The Universal and the Language-Specific in the Construction of Gender
- A Comparative Semiotic Study -

Abdurrahman GÜLBEYAZ

Abstract

My paper intends to touch upon two different levels of the same subset of social phenomena. On the one hand it tries to diachronically trace back the emergence of 'sex' and 'gender' to the very inception of what came to be called 'human civilisation', and on the other hand - though rather perfunctorily - it synchronically lays bare the nature, structure and major shades of the institution 'gender' in the present-day Turkish language and compares and contrasts these findings with the corresponding data resulting from sociological and sociolinguistic research of western provenance.

In the first half of the paper a sketch of 'humanness' and 'human civilisation' in connection with and on the basis of 'manhood' and 'womanhood' is made, wherewith it is demonstrated that the civilisation of men and women is in the main founded on a phallic, phallocentric dichotomy which underlies the rise and perpetuation of the institutions 'man' and 'woman' and wherein the parameter 'phallus' operates self-referentially. This line of reasoning reveals furthermore that the supremacy of the phallus materialises not until the 'woman' is constructed, that, in other words, both the 'man' and his 'dominance' are existentially dependent on the construction and reconstruction of 'woman'. To a certain extent the first half is a draft of what could be called "a general semiotics of 'gender' embedded in a reconstructed universal history of 'human civilisation'".

The second half could then - in connection with and in contrast to the first half - be named "a comparative local semiotics of 'gender' in the vernacular of modern-day Turkey". In this section the linguistic manifestations of the basic phallic dichotomy and its sub-types peculiar to the modern Turkish language are thrown light upon and compared with corresponding linguistic phenomena in European languages.

Keywords: Gender, Sex, Linguistic Gender, Semiotics, History of Humanity

Gender and the Human Condition

I will firstly attempt to place the institution of gender into a context which I believe to be the only appropriate context for the discussion and comprehension of the fundamental organising principles of social life in humanoid societies. Due to the given

unavoidable physical restrictions I will formulate my line of argument in a somewhat sketchy manner in relatively loose chunks of reasoning.

The sociological and sociolinguistic basics concerning the notion gender will be assumed as given. That is, I shall not talk about the way gender like language, economy, religion, family etc. forms and configures the daily life of the members of humanoid societies and how it, while doing this, flows through, imbues and impregnates the above-mentioned major social institutions. However, I will, albeit very briefly, try to refer to the differential features of the institution of gender, as I understand it. Right from the outset I want to draw attention to the fact that a discourse on gender involves, regardless of the respective particular intention or objective, at least three constitutive facets - each of which splits further into at least two sub-layers, the one being the diachronic and the other synchronic.

The first facet is the fact that the notion gender was fabricated as one of the latest, if not currently the latest, member of a small set of intricately related concepts, all of which historically emerged and developed in emerging capitalist Western 'nations' that became the rulers of the globe during a period of time between the 16th and 20th centuries. In his *The Age of Capital 1848-1875* Eric Hobsbawm emphasises in this connection, above all, the second half of the 19th century, when the process of industrialisation reached a qualitatively new level, on which the underground foundations of the modern global power-structure were once and for all laid[1].

The massive socio-political restructuring which laid the substratum of the said "modern global power structure" was triggered off by a series of interconnected economic, technologic, military, demographic, linguistic, educational, ideological, religious etc. transformations, which for their part had been set in motion by the extensive contact of the Europeans with the societies in the Near East and with their arabophone - or, more precisely, Arabic-writing - scholars, philosophers and scientists during 12th, 13th and 14th centuries. In order to anticipatorily counteract potential misunderstandings, I would, at this point, like to expressly emphasise that these transformations, however dramatic and far-reaching they might have been, did not amount to a qualitative revolutionary change - which would have led to the thorough abolition of social and political power structures or at least a radical redistribution of economic and political power - but were nothing more than tributary processes of an intrasystemic adaptive reorientation resp. reconfiguration process. For at the end of the day, the new rulers were, once more, the same old rulers or their descendants, and the new underlings were

again the same old underlings or their offspring. The noble landowner became factory owner and the knight, the hired soldier of the former, became general in the modern army. Cathedrals have been transformed into academic cathedras[2] and the cleric became professor. The serf became proletarian and the artisan foreman.

Even so, this intrasystemic reconfiguration, the rejuvenatory self-adjustment of the decrepit system in response to the overwhelming surge of multifarious changes, had to develop and deliver - as is the rule with any restructuring of the existing power constellation since the spirit of God got bored of hovering all alone upon the face of the waters - the fundamental language elements[3] for the constitution of its self-legitimatory mode of meaning generation, or, in other words, for the construction of a programming language capable of reprogramming the Zeitgeist[4]. This reprogramming, an exhaustive reinterpretation/rereading of natural and social phenomena, necessitated qualitatively new and powerful tools. Along an intricate process which could be described in the light of a set of keywords such as mercantilisation, rationalisation, industrialisation, marketisation, nationalisation, unification, homogenisation, uniformisation and monolingualisation, a small set of ground-breaking inventions and ingenious creations, the modern subject, individual, identity, race, ethnicity, nation and the culture, constituted a vigorous and secure fundament for the said task of reinterpretation. Since every single one of these inventions proved to be a powerful generator of a multitude of further secondary productions they constituted, so to speak, the heavy industry of immaterial production and reproduction of modern societies[5].

The second facet involved in any conceivable discourse on gender is the already mentioned sociological and - in connection with it - psychological component. The notion gender came into general social-scientific usage in the knowledge production sector of highly developed western societies in the late 20th century, mainly as a result of the women's liberation movement on the one hand and feminist social-scientific production on the other. There is a unanimous consensus among researchers that the concept of gender is a product of the so-called second-wave feminism[6]. It has since then been a mighty pivotal concept by means of which the entire history of human civilisation has been repeatedly reread and reprocessed. In a relatively short period of time gender has developed into a conceptual tool which has meanwhile almost the exclusive say in probably the oldest and most elemental regulatory principle of humanoid societies[7].

The third facet is the linguistic/sociolinguistic facet of gender. The relation of gender and language is a bifacial relation. Gender belongs on the one hand to those

abstract categories which govern the basic syntactic behaviour of the classes of the lexis of a given natural language such as case, number, tense, mood, etc. and on the other hand it refers to the production and reproduction of the two basic, primordial social institutions of the human society: man and woman. The first-mentioned face of gender which has so far been dealt with within the framework of traditional linguistic theory on the basis of the dichotomy of grammatical gender and natural gender must be regarded and dealt with as a language-specific phenomenon whereas the second face stands evidently for one of the pivotal universals of human civilisation.

Apropos of the network of concepts of which the youngest offshoot is the notion of gender I would self-referentially and self-critically like to allude to the fact that the concepts at issue here are all artefacts of professional social scientific activity in the modern western societies wherefrom they were preached and disseminated to the rest of the globe. The scientific activity which, to put it in a few words, springs from the separation of social production and linguistic processing or reprocessing of the same, manifests itself at first sight in the form of a quasi-translational process: it renames, codifies and encodes the social; that is, it subjects the social to a radical transformation, a process which I term, dependent on certain parameters, either trans-semiosis or re-semiosis.

I believe in connection with the present state of the human condition that all social acts, processes and institutions, both in their planning and construction phases, together with their phases of realisation and execution, and also in relation to all consequences derived from them, are signs or sign phenomena. In other words, all acts of the social human being whether they be hypothetical, real or unreal are semiotic phenomena (cf. Gülbeyaz (2010) 343 ff.). Before all else, this fact has to do with the specific modality of human existence. It originally stands in relation to the nature of the material texture of the human species, i.e. its corporeality as an ontological entity. As opposed to the ideal liquid, ideal solutions or ideal gases, the human body does not constitute an amorphous, homogenous continuum, but rather manifests itself in the form-bound, and to all appearances self-acting clumps or chunks of biomass. This fact is both the source and the explanation for the spatio-temporal laceration - that profound, baying breach - the differential aspect that defines human existence[8].

It is, furthermore, exactly this process which I take as the basis for my critique and repudiation of the prevailing modern concept of culture and my attempt at a reformulation of an admissible and justifiable culture-concept. I proposed elsewhere

to define culture as the interface between socialised intelligent earthlings and their natural environment where the denaturalisation process, with all its layers and facets, betides. According to the theoretical template developed there, culture is necessarily a categorical *singulare tantum*; it is a sign whose signifier reached in the course of a series of re-semiosis such a degree of permeability and elasticity that it is capable of pointing to all conceivable phenomena, events, artefacts, aspects etc. of the said interface where the denaturalising humanoid and Mother Nature meet and interact[9]. The result of such a re-semiosis is necessarily abstract and non-representational. It stands for something that constitutes the *condicio sine qua non* of anything human. That is, it precedes and embraces everything human, every conceivable human act so that there is neither a tenable need nor indeed a feasible way to speak about it[10].

If, having touched upon the socio-historical moments and layers in which the phenomenon of gender is embedded and the basic concepts relating to them whose acquaintance is an irreducible prerequisite for the understanding of gender and gender-related phenomena, I was to take a closer glance at the approaches to the concept of gender in the modern feminist and post-feminist literature, a broad spectrum of gradient shading with hardly discernible transition zones would come to light. Even so, the outermost margins of this gamut of loosely connected approaches could be contrasted with each other. The one pole would then be characterised by the tendency to derive gender from the biologically given features, to put it ultimately down to sex[11]. This approach departs from the assumption/postulation that sex is an *a priori* given solid pedestal on which the entire edifice of linguistic practice/production concerning gender and related phenomena comes to pass[12].

This uni-directional quasi-chronological approach according to which gender is a somehow socially, culturally etc. processed, transformed reproduction of sex was radically rejected and opposed by Judith Butler in her 1990 book *Gender Trouble*:

It would make no sense, then, to define gender as the cultural interpretation of sex, if sex itself is a gendered category. Gender ought not to be conceived merely as the cultural inscription of meaning on a pre-given sex (a juridical conception); gender must also designate the very apparatus of production whereby the sexes themselves are established. As a result, gender is not to culture as sex is to nature; gender is also the discursive/cultural means by which sexed nature or a natural sex is produced and established as pre-discursive, prior to culture, a politically neutral surface on which culture acts[13].

Gender and Language

The social institution of gender belongs simply and precisely - along with the entire set of phenomena subsumed uncritically and almost automatically under the concept of culture - to this interface devised and depicted above. I divide the history of the human species, i.e. the process of humanisation, into three overarching stages. The first one is the primordial soup, the *urschleim*, the pre-semiotic era. The second one is the early semiotic age the inception of which is marked by the first semiotic act, the first semiosis; that is by the first word-like exclamation, by what I elsewhere called the Adornoian *ur-cry*[14]. With the Adornoian *ur-cry* the first fissure splits open, the denaturalisation gets under way. The third stage is the current socio-historical space-time whose dawn coincides with the beginning of what is called the Neolithic.

The third stage revolutionises the conditions and parameters at the above said nature vs. human interface and elevates the level of the denaturalisation process qualitatively (the Neolithic revolution marks the beginning of sedentary human society and with it the whole array of developments such as surplus production, food preservation technology, pottery, private property, social classes, writing, priest-scientist cast etc., which straight away and seamlessly lead to the present stage of human civilisation). Ontologically speaking, the intelligent earthling is still there where it stood in the so-called Neolithic Age.

Correlating gender and the related phenomena with the above sketched stages would show that biological sex is a phenomenon of the pre-semiotic era, the *urschleim*. Sexuality and gender emerge with the beginning of the primordial fissure and accompany the entire process of denaturalisation down to the present day. They won't cease to exist as pivotal mighty social institutions moulding social behaviour and permeating simultaneously the other relevant social institutions until the process of denaturalisation is completed (something, by the way, even the most daring science-fiction writers or directors just don't seem to be able to depict or dream of).

The one and only basic form of social organisation brought about by the denaturalising humanoids since the known beginnings of the history of so-called human civilisation is what I have elsewhere called a death-driven phallocracy[15].

The interstice that results from the pre-semiotic *ur-rift* is pointed or stopped up by signs resp. by semiosis. Spoken language occupies the uppermost position in the hierarchy of the socially relevant sign-systems[16]. In other words, the linguistic semiosis

is the epitome of semiotic processing. In order to function and to subsist stably, every relevant social institution with its, as a rule quite complex, periphery and intricately twisted relation to the other social institutions has to be produced and continually reproduced by and within at least one of the socially relevant semiotic systems. The linguistic semiosis seems to mark in this connection some sort of a threshold value, so that it could be assumed that linguistic semiosis constitutes the minimal precondition for any social phenomenon to come into being and to subsist. In accordance with this assumption I would assume that the social institution of gender emerged in the vernacular of the communities of denaturalising humanoids. Above all in the modern western societies it is now reproduced not only in language but also in almost all relevant semiotic systems.

It seems to be safe to state on the basis of observations both synchronically and diachronically that all known human forms of social organisation, that is all types of death-driven phallocracy, are gendered societies. There is so far no exception to this circumstance. But as far as the vernaculars of these gendered societies are concerned there are, in terms of governing grammatical structures and processes, gendering languages and non-gendering ones.

A superficial juxtaposition of some of the major language families would reveal that for example, the so-called Semitic languages and almost all Indo-European languages are strongly gendering on the level of morpho-syntax, whereas modern Turkish and the other Altaic languages like, among others, the Sino-Tibetan and Uralic languages, do not gender at all morpho-syntactically. The repeated and stressed reference to the morpho-syntax is in this connection crucial. For it is simply impossible to cleanly demarcate a social sphere from a linguistic one. It is practically impossible to declare that, e.g., the society in modern Turkey is a gendered society but the vernacular of this society, modern Turkish, is not a gendering language. As I both overtly and implicitly stated above every social act and institution is before anything else language - semiotic act. Every conceivable act of social gender-ascription has before anything else to be a semiosis and therein above all a linguistic semiosis. Accordingly, the Turkish language as well is ultimately not clear of or immune to the phenomenon of linguistic gendering. That the morphological and syntactical laws and criteria that govern the behaviour and the modes of operation of the physical units and constituents of a given language do not entail the category of gender does not rule out the probability that on other layers of language the phenomenon of gender decisively marks and shapes linguistic

behaviour. The Japanese language, for example, is, as expected, a morpho-syntactically non-gendering language like Turkish. But society on the Japanese archipelago is, in comparison with that of modern Turkey, exceedingly gendered, so that the Japanese language has developed strategies on the level of discourse and pragmatics which endow the speaker with the capability of dealing with and processing the said exceptional genderedness of the society.

An important aspect which needs to be taken into account in this connection is that despite the fact that they all are nothing but varieties of one and the same mode of social organisation the degree of genderedness among different societies differs significantly. We know that European societies, above all those with Germanic languages[17], not only have strongly gendering languages, but also, they all are heavily gendered societies. In this connection, it seems to me to be of some relevance to contemplate this circumstance from a certain perspective: with almost no exceptions, the languages of the so-called cradle of civilisation, i.e., of the regions identified as the sites of the emergence of civilisation (Semitic and Indo-European languages) are strongly gendering languages. This area was and is, at the same time, the birthplace and the playground of Abrahamism, the mighty monotheistic religion with its three basic variants, or rather three subsequent historical stages of development: Judaism, Christianity, and Islam.

On the other hand, Turkish and the other Altaic languages are, in sharp contrast to the former, morpho-syntactically non-gendering. The question which imposes itself upon me in the face of this comparison is if there is a causal link between linguistic gender and the material conditions governing the socio-historical genesis and development of respective societies. I provisionally tend to answer this question in the affirmative. The reasons of this bias have partly been presented even though more tacitly than overtly within the course of my reasoning so far.

Furthermore, I cannot prevent myself from making a rather personal remark on this state of affairs: I personally suffer under the extreme difficulty if not even the sheer impossibility of articulating something - say, ordering a cup of coffee in a cafeteria - in German or similar gendering languages without simultaneously and automatically fabricating a complex network of sexes and genders, an entire social texture and text based on if not even consisting in the phallic binomials. Turkish is, needless to add, a heavenly port where I feel at least in this respect safe and secure.

The Making of Man and Woman

The civilisation of Men and Women is founded in the main on a phallus-oriented if not even phallus-generated dichotomy which, I believe, could be referred to as a phallic or phallogenic dichotomy. This basal dichotomy underlies the creation and perpetuation of the institutions of man and woman in human society. In this connection I think it would not be out of place to refer to the fact that Lacan assigns, in a somewhat similar manner, a central position to the concept of phallus within his theory of man and woman. The mode of operation along which the sexual differentiation in Lacanian psychoanalysis is realised is illustrated in Judith Butler's *Gender Trouble*:

> Being the Phallus and having the Phallus denote divergent sexual positions, or nonpositions (impossible positions, really), within language. To be the Phallus is to be the signifier of the desire of the Other and *to appear as* this signifier. In other words, it is to be the object, the Other of a (heterosexualized) masculine desire, but also to represent or reflect that desire. This is an Other that constitutes, not the limit of masculinity in a feminine alterity, but the site of a masculine self-elaboration. For women to be the Phallus means, then, to reflect the power of the Phallus, to signify that power, to embody the Phallus, to supply the site to which it penetrates, and to signify the Phallus through being its Other, its absence, its lack, the dialectical confirmation of its identity. By claiming that the Other that lacks the Phallus is the one who is the Phallus, Lacan clearly suggests that power is wielded by this feminine position of not-having, that the masculine subject who has the Phallus requires this Other to confirm and, hence, be the Phallus in its extended sense[18].

The similarity of the Lacanian position and the position developed in the present paper consists basically in the fact that both approaches establish and emphasise that the institution 'man' owes its existence and subsistence to the woman, i.e., that the former cannot reproduce and preserve itself without the latter. An additional point worth mentioning in this connection is the role the language and modern linguistic theory are assigned in Lacans theoretical edifice:

> Freud could not have taken into account modern linguistics, which postdates him, but I would maintain that Freud's discovery stands out precisely because, in setting out from a domain in which one could not have expected to encounter linguistics' reign, it had to anticipate its formulations. Conversely, it is Freud's

discovery that gives the signifier/signified opposition its full scope: for the signifier plays an active role in determining the effects by which the signifiable appears to succumb to its mark, becoming, through that passion, the signified.

This passion of the signifier thus becomes a new dimension of the human condition in that it is not only man who speaks, but in man and through man that it [ça] speaks; in that his nature becomes woven by effects in which the structure of the language of which he becomes the material can be found again; and in that the relation of speech thus resonates in him, beyond anything that could have been conceived of by the psychology of ideas[19].

Below is a simple table which illustrates the generation of not only sex and sexuality but also implicitly gender differences on the basis of a unique operator: phallus.

basal **phallogenic dichotomy**	subtypes	primary distinguishing feature: possesses phallus **(phallus possessor)**	secondary distinguishing feature: mates with phallus **(phallophile)**
man	heterosexual	+	-
	homosexual	+	+
	bisexual	+	+/-
woman	heterosexual	-	+
	homosexual	-	-
	bisexual	-	-/+

The sub-typology of this basic phallogenic dichotomy becomes in certain areas more and more sophisticated and branches further out on the basis of tertiary features such as [penetration]. The analysis of possible combinations with this additional feature would yield two new subtypes in the vernacular of modern Turkey:

[+ phallus] [+ phallophile] [+ penetration] = kulampara[20] (active male homosexual)

[+ phallus] [+ phallophile] [- penetration] = puşt[21] (passive male homosexual)

The supremacy of phallus emerges in that woman is constructed in accordance with the primary distinguishing feature [- phallus]. That is both man and his power are dependent existentially on woman, on that the existence/presence of woman is continually rendered visible and clear. What the second- and third-wave feminist movements and especially the feminist intervention into the vernaculars of European societies ultimately yielded was exactly this: the accentuation and fortification of the woman through its reduplication in almost all socially relevant semiotic systems. The

feminist linguistic gadgetry constitutes nothing but another tool of visualisation of woman, that is just another gender-ascription-mechanism just to the liking of the phallic dichotomy.

This feminist intervention doesn't reject the phallogenic dichotomy; it does not modify it; it does not suggest an alternative model. On the contrary it departs from it and it submits itself to it. It legitimises the primary distinguishing feature [+ phallus or - phallus] and helps phallocracy to equip itself with the appearance of an authorised, permissible hegemony. The enterprise to fight or to resist against the phallocracy as a woman, that is by dint of female or feminist self-assertion, is comparable with the one which common parlance maintains to describe with the saying 'add fuel to the fire'.

A human being is, as a rule, something which is externally declared to be so by those animate phenomena which themselves are heteronomously declared to be humans. A man is a humanoid who on account of a small set of external traits is thought to be furnished with a phallus. The rest of the entire complex of gender-phenomena and institutions emerge as derivatives of this assumption.

Notes

[1] But between 1848 and 1871, or more precisely during the 1860s, three things happened. First, the expansion of industrialisation produced other essentially industrial capitalist powers besides Britain: the United States, Prussia (Germany) and, to a much greater extent than before, France, later to be joined by Japan. Second, the progress of industrialisation increasingly made wealth and industrial capacity the decisive factor in international power; hence devaluing the relative standing of Russia and France, and greatly increasing that of Prussia (Germany). Third, the emergence as independent powers of two extra-European states, the United States (united under the North in the Civil War) and Japan (systematically embarking on 'modernisation' with the Meiji Restoration of 1868), created for the first time the possibility of global power-conflict. The increasing tendency of European businessmen and governments to expand their activities overseas, and to find themselves involved with other powers in such areas as the Far East and the Middle East (Egypt), reinforced this possibility. (Hobsbawm (1995) 100-101.)

[2] Gülbeyaz (2016) 12.

[3] A vocabulary - a set of terms, expressions and definitions - and syntactic rules.

[4] This 'programming language' was and is an alternative mode of linguistic processing and reprocessing that is capable of modifying resp. rewriting the history, the present and the future of a given social universe or a subspace thereof into a continuous and comprehensive narrative. There would be no harm in analogising this narrative to the epic of Enuma Elish, which fulfilled, during the reshuffle of power positions in the Sumero-Babylonian Pantheon, precisely the above depicted function, thus enabling the consolidation, on the one hand, of the newly won supremacy of Marduk, who had been nothing but a minor Old-Sumerian deity, and on the other and in direct connection with it, of the law and order of Hammurabi, the sixth King of the First Dynasty of Babylon.

[5] Cf. Gülbeyaz (2012).

[6] All feminism is characterised by a political commitment to changing existing power relations between men and women, but feminist thought is perceived as having advanced in three separate

waves. There is some disagreement amongst feminists as to the precise breakdown of these stages; one common definition is outlined here (after Humm 1995; Brooks 1997). The 'first wave' refers to the suffrage movements, between roughly 1880 and 1920, through which women achieved public emancipation and greater rights in the realms of politics, education and employment. The late 1960s saw the emergence of second-wave feminism, which focused more on personal issues of equality in relation to sexuality, reproduction, and fulfilment in public and private spheres (Deckard 1975). The intellectual movements that grew out of the second wave were concerned with identifying the root causes of women's oppression: in particular, the theory of patriarchy provided a universal, explanatory framework. Third-wave feminism has emerged over the last decade, as feminist theorists have embraced elements of postmodernist thought and shifted their interests to more cultural and symbolic approaches. Significantly, the universalist meta-narratives of second-wave feminism have been replaced by greater pluralism, while the emphasis on addressing inequality between men and women has been superseded by the imperative to understand gender difference (Brooks 1997). (Gilchrist (1999) 2.)

[7] 'So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them.' (Old Testament, King James Version, Genesis 1:27)

[8] Cf. Gülbeyaz (2011) 159 ff.

[9] The interaction is indeed hardly an interaction for it consists basically in the one-sided and still fruitless efforts of the first for the purpose of freeing itself from the latter by cutting the tough umbilical cord connecting both ontologically. Its efforts are fruitless because the instrument or the technology required for a successful cord severance is still waiting to be developed/invented. Ontologically speaking, the intelligent earthling is still there where it stood in the so-called Neolithic Age.

[10] The consequence of this is obvious: First, a thus conceived concept of culture is not suitable to be employed as a conceptual tool in the so-called social scientific activity/production. It lacks the capacity of transmitting anything concerning any marked/definable phenomenon. Secondly, the noun 'culture' is necessarily a *singulare tantum*. Whoever employs it as a *plurale tantum* lines up *nolens volens* with the tradition of Herder and the German Idealists and submits himself to that sanguinary biologism which has exterminated in the last three centuries with increasing efficacy innumerable humanoids. And lastly, any scientific model, any scientific discourse, any scientific attempt which relies upon the concept of culture would yield nothing but destruction for both sides of the interface introduced above.

[11] The extreme outpost of this side of the scope would be the sociobiologists' account of gender. Sociobiologists depart from the supposition that gender difference, sexual preference etc., as is human behaviour in general, are ultimately driven and regulated by a set of innate forces programmed and transmitted genetically.

[12] 'My definition of gender has two parts and several subsets. They are interrelated but must be analytically distinct. The core of the definition rests on an integral connection between two propositions: gender is a constitutive element of social relationships based on perceived differences between the sexes, and gender is a primary way of signifying relationships of power.' (Scott (2007) 66.)

[13] Butler (1999) 11.

[14] Cf. Gülbeyaz (2011) 159ff.

[15] Cf. Gülbeyaz (2009) 73ff.

[16] For a detailed discussion cf. Gülbeyaz (2011) 159ff.

[17] Apart from the exceptional development of the English language which is presently counted as a nongendering language.

[18] Butler (1999) 56.

[19] Lacan (2006) 578.

[20] This lexeme is derived from Persian 'ġulām-bāre' 'هغلامبـاره' (pederast: ġulām غلام 'boy, servant + 'bāre بــاره impassioned, addicted).

[21] This lexeme is derived from Persian 'puşt پشـــت' (back, behind) and Kurdish 'pişt پشـــت (back, behind). Compare with Avestan 'parşti' (back, behind), Sanskrit 'prişṭa' (behind, after), Latin 'post' (behind, after) etc.

References

Brooks, Ann. (1997) *Postfeminisms: Feminism, Cultural Theory and Cultural Forms*, London: Routledge.

Butler, Judith P. (1999) *Gender trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. London: Routledge.

Deckard, B. (1975) *The Women's Movement: Political, Socio-Economic and Psychological Issues*, New York: Harper and Row.

Gilchrist, Roberta. (1999) *Gender and archaeology: Contesting the past*. London, New York: Routledge.

Gülbeyaz, Abdurrahman. (2009) *Musicalization of Language as a mode of social memory construction and as a strategy of self-preservation of the oppressed*. In Liccosec, vol. 12 Languages and Memories. Research Institute for World Languages, Osaka University. Osaka: Vol. 12:73-82.

Gülbeyaz, Abdurrahman. (2010) *Küresel-Toplumsal Dönüşüm Süreçleri ve Dillerin Devinimi*. In V. Uluslararası Büyük Türk Dili Kurultay Bildirileri, edited by Zülfikar, Hamza; Özyürek, Rasim, Ankara: Bilkent Üniversitesi Yayınlari, 343-353.

Gülbeyaz, Abdurrahman. (2011) *Ungenierte Meditationen über Zeichentheorie mit Schwerpunkt auf Komplexen Zeichenprozessen*. Journal of the Research Institute for World Languages. Osaka: No. 6. 159- 173.

Gülbeyaz, Abdurrahman. (2012) *A New Approach to Language Acquisition and Learning: Beyond Skinner and Chomsky*. In ICT for Language Learning, Conference Proceedings 2012. Florence: Libreriauniversitaria.it Edizioni.

Gülbeyaz, Abdurrahman. (2016) *Meaning in Language and Music: Sign and Slaughter*. Osaka: MATSUMOTOKOBO.

Hobsbawm, E. J. (1995) *The Age of Capital 1848-1875*. London: Abacus A Division of Little, Brown and Company.

Humm, Maggie. (1995) *The Dictionary of Feminist Theory*. Second Edition, London: Prentice Hall/ Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Lacan, Jacques. (2006) *Ecrits: the First Complete Edition in English*. Translated by Bruce Fink in Collaboration with Heloise Fink and Russell Grigg. New York: W. W. Norton & Company.

Scott, Joan Wallach. (2007) *Gender as a Useful Category of Historical Analysis*, In Culture, Society and Sexuality, a Reader, edited by Aggleton, Peter and Parker, Richard. Oxon, New York: Routledge.

原著論文