

Gender differences in the Use of Taboo Expressions in Iraq: A Sociolinguistic Study

Dr. Ibrahim Khidhir Sallo, Assistant Professor, Duhok University, College of Languages,
Kurdistan, Iraq

drreemanibrahim@yahoo.co.uk

ABSTRACT

This paper attempts to examine gender differences (henceforth GDs) in the use of 'taboo' expressions in Iraq. Unfortunately, this area has not received any attention from Arab and Iraqi sociolinguists. In Iraq, male speakers swear more than female speakers. Moreover, both women and men swear more in the company of their own sex, but male usage of swear words drops automatically in mixed-sex conversation. 'Taboo' expressions related to sexual organs, sex and intercourse are socially and morally forbidden and they are never used by people in ordinary life except among teenagers or when illiterate women and men quarrel. So, it is expected to hear them commonly used where poor illiterate people live. It is very common to hear such dirty taboo items uttered by drivers, fitters, etc. As a matter of fact, the use of 'taboo' words is strongly correlated with literacy rather than sex. The paper introduces the problem, hypotheses, purpose and objectives of the study, scope and limitation of the empirical research, definitions of related concepts, procedures of data collection, and recommendations and findings. This study attempts to shed light on the phenomenon of GDs in the use of 'taboo' expressions in Iraq including its nature, causes, and sociolinguistic restrictions imposed on them and how, where and why they occur. The study also highlights the role and impact of some sociolinguistic variables. Suggestions are advanced about when, how and why GDs occur, emphasizing the influence of sociolinguistic variables (i.e., topic, setting, and participants including their age, sex, education, rural vs. urban and socioeconomic background) as well as psychological, academic and other non-linguistic constraints. This paper will focus on the daily language used in expressing the common speech acts. It is hypothesized that women use their own lexical items and expressions that are different from men's in expressing these socially unacceptable expressions. The study aims at verifying that GDs are social and rejecting the notion of innate GDs. Moreover, it aims at proving that Iraqi speech community is not a homogeneous society with shared linguistic norms in the Chomskyan sense (i.e., the ideal speaker/hearer theory). This empirical study is based on the analysis of data collected from 100 informants (50 Fs and 50 Ms) aged between 18 and 25 to answer whether (Fs or Ms or Fs and Ms) use them. Since the focus of this study is on GDs the third option (the use by both sexes), which implies similarity between the two sexes, was cancelled. Using a variety of ways, which include social participation, personal observation, interviews, questionnaires and utilising tapes where natural conversations could be approached. The results are reported in the analysis and discussion, which identify the language associated with the informants' sex. Finally, some conclusions are drawn and some recommendations made for future GDs studies in Iraq as well as the other Arab countries. Among the outstanding questions to be addressed are: (i) whether GDs have universal linguistic and extra-linguistic constraints, (ii) whether they are related more to competence or to performance; (iii) and whether the speakers of Arabic have the same competence in the Standard and the Iraqi varieties (Sallo 1983, 1988: 78). The answers to such questions may profoundly reshape our views of Arabic language in Iraq, whether in geographic, academic, or professional settings all around the world. To sum up, this paper does not claim that it covers the whole subject since the area of speech GDs is fresh and virgin especially in Iraq and there are many aspects which have not been investigated yet. Further studies, MA and Ph. D. dissertations depending on extended data, could be conducted on GDs in Mobile messages, Chat language and in other countries to have a comprehensive picture about this phenomenon. Courses of GDs in email writing style, mobile messages and chat language could be introduced similar to writing courses to enable students to keep pace with the rapid changes and challenges that are happening around us in the wake of globalization.

KEYWORDS: Taboo Expressions, Abuse, Sociolinguistics.

Article Received: 10 August 2020, Revised: 25 October 2020, Accepted: 18 November 2020

Key to Phonetic Symbols
A. Iraqi Arabic Vowels

/i:/	As	In	/di:n/	'religion'
/i/	=	=	/kita:b/	'book'
/a:/	=	=	/musa:fi:r/	'traveller'
/a/	=	=	/qarya/	'village'
/o:/	=	=	/tho:r/	'ox'
/u:/	=	=	/khdu:d/	'cheeks'
/u/	=	=	/tufa:Ha/	'apple'
/e:/	=	=	/leel/	'night'
Iraqi Arabic Consonants				
/ʔ/	=	=	/ʔalam/	'pain'
/b/	=	=	/ba:b/	'door'
/p/	=	=	/parda/	'curtain'
/ch/	=	=	/chibi:r/	'big'
/j/	=	=	/ijtima9/	'meeting'
/d/	=	=	/Sadar/	'chest'
/dh /	=	=	/dharra/	'atom'
/dh /	=	=	/9adhum/	'bone'
/t/	=	=	/taHri:r/	'liberation'
/T/	=	=	/Ta:lib/	'student'
/f/	=	=	/faraH/	'happiness'
/g/	=	=	/galub/	'heart'
/kh /	=	=	/khila:l/	'during'
/g/	=	=	/lugha/	'language'
/h/	=	=	/hawa:ʔ/	'air'
/H/	=	=	/Hub/	'love'
/k/	=	=	/9askari/	'military'
/q/	=	=	/qalam/	'pen'
/l/	=	=	/Tawi:l/	'tall'
/l/	=	=	/walla/	'by God'
/m/	=	=	/huju:m/	'attack'
/n/	=	=	/na:r/	'fire'
/r/	=	=	/masraH/	'theatre'
/s/	=	=	/jasu:s/	'spy'
/S/	=	=	/Sadi:q/	'friend'
/sh/	=	=	/shamis/	'sun'
/th/	=	=	/thawra/	'revolution'
/w/	=	=	/walad/	'boy'
/y/	=	=	/yo:m/	'day'
/z/	=	=	/ziya:ra/	'visit'
/9/	=	=	/ju:9a:n/	'hungry'

hearers in a homogeneous speech community in the Chomskyan sense. Instead they view language as more than a series of utterances which are influenced by

Introductory:

Sociolinguists believe that language is not a monolith with fixed rules uniformly used by ideal speakers and

fact, the use of 'taboo' words is strongly correlated with literacy rather than sex.

Recently, GDs have been studied from psychological and sociological perspective (e.g., the influence of topic, participants and situation on them). GDs studies have also attempted to answer questions related to the functional motivations and the linguistic constraints of them and the attitudes of people towards them.

3. Problem:

One specific area of recent sociolinguistic research has been SDs. The most outstanding systematic investigations of GDs are (Thorne and Henley 1975; Lakoff 1973; Key 1975; Kramarae 1981; Coates 1987, etc). It is significant to mention that GDs studies are still in their infancy because some aspects of them, e.g., GDs in the use of 'taboo' expressions, remain unstudied completely. Therefore, theories have been formulated and studies have to be done to confirm or refute the validity of hypotheses (Judd 1983: 235, 243).

Observers have described women's speech as being different from men's. Undoubtedly, the bias is inherent in these observations since the speech of Ms is regarded as the norm against which the speech of FS is judged (Wardhaugh 1989: 303).

In Iraq, almost all Iraqis in daily life use IA. It is expected that there are GDs correlated with social factors (i.e., topic, setting and participants). Unfortunately, this subject has not received any attention from the Iraqi sociolinguists. The questions demanding answers in this study are: Do Iraqi Fs and Ms speak differently? If they do, do the GDs exist in 'taboo' expressions as well? Do the GDs arise from the language itself or do they reflect their social roles?

4. Hypotheses:

The following hypotheses are proposed:

1. It is hypothesized that women and men speak differently and that women use their own lexical items and expressions that are different from men's in expressing these socially unacceptable expressions.
2. The study aims at verifying that GDs are social and that there are social and cultural implications of them and rejecting the notion of innate GDs.
3. It aims at proving that Iraqi speech community is not a homogeneous society with shared linguistic norms

human differences and extra-linguistic factors. Thus, language is a social behaviour and the linguistic variation is the outcome of social differentiation as Judd (1983: 2340) assumes. One sociolinguistic topic that has not been studied until recently is the correlation between language and the social roles of Fs and Ms in a speech community. Bower (1982: 708,709) claims that introspective judgments made about language GDs by Jespersen (1922) are similar to those expressed recently by Lakoff (1972) and different explanations are proposed since 'they are no longer based on biological assumptions but on social ones'. The explanations suggested for the variations are speculative. The biological explanations are circular (i.e., 'women speak differently because they are women and men'). This is similar to the old-age question of the chicken and the egg.

Anthropologists noted the GDs. Missionaries and explorers come across societies where linguistic contrasts were correlated to the sex of the speakers. But they failed to notice that language GDs were not features of 'primitive' societies only. Coates (1987: 35, 40) raised the question of why they neglected GDs in the familiar European societies. The answer is that they probably observed the European languages, which involve 'sex-preferential' differences. Dialectologists, unlike anthropologists, have been sensitive to GDs in the European languages.

There is a great deal to be done in the area of language GDs which do not exist in vacuum. There is a need for more detailed sociolinguistic studies. To sum up, this study deals with a virgin and vast subject but it does not claim that it exhausts the topic, on the contrary, it asks for further future studies to give a clear comprehensive picture about the everlasting universal sex discrimination.

This paper attempts to examine gender differences (henceforth GDs) in the use of 'taboo' expressions in Iraq. Unfortunately, this area has not received any attention from Arab and Iraqi sociolinguists.

In Iraq, male speakers swear more than female speakers. Moreover, both women and men swear more in the company of their own sex, but male usage of swear words drops automatically in mixed-sex conversation.

'Taboo' expressions related to sexual organs, sex and intercourse are socially and morally forbidden and they are never used by people in ordinary life except among teenagers or when illiterate women and men quarrel. So, it is expected to hear them commonly used where poor illiterate people live. It is very common to hear such dirty taboo items uttered by drivers, fitters, etc. As a matter of

At present time, efforts should be made to identify language GDs and incorporate them into language materials. Consequently, patterns of sex-based language should be embodied in areas since they will be aware of GDs and avoid unintended offence for the addressee (Judd 1883: 236, 239, 240). Failure to learn GDs on the part of some learners might cause frustration for them in the future. Accordingly, the sociolinguistic competence of a language demands teaching the GDs to the non-native speakers. Thus, if textbooks provide the learners with the speech of one sex only then a comprehensive picture is not given. Further, the shift from grammatical competence to sociolinguistic competence has reinforced the need for carrying out sociolinguistic studies, which may highlight the shortcomings of the Chomskyan “ideal speaker-hearer competence”.

6. Scope and Limitation of the Study:

This study attempts to demonstrate that in Iraq, as in other speech communities, there are clear GDs in the use of ‘taboo’ expressions. It is limited to: (i) discussing the phenomenon of GDs, suggesting sex-linked linguistic hypotheses and adopting certain fieldwork procedures for collecting the required data, (ii) dealing with the differences between Fs and Ms in using ‘taboo’ items and expressions, (iii) highlighting the role of some variables which impose sex differentiation, i.e., topic, setting and participants with reference to their sex, age, and literacy, and (iv) listing the findings of the study and proposing recommendations for future GDs studies.

6. Definitions of Related Concepts:

1. Gender Differences:

They refer to the differences between Fs and Ms in Iraq. They can occur in phonology, lexicon, semantics and syntax. They may also occur in speech acts, e.g. apology, compliments, refusal, greetings, thanks, threatening and leave taking, carried out by the two sexes. Their speech may also embody differences related to politeness, interruption, turn-taking, topic, topic control and topic shift, self-disclosure, the use of proverbs and colour terms, stereotypes, joke-telling, and verbosity triviality of topics. The quality and quantity of GDs are influenced by significant variables, particularly, age and literacy. In this study, GDS refer to sex differences in the use of ‘taboo’ and vulgar expressions.

2. Speech Repertoire:

in the Chomskyan sense (i.e., the ideal speaker/hearer theory).

4. Taboo GDs are linked with social factors (e.g., topic, setting and participants including their sex, age and literacy). At present time, GDs studies give rise to better grasp of these variables and enhance awareness that such patterns are nearly universal, as much of the literature would suggest.

5. Purpose of the Study:

This paper is a data-based study of GDs in the spoken variety of the Arabic-speaking speech community in Iraq and it is located in the field of sociolinguistics. It offers a vivid description of language used by women and men in terms of the relations between topic, setting, participants, literacy, and other sociolinguistic factors following Ervin-Tripp (1964).

This study attempts to shed light on the phenomenon of GDs in the use of ‘taboo’ expressions in Iraq including its nature, causes, and sociolinguistic restrictions imposed on them and how, where and why they occur.

The study also highlights the role and impact of some sociolinguistic variables and what motivates women and men to speak differently. Suggestions are advanced about when, how and why GDs occur, emphasizing the influence of social factors (i.e., topic, setting, and participants including their age, sex, education, rural vs. urban and socioeconomic background) as well as psychological, academic and other non-linguistic constraints. This paper will focus on the daily language used in expressing the common speech acts with reference to the use of ‘taboo’ expressions..

This paper aims at proving that Iraqi speech community is not a homogeneous society with shared linguistic norms and identifying the extra-linguistic constraints of, which will nullify the fact that GDs occur randomly. This false claim has been refuted through carrying out many studies in different multilingual communities that have come up with similar findings, i.e., GDs is a programmatic process, which has underlying norms (see). This study is identical in goal to the above-mentioned studies. Following this line, it is expected that. In addition, they are expected to follow the linguistic constraints of the host language and the guest language. In other words, it is hypothesized that this phenomenon is linguistically rule-governed.

for the informants of this study they use this variety. The GDs are more common in this variety than in the Standard variety.

As for colloquial and variety, the former refers to a version of a language associated with a specific region, social class, ethnic, sex, or age group. It is usually identified at all levels including sounds, words and sentence structures, and even speech acts. The latter refers to a variety of language correlated with everyday, casual or intimate speech as distinct from standard language.

7. Data Collection:

The speech community chosen for this study is Iraq. My usage of it is compatible with Gumperz's definition of speech community as a group of speakers, not necessarily of the same language, who share a set of rules for the use of the languages (Thorne et al 1983: 56). With regard to the method, scope and goals of the present subject, they are different in certain aspects from those carried out in the urban western speech communities (e.g., Labov 1963, 1964, 1966, 1986; Trudgill 1974a among others). Actually, the conservative Arab and Islamic speech communities have nearly identical situations in contrast with the western ones.

This empirical research is a data-collected study which aims at identifying the vulgar language which is expected to show sex-related variation. Apart from conducting a random sample, existing relations of kinship and friendship to recruit respondents were used. Response time to the interview lasted for 30 minutes for each informant. Using a variety of ways, which include social participation, interviews, and personal observation, questionnaires and utilising tapes where natural conversations could be approached. My wife and I tape-recorded data elicited through interviews with selected informants. The speech behaviour is drawn from a corpus which is centred on everyday language of Fs and Ms. The results are reported in the analysis and discussion, which identify the language associated with the informants' sex. Recent work (Guy 1980) suggests that such a sample is sufficient for the examination of 'fine-grained variation' (quoted in Hill 1987: 1222, 123)

The next stage was the distribution of the questionnaire forms.

The task was carried out successfully because almost all the informants were co-operative. The data collected from the questionnaire was processed. All the utterances

It is believed that a perfectly homogeneous language community is an ideal claim because in every speech community there is a variety of repertoires which covers alternate ways of expression, i.e., they are not single-style speakers. Hymes (1972: 154) refers to the phenomenon of variation saying, "No normal person and no normal community is limited to repertoire to a single variety of code ...".

3. Speech Community:

It refers to a community in which a group of people shares norms of linguistic behaviour with regard to expected sources of diversity such as regional, social, socio-economic, and educational backgrounds.

The term 'repertoire' is defined by Gumperz (1964: 565) as "the totality of linguistic forms available to the speakers of a speech community", while Kachru (forthcoming: 24), who used the phrases 'linguistic repertoire', 'code repertoire', 'verbal repertoire' defines it as "the total range of codes which members of a speech community have available for their linguistic interaction". 'Linguistic repertoire' is not confined to a bilingual's competence in separate languages only but it refers to the repertoires of styles, varieties and dialects as well.

4. Diglossia:

It refers to the existence of high and low varieties of a single language, which fulfill different functions within a speech community (Giglioli 1976: 177). In diglossic situations, the people have competence in two varieties of the same language, while bilinguals have competence in two languages. So, 'diglossia' is a social phenomenon, whereas 'bilingualism' is an individual one (Dittmar 1976: 177). GDs are more common in Iraqi Arabic than in Standard Arabic. Concerning the Iraqi situation, Standard Arabic (henceforth SA) is the medium of education, and used in broadcasting, mass media and worship whereas IA is used in daily life (Ferguson 1959).

3. Iraqi Arabic:

It refers to the Ar variety spoken by most of Iraqi people. It has two dialects, i.e., 'qultu dialect' spoken mostly in Mosul and the 'Baghdadi dialect' spoken in Baghdad and south of Iraq. The latter often refers to IA. IA differs from SA in phonology, lexicon and syntax to some degree. As

behind filling in the forms and requested them to hand the forms over after one week. When they were received, they were subjected to a statistical analysis. The fieldworker commenced the task of ‘frequency counts’, which were changed into ‘percentages’ to simplify the comparison. The percentages in the tables were got by multiplying the ‘frequency counts’ of each item in the table by 100 divided by the total number of the ‘frequency counts’ of all the items in the same table. The idea behind the combination of data collection through interviews, and the distribution of the questionnaire forms is to support the use of them by each sex.

Following is the analysis of the tapes and the results of the questionnaire given to the informants. The analysis covers the impact of the constraints: topic, interlocutors, setting, purpose and mood on CS (for details, see Hymes 1972: 58-65 of which the first three seem to be most influential).

and examples were transcribed from the questionnaires. Since the core of this paper is ‘GDs’ the expected replies in the questions were three (i.e., whether they were used by Fs or Ms or both sexes). In addition, the social variables, age and literacy, were not used in this questionnaire as dependent variables due to lack of time, their secondary roles and scope of this study. Furthermore, the last option (both sexes) was cancelled in the statistical analysis of frequency counts since it stood for a similarity between the two sexes. The focus of this study is on GDs rather than similarities.

The questionnaire forms of this empirical study were given to one hundred informants (50 Fs and 50 Ms aged between 18 and 25) of the Department of English and Translation in the College of Arts, University of Mosul. They were randomly selected. The purpose behind the number 100 was to facilitate the statistical analysis. The equal number of the respondents of each sex was significant. The fieldworker explained the goal

8. Analysis and Discussion:

No.	Taboo Expressions	F %	M %
1.	“?alla yishiilak” (may God not keep you alive)	2.80	0
2.	“saleema illi taakhdhak” (A snake of the prophet Suleiman may stink you)	2.80	0
3.	‘ghamaad ?ab ghaasak’ May you be buried to death)	2.80	0
4.	‘matooba9’ (Devil, very naughty)	2.80	0
5.	‘?um ?al sqaqaat’ (A woman who is fond of wandering aimlessly)	2.80	0
6.	‘boola’ (Immoral woman, whore)	2.80	0
7.	‘9aagha’ (Untidy, or filthy woman)	2.80	0
8.	‘piisii’ (Filthy)	2.80	0
9.	‘?aafii’ (Strong-headed and foxy)	2.80	0
10.	‘matweeghii’ (May you be buried to death).	2.80	0
11.	‘tawaagheet’ (May you be buried by dust).	2.80	0
12.	?alla laa yikhaliik’ (May God not keep you alive).	2.74	0.05
13.	‘9een qawiyi’ (A sharp-eyed man).	2.71	0.05

	(What a shyless man you are!)		
14.	'?alla yiqSaf 9umghak' (May God kill you).	2.69	0.07
15.	'?alla laaa yanTiik' (May God not donate you).	2.66	0.10
16.	'?alla yiqtalak' (May God kill you).	2.63	0.16
17.	'safiih' (Sharp-tongued)	2.56	0.21
18.	'chamaaqa' (A prostitute, tricky woman, sharp-tongued woman)	2.54	0.20
19.	'?alla laa yaHfadhak' (May God not keep you from evil).	2.52	0.21
20.	'waja9' (May pain be upon you). (May you be hurt).	2.50	0.24
21.	'?alla laa yahniik' (May God bring you miseries).	2.46	0.27
22.	'maa matghabii' (Brought up in a bad way. Ill-bred)	2.41	0.35
23.	'?aban ?al qaHpa' (Son of bitch)	2.32	0.40
24.	'maa 9andak sharaf' (Haven't you honour?)	2.29	0.40
25.	'?alla laa yarzaqak' (May God not donate you).	2.24	0.46
26.	'maal al 9ama' (Are you blind? Do n't you see?)	2.22	0.43
27.	'?alla yihjam beetak' (May God destroy your house).	2.18	0.54
28.	'laa tadhhal beehat' (Don't be silly and naughty).	2.17	0.43
29.	'?aban shaara9' (He is a vagabond. Ill up bringing)	2.15	0.53
30.	'maa yistaHii' He is immoral and shyless)	2.10	0.62
31.	'kalb ?aban sata9ash kalb' (A dog and the son of 16 dogs)	2.07	0.68
32.	'?alla yintaqam minak' (May God avenge you).	1.96	0.18
33.	'?alla laa yiwafqak' (May God deprive you of prosperity and good luck).	1.84	0.81
34.	'qawaad' (Cuckold)	1.68	0.90
35.	'iid Tawiiliii' (A long-handed person. Metaphorically a thief)	1.62	0.81
36.	'?adabsaz' (Immoral. Ill-behaved. Lack of morals and principles).	1.59	0.95
37.	'quzalqut'	1.44	1.22

	(Shup up. May you be dumb).		
38.	'sarsari' (Immoral person. Ill-mannered. Down-to-earth).	1.42	1.09
39.	'qilat Haya' (This is immorality)	1.23	1.39
40.	'laa khalaf alla 9aleek' (May God not substitute you).	1.06	1.69
41.	'sawad alla wajhak' (May God blacken your face).	1.04	1.36
42.	'kalb' (dog)	0.84	2.04
43.	'?ashqad faTiir' (How naïve he is!) (What a boring person you are!)	0.58	1.71
44.	'?ashqad sakhiif' (You are such a silly boy!)	0.56	1.96
45.	'?anchab' (shut up)	0.53	2.18
46.	'Haywaan' (Animal)	0.47	2.21
47.	'masarbat' (He is loose and ill bred).	0.42	2.21
48.	9ajii' (He is (or You are) still in diapers. Childish!)	0.36	2.29
49.	'balaa taribya' (Ill up-brought)	0.30	2.18
50.	'Haqiir' (Mean, unworthy)	0.28	2.37
51.	'?ashqad ?athwal' (He is such a dull person). (How an absent minded he is!)	0.26	2.48
52.	'mal9uun' (He is damned and cursed).	0.24	2.45
53.	'qashmar' (Gull. Clownish)	0.22	2.51
54.	'mal9uun ?al waaldeen' (What damned parents you have!)	0.21	2.85
55.	'duunii' (A down-to-earth man). (Scum of the earth)	0.14	2.56
56.	'khanziir' (Pig)	0.11	2.59
57.	'Himaar' (Donkey)	0.05	2.67
58.	'jaHash' (Donkey)	0.05	2.64
59.	'?aban Haraam' (Son of bitch. Bastard!)	0.05	2.67
60.	'saafal'	0.05	2.53

	(Down-to-earth. Bastard!)		
61.	'?aban zina' (Son of bitch. Illegal Son. Bastard!)	0.03	3.70
62.	'kalachii' (Gypsy. Immoral)	0	3.72
63.	'?azmaal' (Donkey)	0	3.63
64.	'luutii' (Foxy or Ill-mannered)	0	3.72
65.	'naaqaS' (Mean or Down-to-earth).	0	3.70
66.	'palashtii' (Ill-mannered man).	0	3.72
67.	'shalaatii' (Foxy and crooked person)	0	3.72
68.	'churuk' (Futile, worthless, good for nothing)	0	3.72
69.	'barbuuk' (Foxy or tricky person). (A deceitful man or woman)	0	3.72
70.	'dayuuth' (Cuckold)	0	3.72
71.	'muHtarifa' (‘professional’ for women)	0	3.72

Some taboo expressions are used by both sexes as in the other examples of the table especially in examples 37-41 since the use of them is not confined to one sex in particular.

To sum up, ‘taboo’ expressions related to sexual organs, sex and intercourse are socially and morally forbidden and they are never used by people in ordinary life except among teenagers or when children or illiterate women and men quarrel. So, it is expected to hear them commonly used where poor illiterate people live. It is very common to hear such dirty taboo items uttered by drivers, fitters, etc. as a matter of fact, the use of ‘taboo’ words is strongly correlated with literacy rather than sex. Among the collected ‘taboo’ expressions are the following examples:

1. ‘?aban al qundra’ (Literally, the son of shoes)
2. ‘kus ?uxt as shahaada’ (Be gone with or damn degrees).
(Literally, the vagina of the sister of the degree).

The table shows that there are GDs in the use of taboo expressions, e.g., examples from 1 to 11 are always used by Fs. They score 2.80 % for Fs versus nil for Ms in all the examples. It has been noticed that women’s taboo expressions embody praying to God to ..., and curses to have bad omen and inflict damnation upon the addressee or ask God to do so and so, especially bad things, for the addressee. Such examples are socially unacceptable to be used by Ms. It has also been found that most of women’s taboo expressions, curses and insults are directed to other women and children, and rarely to the male strangers.

The table also shows that some taboo expressions and words are always used by Ms as in examples 62-70 where Ms score 3.72% versus nil for Fs in all of them since it is impolite for women to use them. It has been observed that men usually focus in their taboo expressions on using dirty lexical items, animal names or accusing the addressee of being bastard, cuckold, ill-mannered, etc. Moreover, most of men’s taboo language is directed towards other men and rarely towards women and children because it is socially unacceptable.

and worked in. But it should be taken into consideration that they are not taboo in other Arab countries which reflect there are cross-cultural differences in using them. For example in Jordan and Palestine 'zabuur' or 'zanbuur' (Wasp) is taboo since it refers to ('cock', 'dick'), 'bazuuna' (Cat in Iraq) referring to (breast) in Jordan, and 'Sadriya' (white apron) used in laboratories is taboo referring to underclothes for women in Jordan and Palestine. In Yemen, 'khaTiya' (poor and miserable in Iraq), is taboo referring to illegal child. In Sudan 'dabba', (gas cylinder) unlike Iraq and Jordan, is taboo since it refers in Sudan to ('vagina', 'pussy'). In Libya, 'taraachii' (earrings) in Iraq, refers to women's background (buttock) and 'Samuun', (bread in Iraq and Gulf countries), refers to (women's breasts 'boobs').

In Iraq, the English word 'unique' is taboo meaning 'fuck' in Arabic. It is embarrassing in shopping for a lady to say 'sadar' (chest) and 'afkhadh' (thighs) of chicken since they have double meanings, i.e., sexual vs. neutral. This is why they are avoided in public. The Iraqi lexical items 'shilu' (Take it), 'faat' (Entered), 'Hutu' (Put it), 'khash' (Entered), 'Tab' (Entered), 'hanu' (Buttock in Standard Arabic), 'yabla9' (swallow). These words have to be avoided as far as possible since they are loaded with pejorative and taboo meanings. Students often unconsciously and unintentionally use 'bayadhat' or 'tabyiidh' (Writing rough draft as fair copy, polishing).

In Kurdistan, the English verb 'continue' is taboo in Kurdish since it refers to fucking. The cheese 'kiirrii' or the name of the American candidate for elections 'keerii' is taboo among Kurds since it refers to (Lit. translation my 'dick', 'cock'). 'baka teeda' (put), 'ee weya' (hers), 'navst gal ta' (Did he sleep with you, i.e., making love), 'ma3at' (suck), 'mazan' (big), 'daree3' (long), 'tang' (tight), 'mazraka' (used in baking bread). If we say 'mazraka 9ayshee', it refers to sexual organ.

Moreover, some lexical items are positive but maybe explained by the hearer or the addressee as carrying bad connotation, for example:

1. The Arabic word 'Hatt' (put) as in the sentence 'yajii abu falaan , yaHut raasu u yanaam' (When the father of ... comes home, he put his/its head and sleep!) is taboo meaning '.... He put the head of his penis and sleep' whereas she does

Illiterate men who fail in their academic life and leave schools only use the last example. So they hate the degrees, certificates and educated people.

In Iraq, it has been observed that Kurdish songs, unlike Arabic ones, embody bodily 'taboo' expressions like 'breasts', 'lips', 'kissing', 'touching', 'smelling', 'flirting', 'playing with the hair', 'hugging', etc. In addition, it is accepted by Kurds for Fs and Ms together to listen to such songs without any reservation.

9. Extra-linguistic Constraints and Cross-cultural Differences of

Using Taboo Expressions:

The data surveyed indicate that Fs are more polite in their behaviour and pay too much attention when they talk because the society is too harsh with them whereas men have full freedom in the way they behave and they talk because the social traditions and values are with Ms and against Fs.

The extra-linguistic aspects of the data need to be considered as well. We found that academic, psychological, and social motives were influential. Illiterate and young Iraqi people commonly use taboo expressions when they become angry and nervous or quarrel.

As was observed by the author, the social prestige of Arabic leads people to overstate their own proficiency of using it appropriately and throw in standard Arabic words and avoid GDs, especially when their socioeconomic status is improving. Educated people were found to be the extreme Standard Arabic users where less GDs and less vulgar language can be noticed. Sometimes the situations were quite incongruent.

Switching to English can avoid socially 'tabooed' expressions that could be stressful to utter in the native language, e.g. saying 'W.C.' and /tuwaaleet/ despite having six Arabic equivalents and the use of dawra shahriya 'Period' (Annamalai 1978: 242). Some women in Iraq call it 'faj3a' (catastrophe) ironically and metaphorically or '9leeha al 9ada' (Period). English words were popular in lecture with the sexual organs in College of Medicine.

It is noteworthy to refer to the use of certain taboo expressions in some Arab countries I have visited

The study indicates that the phenomenon of GDs is linguistically rule-governed. This systematicity supports the idea that is not a random blending of two languages since it is determined by extra-linguistic factors (i.e., status, psychological and sociological). 'Topic', 'participants' and 'setting' have been found to be the most influential factors on using 'taboo' expressions in Iraq. It is less limited to the educational, scientific, technical, and religious topics while it is more favoured with casual ones.

By showing that it occurs systematically, we can refute the popular bias that GDs is utterly unsystematic and random (Sallo 1983, 1988: 80, 1994: 129).

The extra-linguistic ones concern the academic, psychological, and social motivations. People will avoid GDs if they believe that it is essential for access to better socioeconomic status and technological progress.

It has also been found out that different types of interlocutors choose different lexical items and expressions of taboo and vulgar language. They are more used when there is 'solidarity', less when there is 'power' relationship. They seem to be less used in sophisticated, formal and academic situations whereas they are more frequent in everyday and familiar settings.

Finally, some conclusions are drawn and some recommendations made for future GDs studies in Iraq as well as the other Arab countries. Among the outstanding questions to be addressed are: (i) whether GDs have universal linguistic and extra-linguistic constraints, (ii) whether they are related more to competence or to performance; (iii) and whether the speakers of Arabic have the same competence in the Standard and the Iraqi varieties (Sallo 1983, 1988: 78). The answers to such questions may profoundly reshape our views of Arabic language in Iraq, whether in geographic, academic, or professional settings all around the world.

To sum up, this paper does not claim that it covers the whole subject since the area of speech GDs is fresh and virgin especially in Iraq and there are many aspects which have not been investigated yet. Further studies, MA and Ph. D. dissertations depending on extended data, could be conducted on 'taboo' GDs in Mobile messages, Chat language and in other countries to have a comprehensive picture about this phenomenon.

intend that because she means that he puts his head on pillow and sleep. The ellipsis is syntactic and it creates a problem in translation too.

2. The Arabic word 'farakh' (chick) is taboo in Iraq referring to (homosexual). In Iraq, 'abu faruukh' (Lit. father of chicks) stands for a man looks for homosexual relations. It is correlated with 'abu Khalid' a stereotypical name for homosexual person. By the way, there is a lot of dirty sexual jokes about him.
3. The Arabic word 'mashta9al' (burning) is taboo if we do not give full sentence, otherwise it refers to the state of being 'hot', 'excited sexually'. In Jordan the word 'muwalla9' (flammable) stands for it and it refers to the state of being highly excited. In addition, the word 'balal' (wet) in Iraq and 'mabloola' (wet) in Iraq is taboo referring to a woman being wet and hot waiting for cumming of man and orgasm. In Jordan and Palestine, 'mablul (wet) and 'mawalla9a' (excited and hot) are used in making love.
4. The Arabic proper name 'anas' is taboo in English referring to (anus).
5. The Arabic proper name 'zaamal' is taboo in Libya referring to (homosexual).
6. The Malysian proper name 'zaaniya' is taboo in Arabic referring to (bitch, prostitute, whore).

10. Conclusion:

16. **Cameron, Deborah and Jennifer Coates. Eds.** (1988). "Some Problems in the Sociolinguistic Explanation of Sex Differences". In *Women in Their Speech Communities. New Perspectives on Language and Sex*. Pp. 13-26.
 17. **Cheshire, J.** (1984). Language and Sexism, in Trudgill, P. (ed.). *Applications of Sociolinguistics*. Edward Arnold, London.
 18. **Coates, Jennifer.** (1987). *Women, men and language: A Sociolinguistic account of differences in language*. Longman Co. Ltd.
 19. **Chapman, Antony J. and Nichlos J. Gadfield.** (1976). Is sexual humour sexist? *Journal of Communication*, 26 (3), 1414-153.
 20. **De Beaugrande, Robert , Abdulla shunnaq and Mohamed Helmy Heliel. eds.)** (1994). *Language Discourse and Translation in the West and Middle East*. Selected and revised papers from the conference on Language and Translation, Irbid, Jordan 1992. John Benjamin Publishing Company, Amsterdam, Philadelphia. Published as Vol. 7 of the series Benjamins
 21. **Ervin-Tripp, Susan M.** (1973). *Language Acquisition and Communicative Choice*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
 22. **Erwin, Wallace M.** (1963). *A Short Reference Grammar of Iraqi Arabic*, Washington, D.C. : Georgetown University.
 23. **Graham, A.** (1975). The making of a no-sexist dictionary. In B. Thorne and N. Henley (eds). *Language and Sex: Difference and Dominance*. Rowley, Mass: Newbury House.
 24. Courses of GDs in email writing style, mobile messages and chat language could be introduced similar to writing courses to enable students to keep pace with the rapid changes and challenges that are happening around us in the wake of globalization.
- References:**
1. **Abd-el-Jawad, Hassan .** (1989). "Language and Women's Place with Special Reference to Arabic". *Language Sciences*. Great Britain, Vol. 11, No. 3, Pp. 305-324.
 2. **Abu Haidar, Farida.** (1989). "Are Iraqi Women More Prestige Conscious than Men? Sex Differentiation in Baghdadi Arabic". *Language in Society*, Vol. 18, No. 4, Pp. 471-81.
 3. **Blake, C. F.** (1979). "Death and abuse in marriage laments: the curse of Chinese brides". *Folklore Studies* 37, 13-33.
 4. **Bell, Roger.** (1976). *Sociolinguistics: Goals, Approaches and Problems*. London : a. Batsford.
 5. **Bentahilla, Abdelali.** (1983). *Language Attitudes among Arabic French Bilinguals in Morocco*. Multi-Matters Ltd.,4.
 6. **Brown, P.** (1980). "How and why are women more polite: Some evidence from a Mayan Community". In McConnell-Ginet, Broker & Furmen (Eds.), 111-36.
 7. **Brown, R. and Albert Gilman** (1972). "The Pronouns of Power and Solidarity". a. *Readings in the Sociology of Language*. Ed. Fishman. The Hague: Mouton. Pp. 252-75.
 8. **Cameron, D.** (1984). "Sexism and Semantics". *Radical Philosophy*, 36, 14-16.

- a. *Directions in Sociolinguistics: the Ethnography of Communication*. Eds. J. J. Gumperz and Dell Hymes. Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc. Pp. 35-71.
48. **Jacobson, Rudolfo.** (1976). Incorporating sociolinguistic norms into an EFL programme. *TESOL Quarterly* 10/4, 411-422.
49. **Judd, Eliot.** (1983). "The Problem of Applying Sociolinguistic Findings to
50. TESOL: The Case of Male/Female Language". *Sociolinguistics and*
51. *Language Acquisition*. Eds. Nessa Wolfson and Eliot Judd, Newbury
52. House Publishers.
53. **Kachru, Braj. ed.** (1982). *The Other Tongue: English across Culture* Urbana:
a. University of Illinois Press.
54. **Kramarae et al.** (1983). "Sex similarities and differences in Language, speech
55. and non-verbal communication: an annotated bibliography". *Language,*
56. *gender and society*. Eds. Thorne et al. Newbury House Publishers Inc.,
57. Pp. 151-331.
58. **Labov, W.** (1972). "Rules for ritual insults". In T. Kochman (ed). *Rappin' and*
59. *Sylin' out*. University of Illinois Press, Chicago, 265-314.
60. **Lakoff, R.** (1973). "Language and woman's place". *Language in Society*, 2, 45-
61. 80.
62. **McCarthy, R. J. & Faraj Raffoul.** (1964). *Spoken Arabic of Baghdad: Grammar*
a. *and Exercises*. Beirut Librarie Orientale.
63. **Nilsen, A. P.** (1977). "Sexism as shown through the English vocabulary". In A. P.
64. Nilsen, H. Bosmajian, H. L. Gershuy and J.P. Stanley (eds). *Sexism and*
65. *Language*. Urbana Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English.
35. **Guidelines for improving the Image of Women in Textbooks** (1972). Glenview,
36. III: Scott & Forman Co.
37. **Gumperz, John.** (1968). The speech community. *International Encyclopedia of the*
a. *Social Sciences* ed. by David Sills & Robert Merton. London: Macmillan, 381-386.
- b. _____ & Dell Hymes, eds. (1972). *Directions in Sociolinguistics: The*
- c. *Ethnography of Communication*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Inc.
38. **Halliday, Michael, et al.** (1972). The users and uses of language. *Readings in the*
a. *Sociology of Language* ed. by Joshua Fishman. The Hague; Mouton, 139-169.
39. **Hass, A.** (1979). Male and Female spoken language differences: stereotypes and
40. evidence. *Psychological Bulletin*, 86, (3), 616-26.
41. **Haugen, Einar.** (1964). *Bilingualism in the Americas: A Bibliography and*
a. *Research Guide*. Gainesville, FL: American Dialect Society, No. 26.
42. **Hayes, Peter.** (1956). *Colloquial Arabic of Iraq: Grammar, Exercises, and*
a. *Vocabulary*. Beirut: Dar El-Ilm Lil Malayen.
43. **Holmes, Janet.** (1989). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. ***
44. **Hudson, R. A.** (1980). *Sociolinguistics*. CUP.
45. **Hymes, Dell.** (ed.) (1964). *Language in Culture and Society*. Harper
46. International, New York.
47. **Hymes, Dell.** (1972). "Models of the Interaction of Language and Social life".

85. **Smith Hefner, Nancy.** (1988). "Women and Politeness: The Javanese Example"
86. *Language in Society*, Vol. 17, No. 4, Pp. 535-54.
87. **Smith, Philip M.** (1985). *Language, the Sexes and Society*. Basil Blackwell.
88. **Spender, D.** (1978). "The right way to talk: sex differences in language". *Times Educational Supplement*, 3 Nov. 19.
89. *Educational Supplement*, 3 Nov. 19.
90. **Stanlaw, James.** (1982). *English in Japanese communicative strategies*.
91. Kachru ed. 1982, 168-197.
92. **Stanley, J. P.** (1977). "Paradigmatic Women: The Prostitute". In D. I. Shores and B. P. Hines (eds.) *Papers in Language variation*. University of Alabama Press.
93. Press.
94. **Thorne et al. Eds.** (1983). *Language, gender and society*. Newbury House Publishers Inc., Pp. 3,4.
95. Publishers Inc., Pp. 3,4.
96. **Todd, Loreto.** (1974). *Pidgins and Creoles*. London: Rutledge and Kegan Paul Ltd.
97. **Trudgill, P.** (1983). *Sociolinguistics: An Introduction to Language and Society*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
98. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
99. **Wardhaugh, Ronald.** (1989). "Language and Sex". *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. Blackwell, Pp. 302-313.
100. *Sociolinguistics*. Blackwell, Pp. 302-313.
101. **White, A. and Wood, V. (eds).** (1982). *Naked Ape 2 : An Anthology of Sexism Collected by the Guardian*. London: Duckworth.
102. *Collected by the Guardian*. London: Duckworth.
103. **Wolfson, Nessa and Elliot Judd.** (1983). *Sociolinguistics and Language Acquisition*. Newbury House Publishers Inc.
104. *Acquisition*. Newbury House Publishers Inc.
66. **Omwake, Louise.** (1937). "A study of sense of humour: Its relation to sex, age and personal characteristics". *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 21, 688-704.
67. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 21, 688-704.
68. 704.
69. **Romaine, Suzanne.** (1981). The status of variable rules in
- a. sociolinguistic theory. *Journal of Linguistics* 17/1, 93-119.
70. **Rubin, Joan.** (1972). "Bilingual Usage in Paraguay" *Readings in the Sociology of Language*. Ed., J. A. Fishman. The Hague: Mouton, pp. 512-30.
- a. *Language*. Ed., J. A. Fishman. The Hague: Mouton, pp. 512-30.
71. **Sallo, Ibrahim Khidhir.** (1983). A Psychosociolinguistic Study of Arabic-English
- a. Code-Switching at University Level in Iraq. Unpublished MA Thesis. Baghdad University, Baghdad, Iraq.
72. _____ (1994). "Arabic-English Code-Switching at University Level: A Sociolinguistic Study". In *Language Discourse and Translation in the West and Middle East*. De Beaugrande et al. eds. John Benjamin Publishing Company, Amsterdam, Philadelphia. Published as Vol. 7 of the series Benjamins Translation Library issue 0929-731.
73. *Language Discourse and Translation in the West and Middle East*. De Beaugrande et al. eds. John Benjamin Publishing Company, Amsterdam, Philadelphia. Published as Vol. 7 of the series Benjamins Translation Library issue 0929-731.
74. *West and Middle East*. De Beaugrande et al. eds. John Benjamin Publishing Company, Amsterdam, Philadelphia. Published as Vol. 7 of the series Benjamins Translation Library issue 0929-731.
75. Publishing Company, Amsterdam, Philadelphia. Published as Vol. 7 of the series Benjamins Translation Library issue 0929-731.
76. the series Benjamins Translation Library issue 0929-731.
77. **Schor, David P. and Abigail B. Sivan.** (1989). "Interpreting Children's Labels for Sex-Related Body Parts of Anatomically Explicit Dolls". *Child Abuse and Neglect: The International Journal*. Vol. 13, No. 4, Pp. 523-31.
78. *Child Abuse and Neglect: The International Journal*. Vol. 13, No. 4, Pp. 523-31.
79. and Neglect: *The International Journal*. Vol. 13, No. 4, Pp. 523-31.
80. **Schulz, M.** (1975). "The semantic derogation of women". In B. Thorne and N. Henley (eds). *Language and Sex: Difference and Dominance*. Rowley Mass: Newbury House.
81. Henley (eds). *Language and Sex: Difference and Dominance*. Rowley Mass: Newbury House.
82. Mass: Newbury House.
83. **Siegler, D. M. and Siegler, R. S.** (1976). "Stereotypes of males' and females' speech". *Psychological Reports*, 39, 167-70.
84. *Psychological Reports*, 39, 167-70.

