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ABSTRACT

There is persistent linguistic sexism in the anthems of some countries that are members of the United Nations which diametrically negates the principle of gender equality and the global condemnation of gender-biased language use, especially in public communication. This can be very serious because anthems represent unique symbols of national identity that epitomise nations whose male and female citizens deserve equal recognition and representation. This paper presents the outcome of a linguistic investigation of selected fifty-eight translated anthems originally written in some West/North Germanic and Romance/Italic languages. Firstly, this reveals twenty (20) cases of replication of linguistic sexism that originate from the Source Texts (STs) and which are duplicated in the Translated Texts (TTs) of the anthems. Secondly, it discovers thirteen (13) cases of evocation of linguistic sexism in the anthems which do not originate from the Source Texts (STs) but which only emanate from the Translated Texts (TTs) of the anthems. Thirdly, it detects eleven (11) cases of revocation of linguistic sexism where cases of sexism reflected in Source Texts (STs) are neutralised in Translated Texts (TTs) of anthems. The paper then details a Critical Discourse Analysis via the description, interpretation and explanation of the cases of replication, evocation and revocation of linguistic sexism of the translated national anthems. Finally, the paper suggests the need for resolution of linguistic sexism of translated anthems via replacement of misogynistic expressions which are gender-biased with androgynous expressions that are gender-neutral among others.
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INTRODUCTION

Linguistic sexism according to the semantic interpretation of the concept by Devito (2015) refers to the use of language that is derogatory towards a given gender especially the feminine gender. To Osborn, Osborn, Osborn and Turner (2015, p. 46) linguistic sexism or sexist language involves “using disparaging labels or reference to gender or using masculine nouns or pronouns when the intended reference is to both sexes”. In a similar vein, Raga and Woldermariam (2014) describe linguistic sexism as a linguistic feature exhibited in many languages which denigrates people of given gender, usually females or women, thereby presenting or representing them in a discourteous way. A salient point raised in these semantic interpretations of linguistic sexism is that it is all about linguistic discrimination or use of discriminatory language which, generally speaking, can affect either of the genders but which, specifically speaking, usually affects the feminine gender more than the masculine gender.

A national anthem according to the New Encyclopaedia Britannica simply refers to a song or hymn that expresses patriotic sentiment (about a particular country or nation) and
which is governmentally authorised as an official song or hymn or which holds such a position simply in popular feeling. The national anthem, in the opinion of Kyridis et al. (2009, p. 5), “is of the most important symbols of every nation(al) state the lyrics of which include reference to the people’s glorious past, love and respect to homeland and its symbols”. Curtis (2010), however, stresses the fact that, a national anthem, to be a potent (political) instrument must not just be national music occasionally and collectively sung by the people but must be nationalistic music that sketches, defines, shapes and embodies a nation. It is in the light of this that all the one hundred and ninety-three countries that are members of United Nations have distinct national anthems. These usually capture facts relating to the cultures, traditions, histories, philosophies, ideologies, economies, (geo) politics, governments, and aspirations of the nations among others. The anthems, therefore, more or less epitomise or miniaturise the respective nations.

Linguistic sexism is constantly criticised especially in various forms of public communication. This is because such a gender-based linguistic discrimination negates the spirit of gender equality now propagated and systematically embraced across the globe. This, therefore, explains the essence of contemporary global trends in support of gender-neutral language with reference to both genders as opposed to the gender-biased language. The former is encouraged as it depicts linguistic equality but the latter is discouraged as it alienates members of a given gender, linguistically oppresses them and therefore represents a form of linguistic violence. It is against this background that the advertisement of Heineken Beer with the expression All men are born equal, not all beers and that of Macmillan with the expression Reading makes a man are considered linguistically defective. The same applies to a number of proverbs and idioms with the generic use of the word ‘man’ like the common proverb Man proposes; God disposes. Yusuf (1997, p. 171), however, suggests the expression To propose is human, to dispose is divine as the gender-neutral alternative of Man proposes, God disposes. Despite the consistent condemnation of gender-biased linguistic discrimination, there is persistent linguistic sexism in the discourses of some key forms of public communication including the national anthems. This is evident in the Source Texts (STs) of some anthems originally written in English as well as the Translated Texts (TTs) of other anthems originally written in other languages but translated to English to facilitate international communication. In some translated anthems there are elements of sexism duplicated as in the original texts which represent cases of replication of linguistic sexism. There are cases of sexism that only result from the translation of the anthems which represent cases of evocation of linguistic sexism. Also, there are cases where the sexism of the original anthems is eliminated in the translation of the anthems which represents the cases of revocation of linguistic sexism. This, therefore, motivates the present investigation of selected translated national anthems aimed at identifying and critically analysing cases of linguistic sexism of the affected translated national anthems.

AN OVERVIEW OF THE CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYTICAL PERSPECTIVE

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) simply put represents a critical approach to the analysis of spoken or written discourses. CDA, therefore, according to Luke (1997) helps a great deal in identifying, describing, interpreting, analysing and critiquing social life in spoken or written texts. On the critical dimension of CDA, Wodak (2004) specifically points out the fact that the intended critique involves establishing the interconnection of things in respect of a given text or discourse. Ayoola (2008, p. 98) further adds that CDA centres on “matters of grave concern to humanity such as inequality, injustice, all kinds of discrimination or oppressive
behaviours, all shades of ideological discrepancies and societal conflicts”. It is against this background that Fitch (2005, p. 254) expressly declares that “CDA is a framework considered as a general methodology, theory or critique allied to social constructionism, social power and oppression”. Therefore, CDA has been employed in the study of topical social phenomena as depicted in texts or discourses (Al-Sharabi, Noraini Ibrahim & Nor Fariza Md Nor 2011, Nor & Aziz 2010, Yasin, Hamid, Keong, Othman & Jalaluddin 2012).

Three main approaches to Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) stand out among those often adopted or adapted in the analysis of spoken and written texts or discourses. The review of ways and methods of CDA done by Ramanathan and Hoon (2015) confirms this position. These three major approaches are Fairclough’s Critical Language Analysis/ Analytical Approach, Wodak’s Discourse Historical (Analytical) Approach (DHA) and van Dijk’s Socio-Cognitive (Analytical) Approach (SCA). However, the Faircloughian Critical Discourse Analytical Approach/Perspective is considered most appropriate for the intended analysis of the cases of linguistic sexism of the selected translated national anthems. This is simply because the Faircloughian CDA according to Stibbe (2001) primarily focuses features like vocabulary, grammar, punctuation and textual structure which must have informed the description of the approach by Jorgensen and Philips (2002) as a most linguistically oriented CDA approach.

Specifically, Fairclough’s (1989, 1992) Three Dimensional Model is the adapted framework for the critical analysis of the identified cases of linguistic sexism of the affected translated national anthems. The rationale for adapting the 3DM is not far-fetched as Lande (2010) identifies the Faircloughian tripartite model or framework as the cornerstone of CDA simply because it represents the first to present sort of systematic guidelines for CDA researches/researchers. The adapted analytical framework is a five-level analytical framework premised on the three levels of the Faircloughian Three-Dimensional Model. It starts with exploration as the first level which is followed by description, interpretation and explanation that form the three levels of the adapted 3DM and it ends with resolution which represents the fifth level of the adapted analytical framework. The diagram of the analytical framework as adapted from the Faircloughian Three-Dimensional Model is shown below:
EXPLORATION OF THE LINGUISTIC SEXISM OF THE TRANSLATED NATIONAL ANTHEMS

This is the first level of the adapted critical discourse analytical framework. It is not usually identified as a distinct stage of a critical discourse analysis of text or discourse because it is believed that there is always an existing text or discourse for whoever wants to employ a critical discourse analytical approach. However, for the present purpose it is regarded as the level that marks the beginning of CDA as it ensures the discovery or availability of sizable and suitable discourse fragments to be subjected to the different levels of the CDA. The exploration done, therefore, involves linguistic examination of the target translated national anthems via careful study of the language of the national anthems. This basically is done with a view to identifying and isolating the actual translated national anthems which exhibit various elements of linguistic sexism.

Specifically, translated anthems originally written in some broadly spoken Germanic and Italic Indo-European languages are focused and considered for the purpose of the linguistic examination. Fortson (2015) identifies the ten branches of the Indo-European language family most of which have living or existing members as they are still spoken in different countries. The first group of translated anthems explored includes anthems written in West Germanic languages which include German and Dutch. The English language to which all the anthems are equally translated for international intelligibility is also a member of this language family but anthems originally written in English are not included in the exploration. The second group of translated anthems explored comprises anthems written in North Germanic languages, namely, Swedish, Danish, Icelandic and Norwegian to which Finnish is added due to their Nordic or Scandinavian geo-linguistic similitude. The third
group of translated anthems linguistically examined consists of anthems originally written in Italic or Romance languages which are French, Italian, Spanish, Portuguese and Romanian.

The motivation for the consideration of the anthems originally written in the selected Indo-European languages is basically not unconnected with the relatively significant numerical representation of the affected anthems. For instance, fifty-eight translated anthems are originally written in the selected Germanic and Italic Indo-European languages. These constitute about thirty percent of the entire population of one hundred and ninety-three anthems of the United Nations member states. The translated anthems written in these selected languages also constitute about thirty-six percent of the entire one hundred and sixty-one anthems of the different countries of the world that are originally written in some other national or indigenous languages of the countries but which are equally translated to English for the sake of international communication.

Moreover, the anthems written in the Germanic and Italic Indo-European languages have broad geographical spread as some of them cut across nations while many cut across continents of the world. German, for example, is used for the anthems of Germany, Austria, Switzerland and Liechtenstein which are all European nations. Similarly, Romanian is the original language of the anthems of Romania and Moldova which are also European nations. However, some of the Romance languages are the original languages of anthems of nations that cut across at least three continents of the world. The anthems of African countries like Togo, Cameroon, Chad and Niger, European countries like France and Belgium, as well as Haiti a Caribbean country are originally written in French. Spain in Europe, Equatorial Guinea in Africa and South/Central American countries like Bolivia, Peru, Chile, Honduras and Panama have anthems originally written in Spanish. Likewise, Portuguese is the original language of the anthems of Portugal in Europe, Brazil in South America as well as Cape Verde, Mozambique and Guinea Bissau in Africa.

DESCRIPTION OF THE LINGUISTIC SEXISM OF THE TRANSLATED NATIONAL ANTHEMS

This simply involves the identification of the cases of linguistic sexism discovered in the course of exploration or linguistic examination of the target translated anthems originally written in the stated languages. This means the description here is vocabulary-based as this, as far as the Faircloughian Three-Dimensional Model of CDA is concerned, can be from the view point of vocabulary, grammar, punctuation, cohesion or textual structure. The fifty-eight translated national anthems originally written in the selected West/North Germanic and Italic Indo-European languages are linguistically examined and this reveals various elements of linguistic sexism both in the Source Texts (STs) i.e. the original texts of the anthems and the Translated Texts (TTs) of the anthems. The three main cases of the linguistic sexism of anthems discovered are classified as cases of replication, evocation and revocation of linguistic sexism of translated national anthems.

CASES OF REPLICATION OF LINGUISTIC SEXISM

The cases of replication of linguistic sexism are in respect of situations where elements of linguistic sexism that can be traced to the Source Texts (STs) of national anthems are equally duplicated in the Translated Texts (TTs) of the anthems. This means the linguistic sexism of the Translated Texts (TTs) of the national anthems in question is not the making of the translators of the anthems as they only mirror or capture sexist linguistic elements that are introduced by the composers of the anthems. The linguistic examination of the fifty-eight
translated national anthems originally written in the selected West/North Germanic and Romance Indo-European languages shows that twenty of these translated national anthems have cases of replication of linguistic sexism that emanate from the original texts of the anthems. Translated anthems that exhibit such elements of replication of linguistic sexism include the anthems of Germany, Austria, Liechtenstein, Norway, Iceland, Netherlands, Spain, Paraguay, Guatemala, Chile, Costa Rica, Portugal, Angola, France, Cameroon, Guinea, Burkina Faso, Benin, Senegal, and Belgium as shown in the following illustrative excerpts:

**National Anthem of Germany (Stanza One)**
For the German fatherland Line 2
Für das deutsche Vaterland! (German)
Brotherly with heart and hand Line 4
Brüderlich mit Herz und Hand! (German)

**National Anthem of Austria (Stanza Three)**
Pledge allegiance to thee, Fatherland Line 5
Vaterland, dir Treue schwören (German)

**National Anthem of Liechtenstein (One Stanza Anthem)**
Long live our fatherland Lines 16 & 19
Hoch unser Vaterland (German)

**National Anthem of Norway (Stanzas Six & Eight)**
Now we three brothers stand united Stanza 6 Line 7
Nå vi står tre brodre sammen (Norwegian)
And as the fathers’ struggle has raised from fear to victory Stz. 8/3
Og som fedres kamp har hevet det av nød til seir (Norwegian)

**National Anthem of Iceland (Stanza Two)**
Lord, God of our fathers from age unto age Line 3
guð faðir, vor drottinn frá kyni til kyns (Icelandic)

**National Anthem of Netherlands (Stanza Four)**
My brothers high in rank Line 3
Mijn broeders hooch van Namen (Dutch)

**National Anthem of Spain (Stanza Two & Three)**
A hymn of brotherhood Stanza 2/Line 4
un himno e hermandad (Spanish)
Love the fatherland Stanza 3/Line 1
Ama a la Patria (Spanish)

**National Anthem of Paraguay (Stanza One)**
Our fathers, grandiose in battle Line 5
Nuestros padres, lidiando grandiosos (Spanish)

**National Anthem of Guatemala (Stanza Three)**
Our fathers fought one day Line 1
Nuestros padres lucharon un día (Spanish)

**National Anthem of Chile (Stanza Two)**
And yesterday’s invader is now our brother Line 2
Ya es hermano el que ayer invasor (Spanish)

**National Anthem of Costa Rica (One Stanza)**
That brings a glow to men’s faces Line 6
Que enrojece del hombre la faz (Spanish)
The cases of evocation of linguistic sexism in translated national anthems are in relation to situations where elements of linguistic sexism that do not emanate from the Source Texts (STs) are injected into the Translated Texts (TTs). This means the original composers of the affected translated anthems are not actually the initiators or originators of the sexist linguistic elements that characterise such anthems. Rather, the translators of the anthems are the ones who advertently or inadvertently incorporated the sexist elements in the affected anthems in the course of translating or reproducing the anthems in question. The outcome of the linguistic exploration of the translated anthems of nations originally written in the target West/North Germanic and Italic Indo-European languages shows that thirteen national anthems out of the fifty-eight anthems originally written in the selected languages exhibit cases of evocation of linguistic sexism. The translated anthems of the countries with such cases of evocation of linguistic sexism are the anthems of France, Dominica Republic, Niger, Republic of Congo, Peru, Togo, Venezuela, Cuba, Democratic Republic of Congo, Romania, Moldova, Chad and Finland with the following illustrative excerpts:

National Anthem of France (Stanza Four)
The shame of all good men Line 2
L’opprobre de tous *les partis* (French)

*National Anthem of Dominica Republic (Stanza One)*
Brave *men* of Quisqueya Line 1
Quisqueyanos valientes, alcemos (Spanish)

*National Anthem of Niger (Stanza One)*
Rise united, surging as from one *man* Line 9
S’élèvent dans un même élan (French)

*National Anthem of Republic of Congo (Chorus)*
Arise, Congolese, proud every *man* Line 1
Congolais, debout fièrement partout (French)

*National Anthem of Peru (Stanza Six)*
*Countrymen*, may we see her a slave no more Line 1
*Compatriotas*, no más verla esclava (Spanish)

*National Anthem of Togo (One Stanza Anthem)*
Hail to the land of our *forefathers* Line 1
Salut à toi pays de nos *aieux* (French)

*National Anthem of Venezuela (Stanza Two)*
Oh, loyal *countrymen*, strength is in unity Line 3-4
*Countrypatias* fieles, la fuerza es la union (Spanish)

*National Anthem of Cuba (Stanza One)*
Hasten to battle, *men* of Bayamo Line 1
Al combate corred Bayameses (Spanish)

*National Anthem of Democratic Republic of Congo (Stanza One)*
*Countrymen*, sing the sacred hymn of your solidarity Line 8
*Citoyens*, entonnez, l’hymne de votre solidatite (French)

*National Anthem of Romania (Stanza Three)*
Hundreds of thousands of strong *men* stand; Line 2
Cum stau ca brazi în munte voinici sute de mi; (Romanian)

*National Anthem of Moldova (Stanza Two)*
Amidst *brothers*, awakened Line 2
Într-un neam, ce fără veste (Romanian)

*National Anthem of Chad (Stanza Two)*
Faithful to your *fathers* who are watching you Line 4
Fidèle à tes *anciens* qui te regardent (French)

*National Anthem of Finland (Stanza One)*
Our land, our land, our *fatherland*, Line 1
Oi *maamme* Suomi, synnyinmaa, (Finnish)

**CASES OF REVOKEATION OF LINGUISTIC SEXISM**

Revocation of linguistic sexism of translated national anthems describes a situation where lexical elements of linguistic discrimination incorporated in the Source Texts (TTs) of anthems are eliminated or reverted in the Translated Texts (TTs) of national anthems. This, therefore, represents a case of lexico-semantic neutralisation of the composer-induced elements of linguistic discrimination in the course of the translation or reproduction of the affected national anthems. However, this situation only partially addresses the problem of linguistic sexism of such anthems and does not completely redress the linguistically defective
usage. This is simply because the linguistic sexism of the Source Texts (STs) of the affected anthems remains unresolved and there is no way the Translated Texts (TTs) of such anthems will be considered without reference to their Source Texts (STs). The eleven anthems out of the fifty-eight selected translated national anthems with identified cases of revocation of linguistic sexism are the anthems of Switzerland, Brazil, Cuba, Costa Rica, Ecuador, El Salvador, Cote D’Ivoire, Uruguay, Denmark, Haiti and Guinea Bissau with the following illustrative excerpts:

National Anthem of Switzerland (Stanza Three)
That God dwelleth in this land Line 9
Gott, den Herrn, im hehren Vaterland (German)

National Anthem of Brazil (Stanza Two)
O beloved, idolized homeland, hail, hail! Line 1
O Patria amada, idolatrada, salve! Salve! (Portuguese)

National Anthem of Cuba (Stanza One)
For the homeland looks proudly to you Line 2
Que la patria os comtempla orgullosa (Spanish)

National Anthem of Costa Rica (Stanza One)
Noble homeland, your beautiful flag Line 1
Noble patria, tu hermosa bandera (Spanish)

National Anthem of Ecuador (Stanza One)
Your children of the yoke were outraged Line 1
Indignados tus hijos del yugo (Spanish)

National Anthem of El Salvador (Chorus)
Proud to be called your children Line 2
De hijos tuyos podernos llamar (Spanish)

National Anthem of Cote D’Ivoire (Chorus)
The homeland of true brotherhood Line 6
La patrie de la vrai fraternite (French)

National Anthem of Uruguay (Stanza Two)
This is the outcry which our nation saved Line 1
Este grito a la patria salvó (Spanish)

National Anthem of Denmark (Stanza Four)
Hail sovereign, hail home! Line 1
Hil drot og fødreland! (Danish)

National Anthem of Haiti (Chorus)
For our forebears, for our country Line 5
Pour les aieux, pour la patrie (French)

National Anthem of Guinea Bissau (Chorus)
Long live our glorious country! Line 1
Viva a Pátria gloriosa! (Portuguese)

DIAGRAMMATIC REPRESENTATION OF THE CASES OF REPLICATION, EVOCATION AND REVOCATION OF SEXISM

This involves a diagram that presents a schematic overview of the identified cases of linguistic sexism of the target translated national anthems. Keyton (2015) supports the diagramming of data so as to have a reduced but vivid version of the whole data. So, this diagram basically miniaturises the outcome of the linguistic exploration of the translated national anthems aimed at capturing the identified cases of linguistic sexism of affected national anthems. The schematic diagram shows the continental affiliation of the various
countries whose anthems exhibit the different cases of linguistic sexism that characterise the translated national anthems. The various countries with affected national anthems are from four of the six main continents of the world, namely, Europe, North America, South America and Africa. However, the continents are grouped into two for ease of presentation of the countries having anthems identified with the cases of replication, evocation and revocation of linguistic sexism. For each of the cases, the European and North American countries are first enumerated followed by the South American and African countries in that order. Below is the schematic diagram that recapitulates the identified cases of linguistic sexism of the affected translated national anthems with four distinctive coloured stars marking the different continents of the various countries with the identified cases.

**FIGURE 2.** Diagrammatic representation of the linguistic sexism of translated anthems
FORMS OF THE IDENTIFIED CASES OF THE LINGUISTIC SEXISM OF TRANSLATED ANTHEMS

One key form of linguistic sexism exhibited in the various illustrated cases of replication, evocation and revocation of sexism in translated national anthems is the use of masculine generic lexemes. There is a generic use of the word ‘man’ in the anthems of Niger, Costa Rica, Burkina Faso, France, Romania, Dominica Republic, Congo and Cuba. The word ‘sons’ which is semantically equivalent to ‘fils’ in French is generically used in the anthem of Benin just ‘hijos’ the Spanish equivalent is used in the anthems of Ecuador and El Salvador but given the neutral translation ‘children’. The word ‘father’ is also used generically in the anthems of Norway, Iceland, Paraguay, Guatemala, Cameroon and Chad. Similarly, there is the generic use of the word ‘brother’ in the anthems of Norway, Netherlands, Chile, Guinea and Moldova. Likewise, there is the generic use of ‘hero’ in the translated anthem of Senegal.

However, Sczesny, Formanowicz and Moser (2016) describe such masculine generics as gender unfair language that restricts the visibility of women and which is disadvantageous.

Another form of linguistic sexism evident in the cases of replication, evocation and revocation of sexism of translated anthems is masculine-lexeme-based morphological derivation. This is in respect of (the cases of) words morphologically derived from or in combination with obviously masculine words exemplified in the uses of the words ‘fatherland’, ‘forefathers’, ‘countrymen’ and ‘brotherhood’ in identified translated anthems. The word ‘fatherland’ is used in the translated anthems of Germany, Austria, Liechtenstein, Portugal, Angola, France, Spain and Finland. However, there is the neutralisation of the equivalent ‘vaterland’ in the anthem of Switzerland, ‘fædreland’ of the anthem of Denmark, ‘patria’ of the anthems of Cuba, Brazil, Costa Rica and Uruguay and ‘patrie’ of the anthems of Cote D’Ivoire and Haiti as ‘home(land)’, ‘this land’, ‘country’ or ‘nation’. The word ‘countrymen’ is used in the translated anthems of Peru, Venezuela and Democratic Republic of Congo just as the words ‘forefathers’ and ‘brotherhood’ are used respectively in the translated anthems of Togo and Spain as illustrated in the respective excerpts of these anthems.

There is also the case of feminisation of geographical entities as rare form of linguistic sexism displayed in duplication, evocation or revocation of sexism in some translated national anthems. Feminisation of geographical entities as an identified form of linguistic sexism in translated anthems is in respect of the way nations or continents mentioned in some anthems are arbitrarily ascribed the feminine gender via their figurative description as mothers. The two translated national anthems with cases of feminisation of geographical entities as already illustrated are the anthems of Belgium and Senegal. In the anthem of Belgium the nation in question is feminised while in the anthems of Senegal the continent of Africa is feminised as they are both regarded as mothers. These two cases of feminisation of geographical entities of the anthems of Belgium and Senegal are the only feminine-gender-favoured cases of linguistic sexism of translated anthems. All the remaining ones identified are cases of masculine-gender-favoured linguistic sexism of translated national anthems.

INTERPRETATION OF THE CASES OF LINGUISTIC SEXISM OF THE TRANSLATED ANTHEMS

Interpretation as a critical discourse concept, especially in relation to the Faircloughian Three-Dimensional Model, basically, centres on the analysis or consideration of some relevant factors or circumstances surrounding the process of production or consumption of a particular text or discourse. It is believed that such facts can corroborate or reinforce the
expressly provided information of a text or discourse thereby facilitating better comprehension of the text or discourse in question. Three main factors are crucial to getting the facts required for good interpretation of text which are the content of text, the context of the text and contents of related text. It is against this background that the interpretation of the linguistic sexism of the translated national anthems is based on textual interpretation, contextual interpretation and inter-textual interpretation as discussed below.

TEXTUAL INTERPRETATION OF THE LINGUISTIC SEXISM

Linguistic sexism with respect to the identified cases of the translated anthems actually depicts linguistic discrimination against the masculine or feminine gender in the course of disseminating information targeted at both males and females. However, the identified cases of the linguistic sexism of the translated national anthems show that it is predominantly in favour of members of the masculine gender - males or men. This is because thirty-eight out of the forty identified translated anthems with cases of linguistic sexism have elements of masculine-gender-favoured linguistic sexism while just two anthems have cases of feminine-gender-favoured linguistic sexism.

The express identification or recognition of just males via the use of generic word like ‘sons’, ‘brothers’, ‘fathers’, ‘forefathers’, ‘brotherhood’ and ‘heroes’ as if it is a mono-gender world is a clear case of gender alienation or segregation. This is irrespective of the rationalised presumption that such words when so used have both-gender-inclusive semantic interpretations. It is obvious that the males categorically mentioned in the affected anthems are primarily the direct referents of the ideas communicated. This, therefore, amounts to presenting males who are members of the expressly stated gender as the active participants while the females who are not directly identified are the passive participants.

It is also obvious that even the presumed extended generic use of masculine lexemes for both males and females is not linguistically impeccable. This is essentially because of the existence of similar feminine words with equivalent semantic interpretations. For example, the words ‘daughters’, ‘sisters’, ‘mothers’, ‘foremothers’, ‘sisterhood’ and ‘heroines’ are supposed to be the feminine equivalents of the words ‘sons’, ‘brothers’, ‘fathers’, ‘forefathers’, ‘brotherhood’ and ‘heroes’. However, these feminine words are not usually used generically to encompass or represent both male and female referents as exemplified in some of the illustrated translated national anthems. This is, therefore, a pointer to the fact that the masculine generic use is simply one-sided and it amounts to linguistic discrimination. Discrimination according to Coan and Mitterer (2015, p. 240) involves “treating members of various groups differently in circumstances where their right of treatment should be identical”.

CONTEXTUAL INTERPRETATION OF THE LINGUISTIC SEXISM

The contextual interpretation is premised on the concepts of contextualisation which Wardhaugh and Fuller (2015) describe as the use of verbal and non-verbal signals to facilitate logical processing and interpretation of texts or discourses. Richardson and Wodak (2014) stress the importance of context and identify forms of context relevant to the interpretation of texts. One factor that is crucial to the interpretation or understanding of the identified cases of linguistic sexism of the affected translated national anthems therefore is the situational context of the production. This is in respect of the situation surrounding the composition of the anthems in question in their respective production environments or societies. For example, the names of the anthem composers show that most of the identified translated anthems with cases of linguistic sexism were composed or translated by men. This
presupposes that the affected anthems were produced from the linguistic viewpoints of men who championed the composition and translation of these anthems. This, therefore, accounts for the preponderance of masculine-gender-favoured cases of linguistic sexism in the identified translated national anthems with just two out of forty translated anthems with elements of linguistic sexism having cases that are in favour of the feminine gender.

Another factor that is vital to the interpretation or comprehension of cases of linguistic sexism of the identified translated national anthems is the spatio-temporal context of the production of the affected translated anthems. This is considered to be equally relevant to the linguistic sexism of translated national anthems simply because many of the affected anthems were produced in many societies at periods of time when gender discrimination was more or less the order of the day. It was not really seen as a social menace as it is seen today in various societies where it is consistently criticised and discouraged especially by radical feminists who are propagating the principle of gender equality. Many of the anthems were written when members of the feminine gender were still subjected to the background roles in various domains and could not yet boast of enjoying equal rights compared to the members of the masculine gender. The predominantly masculine-gender-favoured cases of linguistic sexism in the translated national anthems, therefore, only reflect prevalent trends when and where the anthems were composed or produced.

Relevant social/gender theories have been advanced for the explanation of the gender-based discrimination or inequality that members of the feminine gender have been subjected to over the years. Some of these theories could also account for the linguistic alienation of the feminine gender via the instrumentality of linguistic sexism exhibited in the illustrated excerpts of translated national anthems. Penelope’s (1990) Patriarchal Universe of Discourse is one of such gender-based theories that focus the issue of gender dominance or dichotomy. According to this theory, men or males who are believed to be instrumental to the codification of language are in control of language which they often use to their advantage so as to protect their interest and to ensure their linguistic domination. Kramarae’s (2006) Muted Group Theory is another gender-based theory which accounts for the silenced state of women who are rendered voiceless or less prominent and who are thereby denied the vocal advantage enjoyed by their male counterparts.

**INTER-TEXTUAL INTERPRETATION OF THE LINGUISTIC SEXISM**

Inter-textual interpretation is an attempt to account for the linguistic sexism of anthems based on the concept of inter-textuality which primarily centres on the possible interconnect or interrelationship of texts. This is informed by the belief that texts are not usually produced, and do not usually exist, in isolation, hence, the possibility of given texts to reflect (on) antecedent texts and to be reflected in prospective texts. It is against this background that Fairclough (2014) points out that every text usually has a set of potentially relevant or incorporated texts. Kolawole (2005) also affirms that a text is directly or indirectly influenced by some other texts, ideologies, literary traditions, linguistic pattern or belief system of a given social environment. In a similar vein, Felluga (2015) posits that a text represents the absorption or transformation of another text which is in line with the position of Julia Kristeva who according to the author actually coined the word.

The excerpts of anthems show some lexical similitude in respect of cases of linguistic sexism especially in anthems of nations with similar linguistic, historical or geographical milieu. For example, the word ‘patria’ of the anthem of Spain is also replicated in the anthems of Peru, Uruguay, Paraguay, Mexico, Ecuador, Chile, Columbia, Costa Rica and El Salvador where it is translated as ‘fatherland’ except in the last three anthems. Similarly, the word ‘vaterland’ of the anthem of Germany is replicated in the anthems of Austria and
Liechtenstein and translated as ‘fatherland’ but the sexism of the word is revoked in the translated anthem of Switzerland with its translation as ‘this land’. Likewise, the word ‘patrie’ of the anthem of France is also replicated in the anthems of Belgium, Gabon, Cameroon, Mali and Central African Republic and translated as ‘fatherland’ except in the anthem of Cote D’ivoire.

EXPLANATION OF THE LINGUISTIC SEXISM OF THE TRANSLATED NATIONAL ANTHEMS

Explanation entails social analysis in respect of the possible societal factors relating to the observed situation in text or discourse. Texts are believed to be motivated by some prevalent ideologies of certain members of given societies. Ideology according to Dijk (2006) is the shared belief system of a group or society which informs or influences its opinions or positions on contemporary issues. Tahir (2013) points out the fact that social actors often employ the instrumentality of ideology in propagating, legitimising and reinforcing their own ideas or ideals. Alo and Ajewole-Oromogunje (2013) also confirm this position as they expose the ideological biases of selected radio lead news. The linguistic sexism of the identified translated national anthems is reflective of the patriarchal and chauvinistic ideologies characteristic of many of the societies with the affected national anthems. The spate of patriarchy – the predominant leadership of/by men and chauvinism - showing preference for males is, therefore, linguistically mirrored in the sexist language of affected translated anthems.

Translated Texts (TTs) as pointed out by Lande (2010) are ideologically motivated just as their Source Texts (STs). Likewise, they are both reflective of the discourse power at the disposal of the key discourse participants. The linguistic sexism of the original national anthem texts is a pointer to the linguistic power available to the original anthem producers exhibited in the choice of words which promote or support their ideological stance forced on the target audience. The composers, therefore, occupy a powerful discourse position while members of the target audience, made to rationalise the composers’ diction which may negate their own ideological stance, occupy a less powerful or powerless discourse position. Similarly, the anthem translators or reproducers also display the linguistic power at their disposal which can be used to reinforce, neutralise or negate the linguistic power of the original text or discourse producers. This explains why in the translated anthems the linguistic sexism of the original anthem texts is retained in some anthems, removed in some anthems or reversed in some other translated national anthems.

RESOLUTION OF THE LINGUISTIC SEXISM OF THE TRANSLATED NATIONAL ANTHEMS

There is the dire need for the resolution of the linguistic sexism of both the Source Texts (STs) and the Translated Texts (TTs) of the identified national anthems in line the emancipatory cum problem-solving role of CDA. It is, therefore, not enough when the Source Texts (STs) are free of linguistic sexism which is evoked in the Translated Texts (TTs) or when the linguistic sexism that is revoked in Translated Texts (TTs) remains in the Source Texts (STs). It is, therefore, pertinent for the affected anthems to be linguistically overhauled with a view to observing the principle of linguistic equality as opposed to linguistic sexism exhibited in the identified translated national anthems. This way, the linguistic sexism of translated anthems with misogynistic expressions like ‘fatherland’ or ‘motherland’,
‘forefathers’ or ‘countrymen’ which are gender-biased can be resolved by replacing them with alternative androgy nous expressions like ‘native land’, ‘ancestors’ and ‘citizens’ with semantic cum syllabic similitude and which are obviously gender neutral.

There is also the need to streamline the composition or production and translation or reproduction of anthems by stipulating well defined process that should be strictly followed to ensure that their language and contents are critically examined and refined even before such anthems are approved. This is to ensure that such anthems actually capture vivid pictures of the citizens of given countries and intended notions about the nations they represent which can facilitate their general acceptability other things being equal. It is against this background that a six-stage anthem (re)production process is hereby proposed as a fundamental way of bringing out the best of anthem composition or production and translation or reproduction. This involves soliciting for anthem submissions, screening submissions and selecting the best anthem, subjecting selected anthem to referendum, supporting accepted anthem with legislation, starting use as legislated and stipulating periodic review of approved anthem. This is to make sure that the language and content of anthems are in tandem with contemporary trends or societal realities. Below is the diagram of the proposed anthem (re)production process:

FIGURE 3. Proposed six-stage anthem (re)production process

The first stage is a call for submissions from talented creative writers as specified by the authority at the elms of affairs. The second stage enables a team of versatile experts to objectively scrutinise the submissions and collectively choose the one with the best content and diction. The third stage involves conducting sort of representative opinion polls on the popularity of the selected anthem so as to ensure its acceptability by the vast majority of the people. The fourth stage involves backing the choice and use of the selected and generally accepted anthem with an enabling law. The fifth stage involves the commencement of the use of the anthem as approved or legislated to prevent any misuse that deviates from the set goal of the anthem or any abuse that may be inimical to national interest. The sixth and last stage is necessitated by the fact that we are in a dynamic world where the only constant thing is change. Also, language itself used in communicating the ideas of the anthems is a living and dynamic phenomenon, hence, it is pertinent for the anthems to be reviewed periodically to ensure that the ideas disseminated therein and the language used are in line with contemporary trends or realities.

It is important to point out the fact that the above proposed anthem (re)production process practically has a three-in-one functionality or applicability. This is simply because it is relevant to the fresh production or composition of original anthems, the reproduction or translation of the original anthems to English for international communication and possibly partial or holistic review of anthems especially those considered due for linguistic or thematic overhaul. Another good thing about the proposed anthem (re) production process is that it
enables as many good heads as possible to be involved in the production of the anthem and to ensure the popularity or general acceptance of the selected anthem by the representative majority via a democratic process. The advantage of so doing lies in the fact that such an anthem, eventually backed by the law, will be seen as the product of the collective decision of the people, hence, it will be highly respected and supported by the people. This, therefore, prevents a situation where people/citizens dissociate themselves from the contents or aspects of the national anthems that epitomise them and their nations.

CONCLUSION

The Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) of the forty-four cases of linguistic sexism identified in the affected forty translated national anthems via the instrumentality of a five-level analytical framework adapted from Fairclough’s (1989, 1992) three-dimensional model has revealed three distinct instances of linguistic sexism. The first case is in respect of the replication of linguistic sexism in translated anthems as initiated in the original anthems. This has the highest numerical representation with the twenty cases identified. The second case is in relation to the evocation of linguistic sexism in the translated anthems where the original anthems do not reflect such a case. This is next to the first case in numerical representation based on the thirteen cases identified. The third case is basically on the revocation of linguistic sexism that emanates from original anthems but obviously neutralised in the translated anthems. This of course has the lowest numerical representation which is buttressed by the eleven of such cases identified.

It is evident from the analysis of the identified translated anthems that the linguistic sexism of the affected anthems is predominantly in favour of the masculine gender and significantly to the disadvantage of the feminine gender. This is simply because only two of the identified translated national anthems with cases of linguistic sexism investigated exhibit elements of feminine-gender-favoured linguistic sexism. The cases of the remaining thirty-eight translated national anthems represent different forms of masculine-gender-favoured linguistic sexism. This accounts for why some people narrow down the semantic interpretation of linguistic sexism to gender-biased language that sidelines or alienates and denigrates or disparages women or females where men or males are expressly identified and duly recognized (He 2010, Reep 2011).

The linguistic sexism of the Source Texts (STs) and Translated Texts (TTs) of anthems, however, both need to be properly addressed and redressed so as to ensure the use of gender neutral language in disseminating the contents of the national anthems. Sczesny, Formanowicz and Moser (2015) describe this as Gender Fair Language (GFL) use that aims at reducing gender stereotyping and discrimination by treating women and men symmetrically. Such gender-inclusive language according to Griffin (2015) recognizes both women and men as active participants in the world. It is also reflects social justice which according Gerad (2016) is the assurance of equity for those systematically marginalised based on gender, age, race or ethnicity.

There is therefore the need to linguistically overhaul translated anthems with various cases of linguistic sexism considering the suggested linguistic panaceas especially the use of androgynous lexemes or expressions that are gender-neutral instead of the misogynistic lexemes or expressions that are gender-biased in the composition and translation of national anthems. This will enable the language of the anthems to reflect the basic principle of linguistic equality as opposed to that of linguistic discrimination. This position is in line with contemporary global trends towards the condemnation of all forms of gender-based linguistic marginalisation especially in public communication.
The proposed six-stage anthem (re)production process, when strictly enforced and carefully followed or observed will help a great deal in getting the best of the exercise. This can be useful when there is the need for the composition of fresh anthems for nations, the translation of original anthems of nations usually to English for a wider audience or the review of existing anthems of nations to reflect contemporary realities. This essentially will facilitate the (re)production of national anthems that are properly worded with well-articulated contents which not only accurately epitomise the countries in question but also correctly represent the citizens who are basically males and females deserving equal rights. In a nutshell, its end result is the (re)production of popular or generally acceptable national anthems that all and sundry can identify with and defend at all times and in all situations other things being equal.
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