Language and Feminism

A Graduation research submitted to the council of the Department of English Language, College of Education for Human Sciences, University of Diyala in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the degree of Bachelor of Education in English Language

By

Mariam Ahmed Kadhim & Ru'a Mit'eb Mansour

Supervised by

Asst. Prof. Shawqi K. Ismail   (M.A.)

1440 A. H.   **2019 A.D.**

بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم

(وقل رب زدني علماً)

صدق الله العظيم

سورة طه (الايه114)

To… Our guide and spark of hope and light in our life the prophet and messenger "the peace and prayers of GOD be upon him.

To… The pearls our life , our parents.

To… The sweetest figures , our brothers and sisters.

Acknowledgements

Contents

Introduction

As people become aware that society treats women unfairly, they also perceive related shortcomings in the way that Modern English references women. For example, many have objected to the so-called generic he, the third-person masculine pronoun employed to refer to a person of unknown gender, and provided several alternatives, few of which have been widely adopted. Nonetheless, change is evident in the case of they becoming an increasingly common solution to refer to a person of unidentified gender. There is no doubt that feminism has been and continues to be one of the main social movements of this century. Its impact is felt in many societies around the world and in many spheres of life .

This study will discuss many things :- first , thing is the false gender neutral and how it we can distinction between male and female . second, invisible of women's and how the try to make her invisible in all sides of life not only in language . third , Sex-Marking try to discuss that ones can not use pronouns to refer to a particular individual with out knowing their sex,does not consider trans issues . . forth , Maleness of language That has made the men dominant in women in everything including language so That led her to inability to express herself easily . fifth , man as a norm try to make a man as a base and make him as model in language and all sides of life . finally ,all that reason led the linguistics to find solutions to all problems which try to make women invisible and also make her far away from all sides of life not only language , so in language side the use the pronoun she for women instead of he to all human beings and many reforms we will see it in that research.

False Gender Neutrality

Gender neutral language is generic term covering the use of non-sexist language , inclusive language or gender-fair language. The purpose of gender neutral language is to avoid word choices which maybe interpreted as based ,discriminatory or demeaning by implying that one . sex or social gender is the norm using gender-fair and inclusive language .also helps reduce gender stereotyping , promotes social change and contributes to achieving gender equality.

The traditional grammatical conversation in most grammatical gender language is that for groups combining both sexes. The masculine gender is used as the inclusive or generic form, whereas the feminine is exclusive . this generic or neutralizing use of masculine has often been perceived as discriminating against women . most grammatical gender languages have developed their own strategies to avoid such generic use , so the solution that reduce the readability of text such us combined forms (`she, him, her). In addition the use in many languages of the word 'man' in a wide range of idiomatic.

The writer and speaker who wish to be understood and taken seriously need to be aware of gender-neutral which means both gender (male-female). There are some words that refer to generic and consider as a false neutrality like mankind , spokesman and chairman as result the writers always try to avoid such a kind of words .The mostly widely used false neutrality are 'he',him and his that pronoun for masculine and if it used generically omitted female. . (Franklin & Marshall, 2018 :1)

Ways to Avoid the Generic Use of "He / His / Him"

In an effort to be inclusive, many speakers and writers use he or she and his or her. Certainly this alternative eliminates the false generic "he / him

/ his," but it leads to choppy, repetitive writing. As the following examples suggest, there are other more gracefully ways to be gender neutral in avoiding the false generic "he / his / him".

1. Eliminate the pronoun from your sentence or replace it with "a," "an," or "the".

Example (1): The student should complete the work assigned to him, but he should not make his test papers into paper airplanes .

Can Become: The student should complete the assigned work, but should not make the test papers into paper airplanes.

2. Make the pronoun and the noun to which it refers plural rather than singular.

Example (2): I will contact each student and tell him when to come for a conference.

Can Become: I will contact all the students and tell them when to come for conferences.

3. Substitute "you / your / yours" when you are addressing your reader directly.

Example (3): If a student misses two successive appointments, he will lose his standing appointment.

Can Become: If you miss two successive appointments, you will lose your standing appointment .

4. Substitute "I / my / mine / me" or "we / our / ours / us" when that is more accurate or appropriate.

Example (4): The student agrees to pay for any damage he does to the residence hall.

Can become: I agree to pay for any damage I do to the residence hall. OR We agree to pay for any damage we do to the residence hall.

5. Change an "if" clause to a "who" clause.

Example (5): If a student comes late to class, he interrupts the lecture or discussion.

Can Become: The student who comes late to class interrupts the lecture or discussion.

6. Change "when" clauses to "on / upon" clauses.

Example (6): When a student learns of the death of a close relative, he should immediately notify the Student Life Office.

Can become: Upon learning of the death of a close relative, a student should immediately notify the Student Life Office .

If all else fails, use either "she or he" or "he or she.anicee moulton (1981:221-254) and Adele mercier (1995:100-115) provide examples in which there is no doubt that a gender-neutral meaning is intended but this meaning seems unavailable.

 As result ,the sentences seem ill-formula:

(7) Man has two sexes: some men are female.

(8) Man Brest feeds his young.

We are, then, making a classificatory error if we claim that 'man' and 'he' are gender-neutral terms. In order to avoid such a classificatory error, we need to do more careful work on what the meanings of these terms

actually are. Perhaps the meaning of 'he' that has been called 'gender-neutral' is not really gender-neutral, but something much more complex. Mercier suggests, for example, that we terms should understand the 'gender-neutral' use of 'man' as referring to either (a) a person or persons of unknown sex; or (b) males or a combination of males and females. This explains why 'men' in (7) and 'man' in (8) are anomalous: these terms are being used to refer exclusively to persons known to be female .

Invisibility of Women

Negative effects of sexism manifest daily in different ways across the globe. Sexism and gender discrimination are forms of structural violence built into societal systems to keep male dominance alive and women "in their place.(Saul,2004: 22) " Feminist concerns, however, go beyond mere classificatory ones according to Guimei He (2010:332-335). Feminists have also argued about two terms :

Generic Nouns In English

there are a group of nouns of common gender, which refer to either male or female such as student, person, teacher, etc. When such nouns are used with generic reference in single form, the traditional grammar advocates to use the masculine pronouns in the context for the purpose of coherence with generic nouns .Generic pronouns are pronouns that are said to refer, with equal likelihood, to woman and men. But the English language ignores women by allowing masculine terms to be used specifically to refer to males and commonly to refer to human beings in general. The generic pronoun "he" is perhaps the most well known example of the gender-specific of sexism language, and is frequently referred to be "he/man" language. For example, in the sentence:

(9) An instructor should offer his students challenging projects ,

"his" refers to the subject: an instructor. To examine instructor in a sense of gender, it is either a male or a female See the examples,

(10) If one wants to see the ruins, he must find his own guide.

(11) everyone must do his work well.

In (10) sentence, one refers to the concept of people, which is a concept of common gender, but in (11) the usage of masculine pronoun, he and his in the context formally manifests the imagery of men but semantically represents people of either gender. The operation of the grammatical rule conventionally elevates the status of the masculine pronouns and lowers the feminine ones.

The Generic Pronoun

Another well-known example of generic masculine term is "man". Man and woman as two equal components of human race are actually not equal in English lexicon. Man, besides its reference to male human being can also refer to the whole race. The usage in a general sense of man makes woman invisible. For example;

(12) All men must die .

(13) Man is a social animal .

It is easy to see that "man", and "men" can be used generically to refer to both male and female. But "woman" and "women" cannot be employed in reference to men. When man appears in discourse, it is commendatory and positive in main circumstances. Look at the following examples :

(14) Wine, women, and song: drinking, dancing, etc , and enjoying oneself

(15) Make an honest woman of somebody: marry somebody having had sexual relationship with her .

In the English language, some words referring to female firstly are commendatory words, but afterward slowly have derogatory senses. Survey in the dictionary on the illustrative idioms of man and woman as a quantity observation, derogation of woman is clearly seen .

There are totally 33 illustrative idioms for man, of which 15 are with positive meaning, five negative and the rest are neutral with five shared by both man and woman in structure and meaning; While in case of woman, there are only 8 illustrative idioms of which five shared with man in structure and meaning, the rest are all derogatory. From this, one can know that in English using "man" or "men" indicates "the human race", they treat man as the center of the society, an embodiment of criterion and totally ignore the existence of woman.

sex marking

This subject is the influence of linguistic manifestations of sex-based distinctions on economic outcomes. Grammatical gender is commonly understood as a system of agreement of classes of nouns with other elements in the sentence . However, not all differences in grammatical gender track underlying differences in biological sex. Many nouns designate things which lack a biological sex yet may have masculine or feminine grammatical gender. For example, 'la lune' (the moon) in French carries feminine grammatical gender. On the other hand, not all nouns which refer to individuals with feminine biological sex receive the corresponding grammatical gender: German 'das Mädchen' (the girl) has a grammatical neutral gender, but biological feminine gender. Indeed, for less than half of the 112 languages in the World Atlas of Language

Structures, is the assignment of nouns into genders on a semantic basis (Corbett, 2008: 160). In order to investigate whether there are inequalities based on biological sex ,we have to rely on linguistic distinctions that grammatical the differences in biological sex. That is why we focus on languages' personal pronoun systems, where gender assignment is semantically organized (e.g. Audring 2008:93-116). Here, grammatical distinctions encode differences in the biological sex of the pronoun's referent. For example, the English pronoun 'he' can only correctly be used to refer to male individuals, while 'she' only applies to female individuals, and likewise in other languages.

Siewierska (2008: 43) presents a categorization of languages based on gender distinction in personal pronouns into six groups:

1. distinction in third-person and also the first- and/or the second-person pronouns.

 2. distinction in third-person only, in both singular and non-singular.

 3. distinction in third-person singular only.

 4. distinction in first or second person but not third'.

5. distinction in third-person nonsingular only.

6. no gender distinction. we use this standard categorization as a basis for defining the extent of gender-intensity of languages, taking two further English , like most _but not all languages ,require a great deal of what Marilyn calls 'sex marking ' (Frye, 1983: 35) For example, ones cannot use pronouns to refer to a particular individual without knowing their sex. (Frye, in common with most feminists of the early 1980 ,does not consider trans issues . She also does not consider the possibility that pronouns like 'he' and 'she' might be a matter of gender ,not sex.) Fry

notes the absurdity of this ,So for some time now ,there has been a moment to address the English language need for a gender neutral singular pronoun . This need originates in the growing realization that using "he" to refer to person whose gender you do not know is exceedingly troubling in case studies and examples ,then , all professionals become presumptively men . In addition , people who do not fit into classic gender norms may not want to be shoved in to them by "he" and "she" as English only singular pronouns and as Marilyn Frye noted in the politics of reality ,English use of only gender singular pronouns requires used to constantly engage in sex-marking (the determination of other sex before we can know how to refer to them ,relate to them ,shake hands ,touch them ,interpret body language ,adopt body language etc.) It also requires each of use constantly announce our sex by using the techniques that fit into established gender norm . Work on the social construction of identities has become central to say of thinking about language gender and sexuality in sociolinguistics and linguistic anthropology . we focused on gender not as the source of linguistic behavior but as the product of our language performances .Identity may be constructed through a variety of linguistic mean for instance the use of certain lexical forms or language varieties may contribute to the identification of speaker ,just as particular communicative practices ,such as silence ,greeting formulas ,or gaze do ,Identity is neither an attribute nor a possession ,it is process of senior is (Nendoza_Denton2002). Heller (2007) points out that the concept of identity ,along with community and language , are 'heuristic' devices rich capture some elements of how we organize ourselves but which have to be understood as social construct (Heller 2007,13) . Furthermore, speaker's identification involves social categories of many different type not just social categories for gender and sexuality such as 'male' and

'gay' but also situational roles such as "patient" or "customer" and interactions stances of similarity and difference what ,there for , are the consequences for gender identity in particular? Gender identity is not separate from other types of identity in two ways .First it is what has been called intersections ;an individual does not construct an identity just as a woman ,but as a women plus other intersecting categories, Latina, middle class ,bilingual ,straight ,mother ,urban; and so on . Second ,if identity is something that must be performed ,gender identity might not always be in the forefront of a performance .Everything a man does is not primarily a performance of masculinity..

Maleness of language

In the last three decades of the twentieth century, linguists began to study how language is used by speakers to do social things like expressing power, solidarity, and identity. Within that research, one of the most fruitful and contentious areas has been the investigation of how people use language to express gender, how a person's gender affects the choices they make in how they speak, and how their talk is received. Almost every area of language has been shown to be connected with gender, from the smallest segments of sound to broadly characterized discourse strategies. Language and gender is often presented as having certain 'schools' or theories (see, for example, Crawford 1995 and Cameron 1998:437–55): difference and dominance. As often happens, this characterization of the field oversimplifies positions that are much more complex, but I would like to indicate how each of the perspectives characterized men. The dominance view supposedly saw the root of (almost) all gender differences in language as being related to male dominance and female subordination, while the difference perspective viewed these differences as arising from the different 'cultures' that girls

and boys inhabit when they are young. For 'difference' researchers, among whom Deborah Tannen is usually taken to be the main proponent (especially in Tannen 1990), men and women's misunderstandings are a kind of cross-cultural communication problem, and men simply have different goals than women. With respect to men ,either side can be taken to indefensible extremes: 'men are evil villains whose only goal is to dominate women,' or 'men do not ever try to dominate women and the misunderstandings they have are simply that, misunderstandings.' Of course, most researchers do not present such simplistic findings (they occasionally do – usually when describing the views of the other school), but this dichotomy characterized the field for two decades (Kiesling 2007 : 653-654). Some feminists (e.g., Penelope 1990; Spender 1985) argue that English is, in some quite general sense, male. (Corresponding arguments are also put forward about other languages.) One thing that is meant by this is that English can be said to be male in a manner similar to that in which particular terms can be said to be male—by encoding a male worldview, by helping to subordinate women or to render them invisible, or by taking males as the norm. One sort of argument for this begins from the examination of large quantities of specific terms, and the identification of patterns of male bias, and proceeds from this to the conclusion that the male bias of English is so widespread that it is a mistake to locate the problem in a collection of words, rather than in the language as a whole. The first stage of this sort of argument is, obviously, a lengthy and complex one. The sorts of claims (in addition to those we have already seen) cited include (a) that there are more words for males than for females in English, and that more of these words are positive (Spender 1985: 15, citing Julia Stanley 1977:44,76); (b) that a "word for women assume[s] negative connotations even where it designated the same state or condition as it did for men" (Spender 1985: 17), as with

'spinster' and 'bachelor'; (c) that words for women are far more frequently sexualized than words for men, and that this holds true even for neutral words, when they are applied to women. Dale Spender, citing Lakoff (1975:653–673), discusses the example of 'professional', comparing 'he's a professional' and 'she's a professional', and noting that the latter is far more likely than the former to be taken to mean that the person in question is a prostitute. The sexualisation of words for women is considered especially significant by the many feminists who take sexual objectification to be a crucial element, if not the root, of inequalities between women and men. This widespread encoding of male bias in language is, according to theorists like Spender, just what we should expect. Males (though not, as she notes, all of them) have had far more power in society, and this, she claims has included the power to enforce, through language, their view of the world. Moreover, she argues, this has served to enhance their power.There is sexism in language, it does enhance the position of males, and males have had control over the production of cultural forms. (Spender 1985: 144)

This, Spender claims, provides circumstantial evidence that "males have encoded sexism into language to consolidate their claims of male supremacy" (Spender 1985: 144). Spender takes the evidence for this claim to be far more than circumstantial, however, and to support it she discusses the efforts of prescriptive grammarians. These include, for example, the claim that males should be listed before females because "the male gender was the worthier gender" (Spender 1985: 147, emphasis hers), and the efforts (noted earlier) to establish 'he' as the gender-neutral third-person English pronoun. According to theorists like Spender, men's ability to control language gives them great power indeed. We have already seen ways in which what one might call the maleness of language

contributes to the invisibility of women (with respect to words like 'he' and 'man'). If one takes the maleness of language to go beyond a few specific terms, one will take language's power to make women invisible to be even stronger. We have also seen ways that what might be called maleness can make it more difficult for women to express themselves. Where we lack words for important female experiences, like sexual harassment, women will find it more difficult to describe key elements of their existence. Similarly, where the words we have—like 'foreplay'—systematically distort women's experiences, women will have a difficult time accurately conveying the realities of their lives.

Men as norm

If one's only worry concerned the obscuring of women's presence, Many of the studies show starting point that workplace norms are masculine norms, owing to the historically greater participation of men in these professions, the current numerical' predominance of men at higher levels, and/or the cultural interpretation: of given types of work that dictate who is thought to be best suited~ for that work. (See McElhinny, 1993, for a discussion of the cultural ,interpretations of types of work that result in one or the other gender. ~being regarded as being best suited for a given type.) Man as norm : focus is motivated, in part, by discussions of the links between language, gender, and power. For example, Lakoff explains that the norms of men's discourse styles are institutionalized, that they are seen:' not only as 'the better way to talk but as the only way' (1990: 210). Gal argues that men's discourse styles are institutionalized as ways of-speaking with authority, that institutions are 'organized to define,: demonstrate, and enforce the legitimacy and authority of linguistic strategies used by one gender - or men of one class or ethnic group -while

denying the power of others . Given these findings, it is not surprising that many studies have focused on women in professions in which women have not traditionally been significantly represented. In particular, numerous studies have addressed the question of whether women and men enact authority in these professions in ways similar to their male counterparts. The majority of studies conclude that women adopt some of the practices associated with the profession that have been established by men while adapting others. For example, McElhinny found that the women police officers she observed project a 'police officer' identity by adopting discourse management techniques that portray 'facelessness in face-to-face interaction' (1995: 236). But they also adapt interactional norms of policing by projecting a more middle-class image of a police officer who is rational, efficient, and professional, rather than the working-class image of the police officer that is centered on displays of physical force and emotional aggression . West (1984; 1990), Pizzini (1991), Ainsworth-Vaughn (1992), and Fisher (1993) consider how women and men physicians interact with patients. West (1984) finds that, although doctors generally interrupt patients more frequently than the reverse, when women doctors see} men patients, it is the doctors who are interrupted more often . west (West 1990;85-112) analyzed directive-response sequences in medical encounters. ,She found that men doctors tended to give aggravated directives that explicitly establish status differences, whereas women doctors tended to, Digitate their commands, using directive forms that minimize status ;distinctions between themselves and their patients. , West concludes that Women are constituting the role of physician in a way that exercises less interactional power than men physicians typically exercise. Researchers have also focused on how women and men enact authority in managerial positions. Tannen (1994: 9-5,90), investigate how superiors give orders to

subordinates. Patterning much as physicians were shown to speak with their patients, the men superiors in these studies tended to speak in ways that maintain or maximize status differences, whereas the women superiors tended to speak in ways that minimize status difference In her analysis of women and men in corporations, Tannen notes that the women she observed in positions of authority tended to give directives to subordinates in ways that saved face for the subordinate, whereas many men in similar positions tended not to give directives in this way. However, Tannen cautions against assuming that talking in an indirect way necessarily reveals powerlessness, lack of self-confidence, or anything else about the internal state of the speaker. Indirectness, she notes, is a fundamental element in human communication and one that varies significantly from one culture to another. Although women in her study were more likely to be indirect when telling others what to do, she suggests that their motivation may be to save face for their interlocutors, especially subordinate interlocutors. Men were also often indirect, but in different situations and in different ways. For example, many men tended to be indirect when revealing weaknesses, problems, or errors, and when expressing emotions other than anger . Tannen explains that those who would not use indirectness in a particular way often misjudge those who use it in that way. Those who expend effort to save face for a subordinate -including indirect approaches - can be seen as being manipulative or somehow less than honest(Ruth Wodak: 86-87-88) . it would be difficult to object to certain other terms to which feminists do commonly object: gender-specific occupational terms like 'manageress' (still common in the UK, though not in the US) or 'lady doctor'. These terms certainly do not contribute to the invisibility of women. Instead, they call attention to the presence of women. Moreover, they call attention to women's presence in positions of authority—doctor and manager. Nonetheless, most feminists

who think about language find these terms objectionable. The clearest reason for objecting to 'manageress' and 'lady doctor' is that the use of these terms seems premised on the idea that maleness is the norm, and that women filling these jobs are somehow deviant versions of doctors and managers. This is also a key objection to the use of 'he' and 'man'. Moulton (1981: 100-115) understands these terms on the model of brand names, like 'Hoover' or 'Scotch tape' that become generic terms for a product type. The message of such terms, she suggests, is that the brand in question is the best, or at least the norm. According to Moulton, terms like 'he' and 'man' work in the same manner: they are gender-specific terms for men whose use has been extended to cover both men and women. This, Moulton argues, carries the message that maleness is the norm. As a result, the use of these terms as if they were gender neutral constitutes a sort of symbolic insult to women. Laurence Horn and Steven R. Kleinedler (2000) have disputed the details of this, noting that 'man' did not begin its life as gender-specific and then get extended to cover both women and men. Rather, 'man' actually began its life as 'mann', a gender-neutral term, which only later acquired a gender-specific meaning. The temporal sequence, then, cannot support the claim that a gender-specific term has been extended to cover both genders. Nonetheless, Horn and Kleinedler agree that the use of terms like 'he' and 'man' as if they were gender-neutral perpetuates the objectionable idea that men are the norm for humanity .In summary, studies that focus on how women and men enact authority in professional positions suggest that women tend to expend linguistic effort to minimize status differences between themselves and their subordinates or patients (or, as Tannen puts it, save face for them), whereas men tend to use strategies that reinforce status differences. Thus, the women and men in these studies tend to create and maintain different alignments between themselves and their subordinates

or patients. The women exercise their authority by using language strategies that create a symmetrical alignment (that is, they dolangua L their authority). The men use language strategies that create and Tmaintain an asymmetrical alignment, the alignment that is traditionally associated (Ruth Wodak : 91)

Feminist reforms on language

Feminist Foundations and Approaches to Language Reform Modern feminism has its roots long before the twentieth century. Before Modern English even could have been anticipated, women's rights throughout the world, and particularly Europe, were deemed insufficient by several authors over the centuries even prior to the Renaissance. While a primary concern of many feminists today is often the recognition of the equality among genders and the provision of equal rights to women and men, it is not their sole concern. Feminism now can more broadly encompass the struggle against any form of oppression. Since its early beginnings, the word feminism has been a misleadingly simple label for the complex set of theories and goals that falls under that umbrella. All labels (including linguistics and rhetoric) imply a similarity of practices that may not exist in reality, but feminism is particularly complex. It does not deal only with women. It does not deal only with women's rights. It is not a single discipline (as rhetoric and linguistics are). Feminists can and do come to many disciplines. Indeed, many of the authors I call ―feminists‖ here are professional linguists or extend their research to that field. In an attempt to deal with this diversity, some have classified feminism into waves. Through further classification, feminism in general is often divided into the first, second, and third waves, which in turn are often further subdivided by time periods, activity, and goals**. The first** wave began in the mid-1800s, somewhere between 1830 to 1848, and ended with the

women's suffrage movement in 1920 (Heywood 134), though a foundational work to the first wave is Mary Wollstonecraft's 1792 piece, A Vindication of the Rights of Woman. **Feminism's second wave** began in the mid-1960s, ending ―with the defeat of the Equal Rights Amendment (ERA) and the advent of the Reagan/Bush era.‖ Finally, while Leslie Heywood argues that ―**third-wave** feminism has never had a monolithically identifiable, single-issue agenda that distinguishes it from other movements for social justice‖ (xx), she begins a chronology of the third wave in the early 1990s; these events include the advent of the Clinton administration as well as Rebecca Walker's 1992 declaration: ―I am not a postfeminist feminist. I am the third wave‖ (139). Further, the other ―movements‖ that Heywood mentions encompass issues of gender, race, class, and religion. Third-wave feminism, then, is still ongoing. While the idea of categorizing feminism may seem distinctly antithetical, doing so allows focus when investigating the perspective offered by its many methodologies. Although each of the waves addresses language reform to some extent, language reform dominates second-wave publications during the later decades of the twentieth century.. Occasionally, reform attempts which focus on one single method may be deemed insufficient; this is particularly the case with the American linguist and science-fiction author Suzette Elgin, who constructed the Láadan language originally for her Native Tongue trilogy of books. According to Elgin, it was ―several seemingly unrelated activities‖ that led her to consider that:

1.Existing human languages are inadequate to express the perceptions of women.

2.If women had a language adequate to express their perceptions, it might reflect a quite different reality than that perceived by men.

3. What was being called the "natural" way to create words seemed to me to be instead the male way to create words.

This combination of various ideas, in addition to her academic background in linguistics, instilled in Elgin the desire for a completely new and constructed language, Láadan .

Importantly, Elgin states that it would have been inadequate to —just insert a handful of hypothetical words and phrases‖ to advocate her method of reform; instead, she —needed at least the basic grammar and a modest vocabulary‖ of at least one thousand words in order to have a sufficient amount —for ordinary conversation and informal writing.‖ To Elgin, then, the more simple method of English vocabulary reform is too slight to cause a rhetorically significant shift of perspective for women. The only way for women to achieve Elgin‘s feminist goal of—express [ing] their perceptions‖ would be to employ this new, woman-centered language, a Influential in the pursuit of knowledge about language reform is the construct known as the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis, variously (and more usefully here) encompassing two principles termed linguistic relativity and linguistic determinism, both of which provide contexts for relating cultures, the languages they use, and the relationship between the two to influence those cultures‘ perceptions of reality.Linguistic relativity, also known as the weak form of the Sapir-Whorf construct, is the belief that culture directly influences language; language under such a purview, then, becomes secondary to a culture. Language is interpreted as an effect of the society that uses it. Lakoff ,Fasold, and Livia support such an interpretation of the relationship between language and culture. On the other hand, linguistic determinism, or the strong form of the Sapir-Whorf construct, calls for the opposite: any culture‘s language influences its worldview. In their

adamant support of and belief in vocabulary reform, Spender, Penelope, and Muscio necessarily operate under the assumption that linguistic determinism is the social norm; that is, by changing the words a culture uses, the culture will thus undergo change. concept originally tested in Elgin's science-fiction trilogy which has since evolved into a language on its own, with grammar lessons and dictionaries offered via different media, in various books and Internet sites.

Conclusion

Feminist philosophy of language is characterized by attention to the social context of language use. This generally takes many forms .

First, feminist philosophers have critiqued language itself, arguing that that various human languages masquerade as gender neutral while in fact encoding a world view on which maleness is the norm and women are either invisible or represented as the other .

Second, they have critiqued analytic philosophy of language as itself displaying a male bias, and in particular as being driven by an overly individualistic picture of language use. This is not to say that feminist philosophers of language are not interested in meaning, reference, and truth. Rather, many would argue that these central topics in mainstream analytic philosophy of language cannot be properly investigated without attention to the social context in which language operates.

Third ,The women's or feminist movement strives, amongst other things, for the elimination of gender discrimination.

 Fourth , the greater recognition of women's contributions to society as well as aims to change many cultural and socialpractices which perpetuate patriarchal value systems .

References

Ainsworth-Vaugh 1992 "Topic transitions in physician _patient interviews ;power gender ,and discourse Change ,language in society ;21:409-26

Audring, J. 2008. Gender assignment and gender agreement: Evidence from pronominal gender languages. Morphology, 18(2), 93-116.

Bosmajian, H. Lee Gershuny, and Julia P. Stanley (eds.), Sexism and Language, Urbana, IL: NCTE, pp. 44–76

Cameron, Deborah. 1998. Is there any ketchup, Vera? Gender, power and pragmatics. Discourse & Society 9.4.437–55.

Cameron, Deborah. 1998. Is there any ketchup, Vera? Gender, power and pragmatics. Discourse & Society 9.4.437– 55

Corbett, G. G., 2008b. Systems of gender assignment. In: Haspelmath, M., et al. eds. The World Atlas of Language Structures Online. Munich: Max Planck Digital Library: Chapter 32. http://wals.info/feature/32.

Crawford, Mary. 1995. Talking difference: on gender and language. London: Sage (6-14)

Crawford, Mary. 1995. Talking difference: on gender and language. London: Sage

Fisher, Sue (1993) 'Gender, power, resistance: is care the remedy?', in Sue Fisher and Kathy Davis (eds), Negotiating at the Margi1l3: the Gendered Discourse of Power and Resistance. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Frye, Marilyn(1983). **The Politics of Reality: Essays in Feminist Theory, Freedom, Trumansburg**. NY: The Crossing Press.

Guimei he , "An Analysis of Sexism in English" **Journal of Language Teaching and Research**, Vol. 1, No. 3, pp. 332-335, May 2010 https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&source=web&rct=j&url=https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/331b/55c94388bdc338fefc3e167f513566655d79.pdf&ved=2ahUKEwjyoZL8hrHfAhVFBiwKHRqFBukQFjABegQIAxAB&usg=AOvVaw1wHYG4mph60hTT9I1pC-0t

Heller M. (2007) Bilingualism as Ideology and Practice. In: Heller M. (eds) Bilingualism: A Social Approach: 13. Palgrave Advances in Linguistics. Palgrave Macmillan, London

Heywood, Leslie L., ed. **The Women's Movement Today: An Encyclopedia of Third-Wave Feminism**. Westport. CT: Greenwood Press. 2006.Print.

Horn, Laurence R. and Steven R. Kleinedler, 2000, "Parasitic Reference vs. R-Based Narrowing: Lexical Pragmatics Meets He-Man", paper presented to the Linguistic Society of America, Chicago, 6 January, available online.

Horn, Laurence R. and Steven R. Kleinedler, 2000,"Parasitic Reference vs. R-Based Narrowing:Lexical Pragmatics Meets He-Man", paper presented to the Linguistic Society of America,Chicago, 6 January

http://ling.yale.edu/sites/default/files/files/horn/HornKleinedler2000_he-man.pdf

https://www.google.com/amp/s/www.researchgate.net/publication/47714275_FEMINIST_LINGUISTIC_AND_RHETORICAL_PERSPECTIVES_ON_LANGUAGE_REFORM/amp

Lakoff, Robin T. 1990 "why can't a woman be less like aman?" in Talking power :the politics of Language,. San Francisco :Basic Books.210

Lakoff, Robin, 1975, Language and Women's Place, New York: Harper & Row.

Kiesling, Scott (2007) "Men ;Masculinties and langauge ", **Language and Linguistics Compass** 1/6 (2007): 653–673, 10.1111/j.1749-818x.2007.00035

Mc Elhinny, Bonnie (1993) "We all wear the blue: language, gender and police work". Ph.D. Dissertation, Stanford University .

McElhinny, Bonnie (1995) 'Challenging hegemonic masculinities: female and male police officers handling domestic violence', in Kira Hall and Mary Bucholtz (eds), **Gender Articulated: Language and the Socially Constructed Sel**f. New York and London: Rutledge.

Mercier, Adèle, 1995, "A Perverse Case of the Contingent A Priori: On the Logic of Emasculating Language (A Reply to Dawkins and Dummett)", Philosophical Topics, 23(2): 221–259.

Moulton, Janice, 1981, "The Myth of the Neutral 'Man'", in Vetterling-Braggi100-115 – 115.https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&source=web&rct=j&url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.fandm.edu%2Fuploads%2Ffiles%2F248220594580087447-gender neutral.pdf&ved=2ahUKEwjE56y8xKnfAhW3UxUIHWXICQsQFjADegQICRAB&usg=AOvVaw2Vb9hk3dePHcfQXDvF2K31

Penelope, Julia, 1990, Speaking Freely: Unlearning the Lies of the Fathers' Tongues, New York,NY: Pergamon.

Pizzini,Franca1991 'communication hierarchies in humour: gender differences in the obstetrical/gynecological setting Discourse and society ,2 (4):477:88

Siewierska, A., 2008. Gender distinctions in independent personal pronouns. *In:* Haspelmath, M.*, et al.* eds. *The World Atlas of Language Structures Online.* Munich: Max Planck Digital Library: Chapter 44. http://wals.info/chapter/44

Spender, Dale, 1980 [1985], Man Made Language, second edition, New York: Routledge.

Spender, Dale, 1980 [1985], Man Made Language, second edition, New York: Routledge.(p 15-17,144-147)

Stanley, Julia P., 1977, "Gender-Marking in American English", in Alleen Pace Nilsen, Haig

Tannen, Deborah (1994) Talking from 9 to 5: Women and Men in the Workplace: Language, Sex Power. New York: Avon

Tannen, Deborah. 1990. You just don't understand: women and men in conversation. NewYork, NY: William Morrow & Company.

West, Candace (1984) Routine Complicati0118: Troubles with Talk between Doctors and Patients. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press .

West, Candace (1990) 'Not just "doctor's orders":directive-response sequences in patients' visits to women and men physicians', Discourse and Society,1(1): 85-112

William DornerFeminist, Linguistic, And Rhetorical Perspectives On Language Reform 2010 University of Central Florid p. 9 ,25 ,11

Wodak , Ruth 1997 "Gander and discourse " p.91 '86-88,SAGE
Publications London • Thousand Oaks • New Delhi