

The gender asterisk in German: the sensorial impact of linguistic change

Ana Margarida Abrantes*

Abstract

Changes to orthography are bound to meet strong resistance by language users. Examples of this are reactions to the orthographic reform of the German language in the late 90s (Heller, 1996) or the debate around an orthographic agreement for Portuguese as pluricentric language (Correia, n.d.). Negative opinions about these two processes are often supported by argumentation concerning the apparent contradiction of having principles of phonology and etymology guiding the changes. A similar situation has recently been introduced by the gender asterisk in German, an orthographic change seeking more gender justice in language. The asterisk in writing has led to a sensorially disruptive change in how words are pronounced, namely through the introduction of a glottal stop in a sound context that normally does not foresee it, as a way to mark in speaking what the asterisk does in writing: to highlight the difference between the gender-inclusive form and the representation of the feminine in a binary morphological marking; e.g. *Student*innen* vs. *Studentinnen*.

This paper proposes to investigate the resistance to the gender asterisk and to explain it from a linguistic perspective, namely with consideration of the morphological rules of the language. It further seeks to relate this analysis to the argumentation used against the asterisk to see whether this is sustained by language studies.

Keywords: Gender asterisk; gender identity; representation; orthography; language change.

* CECC & UCP

1. The problem: biological gender, grammatical gender and identity

Inspired by a visit to Italy in 1920, German poet Rainer Maria Rilke wrote a letter to his Swiss friend and patron Nanny Wunderly-Volkart in which he disserted, among other things, about grammatical gender. Rilke was puzzled by the difference between Romance languages, in which the sun is masculine and the moon is feminine, and the German exact opposite:

[I]ch denke immer im Sinne von le soleil und la lune, und das Umgekehrte in unserer Sprache ist mir konträr, so daß ich immer machen möchte „der“ große „Sonn...“ und die Möndin!... so geht es einem oft, daß man mit dem äußerlichen Benehmen der Sprache uneins ist und ihr Innerstes meint, oder eine innerste Sprache...

I always imagine that, as in French, the sun is masculine and the moon feminine; the opposite phenomenon in our language doesn't make sense to me. I would always prefer to speak of the great masculine sun (“der große ‘Sonn...’”) and the feminine moon (“die Möndin”)!... It frequently happens that we disagree with the external manifestation of our language and intend what is most intimate (Innerstes), or a most intimate speech.¹⁰⁴

Rilke's observation is linguistically philosophical, as he mentions the difference between the surface of expression and the depth of meaning, in its relationship with the referent. To him it seems less natural that the sun be feminine, and the moon be masculine.

Some 40 years before, and in a wittier tone, American writer Mark Twain (1997 [1880]) wrote about the same randomness and apparent unnatural attribution of grammatical gender in the report on his travels through Europe, *A Tramp Abroad*. In the appendix to this book, called *The Awful German Language*, Twain disserts about young girls and turnips, and how unfairly the first are treated in speech:

¹⁰⁴ Rilke, Rainer Maria. Translated in Corbeil (2015: 59-60).

In German, a young lady has no sex, while a turnip has. Think what overwrought reverence that shows for the turnip, and what callous disrespect for the girl. See how it looks in print -- I translate this from a conversation in one of the best of the German Sunday-school books:

Gretchen: "Wilhelm, where is the turnip?"

Wilhelm: "She has gone to the kitchen."

Gretchen: "Where is the accomplished and beautiful English maiden?"

Wilhelm. "It has gone to the opera."

Twain seems impressed by the callousness with which the German language treats women. And in fact, while the reference to men, young and old, is consistently masculine in the grammar (*der Bub, der Junge, der Jugendliche, der Man, der Greis*, 'the boy, the youth, the man, the old man'), women are traditionally only entitled to their gender either when married or rich: *das Mädchen, das Weib* vs. *die Frau, die Dame* 'the girl, the woman' vs. 'the [married] woman, the lady'.

The apparent arbitrariness and unfairness in the distribution of grammatical gender is thus not a new problem. Yet today it resonates loudly in society originating a debate around *gendergerechte Sprache*, i.e. gender-neutral or gender-inclusive language. Within this broad issue, the specific concern of how to address a person in language so that they feel included, or at least meant in and by the designation, has gained more prominence.

While linguists of the second wave feminism raised awareness to the inequalities in the way language refers to men and women¹⁰⁵ – namely by the pervasiveness of the generic masculine – today this problem is more complex: it is no longer only about how to include women in language, but how to acknowledge multiple and more differentiated categories of gender in a language that remains, for the most part, openly masculine.

So, what forms are languages finding to address the problem more adequately? How flexible and creative are they to allow for new forms, especially schematic or closed-class new words? Creating a new categorical word or morpheme for a new semantic referent is not difficult: language is ever

¹⁰⁵ See Kramer (2016), Cameron (1998) or Pusch (1991).

permeable to new nouns, new adjectives, new verbs. But how easily can it accommodate a new conjunction, a new number category or a new pronoun? And is it language that accommodates these changes, or rather the community of its users, the speakers who keep it alive?

2. One solution: the gender asterisk

The recent and ongoing polemic over the new inclusive plural pronoun *iel* in French, and how it found a way into the dictionary *Le Robert*¹⁰⁶, is just an example of both the flexibility of linguistic structure and the creativity of its speakers.

In German, one of the ways to mark inclusive reference, when referring to a group of people who share an occupation or a function, but not gender identity, is the so-called *Sternchen* or “little star,” i.e. the asterisk used between the main morpheme and the suffix, as in *Student*innen* or *Zuschauer*innen*. Other proposed differentiating spellings are adding a colon before the feminine plural suffix (*Student:Innen*, *Zuschauer:Innen*), capitalizing the feminine plural suffix, known in German as „das Binnen I“ or “the inside (or *internal*) I” (*StudentInnen*, *ZuschauerInnen*) or adding an underscore before the suffix (*Student_Innen*, *Zuschauer_Innen*). All these forms introduce a visual disruption into the rules of spelling: a punctuation marker as a colon is normally not used inside a word, and capitalizing one of its middle letters is far from conventional. Also, the underscore and the asterisk are not letters or graphemes, nor are they diacritic signs, as is the German *Umlaut*.¹⁰⁷ The use of these markers in writing is a new generalized form of signaling the inclusion of various gender identities. Just as *Le Robert* enunciates the new pronoun *iel/iels* as a generalized form in language use, but not a norm¹⁰⁸, so are the alternatives mentioned for German becoming more recurrent, generalized in use, but not yet a rule of language.

¹⁰⁶ See “French Dictionary Accused of ‘Wokeism’ over Gender-Inclusive Pronoun.” *The Guardian*, November 17, 2021. (Available online: <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2021/nov/17/french-dictionary-wokeism-gender-inclusive-pronoun-iel>.)

¹⁰⁷ The asterisk is a pointer that signals information to be looked for elsewhere in a text or page (normally at the bottom, as a footnote) and the underscore, used before as underlining sign in typewriting, has seen its use generalized to mark in electronic contexts the gaps normally left in writing (e.g. the gap between first and last name in an e-mail address).

¹⁰⁸ “*iel* – Définitions, Synonymes, Conjugaison, Exemples” | *Dico En Ligne Le Robert*,” n.d. (Available online: <https://dictionnaire.lerobert.com/definition/iel>.)

Why these new forms are emerging and being adopted or negotiated by language users shows how language is very much alive and changing, flexibly adapting to the expressive needs of its users and to changes in society. The need that spiked these forms is the emancipation of multiple gender identities and the claim for heteronormative groups to acknowledge these identities.

However, two questions emerge: The first is why a gap or disruption (marked in writing by the asterisk and in speaking by an unexpected glottal stop) between the masculine lexeme and the feminine suffix is considered a good form for representing all gender identities. In other words, how is including these alternative identities in a graphic gap between masculine and feminine, different from the classic problem of including the feminine reference in the generic masculine? If earlier feminist linguists called attention to the fact that women did not feel automatically represented by the masculine form just because it was supposedly generic, do other gender identities – queer, transgender, bisexual, etc. – feel represented now by a generalized yet not differentiating gap? And does the same gap duly represent such diverse identities? Is it gender fair (*gendergerecht*), or does it amalgamate gender identities in a overgeneralized, non-differentiating form?

The second question has to do with the reactions to this change. As happens with any change in language, it is welcomed by a few, and resisted by the majority, who hardly ever sees the point of changing what supposedly has worked all along. The point, though, is that while changes in orthography are normally met with resistance but acknowledged still within the boundaries of what spelling does, the gender-inclusive signs mentioned before are sensorially disruptive: both in the visual arrangement of the words in writing and in the pronunciation in speaking, the gap introduced by these forms marks a difference from the norms of spelling and the norms of pronunciation. This sensorial breach, both visual and aural, and the estrangement it generates in the flow of written and spoken language has possibly furred the resistance towards these forms of gender justice in language.

3. The asterisk in writing

The asterisk is a special sign (*ein Sonderzeichen*) used at the level of the text and its organization. It is one of the possible signs used for reference in a

footnote or endnote, when additional information needs to be conveyed but is not integrated in the body of the text. It is not foreseen, within the conventional official rules of orthography and language use, as a sign to be used within a word, as it is not a grapheme, a sign or combination of signs that in writing stands for a phoneme or a conceptual distinctive sound unit in a language. In a multimodal context, the asterisk is a placeholder for something unpleasant or unreferenceable (a curse or swearword), as conventionalized in cartoons or graphic novels. Simply put: the asterisk is not a letter.

The asterisk as a mark of inclusion was first used in the early 90s by English-speaking LGBT communities in the form *trans**, which was described only in 2018 by the *Oxford English Dictionary* as follows:

“*trans**: originally used to include explicitly both transsexual and transgender, or (now usually) to indicate the inclusion of gender identities such as gender-fluid, agender, etc., alongside transsexual and transgender.” (*OED*, 2018)

In Germany, one of the first uses of “*trans**” was in a 2010 report about gender-based discrimination at the workplace published by the anti-discrimination office of the federal government (Franzen & Sauer, 2010). The asterisk is seen here as a generic form replacing all compounds that would refer to diverse identities.¹⁰⁹

According to *Duden*, the reference dictionary for Standard High German, in its edition of August 2020, the asterisk is not acknowledged within the official rules of German orthography;¹¹⁰ however, its use is getting ever more widespread as a form of inclusion of non-binary gender categories.

¹⁰⁹ In the original: “Dabei dient der Stern* als Platzhalter für diverse Komposita.” (Franzen & Sauer, 2010: 7)

¹¹⁰ “Vom amtlichen Regelwerk nicht abgedeckt sind Schreibweisen wie die folgenden: mit Genderstern (Asterisk): Schüler*innen [...] Es ist zu beobachten, dass sich die Variante mit Genderstern in der Schreibpraxis immer mehr durchsetzt. Zu finden ist sie besonders in Kontexten, in denen Geschlecht nicht mehr nur als weiblich oder männlich verstanden wird und die Möglichkeit weiterer Kategorien angezeigt werden soll.” [“The official rules do not cover spellings such as the following: with gender star (asterisk): Schüler*innen [...] It can be observed that the variant with gender star is becoming more and more established in writing practice. It can be found especially in contexts in which gender is no longer understood as only female or male and the possibility of further categories is to be indicated.”]

The handbook on gender-inclusive language, authored by Gabriele Diewald and Anja Steinhauer and edited by the *Duden* publishing house, mentions that the use of the gender asterisk is closely monitored by the German Council for Orthography (*Rechtschreibrat*), as its use is recognized in society as “widespread and legitimate means of striving for gender-equitable written expression.” (Diewald & Steinhauer, 2020, 127)

Thus, what by many is seen as a breach of orthographic rules is indeed intended as such: the irritation makes language users pause and puzzle before the asterisk, to then question why it is used in the middle of a written word and what it is there for. In other words, to make language users more aware of language and its effects.

4. Pronouncing the asterisk – or how a glottal stop becomes a phoneme

The gender asterisk is however not only a stranger in the rules of spelling, but it also further triggers an effect in spoken language that is viewed as somewhat unnatural. When considering the relationship between oral and written language – and we intentionally leave out sign language –, a look at both language history and developmental psychology shows that long before a language is written, it is spoken. Writing is the necessary convention that makes spoken language more permanent and recordable.

In the case of the asterisk, however, it seems that the orthography came first and forced a change in speaking. In other words: a change in writing (graphic, visual) is turning into a change in speaking (aural and phonetic). In examples like *Student*innen* what happens between the lexeme and the suffix is a glottal stop. This is no stranger to the German language, where a syllable or word beginning with a vowel sound is anticipated by this briefest break (very much responsible for the *staccato* rhythm of the language). A few examples: *bearbeiten* [bɐ'ʔarbaɪtɪŋ], ‘to work on something, to deal with something’, *enteignen* [ɛnt'ʔaɪgnən], ‘to expropriate’, or a sentence like *Das ist ein Abenteuer* [das'ʔɪst'ʔaɪn'ʔa:bɛntʊɐ], ‘this is an adventure’.

The International Phonetic Alphabet symbol [ʔ] transcribes the glottal stop, a consonant sound in German produced by the constriction and sudden release of the air stream at the glottis. The brief pause produced by the glottal stop,

which in German is called *Knacklaut* (the “crackling sound”), follows a phonological principle and is not marked in writing with a specific sign. Because the syllable is a sound unit and the morpheme is a unit of meaning, they do not always coincide; in fact, the morphological separation between the stem word and the suffix is normally not marked: neither in the pronunciation nor in spelling of the word (for example, *Leh|re|rin*, not *Lehr|er|in*).

Yet the gender asterisk, which began in writing, inverts this when it is “read” or spoken: suddenly, the gender morpheme in the plural is highlighted in speaking, a change that strikes as unnatural. In this phonological context, the pause is unexpected and it causes estrangement and even resistance.

To establish a difference between the plural feminine and the gender inclusive form, which resorts to the same suffix, speakers began to produce a pause before the suffix, a glottal stop. This language sound marks the pronunciation of the gender asterisk, a sign that before this function did not transcribe a language sound. In these gender fair nouns the glottal stop is thus phonemic, i.e. it generates a difference in the meaning of the word (Haider, 2021), visible in the following minimal pair:

1) *Studentinnen* [ʃtuˈdɛntɪnən] vs.

2) *Student*innen* [ʃtuˈdɛntʔɪnən].

In examples such as these, one can see that the glottal stop is a distinctive unit of speech that separates the meaning of the two words. In other words, a phoneme. It further indicates that the suffix *-innen* in 1) is not the same as the suffix *-innen* in 2) but instead they are homonymous suffixes: in 1) it means the plural feminine, in 2) it means the plural diverse.

It is true that one can introduce a pause before the feminine suffix when one wants to stress the feminine gender of the referent: *Minister-IN* (‘Madam Minister’). But this is a *discursive* stress, different from the syllabic structure of the word: *Mi|nis|te|rin*. So, when the feminine suffix is stressed in sentence prosody, it behaves similarly as in the case of the non-binary *-in*: there is a break before the suffix, to mark and stress that the referent is feminine. In the gender inclusive glottal stop before the suffix *-innen*, though, the pause is intended differently, namely as a gap to force awareness about diverse categories of gender identity. So, the effect of the non-binary form would be the effect of permanent stress of this suffix, which by extension is the stress of the referent,

i.e. an effect of awareness raising to the non-binary gender identity categories. What the defenders of the asterisk wish, in the end, is to force awareness to the fact that identity is an individual construct, not a grammatical category. And they do that by means of language.

These considerations interest primarily linguists. Language users, in their turn, are left with an impression of estrangement in face of this change from the previous widespread use of the generic masculine. In an interview to the German newscast *Tagesthemen* linguist Ewa Trutkowski demonstrates how the systematic use of gender fair forms might lead to a collapse in spoken communication, by making gender through the pervasive use of the glottal stop in the sequence *Jede*r Professor*in lobt seine*n /ihre*n Student*in* ('Every professor praises their student').¹¹¹ The example takes it to the extreme, and we could contest that the glottal stop before the *-r* in the first determiner (*jede*r*, 'every') is hardly even possible, because it bypasses the distribution rule of the glottal stop in the language, by occurring before a consonant and not a vowel sound. Nonetheless it is illustrative of how unnatural this pause feels in speech.

5. More than words: The public debate on the gender asterisk

The debate on the generalized use of the asterisk to mark diverse gender identities has been quite heated, as generally is the case when language change becomes visible. Linguist Peter Eisenberg is one of the loudest voices defending the generic masculine as the only sensible form to make reading and speaking viable (Eisenberg, 2021). He argues for the generic masculine, claiming that it is widespread and devoid of an exclusive masculine marker, a position which is strongly contested and linguistically argued against by Gabriele Diewald in her essay *Zur Diskussion geschlechtergerechten Sprache* (Diewald, 2018).

Occasionally, taking sides in this debate and acting in consequence may produce questionable results. On August 17, 2021, the German TV station

¹¹¹ A gender-neutral translation could be: 'Every professor praises their students.' (in: *Tagesthemen*, June 9, 2021, available online: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=DpqEcD0oKsA> [4'22"], last accessed on November 3, 2022).

Changing Norms: System and Evolution in Modern European Languages

ZDF, known for openly adopting gender-inclusive language, produced an Instagram post about the advances of the Taliban in Afghanistan, which read as follows:

Die Islamist*innen ziehen in immer mehr afghanische Städte ein.
(‘The Islamists are moving into more and more Afghan cities.)

The post and the station were immediately object of protest on social media, fueled by boulevard media such as the *Bild Zeitung* (Fabian & Altrogge, 2021). The outrage about a gender dictatorship was met with condescending irony towards the station, which withdrew the post. Nonetheless, the weekly *Die Zeit* picked it up a month later to explain what was so strange about the word:

Islamist*innen, okay. Gemeint waren also nicht nur männliche Islamisten und nicht nur weibliche Islamistinnen. Sondern, dafür steht der Genderstern, auch transgeschlechtliche, intergeschlechtliche und nicht binäre Personen mit islamistischer Gesinnung. (Parnack, 2021)

[‘Islamists, okay. This meant not only male Islamists and not only female Islamists. But, as the gender star indicates, also transgender, intergender and non-binary persons with Islamist convictions’].

Whether the Taliban recruit gender diverse fighters for their cause remains to be seen. The comment, however, draws attention to what the asterisk means: the inclusion of all possible gender identities.

The debate about the gender asterisk is widespread, recurrent and polarized. The main arguments for its use concern how people with non-binary gender identities do not feel represented in the generic masculine forms established in language use (very much echoing and widening the claim of second-wave feminists). Another argument for the use of gender-fair language and thus also for the asterisk is that cognitively the reference to the masculine form alone narrows how we see the world: predominantly as masculine and silenced of the presence of diverse identities. A concrete consequence of this is, for example, the response to a job description: if it is formulated in masculine terms only, applications by women and other identities are far less, than when

a gender-neutral form is selected (e.g. *Führungskraft*, or *Lehrperson*, i.e. ‘manager’ and ‘teacher’ or, literally, ‘leading force’ and ‘teaching person’).

Against gendering on language, there are two main arguments: the first is that the use of gender-inclusive forms (like the asterisk) is in fact divisive for society, not just because there are people who use it and others refuse to use it, but because speakers who refuse to use it report feeling patronized by other speakers, as though the refusal of the asterisk would be a sign of not being up to the times. The second main argument is that language runs the danger of collapsing in its communicative efficiency under the weight of accommodating ever new forms and all possible reference scenarios, as seen in the example mentioned by Ewa Trutkowski. In this perspective, gender inclusion is introduced at the cost of communicative efficiency.

This paper does not aim to take position in this debate, which is and will be ongoing. Instead, it wishes to stress the fact that language is both collective and individual. Collectively it is organized, normalized and heatedly discussed. Individually, it is used, spoken, written, not always in consensus with the debates of the moment. And more importantly, it is not a system on its own, oblivious to mind and life. On the contrary, it is deeply related to the perception of the world and reality and to how this reality may affect it.

5. Conclusion: Language and the imprint (*Prägung*) of culture

Language lives because it is used and its change is driven by change in society and culture. What only a few decades ago might be seen as a problem of political correctness must today be considered in the context of cancel culture. The question of how one should speak and write is probably as old as language itself.

Language change is however hardly arbitrary. On the one hand, it goes hand in hand with developments in society. On the other hand, it pushes and challenges the limits of the linguistic system, but it is constrained by the cognitive underpinnings of language itself. In his *Cognitive Semantics*, Leonard Talmy gives multiple examples of how language mirrors the cognitive constructions of our mind. For example, when we say that *the book is on the table*, but not that *the table is under the book*, the choice is consonant with the principles

of perceptual organization in terms of Figure and Ground (Talmy, 2003, vol. 1, 311-345). We could add another observation to this: there is a prevalence of a first, a second and a third person singular and plural across languages, which could be related to agency, empathy and object manipulation. And a further example is modality, which, despite being expressed differently by different languages, rests on a stable arrangement of force-dynamic schemas, by which we understand the physical, the social and the mental world.

Gender identities are certainly not new. What is new is how they are openly debated in the public sphere and how from this debate linguistic change ensues. Between feminine and masculine, the room is open for new forms that acknowledge reality and promote mutual respect and convivial forms of life in a society, of which language is a central part.

References

- CAMERON, Deborah. 1998. *The Feminist Critique of Language: A Reader*. London, New York: Routledge.
- CORREIA, Margarita (n.d.). Para Uma Língua Efetivamente Pluricêntrica – Acordo Ortográfico, in: *Ciberdivídas Da Língua Portuguesa*, ISCTE-IUL. [Available online: <https://ciberdividas.iscte-iul.pt/artigos/rubricas/acordo/para-uma-lingua-efetivamente-pluricentrica/4186>.]
- DIEWALD, Gabriele. 2018. Zur Diskussion: Geschlechtergerechte Sprache als Thema der germanistischen Linguistik – exemplarisch exerziert am Streit um das sogenannte generische Maskulinum. *Zeitschrift für germanistische Linguistik* 46(2), 283-299.
- DIEWALD, Gabriele & Anja Steinhauer. 2020. *Handbuch geschlechtergerechte Sprache: Wie Sie angemessen und verständlich gendern*. Herausgegeben von der Duden-Redaktion. Berlin: Dudenverlag, 127.
- DUDEN-REDAKTION, (eds.) 2020: *Duden: Die deutsche Rechtschreibung* (Band 1/12). 28., völlig neu bearbeitete und erweiterte Auflage. Berlin: Dudenverlag, 112-114: "Geschlechtergerechter Sprachgebrauch".
- EISENBERG, Peter. 2021. Ein Säugling ist nicht dasselbe wie ein Gesäugter, *Deutschlandfunk* [Available online: https://www.deutschlandfunk.de/linguist-kritisiert-geschlechtergerechte-sprache-ein.691.de.html?dram:article_id=380828.]
- FABIAN, Philip & Georg Altrogge. 2021. ZDF gendert auch die Taliban. *Bild*, 18.08.2021 [Available online: <https://www.bild.de/politik/inland/politik-inland/islamist-innen-zdf-gendert-auch-die-taliban-77418418.bild.html>.]
- FANZEN, Jannik & Arn Sauer. 2010. *Benachteiligung von Trans*Personen, insbesondere im Arbeitsleben*. Berlin, Antidiskriminierung des Bundes. [Available online: https://www.antidiskriminierungsstelle.de/SharedDocs/downloads/DE/publikationen/Expertisen/expertise_benachteiligung_von_trans_personen.pdf?__blob=publicationFile&v=3.]
- "French Dictionary Accused of 'Wokeism' over Gender-Inclusive Pronoun." *The Guardian*, November 17, 2021. [Available online: <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2021/nov/17/french-dictionary-wokeism-gender-inclusive-pronoun-iel>.]

- HELLER, Klaus. 1996. Rechtschreibreform – Eine Zusammenfassung. In *Sprachreport Extraausgabe*. Mannheim: Institut für deutsche Sprache [Available online: https://ids-pub.bsz-bw.de/frontdoor/deliver/index/docId/948/file/Sprachreport_20_2004_Extra.pdf.]
- KRAMER, Elise. 2016. Feminist Linguistics and Linguistic Feminisms. In Lewin, Ellen & Leni M. Silverstein (eds.), *Mapping Feminist Anthropology in the Twenty-First Century*. Ithaca, NY: Rutgers University Press, 65-83. <https://doi.org/10.36019/9780813574318-005>
- LE ROBERT, n.d. "Iel – Définitions, Synonymes, Conjugaison, Exemples" | *Dico En Ligne Le Robert*, n.d. [Available online: <https://dictionnaire.lerobert.com/definition/iel>.]
- Oxford English Dictionary*, s.v. "trans*, adj.," July 2018. [Available online: <https://doi.org/10.1093/OED/1137339111>.]
- PARNACK, Charlotte. 2021. "Islamit*innen und vegane Bären". *Die Zeit*, September 15.
- PAYR, Fabian. 2021. Der Genderstern – generisches Femininum mit Asteriskus. In *Von Menschen und Mensch*innen*. Springer, Wiesbaden. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-658-33127-6_11
- PUSCH, Luise F. 1991. *Das Deutsche Als Männersprache: Aufsätze Und Glossen Zur Feministischen Linguistik*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- Rat für deutsche Rechtschreibung (RdR): *Die Entwicklung und Bewertung des Themas „Geschlechtergerechte Schreibung“ in der Beobachtung des Schreibgebrauchs 2018–2020 vom Rat für deutsche Rechtschreibung, gebilligt am 26.03.2021*. Mannheim, March 26, 2021.
- RILKE, Rainer Maria. 1977. *Briefe an Nanny Wunderly-Volkart 1919-1926*, 2 Bde. Frankfurt: Insel Verlag (Brief 48).
- RILKE, Rainer Maria: Brief 48 – Briefe an nanny Wunderly-Volkart, Transl. In Corbeill, Anthony. 2015. *Sexing the World: Grammatical Gender and Biological Sex in Ancient Rome*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 59-60.
- TALMY, Leonard. 2003. *Toward a Cognitive Semantics*. Cambridge, Massachusetts and London, England: MIT Press.
- TWAIN, Mark. 1997 [1880]. *A Tramp Abroad*. New York, NY: Penguin Boks.
- Wenn Reformen zu weit gehen. Geschlechtergerechte Sprache. *Süddeutsche Zeitung*, 10.09.2021 [Available online: <https://www.sueddeutsche.de/kolumne/geschlechtergerechte-sprache-wenn-reformen-zu-weit-gehen-1.5407029>].