

December 2020

Gender, sex, and society. On the formation and usage of feminine forms in Polish and Slovenian

Maria Wtorkowska

Univerza v Ljubljani, Filozofska fakulteta, Oddelek za slavistiko, Aškerčeva c. 2, 1000 Ljubljana, Slovenia,
MariaZofia.Wtorkowska@ff.uni-lj.si

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digijournals.uni.lodz.pl/kpc>

Recommended Citation

Wtorkowska, Maria (2020) "Gender, sex, and society. On the formation and usage of feminine forms in Polish and Slovenian," *Acta Universitatis Lodzensis. Kształcenie Polonistyczne Cudzoziemców*. Vol. 27 , Article 4.

DOI: 10.18778/0860-6587.27.02

Available at: <https://digijournals.uni.lodz.pl/kpc/vol27/iss1/4>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Arts & Humanities Journals at University of Lodz Research Online. It has been accepted for inclusion in *Acta Universitatis Lodzensis. Kształcenie Polonistyczne Cudzoziemców* by an authorized editor of University of Lodz Research Online. For more information, please contact agnieszka.kalowska@uni.lodz.pl.

PERSPEKTYWA PORÓWNAWCZA

*Maria Wtorkowska**

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9317-2490>

GENDER, SEX, AND SOCIETY. ON THE FORMATION AND USAGE OF FEMININE FORMS IN POLISH AND SLOVENIAN

(THIS ARTICLE WAS TRANSLATED FROM POLISH BY JAKUB WOSIK)

Keywords: feminine forms, word formation, grammatical gender, sex, Polish language, Slovenian language

Abstract. The aim of this article is to highlight selected differences in the formation and usage of feminine names, mainly names of professions, titles, and positions, between Polish and Slovenian. Apart from the traditional ones, I shall also discuss more recent modes of derivation of feminine names in both languages and their formal characteristics. The issue of sex is related in both languages to the grammatical category of the gender of personal nouns, though it is more common in Polish. In the language, which, in fact, is referred to by its native users as *ojczysty* (adjectival form with the stem ‘ojciec’ meaning ‘father’) while a Slovenian would refer to their native language as *materinski* (derived from mother), there exists an additional opposition of names of men vs. names of non-men (including women), which means there is a special privileged position of masculine personal forms over other forms, one which is not found in Slovenian. In Slovenian, the previously used neutral masculine form when referring to both men and women, being the shortest and morphologically least complicated, is no longer viewed as non-marked, and in some documents, it is being replaced with the feminine form. I shall discuss the changes which have occurred in terms of the formation and application of feminine forms, starting with their masculinisation as a sign of women’s emancipation, through the intention to eliminate the asymmetry in the word formation of those names viewed within the context of gender/sex issues in language, to the reasons for blocking feminine derivation. I shall also mention the modes for neutralising gender and the device of splitting, the rules of which, in both languages, have not yet been sufficiently defined.

*MariaZofia.Wtorkowska@ff.uni-lj.si, Univerza v Ljubljani, Filozofska fakulteta, Oddelek za slavistiko, Aškerčeva c. 2, 1000 Ljubljana, Slovenia.

The notion of the language–sex relationship has been a focus of Polish researchers for a long time, yet it has been only in the last decade that one could see a proliferation of publications centred on that issue; it has become so trendy that it would be impossible to list at this point all the works devoted to it¹, cf. e.g.: Woźniak 2020, 2014; Wtorkowska 2019; Małocha-Krupa 2018, 2015; Arabski, Łyda, Ziębka (eds.) 2013; Walczak 2013; Rejter 2013; Bobrowski 2012a; Łozowski 2012; Karwatowska, Szpyra-Kozłowska (eds.) 2012; Arabski, Ziębka-Białożny (eds.) 2010; Karwatowska, Szpyra-Kozłowska 2010; Nowosad-Bakalarczyk 2009²; Radomski, Truchlińska (eds.) 2008; Dąbrowska 2008; Kępińska 2007; Kubiszyn-Mędrala 2007; Łaziński 2006; Anusiewicz, Handke (eds.) 1994, and more. Even though in Slovenian the formation and usage of feminine names when compared to those of masculine names does not indicate such striking differences as in Polish, in Slovenia (cf. Kranjc, Ožbot 2013, p. 234; Derganc 2017, p. 126) the problems associated with the application of masculine and feminine forms within the aspect of non-sexually marked language usage (Slovenian *spolno (ne)občutljiva raba jezika*) were first indicated and attempts were made to legislate them in the 1990s (Stabej 1997; Ščuka 2014; Doleschal 2015; Kranjc 2019; Lengar Verovnik, Kalin Golob 2019; Marvin 2018, 2019; Vidovič Muha 2019; Žele 2019, and more)³. This notion is discussed not only within the feminist framework, but also within the fields of sociolinguistics, psycholinguistics, and ethnolinguistics. Therefore, one should stress that the asymmetry in terms of the word formation of masculine and feminine names of actors may appear as one of the most popular objects of analyses and of the plans for gender reforms in languages (cf. Łaziński 2006, pp. 210–211, p. 246).

In this article, I shall only discuss the differences in the formation and usage of feminine names, mainly the names of professions, titles, and positions, between Polish and Slovenian, and related problems. This study is intended to support the practice of teaching non-native languages. There are no links between gender as a grammatical category and the categories of extra-linguistic reality (Nagórko 2003, pp. 108–109; Marvin 2018), and, as Alina Kępińska, researcher

¹ I have indicated only a few sample publications which constitute collections of articles by various authors regarding the broadly considered language–sex relationship in Polish.

² This author has interestingly proposed ranking the semantic types of women’s names within a scale of their masculinisation (Nowosad-Bakalarczyk 2009, pp. 143–157). The names of professions, titles and positions can be assigned the parameter of semantic masculinisation with a specific value. Academic titles feature the highest degree of masculinisation. Next on the scale there are official titles, and further still there are professional names. By extending the issue of the parameter of masculinisation one could hypothesise that there might exist a relationship between the degree of the masculinisation of a noun and its receptivity to suffix-based derivation.

³ Consider volume XXXIII of the seminar on Slovenian, literature and culture (33. *seminar slovenskega jezika, literature in kulture* 1997), devoted to women in the Slovenian language, literature, and culture, and the *Slavistična revija* journal 67/2 (2019), with articles discussing the relationships between language and sex.

of masculine personal and non-masculine personal categories, has argued: “one cannot refer to sex or immaturity as the basis for separating a [gender] group since such a reference only applies to some nouns which belong to it,” (Kępińska 2006, p. 325). The issue of sex in Polish is, however, related to the grammatical category of the gender of personal nouns. It is based not only on the difference in terms of sex, but also on the properties of objects such as animate/non-animate (also in Slovenian), personal/non-personal, though with certain exceptions, cf. nouns (*to dziewczę* [(it) young girl], (*to*) *dziecię* [(it) child] – similarly in Slovenian (*to*) *dekle* (grammatical gender: neutral or feminine, biological gender: feminine) and (*to*) *dete* or (*to*) *dziecko* [(it) child], (*to*) *niemowlę* [(it) infant], are considered to be of neutral gender even though a human being is sexually defined from the very start of their life. Gender is a syntactic category – it is mainly used to indicate links between elements of an expression, yet there may also exist a relationship between grammatical gender and the sex of living beings, mainly humans (Nagórko 2003, pp. 108–109). In Polish, there are five grammatical genders⁴: masculine personal (*pan* [mister], *student*, *redaktor* [editor]), masculine animate (*pies* [dog], *kot* [cat]), masculine inanimate (*dom* [house], *rower* [bicycle]), feminine (*papuga* [parrot], *książka* [book]), and neutral (*pole* [field], *auto* [car]). Only masculine nouns are assigned the additional distinction of animate/inanimate and personal/non-personal. Therefore, the non-masculine personal gender which exists in plural applies to both nouns which are masculine animate non-personal (*psy* [dogs], *koty* [cats]) and inanimate (*domy* [houses], *rowery* [bicycles]), and to feminine and neutral names of animals and objects (*papugi* [parrots], *książki* [books]; *pola* [fields], *auta* [cars]) and personal feminine names (*kobiety* [women], *studentki* [female students], *redaktorki* [woman editors]). The animate–inanimate opposition has been enhanced with the distinction between male names⁵ vs. other names, which is visible in the plural in the form of plural suffixes in the nominative case of male names ‘-owie’ (*panowie* [misters], *synowie* [sons], *profesorowie* [professors]) and the equating of the plural accusative form with the genitive⁶. The emer-

⁴ The division into 5 gender categories does not consider the relationship between gender and number, as the division criterion is whether elements collocate syntactically. That is the most commonly applied division, though not the only one. Many formal studies include a division based on extended syntactic criteria (collocations with numeral forms), which if applied produce a division into 9 gender classes (vide the classical study: Saloni 1976, pp. 43–78, in a simplified version also in: Saloni, Świdziński 1989).

⁵ In Polish, there is the plural pronoun and title *państwo* signifying a woman and a man as a married couple (*państwo Nowakowie* [the Nowaks], *państwo Kowalscy* [the Kowalskis]) or a mix-gender couple, which often replaces the complex title: *Panie i Panowie* [Ladies and Gentlemen] (Łaziński 2006, pp. 45–46). It is a special form of referring to both sexes, which, for example, in the past tense requires the use of a masculine personal verb, cf. *Państwo byli* [they were], *czytali* [they were reading], *zwiedzali* [they were visiting].

⁶ In Russian, that applies in plural to all nouns with the animate classification (the *oduševlennost'*: *neoduševlennost'* opposition), so, for example (*ne*) *vižu studentok* ~. In Slovenian, the situ-

gence of the masculine personal morphological category, as argued by Krystyna Kleszczowa, constitutes a sum outcome of the influence of various factors, i.e. phonological-syntactic, inflection-syntactic and even extra-linguistic considerations associated with the unequal evaluation of the social roles assigned to women and men (Kleszczowa 1994, p. 75). Additionally, masculine personal gender reflects the old patriarchal social structure. Therefore, scholars have identified in Polish three genders in singular and only two in plural⁷. Even an introductory presentation of this problem requires teachers of Polish as a foreign language to possess appropriate training in this matter, and for foreigners learning Polish it is no easy task to understand it and achieve proficiency in applying gender forms in context correctly. Thus, already at the beginning of the learning process it is necessary to draw learners' attention to the fact that in Polish, to which a native speaker would refer as *ojczysty*⁸ [adjective with the stem 'ojciec'], there exists an additional opposition of male names vs. non-male (including female) names which, in turn, establishes a privileged position of masculine personal forms over other forms and a masculinisation of feminine forms⁹.

In Slovenian, every noun carries an indication of its gender, and three genders are defined: masculine (*moški spol*), feminine (*ženski spol*), and neutral (*srednji spol*) in all three number classes: singular (*učitelj, pes, zvezek, avto*¹⁰; *gospa, učiteljica, mačka, knjiga; dekleta (n or ž), morje, polje*), dual (*učitelja, psa, zvezka, avta; učiteljici, mački, knjigi; dekleti, morji, polji*), and plural (*učitelji, psi, zvezki, avti; učiteljice, mačke, knjige; dekleta (n or ž), morja, polja*) (Marvin 2019, p. 151). Saška Štumberger (2019, p. 203; own translation) added that "the Slovenian language belongs to a group of sex-sensitive languages because it contains

ation is similar to that in Polish: *vidim študentke – ne vidim študentk : widzę studentki – nie widzę studentek* [I can see female students – I cannot see female students] (the Polish and Slovenian examples indicate the application of the genitive with negated nouns).

⁷ The 3 + 2 gender division is morphologically justified as it has a smaller number of morpheme determiners of the gender category and, in turn, a higher syncretism of declension patterns.

⁸ Slovenians refer to their language as *materni* (from the noun *mater* meaning 'mother'). The Polish word *macierz* meaning 'ojczyzna' [fatherland] or 'matka' [mother] is stylistically marked and used rarely, while the adjective *macierzysty* [native] does not directly refer to a mother (USJP II, pp. 522–523).

⁹ The masculine personal/non-personal category does not apply exclusively to the inflection of names. It is also necessary to discuss it in detail with learners of Polish as a foreign language in the case of verbal inflection – mainly in the context of the past tense (and the future tense of imperfective verbs) as that is mainly where grammatical gender becomes visible: *mężczyźni, studenci leżeli (będą leżeli)* [men, students were lying (will be lying)], while *psy, koty, telefony, kobiety, studentki, papugi, torebki, pióra i dzieci leżały (będą leżały)* [dogs, cats, telephones, women, female students, parrots, purses, feathers and children were lying (will be lying)].

¹⁰ Even though similar forms ending in *-o* are usually masculine in Slovenian, cf. *gasilski avto, rešilni avto, potujoči kino, letni kino, (ne)varni rondo*, in the plural there also appear forms ending in *-a*, e.g. *geto*, <https://viri.cjvt.si/gigafida/Concordance/Search?Query=%22geta%22> [13.05.2020]: *Sicer pa si za razliko od nekaterih drugih občin na Jesenicah prizadevajo preprečiti socialna geta*.

the category of gender expressed not only in nouns, but also in adjectives, verbs and pronouns.” In the sentences *Mama in oče sta šla v kino – Mama i tata poszli do kina* [Mum and dad **went** to the cinema] the feminine form as part of the whole with the masculine form requires the masculine past suffix both in Polish and Slovenian, though in the latter it is the dual form. Both languages also feature common-gender words, which are mainly declined per feminine declension, and they can be used in relation to representatives of both sexes, e.g. neutral: *świadek – priča* [witness], *sierota – sirota* [orphan], expressive, usually negatively marked: Polish *lamaga* [bungler], *niedzara* [lubber], *niedolega* [twerp], *nedorajda* [klutz], *fajtlapa* [butter fingers], *ślamazara* [sluggard], *beksa* [cry-baby], *plaksa* [cry-baby], *beksa-lala* [cry-baby], *oferma* [looser], and *sierota* [wimp]; Slovenian *čveka*, *prismoda*, *klepetulja*, *blebetulja*, *čvekulja*, *gobezdalo*, *čvekal*, *jezikalo*. In a sentence in Slovenian, those forms can be accompanied by a predicate, pronoun or a masculine or feminine relative pronoun: *On/ona je velika baraba; Ta baraba mi je ukradel/ukradla kolo, Baraba, pri kateri/katerem sem pustil kolo, mi ga ukradla*, but not in the case of a modifier in pre-position: *velika baraba*¹¹ (Toporišič 1981, 2000; Kunst Gnamuš 1994/1995, Doleschal 2015).

Please first consider the traditional determiners of feminine derivation in Polish indicated in textbooks for descriptive grammar; I am mainly referring to the so-called yellow grammar and its part devoted to morphology (Grzegorzczkova, Puzynina 1999). From the point of view of word formation, feminine names are usually considered in Polish modifying derivatives in which the meaning of the feminine gender is communicated by suffixes, though many, especially the names of professionals, can be treated as mutant formations as they enable a different (verbal) interpretation, cf. 1) *lekarka* [a woman physician] – a feminine derivative, produced as a modification, i.e. the feminine name comes from the masculine name, and 2) *lekarka* [a woman who treats people] – a verb-derived performer of activities with the additional information regarding the performer’s gender (feminine); mutational derived form. Feminine names are derived in Polish usually from masculine names using paradigmatic affixes *-a* and suffixes: *-ka*, *-ini/-yni*, *-ica*, with consideration for certain rules which determine the application of individual affixes (Grzegorzczkova, Puzynina 1999, p. 422)¹².

The **change of the inflection paradigm** is the essence of paradigmatic derivation. The change of the inflection paradigm is indicated by the change of the model of inflection within a single grammatical category or between grammatical classes, e.g. from masculine nominal to feminine nominal, e.g. *kum* → *kum-a* [god-

¹¹ In Slovenian, demonstrative pronouns have in singular the same forms for masculine and feminine, cf. *ta fantek* [this boy] and *ta deklica* [this girl], while the noun *spol* is used both in reference to grammatical gender (*moški, ženski, srednji spol*) and sex (Slovenian (*biološki spol*)).

¹² The authors considered as rare such types of formation of feminine names as derived forms with the suffixes *-owa* (*krawiec* → *krawc-owa* [tailor]), *-ina* (*starosta* → *starość-ina* [mayor]), *-anka* (*kolega* → *koleż-anka* [colleague]), *-ówka* (*Żyd* → *Żyd-ówka* [a Jew]).

parents towards each other], *blondyn* → *blondyn-a*¹³ [a blond], from masculine adjectival to feminine adjectival, e.g. masculine names with adjectival inflection with the elements *-ny*, *-owy*, *-al(ski)*, *-ący* constitute the basis for regularly derived feminine names: *radny* → *radn-a* [councilman – councilwoman]; *księgowy* → *księgow-a* [accountant]; *spóźnialski* → *spóźnialsk-a* [latecomer]; *przewodniczący* → *przewodnicząc-a* [chairman – chairwoman], etc. Paradigmatic derivation also consists of **changing grammatical gender** in combination with **not inflecting the noun** – that mainly applies to titles and higher positions, as well as typically masculine professions. Therefore, we use feminine paradigmatic derived forms, e.g. *minister*, *premier* [prime minister], *dziekan* [dean], *rektor* [chancellor], *dyrektor* [director], *profesor* [professor], *doktor* [Ph.D.], *magister* [M.A.], *ambasador* [ambassador], which in their uninflected forms (with the addition of a person's name and/or the word *pani* [Ms.]) may constitute the centre of the nominal group being expanded to include adjectives with inflectional feminine gender and feminine predicate: *Pani doktor habilitowana została odznaczona* [Ms. Ph.D. received an award], *Pani minister uczestniczyła* [Ms. minister participated], *byłam u naszej pani dziekan* [I visited our Ms. dean], *motorniczy Anna Kowalska przysłała* [tram driver Anna Kowalska came], *prezes Trybunału Konstytucyjnego oświadczyła* [chairwoman of the Constitutional Tribunal declared], *pierwsza Marszałek Sejmu jest uprawniona* [the first Speaker of the Sejm is authorised].

Feminine names consist of names of women not only based on their national affinity, origin, religion, beliefs, physical and mental capabilities, activities they perform, etc., but also considering their titles, the functions they fulfil, the positions they occupy, and the professions they have. Women's academic titles, official titles, and professional titles have until recently been created from masculine names under the process of affix-based derivation usually using the suffix *-ka*, e.g. *malarz* → *malar-ka*¹⁴ [male/female painter], or less often using the suffix *-inil/-yni*, e.g. *sprzedawca* → *sprzedawcz-yni* [male/female vendor], *członek* → *członk-ini* [male/female member], which has become particularly popular as the only women-exclusive suffix, for example in potential still fiercely debated forms: *naukowcz-yni* [woman researcher], *gość-ini* [hostess], *kierowcz-yni*¹⁵ [woman manager], or less often using the suffix *-owa*, e.g. *król* → *król-owa* [king

¹³ The form *blondyna* (and other similar derived forms) is more often interpreted as expressively marked and derived from the neutral form *blondynka* [blond woman] through a cutting off of the morpheme element *-k-*.

¹⁴ Nowadays, the application of this affix for creating the names of the performers of professions derived from masculine forms ending in *-log* which did not originally have a feminine counterpart is growing in popularity (including the names of academics), cf. *psycholożka* [woman psychologist], *filolożka* [woman philologist], *geolożka* [woman geologist] (though those forms still seem slightly colloquial or humorous). I shall discuss the growing acceptance of those types of forms further in the article.

¹⁵ In Slovenian, derivation with the affix *-inja* is common and established, cf. *šef-inja*, *strokovnjak-inja*, *sociolog-inja*, *ginekolog-inja*, *pediatr-inja*.

→ queen], *cesarz* → *cesarz-owa* [emperor → empress] meaning ‘władczyni’ [woman ruler]. Other commonly found affixes include: a) *-ica/-yca* (which may be negatively or mockingly marked, e.g. *caryca* [tsaress], *anielica* [female angel], *pannica* [young lass]; additionally, the suffix is used for creating the names of female animals, cf. *lwica* [lioness], *oślica* [female donkey]), b) *-na* (*księżna* [duchess], *druhna* [bridesmaid]), c) *-icha/-ycha* (usually with a coarse or ill-disposed attitude, e.g. *Cyganicha* [Gypsy woman]). The *-owa* suffix, similarly to *-ina/-yna*, is no longer useful for creating feminine forms as it specialised to denote ‘żona’¹⁶ [wife]: *ambasadorowa* is ‘ambassador’s wife’, *prezydentowa* is ‘president’s wife’ resembling the rare nowadays maritonymic names (*Nowak* → *Nowakowa* ‘Nowak’s wife’, *Zaręba* → *Zarębina* ‘Zaręba’s wife’)¹⁷. Exceptions include *krawcowa* meaning a ‘woman tailor’ and not ‘tailor’s wife’, and *szełfowa* meaning ‘a woman boss’ and rarely ‘boss’s wife.’

Modern researchers discussing feminine forms have devoted most space to the names of professions, positions, and the related titles as it is within that group that the most dynamic changes have been occurring. The appeal of the issue¹⁸ is caused by the tendencies in contemporary Polish which indicate the users’ willingness to eliminate the word-formation asymmetry in terms of the names of professions and titles viewed within the context of gender/sex issues in language, often discussed in feminist linguistics or linguistics of the sexes (Karwatowska, Szpyra-Kozłowska 2010). The high level of professional and social activeness of women in Poland in the latter half of the 20th century and before the political transformation, somewhat paradoxically, disturbed the productivity of the suffix -based derivation of feminine forms from applicable masculine forms, while in Slovenian the productivity began to increase though the use of masculine names in reference to famous women which was quite common in 1945¹⁹ and according to Breda Pogorelec was the result of a two-stage adoption of foreign linguistic pat-

¹⁶ Among the names of professions developed using the suffix *-ina* there apparently only survives the colloquial *sędzina* [woman judge] (USJP), officially referred to as *pani sędzia* [Ms. judge]. As Łaziński has indicated (2006, p. 251) “today, maritonymic surnames ending in *-owa*, *-ina* and patronymic surnames ending in *-ówna*, *-anka* are mostly used by people intentionally emphasising their attachment to tradition, usually in academia and the arts community.” Therefore, in official Polish, feminine forms of surnames are no longer used, with the exception of adjectival surnames (*Nowakowski* – *Nowakowska*, *Niedźwiecki* – *Niedźwiecka*). The surnames *Nowak* and *Rodowicz* apply both to men and women, which women generally accept.

¹⁷ The same mechanism exists even today in rare patronymic names of daughters of the *Nowakówna* meaning ‘Nowak’s daughter’ or *Zarębianka* meaning ‘Zaręba’s daughter’ type.

¹⁸ *Gender studies* continue to be highly contested by some, though in recent decades they have become strongly rooted within the Polish linguistic space. Often, they are also associated with the application of the (trendy) principles of political correctness.

¹⁹ The common use of masculine forms regarding well-known women particularly in 1945 has been confirmed in a study of those in selected issues of Slovenian newspapers *Slovenski poročevalec* and *Delo* from 1945, 1969, and 2000 (Umek 2008).

terns and ideological attitudes, i.e. the Soviet and the Serbo-Croatian (Pogorelec 1997, as quoted in: Štumberger 2019, p. 205).

The growing frequency of the use of masculine names of professions and titles in reference to women, and the freezing of inflection as an indication of femininity was a sign of emancipation after 1945. Antonina Obrębska-Jabłońska considered masculinisation and the lack of inflection of forms applied in the case of women holding positions, especially higher ones, as a social appreciation of professional names (Obrębska-Jabłońska 1949, p. 2). The phenomenon of the masculinisation of professional titles and names considered as assigning more importance has been widespread and has continued to exist ever since. The discussed tendencies helped the identification of other trends in language, which can be reduced to two positions: one promotes gender symmetry in word formation in the names of professions and titles, e.g. *doktor* – *doktorka* [male/female doctor], *lektor* – *lektorka* [male/female language teacher], while the other accepts the use of masculine names for denoting professions and titles which belong to women. What, then, is the factor which determines whether nowadays we use feminine forms for denoting professions, position, and functions held by women or not?

Studies which discuss the formation of feminine names of professions, titles, and positions indicate various factors which might cause the emergence of lexical gaps and word-formation asymmetry in feminine forms. The most significant reasons exist in the system itself: word formation is irregular, which is why expecting full symmetry seems doomed from the start.²⁰ Among these factors scholars note the intention to avoid homonymy, though homonymy is not a problem either for users of Polish or Slovenian as expressions exist in contexts which successfully indicate which unit is being denoted. Polish feminine suffixes (mainly *-ka*) at the same time handle other word-formative categories. Sometimes, then, there emerge instances of unwanted polysemy, cf. *Kanadyjka* meaning ‘a woman of Canadian nationality’ and *kanadyjka* meaning ‘a light boat’ or ‘a kind of a jacket’²¹, *pilotka* meaning ‘a woman guide, usually on a coach’ and ‘a type of a hat’, *cukierniczka* meaning ‘a woman pastry chef’ and ‘a small container for serving sugar on a table’²², and in Slovenian, e.g. *lovka* meaning ‘a woman hunter, huntsman or

²⁰ Suffix-based derivation in particular has its limitations, hence the turn towards paradigmatic derivation.

²¹ The same principle applies to the Polish *Węgierka* and Slovenian *Madžarka* meaning ‘a Hungarian woman’ (Slovenian also *Bosanka*) and *węgierka* – *bosanka* or *madžarka* meaning ‘a kind of plum – tree, bush’, as well as ‘the fruit of that kind of plum’, and the only difference is indicated through the words’ spelling.

²² It is sometimes the case that *-ka* forms apply only to the names of objects and not persons of the feminine gender, e.g. *magisterka* colloquially means ‘a master’s thesis’, *dylomatka* means ‘an elegant document folder’ or ‘a narrow beltless coat with long narrow lapels’, and *marynarka* meaning ‘a piece of clothing’ or the product of univerbation of the phrase *Marynarka Wojenna* [the Navy] meaning ‘a kind of Polish Armed Forces’. Therefore, sometimes feminine forms denoting women simply are non-existent.

potentially a *huntswoman' and 'a moving organ in some animals for grasping food, and touching', *generalka* meaning 'a woman general', 'the main and final rehearsal before a première' or 'a small-scale topographical map', which is why an additional derived form with the affix *-ica* emerged: *generalica*, and sometimes there also appears the form *generalinja*²³.

Some feminine names denoting professions or positions are, because of that fact, perceived as less serious or colloquially marked. Additionally, the *-ka* suffix is also responsible in Polish for creating diminutive forms, which means that feminine forms created using it indicate the smallness of the referent, which in the minds of language users may lower the stature of the word (cf. *lampka* [a small lamp], *nóżka* [a small leg], *rączka* [a small hand], *główka* [a small head]; the second, third and fourth diminutive forms are also used in figurative meanings designating parts of objects, plants or other organisms, e.g. *nóżka borowika* [the leg of a penny bun mushroom], *rączka walizki* [a suitcase handle], *główka zapalki* [a match head]. Few realise that masculine names of persons also denote something different, take, for example, the words *bokser* meaning 'a sports person practising boxing' and 'an attack dog', *pilot* meaning 'a person flying an aircraft' and 'a device for controlling a television, etc. from a distance', *adwokat* meaning 'a lawyer' and 'a kind of alcoholic beverage or sweet filling', while some feminine names which formed through suffixation using the *-ka* suffix, e.g. *kosmetyczka* meaning the profession performed by a woman as well as a purse for cosmetics, are socially acceptable. Therefore, homonymy is a factor which only seemingly prevents the creation of feminine names.

Some researchers argue that lexical gaps and the asymmetry in the word formation of feminine names are also caused by a morphological and phonetic factor (i.a. Jadacka 2012, p. 1687), i.e. the emergence of difficult to pronounce consonant clusters. That particularly applies to situations where a masculine form which is the basis ends in a consonant cluster, e.g. *chirurg* [surgeon], *dramaturg* [playwright], or when it contains the phone *-k-* (*architekt* [architect], *adiunkt* [assistant professor]). In such cases, feminine forms created using the suffix *-ka* would be difficult to pronounce due to their consonant clusters, cf. the incorrect forms *architektka*, *adiunktka*, *pediatrka*, *chirurgzka*, *dramaturzka*, though there are similar words in Polish the pronunciation of which poses no major problems for the language's users, e.g. *zmarszczka* [a wrinkle] or *bezwzględny* [absolute].

Others still, argue that the difficulty arises from the bases of masculine names of professions, titles and positions ending in *-log*: *psycholog* [psychologist], *filolog* [philologist], *stomatolog* [stomatologist]. Until recently, only a change of gender and the lack of inflection of these words determined their application towards women – *Pani stomatolog przyjmowała* [Ms. stomatologist was seeing patients], *Pani ginekolog przyszła* [Ms. gynaecologist came]. In recent years it has been

²³ <https://fran.si/iskanje?View=1&Query=generalinja> [25.05.2020].

common with this type to create feminine names through suffixation where the addition of the suffix *-ka* requires one to replace the *-g* in the coda of the basis with *-ż*, which is still evaluated negatively due to the deformation of the foreign element *-log*: *psycholożka* [woman psychologist], *dermatolożka* [woman dermatologist], *filolożka* [woman philologist] – those names, as argued by, e.g. Nagórko (2011, p. 209) and Kubiszyn-Mędrala (2007, p. 33), continue to be viewed as colloquial (often with a mocking taint) and are rarely used in official texts, which does not support their consolidation in common usage²⁴.

The argument that feminine derived forms with the indicator *-ka* lower the prestige of women fulfilling social roles which are new for them, in which the social status of a profession, function or position is high, e.g. *prezydent* → *prezydentka* [man president → woman president], or even the abandoning of names which have already been accepted, e.g. *dyrektorka* [woman director], *kierownicza* [woman manager], *profesorka* [woman professor] and turning to *pani dyrektor* [Ms. director], *pani kierownik* [Ms. manager], *pani profesor* [Ms. professor] (Jadacka 2012, p. 1687) have triggered a search for new solutions for creating feminine forms. In 2012, Joanna Mucha, the minister for sport at that time, during a television interview suggested that her position should be referred to as *ministra* and not as the more expected *ministerka* (which would have followed the pattern *reporter* → *reporterka* [man/woman reporter], and not *reporter* → *reportera*). And even though the analysis of the process of the formation of the new form and of similar propositions (*premiera* instead of *premierka* meaning ‘woman prime minister’) has enabled some researchers to accept it as an acceptable form (i.a. Bobrowski 2012b), some linguists consider it incorrect, indicating that the utilisation of the suffix *-a* for creating nominal names of professions is not traditionally grounded in Polish, and thus derived forms overlap other forms in the language – *premiera* also means ‘the first staging of a play or a screening of a film’, may be perceived as augmentatives (*ministra*, *profesora*) or may be considered as possessive names: *pani* whose? *ministra*²⁵ [Ms. whose? the minister’s].

New tendencies in creating some feminine forms using the suffix *-ka* are not sanctioned in codification terms, cf. the codified *optymistka* [woman optimist], *aktywistka* [woman activist], *anglistka* [woman English teacher], *flecistka* [woman flute player] vs. *filolożka* [woman philologist], *stomatolożka* [woman stomatol-

²⁴ Usus, i.e. the common lack of acceptance of forms derived from foreign bases ending in *-log*, in combination with the general perception of those forms as non-traditional, humorous and silly is yet another reason why they are commonly considered incorrect. Currently we are, however, seeing a decline in such categorical judgements as forms with *-(ło)żka* are being promoted and are gaining popularity in usus.

²⁵ Cf. *Stanowisko Rady Języka Polskiego w sprawie żeńskich form nazw zawodów i tytułów z 19 marca 2012 roku*, http://www.rjp.pan.pl/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=1359:stanowisko-rady-jzyka-polskiego-w-sprawie-eskich-form-nazw-zawodow-i-tytuow [28.05.2020].

ogist], *ginekolożka* [woman gynaecologist]. Even though conservatively-disposed Hanna Jadacka in a topical entry regarding women's titles wrote: "Feminine forms are only retained in the case of names of professions traditionally performed by women, e.g. *aktorka* [actress], *malarka* [woman painter], *nauczycielka* [woman teacher], *pisarka* [woman writer], or of professions considered unattractive and bearing a low social status, e.g.. *ekspedientka* [woman shop assistant], *fryzjerka* [woman hairdresser], *sprzątaczkę* [cleaning lady]. In contemporary Polish there are no names of prestigious positions or academic degrees and titles which would possess a feminine word formative form" (Jadacka 2012, p. 1687), modern women who refer to themselves as a *filolożka*, *stomatolożka* or *psycholożka* often promote those forms to enable the community to become accustomed to them and to neutralise the current markedness of this form. Therefore, in extra-linguistic terms, feminine derivation is also blocked for reasons of the prestige and social status of a profession and the perception that feminine forms lower the prestige of women who fulfil social roles which are new for them. The above-mentioned author of the monograph *O panach i paniach* also has stressed that prestige and social status are not equivalent notions. The former is associated with the number of women who perform a profession or activity, while the latter is related to their earnings, the level of envy felt by others towards a professional group, and the sense of dependency on the group (Łaziński 2006, p. 253). He has argued that it is rather the status of a profession and not its prestige that drives the limiting of derivation of feminine names of professions. Professions which entail a high social status are associated with the form of address *pan/pani* [Mr/Ms] + title, position. The ability to apply a noun in title forms of address is for some linguists a decisive criterion whether a feminine name can be used or not. In a direct form of address a title must possess a masculine form (Jadacka 2012, p. 1687), i.e. *Pani poseł* [Ms deputy] and not *Pani posłanko* [Ms woman deputy]. Łaziński (2006, p. 254) added that the very unit *pan/pani* (or first name) clearly indicates one's sex, which is why any additional indication of gender or sex in a name is no longer necessary.

The preferred gender principle of not indicating sex is expressed in the process of *splitting*, i.e. indicating the selectable nature of sex in texts, the rules of which have not yet been defined in either of the languages²⁶, and which defies the striving for a language to be frugal²⁷; even though it does not lengthen a text

²⁶ In *Edycja tekstów* in a chapter devoted to the use of the hyphen, Adam Wolański (2008, p. 54) indicated the following spellings as model ones: 1) elements differentiating masculine forms from feminine ones are placed in parentheses, where the element added to the full form without any phonic alterations is spelled without a hyphen, cf. *pan(i)*, *otrzymał(a)*, *był(a)by*; 2) the changed element is preceded by a part of the root and is spelled with a hyphen: *urodzony(-na)*, or 3) with the use of a forward slash dividing two selectable full forms: *pan/pani* [Mr/Ms], *uzyskał/uzyskała* [he received/she received]. Those guidelines could also be applied to splitting.

²⁷ The inconvenience of using splitting has been discussed by, e.g. Szpyra-Kozłowska and Karwatowska (2010).

significantly, if applied in the title of a letter or an apostrophe, it does, to some extent, decrease clarity. In Slovenian, the language–sex relationship developed significantly as a result of a 1995 public debate between experts²⁸, which opened the question about the use of masculine forms as neutral ones and about the asymmetry between masculine and feminine forms in the language; its goal was to find possible language forms which could apply to the whole society (Žagar, Milharčič Hladnik 1995). In Slovenian, both in its general version and the colloquial or dialectic variants, masculine forms are used as the neutral ones as they are the shortest and, morphologically, the simplest (i.a. Kunst Gnamuš 1994/1995, Vidovič Muha 1997; Toporišič 2000; Stabej 2003). In that neutral usage some found problems seeing the neutral masculine gender as exclusive, non-inclusive towards women; they argued that language should be corrected in that respect, i.e. it should change in such a way as to be satisfactory for all its users. In 2018, there emerged an opportunity to use a feminine form in reference to both women and men in legal acts of the Faculty of Philology (*Filozofska fakulteta*), which was supported by the Faculty of Social Science (*Fakulteta za družbene vede*) of the University of Ljubljana²⁹. It triggered fierce and often adverse and critical reactions in the media.³⁰ The application of this solution interchangeably, i.e. alternately (every three years) with masculine forms in every other act was, in the minds of some, less discriminating than the existing practice, and it only applied to forms of address in specific directives (*profesorica, asistentka, študentka...*), though its originators and supporters did admit that the proposal on its own would probably not have any major impact on women's equal rights and it was a rather symbolic gesture.³¹

²⁸ In that debate Vera Kozmik indicated the problem of naming persons, their positions and functions. She has noted that the lack of feminine forms of names of professions is discrimination. In 1997, the Slovenian Journal of Laws of the Republic of Slovenia (*Uradni list Republike Slovenije*) published a standard classification of professions, for the first time in history with a consistent consideration of the forms of both genders (Kranjc, Ožbot 2013, pp. 236–237). Despite that, sometimes it is possible to find the masculine form *tajnik* meaning ‘secretary; manager of office’ next to the name and surname of a woman working in that position. As users of Slovenian have indicated, it is through that particular method preserving the masculine form that they intend to differentiate that position of a person managing administrative and organisational work in institutions and offices from the place of work of a secretary (Slovenian *tajnica*), i.e. a person performing office work associated with the activities of another person or institution.

²⁹ Article 6a of the Rules and Regulations of the Faculty of Philology, University of Ljubljana (Pravilnik Filozofske fakultete Univerze v Ljubljani) reads: “V teh Pravilih uporabljen ženski slovnčni spol (študentka, učiteljica itn.) se nanaša na kateri koli spol” [In these Rules and Regulations, any and all instances of the grammatical feminine gender (woman student, woman teacher, etc.) apply to every sex].

³⁰ Consider, e.g. an article by Kozma Ahačič from the Fran Ramovš Institute of the Slovenian Language at the Science and Research Centre of the Slovenian Academy of Sciences and Arts entitled *Janez Novak, študentka slovenščine* of 27 May 2018 published in the *Delo* newspaper, <https://www.delo.si/novice/slovenija/janez-novak-studentka-slovenscine-54157.html> [01.06.2020].

³¹ I do not believe such an idea could become popular in Poland.

According to Tina Lengar Verovnik and Monika Kalin Golob, such an option is actually more convenient for legal texts than forms with slashes, hyphens, parentheses or underscores which, if applied, offer only partial consistency due to the morphological characteristics of Slovenian (Lengar Verovnik, Kalin Golob 2019, pp. 386–387). However, the introduction of the feminine form as the neutral one would remove from masculine forms their general neutral nature, a fact which would not help solve the problem of people who remain outside the masculine–feminine dichotomy (Marvin 2018). A response issued by the ZRC SAZU Language Clinic³² at the Fran Ramovš Institute of the Slovenian Language to a question regarding the mode of writing masculine and feminine forms in Slovenian states that there are other modes of avoiding the repeating of masculine and feminine forms, i.e. a spelling with an underscore (Slovenian *podčrtaj*): *zdravnik_ca* vs. *zdravnica_k*, in the plural *zdravniki_ce* vs. *zdravnice_ki*, and even though the method is nothing new, there is no reason to authoritatively deem it unacceptable. People who support the new spelling with the underscore argue that it is the only means of encompassing the entire society. Linguistics as a field has not yet issued a statement on the matter as such spelling has not been sufficiently studied, e.g. from the perspective of syntactic applications.³³ Therefore, the underscore, which is supposed to be inserted between a feminine form and a masculine suffix or masculine suffix with the coda of inflectional base, e.g. *Spoštovane_i sodelavke_ci, pri udeleženkah_cih, posameznice_ki*, “symbolically replacing all not (yet) existing suffixes and affixes expressing non-binary sexual identities which exceed the pattern of *either masculine or feminine*” and works more inclusively than a hyphen (*stanujoč-a*), slash (*zaposlen/a*), parenthesis (*rojen(a)*) or their combination (*avtor/-ica, rojen(-a)*), which we use when a text has insufficient space and which, according to transsexual persons, “indicate [only] two mutually exclusive specific sexual positions” (Vičar, Kern 2019, p. 418; 2017, p. 232; own translation). In Polish, it is possible to neutralise gender using nominal analytical structures, e.g. Gabriela Koniuszaniec and Hanna Błaszowska (2003) have recommended using instead of *maturzyści* [high-school graduates] a periphrastic structure using the word *osoba* [person]: *osoby zdające maturę* [persons/people graduating high school] or using other nouns: *naukowcy – kadra naukowa* [scientists – scientific staff], *fachowcy – siła fachowa* [professionals – professional force], including collective: *pracownicy – personel* [workers – staff], *klienci – klientela* [clients – client base] (Łaziński 2006, p. 210).

Even though, after 1945, women were in favour of using masculine forms of the names of professions, titles, and positions, many of them now support the

³² ZRC SAZU = Znanstvenoraziskovalni center Slovenske Akademije Znanosti in Umetnosti (Science and Research Centre of the Slovenian Academy of Sciences and Arts).

³³ The response: “Pisanje moških in ženskih oblik in uporaba podčrtaja za izražanje ‘spolne nebinarnosti’” (Boris Kern, Helena Dobrovljč, July 2017).

creation of feminine names, which remains in line with the traditions and history of the Polish language. Zenon Klemensiewicz (1957) stressed the social factor in reference to the creation of feminine forms concluding that “though the creation of feminine forms encounters semantic and formal difficulties, from the point of view of the linguistic system they would be somehow solved and overcome if the pressure of social needs had been moving in this direction.” It seems that in recent years that pressure has been increasing, yet it has also been mitigated by a lack of conviction in society as to the necessity of using feminine forms.³⁴ As Ewa Woźniak (2014, p. 310) has noted, a certain paradox has occurred: something which had been considered traditional, i.e. feminine names, is currently a manifestation of modernity and progressive attitudes. The Council of the Polish Language has taken an official stance on the issue of feminine forms, first confirming in 2012 that “[...] feminine forms of the names of professions and titles are systemically acceptable” and saw the reason why they were missing from everyday linguistic practice in the fact “that they evoke negative reactions in the majority of the speakers of Polish,”³⁵ and more recently, in November 2019, saw the need to reflect in the language the growing importance of women yet appealed for restraint and common sense when approaching this issue. The Council’s most recent statement was a reaction to a tumultuous debate sparked by social media posts by Magdalena Biejat, in which the Polish deputy announced that she would be a “gościńia” [a guestess] on a TVP (Polish state television) show, and later in correcting her supposed error and apologising for it she wrote that she would be a “gością” on the show. Therefore, she used two forms which are neither clear nor common as the masculine form *gość* [guest] is generally used. That indicates that it is not enough to change a language itself, but it is also necessary to achieve a balance in social awareness (Łozowski 2012, p. 90).

The creation of Slovenian feminine names, including the names of professions, titles, and positions, basically causes no major problems as the language’s system of word formation offers various opportunities for deriving them. Sometimes there are even neutral feminine derived forms with the same meaning yet created using different affixes, cf. *dekan-ja*, *dekan-ica*, *dekan-ka* i *koordinator-ica*, *koordinator-ka*³⁶. Saška Štumberger (2019, p. 208) has argued that, in the standard variety of Slovenian, well-known women fulfilling functions and social activities are often referred to using feminine names and that is why, according to Aleksandra Derganc, the number of such names continues to increase both in dictionaries and usage, “which is an outcome of both lin-

³⁴ A 2008 study conducted by Marta Dąbrowska of the Jagiellonian University has indicated that few women (21%) and men (28%) supported the idea for feminine forms to be used equally to masculine ones (Dąbrowska 2008, pp. 69–70).

³⁵ http://www.rjp.pan.pl/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=1359:stanowisko-rady-jzyka-polskiego-w-sprawie-eskich-form-nazw-zawodow-i-tytuow [08.06.2020]

³⁶ Also consider the formations: neutral *šef-inja* and marked *šef-ica*.

guistic-political operations and the fact that there are more and more women pursuing professions or fulfilling functions which had previously been reserved for men” (Derganc 2017, p. 126; own translation). Ada Vidovič Muha (1997, pp. 70–76) developed a typology of feminine names by their semantic classification with indications of the affixes utilised for creating those derived forms. In Slovenian, similarly to Polish, there are names which refer to “women as biological creatures” (Vidovič Muha 1997, p. 70), which are unrelated in word formation terms: *ženska – moški* (*kobieta – mężczyzna*) [woman – man], *žena – mož* (*żona – mąż*) [wife – husband], *mati – oče* (*matka – ojciec*) [mother – father]. The feminine names of professions, titles and positions are mainly derived from masculine names (i.e. nouns) or verbs and adjectives created using suffixes, and rarely through changing the declension pattern. Among the affixes creating feminine names (according to Ada Vidovič Muha’s understanding these are only those feminine nouns which were derived from masculine names and denote intellectual professions, functions, positions or activities) the author (Vidovič Muha 1997, pp. 74–75) listed the following suffixes: **-ica**: *lektor* → *lektor-ica*, *učitelj* → *učitelj-ica*, *direktor* → *direktor-ica*; **-ka**: *inženir* → *inženir-ka*, *slavist* → *slavist-ka*, *zgodovinar* → *zgodovinar-ka*, *ekonomist* → *ekonomist-ka*; **-(ar)ka**: *fizik* → *fizič-(ar)ka* (k : č), *matematik* → *matematič-(ar)ka* (k : č), and **-inja**: *filozof* → *filozof-inja*, *kirurg* → *kirurg-inja*; *advokat* → *advokat-inja*. She added that such feminine names (names of professions and intellectual functions) created as a result of a university transformation, express the hierarchic structuring of social criteria in a covert form, as feminine names are created in this case from a parallel name of a man’s activities. The other affixes she listed were: **-esa**: *klovn* → *klovn-esa*; **-isa**: *diakon* → *diakon-isa*; **-ja**: *gost* → *gost-ja*, *župan* → *župan-ja*; and a change of the declension pattern from masculine to feminine, e.g. *suženj* → *sužnj-a* (e : Ø).

Saška Štumberger noted that “for the names of people fulfilling specific roles or social functions it is possible to create independent names exclusively for women, e.g. *učiteljice* ‘woman teachers’, and not just to use nouns not marked in terms of gender, while there are no special names for denoting exclusively men”³⁷ (Štumberger 2019, p. 204; own translation). Even though the researcher indicated a major difference in the frequency of the appearances of feminine and masculine forms, which is understandable considering the use of masculine forms in relation to both men and women (Slovenian *spolno neobčutljiva raba jezika* – sexually unmarked use of language), and also because fewer women hold especially high positions, she concluded that in non-linguistic debates the lack of definition of gender in language is associated with the masculine gender or even men in general (Štumberger 2019, p. 209). That does not change the fact, though, that Slovenian

³⁷ A similar situation exists in German; Peter Eisenberg (2017) wrote thus about it: “Women are visible in the language twice, and men only once” (as quoted in Štumberger 2019, p. 204).

offers various ways of creating feminine names, which we would expect to be reflected in *usus*.

The aim of this article is to highlight some differences in the formation and usage of feminine names of professions, titles, and functions between Polish and Slovenian. In both languages, masculine forms of the *dziekan* – *dekan* [dean] type are used as unmarked forms because they can denote a man or a woman who holds that title or fulfils that function³⁸. One should note that even though in Slovenian the feminine name *dekanja* or *dekanka*, sometimes even *dekanica*, is created and used without any problems, in Polish it is more difficult as the derived form *dziekanka* is also used to denote an additional year during one's studies (dean's leave), as well as to denote the dean's wife (cf. *Słownik języka polskiego* by Doroszewski). The *Wielki Słownik Języka Polskiego* dictionary also indicates a meaning referring to a woman dean, yet in modern Polish the dominant form is the genetically masculine one which, as the centre of the nominal group *nowa (pani) dziekan* [new (Ms) dean], functions as a legitimate feminine noun, without a formal indicator of femininity with fixed inflection, often with the word *pani* [Ms] or without it, which in sentences connects with the adjunct and a feminine predicate, cf. *nowa (pani) dziekan oświadczyła* [new (Ms) dean stated], *(pani) doktor powiedziała* [(Ms) doctor said], *była (pani) minister została nagrodzona* [former (Ms) minister received an award], which is understandable, and stylistically unmarked, while Slovenian avoids such structures (Derganc 2017, p. 129). In most cases, in Slovenian one would use a feminine form in reference to a woman: *ministrica*, *profesorica*, *učiteljica*, *dekanja*, *šefinja*, *doktorica*, *magistrica*, *strokovnjakinja*, *predstojnica*, etc., but if one chooses the (less common) use of the masculine form, one would precede it with the word *gospa* meaning 'Ms': *gospa profesor*, and would also use a feminine adjunct and predicate: *naša profesorica / gospa profesor je prišla* (not: **profesor je prišla*), in the case of the common-gender noun *vodja* meaning 'manager – manageress' one can use the adjunct and predicate of two kinds: *nov-a umetnišk-a vodja je hotel-a* (f) and *nov-i umetnišk-i vodja je hotel-Ø* (m). This solution also entails a manner of creating honorifics other than that in Polish, i.e. in which there appears the so-called *vikanje*, the application of the second person plural verb form in reference to a single person, cf. *Profesorica / Gospa profesor, a boste šli z nami na izlet?* 'Ms Professor, would you come with us for a trip?'

In defending their position, the proponents of feminine forms in Polish stress that, in their opinion, feminine forms are hardly some comical new forms, and they are actually correct as they are created in line with the principles of word formation, and they enable women to become visible in public space. Apparently, those arguments are not sufficient. Perhaps a more frequent use of feminine

³⁸ Simona Kranjc and Martina Ožbot (2013, p. 234) have argued that the use of masculine forms in reference to men and women stopped being neutral and became marked.

names will enable people to become accustomed to them enough so that they are no longer striking to them, as per Mirosław Bańko's suggestion: "if, however, we start promoting these types of words in everyday speech, which is already happening, then we shall open the door for them to the official style."³⁹ In summary, in Slovenian feminine names of professions, titles and positions are not stylistically marked, and the problem applies not so much to word formation as to the inclusion and the spelling of those forms in documents, i.e. splitting, though the use of a single term *spol* denoting both gender and sex (Slovenian *biološki spol*) surely causes the erroneous understanding of the role played by gender (Slovenian *slovníčni spol*) in social relations. The problem of using feminine forms in Polish is not a problem of the linguistic system, but rather of the convictions and habits of native users of Polish who tend to oppose the creation and use of feminine names, especially when they consider such processes exclusively as declarations of feminist (or feminising) views or a product of political correctness. It is impossible to impose anything on language. Therefore, the best solution seems to be to leave it to language users who can alter it by frequently using forms which they wish to introduce.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ahačič K., 2018, *Janez Novak, študentka slovenščine*, "Delo" 27.05.2018 [online], <https://www.delo.si/novice/slovenija/janez-novak-studentka-slovenscine-54157.html> [01.06.2020].
- Anusiewicz J., Handke K. (eds.), 1994, *Pleć w języku i kulturze*, "Język a Kultura", vol. 9, Wrocław.
- Arabski J., Łyda A., Ziębka J. (eds.), 2013, *Gender w języku, kulturze i literaturze*, Katowice.
- Arabski J., Ziębka-Białożny J. (eds.), 2010, *Pleć języka – język płci*, Katowice.
- Bobrowski I., 2012a, *Modele gramatyczne a równość płci. Problemy rzeczywiste i pozorne*, in: M. Karwatowska, J. Szpyra-Kozłowska (eds.), *Oblicza płci. Język – Kultura – Edukacja*, Lublin, pp. 13–21.
- Bobrowski I., 2012b, *Czy Joanna Mucha gwałci język?* "Język Polski", vol. 3, pp. 227–230.
- Dąbrowska M., 2008, *Rodzaj gramatyczny a seksizm*, "Studia Linguistica Universitatis Jagellonicae Cracoviensis", col. 125, pp. 67–78.
- Derganc A., 2017, *Poimenovanja za ženske nosilke poklicev in položajev v slovenščini in ruščini*, "Jezikoslovni zapiski" 23, issue 2, pp. 125–130.
- Doleschal U., 2015, *Genderlinguistik im Slowenischen*, in: D. Scheller-Boltz (ed.), *New Approaches to Gender and Queer Research in Slavonic Studies*, Wiesbaden (Die Welt der Slaven 59), pp. 87–100.
- Eisenberg P., 2017, *Das missbrauchte Geschlecht*, "Süddeutsche Zeitung" 2.03.2017, <https://www.sueddeutsche.de/kultur/essay-das-missbrauchte-geschlecht-1.3402438> [03.06.2020].
- Grzegorzczkova R., Puzynina J., 1999, *Słowotwórstwo*, in: R. Grzegorzczkova, R. Laskowski, H. Wróbel (eds.), *Gramatyka współczesnego języka polskiego. Morfologia*, vol. 2, 3rd edition, corrected, Warszawa.
- Jadacka H., 2012, *Tytuły (naukowe, służbowe, zawodowe) kobiet*, (entry) in: A. Markowski (ed.), *Wielki słownik poprawnej polszczyzny*, Warszawa, pp. 1687–1688.

³⁹ <https://sjp.pwn.pl/poradnia/haslo/goscini;12408.html> [01.06.2020].

- Karwatowska M., Szpyra-Kozłowska J., 2010, *Lingwistyka płci. Ona i on w języku polskim*, Lublin.
- Karwatowska M., Szpyra-Kozłowska J. (eds.), 2012, *Oblicza płci. Język – Kultura – Edukacja*, Lublin.
- Kępińska A., 2006, *Kształtowanie się polskiej kategorii męsko- i niemęskoosobowości. Język wobec płci*, Warszawa.
- Kępińska A., 2007, „Pani prezydent” czy „pani prezydentka”? „Poradnik Językowy”, col. 3, pp. 79–84.
- Klemensiewicz Z., 1957, *Tytuły i nazwy zawodowe kobiet w świetle teorii i praktyki*, „Język Polski”, vol. XXXVII, col. 2, pp. 101–119.
- Kleszczowa K., 1994, *Zbiory różnorodnej a problem genyzy rodzaju męskoosobowego*, in: J. Anusiewicz, K. Handke (eds.), *Płeć w języku i kulturze*, „Język a Kultura”, vol. 9, Wrocław, pp. 75–84.
- Koniuszaniec G., Błaszczowska H., 2003, *Language and gender in Polish*, in: M. Hellinger, H. Bußmann (eds.), *Gender across languages*, vol. 3, pp. 259–285.
- Kranjc S., 2019, *Spolno občutljiva raba jezika v učnih gradivih*, „Slavistična revija” 67, issue 2, pp. 395–404.
- Kranjc S., Ožbot M., 2013, *Vloga spolno občutljivega jezika v slovenščini, angleščini in italijanščini*, in: A. Žele (ed.), *Družbena funkcijskost jezika: vidiki, merila, opredelitve* (Obdobja 32), Ljubljana, pp. 233–239.
- Kubiszyn-Mędrala Z., 2007, *Żeńskie nazwy tytułów i zawodów w słownikach współczesnego języka polskiego*, „LingVaria”, col. 1 (3), pp. 32–40.
- Kunst Gnamuš O., 1994/1995, *Razmerje med spolom, kot potezo reference in spolom kot slovnično kategorijo*, „Jezik in slovstvo” 40, issue 7, pp. 255–261.
- Lengar Verovnik T., Kalin Golob M., 2019, *Spol med družbo, jezikovno rabo in predpisom*, „Slavistična revija” 67, issue 2, pp. 385–394.
- Łaziński M., 2006, *O panach i paniach. Polskie rzeczowniki tytularne i ich asymetria rodzajowo-płciowa*, Warszawa.
- Łozowski P., 2012, *Gender jako językowa symbolizacja doświadczenia płci: płeć w języku, płeć języka czy język płci*, in: M. Karwatowska, J. Szpyra-Kozłowska (eds.), *Oblicza płci. Język – Kultura – Edukacja*, Lublin, pp. 87–94.
- Małocha-Krupa A., 2018, *Feminytywum w uwikłaniach językowo-kulturowych*, Wrocław.
- Małocha-Krupa A. (ed.), 2015, *Słownik nazw żeńskich polszczyzny*, Wrocław.
- Marvin T., 2018, *Jezik in spol*. Kvarkadabra 22.06.2018, <https://kvarkadabra.net/2018/06/jezik-in-spol/> [04.06.2020].
- Marvin T., 2019, *O predvidljivosti slovnične kategorije spola v slovenščini*, „Slavistična revija” 67, issue 2, pp. 151–158.
- Nagórko A., 2003, *Zarys gramatyki polskiej*, Warszawa.
- Nagórko A., 2011, *Podręczna gramatyka języka polskiego*, Warszawa.
- Nowosad-Bakalarczyk M., 2009, *Płeć a rodzaj gramatyczny we współczesnej polszczyźnie*, Lublin.
- Obrębska-Jabłońska A., 1949, *O żeńskich formach tytułów i nazw zawodów*, „Poradnik Językowy”, col. 4, pp. 1–4.
- Pogorelec B., 1997, *Slovenska skladnja in poimenovanja ženskih oseb*, Insert k 33. SSJLK.
- Radomski A., Truchlińska B. (eds.), 2008, *Męskość w kulturze współczesnej*, Lublin.
- Rejter A., 2013, *Płeć – język – kultura*, Katowice.
- Saloni Z., 1976, *Kategoria rodzaju we współczesnym języku polskim*, in: *Kategorie gramatyczne grup imiennych. Materiały konferencji w Zawoi, 13–15 XII 1974*, Wrocław, pp. 43–78.
- Saloni Z., Świdziński M., *Składnia współczesnego języka polskiego*, Warszawa 1989.
- Stabej M., 1997, *Seksizem kot jezikovnopolični problem*, in: A. Derganc, 33. SSJLK. *Zbornik predavanj*, Ljubljana, pp. 57–68.
- Stabej M., 2003, *Ene in drugi: slovenščina in spola*, „Delo” (07.02.2003). Sobotna priloga, p. 26.

- Stanowisko Rady Języka Polskiego przy Prezydium PAN w sprawie żeńskich form nazw zawodów i tytułów z 25 listopada 2019 r.*, http://www.rjp.pan.pl/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=1861:stanowisko-rjp-w-sprawie-zenskich-form-nazw-zawodow=-i-tytulow&catid=98&Itemid=58 [01.06.2020].
- Stanowisko Rady Języka Polskiego w sprawie żeńskich form nazw zawodów i tytułów z 19 marca 2012*, http://www.rjp.pan.pl/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=1359:stanowisko-rady-jzyka-polskiego-w-sprawie-eskich-form-nazw-zawodow-i-tytuow [01.06.2020].
- Ščuka N., 2014, *Jezik in spol: ženska poimenovanja v slovenščini*, "Jezikoslovni zapiski" 20, issue 2, pp. 79–88.
- Štumberger S., 2019, *Slovarska obravnava samostalnikov za poimenovanje oseb*, "Slavistična revija" 67, issue 2, pp. 203–211.
- Toporišič J., 1981, *K teoriji spola v slovenskem knjižnem jeziku*, "Slavistična revija" 29, issue 1, pp. 80–94.
- Toporišič J., 2000, *Slovenska slovnica*, Maribor.
- Umek N., 2008, *Feminizacija v slovenščini in francoščini: družbeni in/ali jezikovni problem?* Ljubljana: FDV, 2008.
- USJP = *Uniwersalny słownik języka polskiego*, 2008, vol. I–IV, S. Dubisz (ed.), Warszawa.
- Vičar B., Kern B., 2017, *Možnosti jezikovnega izražanja nebinarnih transspolnih identitet v slovenščini*, "Dialogi" 53, col. 11–12, pp. 223–237.
- Vičar B., Kern B., 2019, *Jezik in transspolne identitete*, "Slavistična revija" 67, issue 2, pp. 413–422.
- Vidovič Muha A., 1997, *Prvine družbene prepoznavnosti ženske prek poimenovalne tipologije njenih dejavnosti, lastnosti*, in: A. Derganc (ed.), 33. SSJLK. Zbornik predavanj, Ljubljana, pp. 69–79.
- Vidovič Muha A., 2019, *Spol – jezikovni sistem in ideologija*, "Slavistična revija" 67, issue 2, pp. 127–137.
- Walczak B., 2013, *Czy językowa nierównorzędnność płci ujawnia się w planie synchronicznym na płaszczyźnie systemu gramatycznego?* in: J. Arabski, A. Łyda, J. Ziębka (eds.), *Gender w języku, kulturze i literaturze*, Katowice, pp. 105–119.
- Wolański A., 2008, *Edycja tekstów*, Warszawa.
- Woźniak E., 2014, *Język a emancypacja, feminizm, gender*, "Rozprawy Komisji Językowej ŁTN", vol. LX, pp. 295–314.
- Woźniak E., 2020, *Pošlica, poselkini, pošlina, poselka. „Formy żeńskie to desowietyzacja języka”*, in: "Gazeta Wyborcza" ("Tygodnik Łódź"), 06.01.2020 [25.05.2020].
- WSJP = *Wielki słownik języka polskiego*, P. Żmigrodzki (ed.) [online], <https://www.wsjp.pl/index.php?pokaz=autorzy&l=6&ind=0?pw=0> [23.05.2020]
- Wtorkowska M., 2019, *O żeńskich formach nazw zawodów, tytułów i stanowisk w języku polskim*, "Slavistična revija" 67, issue 2, pp. 223–232.
- Žagar I. Ž., Milharčič Hladnik M., 1995, *Temeljna izhodišča prizadevanj za odpravo seksistične rabe jezika*, in: V. Kozmik, J. Jeram (eds.), *Neseksistična raba jezika*, Ljubljana, pp. 7–18.
- Žele A., 2019, *Spol v predikaciji*, "Slavistična revija" 67, issue 2, pp. 141–149.

Maria Wtorkowska

RODZAJ, PŁEĆ, SPOŁECZEŃSTWO – O TWORZENIU FEMINATYWÓW W JĘZYKU POLSKIM I SŁOWEŃSKIM

Słowa kluczowe: feminatywy, słowotwórstwo, rodzaj gramatyczny, płeć, język polski, język słoweński

Streszczenie. Celem artykułu jest zwrócenie uwagi na wybrane różnice w tworzeniu i używaniu nazw żeńskich, głównie nazw zawodów, tytułów i stanowisk między językiem polskim a słoweńskim. Obok tradycyjnych przedstawiono też nowsze sposoby derywowania nazw żeńskich w obu językach oraz ich wykładniki formalne. Kwestia płci wiąże się w obu językach z gramatyczną kategorią rodzaju rzeczowników osobowych, jednak w większym stopniu w polszczyźnie. W języku polskim, który *nota bene* rodzimy użytkownik polszczyzny nazwie *ojczystym* (od ojciec), gdy Słoweńiec swój język ojczysty określi jako *materinski* (od matka), mamy dodatkową opozycję nazwy mężczyzn – nazwy niemężczyzn (w tym kobiet) i przez to wyjątkową, uprzywilejowaną pozycję form męskoosobowych w stosunku do pozostałych, której nie znajdziemy w języku słoweńskim. W języku słoweńskim dotychczas neutralna forma męska odnosząca się zarówno do mężczyzn jak i kobiet, jako najkrótsza i morfologicznie najprostsza, przestała być odbierana jako nienacechowana, a w niektórych dokumentach została zastąpiona formą żeńską. Omówiono zmiany, jakie zaszły i nadal zachodzą w zakresie tworzenia i stosowania feminatywów, od ich maskulinizacji jako przejawu emancypacji kobiet poprzez chęć likwidacji asymetrii słowotwórczej tych nazw, rozpatrywanej na tle problematyki rodzajowo-płciowej w języku, do przyczyn blokady derywacji żeńskiej. Wspomniano również o sposobach neutralizacji rodzaju i zabiegu splittingu, którego zasady w obu językach nie zostały jeszcze dostatecznie ustalone.

Data wpłynięcia tekstu: 11.06.2020