Adab Al-Rafidayn Journal

**A refereed quarterly scientific journal
Issued by College of Arts - University of Mosul**

A

Adab Al-Rafidayn Journal

Publishing instructions rules

1. A researcher who wants to publish in Adab Al-Rafidayn journal should enter the platform of the journal and register by an official or personal activated email via the following link:

https://radab.mosuljournals.com/contacts?_action=signup

2. After registration, the platform will send to your mail that you registered on the site and a password will be sent for use in entering the journal by writing your email with the password on the following link:

https://radab.mosuljournals.com/contacts?_action=login

3- The platform (the site) will grant the status of the researcher to those who registered to be able in this capacity to submit their research with a set of steps that begin by filling out data related to them and their research and they can view it when downloading their research.

4-File formats for submission to peer review are as follows:

• Fonts: a "standard" type size is as follows: (Title: at 16point / content : at 14point / Margins: at 10 point), and the number of lines per page: (27) lines under the page heading line with the title, writer name, journal name, number and year of publishing, in that the number of pages does not exceed 25 in the latest edition in the journal free of illustrations, maps, tables, translation work, and text verification, and (30) pages for research containing the things referred to.

- Margins are arranged in numbers for each page. The source and reference are defined in the margin glossary at the first mentioned word. List of references is canceled, and only the reference is mentioned in the first mentioning place, in case the source is repeated use (ibid.)

• The research is referred to the test of similarity report to determine the percentage of originality then if it pass the test it is referred to two referees who nominate it for publication after checking its scientific sobriety, and confirming its safety from plagiarism , and if the two experts disagree –it is referred to a third referee for the last peer review and to decide on the acceptance or rejection of the research .

C

5- The researcher (author) is committed to provide the following information about the research:

•The research submitted for evaluation to the journal must not include the name of the researcher, i.e. sent without a name.

•A clear and complete title for the research in Arabic and English should be installed on the body of the research, with a brief title for the research in both languages: Arabic and English.

•The full address of the researcher must be confirmed in two languages: Arabic and English, indicating: (the scientific department / college or institute / university / country) with the inclusion of an effective email of the researcher.

• The researcher must formulate two scientific abstracts for the research in two languages: Arabic and English, not less than (150) and not more than (250) words.

•presenting at least three key words that are more likely to be repeated and differentiated in the research.

6-The researcher must observe the following scientific conditions in writing his research, as it is the basis for evaluation, otherwise the referees will hold him responsible. The scientific conditions are shown in the following:

•There should be a clear definition of the research problem in a special paragraph entitled: (research problem) or (problem of research).

•The researcher must take into account the formulation of research questions or hypotheses that express the problem of research and work to achieve and solve or scientifically refute it in the body of the research.

• The researcher works to determine the importance of his research and the goals that he seeks to achieve, and to determine the purpose of its application.

•There must be a clear definition of the limits of the research and its population that the researcher is working on in his research.

•The researcher must consider choosing the correct methodology that is appropriate to the subject of his research, and must also consider the data collection tools that are appropriate for his research and the approach followed in it.

- Consideration should be given to the design of the research, its final output, and the logical sequence of its ideas and paragraphs.

•The researcher should take into consideration the choice of references or sources of information on which the research depends, and choose what is appropriate for his research taking into account the modernity in it, and the accuracy in documenting , quoting form these sources.

•The researcher should consider taking note of the results that the researcher reached, and make sure of their topics and their rate of correlation with research questions or hypotheses that the researcher has put in his research.

7- The researcher should be aware that the judgment on the research will be according to a peer review form that includes the above details, then it will be sent to the referee and on the basis of which the research will be judged and weights will be given to its paragraphs and according to what is decided by those weights the research will be accepted or rejected. Therefore; the researcher must take that into account in preparing his research.

Editor-in-chief

CONTENTS

A History of the Grammatical Category of: "Gender"

Mahfoodh Khalaf Mahmood *
Marwan Najib Tawfiq **

Abstract

Grammatical categories, like all scientific phenomena, have passed through different stages of development and modification, and gender is no exception. This category is deeply rooted in the history of linguistic studies from the time of the Greeks to present day. This study tries to trace the history of this linguistic phenomenon in the Western and Arab schools of linguistics. A chronological basis is followed in the presentation of ideas for each school. Every major contribution is discussed, compared and evaluated in light of modern theory of linguistic gender. The study is concluded with a summary of the literature in both schools of thought which show how each school is characterized by peculiar features in the approach followed in the analysis of nominal systems.

Keywords: grammatical categories, gender assignment, nominal classification.

1. Introduction

Etymologically, gender is derived from the Latin genus "kind" or "sort" (Huddleston & Pullum, 2002, p. 485). It is a controversial issue in the history of linguistics due to the wide gap between languages as far as the reality and role of this grammatical category in the semantics and syntax of languages is concerned. Gender being a feature of nouns acquires its semiotic dimension from the association of linguistic form with the referent's features in the natural world. This cognitive interconnection of linguistic form

---

 *PhD student/ Dept. of English/ College of Arts / University of Mosul.

* *Asst.Peof/ Dept. of English/ College of Arts / University of Mosul.

with non-linguistic objects gave rise to a rich literature of speculations and explications of this phenomenon.

The history of the literature on the grammatical category of gender (GG) or noun classes can be described as a gradual development of the study of this phenomenon starting from a simple view to a more complex perspective. There are multi-disciplinary views of the motivation and function of gender assignment (GA) in the literature of both Arabic and Western linguistics. This historical overview of the grammatical category tries to answer questions like:

1. When did grammatical gender start to appear in the literature of linguistic studies?
2. What stages did it go through?
3. How was it affected by the philosophical atmosphere of each stage?
4. What are the principles that dominate the grammatical gender theories?
5. How are Western theory and Arabic theory similar or different?

Western Literature on GG

The main ideas and the terminology of gender dates back to as early as the 5th century B.C., but this period is described as prescientific. Therefore, the focus here is on the literature of gender studies that starts with the turn of the 19th century which represents the start of the scientific and descriptive thinking. Two major ideas dominate the studies of GG: the mechanism behind the GA of nouns and the relation between the sign and its meaning.

Is Gender Arbitrary or Motivated?

Gender or noun classification is about the relationship between a noun's form and meaning. This dichotomy shows how this grammatical category crosses the borders of grammar and semantics while at the same time being deeply rooted in both. Form is an arbitrary thing which completes the triangle of signs with the signification associated with it in the minds of speakers of a certain language and links it with the outside world (Peirce, 1991). We can

state with confidence here that gender may be the only grammatical category that has an implicit sub-meaning to the signified part of the sign which is the psychological representation of the nominal entity in the mind of the speaker to be added to the entity itself in the extra-linguistic world. This is the theory of the semantic triangle where meaning is essentially a threefold relationship between *linguistic forms, concepts and referents* (Peirce, 1991).   For example, when we are encountered with the word tree in any language, the connection this word makes in the minds of speakers of different languages is almost one except for some minor differences, but a great majority of them may differ in the gender association of this very entity. This is, in our opinion, a new dimension of the theory that is not clearly stated by Pierce i.e., every community has its own system of motivation that determines the type of gender a noun is assigned to.

The issue of GA has always been there ever since man started to speak as evidenced by the historical and linguistic literature. The earliest reference to gender by the Greek philosopher Protagoras about inanimate gender which reveals an early attempt to see the world as comprising different entities even if the view is restricted to having life from not having life. We know how simple is the early treatment of gender in the old world, but it is like every beginning, a starting bullet. Lyons,(1968) points to Protagoras as the earliest grammarian who is credited with the distinction of three genders in Greek: masculine, feminine and "things". He also cites Aristotle's introduction of the term "intermediate" (third gender), which are neither masculine nor feminine, to be labelled later as "neither" and even later as "neuter". However, this first step was a milestone in the continuous work in this domain.

Kilarski (p. 323) cites first attempts to disclose the existence of regularities in grammar by Apollonius Dyscolus and Varro. This is a very significant point in the history of grammar in general and gender in particular. This had tremendous effect on the subsequent development of the discipline. The word regularity necessarily means a motivated process because arbitrary things are not usually rule-based.

The grammarians of the early centuries believed that the semantic motivation was accepted as long as it classifies animate nouns into masculine or feminine, deeming inanimate nouns and other genders classes as arbitrary (Lyons:99).

James Harris (1751), in contrast, interpreted gender in comparison with the extralinguistic world. He considers the assignment of inanimate nouns as fixed properties of males and females. This is, in our opinion, the first step towards a binary theory of grammatical vs natural gender (natural gender means that the gender of the noun that reflects the biological sex of the referent, whereas grammatical gender means that the noun behaves syntactically as masculine or feminine without having natural sex) (Fromkin, Rodman, & Hyams, 2011, p. 72).

The Semantic properties of nouns are observed in the literature of non-Indo-European gender systems. One example is the GA of Algonquian (north American Indian) languages during the 17th through the 19th centuries which depended on the concept of animacy and other factors such as ***respect and rank*** (Corbett, 1991).

Kilarisk (2013, p. 323) notes that in line with the dominant 'Romantic' view adopted by Herder and others, the Indo-European gender has an inherently semantic feature instituted in the imagination and personification of early man.

Grimm (cited in (Kilarski, 2013)), views grammatical gender as an extension of natural gender to inanimate nouns depending on ***strength, size and activity*** of the referent. This is also applicable to Arabic which is famous for its extension of natural gender to inanimate things.

There was a departure from the diachronic perspective in the 19th century towards descriptive sentiment in the early 20th century. This shift echoes Saussure's separation between synchronic and diachronic linguistics and abandoning historical analysis of the morphology of Indo-European gender which was seen as unproductive. The repercussion of this sentiment is a departure from historical link of the motivation of noun classes towards a

description of the present state of the language, the idea which leaves motivations to speculations.

There was an increase in comparative studies which considered "the sex principle, which underlies the classification of nouns in European languages, is merely one of a great many possible classifications of this kind" (Boas, 1911, pp. 36-7).

Leonard Bloomfield's remarks on Indo-European gender in **Language** (Bloomfield, 1933) is part of the wave of the arbitrariness of GA. His treatment of gender is defined in terms of **agreement classes** rather than semantic content (which is in congruence with his sentiment towards excluding meaning from grammar). For instance, in German, "genders are arbitrary classes, each of which demands different congruence-forms in certain kinds of accompanying words" (p. 192).

The categories of gender in English are close to our non-linguistic recognition of personality and sex. However, some animals and other things (bull/ ship) are in some occasions treated differently. The gender-categories of most Indo-European languages, such as the two of French or the three of German, do not agree with anything in the practical world, and this is true of most such classes. The Algonquian languages, like Arabic, treat persons and animals as 'animate' gender, and some other objects, such as 'raspberry,' 'kettle,' and 'knee'; while all other inanimate objects are classified as 'inanimate' gender (Bloomfield 1933: 271–272). Arabic may differ in dividing all nouns, whether animate or inanimate, into masculine and feminine, but the similarity is in mixing different classes.

Based on its arbitrary nature, Bloomfield who considers gender as arbitrary, considers it as part of the lexicon, as "an appendix of the grammar, a list of basic irregularities" (p. 274). For him gender is not open to linguistic classification.

Gender in Semitic and Indo-European Languages

The origin of grammatical gender was thought to be motivated by "belief systems" of the early men. Kilarski cites an example of Indo-European gender by Joseph Vendryes (Kilarski, 2013, p. 214). He describes Gender as an attempt by the mind to classify the various concepts expressed by nouns. This classification must be a response to the way our ancestors imagined the world and shaped by *mystical and religious* motives.

Following 19th century scholars, Bonfante (cited in Kilarski, 2013, p. 847) considers personification (divinisation) of inanimate objects and natural phenomena as the motivation behind Indo-European gender (p.847). We can see that early religious and metaphysical beliefs had their repercussions too on the assignment process.

The origin of the grammatical gender in Indo-European languages was also linked to *implicit female and male* features. For example, Meillet (cited in Kilarski, 2013, p. 176) linked the masculine and feminine genders of "sky" vs. "earth", and "foot" vs. "hand" with the feature male=active vs. female=passive, which is suggestive of the parallels made by classical and medieval scholar.

According to Kilarski (2013, p. 190); however, Semitic languages have their own way. In Semitic languages, the feminine name is derived from the masculine name as suggested by Baudouin de Courtenay (translated by Kilarski 2013, p. 190) as one of the commonest ways of forming words, yet some nouns are only seemingly derived from masculine nouns. Many feminine marked nouns do not have masculine counterparts such as the marked feminine common nouns like "hajja" (snake fem.) or even sometime they have different pairs such "baqara" (cow) whose male counterpart is "thawr" (bull) not to mention inanimate and abstract nouns.

Wensinck (1972, p. 52), however, links the origin of the Semitic feminine gender to such notions as *'intensity'* and *'magical*

energy'. This may be true for early classical Arabic but modern Arabic does not support this hypothesis.

Straus and Brightman (1982) suggest a **referential and contextual** motivation of GA such as narratives, word lists, and loanwords from English which are assigned by native speakers depending on the referent's meaning only.

The imperfect match between gender and meaning has inspired two diverging lines of thinking which date back to the early Greek scholars. The first resorted to hidden layers of meaning attributed to metaphorical extension, personification, or culture-specific classification often inaccessible to the outside observer (Grimm, 1831 and von Humboldt, 1822). The second line maintains that gender is, to a large extent, a matter of grammar: a classification of nouns rather than of **kinds and concepts** (Kilarski, 2013).

The syntactic behaviour of gender is also part of the history of this linguistic phenomenon. Arabic, as a Semitic language, is peculiar in the nature of the syntactic behaviour of nouns whose gender and number play a profuse role in modifying the form of the associated elements of the sentence in which the noun occurs: demonstratives, pronouns, reflexive pronouns, numbers etc.

Gender's Turning Point

Alfred Irving Hallowell drew the dividing line between traditional and modern theory of gender in linguistics (Hallowell, 1955). He pointed out that the use of the terms "animate and inanimate" shows the European bias in thought. He insists that linguistic data has to be configured within a cultural context. This is the first reference to extralinguistic factors leading to the GA of nouns.

The sociocultural factors indicated by Hallowell opened the door to the explanation of a seemingly confusable linguistic phenomenon. After considering the Ojibwa language, he expresses his opinion with certainty that only when evidence from *attitudes, beliefs, conduct, and linguistic* characterization are considered

together, can the psychological basis for their unified cognitive position be appreciated (Hallowell, 1960, p. 24).

The Twentieth Century

Descriptions of nominal classification in the 20th century show conflicting approaches ranging from formal accounts which focus on semantic arbitrariness of gender to interpretations within social and anthropological perspectives.

In this period of time, we find conflicting approaches to the study of gender. Structural studies, we can claim, are characterized by the arbitrary nature of gender. Jespersen (1924), for example, talks about 'chaos' in GA. Bloomfield (1933) states clearly his mind on the arbitrariness of gender in French and German. Kilarski's opinion (2013, p. 324), however, attributes the origin of this category to language-internal factors- phonological *or morphosyntactic*- rather than cognitive or cultural ones.

Contemporary studies of gender systems, however, offer a number of approaches focusing on the *motivation* of these systems. Other studies tackle the issue of **functionality** of gender systems. Some scholars take a broader view of the functionality of GA, adding to the referential function other functions like *affective, poetic and metalinguistic* functions (Jakobson, 1960b).

Heath (1975) suggests what he calls "*little functions*". it is a marked **pragmatic** use to express a speaker's positive or negative attitude, for example, recategorizing (marked use) the referent in discourse and making use of the noun's connotations for *diminutives or augmentatives*. This is a context-bound use which reflects the pragmatic dimension of GA.

Kilarski, (2013:167) cites Antoine Meillet who distinguishes between animate and inanimate gender in Indo-European languages citing examples from French. The gender of inanimates is semantically motivated, as in nouns for:

- objects considered as animate, e.g., "sky" (masc.) vs. "earth" fem.,

- objects associated with active and passive properties such as "foot" masc. vs. "hand" fem.

Here we would like to say that we have a social-cognitive unanimity (so to speak) on associations of inanimate and even sometimes animate nouns that can either bring in occasional shift in gender for certain semantic or pragmatic reasons.

Other opinions attribute GA to **formal** reasons i.e., morpho-phonological information in the noun. Lehmann, for example, (1958, pp. 179-202) argues against using *semantic or psychological* properties of nouns.

The History of the Category of Gender in Arabic

Arab linguists have a unique way of looking at such linguistic phenomena. The Arab sentiment to gender study is closer to descriptive than it is to historical thinking. Descriptive thinking is tightly linked to the concept of regularity as it tries to find an explanation to any linguistic phenomenon in terms of a minimalized frame i.e., trying to arrive at a system of finite rules that mirror the hidden competence of speakers. They have dealt with this phenomenon since the very beginnings.

Arabic linguistics is characterized by a number of peculiar approaches to the study of language if we consider them in light of modern universal theories of language such as the way Arab linguists look at word classes, the difference between sound and form etc. The point that is worth mentioning here is the date of writing the Arabic source and the date of publishing. Most of the sources have been written as manuscripts centuries ago and only recently that most of them have been published. In the following part, a critical chronological account of Arabic gender is given.

Arab Linguists and Gender

Alfara's (1975) (born c761 A.D.) is the first book about noun classification in the Arabic literature. It starts with a listing of the morphological markers of feminine gender. This in fact agrees with what Kilarski (2013, p. 190) describes as a common phenomenon in the Semitic languages where, in his opinion, the feminine is derived from the masculine.

What is worth mentioning here is that morphology and phonology in Arabic are somewhat confusable, but we shall try here to fix things to be in accordance with modern linguistic thinking. Arab linguists, when dealing with formal indicators of lexical or syntactic cases, do not distinguish between morphemes and integral segments of words. For example, in the case of feminine gender we have the feminine indicators /a/, /aa/ and /aʕ/ which indicate that the noun is feminine. The first one is sometimes considered as a bound morpheme when the female noun is derived from the male noun:

- ذئب "thiʕb" (wolf) / ذئبة "thiʕba" (bitch)

If we remove this indicator, the resulting noun is the male of the pair. But look at nouns like:

- حية "ħajja" (snake fem.)

the final segment is an integral part that cannot be removed without having a different stem or even a non-existing noun. This shows that the feminine indicator is not always a morpheme; it can be a phoneme and still indicating the gender of the noun. Therefore, we must be very cautious when we deal with the terminology used by Arab linguists.

Alfara' studied what Arab linguists call "empirical feminine" (exceptional cases of gender) and a number of general issues in the gender phenomenon in Arabic. In his book, Alfara' tackles the three gender markers of the feminine nouns, unmarked feminine nouns and the issue of marked switching of the gender of nouns for pragmatic purposes.

Al-Mubarrid (1970) (born c826 AD) starts his investigation of the gender system in Arabic by listing the indicators of the feminine gender following the model of his predecessor Alfara'. We can see that most of the Arab linguists focus on the formal property of noun classification represented by the feminine indicators which is actually the derivation of the feminine from masculine nouns of animate sexed objects. Then, he proceeds to propose an insightful discussion of noun classes and GA for Arabic nouns by presenting an advanced opinion concerning what Arab grammarians call "real feminine"[1](natural feminine) and the "figurative feminine" (grammatical feminine).

So far, we had three types of gender in Arabic: the empirical feminine, the real feminine and the figurative feminine, which are analogous with the western modern classification of nouns i.e., the grammatical gender and the natural gender. This was a milestone in the history of linguistic studies of grammatical categories? He states that the grammatical feminine is assigned semantically not formally (an early reference to the motivation behind assignment of nouns to different genders). He lists a number of nouns that can be both assigned to feminine or masculine gender. After that, he discusses the morphology (according to Arabic linguistic concept) of noun classes as well as the relevant grammatical issues. He also deals with the morpho-phonologically marked and morpho-phonologically unmarked feminine nouns. Finally, he identifies the different types of feminine-masculine pairs as well.

Another Arab scholar who researched gender system in Arabic is Al-Mufadhal bin-Salama (born c903 AD) (1972). He wrote Mukhtasar Al-Muthakkar wal Muaanath (a summary of masculine and feminine). The book also starts with mentioning the indicators of the feminine nouns in Arabic. It also discusses the different types of feminine- masculine pairs. One of his brilliant remarks concerns a case of gender-switch that takes place for pragmatic and rhetorical purposes. In addition to that, he discusses

---

[1] "Real Feminine" is the noun of a female which has a male counterpart or the noun of an animate that begets or lays eggs.

the empirical feminine. We also find a consistent mixing between nouns and adjectives due to the concept of the parts of speech in Arabic linguistics.

Suleiman Al-Hamidh (born 918 AD) (Al-Hamidh, 1967) ,yet another Arab linguist lists names of parts of the human body such as رأس ("head" masculine) الهامة ("upper head" feminine) as well as names of human clothes. This is another early step towards a classification of nouns that are not part of the natural gender per se, in other words nouns that have no natural sex. This is an early hint forward to a phenomenon in Arabic- and may be in other languages- where nouns that do not have a natural sex are listed under classes that have a natural sex.

Mohammad Al-Anbary's book (born c884 AD) (Al-Anbary M. , 1978) is, in our opinion the best book about gender in the history of Arabic linguistics. He classifies nouns and mentions the indicators of femininity. In addition, Al-Anbary traces cases where gender is neutralized in which the feminine is unreal (grammatical gender). He also includes among other things the gender of homonyms. He sometimes extends his discussions to syntactic behaviour of nouns. His study is an inclusive one that pinpoints almost to every aspect of noun classification in Arabic and even in other schools of linguistics.

Saeed Al-Tastury (died c970 A.D.) (Al-Tastury, 1983) issued a book on gender. In the preface, like all other linguists, he lists the gender markers of the feminine nouns. However, he expresses his doubts about their consistency due to the fact that the masculine gender, in some cases, shares the same signs with the feminine, a remark that draws the linguist's attention to an exception that was not referred to in previous studies. His theory includes smart remarks such as the use of the feminine final indicators for exaggeration or overstatement. This is a valuable universal contribution to the literature on noun classification from a functional point of view.

Another Arab linguist who wrote a book which carries the same title as the ones above "Al-Muthakkar-wal-Muaanath"

(Masculine and Feminine) is Ibn-Jinny, who died in 1002 A.D., (Ibn-Jinny, 1985). In this book, he gives a list of feminine nouns which cannot be switched to masculine, he also annexed to his book a lexicon of masculine only nouns, feminine only nouns and nouns that can be both masculine and feminine.

Ahmad Al-Razzy (born c941 A.D.), (Al-Razzy, 1969) gives a discussion of the indicators of the feminine gender. He also studies the gender of Arabic numbers.

The last Arab scholar who is considered as one of the forerunners in this domain is Abdul-Rahman Al-Anbary (born c1119 AD), (Al-Anbary A. , 1970). His book is entitled "**Albulgha**" dedicated to the study of gender in Arabic. He gives definitions for the masculine and feminine dividing each one into natural and grammatical gender, which sounds quite contemporary. He further divides the grammatical feminine into "maqees" (marked) and "non-maqees) "unmarked). He focuses on the latter because it is the source of ambiguity, in his opinion. It seems that this scholar is the forerunner of modern studies of noun classification.

Modern studies of Arabic noun classification followed the path of the forerunners and we can easily prove that the Arab linguist who are considered as followers of the classical Arabic school of linguistics added nothing to what have already been said.

So far, Arab and Western linguists share a common understanding of the phenomenon of noun classification. Yet, we can notice systematic difference in their treatment caused by the differences in theory.

A Summary of the Literature on Gender

Putting ideas in their historical order can be accomplished in two ways. If we assume that there is a connection of influence between Western and Arab schools of linguistics, then we can depend on time as a criterion and under this umbrella we search for the traces of mutual influence if any. But this is hard to prove even if we encounter points of common ground, for science coincidence is not an impossibility. Therefore, it will be assumed that we are dealing with entirely separate lines.

The already demarcated stages in the history of science may be a guideline for such an endeavour. In the time of the Greek scientific boom, philosophy and science witnessed extensive development. Linguistics is not an exception. Part of the development in the area of the philosophy of language are attempts by Greek thinkers to discuss the position of language in life. This discussion encompasses the philosophical investigation of the nature of language; the relations between language, users, and the world; and the concepts of linguistic analysis (Philosophy of language, 2017). Part of this activity is the attempts made by Greek scholars to investigate the phenomenon of gender in language.

Protagoras thinking that what is common knowledge does not need to be classified in the form of written document, so he goes directly to discuss the gender of inanimate nouns leaving nouns with natural gender as axiomatic knowledge. He also tackles the concept of regularities in linguistic analysis along with Varro. A long time elapsed between this stage and Harris' time (18th Century) where research was a reproduction of early theories. Then, we have Harris' ingenuity in linking language to the world.

In the 19th century Grimm documents cases where gender extension takes place. He suggests that extending animate gender to inanimate nouns is made according to the physical properties of the inanimate noun as part of the theory of the motivation behind GA.

With the advent of the 20th century there was a shift towards a descriptive treatment of linguistic phenomena and away from attempts to use history as a tool to explain these phenomena. A synchronization of the state of language at the moment of study has become the position adopted by scholars. This implies that the amount and speed of language change were very high which makes it hard to cope with.

However, some scholars kept looking for motivations behind noun classification. Hallowell, (1955) links culture and social factors to noun classification. He suggests solutions to some puzzling cases of GA by ascribing them to socio-cultural factors. But the question is: how can we explain the ability of the new born kids, who have not

yet mastered the game of culture and society, to classify nouns even if they were new nouns or invented nouns? The answer is that there must be an intuitive innate ability the speakers use when producing language.

Kilarski's book made a dramatic shift in the way linguistic analysis of gender is pursued. He rejected all suggested solutions to GA and suggests alternatives. The alternative is the language internal phonological or morphosyntactic factors rather than cognitive or cultural ones. What we add here to this theory is that whenever there is a deviation from the norm, then there must be some pragmatic function. The context-dependent use of deviated gender creates a special meaning which depends on the marked use and hence creating a kind of cognitive association with the intended meaning.

As far as the Arabic related literature is concerned, there is a common interest in a number of strategies in dealing with noun classification. Most of Arab scholars and grammarians begin their analysis by citing the morpho-phonological basis of GA by which derives feminine gender from masculine nouns. This is consistent with what is commonly pursued by Arab grammarians to begin their analysis by what is given and easy towards more complicated issues. Alfara's contribution to the study of gender is the "irregular feminine" and the so-called gender switch. Al-Mubarrid adds to his predecessors the opposition of natural vs grammatical gender as part of his attempt to establish the concept of motivation. However, he believes that the assignment is semantically motivated rather than formally motivated. He also draws attention to the common gender in Arabic. His final contribution to the discussion of noun classification is the two types of feminine in Arabic: the regular (morpho-phonologically marked) and the irregular (morpho-phonologically unmarked).

Al-Mufadhal was not different from other Arab scholars in the issues discussed above; however, he has his own view of the category. He talks about what is known as gender-switch and a marked use of noun classifiers for pragmatic purposes.

Al- Anbary adds another dimension to the study of gender which is the syntactic behaviour of gender. This exegesis goes beyond the morphosemantic reduction of the phenomenon towards a morphosyntactic explication of the category.

Finally, Al-Tastury's major contribution is the context-bound use of gender to express overstatement. In this sense, Arab linguists have their own concept of the nominal classification. They ascribe such phenomena to rhetoric rather than pragmatic causes. It is, at any rate, an advanced reference to contextual meanings of language where it acquires additional marked meanings from the context of situation.

Thus, we can see the diverse treatment of this linguistic phenomenon in places and orientation. Almost all ages and communities added something to the description and explanation of the motivation, function and system of this phenomenon.

Bibliography

Al-Anbary, A. (1970). *Al-Bulgha.* (R. Abdu-Tawab, Ed.) Egypt.

Al-Anbary, M. (1978). *Al-Muthakar wal Muanath* (1 ed.). (T. Al-Janaby, Ed.) Baghdad: Al-Aany Press.

Al-faraa. (1975). *Al-Muthakar wal Muanath.* Cairo: Dar Ut-Turath.

Al-Hamidh, S. (1967). Ma Yuthakar wa Yuanath min Al-Insan wal Libas. In R. Abdu-Tawab, *At-Tathkeer wat_Taneeth in Arabic.* Cairo.

Al-Mubarrid, M. (1970). *Al-Muthakkar wal Muaanath.* (R. A.-T. Al-Hadi, Ed.) Cairo: Dar Ul-Kutub.

Al-Razzy, A. (1969). *Al-Muthakkar wal Muaanath.* (R. Abdu-Tawab, Ed.) Cairo.

Al-Tastury, S. (1983). *Al-Muthakkar wal Muanath.* (A. Hareedy, Ed.) Cairo: Al-Khanjy.

Bin-Salama, M. (1972). *Mukhtasar Al-Muthakkar wal muaanath.* (R. Abdu-Tawaab, Ed.) Cairo.

Bloomfield, L. (1933). *Language.* New York: Henry Holt and Co.

Boas, F. (1911). *Handbook of American Indian Languages.* Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office.

Contini-Morava, E. (2002). (What) do noun class markers mean? *Signal, Meaning, and Message*, 3-64.

Corbett, G. (1991). *Gender.* Cambridge : CUP.

Ervin, S. M. (1962). The Connotations of Gender. *Word*(18), pp. 249–261.

Fromkin, V. A., Rodman, R., & Hyams, N. (2011). *An Introduction to Language.* Wadsworth.

Guthrie, M. (1948a). *The Classification of the Bantu Languages.* Oxford: OUP.

Guthrie, M. (1948b). Gender, Number and Person in Bantu Languages. *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*(12:3/4), pp. 847–856.

Hallowell, I. (1955). *Culture and Experience.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania.

Hallowell, I. (1960). *Ojibwa Ontology, Behavior, and World View.* Columbia University Press.

Harris, J. (1751). *Hermes: Or, a philosophical inquiry concerning language and universal grammar.* London.

Heath, J. (1975). Some Functional Relationships in Grammar. *Language*(51), pp. 1.89–104.

Huddleston, R. D., & Pullum, G. (Eds.). (2002). *The Cambridge grammar of the English language.* Cambridge University Press.

Ibn-Jinny, O. (1985). *Al-Muthakkar wal Muaanath.* (T. N. Abdullah, Ed.) Dar ul-Bayan Al-araby.

Jakobson, R. (1960b). *Linguistics and Poetics". Style in Language.* (T. A. Sebeok, Ed.) Cambridge: MIT Press.

Jespersen, O. (1924). *The philosophy of grammar.* London: Allen & Unwin.

Kilarski, M. (2013). *Nominal Classification A history of its study from the classical period to the present.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins B.V.

Lehmann, W. (1958). On Earlier Stages of the Indo-European Nominal. *Language, 34*(2), pp. 179-202.

Lyons, J. (1968). *Introduction to Theoretical Linguistics.* Cambridge: cambridge University Press.

Mel'čuk, I. (1974). Statistics and the Relationship between the Gender of French Nouns and their Endings. (V. Rozencvejg,

Ed.) *Statistics and the Relationship between the Gender of French Nouns and their Endings*, pp. 11–42.

Peirce, C. S. (1991). *Peirce on Signs.* University of North Carolina Press.

Philosophy of language. (2017, June 15). Retrieved July 18, 2020, from Encyclopaedia Britannica: https://www.britannica.com/topic/philosophy-of-language

Straus, T., & Brighton, R. (1982). The Implacable Raspberry. *Papers in Linguistics*, pp. 15.79-137.

Wensinck, A. (1972). *Some Aspects of Gender in the Semitic Languages.* Amsterdam: Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen.

دراسة في تاريخ التذكير والتأنيث

محفوظ خلف محمود *

مروان نجيب توفيق **

المستخلص

إنَّ الصيغ النحوية، شأنها شأن جميع الظواهر العلمية، قد مرت في مراحل مختلفة من التطور والتغيير، والتذكير والتأنيث ليس استثناءً من ذلك وهذه الصيغة متجذرة في تاريخ الدراسات اللغوية منذ زمن الإغريق وإلى زماننا الحاضر، ونحاول في هذه الدراسة تتبع تاريخ هذه الظاهرة اللغوية في المدارس اللغوية الغربيَّة والعربيَّة، ولقد تم اتباع التسلسل الزمني في تقديم الأفكار لكل مدرسة، وقد تم مناقشة ومقارنة وتقييم كل إسهام أساسيَّة وفي ضوء النظريات اللغوية المعاصرة للتذكير والتأنيث، وتخلص الدراسة إلى ملخص لهذا التاريخ في كلا المدرستين الَّذي يظهر كيفية تميز كل مدرسة بخصائص في طريقة تناولها تحليل نظام الأسماء الخاص بها.

الكلمات المفتاحية: المعدلات التجميعيَّة ، الروابط ، الروابط ، التماسك ، النص.

* طالب دكتوراه/قسم اللغة الإنكليزية/كلية الآداب/جامعة الموصل.

** أُستاذ مساعد/قسم اللغة الإنكليزية/كلية الآداب/جامعة الموصل.