

Gender-identity in the Linguistics Literature: a Review

By Karen Parker

Centre for Research on Language Diversity

Introduction

This paper was written with the ‘identity’ theme of the first issue of Mercury in mind. The intended audience for the paper includes linguistics students with an interest in transgender issues, especially queer students who may be looking to contribute to research in the field of queer linguistics. ‘Gender identity’ encompasses a complex and evolving set of concepts, practices and lifestyles, within which a very broad spectrum of individuals move. The importance of language theory to gaining an understanding of gender identity has increased in emphasis over time in the literature, especially over the last two decades. This review covers some of the key linguistics literature relating to queer sexuality and gender identity, with special reference to transgender issues.

The review is by no means exhaustive, and relies heavily on specific observations of some key writers in the field, particularly Hall (1997, 2003, 2005, 2013), Cameron (1990; 1992) and Kulick (1998, 1999, 2000). Special critical attention is given to one particular paper, Kulick (1999), which constitutes the only review of linguistics literature to specifically focus on transgender issues.

While the literature reviewed here is almost wholly from linguistics and linguistic anthropology, it should be mentioned that a wealth of material on transgenderism, queer politics and queer culture is available from other fields, much of it enlightening to the study of queer linguistics. For a useful collection of diverse approaches to issues relating to transgender culture generally, the *Transgender Reader I* (Stryker & Whittle 2006) and *Transgender Reader II* (Stryker & Aizura 2013) are indispensable, as is the concise *Transgender History* (Stryker 2008). The *Transgender Readers I* and *II* in particular constitute an excellent resource for gender-variance studies from a variety of non-linguistic disciplines, including key historical, activist, medical and psychological viewpoints. Regarding general approaches to the ethnography of transgender communities in an urban Western setting, various works by Valentine (2002, 2003, 2007) provide thoughtful approaches.

Note: In the body of the paper, variance in speech between female and male speakers is referred to as *sex-variance* while variance in speech involving gender-crossing practices (for example, transgenderism) is called *gender-variance*. Transgender women and transgender men are referred to as *transwomen* and *transmen* respectively, while transgender people collectively are referred to as *transfolk*.

Sex and Gender

The study of language and gender-variance is intertwined with that of sex-variance, and in the linguistics literature, attention of academics to gender-crossing activities emerged from the notion of a ‘women’s language’ and a ‘men’s language’. As will be shown, this dichotomous concept has proven to be highly problematic. These concepts of dual languages drawn on gender lines were first presented as having a basis in structural linguistics by anthropologists in the 19th century. The review begins with Chamberlain’s account of ‘men’s and ‘women’s languages.

Chamberlain (1912) lists a few sources, the earliest among them a dictionary of *Carib* by French missionary Raymond Breton, which along with a History of the Carib people by lexicographer Cesar de Rochefort was compiled in the 17th century. As will be shown, this text becomes one of key relevance in terms of how linguistics goes on to construe sex-variance and gender-variance.

As Chamberlain reports, the account given by Rochefort gives the reason for sex-variance among the Carib language as being the result of warfare and the kidnapping of women.

In Davies’ translation of Rochefort, the situation is described thus¹:

‘In the first place, the men have many expressions proper only to themselves, which the women understand well enough, but never pronounce: And the women have also their words and phrases, which if the men should use they would be laugh’d at; whence it comes, that in this Discourse one would think the women spoke a Language different from that of the men, old’

(Rochefort 1666: 261)

Rochefort’s account goes on to argue that the apparent language difference between men and women was a result of warfare, however Chamberlain is skeptical of this explanation, and instead promotes an

explanation by Sapper (1897) that the difference was really the result of ‘social-economic factor of differentiation of occupation and labor’ Chamberlain offers his own spin on the reasons for sex-variance, no doubt reflecting the standard academic chauvinism of the day:

‘Religious and animistic concepts in woman's sphere of thought may also have had some influence here; likewise the play-instinct, which often makes itself felt longer in woman’

(Chamberlain 1912: 579).

Chamberlain goes on to discuss the work of German ethnologist Fritz Kraus, who, Chamberlain reports, identified an intervocalic /k/ insertion in the women’s speech as being the main phonetic difference. Chamberlain goes on to elaborate on a reported experience of Krause:

‘Dr Krause... cites the jest of the Caraya Indian Pedro, who said one day that Dr Krause's companion, Francisco Adam, "was a woman", because he pronounced the Brazilian word *jacuba* (a kind of drink), not *digbd*, as a man would have done, but *sikibd* after the fashion of the women’

(Chamberlain 1912: 580)

In her review of ‘exceptional speakers’, Hall (2003) discusses the way anthropological reporting on gender-crossing language, such as characterized by Chamberlain, is constructed to give ideological support to a dichotomous model of sex-variance which has remained pervasive in the linguistics literature. It is a model which promotes a dichotomy in those texts between western ‘civilization’ and *exotified* non-Western cultures; simultaneously, a dichotomy is presented between linguistic concepts of ‘maleness’ and ‘femaleness’. Thus a ‘double dichotomy’ is formed, a pattern of cultural exoticism, coupled with male/female difference.

Of Chamberlain’s reference to the *Carava* /k/ insertion, Hall says:

‘The anecdote works to affirm the ‘separateness’ of the two varieties, since a male speaker who crosses the linguistic divide will not just be seen as womanly or effeminate, he will actually *be* a woman’ (Hall 2003: 356)

A decade after Chamberlain’s paper, Jespersen (1922) [reprinted in Cameron 1990], again depending largely on the writings of Rochfort, makes a case for ‘women’s language’ as a separate, conservative form of speech. As will be seen, this anticipated later sociolinguistic approaches, such as Trudgill (1972, 1983) and Chambers & Trudgill (1980), which categorized the speech of females and males as distinct sociolectal varieties.

Jespersen's chapter *The Woman* has no corresponding chapter titled *The Man*, as noted by Cameron (1990: 43). Thus, Jespersen construes the linguistic behaviour of women as being of a separate order from an unnamed norm (i.e., male). In effect, as Hall says, Jespersen portrays women as the 'linguistic other' (Hall 2003: 358). Like Chamberlain before him, Jespersen too implies that the Indo-European linguistic heritage is fundamentally different from that of non-Western cultures, asserting of the former that 'there are few traces of real sex dialects in our Aryan languages' (Jespersen 1990: 206). Again, the binary concepts of 'woman/man' and 'primitive/modern' are intertwined. Jespersen mentions various morphosyntactic and phonetic variances between females and males in non-Western cultures, featuring those reported by Breton in the 17th century. As Hall comments, Jespersen takes pains to argue that English is devoid of such variant forms, and relates the supposed cultural difference as 'evolutionary':

'The divergent uses of vocabulary and syntax that Jespersen subsequently identifies are then theorized not as sociological, but as cognitive, psychological, and personal'

(Hall 2003: 359).

A work of the same era as Jespersen is Sapir's (1929) study of male and female forms among the *Yana*, a native American Indian community. Sapir identifies several classes of sex-variance, featuring a large class of polysyllabic words which show voicing variations and variances from diverse parts of the grammar: demonstratives, case forms, interrogatives, imperatives and possessives all show phonological variance according to whether the speaker is identified as male or female. The 'male' forms tend to augment words, so Sapir concludes with the suggestion that 'possibly the reduced female forms constitute a conventionalized symbolism of the less considered or ceremonious status of women in the community... which contrasts in many ways with the parallel system of forms used by males in addressing males' (Sapir, 1929 [in Mandelbaum, 1963: 212]).

Sapir theorizes historical derivation as being a factor in creating the variance; however, he only makes a case for a one-way derivation, in which the female speech forms are assumed to be derived from the forms in the speech of the males. As Hall notes, with some exasperation:

'There is no way for women to win in these early texts: when their language forms are discussed as fundamental or older, they are theorized as conservative and archaic before their more innovative and youthful male counterparts; when their language forms are discussed as derived or newer, they are theorized as psychologically deviant or otherwise abnormal'

(Hall 2003: 360).

Haas (1944), like Sapir's work from fifteen years previous, gives examples of sex-variant structures in morphosyntax and phonology. Haas' work is ostensibly an account of sex-variance in *Koasati*, a Muskogean language. In its second half, the work is a mini-typology of sex-variant language forms. Haas begins with an account of variance between female and male speakers as dependent on three types of phonological contrasts in verb endings: nasalized vowels, vowel duration, and what Haas calls 'pitch-stress' (Haas 1944: 144). She goes on to give a brief account of sex-variance in other Muskogean languages, finding that the variance seems to be concentrated in the Eastern Muskogean language group. In the third and final part of her paper, Haas discusses sex-variance in several languages, including Thai and 'Chukchee' (Chukchi), a language of Eastern Siberia. She also refers to Sapir's study of the Yana, as well as several other native American Indian languages.

Haas makes an extremely interesting observation in her paper which sets it apart from the others of the era: she identifies the fact that the occurrence of sex-variant forms is dependent on the identity of the hearer as much as the speaker. She draws a paradigm, identifying three types of sex-variance, based on combinations of this pragmatic condition. This insight brings the phenomena of sex-variant forms squarely into the domain of the context of the speech situation, anticipating sociolinguistic and pragmatic interpretations which would follow in coming decades.

Soon after Haas, Flannery (1946) describes sex-variance among speakers in a native American Indian *Gros Ventre* community. As Hall notes, Flannery construes the dichotomy somewhat differently to her predecessors, avoiding talking about women's and men's speech as separate 'languages', or even 'varieties', instead referring to the variation only as 'differences'. Flannery supplies a great deal of information regarding gestural and other non-verbal communication. As far as gender-crossing talk, Flannery also supplies an interesting, if sad account of the social ostracization of a Gros Ventre person:

'A much older woman said that if a member of either sex "talked like the other" he or she was considered bisexual. This she illustrated by telling of the mortification suffered by the parents of a boy who persisted in acting like a girl in every way. The boy's mother was so sensitive that she never went about and she just bowed her head in shame when her son was heard talking like a woman' (Flannery, 1946: 135)

What is evident is that the social consequences in Gros Ventre culture for those who gender-cross are similar to that in Western cultures. Thus, when those who were assigned ‘male’ at birth give up their social male privilege, they become outcasts. As Hall points out, devastating linguistic consequences of this intolerance are also evident in these anecdotal portions of Flannery’s text, for the implication is that non-heterosexual young people will be ostracized by the older members of their communities if they use gender-crossing forms of speech. In other words, as Hall puts it, the ‘mortification and shame causes language loss’, as young, queer speakers will be likely to be forced to use English.

To Furfey, writing in the mid-nineteen forties, linguistic sex-variance is evidence of men and woman as ‘different categories of human beings’ (Furfey 1944: 222). In a style of pompous grandeur which harkens back to Jespersen, he asserts that sex-variance in language is ‘barely discernible in the familiar languages of Europe, but not at all uncommon among primitive peoples’ (Furfey 1944: 218).

In general, the early anthropologists ignored gender differences within European languages, the reason given by Coates as being that:

‘They defined the problem in terms of gender exclusive differences. That is, they commented on differences between women’s and men’s usage where certain linguistic forms were reserved exclusively for the use of one gender or the other... the variation found in European languages however, involves gender-preferential differences, that is, while women’s and men’s language differs, there are no forms associated specifically with one gender; rather there is a tendency for women or men to prefer a certain form.’

Coates (2004: 80).

Hall draws attention to the fact that Furfey, in a footnote, quotes Herzfield (nee Flannery) in stating that ‘a man using a woman’s language would be considered effeminate’, yet as Hall notes, his relegation of this apparent overlapping of sex-variance and gender-variance to footnote status, serves only to marginalize the non-typical speaker, a tendency which, as Hall notes, is characterized by many early anthropological texts (Hall 2003: 356). In such portrayals, non-typical speakers are allocated to the realm of what she calls ‘footnote deviance’. Meanwhile in the main body of the text, Furfey repeatedly makes his ‘argument’ that the sex-variance reported is a reflection of ‘sex dominance’ and ‘masculine domination’ in so-called ‘primitive’ culture. Thus, like many of those before him, Furfey mixes up sex-variance with notions of ‘primitive vs modern’ culture. By smugly concluding that differences between men and women’s speech are

reflections of a dominant social group (i.e. men) in non-English speaking societies, the implicit suggestion is that the natural progress of linguistic evolution is towards European language structures. Thus, through Hall's 'footnote deviance', in the context of exoticism and cultural imperialism, gender-variance makes a subtle entrance into the linguistics literature, on the periphery of the more 'mainstream' research area of sex-variance.

Gender Dialects

Following the anthropological tradition, the next major wave of influence in the linguistics literature regarding gender studies, and which to a large degree remains dominant in the discipline, is that of sociolinguistics and dialectology. It is characterized by works such as Labov (1972a, 1972b), Lakoff (1973, 1977, 1990), Trudgill (1972, 1974, 1983), and Chambers & Trudgill (1980). These works represent a break from the previous wave, in that gender-variant linguistic forms are now seen as being a consequence of social construction. Methodologically, the difference is that quantitative techniques are given a central role in linguistic analysis.

Studies by both Trudgill in Norwich, England, (1971, 1972) and by Shuy, Wolfram & Riley (1967) in Detroit in the United States, form the rudimentary basis of influential statistical sociolinguistic approaches which were to come in future gender-language research. The Norwich and Detroit studies had themselves both followed closely in the socio-phonetic methodology established by Labov in his studies of diphthong centralization on the island of Martha's Vineyard, and of the distribution of /r/ in New York City (Labov 1972b). In the latter two studies (both well known to linguistics undergraduates) Labov demonstrates that phonetic variance correlates with dimensions of social stratification, particularly the stratum of class.

Also of continued significance is the study of speakers in Norwich, East Anglia, by Peter Trudgill (1971, 1972) wherein the estimated frequency of 'prestige forms', that is, high-status forms of pronunciation, were found to be of much higher frequency in women than in men. Trudgill's study has become a central part of many textbooks on sociolinguistics (Trudgill 1974; Labov 1972; Coulmas 1997) in explaining sex-variance in language. Trudgill's Norwich study, like that of Shuy et al in Detroit, correlates the distribution of linguistic forms with class, but takes the extra step of focussing on gender as a key variable, specifically

of women being more prone to the use of prestige forms. While Shuy et al's study demonstrated a pattern of vowel raising and fronting in women's speech (Shuy et al 1967), Trudgill's Norwich study showed there was also a trend among working class Norwich women of *overestimating* the frequency of their usage of forms associated with British received pronunciation (RP) such as palatalizing certain word-initial consonants (e.g., 'music', 'tune' [m^husik, t^hu:n]), and of realizing velar nasal endings in verbs with *-ing* endings. Women, far more than men surveyed in Trudgill's study, were inaccurate in their self-estimations regarding usage of these forms, which were interpreted as signs of desired prestige or status.

In Labov's study, a similar finding reports that women use fewer 'stigmatized forms' (i.e. non-prestigious forms) than men (Labov 1972: 243). Labov speculates that the 'behaviour' of women must somehow be involved, and in passing, draws on the role of motherhood as a potential explanatory factor, reasoning that since women as mothers are largely responsible for teaching their children the language, they are therefore 'more sensitive' to language structures, and thus more likely to speak the standard. Labov discounts biological explanations of sex-variance such as 'natural dimorphism', recognizing that social factors are in general terms intertwined with physical realities, concluding only that:

'The sexual differentiation of speakers is therefore not a product of physical features alone, or of different amounts of referential information supplied by speakers, but rather an expressive posture which is socially more appropriate for one sex or the other'

(Labov 1972: 304).

This position would be later supported by phonological theory, and become crucial to a challenging of the *gender-binarist* essentialism which had been the currency of the earlier anthropological investigations into sex-variance.

However, the overall quantitative methodology itself, as employed by the dialectologists is disputed by Eckert & McConnell-Ginet (2003). They argue that if such assumptions such as those made in Trudgill (1974) are supported by statistical analyses alone, then they give a skewed account of the complexity of social dimensions which contribute to a person's linguistic behaviour, in relation to gender.

Eckert & McConnell-Ginet promote Ochs' concept (1991) of 'gender indexing' as a more valid method of analysis, and argue that Ochs' theory sees the role of sociological factors and their interplay with language in a far more complex way than can be demonstrated by statistical analyses. According to Ochs:

'Knowledge of how language relates to gender is not a catalogue of correlations between particular linguistic forms and sex of speakers, referents, addressees and the like. Rather, such knowledge entails tacit understanding of (1) how particular linguistic forms can be used to perform particular pragmatic work (such as conveying stance and social action) and (2) norms, preferences, and expectations regarding the distribution of this and work vis-a-vis particular social identities of speakers, referents and addressees. To discuss the relation of language to gender in these terms is far more revealing than simply identifying features as directly marking men's or women's speech'

(Ochs, 1991: 342).

Och's concept is probably as relevant for research into gender-variance in language as it is for analyses of sex-variance in language. While the major studies of the sociolinguistic wave did not focus on transgenderism *per se*, the relation between gender and language as interpreted through relations between men's and women's speech continued to be analysed. Roughly concurrent with the quantitative approaches to sociolinguistics, another approach to the study of gender and language also grew out of sociolinguistics, characterized by the work of Lakoff (1973, 1977, 1990) and Tannen (1986, 1990, 1993, 1994, 1998, 1999). Lakoff marks a major advance in understanding sex-variance from a linguistics point of view, the main improvement on earlier works being that Lakoff is informed by feminist theory. Thus, in *Language and Woman's Place* (1973) Lakoff identifies the reason for sex-variance in language as being on account of the fact that a patriarchal society affords power to men, and that, in general, women are marginalized- socially, professionally and sexually.

However, Kulick (1998), Cameron (1992), Hall (2003) and Holmes (1998) have been critical of Lakoff's casual assignation of 'maleness' or 'femaleness' to this or that linguistic form as if specific usages reflected natural or innate behaviour. While Lakoff does go some way to implying that a power differential in society exists along gender lines, she does not go so far as to argue that sex-variance in speech is determined by complex social roles of speakers. Rather, men and women are characterized as 'natural' speech communities inhabiting a common island, a concept which by design alone ultimately reinforces a

binary notion of gender. For example, Lakoff speaks of ‘male’ and ‘female’ speech as if their interaction equates to linguistic contact phenomena, akin to ariel linguistics:

‘Gender differences in language arise not because male and female speakers are isolated from each other, but precisely because they live in close contiguity, which constantly causes comparisons and reinforces the need for polarization – linguistic and otherwise’

(Lakoff 1990: 202).

This ‘gender island’ conception is vaguely reminiscent of the dialectology approach of Trudgill discussed earlier which posited ‘male and female speech varieties’, yet Lakoff’s writing is without the benefit of statistical evidence.

Lakoff has also been accused of stereotyping women’s speech. According to Lakoff (1973), women use certain structures like tag questions (*you know?*; *isn’t it?*, etc.) and hedges (‘softeners’ and euphemistic phrasings) more than men, and she asserts that these structures are associated with ‘uncertainty’, reflecting a desire on the speaker’s part to express support for their addressee’s stance. However, Holmes (1998) contests these assertions, her review of studies into tag questions and hedges finding that considerable evidence exists where such forms can be alternatively interpreted as the result of quite different communicative functions. Similarly, Lakoff associated the incidence of high-rising terminal intonation on the tags of declaratives as a pattern correlating to ‘uncertainty’ among women speakers, yet as Holmes points out, these patterns can be used to convey friendliness and to add a sense of informality to the interaction (Holmes 1998: 467).

Hall (2003) acknowledges the shortcomings of Lakoff’s work, but gives due credit to the historical role Lakoff played in bringing feminist theory into linguistic discussions about gender. For example, Hall points out that Lakoff’s identification of categories of people who in different ways ‘opt out’ of the prescribed patriarchal language usages: ‘*hippies, historians and homos*’ – is constitutive of an astute observation of an unlikely ‘alliance’, a leftfield observation by Lakoff, which may have not been identified by previous writers. Hall comments that ‘all of these identities share a marginality determined by their exclusion from institutionalized male power’ (Hall 2003: 362).

Deborah Tannen, a student of Robin Lakoff's, is known for a series of best-selling books on conversation, specifically as relating to interactions between women and men. Tannen's style is highly personal and, like Lakoff's work, her writing abounds with anecdotal examples. Tannen utilizes her own version of semantic 'framing' to talk about how gender is constructed semantically by classificatory means. She distinguishes between two binary categories: on the one hand, the 'classes of men and of women', referring to social categories; and on the other hand, 'men' and 'women', corresponding to biological categories. Evident from these semantic pairs is Tannen's separating out of 'gender' and 'sex' in a hierarchical way. Sex-variance, entailing biological 'men and women' is seen by Tannen as 'natural', and as preceding gender-variance, the latter which entails 'the classes of men and women'. Gender is seen as merely a sociological variable, rather than an underlying imbalance of power:

'My claim is that dominance relations and cultural influences of all types (gender-related as well as other influences, such as geographic region, ethnicity, class, age, sexual orientation, and profession) are at play at every moment of interaction: they too dovetail and intertwine' (Tannen, 1999:222).

Tannen's book *You Just don't Understand* is criticized by Cameron & Kulick (2003) for its hetero-centric viewpoint. Jacobs (1996), in his review of literature of lesbian and gay speech, is also highly critical of Tannen, specifically for her exclusionist approach to queerness. Essentially, Tannen summarizes the differences in how woman and men interact communicatively as 'misunderstandings'. Indeed, on investigation, it is apparent that the 'misunderstandings' with which Tannen is concerned are only between those involved in heterosexual relationships. Same-sex, transgender and non-binary gender relationships are concepts which are completely outside of the conversational structures discussed by Tannen. Evidently, speech is an exclusively heterosexual behaviour. However it should be noted that the erasure of non-heterosexual speakers is not restricted to Tannen. Indeed, as has been demonstrated by the works reviewed here since Chamberlain (1912), there has been a general absence in the literature of queer speakers. Gaudio (1994) notes the pre-1990's dearth of research on gay and lesbian speech in the literature:

'If one were to take sociolinguistic literature as actually representing social groupings in the United States, one would think that gays, lesbians, and bisexuals scarcely existed' (Gaudio 1994: 30).

Following Gaudio, Kulick (2000), in his review of gay and Lesbian speech studies, makes a similar observation that few references can be found among the ‘hardcore’ linguistics literature regarding lesbian, gay or transgender language. He points out that, for example, among the work of esteemed linguistic anthropologists such as Foley and Duranti there is no mention of such studies, yet Kulick does note that he manages to locate almost 200 titles by means of his own search. The unhappy conclusion to be drawn from this, according to Kulick, is that the gay and lesbian literature which has been done has had no real impact on the discipline (Kulick 2000: 246).

Transfolk and Voice

The only published review of literature wholly about gender-variance and language is by Kulick (1999), who is best known for his fieldwork among the *Gapun* people of the Sepik River region of Papua New Guinea (1997), and, more pertinently for this review, for his study of the culture of the *Travesti* transgender community of Brazil (1998). There are various problematic issues raised by Kulick (1999), and because it is the only extant review of the transgender literature in linguistics (apart from the current review) some space is now given over to address these vexing issues.

Kulick (1999) provides a critical view of what he calls ‘the literature’, although unfortunately he dwells for an inordinate period on what he characterizes as an ‘obsession’ among transwomen with voice. Kulick’s assertion is that transwomens’ attention to voice ‘reflects and invokes widespread cultural attitudes that hold that being a man is self-evident, whereas being a woman is a complex set of procedures that require careful adherence to detailed, explicit instructions (often issued by men) about how to walk, talk, sit, eat, dress, move, and display affect’ (Kulick 1999: 609).

Unfortunately Kulick’s paper is not a review of the linguistics literature, but a sampling of ideas from several disparate voices from a range of disciplines. Only a handful of actual linguistic studies are cited by him, and he relies heavily on observations of cultural studies writers, as well as hitching his paper theoretically to some big names from post-structuralist philosophy (i.e. Foucault and Derrida). The contemporary linguists which are mentioned for (the most part only in passing) are Hall & O’Donovan

(1996), Moriel (1996), Manalansan (1995) and Johnson (1997), however more time is spent discussing random statements lifted from online advertising material of speech pathologists, pop-culture handbooks about cross-dressing, and the deficiencies of some of Lakoff's views outlined earlier.

Kulick is particularly critical of the fact that many transwomen spend a great deal more time than transmen thinking, writing, reading and consulting specialists about voice. He argues this has led to a disparity of research into transmen's voices, whereas there is abundant literature on transwomen's voices. Kulick is correct in saying that more data needs to be collected on transmen and voice, although a significant step toward filling the void since Kulick (1999) has to degree been filled by Zimman (2013a) and Edelman & Zimman (2014).

As to the reason for the disparity in research, Kulick is suspicious of positing hormone use as an explanatory physiological cause. In that explanation, the fact that the effects of hormone treatment vary between transmen and transwomen in relation to voice, explains the dearth of literature on voice in transmen. Testosterone, which transmen often take, has the effect of lowering fundamental frequency (perceived as pitch), while for transwomen who take oestrogen, there is no corresponding effect such as raising f0 levels. Among transwomen, voice is a commonly felt to be an impediment to 'passing'ⁱⁱ. Therefore transwomen often undertake voice training, some taking the extra step of having plastic surgery carried out on the cricoid and thyroid cartilages (van Borsel et al 2006; Hillenbrand & Clark 2009; Hancock & Helenius 2012). For transmen, voice is often not a factor in passing, since it is one of the physiological areas addressed by their hormone treatment. As a result, there have been far more studies done on transwomen and voice, particularly relating to intonation. Kulick however, rejects the 'hormonal argument', instead arguing that social pressures to conform make transwomen feel compelled to undergo voice training as a kind of 'brainwashing' exercise. In a somewhat reactionary gesture, Kulick (1999) decides that when it comes to voice training for trans women, he is in agreement with uber-transphobe Janice Raymond, whose *Transsexual Empire* (1994) is widely considered a landmark in hate-speech toward transgender people (Stryker, 2006: 131). Raymond's characterization of transsexuals is rabid, and controversially, Kulick concurs with her regarding the idea that trans women - 'male to females' in Kulick's unfortunate terminologyⁱⁱⁱ - are no less than 'rear-guards of the patriarchy'.

Cameron & Kulick (2003) elaborate Kulick's (1999) argument to one in which transwomen in voice therapy are construed as actively colluding in the spreading of a counter-feminist 'women's language' reinforced by speech pathology. For this, Cameron & Kulick (2003) depend heavily on Kate Bornstein's anecdotal account of her negative experiences at a voice clinic (reported in Bell, 1993). Bornstein's account is engaging and she does make a valid point about the risk of the commodification of stereotypes in such therapies, however her experience is not universal.

In fact, at a clinic like the one Georgia Dacakis runs at LaTrobe University, voice patients with no prior knowledge of phonetics and intonation learn a wide range of techniques, which, as it turns out, assist them in various non-linguistic ways^{iv}. Aside from the obvious goals, such as raising f0 levels, the process of attending voice training sessions lowers anxiety, and helps practitioners become more 'comfortable in their own skins'.

According to Dacakis, who has operated the voice training clinic at LaTrobe University for two decades, voice training helps in the wider psychological struggle of transsexual women to realize their identities (Dacakis 2014). This tells us something very important about voice and about transgender voice training which is missed by Kulick (1999) and Cameron & Kulick (2003) - that voice is a dimension of identity which entails a very personal aspect of reality.

Many transwomen want voice training so they can pass as females, within the confines of a society which makes quick judgements about how 'female' or 'male' a speaker sounds; at the same time, many of those same transwomen are extremely conscious of the patriarchal standard being imposed, and many most certainly do identify as feminists.

Implicit to Kulick's argument is an acceptance that voice can be a social role identifier which has the power to stereotype women, however the same argument can conversely be applied to the position of transwomen seeking voice training: they may live under oppressed conditions, perhaps in settings where they have felt it necessary to regularly hide, disguise, 'deepen' and otherwise masculinize their voices. Such long-term oppression cannot be undone easily, so many feel it necessary to undergo voice training. The personal decision to undertake voice training does not amount to a counter-feminist socio-political stance.

Furthermore, for transwomen undergoing transition, there is a reality in which an ideolectal transition accompanies other physical changes, and this entails a psychological and emotional and experiential shift concurrent with a phonological one. When transwomen go to voice training clinics they ostensibly study voice, they focus on voice, but they also become more acquainted with their beliefs about social roles. Their progress is not uniform and is relative to these beliefs, which vary greatly. Therefore the degree to which they become more comfortable with the voice related aspects of their transition is highly individualized. This point of view is left unconsidered by Kulick (1999) and Cameron & Kulick (2003).

Kulick is undoubtedly influenced by his time with *Travesti* of Brazil, among whom, as he reports there is no apparent interest in voice alteration. As he found in his study (Kulick 1998), the Travesti don't consider themselves as transsexuals or as being in transition; rather, they view themselves as gay men. Kulick discusses in detail the way in which Travestis go through a 'partial transition' (e.g., they may take hormones and/or inject silicone) and in addition dress as women and take female names, yet, unlike many members of transgender communities of the Western world, they do not identify as women. Kulick therefore found that for the most part, 'Travestis did not conform to standard Northern Euro-American sexual typologies – Travestis were neither transvestites nor transsexuals' (Kulick 1998: 12). Kulick further theorizes that:

'The fundamental difference is that whereas the northern Euro-American gender system is based on anatomical sex, the gender system that structures Travestis' perceptions and actions is based on *sexuality*'

(Kulick, 1998: 227)

While the Travesti are a culturally specific group, the 'Euro-American' transsexuals' Kulick speaks of are a non-homogenous grouping of culturally, socially and linguistically diverse people. Western transwomen, just like Western transmen, come from a diverse set of experiences and social contexts. Despite this, Kulick speaks of 'Euro-American' transsexuals' as if this category represents an all-encompassing homogenous group across the entire Western world. Apart from the obvious fact that transsexuals do reside in continents other than the Americas and Europe, it is simply not sociologically sound to portray transfolk in this monolithic way.

While Kulick (2000) and Cameron & Kulick (2003) in their criticism of transwomen's voice training do raise vexing questions regarding transwomen wanting to 'feminize' their voices, the fact remains that many transwomen continue to want to undergo voice training, and as Dacakis has attested, many of them gain considerable psychological benefits from the process. Given that transgender people are estimated, according to a recent North American study, as having a 41% suicide attempt rate (Haas et al 2014), any psychological improvement is surely a positive outcome.

Queer Linguistics

In the 1980s and 1990s several works began to be written which acknowledged 'queer speech' communities, and a foundation was made for what would become *queer linguistics*. Jacobs reviews the work done on phonological variation among queer/straight speakers, particularly the studies done by Moonwomon (1985) on lesbian speech and Gaudio (1994) on gay male speech. Jacobs comments on the general dearth of work done on grammatical variation from a queer point of view, and in a critique of a study done by Fai (1988) calls for more to be done on how sexuality and standard speech actually intersect. On lexical and discourse analysis, Jacobs notes that quite a bit of work has been done involving queer speech communities, and while a good deal more remains to be done, this is encouraging.

The shift to the present state of affairs, where queer linguistics is a small but recognized subfield of sociolinguistic research, has largely been due to the writings of Livia & Hall (1997), Bucholz (1999), Hall (2003) and Cameron & Kulick (2003), wherein Judith Butler's concept of *performativity* (Butler 1988) was introduced into linguistic thought, and as a result has had a strong influence on queer linguistics for the decade and a half which has followed. While the origin of the term lies in the proto-pragmatic theory of Austin (1962), Butler's term combines the concept with post-structuralist feminist theory to arrive at an anti-essentialist view of not only gender, but also of sex. Gender was, according to Butler, something that was and is continually negotiated. Furthermore, gender was not only constructed, but as the concept suggests, *performed*, hence 'gender performativity'.

Further developments in the theory see the concept of sex differentiation as also a construction, especially in the work of Hall (2005) and Hall & O'Donovan (1996). Sexual identity, as a construction, was

only the biological aspect of an identity which was imposed by culture, and which, as people transitioning prove every day, can have shifting borders rather than being a 'natural' or absolute human category. The influence of Butler is clearly evident in virtually all the queer literature that followed it, including *Reinventing Identities* (eds Bucholtz, Liang & Sutton, 1999), Valentine (2007) and Cotton (2012) among many others. In documentary linguistics, awareness of the wider applications of the concept of *performativity* is virtually unknown, but is growing, as evidenced in Stebbins (2012) who uses the concept to design a fieldwork methodology which benefits the linguist and the community in terms of identity negotiation.

In descriptive linguistics, there are increasing efforts toward reducing the focus on 'queer language patterns' from Western cultures, and placing it instead on communities in non-Western cultures, hence the studies of speech and communication of the Hijra community in India, undertaken by Hall (1997, 2005), Hall & Donovan (2008) are pioneering. In addition, several other cross-cultural studies which have been done on groups within a given non-Western community who are in some way gender variant, such as Shepherd et al (1978) and Brain (1978), who described the Xanith of Omani culture in the Middle east; Stephen (2002), who described gender variance among the Zapotec of Southern Mexico; Kulick (1998) as already discussed, who documented the situation of the Brazilian Travesti; Schmidt (2010) who gave an account of the gender variant Fa'afafine in Samoan culture; and Roscoe (1998) who is well known for his study of so-called 'third and fourth gender' people in native North American culture. Further studies of North American gender-variant communities have also been carried out by Lang (1992, 1993) and Trechter (1999). Trechter (1999) in her study of native American Lakhota speakers challenges many generalist linguists (she cites O'Grady and Finnegan, among others) for their insistence on the pervasive existence of gender-exclusive morphological patterns in non-European languages of the world. Interestingly, Trechter argues that the rigid adherence to the idea of an isomorphic relationship between the sex of a speaker and its correlation with morphosyntactic forms amounts to an exoticization of non-European languages (Trechter 1999: 104).

In other works which investigate contemporary notions of gender in non-Indo-European languages, Moriel (2004), analyses gendering in Hebrew, specifically in relation to *Dana International*, an Israeli transsexual and professional diva; and Manalansan's study (1995), looks at how forms drawn from a number of language sources are used by gay male speakers from the Phillipines in the context of contemporary American culture, for purposes of self-reference and self-representation. These and other works acknowledge patterns of variance between queer vs straight-cisgender^v as being vibrant in languages aside from English and other Indo-European languages, and such works signal a move beyond the mainstream analyses of descriptive grammars, bringing the focus into communities where speakers might, if they were to be classified by English terminology, be called 'queer communities'. In some such communities, as in the case of the Hijra of India, and the Crow native Americans of North America, such speakers frequently have ascribed to them an 'official place' in their respective cultures, which more or less allows for their expression as 'gender-variant' or sexually non-heteronormative. This alone is an ethnographically interesting observation which deserves further research.

Two papers which give accounts of Burmese gay and *Nat Kadaw* culture are van Driem (1996) and Ho (2009). The work by van Driem is an interesting slice of linguistic life from various queer communities in urban Rangoon (Yangon). The origins of the *Nats* are pre-Buddhist although in the hyper-Buddhist Burmese society, they are subsumed into its pantheon. The paper concentrates on the way group names in Burmese correspond to a variety of 'queer identities'. A precise explanation of the terms' phonological realizations is supplied. The lexical terms are also given in Burmese orthography, which is additionally helpful in terms of providing a full document of the categories under discussion. There are also a series of six personal profiles of individuals, codenamed 'M1, M2, M3, etc, who represent some of the main 'queer types' of Rangoon. This part of van Driem's account is not without a kernel of humour.^{vi} Meanwhile, Ho's work is a many-faceted anthropological paper which covers a range of transgender identities within Burmese culture.

Many of the works reviewed, while not all being concerned with strictly grammatical analysis, represent a step towards attaining a typologically rich view of non-binary human culture on a global scale. Some of the studies focus on specific aspects of language use which exhibit the cultural uniqueness of any

given ‘non-typical’ speech community. For instance, Hall (1997) profiles historical and contemporary accounts of the creative and rebellious use of insults by the Hijra community, making the case that their ‘shamelessness’ is strategic, despite assumptions of horrified onlookers who simply assume they are mad (Hall 1997: 452). In a similar vein, Gaudio (1997) writes about the ‘outrageous’ linguistic behaviour of ‘*yan daudu*’ speakers (‘effeminate men’) among the Hausa speech community. Meanwhile, Schmidt’s thorough investigation of Fa’afafine culture in the Pacific pays special attention to issues of representations. She demonstrates the ways in which Fa’afafine have been exoticized, and how they have been misguidedly subsumed into the ‘trans language’ of academia and sexology researchers:

‘There is a tendency among authors in the transgender literature, especially those who work from a poststructuralist perspective, to ‘look through’ the transgendered so that they become signifiers of something else, rather than ‘looking at’ them in their own right’

(Schmidt, 2010: 54)

Coming from another angle altogether, Livia (1997) supplies a fascinating discussion of the interplay of grammatical gender with natural gender, in the particular context of autobiographies by transsexuals. In particular, Livia focuses on the life story *Applez-moi Gina* (1994) by Georgine Noel, in which the author’s creative manipulation of grammatical gender interplays with references to her own identity as a protagonist. Apart from Livia, little research has been done on situations where the concerns of gender-variant speakers overlap with the structure of gender systems. One other example is Moriel’s analyses (1998, 2004) of the ways in which Dana International, a transsexual performer, subverts the gender system of Hebrew. While gender systems are essentially agreement systems where nouns are marked in ways which link them to specific word classes (Corbett 2013), Livia explains how transsexual writer Noel exploits the tension between French grammatical gender and her protagonist’s own identity as a trans person in creative ways, as part of a work of fiction.

In studies of gender-variant and gay and lesbian speech alike, the overwhelming view which emerges in the literature is that any significant difference between ‘women’s and men’s voices’ is as much a social construction as is any other supposed locus of difference.

As Coates says:

‘Gender is not a matter of two separate and homogenous categories, one associated with being female and the other associated with being male: male and female speakers differ in many ways, but there are also many areas of overlap. The preoccupation with gender relies on an essentialist idea of gender, that is, on the idea that male and female can be reduced to unquestioned essences’ (Coates 2004: 402)

Counter-binarist evidence also comes from phonology. For example, Gussenhoven says that:

‘It is tempting to think of the anatomical differences between men and women as just a relic of an earlier evolutionary functionalism, with no relevance for present-day social interaction beyond signalling the sex of the speaker. However, people will project what they perceive as their social role in their voice, and gender roles are no exception...while men will produce lower average formant frequencies than women as a result of their longer vocal tracts, speech communities vary in the social significance they attach to the gender difference, which suggests that one or both sexes may exaggerate the effect’

(Gussenhoven 2004: 81).

Thus, anatomical facts relating to dimorphic variations such as seen in the comparison of larynx sizes, has not been found to be a significant factor in intonational perceptions of sex identity. Rather, features in certain languages become socially associated with a sex role, and concurrently, culture-specific qualities become in turn associated with shared notions of gender roles.

In spite of this evidence, it is evident from the literature on language and gender up until the dawn of the 21st century that sex-variance and gender-variance are significantly tied to the notion of ‘female and male speech’, or *gender-binarism*. Studies of the last decade or so have begun to unravel the traditional positions of sociolinguistics around ‘male’ and ‘female’ speech in relation to gender-crossing. In particular, Zimman & Hall (2009) and Zimman (2013a, 2013b) present data, from the *Hijra* community in India, and from North American culture respectively, that sex as well as gender are negotiated designations of particular cultures, that neither is necessarily binary, and that gender identities are not given universals. Instead, these authors argue, sex and gender constitute fluid categories. Several authors reviewed supply studies which throw into question the validity of concepts of gender exclusivity. Most important of all, as shown by Zimman & Hall (2009), the idea of there being only two genders or only two sexes is inconsistent with the grammar of at least some speech communities and thus the concept cannot be deemed to have universal status.

It should also be noted that fundamental biological evidence also exists which upsets traditional notions of ‘two sexes’. Intersex people are usually overlooked in discussions about sex-variance –even within the queer linguistics literature. Indeed, there has not been the opportunity to elaborate on intersex peoples’ concerns and representation in this paper. Yet, the acknowledgement of the very existence of intersex people should serve as some sort of caution for deterministic accounts of sex-binarism. There are many studies that have come out of contemporary feminist theory which also supply strong arguments for the abandonment of sex-binarism on account of intersex issues, for example, Turner (1999) and Hird (2000). Unfortunately, space constraints, and the fact that these studies are not directly linguistic-based, preclude the opportunity for a review of these and other important works here.

Conclusion

While in early anthropologic and sociolinguistic literature, sexuality and gender identity have been construed according to a binarist philosophy, and have entailed attendant assumptions about heteronormative precedence and male privilege, it has taken a complete turnaround – no less than a fusion of feminist thought with linguistic analysis - to peel back the layers which previously obscured a non-binarist, non-patriarchal view of language and culture.

A great deal of work over the last decade has investigated lexical semantic patterns and discourse pragmatic contexts of speech in urban, Western, queer communities, such as Greco (2012) and Gaudio (1994), and the various others cited. However there is no substantial study to date which typologically compares lexical, grammatical or phonological socio-typological patterning along queer lines in non-Western cultures. This is a potential direction for future research in gender-variance and linguistics. Also, as pointed out by Kulick (1999) more research needs to be done on transmen and language, regarding which Zimman has laid a solid foundation (2013a; 2013b). Finally, the analysis of natural conversation among gender-variant speakers, using established linguistic frameworks of discourse analysis and conversation analysis, remains a worthy direction for research.

Bibliography

- Austin, J.L. (1962). *How to Do Things with Words*. Oxford : Clarendon Press.
- Bell, Shannon. (1993). Kate Bornstein: a Transgender, Transsexual Postmodern Tiresias. In Kroker & Kroker (eds) *The Last Sex: Feminism and Outlaw Bodies*. (pp 104-120) New York: St Martins Press.
- Brain, Robert. (1978). Transsexualism in Oman? *Man* 13, 322-323.
- Bucholtz, Mary & Hall, Kira. 2005. Identity and Interaction: a Sociocultural Linguistic Approach. *Discourse Studies* 7, 585-614.
- Bulcholtz Mary, Liang A C & Sutton Laurel A. (1999). *Reinventing Identities: The Gendered Self in Discourse*. New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bucholtz. Mary. (1999). Bad Examples: Transgression and progress in Language and Gender Studies. In Mary Bucholz, A C Liang & Laurel A Sutton (eds) *Reinventing Identities: The Gendered Self in Discourse*. New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Butler, Judith. (1988). Performative Acts and Gender Constitution: An Essay in Phonomenology and Feminist Theory. *Educational Theatre Journal* 40, 519-531.
- Cameron, Deborah. (1992). *Feminism and Linguistic Theory*. New York: St Martins Press.
- Cameron, Deborah. (1990). *A Feminist Critique of Language: a Reader*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Cameron, Deborah & Kulick, Don. (2003). *Language and Sexuality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Chamberlain, Alexander F. (1912). Women's Languages. *American Anthropologist* 14, 579-581.
- Chambers, J.K. & Trudgill, Peter. (1980). *Dialectology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Coates, Jennifer. (2004). *Women, Men and Language: a Sociolinguistic Account of Gender Differences in Language* (4th edition). Hoboken: Taylor & Francis.
- Corbett Greville G. (2013). Number of Genders. In:, Matthew S. Dryer & Martin Haspelmath, (eds.) *The World Atlas of Language Structures Online*. Leipzig: Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology. URL: <http://wals.info/chapter/30>, Accessed on 2014-08-12.

- Cotton, Trystan T. (2012). *Transgender migrations: the Bodies, Borders and Politics of Transition* New York; London: Routledge
- Coulmas, Florian. (1997). *The Handbook of Sociolinguistics*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- de Rochefort, Cesar de & Breton, Raymond. (2014 [1666]). The history of the Caribby-islands, viz, Barbados, St Christophers, St Vincents, Martinico, Dominico, Barbouthos, Monserrat, Mevis, Antego, with a Caribbean vocabulary John Davies (trans). (J.M.: London) URL: http://0-gateway.proquest.com.alpha2.latrobe.edu.au/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:image:58704:144
- Ducakis G, Appleton B, Cicada A, Thompson B. (2014). *IDAHOBIT conference*. Queer Department, LaTrobe University.
- Eckert, Penelope. (1998). Gender and Sociolinguistic Variation. In Jennifer Coates (ed) *Language and Gender: a Reader*, pp: 64-80. Oxford, London: Blackwell.
- Eckert, Penelope & McConnell-Ginet, Sally. (2003). *Language and Gender*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Edelman, Elijah & Lal Zimman (2014). Boycunts and bonus holes: Discourses about transmasculine bodies and the sexual productivity of genitals. *Journal of Homosexuality*, special issue Trans Sexualities, Carla A. Pfeffer (ed).
- Flannery, Regina. (1946). Men's and Women's Speech in Gros Ventre. *International Journal of American Linguistics*, 12, 133-135.
- Furfey, Paul Hanley. (1944). Men's and Women's Language. *The American Catholic Sociological Review*, 5, 218-223.
- Gaudio, Rudolf P. (1994). Sounding Gay: Pitch Properties in the Speech of Gay and Straight Men. *American Speech*, 69, 30-57.
- Gaudio, Rudolf P. (1997). Not Talking Straight in Hausa. In Anna Livia, and Kira Hall. (1997). *Queerly Phrased: Language, Gender, and Sexuality*. New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Greco, Luca. (2012). Production, Circulation and Deconstruction of Gender Norms in LGBTIQ Speech Practices. *Discourse Studies* 14, 567-585.

- Gussenhoven, Carl. (2004). *The Phonology of Tone and Intonation*. Cambridge, London: Cambridge University Press.
- Haas, Ann P, Rodgers, Philip L & Herman, Jody L. (2014). *Suicide Attempts among Transgender and Gender Non-Conforming Adults: Findings of the national Transgender Discrimination Survey*. Berkeley: Williams Institute, UCLA School of Law.
- Haas, Mary R. (1944). Women's Speech in Koasati. *Language* 20, 142-149.
- Hall, Kira. (1997). 'Go Suck Your Husband's Sugarcane!': Hijras and the Use of Sexual Insult. In Anna Livia and Kira Hall (eds). *Queerly Phrased: Language, Gender, and Sexuality*. pp: 430-460. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Hall, Kira. (2003). Exceptional Speakers: Contested and Problematized Gender Identities. In Miriam Meyerhoff & Janet Holmes (eds) *Handbook of Language and Gender*. pp. 352-380. Oxford, England: Blackwell
- Hall, Kira. (2005). Intertextual Sexuality: Parodies of Class, Identity, and Desire in Liminal Delhi. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, 15, 125-144.
- Hall, Kira. (2013). It's a Hijra! *Discourse and Society*, queer linguistics special issue, 25, 634-642.
- Hall, Kira and Veronica O'Donovan. (1996). Shifting Gender Positions among Hindi-speaking Hijras. In Susan Ehrlich (ed). *Language and Gender: Major Themes in English Studies Vol. III*. New York: Routledge.
- Hancock Adrienne & Lauren Helenius. (2012). Adolescent Male-to-Female Transgender Voice and Communication Therapy. *Journal of Communication Disorders* 45, 313-324.
- Hillenbrand James M. and Clark Michael J. (2009). The role of f_0 and Formant Frequencies in Distinguishing the Voices of Men and Women. *Attention, Perception, & Psychophysics*. 71, 1150-1166.
- Hird, Myra. (2000). Gender's Nature: Intersexuality, Transsexualism and the 'sex'/'gender' Binary. *Feminist Theory*, 1, 347-364.
- Holmes, Janet. (1998). Women's Talk: the Question of Sociolinguistic Universals. In Jennifer Coates (ed). *Language and Gender*. (Oxford, London: Blackwell.

- Jacobs, G. (1996). Lesbian and Gay Male Language Use: A Critical Review of the Literature. *American Speech* 71, 49–71.
- Jespersen, Otto. (1990). *Language: it's Nature, Development and Origin*. In Deborah Cameron, (ed). *A Feminist Critique of Language: a Reader*, pp 201-220 (Routledge: London & New York) [originally published 1922, G. Allen & Unwin: London]
- Johnson, Mark. 1997. *Beauty and Power: Transgendering and Cultural Transformation in the Southern Phillipines* (Oxford: Berg)
- Kulick, Don. (1997) *Language Shift and Cultural Production* (Cambridge: New York & Melbourne)
- Kulick, Don. (1998). *Travesti: Sex, Gender and Culture among Brazilian Transgendered Prostitutes*. Chicago, London: University of Chicago Press.
- Kulick, Don. (1999). Transgender and Language: A Review of the Literature and Suggestions for the Future. *Gay and Lesbian Quarterly* 5, 605-622
- Kulick, Don. (2000). Gay and Lesbian Language. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 29, 243-285.
- Labov, William. (1972a). *Language in the Inner City: Studies in the Black English Vernacular*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Labov, William. (1972b). *Sociolinguistic Patterns*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Lakoff, Robin. (1973). Language and Woman's Place. *Language in Society* 2, 45-80.
- Lakoff, Robin. (1977). Language and Sexual Identity. *Semiotica* 19, 119-130.
- Lakoff, Robin. (1990). *Talking Power*. New York: Basic Books.
- Lang, Sabine. (1996a). Travelling Woman: Conducting a Fieldwork Project on Gender Variance and Homosexuality among North American Indians. In Ellen Lewin & William L.
- Leap (eds) *Out in the Field: Reflections of Lesbian and Gay Anthropologists*, pp: 86-107. Urbana, Chicago: University of Illinois press.
- Leap (eds) (1996b). There is More Than Just Women and Men: Gender Variance in North American Indian Culture. In Sabina Ramet (ed) *Gender Reversals and Gender Cultures: Anthropological and Historical Perspectives*, pp: 183-96. New York: Routledge.

- Leap (eds) (1998). *Men as Women, Women as Men*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Lasch Richard (1907). In Toldt et al (eds) *Mitteilungren def Anthropologischen Gesellschaft in Wien*. v 37. (Horn F. Burger: Germany). URL:
<https://archive.org/stream/mitteilungender06wiengoog#page/n7/mode/2up>
- Leap, William L. (1995). *Beyond the Lavender Lexicon: Authenticity, Imagination and Appropriation in Lesbian and Gay Languages*. Luxembourg: Gordon and Breach.
- Leap William L. & Boellstorff Tom (eds). (2004). *Speaking in Queer Tongues : Globalization and Gay Language*. Urbana & Chicago: University of Illinois Press.
- Leap, William L. & Provencher, Denis M. (2011). Language Matters: an Introduction. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 58, 5-7, 709-718.
- Lewin, Ellen & Leap, William L. (1996). *Out in the Field: Reflections of Lesbian and Gay Anthropologists*. Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press.
- Lewin, Ellen & Leap, William L. (2002). *Out in Theory: The Emergence of Lesbian and Gay Anthropology*. Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press.
- Livia, Anna. (1997). Disloyal to Masculinity: Linguistic gender and Liminal Identity in French. In Livia, Anna and Kira Hall. (eds). *Queerly Phrased: Language, Gender, and Sexuality*, pp 349-368. New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Livia, Anna and Kira Hall. (1997). *Queerly Phrased: Language, Gender, and Sexuality*. New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Manalansan IV, Martin F. (1995). 'Performing' the Filipino Gay Experiences in America: Linguistic Strategies in a Transnational Context. In William L Leap (ed). *Beyond the Lavender Lexicon: Authenticity, Imagination, and Appropriation on Lesbian and Gay Languages*, pp 249-266. Luxembourg: Gordon & Breach.
- McConnell-Ginet, Sally. (1978). Intonation in a Man's World. *Signs* 3, 541-559.

- Moonwomon, Birch. (1985). Towards the Study of Lesbian Speech. In S. Bramner et al. (eds) *Proceedings of the first Berkeley Conference on Women and Language*, pp: 96-107. Berkeley: Women and Language Group.
- Moriel, Liora. (2004). Dancing on the Needle's Edge: Gay Lingo in an Israeli Disco. In William L. Leap & Tom Boellstorff. (eds). *Speaking in Queer Tongues: Globalization and Gay Languages*, pp 105-133. Urbana & Chicago: University of Illinois Press.
- Moriel, Liora. (1998). Diva in the Promised Land: a Blueprint for Newspeak? *World Englishes* 17, pp 225-237.
- Noel, Docteur Georgine. (1994). *Applez-moi Gina*. Paris: Lattes.
- Ochs, Elinor. (1991). Indexing Gender. In Duranti & Goodwin (eds) *Rethinking Context: Language as an Interactive Phenomenon*. New York :Cambridge University Press.
- Raymond, Janice G. (1994). *The Transsexual Empire: the Making of the She-Male*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Roscoe, Will. (1996). Writing Queer Cultures. In Lewin & Leap (eds). *Out in the Field: Reflections of Lesbian and Gay Anthropologists*. Urbana & Chicago: University of Illinois Press.
- Roscoe, Will. (1998). *Changing Ones: Third and Fourth Genders in Native North America*. New York: St Martins Press.
- Sapir, Edward. (1963 [1929]). Male and Female Forms of Speech in Yana. In David G. Mandelbaum (ed). *Selected Writings of Edward Sapir in Language Culture and Personality*, pp: 206-212. Berkeley & Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Sapper, Karl. ([1897 *International Archive for Ethnography* 1 p. 571.] cited in Chamberlain 1912).
- Sauntson, Helen & Kyratzis, Sakis. (2007). *Language, Sexualities and Desires: Cross-Cultural Perspectives*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Schmidt, Johanna. (2010). *Migrating Genders: Westernization, Migration and Samoan Fa'afafine*. Surrey, England; Burlington, U.S.A. : Ashgate.
- Shepherd Gill, Feuerstein G, al-Marzooq S & Wikan Unni. (1978). The Omani Xanith. *Man* 13, 663-671.

- Shuy R, Wolfram W and Riley W.K. (1967). *A Study of Social Dialects in Detroit - Final Report*.
Washington D.C.: Office of Education.
- Stebbins, Tonya. (2012). On Being a Linguist and Doing Linguistics: Negotiating Ideology through Performativity. *Language Documentation and Conservation* 6, 292-317.
- Stephen, Lynn. (2002). Sexualities and Gender in Zapotec Oaxaca. *Latin American Perspectives*, 29, 41-59.
- Stryker, Susan. (2008). *Transgender History*. Berkeley, CA: Seal Press.
- Stryker, Susan & Aizura, Aren. (2013). *The Transgender Studies Reader II*. New York: Routledge.
- Stryker, Susan & Whittle, Steven. (2006). *The Transgender Studies Reader*. New York: Routledge.
- Tannen, Deborah. (1986). *That's Not What I Meant!: How Conversational Style Makes or Breaks Relationships*. New York: Ballantine.
- Tannen, Deborah. (1990). *You Just Don't Understand: Women and Men in Conversation*. New York: Ballantine.
- Tannen, Deborah. (1994). *Talking from 9 to 5*. New York: Morrow.
- Tannen, Deborah. (1998). Talk in the Intimate Relationship: His and Hers. Jennifer Coates (ed) *Language and Gender: A Reader*. Oxford, England; Malden, U.S.A.: Blackwell.
- Tannen, Deborah. (1999). The Display of Gendered Identities in Talk at Work. In Mary Bucholtz, A C Liang & Laurel A Sutton (eds) *Reinventing Identities: The Gendered Self in Discourse*. New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Trechter, Sara. (1999). Contextualizing the Exotic Few: Gender Dichotomies in Lakota. In Bulcholtz Mary, Liang A C & Sutton Laurel A. (1999). *Reinventing Identities: The Gendered Self in Discourse*. New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Trudgill, Peter. (1971). *The Social Differentiation of English in Norwich*. [PhD thesis] University of Edinburgh.
- Trudgill, Peter. (1974). *Sociolinguistics: an Introduction* (1st ed). Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Trudgill, Peter. (1983a). *Sociolinguistics: An Introduction to language and Society* (2nd ed). London: Penguin.
- Trudgill, Peter. (1983b). *On Dialect: Social and Geographical Perspectives*. Oxford: Blackwell.

- Trudgill, Peter. (1995) *Sociolinguistics: An Introduction to language and Society* (3rd ed). London: Penguin.
- Turner, Stephanie S. (1999). Intersex Identities: Locating New Intersections of Sex and Gender. *Gender and Society* 13, 457-459.
- Valentine, David. (2002). We're "not about Gender" : the Uses of "Transgender", in Lewin, Ellen & Leap, William (eds) *Out in theory : the emergence of lesbian and gay anthropology*, pp.222-245. Urbana : University of Illinois Press.
- Valentine, David. (2003). The Calculus of Pain: Violence, Anthropological Ethics, and the Category Transgender. *Ethnos* 68 , 27-48.
- Valentine, David. (2007). *Imagining Transgender: an Ethnology of a Category*. Durham & London: Duke University Press.
- van Driem, George. (1996). Categories of Homosexual Behaviour in Modern Burmese. *Maledicta* 12, 91-110.
- van Borsel John, Van Eynde Elke, De Cuyper Griet, and Bonte Katrien. (2006). Feminine after cricothyroid approximation? *Journal of Voice* 22, 379–384.
- Ho, Tamara C. (2009). Transgender, Transgression, and Translation: A Cartography of Nat Kadaws. *Discourse* 31, 273–317.
- Zimman, Lal. (2009). The Other Kind of Coming Out: Transgender People and the Coming Out Narrative Genre. *Gender and Language* 3, 53-80.
- Zimman, Lal. (2013a). *Voices in transition: Testosterone, transmasculinity, and the gendered voice among female-to-male transgender people*. [PhD thesis]. Boulder, Colorado: University of Colorado.
- Zimman, Lal. (2013b). Hegemonic masculinity and the variability of gay-sounding speech: The perceived sexuality of transgender men. *Journal of Language & Sexuality*, 2, 1-39.
- Zimman, Lal & Hall, Kira. (2009). *Language, Embodiment, and the "Third Sex"*. In Dominic Watt and Carmen Llamas (eds.). *Language and Identities*, pp 166-178. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Zwicky, Arnold M. (1997). Two Lavender Issues for Linguists. In Anna Livia and Kira Hall (eds). *Queerly Phrased: Language, Gender, and Sexuality*, pp 21–34. New York: Oxford University Press.

Endnotes

ⁱ Original punctuation and Old English spelling retained.

ⁱⁱ 'Passing' refers to oneself being interpreted as one's preferred gender from the point of view of others.

ⁱⁱⁱ An annoying, if minor aspect of Kulick (1999) and Cameron & Kulick (2003) is the constant use of the acronym MTF (male to female), which many transwomen find careless if not offensive. Not all transwomen believe they are men 'changing into' women, but rather that they are people affirming (or 'performing') their gender identity.

^{iv} Dacakis has helped many transwomen using her knowledge of phonology and human physiology and regularly gives talks on at transgender meetings and conferences, frequently in non-medical, community-based settings. For example, Dacakis spoke at the *Melbourne Seahorse Society* July 2014 meeting, a private gathering of transgender women.

^v Cisgender is antonymous to transgender; it refers to the practice of presenting oneself as being of the gender assigned at birth.

^{vi} See the reference to informant M1 (van Driem 1996: 104).

[About the author]

Karen PARKER is the invited postgraduate guest author of the first issue of Mercury. She is a PhD student at the Centre for Research on Language Diversity, LaTrobe University, Australia. Her research interests lie in queer linguistics and language documentation.