

marian a masculine noun ; if it was found to be usually coupled with an adjective of the feminine gender, it was called a feminine noun. Some languages had a third form for the adjective which was usually coupled with nouns signifying objects devoid of sex. This form was termed the *neuter* gender, and the noun with which this form of the adjective was most commonly coupled was called a *neuter* noun. Thus, a distinction of nouns into masculine, feminine and neuter came to be noted, and this also was called gender ; and was quite irrespective of the actual sex of the objects signified by those nouns.

Gender, then, in Grammar, is taken in two different significations. Applied to an adjective it signifies a certain form by which *bonus* is distinguished from *bona*. Applied to a noun, it signifies a certain relation of the word to the attributives connected with it—for example, that by which *amor* is distinguished from *cupido*. As sex is a natural characteristic pertaining to living objects, so gender is a grammatical characteristic pertaining to the names representing objects, whether animate or inanimate. Properly speaking, the gender of nouns is not indicated, but it is constituted by the attributives connected with them. Were there no distinction of gender in articles, adjectives, or participles, there could be none in nouns. When we say, that *amor* is a noun of the masculine gender, and *cupido* a noun of the feminine gender, we do not mean to intimate any distinction between the things signified by these nouns. We mean only to state a grammatical fact, namely, that *amor* always requires its conjoined adjective to be of the same form as when joined to a noun denoting a male, and that *cupido* always requires its conjoined adjective to be of the same form as when joined to a noun denoting a female.

The term gender has been introduced into the English Grammars in an acceptance

different from that which it bears in the Grammars of other languages. In English there is no distinction of gender competent to articles, adjectives, or participles. When a noun is said to be of the masculine gender the meaning can only be that the object denoted thereby is of the male sex. Thus, in the English Grammar, gender signifies a quality of the *object* named, while in other Grammars it signifies a quality of the *name* given to the object. The varieties of who, which, and he, she, it, refer, not to what is properly termed the gender of the antecedent *noun* but to the *sex*, real or attributed, of the object signified by the antecedent. That this is so is affirmed, in effect, by writers on rhetoric, who declare that in English the pronouns who, he, she, imply an express personification or attribution of life, and consequently of sex, to the objects to which these pronouns refer. The same thing is more strikingly true of the variations in the terminations of nouns, namely, *ess*, *ine*, *ix*, &c., which are all discriminative of sex and will be found on examination to be neither more nor less than the pronoun 'she' silly incorporated with the noun. Consequently 'lioness' is but a 'she lion,' and not properly an inflection of the noun 'lion,' such as *equa*, *una*, &c., are of *equis*, *unus*, &c.

It is a compliment commonly paid to the English, that it is the only language "that has adapted the gender of its nouns to the constitution of nature." In fact, the English language has adapted the *form* of some of its most common names of living objects, and of a few of its pronouns, to the obvious distinction of male and female ; whilst it has left its nouns without any mark characteristic of gender. The same thing must necessarily happen in any language by abolishing the distinction of masculine and feminine in its attributives. If all languages had been constructed on this plan, it may confidently be affirmed that the grammatical term, gender, would never