which the subject is individuated in discourse. If the subject is mentioned for the first time, as in newspaper headings, the masculine form tends to be used, as in (15):

- (15) Жена президента **стала писателем**.

When the individual's goal in life is to become a writer, the individual is less emphasized, the focal information is the transition to the profession, and the masculine form is likely ((16)):

- (16) Зависеть же от других Карен не могла. Судьба заставила сорокасемилетнюю женщину полностью изменить свою жизнь. В Африке пришли в движение все ее душевные силы и страсти. В Дании кристаллизовался ее талант. Карен **стала писателем**.

In contrast, in the type of discourse that gives an extended biography of one person, the female referent is highly individuated, and the fact of becoming a writer is only one of many facts reported of the individual's biography. Then the feminine form is favored ((17)–(18)):

- (17) Романист и философ американка Аун Ранд умерла сравнительно недавно – в 1982. До эмиграции из Ленинграда в 1926 году она носила имя Алиса Розенбаум. В Америке бывшая Алиса **стала писательницей** и достигла такой популярности, что наиболее восторженные поклонники поставили ее произведения на второе место по влиянию на американские умы после Библии.
- (18) После этого для Жанны наступили тяжелые времена заточения в женской тюрьме, откуда она сбежала – еще одно удивительное приключение в ее жизни, которых было немало. Она поселилась в Англии, где **стала писательницей** и была весьма популярна.

The choice between masculine and feminine nouns can also be influenced by textual considerations. A masculine noun can be used in reference to a woman if the masculine noun was used or was implicit in the previous discourse. In (19), the woman's father was a famous writer, and even though the word *писатель* is not explicitly mentioned, the tacit presence of her father primes a masculine form (note *тоже*):

(19) – Вы чувствуете себя литературной наследницей Виктора Драгунского?

– Мой папа в молодости работал клоуном, у него был рыжий парик. Я считаю, что рыжина моих волос, неизвестно откуда взявшаяся, наверно, связана все-таки с этим. Поскольку отец мало успел со мной пообщаться на этом свете, то он, наверно, каким-то метафизическим образом воздействует на меня. Именно поэтому я тоже **стала писателем**.

Conversely, if the previous discourse brings out the female gender of the referent, the feminine form is likely to be used. In (20) the earlier noun *художница* primes *писательница*:

(20) Рисую детей, Татьяна Ивановна, чтобы они не скучали, рассказывала им сказки, которые тут же и придумывала. И на всех портретах дети серьезны, взволнованы необычайными событиями, происходящими в мире сказок. [...] Из **художницы** она постепенно **стала писательницей**.

Example (21) emphasizes the fact that the writer is a mother, who is then referred to as *писательница*:

(21) Великий Флобер обожал мать и посвятил ей возвышенные строки. Тысячи страниц были написаны об удивительных отношениях Марселя Пруста и его матери. Кроме того, французская литература знает и один пример прямо противоположной зависимости: мадам де Севинье **стала писательницей** потому, что обожала свою дочь ...

In the spirit of Mozdzierz's analysis, which focuses on attitudes towards the profession, we would expect masculine nouns to be used to designate the archetype of the profession, especially in official or respectful contexts, whereas feminine nouns should be used to designate less respected tokens of the profession. In fact, the feminine form is occasionally used to suggest that the speaker's evaluation of the individual's activity as writer as accidental or frivolous ((22)):

(22) Иногда я, вообще, ловлю себя на мысли, что напрасно я **стала писательницей**, начала сочинять романы, теперь, в результате, все меня считают за полную идиотку. А ведь я вполне могла бы стать **ученым, филологом**, защитить диссертацию и даже сделать научное открытие.

Compounds, in the broad sense of the term, emphasize the nature of the role, and are likely to use the masculine, as in (23) and (24).

(23) Нина Катерли (по мужу – Эфрос) родилась [...] в семье журналистов. Мать, Елена Иосифовна Катерли, впоследствии **стала писателем-прозаиком** и была довольно известна в 50-е годы.

(24) Домохозяйка **стала писателем года**.

The rule can be overridden to emphasize the feminine identity of the individual, as in (25):

(25) Сестра поэтессы **стала писательницей-юмористкой** (редкий для женщины жанр), пользовалась признанием в России, а затем и за ее пределами.

Overall, in the choice of *стала писателем/писательницей*, the most general consideration is the degree to which the female referent is individuated in the discourse. Conversely, an emphasis on the profession as such or the fact of change, rather than on the person, decreases the likelihood that a feminine noun will be used.

10. CASE STUDY: *оптимист/оптимистка*

Nouns of Class <i> like *оптимист/оптимистка* describe an individual in terms of a disposition or adherence to a belief system. In Table 2 above, we examined the use of nouns as the predicative complement of *стала*. The pair *оптимист/оптимистка*, however, does not occur in this context; the disposition, after all, is static. To examine the contextual usage of this pair, we considered a closely related context, that in which the noun is predicative complement in the present tense. In this context, there were more than twice as many tokens of feminine nouns (49xx) as masculine (18xx).

The masculine *оптимист* emphasizes the canonical instantiation of the type. A true *оптимист*, such as the speaker's grandmother in (26), is someone who maintains a positive outlook despite hardship, thereby meriting a distal evaluation of respect:

(26) А какой она **оптимист**. Я, ее внук, удивляюсь тому, как она, прожив такую трудную жизнь, не сломилась, а получая такую небольшую пенсию от государства, она не ропщет на свою судьбу.

In a situation of hardship, using the feminine form signals a proximate relation to the referent and expresses sympathy for the individual, as in (27), whose style is informal (note *девчонка*).

- (27) Но это мы знаем, что она – сирота. А так – самая обычная девчонка. Со своими детскими мыслями и мечтами. Валя не унывает. Вообще, она **оптимистка** и считает, что улыбка должна быть на лице у каждого.

An interesting feature of this noun pair is the tendency to use the feminine form *оптимистка* in women's speech settings – women's magazines, horoscopes, romance literature. In these genres, the feminine form emphasizes that the individual fulfills a specifically female role of *оптимистка*, distinct and separate from the canonical gender-neutral role of *оптимист*. Sentence (28), from an on-line journal (www.shpilka.ru) that proclaims itself as intended “для умных и веселых”, discusses an abstract type, but uses the feminine noun to emphasize the distinctly female nature of this personality type:

- (28) Настоящая, восхитительная Стерва – это женщина, которая поняла, как выжить и остаться личностью [...]. Такая женщина всегда держит себя в хорошей внешней и внутренней форме. Она **оптимистка**, но не расслабляется. Она ставит реальные цели и добивается их. В конце концов, она независима.

Overall, the choice of this pair responds to three factors: canonical fulfillment of the role (usually implying *оптимист*), individuation (implying *оптимистка*), and proximate attitude (implying *оптимистка*). Noteworthy is the use of *оптимистка* in all-female genres to refer to a specifically female type of personality.

11. CASE STUDY: *сторонник/сторонница*

Сторонник/сторонница describes an individual who engages in advocacy, often active advocacy of a specific position (Class <h>). In predicative contexts, nouns of both genders occur: 58% feminine in *стала сторонником/сторонницей* (Table 2) and 31% feminine in the present-tense context *она – сторонник/сторонница*.

As a predicative, the masculine *сторонник* tends to be used in discussions of public concerns: issues of state or public policy, professional methodology, and universal values (thus only *сторонник мира*). The individuals referred to by *сторонник* fulfill canonical roles; they are characterized by their professions and professional opinions rather than by their gender. These women hold positions of authority and esteem. The interlocutors – journalists conducting interviews –

maintain a distal, respectful attitude. A woman who is referred to as *сторонник* can be, for example, a prominent politician expressing opinions about policy ((29)):

- (29) Депутат Госдумы Татьяна Астраханкина отметила, что она **сторонник** того, чтобы “Росгосстрах” вообще оставался государственной компанией.

Сторонник is used to refer to professional women when they express opinions or preferences within their field of expertise, such as a certain methodology ((30)):

- (30) Она **сторонник** так называемого системно-комплексного анализа художественного произведения, в совершенстве владеет приемами анализа лирического текста.

In one example with *сторонник*, the referent expresses preference for a certain kind of food, despite the fact that culinary issues are seemingly a personal, domestic concern ((31)):

- (31) Ее завтрак – только чашка кофе, а вообще-то она **сторонник** украинской кухни.

The broader context justifies the masculine. (31) comes at the end of a long journalistic article about an important Ukrainian politician, Ol’ga Kolin’ko (*глава Координационного комитета по борьбе с коррупцией и оргпреступностью при Президенте Украины*). The stylistic tone of the article is neutral to formal. At the end, Kolin’ko’s busy life, dress style and culinary preferences are mentioned, but even when discussing such an apolitical and domestic topic as breakfast, Kolin’ko manages to make a politically relevant statement – albeit perhaps tongue-in-cheek – about her preference for the national cuisine.

The feminine *сторонница* can express various nuances. In texts dealing with foreign women, either real or heroines of translated literature, these individuals, often bearing foreign-sounding names, are designated *сторонница* – in (32), even the Queen of England, the canonical monarch:

- (32) Елизавета Вторая – это воплощение классической монархии сегодня. Она **сторонница** сохранения некоторой дистанции между народом и королевской семьей.

In texts other than translations, *сторонница* is used when the opinions that are advocated are associated with stereotypical female domains such as motherhood ((33)), fashion ((34)), or diet ((35)):

- (33) Хотя я и не **сторонница** таких методов, но надо признать, что многие родители в быстрые сроки учат своих детей спать самостоятельно, разрешив им выплакаться вдоволь.
- (34) Первая моя визуально-виртуальная “покупка” – кожаные брюки с белой блузкой. Не для себя, конечно, для дочери-студентки. Но, как всегда, наши вкусы могут и не совпасть, она – **сторонница** классического стиля и только ей известных критериев.
- (35) Я не **сторонница** диет по группе крови и всяких анализов, основанных на ней.

We observed above that women acting in professional roles would ordinarily be referred to by *сторонник* if the speaker’s attitude is neutral or respectful. If, instead, *сторонница* is used for a professional woman, it means that the speaker feels some personal engagement with the referent and the position she advocates. Because of the resonance of the issue with the speaker, what is advocated becomes proximate. A range of attitudes, sometimes positive (closeness, friendship) but often negative (derision, denial of authority), can be expressed. In (36), a woman politician, by making a statement about the army, intrudes on a traditionally masculine domain of expertise. By designating her as *сторонница*, the male commentator emphasizes her identity as a woman and denies her authority:

- (36) Комментируя заявление Л. Юнус о том, что она – **сторонница** профессиональной армии, в которой, по ее утверждению, нет места альтернативной службе, глава ПЦ отметил, что не понимает, какие противоречия могут существовать между альтернативной службой и профессиональной армией.

In (37), from an article about Microsoft’s representative in Moscow, the journalist uses the feminine form (and a description of her appearance) to undercut her authority:

- (37) Она смеется. Она рассказывает анекдоты. Она подробно и живописно описывает, как подсаживала на шкаф своего кота, а также то, какие цветы любит. Она **сторонница** общения напрямую: на второй фразе разговора разрешает называть себя просто Ольгой и на третьей минуте начинает говорить мне просто «Лёшь». В своей курортной блузке, со спортивной походкой (раньше, когда было время, каталась на горных лыжах), с веселой челочкой она, второй по счету посол империи Microsoft в России, производит хрупкое, легкое, светлое впечатление – птенчик, солнечный зайчик.

To recapitulate, *сторонник* is used for a referent understood to be a professional fulfilling a canonical role and acting with authority; the opinion or position advocated falls within the domain of the referent's expertise; and the attitude of the speaker is one of distal respect. *Сторонница* appears in two types of context. In one, the woman expresses an opinion within the feminine domain (motherhood, fashion, feminism); the attitude of the speaker is neutral. In the other group, the referent is a woman advocating positions in public spheres; the feminine *сторонница* indicates lowering of respect and denial of authority.

12. CASE STUDY: *врач/врачиха*

As the subject of past-tense feminine verbs, the masculine *врач* is much more frequent than the feminine *врачиха*: 83% *врач* for all five verbs investigated (СХТ1 in Table 2 above). The use of *врач/врачиха* is determined above all by the strong stylistic coloring of the feminine *врачиха*. While for other noun pairs the feminine is likely to be used when the speaker refers to a specific woman, with *врач/врачиха* the masculine is used freely when the doctor in question is an individual known to the speaker.

- (38) Сходил в поликлинику, там **врач**. **Врач** сказала: это вирус. **Врач** сказала: много пить, почти ничего не есть. **Врач** сказала: температуру не сбивать, сама пройдет. **Врач** сказала: побольше лежать, поменьше за компьютером.

The fact that the doctor is known to the speaker is often indicated by personal possessive pronouns, generally feminine in the contemporary Russian of the web (*моя/наша/твоя/ваша врач*).¹⁰ The speaker's attitude to the individual can be positive ((39)) or negative ((40)):

- (39) Моя любимая доктор сказала, что о [sic] анализам у меня беременность ... и несмотря на боль, я лежала и улыбалась, чем приводила в замешательство **врача** и анестезиолога, которые развлекали меня, пока ехала моя **врач**. [...] На следующий день я просила у врача дать мне их покормить ... но она решила, что еще рановато.
- (40) Мне очень не нравится наша **врач** Волкова.

The use of *врач* with feminine verb forms and feminine possessive adjectives is frequent in websites devoted to women's issues (sites such as www.mama.ru or www.semeistvo.com). Participants on such sites seem to presume that the doctors are women:

- (41) *Ира*: Не хочу никого пугать, но слышала от своего доктора, что в Инвитро можно сдавать все, кроме гормонов [...]
Madik: Попытаюсь объяснить ситуацию. Ириша, жаль, конечно, что с Вашим анализом так получилось [...] Я думаю, что **Ваша врач** не может этого не знать.

Thus the stylistically neutral *врач* can be used to refer to a woman in in-group discourse as well as in public discourse.

In contrast, *врачиха*, with its strong overtones of informal register, expresses discomfort or ambivalence over the fact that a position of authority is held by someone who is a woman. This discomfort can take various forms. *Врачиха* can be used when the speaker has a derisive attitude with respect to the individual ((42)) or to the whole medical situation ((43)) (note the diminutive *нервишки*):

- (42) Сразу представьте, что все с начала до конца говорилось **врачихой** с каменным лицом, видом своей богоизбранности и моей тупости.
 (43) Моя **врачиха** направила меня к невропатологу по фамилии Горбачевич, подлечить нервишки.

The speaker's attitude towards the person or the situation can be familiarity with a touch of condescension or affection:

- (44) Я старалась, то и дело лезла в учебники, чтобы помочь больным и ничего не упустить. И меня полюбили, ласково звали "наша **врачиха**".
 (45) **Врачиха** пионерлагеря, добрая симпатичная тетенька, прощупала меня, поспросила, дала выпить какой-то зеленоватой жидкости безо всякого вкуса и уложила в кровать.

Врачиха does not always indicate the speaker's attitude to a particular situation or individual, but may reflect simply an overall casual cultural stance on the part of the speaker, as in (46), the slang discourse of a rocker girl:

- (46) Моя **врачиха** хмуро на меня посмотрела (я пришла в больницу с цепью на шее и в диких джинсах) и сказала, что справки в универ надо заказывать прямо в день болезни.

Within a given discourse among the same interlocutors, the use of gender markings – the choice between *врач/врачиха* and also agreement – is likely to be stable. But modulation is sometimes possible. (47), from a maternity forum (www.eva.ru) in which all participants can be presumed to be women, begins with

a masculine noun and masculine agreement, thereby downplaying individuation; the doctor is relevant as the canonical source of technical information:

- (47) *вопрос 1: врач сказал*, что если во второй фазе нет 37,0, то значит, овуляции не было... **Она** права?
ответ 1: [...] Тогда **врач права**.
ответ 2: Дура твоя **врачиха!** Что значит узи не надо, меряй БТ. Ухххх, как я зол.

But as soon as the first speaker refers to the doctor by a pronoun, she must choose the feminine pronoun *она*. The second speaker follows suit, using the feminine adjective as the predicate of the masculine noun. The third interlocutor, in irritation, switches to the informal *врачиха*.

From the examples above, it seems that *врач* is so general that it can easily be used with feminine agreement in a past-tense verb, and with feminine possessive adjectives, even when the referent is known to the speaker as an individual and is relevant to the discourse as an individual. *Врачиха* belongs to a distinctly informal register. It conveys a proximate attitude of the speaker, often derisive, sometimes affectionately familiar.

13. CASE STUDY: *инвалид/инвалидка*

Инвалид/инвалидка is difficult to place in the gradation described above. The masculine form was used almost exclusively (390/393 tokens) as predicative in the context of *стала инвалидом/инвалидкой* (СХТ1, Table 2). This context emphasizes the transition to status of being an invalid; the person is viewed as the token of a type, not as an individual. Indeed, the concept of *инвалид* in Russian society is an officially recognized status, and the fact of becoming an *инвалид* constitutes a significant change in a person's life. Thus, masculine forms are often used for women even when the person is known and individuated in the previous discourse, as in (48) and (49).

- (48) Мать Лидии работала на лесозаготовках, она металась среди трех огней – матерью, Тимофеевой Прасковьей Васильевной, детьми и вторым супругом Василием. Нервы не выдержали, ее разбил тяжелый паралич с эмболией мозга, она **стала инвалидом**, проболев 5 лет, умерла в 42 года.
- (49) Операция прошла неудачно, меня парализовало. Так, по вине врача в 16 лет я **стала инвалидом**.

The status of *инвалид* is often subdivided into groups (I, II, III, etc.) and categories (*по зрению, детства*, etc.). The masculine *инвалид* is frequently used in compounds, as in (50) and (51).

(50) В настоящее время дочь 53 г. **стала инвалидом** 1 группы по общему заболеванию.

(51) Семь лет, как получила я травму позвоночника в результате автодорожной катастрофы и **стала инвалидом-колясочником**.

There were only three examples of feminine forms in our corpus in the context *стала инвалидом/инвалидкой*. In all three, the individual identity of the individual is emphasized and the societal status of *инвалид* is avoided. We consider two below. In (52), the *барыга* (here specifically a drug-dealer) is the main topic of discussion. She became an invalid by jumping out of the window of the police station. Using the feminine noun *инвалидка* makes it possible to indicate her infirmity without suggesting that she became an official *инвалид*.

(52) **БАРЫГА СТАЛА ИНВАЛИДКОЙ** И ПОПАЛАСЬ [headline].

(53) focuses on the Lipmanis family and the fate of the wife in particular. Her medical infirmity is mentioned as an important fact in her biography. Obviously her infirmity was not officially recognized.

(53) **ЛИПМАНИС Давид**, латыш, уроженец Лиепаи, Латвия. [...] 14.06.1941 с женой Софией [...] депортирован в Казачинское КК. [...] Умер в лагере Лесное Вятской обл. в июне 1943 от голода. 12.04.1947 жена вернулась с детьми в Ригу. 22.04.1950 вторично депортирована с дочерьми в Дудинку. В Красноярской тюрьме долго ждали навигации, **стала инвалидкой**. Умерла в ссылке.

To summarize, in the context of *стала инвалидом/инвалидкой*, masculine forms are strongly favored over the feminine, despite the fact that there is no issue of prestige. The use of masculine forms is motivated in most instances by the societal importance of the status of *инвалид*, which is neutral with respect to gender. Use of the feminine both individuates the referent and allows the speaker to talk about incapacitation that would not be recognized in an official way. This concern with official status seems unique to this pair.

14. CASE STUDY: *секретарь/секретарша*

Table 4 records the results of a search with the nouns *секретарь/секретарша* and the verbs *позвонила*, *принесла*, and *сказала* in both word orders, when the subject precedes the verb (SV order) and when it follows (VS order).

Table 4 confirms that the pair *секретарь/секретарша* belongs in the intermediate range between nouns that rarely use the feminine form in reference to a woman and those that consistently do as subject. Accordingly, we can expect

Table 4. Секретарь/секретарша as subject of three verbs

	S _{<M>} V	S _{<F>} V	%F	VS _{<M>}	VS _{<F>}	%F	M (total)	F (total)	%F (total)
позвонила	8	17	68%	35	34	49%	43	51	54%
принесла	20	61	75%	0	8	100%	20	69	78%
сказала	73	116	61%	34	122	78%	107	238	69%
total	101	194	66%	69	164	70%	170	358	68%

S_{<M>}V = masculine subject noun preceding verb.

S_{<F>}V = feminine subject noun preceding verb.

VS_{<M>} = masculine subject noun following verb.

VS_{<F>} = feminine subject noun following verb.

contextual factors to play a large role in the choice of masculine or feminine nouns. Because the results differ according to word order and the verb, it seems appropriate to consider the different collocations separately, examining the salient contextual pressures separately for each.

With *позвонила* we find a significant imbalance in the use of masculine and feminine nouns depending on the word order. The high numbers for the VS_{<M>} context seem to be due to the occurrence of *секретарь* with genitive modifiers which augment prestige and emphasize the role rather than the individual ((54)):

- (54) Мне **позвонила секретарь** Юрия Гагарина Крупская, симпатичная седовласая дама ...

The collocation VS_{<F>} occurs with more quotidian modifiers such as *мужа*, *босса*, *шефа*, etc. that do not enhance prestige.

- (55) Однажды на работе **мне позвонила секретарша** директора и сообщила, что ...

Factors unrelated to prestige can elicit the feminine form. In (56) the feminine noun informs the reader that the secretary will be an active participant in the subsequent story (a tale about finding a good chauffeur):

- (56) И вот полгода назад мне по внутреннему телефону **позвонила секретарша** одного из подразделений моей фирмы, попросилась ее принять. Я подумал, что речь пойдет о каком-нибудь конфликте (увольняют, зарплату не повышают и проч.). Ничего подобного. Пришла молодая женщина приятной, но не кричащей внешности (я ее до этого ни разу не видел) и с порога заявила: “Я хотела бы поработать водителем”.

A feminine noun can indicate deviation from the canonical bureaucratic role, as in (57), where *какой-то* gives an air of suspicion to the narrative.

- (57) По порядку дело выглядело так. Утром, два дня назад, дяде **позвонила секретарша** какой-то дорожно-строительной фирмы и, будто бы по рекомендациям бывших дядиных сослуживцев, предложила ему место консультанта по вопросам топографической съемки. Категорически недовольный собственной пенсией дядя, понятно, тут же согласился. **Секретарша** – хваткая чертовка – обещала прислать за ним машину.

Indeed, as it turns out, the job offer is part of a confidence game, and the uncle gets nothing for his troubles but a sound beating.

The word order *VS* is often used to introduce and define an as yet unknown individual who is functioning as secretary, for example the grey-haired Krupskaja in (54) above. When, in contrast, the order *SV* is used, the individual is typically known, and therefore individuated, in the prior discourse. For instance, in (58) the secretary has already been mentioned, as *секретарша*. She figures as an individual in the narrative, which reports an armed robbery of an office in which only the director and secretary were present.

- (58) Однако пока они разбирались с директором, **секретарша позвонила** в уголовный розыск Центрального административного округа.

With *принесла*, *SV* word order is more prevalent, because the direct object (what is brought) is generally the new information of the utterance. The objects that are transported in this context fall into two categories, documents (*контракт, факс, бумаги на подпись*, etc.) and refreshments (*чай, кофе, поднос, чашки, тортик, пиво*, etc.). The categories correspond respectively to the two spheres of a secretary's activity, the professional, administrative sphere as opposed to the personal, domestic sphere. Documents, as part of the canonical administrative role of the secretary, elicit the masculine, as in (59), even in this colloquial first-person narrative:

- (59) Где-то около 20 часов **секретарь принесла** несколько телеграфных листков, еще влажных от клея, с красной надпечаткой: "Правительственная".

Conveying refreshments is more personal and individual, less bureaucratic and canonical, and feminine forms are more frequent with refreshments with this verb:

- (60) Я предложил гостям садиться в кресла. **Секретарша принесла** на серебряном подносе кофейник с миниатюрными чашечками из китайского фарфора, и разговор наш принял более спокойные формы.

Although the register in (60) is high (and the coffee tray is luxurious), the masculine form is not used. The difference lies in an opposition, specific to this noun pair and possibly this verb, between two roles, one administrative and the other domestic. While the masculine form is the default for the professional role, the feminine form has acquired default status for the no less archetypal domestic function.

With *сказала* the difference between the two word orders revolves around a difference of direct (VS) and indirect (SV) dialogue. Because the VS word order occurs mostly in instances of direct dialogue, the secretary who is speaking is usually individuated in some way in the dialogue (individual in focus); feminine forms predominate. Often the interaction is personalized, as in (61), where the feminine form reflects the secretary's solidarity with the supplicant waiting to see her boss.

- (61) Часы тикали. Уже три часа дня, половина пятого, десять минут шестого. . .
– Борис Иванович уже едет. Так что радуйтесь! – **сказала секретарша** и положила телефонную трубку.

In other cases, the feminine noun seems to be used simply because of the narrative detail it adds by calling attention to the gender of the secretary. (62), for instance, emphasizes the image of the secretary's face, and by synecdoche personalizes the secretary:

- (62) Щелкнул видеофон. На экране появилось лицо **секретарши**.
– Простите, товарищ Рыбников, – **сказала секретарша**, – товарищ Горчинский здесь и ждет вашего вызова.

When masculine forms occur in the VS context, it is often the result of augmenting prestige, as discussed in connection with (54) above. An example is (63), which describes the secretary of the mayor.

- (63) – Мэр готов вас принять, Виктор Семенович, он не против того, чтобы вы работали, но он уехал. Пойдемте к заместителю. Они вчера о вас разговаривали и ваш вопрос, как я поняла, решен, – **сказала секретарь** в приемной мэра.

The secretary in (63) is also de-individuated; she is merely filling her role of representing the mayor.

With the word order SV, used to express indirect discourse, the feminine form is used less frequently, because indirect discourse is less likely to coincide with narrative individuation of the secretary than is direct dialogue. Masculine forms serve to background the secretary in the narrative, as in (64), where the secretary

is only mentioned to indicate her as the source of the information reported; it is the information that is significant, not the individual:

- (64) Я вчера в институт ездил и на кафедру зашел. Там **секретарь сказала**, что у Абросимова отпуск заканчивается 26 августа. Вот, а Белолицкий будет 27 августа – это я у деканата прочитал. Хочу на 4 курсе!!!

Yet the feminine form can easily be used in this context, for example to personalize the interaction, as in (65).

- (65) – А офис Шлыкова вообще выглядел чуть ли не аскетично, но на стенах в приемной висело несколько картин – **секретарша сказала**, что это подлинники каких-то там знаменитостей.

In (65) the secretary's off-hand remark about paintings falls outside the canon of administrative functions.

With the noun pair *секретарь/секретарша* as subject, once this context is examined narrowly with attention to very specific contexts (three verbs *позвонила*, *принесла*, and *сказала*; two word orders), some quite specific concerns emerge, such as the difference between transporting objects and speaking, or the difference between transporting documents and transporting refreshments. These differences have to do with different conceptions of the role of 'secretary'.

15. CASE STUDY: VACILLATION BETWEEN FORMS IN A SINGLE TEXT

(секретарь/секретарша)

Once reference to an individual is established, it might be expected, by the textual principle of priming, that subsequent references to the same individual will use the same noun, masculine or feminine. Yet speakers sometimes vacillate between the two forms, responding to shifts in the constellation of salient forces as the discourse progresses. The following excerpts are taken from a first-person narrative, entitled "Как я поступала", about a young woman's complex and stressful experience of applying and registering for study in France.¹¹ The narrative shows a near even distribution of feminine and masculine forms, all referring to the same individual.

Early in the narrative, the speaker discovers that before she can register, her application file must be approved by a pedagogical commission. After submitting the file, she anxiously awaits a response, and eventually is called to the secretary's office to pick it up ((66)):

- (66) Прихожу. **Секретарша** вынимает мое досье, уже подписанное завкафедрой, и начинает проверять, все ли в порядке! Уже од-

но это поразило меня до глубины души, но дальше выяснилось, что при заполнении досье я совершила дикую глупость, вписав туда все свои дипломы, тогда как во Францию взяла только основную.

Here the speaker describes the activities of an actual person using the feminine form, even though the activities are related to the secretary's bureaucratic duties. The speaker is told to go home and wait until the problem has been sorted out. The speaker complies, but cannot endure the uncertainty and enlists the help of a professor. To report the professor's speech, the speaker switches to the masculine form in reference to the secretary:

- (67) Я решила тоже к нему подойти и объяснила ситуацию. Он велел подождать минутку, вышел, через некоторое время вернулся и сказал, что **секретарь** переделывает мое досье, потом его снова подпишет завкафедрой и уж тогда оно отправится в комиссию по эквивалентности дипломов, но все это будет на следующей неделе. Все ясно и понятно.

At this moment, the secretary is a professional construct of the professor.

As the narrative continues, the speaker decides to wait patiently for the department chair to approve and sign her file:

- (68) На следующей неделе у меня занятий не было, и я решила оставить **секретаршу** в покое.

In (68) the speaker makes a decision about the secretary as an individual, producing the feminine form. But after a week, the speaker learns that her file is still not signed.

- (69) Через неделю, 8 октября, официальное начало учебного года. Прихожу в секретариат: нет, еще не подписано, завкафедрой не было всю неделю. Поверить в это невозможно, спрашиваю у народа – точно, был. Тут я упустила одну маленькую подробность: как только заварилась вся эта каша с досье, **секретарь** сказала мне, что волноваться нечего, так как запись в магистратуру заканчивается 15 октября. То есть, остается всего неделя!

Here the speaker, only four sentences after using the feminine, uses the masculine form at a point when the narrative returns to administrative issues. The secretary is de-individuated; she represents only the source of bureaucratic information.

The indefatigable speaker again approaches the chair of the department:

- (70) После занятий мы с ним пошли в секретариат. **Секретарши** не было, и он сам быстро откопал мое подписанное досье: ну вот, видите, подписано, теперь оно пойдет в педагогическую комиссию.

The speaker uses the feminine form in (70) to speak of the specific, individuated person with whom she has been dealing throughout the narration. When, immediately afterwards in (71), the department chair refers to the secretary, the masculine form returns:

- (71) – Как, – воскликнула я, – ведь до конца записи остаются считанные дни! Если оно только сейчас пойдет на рассмотрение, когда же я буду записываться? – Не волнуйтесь, обычно это быстро, но давайте подождем **секретаря**.

When the secretary arrives, she becomes an individual, and the speaker resumes feminine reference.

- (72) Минут через пять она появилась и, увидев меня с порога, объявила: завтра ваши бумаги будут готовы! Когда приходиться? – С утра. И – о чудо! Они действительно были готовы! **Секретарша** проштамповала какие-то листки, вручила мне их вместе с одной из копий диплома и сказала: “Все, с этим можете записываться!”.

The speaker endures a few more “мытарства”, as she puts it, the last of which involves her needing to include the topic of her thesis in the file.

- (73) Вроде все в порядке, начинают заполнять досье . . . у вас тут нет имени научного руководителя и не указана тема дипломного проекта. Тут надо было сказать, что темы быть не может, так как дипломный проект защищать только на следующий год, и она бы этим удовлетворилась, но я решила перестраховаться и мотанула на кафедру. **Секретарь** сначала долго не могла взять в толк, почему я оказалась в бюро записи иностранцев (!), потом подтвердила, что тема на этот год не ставится.

The speaker chooses the masculine form in (73) because, as in (69) above, it is not the secretary who is the focus – the aside about her dim-wittedness notwithstanding – but her ability within the framework of her canonical administrative role.

When the narrative draws to a close, the speaker sums up her impressions.

- (74) Как говорится, ничего личного. Дело сделано, со всеми сохранились хорошие отношения, скандал устраивать не пришлось,

только немножко потрепала себе нервы. **Секретарша** – сама доброжелательность и, похоже, с обязанностями своими справляется. Логика ее поведения мне понять не дано, поэтому надо приспособливаться.

The focus in (74) is clearly on the secretary as an individual, the personalized relationship that has arisen between her and the speaker, and not on the secretary's institutional role.

The variation in this text – a regular alternation between feminine and masculine forms – expresses the speaker's shifting concern with the personal and the administrative spheres of her narrative. Although only one individual is referred to throughout, the narrative alternates between viewing her in her official capacity (indicated by *секретарь*) and viewing her as a concrete individual (indicated by *секретарша*).

16. CONCLUSION

In the preceding we have presented data on the choice of feminine and masculine nouns naming members of groups, and argued that the choice depends on both lexicon and context. In general terms, and other things being equal, use of the feminine noun focuses on the referent as an individual who is in a proximate relation to the speaker. In contrast, the masculine noun presents the referent as the representative of a type, as perceived (potentially) by any anonymous speaker. The general sense embedded in this overall characterization plays out in myriad subtle ways in context, with respect to reference and evaluation.

Reference is correlated with the syntactic construction: subjects are individuated, as are heads of relative clauses, and accordingly use feminine nouns relatively more frequently; in contrast, nouns used as predicatives or appositives define a token of a type, and use masculine nouns with relatively greater frequency. Reference is also relevant in fluid discourse ways. Thus for example, *писатель* and *писательница* can both be used as predicative nouns with definitional meaning, in the construction *она стала писателем/писательницей*. The choice between *писателем* and *писательницей* then depends on (or signals) a contextual difference in the sense of the individual under discussion: *писателем* downplays individual identity and indicates that it is the fact of the change (of becoming a writer) that is focal, while *писательницей* indicates that the history of the individual, as in a biographical sketch, is central.

In evaluation, in gross terms, the feminine form indicates a proximate relation of speaker to referent, which in more concrete terms can often mean a lessening of prestige or a derisive attitude to the individual or to women who hold a certain role. But evaluation can play out in various ways in context, as in the tendency (not

an absolute rule) whereby women speakers use the masculine form *учитель* in reference to their own kind, while women speakers will often use feminine forms (*врачиха, сторонница*) without negative overtones in in-group speech genres in which women participate.

Lexical items differ in how they interact with context. At one end of an approximate continuum, some nouns use the masculine form predominantly, in all contexts; the feminine derivative is used only in reference to a specific individual, in which, further, the speaker's evaluation intrudes strongly. Examples are *врач/врачиха, режиссер/режиссерша*, as well as many new derivatives (*банкир(ша), дизайнер(ша)*, etc.). At the opposite end of the spectrum are nouns assigning individuals to groups in terms of performance: *бегун/бегунья, артист/артистка*. These nouns use masculine or feminine almost strictly according to the sex of the referent. In between these two extremes is a range of classes of nouns, notably including those referring to functions or professions defined by an activity in society, which quite freely use both masculine and feminine forms in reference to a woman. It is especially for these nouns that the contextual considerations sketched above come into play.

The choice between masculine and feminine forms is not exhausted by broad sociological issues, such as attitudes towards women in professions or the prestige (status) or the stylistic overtones of lexical items, although these considerations are certainly relevant. While some instances of the interaction of lexicon and context do intersect with issues of the prestige of women in professions – for example, a male speaker could use the feminine *сторонница* to denigrate Microsoft's female executive in Moscow (as in (37)) – other instances do not. *Инвалид/инвалидка* favors the use of the masculine much like a vocation noun, but there is no question here of prestige or relative numbers of men and women occupying this status; the masculine is used to define the gender-neutral societal status, the feminine to refer to an individual. The use of *оптимист/оптимистка* has little to do with prestige. The way in which nouns such as *учитель/учительница, руководитель/руководительница*, and *писатель/писательница* are used sometimes relates to status (typically *учительница начальных классов* as opposed to other types of *учитель*), but in many instances the choice of noun has more to do with the way in which the teacher or writer is understood in discourse: if the woman and her life history are central to the discourse, the feminine is used; if not – if what is central is the change of status, or the nature of the role, or the ancillary status of the referent – then the masculine is used. These discourse concerns become prominent when, for a given noun and context, both forms are possible. These contextual concerns do not all follow from the status of women in professions.

The considerations examined here are consistent, up to a point, with a structuralist conception of markedness, in which the marked form – in this instance,

the feminine – indicates a positive value, the unmarked form – here the masculine – indicates an absence of commitment to the positive value. And with nouns of group membership, the unmarked masculine can indeed be used for other than masculine referents. However, the actual value of masculine and feminine forms depends (as we have argued here) on context and lexicon in quite intricate ways that are not expressed by the general maxim. The “unmarked” masculine does not mean just an absence of positive information about gender (“*der Mangel der ‘A-Signalisierung’*” (Jakobson 1971, 3)) but has the positive value of indicating the importance of definitional reference evaluated from a distal perspective.

These are the most overarching generalizations, which we understand as generalizations of consistency – whatever observations about specific contexts or specific lexical items that emerge will be consistent with these broad generalizations – but we do not think of them as exhausting the process of feminization. There are two respects in which usage can be more idiosyncratic and less algorithmic than these generalizations might suggest.

Firstly, the parameters we have identified do not all come into play with every collocation to the same extent. Our case studies were intended to show that which parameter is dominant differs from lexical item to lexical item and from collocation to collocation and even from speech token to speech token. Thus for nouns such as *учитель/учительница*, *руководитель/руководительница*, *писатель/писательница* the dominant issue in variation was the degree of individuation of the individual in the narrative. For some nouns, what is most significant is whether the discourse is a public or a women’s in-group genre of text (*сторонник/сторонница*, *учитель/учительница*). That parameter is closely related but not identical to the speaker’s attitude to the specific individual under discussion (especially important for *врач/врачиха*); the masculine form signals a neutral or detached attitude, the feminine a proximate attitude, often but not always derogatory. In the discussion of *секретарь/секретарша*, some quite specific considerations emerged, as specific as the kind of entity the *секретарь/секретарша* transports. These considerations do not conflict with the general parameters, but the relative importance of factors does change from noun to noun and from context to context and even from sentence token to token.

Secondly, no one parameter can truly be isolated from the others. Rather, movement along one parameter is often linked to movement along others, cooperating in a multi-dimensional and dynamic fashion to pull the speaker in the direction of one form or the other. For both these reasons, there are no necessary and sufficient conditions for a speaker’s choice, but rather a constellation of concerns in a multi-dimensional network, which are shaped by (or impute shape to) the discourse, each prompting more than determining an appropriate form.

NOTES

* This study emerged from a seminar in the Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures at the University of California at Berkeley in Fall 2003 in which the co-authors (along with Dmitry Gudkov) participated.

¹ Rothstein's study is also the source of the anecdote of an anonymous American visitor to the Soviet Union who brought a female chef to tears by paying her the backhanded compliment that she was "*отличная повариха*" (p. 562), a remark which the addressee evidently took to mean that she was less than a *повар*.

² In citing examples from the web, we maintain the punctuation and orthography (and the occasional grammatical error) of the original. We have not provided URLs for the rather numerous data represented by the numbers in the tables or for the specific examples cited here. When sites are maintained (or have been "cached"), the source of examples can be reconstructed by searching for a fragment of the cited text. The web (as is well-known) is quite unstable, and we cannot guarantee that the examples we cite, which were collected in December 2003, are still posted on the web, while new tokens continue to be posted. As an example, we note that 29 tokens of *лечащая врач* (with the feminine adjective) were attested in December 2003, whereas 56 distinct tokens were found in August 2005.

³ We should also mention another parallel development in gender: the type of agreement used with verbs with masculine subject nouns used in reference to a woman, whether traditional "syntactic agreement" (*врач пришла*) or innovative "semantic agreement" (*врач пришла*) (see Китайгородская 1976). We found it impossible to search efficiently for just those tokens of *врач* (or other masculine nouns) that refer to women, and for this admittedly practical reason we did not attempt to investigate this interesting development in gender.

⁴ In contrast to Wierzbicka (1992), which organizes the discussion around feminizing suffixes.

⁵ The last three are mentioned in Krysin (Крысин 1974).

⁶ The distinction goes back to a study by Keith Donnellan (1966), who distinguished two senses of definite descriptions such as *Smith's murderer*: "attributive" (our definitional: 'whosoever murdered Smith') and "referential" (our individuated: 'a certain individual').

⁷ Mozdierz (1999) uses the equivalent term "archetypal".

⁸ Rothstein (1973, 461), in briefly discussing usage in the nineteenth century, notes that a masculine noun could sometimes be used in reference to a woman, "especially in the predicate". That is, the possibility of using a masculine noun for women developed earlier in the predicative context.

⁹ The sex of the speaker can often be determined from the website. The author of (7) is Nikandr Aleksandrovich Petrovskii (http://slovari.gramota.ru/portal_sl.html?petr_intro.htm). Sentence (8) (<http://niac.natm.ru/pressa.nsf/0/f7598e0c147e9f8fc3256d4100238de0?OpenDocument>) was signed by a woman. The author of (9) (<http://gazet.net.ru/article26712.html>) must be a woman, given "я стала".

Ultimately, speakers of both sexes can use either form, *учитель* or *учительница*. Accordingly, the issue here is more complex than simply how the sex of the speaker affects choice of the noun. It is a matter of what point of view or VOICE the speaker chooses to adopt. With male speakers, the choice is between a proximate, patronizing voice (*учительница*) or – less usually – a detached, impersonal voice (*учитель*). Female speakers choose between an impersonal voice (*учитель*) and in-group voice (*учительница*). On the possibility of shifting point of view and voice, see Uspensky (1973, 11).

¹⁰ Descriptive adjectives now frequently appear in the feminine: *опытная врач*. Use of a feminine adjective is generally thought to be limited to the nominative – compare nominative subject *Преподавала нам медицину опытная врач* or nominative predicative *Врач была Алиса Троицкая, очень опытная врач* with accusative *мне посоветовали опытного врача, которая* – though one example of *опытную врача* was attested in December 2003 (*Что связывает опытную врача-акушера с фармацевтической фирмой, занимающейся производством "эликсира молодости"?*). As a rule, an adjective describing the nature of the

medical responsibilities normally invokes the canonical sense of the noun and uses the masculine form of the adjective (*участковый врач; лечащий врач; главный врач; главврач*), even while the verb or a relative pronoun is feminine (*Если бы не лечащий врач, которая пришла однажды к нам на дом, обнаружила его сидящим на постели ...*). Even so, 29 tokens of *лечащая врач* were attested in December 2003.

¹¹ The story from which (66)–(74) derive was posted at www.dolganov.org/history/univ2.asp.

LITERATURE

- Comrie, B., Stone, G., Polinsky, M.: 1996, *The Russian Language in the Twentieth Century*, Oxford.
- Donnellan, K.: 1966, 'Reference and definite descriptions', *The Philosophical Review* **75**, 281–304.
- Jakobson, R. O.: 1971, 'Zur Struktur des russischen Verbums', *Selected Writings*. Vol. 2. *Word and Language*, The Hague–Paris, 3–15.
- Китайгородская, М. В.: 1976, 'Вариативность в выражении рода существительного при обозначении женщин по профессии', Л. П. Крысин, Д. Н. Шмелев (изд.), *Социально-лингвистические исследования*, Москва, 144–155.
- Крысин, Л. П. (изд.): 1974, *Русский язык по данным массового обследования. Опыт социально-лингвистического изучения*, Москва.
- Mozdzierz, B.: 1999, 'The rule of feminization in Russian', M. H. Mills (ed.), *Slavic Gender Linguistics*, Amsterdam–Philadelphia, 165–181.
- Rothstein, R.: 1973, 'Sex, gender, and the October Revolution', S. R. Anderson, P. Kiparsky (eds.), *A Festschrift for Morris Halle*, New York, 460–466.
- Uspensky, B.: 1973, *A Poetics of Composition*, translated by V. Zavarin and S. Wittig, Berkeley–Los Angeles–London.
- Wierzbicka, A.: 1992, *Semantics, Culture, and Cognition: Universal Human Concepts in Culture-specific Configurations*, New York.

University of California, Berkeley
(J. Platt, Columbia University)
 a_timberlake@berkeley.edu