

## Re: Traditional gender-free "he" [was: Re: "16 and 276 are 292"? No. [was: Re: Lack of vocabulary in English?]]

**Source:** <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.lang/2005-03/2732.html>

---

**From:** Peter T. Daniels ([grammatim\\_at\\_worldnet.att.net](mailto:grammatim_at_worldnet.att.net))

**Date:** 03/22/05

Date: Tue, 22 Mar 2005 12:58:52 GMT

Claude Beaudouin wrote:

>

> *Wow. What a discussion.*

>

> *In my limited language education, my professors explained that  
> linguistic/grammatical gender is separate and unrelated to biological  
> gender. But maybe today they would not be considered PC.*

>

> *Imagine if we start discussing the injustices and appropriateness of the  
> gender of nouns in the romance languages. Why is hand (la main) feminin  
> and finger (le doigt) masculin in French? Think of all the possibilites  
> for speculation and and analysis in newsgroups such as this one, for  
> this example and thousands more one could devise.*

It's much less of an issue in a language with grammatical gender, where gender assignment is so easily seen to be arbitrary. In English, with only vestigial grammatical gender, it becomes a problem.

--

Peter T. Daniels

[grammatim@att.net](mailto:grammatim@att.net)