

1. Introduction

In 1970/71, when I had the privilege of serving at the Department of Linguistics of OSU under the chairpersonship of Ilse Lehiste, she and other members of the department were already actively interested in the feminist movement. As successful and less successful coinages (chairperson for chairman vs. woperson for woman) demonstrate, an area of great theoretical activity in the department has been affected by feminist innovations, i.e. morphology.

In this paper, I will bring together both interests and will try to show how feminist morphological innovations can be judged in the light of theoretical morphology. My purpose is neither to promote nor to reject proposed innovations, but to evaluate their relative degree of actual or potential acceptability as far as morphological parameters are concerned. The data analyzed will be German ones, not only for reasons of accessibility to me but also because in German both the opposition of masculine and feminine gender (e.g. the definite singular articles der (Nom. masc.) vs. die) and feminine gender derivation (e.g. Löwe 'lion' → Löw-in 'lion-ess') play a greater role than in English.

The theoretical model espoused is that of Natural Morphology (cf. Dressler 1985a,b,c; Mayerthaler 1981; Wurzel 1984; Dressler et al., in press; Studia gramatyczne 7/1985, on Natural Approaches to Morphology), a theory of universal morphology where several morphological parameters are studied: e.g., the parameter of morphotactic transparency refers to the respective degree of obstruction to morphological processing (e.g. morphonological rules render the identification of conclude in conclusion more difficult than phonological resyllabification the identification of exist in existence). Or the parameter of morphosemantic transparency refers to the degree of semantic compositionality of a morphologically complex word.

What should be differentiated from morphosemantics and established as a separate subdiscipline, is morphopragmatics (cf. Dressler & Merlini, in press). This term refers to the area of relations between morphology and its pragmatic setting (language users and language usage within the speech situation with its presuppositions). In semiotic terms and in regard to our topic, the specific (pragmatic) attitude of an interpreter towards the signatum of a sign concerns morphopragmatics in regard to specific motivations of complex words by specific (groups of) interpreters.

2. Feminism and Morphopragmatics

Irrespective of historic origin (cf. Wienold 1967; Ibrahim 1973) correlations between grammatical gender and sexus (e.g. masculine - male, feminine - female, neuter - inanimate) are only partially effective in German grammar and lexicon. However, gender has a potential of being semantically interpreted (Wienold 1974: 315; cf. Wienold 1982 for psychoanalytic consequence

of this potential). And this was the case when feminist linguists looked for linguistic symptoms of male supremacy (cf. Ritchie Key 1975: 68ff; Trömel-Plötz 1978; Hellinger 1985).

They were not only concerned at cases of sexist inequality similar to the English pair master - mistress, but also by gaps in the lexicon such as *die Bau-frau alongside der Bau-herr 'building contractor' (in view of Frau 'Mrs., woman, madam', Herr 'Mr., Gentleman, master, Sir') and at the generally unmarked status of masculine gender (Spender 1980: 19ff; Hellinger 1985; Pusch 1985; Kalverkämper 1979). E.g. in sex-related gender derivation German feminine nouns are usually derived from masculine forms rather than masculines from feminines (cf. Trömel-Plötz 1978: 56; Kalverkämper 1979: 59; Plank 1981: 96ff, 116ff), e.g. in animal names the type der Löwe 'lion' → die Löw-in 'lioness' is usual, the type die Gans 'goose' → der Gäns-erich 'gander' is exceptional. And whereas feminine -in motion is easy from nouns denoting men, such as der Herr 'lord' → die Herr-in, der Jäger 'hunter' → die Jäger-in, Prior 'prior' → Prior-in, the only example of the opposite direction is der Hex-erich 'sorcerer' (a variant of deverbal der Hex-er from hex-en 'to practice sorcery') derived from die Hexe 'witch'. Cf. also the isolated Witw-er 'widower' from Witwe 'widow'.

Moreover among many pairs der X - die X-in the feminine form may only refer to females, whereas the masculine form either refers to males or is sex-neutral (generic, cf. Kalverkämper 1979; Glück 1979), e.g. der Kunde 'client' may contrast with die Kund-in, but may also be used for both sexes especially in the plural die Kund-en. In inflection, gender is clearly differentiated in the singular (always with the article; feminine nouns never have case suffixation, masculines and neuters may have) but neutralized in the plural of the articles and generally in the distribution of plural suffixes. Thus it is only the absence of the feminine derivational suffix -in which allows the inference that die Kunde-n refers to males (vs. fem. die Kund-inn-en). But see § 5b.

Now male and female addressees may feel more and less addressed by "ambiguous" (i.e. male and generic) nouns (cf. Kramer 1978: 95; on the other connotations see Zubin and Köpcke 1984), but clearly, seen from a morphopragmatic point of view, feminist interpreters are much more likely to interpret such nouns as excluding females because the fem. suffix -in is lacking (cf. Trömel-Plötz 1979: 126; Guentherodt 1979: 126; Hoffmann 1979: 60; Pusch 1985; Hellinger 1985: 30). In other words, the generic vs. male vs. female interpretation of generic nouns depends on the pragmatics of both linguistic context (e.g. inclusion into anaphoric chains of coreference, cf. Kalverkämper 1979: 64ff) and context of situation, including the interpreter's sex and attitude towards feminism.

Notice also that generic nouns such as der Mensch 'human being', die Person 'person' which have no 'heterosexual' counterpart (die *Mensch-in, der *Persön-erich) may have a sexist interpretation due to the grammatical article, e.g. der Mensch may be considered as referring rather to men, die Person rather to women, whereas nothing points to a specific sex in their plurals.

3. Feminist strategies

In antisexist language policy several strategies have been proposed for changing either official or unofficial language use or merely for arousing attention to the issues involved in order to allow equal and unambiguous reference to the intended sex (including sex neutrality) (cf. Wodak et al. 1986; Hellinger 1985; Pusch 1984, 1985). They are as far as morphology is concerned:

1) "Splitting" instead of the masculine and/or generic term: e.g. der Student 'student' → der Student und die Student-in, der/die Student/in. This strategy has often been attacked as uneconomical (e.g. Kälverkämper 1979: 63).

2) Replacement of the more sex-relatable singular by the less sex-relatable plural (cf. §2): e.g. der Student → die Student-en (instead of splitting: die Student/inn/en).

3) Replacement by truly sex-neutral terms: e.g. die Studier-end-en 'the studying persons' (but notice the singular contrast between der Studier-ende/ein Studier-ende-r and die/ein-e Studier-ende).

4) Replacement by collective or functional terms: e.g. der Student → die Student-en-schaft 'the studentship'.

5) Coining of new terms (in addition to the other strategies).

The adequacy of these strategies and the acceptability of their results depends on many factors (cf. Schräpel 1985; more general Allony-Fainberg 1977) of which I will discuss a few morphological ones.

4. Sexist motivation and remotivation

Endeavours towards reinforcing the use of die Kund-in for female clients (§2, 3.1) instead of generic der Kunde presupposes the morphopragmatic identification of male reference of der Kunde. However the probability of male reference of ambiguous terms depends in several factors.

a) The first factor is the morphological makeup of the word. In der Kunde, der Landwirt 'farmer' only the article points to masculine gender, but neither the root Kund-, -wirt nor the stem-suffix -e in Kunde-n. And the plurals die Kunde, die Landwirt-e could belong to a feminine declension class as well, in contrast to oblique singular case forms, e.g. gen. des Kunde-n, Landwirt-s.

b) In contrast, suffixations that have an animate meaning are much more sex-related: -in (and -essin), French derived -ess, -euse, -ine, -ière always refer to females, -erich to males (§2). Nouns in -er (variants -ler, -ner, cf. -iker, -ianer) -ling, -ian, -ikus, -(at)eur, -ar, -(at)or, -ist, -ent, -ant, -är are either male-related or generic. However, a suffixed word such as Bau-er 'peasant' has a much higher probability of referring to males than its non-suffixed synonym Landwirt. Thus, *ceteris paribus*, it is easier to portray a suffixed word as male-related than a suffixless one and therefore to call for a specific female-related term. And in fact die Bäuer-in is much more used than die Land-wirtin instead of including females into Bau-er and Landwirt. Of course knowledge of sex-relatedness of foreign suffixes seems to correlate with knowledge of learned vocabulary (of foreign origin) in general.

c) Morphosemantically transparent (compositional) compounds (cf. §1) behave like their heads. E.g. der Land-arzt 'country doctor' and die Landärzt-in have exactly the same relation as der Arzt 'doctor' and die Ärzt-in.

d) This is not the case with morphosemantically opaque compounds, whose potential sex-relatedness may be even lower than with simplex words in idioms. Let us analyze Mann 'man' and Herr 'master', gentleman, lord': Idioms such as Herr der Lage sein 'to be master of the situation', Herr im Hause sein 'to wear the trousers (lit. 'to be master in the house)', seinen Mann stellen 'to hold own's own' may be used by women referring to a woman (of course the masc. possessive sein-en 'his' must be changed to fem. ihr-en 'her') although many speakers (not only feminists) may not find it very adequate or elegant. Also the com. Alle Mann an Deck! 'all hands on deck!' may refer to women as well. The problem of which idioms allow this, and why the plurals Herr-en and Männ-er (for compounds cf. Samoilowa 1970) are always male-related, need not concern us here.

Similarly in all opaque compounds (i.e. non-compositional morphological constructions) the male-relatedness of -mann (cf. Samoilowa 1970) and -herr is greatly reduced (in a synchronic sense). Some examples are Land-s-mann 'compatriot' (vs. Land-mann 'peasant'), Vorder-mann 'man ahead' (vs. 'front-rank man'), Stroh-mann 'man of straw', Dunkel-mann 'obscurantist' (translation of humanist Latin vir obscurus), Ob-mann 'head-man, chair-man' (lit. 'over man'), Bieder-mann 'man of honour/worth' (lit. 'loyal man'), Haupt-mann 'captain' (lit. 'head man') either as a military title or in doubly opaque compounds such as Landes-haupt-mann 'chief executive/governor/president of a federal province', Burg-haupt-mann, Stadt-haupt-mann, Schloß-haupt-mann, Deich-haupt-mann; the title der Groß-herr (lit. 'great master'), Brot-herr 'employer' (lit. 'bread master'). Reinforcement of sex-relatedness in such compounds is an instance of morphopragmatic remotivation.

e) This last group also shows the second factor, the lexical factor of idiosyncratic global development.

f) Sex-relatedness of a base may be reduced by derivation and compounding (which makes it a non-head). Examples with Mann and Herr are Mann-schaft 'team' (lit. 'man-ship'); Herr-schaft 'mastery, command' (lit. 'master-ship'), mann-s-hoch 'tall as a man'. Establishing sex-relatedness (cf. Hoffmann 1979: 115f) is an instance of higher morphopragmatic remotivation than in d). For there (e.g. in Brot-herr, Ob-mann), it is the head whose sex-relatedness has to be reinforced, whereas here it is the non-head; and the head is known to be more important for the semantic categorization of a complex word than the non-head (cf. § 5 h).

g) An extreme case of remotivation is back-formation, of which I could not find any interesting instances. E.g. die Näh-er-in 'needle woman' and die Zu-geh-er-in 'charwoman' (lit. 'to-go-er-ess') are females without male counterparts, (for social reasons). The masculine potential bases der ?Näh-er, ?Zu-geh-er do not exist, but are potential words (and false intermediate steps in derivation from näh-en 'to sew' and zu-geh-en 'to go up to'),

although the comparative näh-er 'nearer' might exercise some homophony blockage.

5. Feminist neologisms

a) Whenever a female-related counterpart of a male-related or ambiguous term (§ 2,3) is lacking, this gap may be filled by a neologism (cf. § 3). Clearly productive word formation rules must be used. Also, conditions on potential bases (e.g. on concatenating native bases with foreign suffixes and vice versa; -in may not be combined with -ling, cf. Wellmann 1975: 109) and connotative restrictions must be respected.

E.g. compounds (or 'suffixoid formations') with -liese, -suse, -trine must not be proposed because they are all pejorative, as in die Heul-suse/trine 'cry-baby'. Similarly masc. -erich is difficult to use in suffixation since it is either pejorative (e.g. Wüt-erich 'blood thirsty villain') or only applicable to bases designating animals (e.g. Gäns-erich 'gander').

b) Exocentric (possessive) compounds seem to resist feminine gender derivation. E.g. der Trotz-kopf 'pig-headed person' (lit. 'defiance head') or der Dick-häut-er 'pachyderm' (lit. 'thick-skin-er') do not lend themselves to derivations such as die *Trotz-köpf-in, *Trotz-kopf-frau, *Dick-häut-er-in, *Dick-häut-in, *Dick-häut-er-frau (unless in the transparent meaning 'spouse' of a pachydermic male'). The reason seems to be that such compounds are truly and only generic. Therefore Trotzkopf is the name of the heroine of a successful series of novels about and for girls who identify with her. Notice also that die Rot-haut 'redskin' has no female denotations or connotations despite its feminine gender, since the semantic base where sex-relatedness could apply to is, as it were, outside. Thus article inflection alone is not capable of attributing sex connotations. Therefore generics such as der Kunde (§ 2) must be truly ambiguous, i.e. their male-related reading (although maybe often of a latent status) is not a mere invention of feminists.

c) Otherwise -in suffixes and compounds with -frau 'woman' added to words or replacing -mann or -herr in compounds can be freely used (cf. Hellinger 1985; Pusch 1984: 26ff, 35ff; Guentherodt 1979) with the following caveats:

d) The addition of -frau must compete with a series of compounds where X-frau designates the spouse of X in contrast to X-in 'female X', e.g. Lehr-er-in 'female teacher' vs. Lehr-er-frau 'spouse of a teacher' (Plank 1981: 116ff). However this does not entail violating a word formation rule, because such series have only the status of lexical fields (more in Pounder, in press).

e) If -frau replaces -mann or -herr in an opaque complex word, resistance of the speech-community to such neologisms is likely to be greater than in a transparent word... For not only the neologism must be accepted but also the presupposed sexist remotivation. Therefore Frau-schaft as a counterpart to Mann-schaft or Herr-schaft (§ 4f) seems to be unacceptable.

If our gradation of remotivation in §4c-f is correct, then replacing -mann, -herr with -frau in opaque compounds (§ 4d) must be more acceptable, but still less than in transparent compounds. And in fact Stroh-frau, Dunkel-frau, Brot-frau seem to be hardly conceivable as counterparts to Stroh-mann, Dunkel-mann, Brot-herr. Ob-frau alongside Ob-mann is used but resisted;

but Ob-mann itself is such an awkward officialese title that maybe Ob-frau does not sound much funnier.

The proposed Landes-haupt-frau as the designation of an (as yet non-existent) female Landes-haupt-mann is unfortunate for two reasons: 1) because Landeshauptmann is doubly opaque (§ 4d). 2) because Landeshaupt-frau may be felt to contain the noun Haupt-frau 'main spouse' (of a polygamist):

f) One way out might be thought to be -in suffixation. In fact there exists Land-s-männ-in 'female compatriot' in contrast to Land-frau 'peasant woman' as a counterpart to Land-mann. Vorder-männ-in 'female ahead' is usable but unlikely to be accepted. Other conceivable forms in -männ-in seem to be still less acceptable. The proposed transparent form Amt(s)-männ-in 'female magistrate' has been rejected (Guentherodt 1979: 128; Hoffmann 1979: 109). Landes-herr-in 'female sovereign' exists as counterpart to Landes-herr 'sovereign', but only because Herr-in (where social status is more important than sex-reference) exists and Landes-herr 'lord of the country' is transparent. The same holds for Ober-herr-in ← Ober-herr 'supreme lord', Grund-herr-in ← Grund-herr 'lord of the manor'. Since -in forms of opaque Groß-herr, Brot-herr seem rather awkward, -in suffixation seems not to be a viable alternative. Of course the attested forms Mitglied-er-inn-en 'female members', Schluß-licht-er-inn-en 'female tail-lights' (metaphorical) are ungrammatical nonce-formations since they have two plural suffixes interrupted by the derivational suffix -in, a double violation of German morphology.

g) Thus extramorphological strategies must be employed, such as replacing Landes-hauptmann (e) with e.g. Landes-präsident → Landes-präsident-in or speaking of der weibliche Landes-hauptmann 'the female L.'.

h) We have seen (§ 4f) that the head position is semantically more critical than the non-head position. Thus feminizing the head is more important and noticeable than feminizing the non-head. E.g. at the end of the Austrian national elections of 1986 certain politicians thanked their Wähl-er-inn-en und Wähl-er 'female and male voters' (or inverse order), but all of them spoke of the term Wähler-gruppen 'voter groups', nobody in addition of Wähler-innen-gruppen. Therefore the splitting of Dienstnehmer 'employee(s)' into Dienstnehmer/innen (cf. § 3) is easier to promote than the replacement of Dienstnehmer-recht(e) 'employee(s) rights' with Dienstnehmer/innen-recht(e).

References

- Allony-Fainberg, Yaffa. 1977. Linguistic and socio-demographic factors influencing the acceptance of Hebrew neologisms. PhD dissertation, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem.
- Dressler, Wolfgang U. 1985a. On the predictiveness of Natural Morphology. *Journal of Linguistics* 21. 321-337
- Dressler, Wolfgang U. 1985b. Typological aspects of Natural Morphology. *Wiener linguistische Gazette* 35-36. 3-25
- Dressler, Wolfgang U. 1986. Explanation in Natural Morphology, illustrated with comparative and agent-noun formation. *Linguistics* 24. 519-548
- Dressler, Wolfgang U., Willi Mayerthaler, Oswald Panagl, and Wolfgang U. Wurzel. in press. Leitmotifs in Natural Morphology. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Dressler, Wolfgang U. and Lavinia Merlini Barbaresi. in press. How to fix interfixes? *Acta Linguistica Hungarica*
- Glück, Helmut. 1979. Der Mythos von den Frauensprachen. *Osnabrücker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft (OBST)* 9. 60-95
- Guentherodt, Ingrid. 1979. Berufsbezeichnungen für Frauen. *OBST, Beiheft* 3. 120-132
- Hellinger, Marlis (ed.). 1985. Sprachwandel und feministische Sprachpolitik. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.
- Ibrahim, Muhammad H. 1973. Grammatical Gender. The Hague: Mouton
- Kalverkämper, Hartwig. 1979. Die Frauen und die Sprache. *Linguistische Berichte* 62. 55-71
- Kramer, Cherris. 1978. One Review of U.S.A. Language and Sex Research *OBST* 8. 93-101
- Mayerthaler, Willi. 1981. Morphologische Natürlichkeit. Wiesbaden: Athenaion
- Plank, Frans. 1981. Morphologische (Ir)-Regularitäten. Tübingen: Narr
- Pounder, Amanda. in press. The semantic organization of word formation in paradigms and diachrony. *Acta Linguistica Hungarica*.
- Pusch, Luise. 1984. Das Deutsche als Männersprache. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp.
- Pusch, Luise. 1985. Frauen entpatriifizieren die Sprache - Feminisierungstendenzen im heutigen Deutsch. In Hellinger 1985. 23-47
- Ritchie Key, Mary. 1975. Male/Female Language. Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow Press.

- Samoilowa, E.M. 1970. -mann und seine Pluralformen in der deutschen Sprache. *Muttersprache* 80. 191-196
- Schräpel, Beate. 1985. Nichsexistische Sprache und soziolinguistische Aspekte von Sprachwandel und Sprachplanung. In Hellinger 1985. 212-230
- Spender, Dale. 1980. *Man Made Language*. London: Routledge.
- Trömel-Plötz, Senta. 1978. Linguistik und Frauensprache. *Linguistische Berichte* 57. 49-68.
- Wellmann, Hans. 1975. *Deutsche Wortbildung II. Das Substantiv*. Düsseldorf: Schwann
- Wienold, Götz. 1967. *Genus und Semantik*. Meisenheim: Hain
- Wienold, Götz. 1974. *Genus, Sexus. Historisches Wörterbuch der Philosophie* (Basel: Schwabe) III. 311-315
- Wienold, Götz. 1982. Nochmalige Gedanken zu Genus und Semantik. *Festschrift K. Schneider* (Amsterdam: Benjamins). 243-252
- Wodak, Ruth, Sylvia Moosmüller, Gert Feistritzer, and Ursula Dolechal. 1986. *Frau und Mann im öffentlichen Bereich. Linguistische Richtlinien zur geschlechtsneutralen Sprachverwendung*. Universität Wien: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft
- Wurzel, Wolfgang U. 1984. Flexionsmorphologie und Natürlichkeit. *Studia Grammatica* 21.
- Zubin, David and Klaus-Michael Köpcke. 1984. Affect classification in the German Gender System. *Lingua* 63. 41-96