

Abstract

The aim of the article is to examine differences between the speech of women and men in Hemingway's fiction and to typify the linguistic strategies representing female and male dominance or powerlessness in different social contexts.

The precise analysis of the relationships between gender and language, the linguistic strategies (i.e. tag questions and hedges) employed by female and male allowed the authors to make a claim that in E. Hemingway's fiction male use question-tags more often than female do. The research has proved that the usage of tag questions by male is coincident with theoretical claims that men use tags searching for confirmation of their viewpoint in the contest-based social situations.

In the corpus under the research, the authors found that female use hedges more often than men do. This reveals the attitude of the 20th century male writer's attitude towards female heroines, i.e. women are of lower social status and, thus, need support and acceptance of men. Gender differences in language occur because of status-conscious society, cross-cultural differences, misunderstandings of the intent of the other sex, the dominant role of male position in society, and on different linguistic strategies acquired by female and male subcultures in culture and social organization. The authors assume that while many of sociolinguists refer to characteristics of male and female speech styles by different names, they all have identified similar tendencies in terms of gender differences in language: women's use of hedges and tag questions, differences in topics of the conversation and choice of lexicon, differing message interpretation and a higher degree of women's politeness.

Keywords: Gender language differences, literary discourse analysis, E. Hemingway's fiction, linguistic strategies (hedges, question tags), dominance and powerlessness.

Introduction

The study of language and gender might seem as a narrowly focused field, but actually it is interdisciplinary. Within the discipline of linguistics, this article should be referred to as literary discourse analysis in E. Hemingway's short stories. Literary discourse analysis, in our opinion, is the most important for us as it focuses not only on sounds, words or sentences, but also aims at the analysis of connected language beyond the sentence (Tannen, 1994). Our research addresses the intersection of language and social phenomena that is referred to as a field of sociolinguistics.

Gendered language in industrial societies was not taken as a serious topic of study until the 1960s, and did not explode as a subfield in its own right until the publication of Robin Lakoff's book "Language and Woman's Place" in 1975. Lakoff's book and her article entitled "Woman's Language" have served as the basis for much research on the subject.

Theorists in gender and language research conclude that gender differences cannot be discussed simply in terms of the different linguistic

behaviour of male and female as groups (Mills, 2000). The differences must be analysed in terms of the various strategies which women and men adopt in particular circumstances and communicative acts. This article seeks to contribute not only to the language and gender literature, but also intends to be a contribution to the literature of sociolinguistic research.

The methodological considerations: 1. The theoretical and methodological assumptions of the present research derive from Lakoff's (1975, 1979, 1990) theories focusing on the concept of communicative style and the notion that misunderstandings can arise in conversation, both cross-cultural and cross-gender, because of systematic differences in communicative style. 2. The theory of Gumperz (1982) that distinguishes a new method of gender and language oriented research: "interactional sociolinguistics" which can be applied not only to the analysis of authentic conversational acts, but also to dialogue interpretations selected from literary texts. 3. The hypothesis proposed by Sapir (1931) and Whorf (1956) that language shapes the perception of reality as much as reality shapes

language, and that language constructs as well as reflects gender-oriented culture. In this research we support Sapir (1931) and Whorf (1956) approach that the sexist language questions seeming at first to represent a practical agenda, is a point of entry into broader study of women and men as speakers, writers, and bearers of meaning within society and culture.

The novelty of the research: the use of fictional dialogue for linguistic and literary discourse analysis is a relatively unusual practice for contemporary linguistics and sociolinguistics.

The hypothetical questions of the research:

1. Linguistic analysis of an extended segment of fictional discourse can shed light on how stereotypically female and male styles can operate in interaction with each other.
2. The examination of the linguistic forms employed by female and male in interactive discourse is a fruitful site for researching such dimensions as dominance and powerlessness while reflecting certain socio-cultural contexts.

The aim of the article is to examine differences between the speech of women and men in Hemingway's fiction and to typify the linguistic strategies representing female and male dominance or powerlessness in different social contexts.

In order to achieve the aim the following **objectives** have been set:

1. To present attitudes of various scholars towards gender differences in communication process.
2. To reveal how gender differences in communicative competence are represented in Hemingway's fiction.

The research methods used in the work are:

1. Theoretical literature analysis method helped to present theoretical background.
2. Contrastive method was used to identify and interpret similarities and differences across gender and language use.
3. Linguistic text analysis helped to identify and typify female and male interactional patterns in the aspect of dominance and powerlessness.
4. Literary discourse analysis served as the basis for research conclusion making.

The subject of the research: for the purpose of the research 32 examples of the conversations have been picked out from "The Complete Short Stories of Ernest Hemingway" (The Finca Vigia Edition 1998).

The relevance of the research. Different aspects of gender differences in communicative competence have been widely analyzed by many scholars such as Bischooping K. (1993), Cameron

D. (1992), Coates J. (1998), Githens S. (1991), Holmes, J. (1984, 1992, 1998), Kunsmann P. (2001), Lakoff, R. (1975), Mills, S. (2000), Tannen, D. (1990, 1993, 1994, 1995), Trudgill, P. (1972, 1978, 1983) as well as Lithuanian scholars G. Čepaitienė & D. Steigvilaitė-Urbietienė (2004), D. Masaitienė (2002) etc.

Theoretical Approaches towards Gender Language Differences

This part of the article addresses some of the research methods, trends, and findings concerning variation in language and gender. We aim to present an overview of language differences referred to women and men on gender differences in conversational discourse.

According to Lakoff (1975), the differential use of language has to be explained in large part on the basis of women's subordinate social status and the resulting social insecurity, i.e. the style of language serves to maintain women's inferior role in society.

As referred to Graddol & Joan Swann (1989), Martin (1954:58) suggested that "<...> women, it seems, are considerably more disposed than men to upgrade themselves into the middle-class and less likely to allocate themselves to the working-class <...> a finding which confirms the common observation that status consciousness is more pronounced among women". Accordingly, women were found to be closer to a prestige norm (i.e. RP: received pronunciation) than men.

As Trudgill (1972) suggests, women may be more 'status-conscious' because they are less secure and have less well developed social networks than men. Another important factor in this differential usage is that working-class speech has connotations of 'masculinity' and women often want to disassociate themselves from it, for that reason preferring types of speech which are regarded as more refined.

Tannen (1990) argued that gender differences are parallel to cross-cultural differences. She claimed that when interpreting the cultural information encoded by language, women and men rely on different subcultural norms. Male subculture uses language to build hierarchical relationships, while female subculture uses language to build equal relationships. In other words, Tannen (1990) maintained that differences in language between women and men result from a misunderstanding of the intent of the other sex, and not from the dominant position of men in society.

As pointed out by Kunsmann (2001), the

participants in a conversation use many strategies to achieve their conversational goals. One of these goals may be to dominate other participants of the speech situation. Kunsmann (2001) points out that personality differences will have to be considered as well. Individual subjects will react differently in particular situations. In addition, femaleness and maleness are not discrete categories.

According to Tannen (1995, p. 138), “Communication is not as simple as saying what you mean. How you say what you mean is crucial, and differs from one person to the next, because using language is a learned behaviour: How we talk and listen is deeply influenced by cultural experience”. Women

and men are like people who have grown up in two subcultures - they have two broad different styles of speaking showing their social status. It is generally accepted that men and women do not use and interpret language in the same way.

As it was mentioned above, Lakoff (1975) was one of the first linguists who proposed that women’s speech style is a powerless style. She introduced the term “women’s language” which implies that women and men speak different languages. In the related article, “Woman’s Language”, she published a set of basic presumptions about what marks out the language of women.

Table 1

R. Lakoff’s basic presumptions about the women’s language

Presumptions	Explanations
Hedge:	using phrases like “ <i>sort of</i> ”, “ <i>kind of</i> ”, “ <i>it seems like</i> ”, and so on.
Use (super) polite forms:	“ <i>Would you mind...</i> ”, “ <i>I’d appreciate it if...</i> ”, “ <i>...if you don’t mind</i> ”.
Use tag questions:	“ <i>You’re going to dinner, aren’t you?</i> ”
Speak in italics:	intonational emphasis equal to underlining words - <i>so</i> , <i>very</i> , <i>quite</i> .
Use empty adjectives:	<i>divine</i> , <i>lovely</i> , <i>adorable</i> , and so on.
Use hyper-correct grammar and pronunciation:	English prestige grammar and clear enunciation.
Use direct quotation:	men paraphrase more often.
Have a special lexicon:	women use more words for things like colours, men for sports.

As Lakoff (1975) claimed, the differential use of language can be explained not only on the basis of women’s subordinate social status and the resulting social insecurity, but also on the literary work author’s stereotypical attitude toward female and male and on the linguistic forms intentionally put into the speeches of conversational partners. We cannot claim that constructed dialogue represents a reality lacking elements, but rather that author created dialogues reveal an internalised model of a conversation female and male have to access to.

Use of Tag Questions and Hedges

It is generally accepted in sociolinguistic literature the men and women differ in their use of questions in conversations.

As Lakoff (1975) remarked, in certain contexts, women use question tags more often than men do. Lakoff (1975, p. 16) describes the tag question as a “<...> declarative statement without the assumption that the statement is to be believed by the addressee: one has an out, as with questions”. The tag gives the

addressee leeway, not forcing them to go along the views of the speaker. However, further research on the issue of whether men or women do use more tag questions has produced contradictory results, with some researchers finding that women use more tag questions (Case, 1988), other researchers finding that men use more tag questions (Dubois and Crouch, 1975; Lapadat and Seesahai, 1977), and others finding that there is, in fact, no difference between the sexes on how many tag questions they ask (Baumann, 1976).

It should be noted that the tag questions could also function as expressions of politeness, as hedging and boosting devices or communication facilitators. For the different functions of the tag question, Holmes (1992, p. 319) accounted that men use tag questions more often to express uncertainty while women use them largely to ease communication.

Coates and Cameron (1988) defined two functions of tags: an affective function for tags which are directed toward the addressee and signal solidarity and a modal function. In the case of the latter function tags are speaker oriented and indicate

a request for information or a confirmation of the information. According to Coates and Cameron's (1988) study, men use more modal tags while women use more affective tags.

As Lakoff (1975) noted, women tend to use intonation of a question when making a declarative statement as well as a declarative answer to a question, having the rising inflection typical of a yes-no question, as well as being especially indecisive. The effect is as though one were seeking confirmation, though at the same time the speaker may be the only one who has the requisite information.

E.g.: (A) "When will dinner be ready?" (B) "Oh., around six o'clock..?" as though (B) were saying "Six o'clock, if that's OK with you, if you agree".

As Lakoff (1975) observed, **hedges** or **disclaimers** considered a characteristic of female language mainly. Phrases like "sort of", "kind of", "It seems like" or "I could be mistaken, but ..." demonstrate the speaker's insecurity, powerlessness, and unwillingness to express her opinion or avoid making explicit statements. Furthermore, she claims, a hedge is used when the speaker is stating a claim, but lacks full confidence in the truth of that claim and therefore tries to avoid a strong statement.

Coates (1996, p. 152-173) names several words and phrases, such as "I mean", "you know", "sort of", "maybe", "may" and "might" which can act as hedging devices.

Holmes includes pauses and hesitations like ...*ehm*... and ... *eh* ... in the category of hedges since they "<...> can be used to express a speaker's reluctance to impose" (Holmes 1995, p. 75). Other differences in the use of hedging devices between men and women found by Holmes involved the use of the lexical items "you know", "I think" and "sort of". As Holmes (1995) claimed, women tend to use the solidarity marker "you know" (which is used most often between people who know each other well as it emphasises shared knowledge) as an addressee oriented positive politeness device when it protects the speaker's positive face needs. Whereas, men use "you know" more in its referential meaning when it refers to presuppose sharing knowledge or acts as a hedge on the validity of a supposition.

In conclusion, both men and women use the tag questions. Women use more affective tags while men prefer modal ones. Women use hedges to express powerlessness, uncertainty or insecurity, and unwillingness to express her opinion or avoid making explicit statements. Whereas, male speakers use hedging devices most frequently for very

concrete functions. They usually want to keep the floor for them, to strengthen the uttered propositions and to lead the discussion.

However, it should be added that gender differences in the frequency of usage of tag questions depend on the content of the conversation, the situational contexts, and the roles of participants.

Therefore, in the following section, our analysis will be focused on the gender differences of the topic of conversation and choice of vocabulary.

Representation of gender differences in language used in fiction

Methodology of the research

In this part of the paper, we will provide the discourse and linguistic analysis of women's and men's use of language as represented in fiction with the focus on dialogues in Hemingway's short stories. Theoretical framework behind the research work is the sociolinguistic theory of different approach to gender differences in communicative competence. According to Tannen (1994) the question of artistic verisimilitude or the relationship between the representations of reality is one of the most intriguing issues in the theory of communicative competence. For a long time linguists were isolated from this area of philosophical speculation because it seemed irrelevant to the previous interests of research methodology. Tannen (1994) claims that "constructed dialogue represents a reality lacking in transcripts, but rather that artificial dialogue may represent an internalized schema for the production of conversation. If, then, we are interested in discovering the ideal model of conversational strategy, there is much to be gained by looking at artificial conversation first, to see what these general assumptions are". Literary data in this research will help us to identify a different level of validity of represented reality.

The corpus analysed has been restricted to the following short stories:

(I) "The Short Happy Life of Francis Macomber" by Ernest Hemingway (referred to as H: I, in the examples provided);

(II) "The Snows of Kilimanjaro" by Ernest Hemingway (referred to as H: II, in the examples provided);

(III) "Hills like White Elephants" by Ernest Hemingway (referred to as H: III in the examples provided);

(IV) "The Killers" by Ernest Hemingway (referred to as H: IV in the examples provided);

(V) "The Doctor and his Wife" (referred to as H: V in the examples provided);

The above stories were chosen for the study as they contain a considerable amount of spoken language patterns in the form of dialogue with both men and women participating in the conversation. E. Hemingway's short stories were chosen for the following reasons: 1) many critics have accused E. Hemingway of being antagonistic toward women and knowing nothing about them; 2) the heroines of his short stories are submissive or/and manipulative, and seldom are revealed as realistic characters; 3) yet, in his personal life E. Hemingway always admired bold, resourceful, imaginative women who cared deeply for him and in most instances dedicated themselves to creating the kind of environment he needed and demanded. Thus, E. Hemingway's fiction and the study of women's conversational discourse in his short stories deserve a more precise examination.

Our study will be based on the theory of communicative competence (Tannen, 1994), linguistic presumptions on women's language (Lakoff, 1975), and on linguistic text analysis. Due to the limitations of the paper, we will give an account only of some differences in language use by women and men, including the usage of tag questions and hedges.

We will outline the representation of gender differences in fiction, drawing on the examples from dialogues in Hemingway's short stories. We suggest that gender differences should be reflected in fiction as fiction writers aim to represent the existing reality to make the piece of writing realistic and believable while depicting female and male. The writers in fiction use speech characteristics that people most often associate with either women or men to convey character or to reveal specific socio-cultural context.

Empirical findings

As it has been mentioned above, the study of literature in the field of language-gender differences has suggested that women use tag questions and hedges as conversational strategies. In the corpus, we found quite a number of examples illustrating these strategies:

(1) Woman: "They're the big cowy things that jump like hares, aren't they?"

Man: "I suppose that describes them."

Man: "It's very good meat."

Woman: "Did you shoot it, Francis?"

Woman: "They are not dangerous, are they?" (H: I; p.9)

(2) Woman: "You are not afraid, are you?"

Man: "Of course not." <...>. (H: I; p. 12)

(3) Woman (to a man): "You don't have to destroy me. Do you?" <...> "You wouldn't want to destroy me again, would you?" (H: II; p. 47)

(4) Woman: "You didn't say anything to Boulton to anger him, did you?"

Man: "No," <...>. (H: V; p. 75)

(5) Man: "How do you mean?"

Woman: "Because she must have loved you," <...>. "Candidly, now, didn't she?" (H: I; p. 16)

(6) Woman (to a man): "I saw in the paper a few days ago," <...>, "that there had been several local appointments to the Railway Mail. You passed first, didn't you?" (H: I; p. 26)

The interpretation of the above-mentioned examples allows us to make claim that the female speakers feel anxiety and hesitation in different social situations. They feel powerless and need men's support. Male speakers are presented as a contrast: their statements are abrupt, confident, and dominant.

The corpus also provided numerous examples of tag questions produced by men, which serve as a perfect evidence to the study by Holmes (1992) claiming that men produce more tag questions than women do:

(7) Man: "He comes here to eat every night, don't he?"

Man: "Sometimes he comes here."

Man: "He comes here at six o'clock, don't he?" (H: IV; p. 18)

(8) Man: "How much would that be?"

Man: "Lemme see. Six per cent – six times seven – four hundred an'twenty."

Man: "That would be thirty-five dollars a month, wouldn't it?" (H: I; p. 22)

(9) Man (to a man): "It's a beauty, ain't it?" <...> "I didn't know I was talkin' out loud." (H: I; p. 26)

The above examples should be analyzed with reference to the modal function of tag questions, which shows that the tags are speaker-oriented and show a request for additional information or a confirmation of the information.

The following examples explain the usage of tag questions by male characters as an inducement.

(10) Man (to a woman) : <...>. "Or you can shoot me. You're a good shot now. I taught you to shoot didn't I?" (H: II; p. 39)

(11) Man: "You're a pretty bright boy, aren't you?"

Man: "Sure."

Man: "Well, you're not. Is he, Al?" (H: IV; p. 16)

The following examples illustrate the usage of tag questions by male speakers to express uncertainty, but the social context in which male express hesitation is presented in socially advantaged or hazardous situations, like hunting, fishing, drinking.

(12) Man: "*Maybe I can fix it up on buffalo, <...>.*" "*We're after them next, aren't we?*"

Man: "*In the morning if you like.*" (H: I; p. 8)

(13) Man: "*Here's the lunch,*" <...> "*You're very merry, aren't you?*"

Woman: "*Why not? I didn't come out here to be dull and sober*" (H: I; p. 9)

(14) Man (to a woman): "*He is good lion, isn't he?*" (H: I; p. 10)

(15) Man (to a woman): "*You don't think I'm playin' the fool, do you?*" he demanded abruptly. (H: I; p. 53)

Summarising we assume that men in E. Hemingway's fiction use tag questions more often asking for information, confirmation and sometimes to express hesitation, while women use them largely to ease communication, to show that they agree with men's opinion in avoidance of conflict, admitting male dominance in different socio-cultural contexts. Thus, the hypothesis that linguistic analysis of an extended segment of fictional discourse can shed light on how stereotypically female and male styles can operate in interaction with each other was grounded.

Hedges are typically ascribed to female and are interpreted as indications of the speaker's unwillingness to make a strong statement and to express personal views.

(16) Man: "*Where did we stay in Paris?*"

Woman: "*At the Crillon, I believe. You know that. <...> "You said you loved it there."*

(H: II; p. 43)

(17) Man: "*And you? When did you first know?*"

Woman: "*Oh, I knew it all the time, almost, from the first.*"

Man: "*And I have been as blind as a bat!*" <...> "*I never dreamed it until just how, when I--when I kissed you.*"

Woman: "*I didn't mean that. <...> "I meant I knew you loved almost from the first."*

(H: I; p. 25)

(18) Woman: "*What has happened?*"

Woman "*You know?*"

Woman: "*In the name of goodness, child, what are you babbling about?*" <> "*I don't think I know what happened, after all. What did happen?*" (H: I; p. 19)

The examples above support Lakoff's (1975) observations, that hedges or declaimers demonstrate female's insecurity, unwillingness to express her opinion or avoid explicit statements as well as provide a perfect illustration for Holmes's (1995) theoretical claims that lexical items like "you know" serve as female's solidarity or powerlessness markers which are used between well known persons and emphasise the addressee-oriented politeness.

The following examples illustrate the usage of hedges by a female to express her personal views. The usage of lexical items like: "you know", "shouldn't", "actually think" support Holmes's (1995) assumption that the conversational partners know each other well and lay emphasis on general truths or commonly shared beliefs. In the instances below the hedges signal modal function of request and employ the function of certainty.

(19) Man: "*What about a drink*"

Woman: "*It's supposed to be bad for you. It said in Black's to avoid all alcohol. You shouldn't drink.*"

Woman (to a man): "*You shouldn't, <...>. It says it's bad for you. I know it's bad for you.*" (H: II; p. 40)

(20) Woman (to a man): "*You know, it is really not for my sake, Martin, but for your own.*" (H: I; p. 14)

(21) Woman (to a man): "*I actually think you are jealous*" (H: I; p. 26)

(22) Woman (to a man): "*You smoke more than enough as it is, and the brand of tobacco will make no difference. It is the smoking itself that is not nice, no matter what the brand may be. You are a chimney, a living volcano, a perambulating smoke-stack, and you are a perfect disgrace, Martin dear, you know you are.*" (H: I; p. 33)

(23) Woman (to a woman): "*Have you thought about him? He is so ineligible in every way, you know, and suppose he should come to love you?*" (H: I; p. 24)

As Holmes (1986) claimed, men use '**you know**' more in its referential meaning when it refers to presuppose sharing knowledge or acts as a hedge on the validity of a supposition.

(24) Man: "*I'm walking- exercise, **you know.***" (H: I; p. 36)

(25) Man (to a man): "*Makin' dates outside, eh?*" <...> "*You know what that means. You'll bein' the police court yet.*" (H: I; p. 30)

(26) Man (to a man): "*This is too much all at once for yours truly. Give me a chance to get my nerve. You know I didn't want to come, an' I guess your fam'ly ain't hankerin' to see me neither.*" (H: I; p.7)

According to Coates (1996), phrases like ‘I mean’, ‘I think’, ‘I assume’, ‘I guess’, ‘sort of’, ‘kind of’, and adverbials such as ‘maybe’, ‘probably’, ‘relatively’, ‘generally’, ‘really’ act as hedging devices are more commonly exploited by female. They express uncertainty, insecurity and willingness to ease communication as well as to admit the male’s dominance.

(27) Man: “When is he goin’ to sea again?”

Woman: “When his pay-day’s spent, **I guess**,” she answered. (H: I; p. 30)

(28) Woman: “And then, **maybe**, he’ll invite me to dinner again.” (H: I; p. 12)

(29) Woman: “That’s far-fetched, **I am afraid**.” (H: I; p. 19)

The following examples illustrate the usage of hedges by both men and women to express confidence through explicit and confident statements.

(30) Man: “It’s **really** an awfully simple operation, Jig,” the man said. “It’s not **really** an operation at all.” (H: III; p. 22)

(31) Woman: “Dear, I don’t think, I **really** don’t think that anyone would **really** do a thing like that.”

Man: “No?”

(32) Woman: “No. I can’t **really** believe that anyone would do a thing of that sort intentionally.” (H: V; p. 45)

In summary, women’s speech is often described as ‘tentative’ and this assertion is linked to the claim of Lakoff (1975) that women use more hedges.

E. Hemingway employs linguistic strategies of tag questions and hedges assuming that the statements made by female give leeway to the male addressees not forcing them to follow the views of the female speakers. Only six instances from the corpus of research ascribe the qualities of decisiveness and formal request. The rest of the accumulated corpus, in the name of E. Hemingway, worship masculinity depicting male as searchers for information, seekers for dominance and controllers of the conversation. The heroines of E. Hemingway’s short stories remain amorphous, polite, insecure, powerless and representing accommodative conversational manner.

Conclusions

- The hypothesis that linguistic analysis of an extended segment of fictional discourse can shed light on how stereotypically female and male styles can operate in interaction with each other has proved itself. The question whether gender or status and power is the motivating force for conversational behaviour has been resolved in

favour of status and power in literature. Our study has proved that in mixed talks men tend to be stereotypically dominant over women.

- The examination of the linguistic forms employed by female and male in interactive discourse was a fruitful site for researching such dimensions as dominance and powerlessness while reflecting socio-cultural contexts in which the heroes of E. Hemingway’s short stories act. E. Hemingway employs linguistic strategies of tag questions and hedges assuming that the statements made by female give leeway to the male addressees not forcing them to follow the views of the female speakers. Only six instances from the corpus of the research ascribe the qualities of decisiveness and formal request to female. The rest of the accumulated corpus, in the name of E. Hemingway, worship masculinity depicting male as searchers or seekers for information, and controllers of the conversation. The heroines of E. Hemingway’s short stories remain amorphous, polite, insecure, powerless and representing accommodative conversational manner.
- The research has shown that male use tag questions approximately more often than female do. The research has shown that the usage of tag questions by male is coincident with sociolinguistic theories which claim that men use tags searching for confirmation of their viewpoint contest-based social situations like fishing, hunting, and sport.
- In the corpus under the investigation, we found that female use hedges more often than men do. This reveals the attitude of the 20th century male writer’s attitude towards female heroines, i.e. women are of lower social status and, thus, need support and acceptance of men.
- Gender differences in language occur because of status-conscious society, cross-cultural differences, misunderstandings of the intent of the other sex, dominant role of men position in society, and on different linguistic strategies acquired by female and male subcultures in culture and social organization. E. Hemingway’s fiction serves as a perfect example of artificially created conversational acts between female and male that reflect socio-cultural context of the 20th century American society where men’s dominance and female’s powerlessness are stereotypically common.

References

1. Baumann, M. (1976). “Two features of ‘women’s speech’?” in Dubois, B.L. & Crouch, I. (Eds). *The*

- Sociology of Languages of American Women*. Trinity University, San Antonio, TX.
2. Bischooping K. (1993). "Gender Differences in Conversation Topics, 1922–1990". *Sex roles: a Journal of Research*, Jan, 1993.
 3. Cameron, D. (1992). *Feminism and Linguistic Theory*. 2nd Ed. London: Macmillan.
 4. Case, S. S. (1988). "Cultural differences, not deficiencies: an analysis of managerial women's language", in Larwood, L. & Rose, S. (Eds), *Women's Careers: Pathways and Pitfalls*. New York, NY Praeger.
 5. Coates, J. & Cameron, D. eds. (1988). *Women in Their Speech Communities: New Perspectives on Language and Sex*. London: Longman.
 6. Coates, J. (ed). (1998). *Language and Gender: A Reader*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
 7. Čepaitienė G. & Steigvilaitė-Urbietienė D. (2004). Communication of Women and Men on the Phone. *Socialiniai mokslai*. Kaunas: Technologija. 1 (43), p. 101–105.
 8. Dubois, B.L. & Crouch, I. (1975). "The question of tag Questions in women's speech: they don't really use more of them, do they?". *Language in Society*, No.4, p. 289–294.
 9. Githens S. (1991). "Men and Women in Conversation: An Analysis of Gender Styles in Language". Available from: <http://www9.georgetown.edu> [Accessed 20, March 2011].
 10. Graddol, D., & Swann, J. (1989). *Gender voices*. Great Britain. The Camelot Press Ltd., Southampton.
 11. Holmes, J. (1984). "Women's Language: A Functional Approach". *General Linguistics* 24/3, p. 149–178.
 12. Holmes, J. (1992). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. London: Longman.
 13. Holmes, J. (1995). *Women, Men and Politeness*. London: Longman.
 14. Holmes, J. (1998). Women's Talk: The Question of Sociolinguistic Universals. In: Coates, Jennifer (ed.). *Language and Gender: A Reader*. Oxford: 461–464.
 15. Human sex differences. (2010). The Psychology Wikia. Retrieved March 15, 2011 from: http://psychology.wikia.com/wiki/Human_sex_differences#
 16. Kunsman P. (2001). "Gender, Status and Power in Discourse Behavior of Men and Women". *Linguistic online* 5, 1/00. Available from: http://www.linguistik-online.com/1_00/KUNSMANN.HTM [Accessed 20, March 2011].
 17. Labov, W. (1966). *The social stratification of English in New York City*. Washington DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.
 18. Lakoff, R. (1975). *Language and Woman's Place*. New York: Harper & Row.
 19. Lapadat, J., Seesahai, M. (1977). "Male versus female codes in informal contexts". *Sociolinguistics Newsletter*, No. 8, p. 7–8.
 20. Masaitienė, D., (2002). Analysing Casual Conversation. *Respectus Philologicus*. 1(6), p. 127–132.
 21. Maltz, D. & Borker R. (1998). "A Cultural Approach to Male-Female Miscommunication". In: Coates, Jennifer (ed.): *Language and Gender: A Reader*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd., p. 417–435.
 22. Mills, S. (2000). *Rethinking Politeness, Impoliteness and Gender Identity*.
 23. Paulston, C.B. & Tucker G.R., (2003). *Sociolinguistics – the Essential Readings*. UK: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
 24. Sapir, E. (1931). Abstract of "Conceptual Categories in Primitive Languages". *Science* 74, p.578.
 25. Speer S.A. (2005). *Gender Talk: Feminism, Discourse and Conversation Analysis*. USA and Canada: Routledge.
 26. Sociolinguistics. (2010). Retrieved March 18, 2011 from: <http://www.search.com/reference/Sociolinguistics>.
 27. Tannen, D. (1990). *You Just Don't Understand: Women and Men in Conversation*. New York: William Morrow and Co.
 28. Tannen, D. (1993). *Gender and Conversational Interaction*. New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press.
 29. Tannen, D. (1994). *Gender and Discourse*. London: Virago.
 30. Tannen, D. (1995). "The Power of Talk: Who Gets Heard and Why". *Harvard Business Review*, September, v. 73, no 5, p. 138–148.
 31. Trudgill, P. (1972). Sex, Covert Prestige and Linguistic Change in the Urban British English of East Anglia. *Language in Society* 1, p. 179–195.
 32. Trudgill, P. (1978). *Sociolinguistic Patterns in British English*. London: Edward Arnold.
 33. Trudgill, P. (1983). *Sociolinguistics. An Introduction to Language and Society*. Harmondsworth: Penguin, p. 41–42.
 34. Whorf, B.L. (1956). *Language, Thought, and Reality*. Cambridge: MIT.

Sources

1. *The Complete Short Stories of Ernest Hemingway*. (1998). The Finca Vigía Edition. USA: Simon Schuster Inc.

LYČIŲ SKIRTUMŲ RAIŠKA E. HEMINGWAY'AUS MENINIUOSE TEKSTUOSE

Reda Baranauskienė, Vilija Adminienė

Santrauka

Iš pirmo žvilgsnio lyties ir kalbos ryšys gali pasirodyti esąs ribotas tyrimo objektas, tačiau tai tarpdisciplininis sociologijos, edukologijos, antropologijos, psichologijos, literatūros ir lyties studijų tyrimo objektas. Lyties ir kalbos santykis lingvistikoje, pasak Tannen (1994), glaudžiai siejasi su diskurso analize. Daugelyje šiuolaikinių lingvistinių tyrinėjimų persipina su fonetikos, fonologijos, leksikos, morfologijos, sintaksės analize. Diskurso analizė apima daug platesnį tyrimo lauką – „diskurso kontekstą“, kuris yra ne tik lingvistikos, bet ir sociolingvistikos tyrimo objektas.

Straipsnio tikslas – ištirti vyrų ir moterų kalbos skirtumus Ernesto Hemingway'aus meniniuose tekstuose bei suklasifikuoti lingvistines strategijas, reprezentuojančias moterų ir vyrų dominavimo arba bejėgiškumo apraiškas socialiniuose kontekstuose:

- Teorinės ir metodologinės straipsnio nuostatos yra grindžiamos Lakoff (1975) ir Gumperz (1982) teoriniais tyrinėjimais, nagrinėjusiais komunikacinių kalbos stilių konceptus, teigiančius, kad nesusikalbėjimą tarp individų gali sukelti tarpkultūriniai ir lyties skirtumai.
- Remimasi lingvistų Sapir (1930) ir Whorf (1956) nuostata, kad kalba tiek keičia realybės sampratą, kiek realybė keičia kalbą.

Straipsnio autorės kelia tokius hipotetinius klausimus:

1. Lingvistinė analizė, kaip išplėstinė literatūrinio diskurso segmento dalis, gali nušviesti stereotipiškus moterų ir vyrų kalbos stilius dialoguose.
2. Lingvistinių formų, būdingų moterims ir vyrams interaktyviame diskurse, tyrimas gali puikiai pasitarnauti tiriant dominavimo ir bejėgiškumo įvairiuose sociokultūrinuose kontekstuose apraiškas.

Lyties ir kalbos moksliniai tyrimai įrodė, kad lyties skirtumų negalima nagrinėti remiantis vien tik lingvistiniais moterų ir vyrų kalbėsenos skirtumais. Šie skirtumai turėtų būti analizuojami įvairių lingvistinių strategijų kontekste. Straipsnyje išryškunami lyčių kalbos skirtumai XX amžiaus Hemingway'aus meniniuose tekstuose. Pasak Lakoffo (Lakoff, 1975), skirtingą kalbos vartoseną galima paaiškinti tuo, kad moteris visuomenėje atlieka antraeilį vaidmenį, todėl jaučia socialinį nesaugumą. Daugelio autorių kūrinuose ir dirbtinai sukurtose interaktyvaus bendravimo situacijose, moterų kalba nusizeminanachiai ir nuolankiai.

Tai įrodo, kad moterims yra labai svarbus jų statusas visuomenėje ir prestižinės kalbos normų laikymasis, t.y. moterų kalba taisyklingiau ir mandagiau. Pasak Kunsmanno (Kunsmann, 2001), lyčių kalbos diferenciaciją daugiau lemia kultūriniai, o ne socialiniai ar socializacijos veiksniai. Šiai koncepcijai pritaria Trudgillas (Trudgill, 1972), kuris teigia, kad moterų yra labai jautrios visuomeninei nuomonei, nes jaučiasi mažiau saugios ir turi menkiau išplėtotus socialinius, visuomeninius ryšius. Jos taip pat stengiasi priklausyti aukštesnei socialinei klasei per kalbą. Nerafinuotas, grubus kalbos stilius moterims asocijuojasi su vyriškumu.

Tannen (1990) lyčių kalbos skirtumus grindžia bendrakultūriniais skirtumais. Ji teigia, kad interpretuojant kultūrinę informaciją, užkoduotą kalboje, moterų ir vyrai reprezentuoja skirtingas subkultūrinės grupes. Vyriškoji subkultūra vartoja kalbą, grindžiamą hierarchiniais ryšiais, kai tuo tarpu moteriškoji subkultūra pasižymi tokia kalba, kuri grindžiama lygiateisiais santykiais. Ši autorė laikosi požiūrio, kad skirtumai tarp moterų ir vyrų kalbos kyla dėl nesusipratimų tarp dviejų skirtingų lyčių, o ne dėl dominuojančios vyrų padėties visuomenėje. Tannen (1995) taip pat teigia, kad komunikacija nėra vien tik pasakymas to, ką manai. Kaip tu tai pasakai, yra daug svarbiau. Kiekvienas individas vartoja skirtingą kalbą ir turi skirtingą kalbėjimo manierą. Visa tai, ką mes kalbame ir kaip mes išklausome kitų, itin priklauso nuo individo kultūrinės patirties. Moterų ir vyrai, užaugę skirtingose subkultūrose, turi du visiškai skirtingus kalbėjimo stilius, charakterizuojančius jų socialinį statusą.

Visi teoretikai vieningai pripažįsta, kad moterų ir vyrai vartoja ir interpretuoja kalbą skirtingai. Lakoffas (Lakoff, 1975) buvo pirmasis lingvistas, pavadinęs moterų kalbos stilių nevaldingu stiliumi. Pasak autoriaus, moterų kalbai būdingos tokios nuostatos: 1) išsisukinėjimas arba vengimas tiesiai atsakyti, pvz., *kaip ir, lyg ir, panašu į tai* ir t. t.; 2) itin mandagios formos, pvz.: *Ar neprieštarautumėte?; Būčiau labai dėkinga, jei...* ir t. t.; 3) klausiamojo sakinio priduriamosios dalys, pvz.: *Mes šiandien einame vakarienai, ar ne?;* 4) itin taisyklinga gramatika ir tarimas, pvz., norminė anglų kalbos gramatika ir BBC¹ tartis; 5) tiesioginis citavimas (moteris tiksliai cituoja autorius, o vyrai yra linkę perfrazuoti); 6) specifinė leksika, pvz., moterų vartoja daug būdvardžių, susijusių su spalvomis, o vyrai daugžodžiauja apie sportą; 7) imperatyvai klausimo forma, pvz.: *Kodėl neuždarei durų?;* o ne *Uždaryk duris;* 8) daug atsiprašymo formų, pvz.: *Atleiskite, bet aš manau kitaip;* 9) gausus apibrėžiamųjų žodžių vartojimas, pvz.: *Aš manau, kad...*

Šiame straipsnyje tirti moterų ir vyrų kalbos skirtumai Hemingway'aus apsakymų dialoguose. Tyrimo metu naudoti diskurso ir lingvistinį teksto analizės metodai. Svarbiausias buvo sutelktas dėmesys į klausiamojo sakinio priduriamąsias dalis bei išsisukinėjimą arba vengimą tiesiai atsakyti.

¹ BBC – Didžiosios Britanijos nacionalinis transliuotojas (angl. *British Broadcasting Centre*)

Kita lingvistinė strategija – išsisukinėjimas arba vengimas tiesiai atsakyti – Hemingway'aus apsakymuose yra labiau priskirtina moterų kalbai. Ši strategija indikuoja moterų nenorą kalbėti kategoriškai arba išreikšti savo nuomonę, pvz.: *Aš nemanau, kad aš žinau, kas ten atsitiko* arba *Aš to neturėjau galvoje*. Vyrų vartoja išsisukinėjimo strategiją išreikšdami pasitikėjimą savimi ir dažniausia vartodami žodį *tikrai*, pvz.: *Tai tikrai siaubingai paprasta operacija*.

Tyrimo metu paaiškėjo, kad vyrai vartoja klausiamojo sakinio priduriamąsias dalis dažniau nei moterys. Holmes (1995) teorija patvirtina, kad vyrai šią strategiją vartoja dažniau todėl, kad jų pokalbių turinys yra susijęs su medžiokle, žvejyba, sportu, pasisėdijimais baruose, o tokiose socialinio bedravimo situacijose vyrams būdingas noras gauti papildomos informacijos arba įsitikinti, kad jie yra teisūs, pvz. vyras sako moteriai: <...> *Tu gali mane nušauti. Dabar esi gera šaulė. Aš išmokiau tave šaudyti, ar ne?* (H: E; II, p. 39) arba, pvz., vyras sako moteriai: *Norėčiau išgerti*. Moteris atsako vyrui: *Tai turėtų būti tau ne į naudą. Sako, reikia vengti bet kokio alkoholio. Tau nereikėtų gerti*. Šie pavyzdžiai iliustruoja, kad vyrai yra įsitikinę tuo, ką daro, todėl vartoja klausiamojo sakinio priduriamąsias dalis arba kategoriškus teiginius. Tuo tarpu moterys labai mandagiai išreiškia savo asmeninę nuomonę, vengia imperatyvinių konstrukcijų. Tyrimas parodė, kad moterys dažniau vartoja išsisukinėjimo strategiją negu vyrai, pvz.: (1) moteris: *Kas atsitiko?*, (2) moteris: *O ar tu žinai?*, (1) moteris: *Dėl Dievo, vaike, apie ką tu čias burbulioji?* <...> *Aš nemanau, kad žinau, kas atsitiko. O kas atsitiko?* (H: I p. 59).

Pagal Tannen (1993) teoriją, moterys dažniau kalba apie bendruomenės reikalus, privačias gyvenimo situacijas, todėl jų kalboje vyrauja lingvistinio mandagumo, besiribojančio su nuolankumu ir netgi amorfiškumu, tendencijos. Galima daryti išvadą, kad Hemingway'aus apsakymuose vyrų verbalinė komunikacija yra agresyvesnė ir dominuojanti, o moterų įvaizdžiai kalbos dėka išlieka stereotipiškai mandagūs, nuolankūs, jos retai reiškia savo nuomonę.

Apibendrinant galima teigti, kad lyčių kalbos skirtumai atsiranda iš socialinį statusą orientuotuose visuomenėse. Tarpkultūriniai skirtumai, priešingos lyties intencijų suvokimo stoka, dominuojantis vyrų vaidmuo visuomenėje lemia skirtingas lingvistines strategijas kurios būdingas moterų ir vyrų subkultūroms, reprezentuojančioms skirtingas socialines organizacijas ir kultūras.

Pagrindiniai žodžiai: lyčių kalbos skirtumai, diskurso ir lingvistinė teksto analizė, E. Hemingway'us, lingvistinės strategijos (klausiamojo sakinio priduriamosios dalys, išsisukinėjimas arba vengimas atsakyti tiesiai), vyrų dominavimas.