Indexical gender and grammatical gender in Chiquitano

Andrey Nikulin
Universidade de Brasília

The Chiquitano language (unclassified, possibly Macro-Jê; Bolivia/Brazil) presents a typologically rare phenomenon, whereby both the gender of the speaker and the gender of the referent are indexed in the morphology (Falkinger 2002, Rose 2013, 2015, 2018, Fleming 2012, 2015, among others), as shown in (1).

(1) LOMERIANO CHIQUITANO (Sans' fieldnotes *apud* Rose 2018:230)

    a. *ba-páche-ro=ti*   *n-i-kisé-s*
       3-look_for-TAM=3SG.M.♂   N-3-knife-DET
       'He looks for her knife.' (♂)

    b. *ba-páche-ro*   *n-i-kise-s=tí*
       3-look_for-TAM   N-3-knife-DET=3SG.M.♂
       'She looks for his knife.' (♂)

    c. *ba-páche-ro=ti*   *n-i-kise-s=tí*
       3-look_for-TAM=3SG.M.♂ N-3-knife-DET=3SG.M.♂
       'He looks for his knife.' (♂)

    d. *ba-páche-ro*   *n-i-kisé-s*
       3-look_for-TAM   N-3-knife-DET
       'She looks for her knife.' (♂) *or*
       'She/he looks for her/his knife.' (♀)

Chiquitano has been classified as Type F' language[1] with a binary (masculine/non-masculine) gender distinction in Rose's (2018) typology of the genderlect/gender interaction. Fleming (2015), on the other hand, captures the morphological phenomena addressed by Rose by positing a single pragmatic feature [±♂] with a relational speaker-referent focus. All authors agree that overt grammatical gender distinctions are made only in the male genderlect. It should be noted that Rose's and Fleming's analyses are based on the Lomeriano dialect of Chiquitano, which appears to have recently lost parts of the original gender system preserved elsewhere, including a three-way gender opposition and a 1SG.♂/♀ gender distinction.

In this talk, I intend to provide an account of the genderlectal differences in Chiquitano varieties other than Lomeriano, building upon the existing analyses and based on my own fieldwork as well as on published sources.

I will first discuss the genderlectal differences that do not interact with the grammatical gender, such as the 1SG.♂/♀ distinction and the choice of demonstratives.

I further argue that the grammatical gender system of Chiquitano varieties other than Lomeriano is best analyzed as having **three** (rather than two) **gender values**, which I dub *masculine* = M, *feminine-inanimate* = FI, and *non-human animate* = NHA. Although the latter two genders belong to the same agreement class (2), NHA nouns are similar to M nouns and differ from FI nouns in that they receive overt morphological marking (in the masculine genderlect only), as exemplified in (3). I propose to call these two manifestations of grammatical gender *gender indexing* and *gender flagging*, respectively.

(2) Gender indexing in MIGUELEÑO CHIQUITANO (Nikulin, field data)

    a. *Ø-tobii-zo-tí'*   *au*   *tu'u-j*
       3SG-jump-3.FIN-3SG.M.♂ LOC   water-X
       'he jumped into the water' (♂)

    a'. *Ø-tobii-zo*   *au*   *tu'u-j*
       3SG-jump-3.FIN LOC   water-X
       'she/it jumped into the water' (♂) *or*
       'he/she/it jumped into the water' (♀)

---

[1] In Rose's (2018) classification, the Type F' includes languages that meet the following criteria: (1) grammatical gender categorization does not completely coincide across genderlects; (2) there is a total application of the genderlect distinction over the grammatical gender values; (3) there is some syncretism for different grammatical gender values across genderlects. The type F' languages are further characterized by the absence of the grammatical gender distinctions in precisely one genderlect.

b. *Ø-koo-ño-tí'*
3SG-die-3.FIN-3SG.M.♂
'he died' (♂)

b′. *Ø-kóo-ño*
3SG-die-3.FIN
'she/it died' (♂) *or* 'he/she/it died' (♀)

c. *Ø-añetu*   *r-u-pauche-s*
3SG-meat_of   L-NHA.♂-pig-X
'pork' (♂)

c′. *Ø-añetu*   *pauche-s*
3SG-meat_of   pig-X
'pork' (♀)

d. *k[y]oo-j-tí'*   *y-axkate*
[3SG]house-x-3SG.M.♂   M.♂-mayor
'(male) mayor's house' (♂)

d′. *k[y]oo*   *r-axkate*
[3SG]house   L-mayor
'(female) mayor's house' (♂) *or*
'(female/male) mayor's house' (♀)

(3)   Gender flagging in MIGUELEÑO CHIQUITANO (Nikulin, field data)

a. FI   ♀: **unmarked**   ♂: **unmarked**

♀	♂	
pa'ɨj	*pa'ɨj*	'woman'
kupikixh	*kupikixh*	'young woman'
pe'es	*pe'es*	'fire'
pooj	*pooj*	'house'
axkate	*axkate*	'female mayor'
Torórixh	*Torórixh*	'Dolores' (*female name*)

b. NHA[2]   ♀: **unmarked**   ♂: **/o-/**[3]

♀	♂	
tipixh	**o***tipixh*	'ant'
kɨtapakixh	**ok***tapakixh*	'tapir'
pauches	**u***pauches*	'pig'
biyozɨj	**o***biyozɨj*	'genipa tree'
tananakaj	**u***tananakaj*	'Argentine cedar'
sutoñes	**o***stoñes*	'star' (subdialect of San Miguel)

c. M   ♀: **unmarked**   ♂: **/i-/**[4]

♀	♂	
oñɨ'ɨj	**ñ***oñɨ'ɨj*	'man'
kasiki	**k***yasiki*	'male chief'
mexku	**ñ***exku*	'male doctor'
maíxhtɨru	**ñ***aíxhtɨru*	'male teacher'
axkate	**y***axkate*	'male mayor'
Taniéere	**T***yaniéere*	'Daniel' (*male name*)

As dependent NHA and F nouns do not index their gender on their heads in either genderlect, they could in principle be argued to fall into one grammatical gender (*non-masculine*). However, the fact that nouns classified here as NHA and M receive a prefix (/o-/ and /i-/, respectively) under identical conditions (that is, in the male genderlect) suggests that one and the same category is at play.

indexing	FI.SG	NHA.SG	M.SG	PL
♀		3SG-		3PL-
♂	3SG-		3SG-...-tiʔ	3SG-...-maʔ

flagging	FI	NHA	M
♀	unmarked		
♂	unmarked	o-	i-

---

[2] The NHA class includes most nouns that denote animals and trees, as well as the word for 'honey' and 'star' (the latter only in the subdialect of San Miguel; the subdialect of San Juan has *ostoñes* in both genderlects).

[3] This prefix surfaces as *u-* if the next syllable contains an /a/.

[4] This prefix usually surfaces as a palatalization of the next consonant or as *y-/ñ-* before vowels.

I will conclude by discussing a diachronic development in the Lomeriano variety of Chiquitano, that has extended the use of the male speech forms of the NHA nouns to the female genderlect. Therefore, there is no reason to treat NHA as a value of the category *gender* in Lomeriano, which would thus only have a M/NM distinction.

Glossing abbreviations

1 = first person, 3 = third person, DET = determinate (X in my analysis), FI = female/inanimate, FIN = finite, L = linking consonant, LOC = locative, M = masculine, N = epenthetic consonant (L in my analysis), NHA = non-human animate, NM = non-masculine, PL = plural, SG = singular, TAM = time/aspect/mood (FIN in my analysis), X = singular with no referential possessor, ♀ = female genderlect, ♂ = male genderlect.

References

Falkinger, Sieglinde. 2002. Diferencias entre el lenguaje de hombres y mujeres en Chiquitano (Besiro). In: Mily Crevels; Simon van de Kerke; Sérgio Meira; Hein van der Voort (eds.). *Current studies on South American Languages*, p. 43–56. Leiden: CNWS Publications.

Fleming, Luke. 2012. Gender indexicality in the Native Americas: Contributions to the typology of social indexicality. *Language in Society* 41:295–320.

Fleming, Luke. 2015. Speaker-referent gender indexicality. *Language in Society* 44:1–10.

Rose, Françoise. 2013. Le genre du locuteur et de l'allocutaire dans les système pronominaux : genre grammatical et indexicalité du genre. *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 108(1):381–417.

Rose, Françoise. 2015. On male and female speech and more. A typology of categorical gender indexicality in indigenous South American languages. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 81(4):495–537.

Rose, Françoise. 2018. *A typology of languages with genderlects and grammatical gender.* In: Sebastian Fedden; Jenny Audring; Greville G. Corbett (eds.). *Non-Canonical Gender Systems*, p. 211–246. Oxford: Oxford University Press.