

GENDER IN CULTURE AND GENDER IN LANGUAGE

ON TRANSLATION OF THE NOVEL
LUBIEWO BY MICHAŁ WITKOWSKI
INTO GERMAN AND SWEDISH

BARBARA GAWROŃSKA PETERSSON

University of Agder, Kristiansand

1. INTRODUCTION

During the last decades, the term “gender” has been used in different senses. Its biological and linguistic interpretation has more and more frequently been replaced by the sociocultural one, inspired by feminist and queer-theoretical approaches. This paper is an attempt to throw some light on the different aspects of the term, the relations between the biological, sociocultural and linguistic meanings of “gender”, as well as on the interplay between reference to biological and sociocultural distinctions on the one hand, and linguistic exponents of grammatical genders on the other hand. Another question addressed here concerns translation strategies used with regard to the complicated problem of gender. How do translators cope with situations, where the linguistic exponents of gender in the source text have essential consequences for the sociocultural characteristics of the characters in a literary text, and the target language does not utilize the same range of grammatical gender exponents as the source language? What compensation techniques are used?

The novel *Lubiewo* by Michał Witkowski (sometimes called “the Polish homosexual Decamerone”) has been chosen as the primary source of material, due to the fact that the interplay between grammatical gender and sociocultural gender plays a crucial role in this text, as it is responsible for linking the form of the novel with its content.

2. THE NOTION OF GENDER IN LINGUISTICS

The linguistic term “gender” is originally not directly related to the category of biological sex. Corbett (1991:1) states that the Latin word *genus* and *gendre* in Old French meant “kind” or “sort” (cf. also Romaine 1999:67). Perhaps the most universal definition of linguistic gender is the one formulated by Hockett (1958:231): “Genders are classes of nouns reflected in the behaviour of associated words”. As Corbett (1999:10) points out, the use of the terms “gender” or “noun class” is “more a matter of tradition than of substance”: linguists working on Dravidian languages tend to talk about “gender”, while in Caucasian linguistics the term “noun classes” is more usual.

The term “gender”, its relations to natural gender, and the question of arbitrariness of gender as a linguistic category and related problems have been discussed since Aristotle; it would be outside the scope of this paper to give an overview of these debates. For a quite detailed survey, the reader is referred to Kilarski (2007).

There are no natural languages where the relations between the gender (or “class”) of a noun and the biological sex of the noun’s referent are exactly one-to-one; however, the role of the biological male/female distinction plays a certain role in assignment of grammatical gender in all languages that display gender difference. This is especially obvious in languages with so-called strict semantic gender systems, e.g. in Tamil and other Dravidian languages. The masculine category in Tamil comprises male gods and male humans, while nouns denoting goddesses and female human beings are feminine; other nouns belong to the neuter category, with some exceptions that may be explained by religious beliefs (nouns denoting the sun and the moon are masculine – Corbett 1999:8f.).

In his outstanding monograph on linguistic gender, Corbett (1999) gives an overview of more than 200 languages and classifies the gender assignment systems into two main groups: semantic and formal. The first group includes the aforementioned strict semantic systems (Tamil and other Dravidian languages) and predominantly semantic systems, e.g. Dyirbal, where the relations between biological sex and grammatical gender are slightly less obvious:

- gender 1: male humans, non-human animates
- gender 2: female humans, water, fire, fighting
- gender 3: on-flesh food
- gender 4: residue (Corbett 1991:16)

Following Hockett (1958), Corbett takes the presence/absence of widely understood agreement (phrase agreement, sentence internal agreement and anaphoric relations) as the criterion for presence/absence of grammatical gender. As a consequence of this approach, pronominal systems of the English type are regarded as semantic systems, the classification motivated by the agreement between antecedent nouns and anaphoric pronouns.

The gender systems of most Indo-European languages spoken in Europe are classified by Corbett as formal systems. One could obviously agree with Bloomfield's (1933:280) claim that there "seems to be no practical criterion by which the gender of a noun in German, French, or Latin could be determined". The "residue" nouns in those languages, as well as in Polish or Russian, are distributed over the existing genders. This distribution is nevertheless not completely random. Studies on gender acquisition in children and research on assignment of gender to borrowed words and neologisms show that the gender distinctions in so-called formal systems have to do both with form (morpho- and phonology) and semantics of the nouns (Smoczyńska 1985, Köpcke and Zubin 1984, Zubin and Köpcke 1986, Mills 1986). The difference between "semantic" and "formal" systems is to be understood not as a clear-cut borderline, but rather as different placements on a continuum scale that ranges from strict semantic systems (as in Tamil) to phonological systems (as in Qafar, an Ethiopian language, where nouns whose citation forms end in accented vowel are feminine, while all others are masculine – Corbett 1999:51).

The three languages that are of interest for this study – Polish, German, and Swedish – represent such different points on this scale.

Both Polish and German distinguish between masculine, feminine and neuter nouns in singular. In plural, German nouns show no gender-related agreement distinctions, while Polish nouns are divided into two categories: the first one is so-called male-animate or "superanimate" (referring to male human beings); the second one includes practically all other nouns. The Polish gender system thus seems to display more dependence on semantic factors than the German one.

Swedish singular nouns are divided into the so-called common gender (*utrum* or *reale* in the Swedish linguistic terminology) and the neuter gender. "Common gender" is, according to Corbett (1999:124) "simply the name of a gender which combines the earlier masculine and feminine; it does not suggest that the nouns involved are of double gender". The pronominal system of Swedish shows a peculiarity common to mainland Scandinavian languages: it includes four genders. Two of them (masculine and feminine, expressed by the pronouns *han* and *hon*) are reserved for human, certain (especially domesticated) animals and certain vehicles (boats, ships). The remaining two genders (*utrum* and *neutrum*, expressed by the pronouns *den* and *det*) refer to "residue" nouns in accordance with their grammatical gender/class. This feature of the Swedish grammar system has led to a debate concerning the number of grammatical genders in Swedish (Andersson 2000, Dahl 2000, Stroh-Wollin 2005). The question, whether Swedish has two or four grammatical genders, is, however, not relevant for the current study; of relevance are rather the existing linguistic exponents of the biological distinctions male/female.

Table 1 summarizes the main differences between the linguistic exponents of gender in Polish, German, and Swedish. The abbreviation *gl* refers to the

“superanimate” or “male-human” gender of Polish nouns in plural, *re* refers to the “common gender” (*utrum* or *reale*) in Swedish.

Table 1: Exponents of gender in Polish, German, and Swedish

AGREEMENT	POLISH		GERMAN		SWEDISH	
	Sg.	Pl.	Sg.	Pl.	Sg.	Pl.
1. NP-head – determiner	ma/fe/ne	g1/others	ma/fe/ne	–	re/ne	–
2. NP-head – cardinal numeral greater than “one”	–	g1/fe/others	–	–	–	–
3. NP-head – adjective attribute	ma/fe/ne	g1/others	ma/fe/ne	–	re/ne or ma/others	–
4. Subject – finite verb						
Present	–	–				
Past			–	–	–	–
1st person	ma/fe	g1/others				
2nd person	ma/fe	g1/others				
3rd person	ma/fe/ne	g1/others				
5. Subject – predicative adjective/participle	ma/fe/ne	g1/others	–	–	re/ne	–
6. NP-head – relative pronoun	ma/fe/ne	g1/others	ma/fe/ne	–	re/ne or unmarked	–
7. Antecedent – anaphoric personal pronoun	ma/fe/ne	g1/others	ma/fe/ne	–	ma/fe/re/ne	–
8. Antecedent – reflexive possessive pronoun	–	–	fe/others	–	–	–

Table 1 shows clearly that the grammatical category of gender exposed by agreement is more overt and more transparent in Polish than in German and Swedish. The same is true with respect to noun-noun derivations as well as with respect to gender assignment to borrowings. Furthermore, addressing forms in Polish display the masculine-feminine distinction in the so-called v-forms (*pan* for males, *pani* for females), while German utilizes the same v-form (*Sie*) for all sexes/genders, and contemporary Swedish hardly makes use of gender-related or social distinctions in addressing forms. In a literary text where the choice of grammatical gender significantly contributes to the interpretation of the biological and/or socio-cultural gender of the characters, the aforementioned systematic differences pose an obvious obstacle to the translator (cf. McConnell-Ginet 2003, Nissen 2002, Karoubi 2009).

3. THE SOCIOCULTURAL NOTION OF GENDER

As stated above, the linguistic gender is related to, but not identical with the biological characteristics of the referent. Similarly, the term “gender”, as discussed from the sociocultural point of view during the last three decades, is related to, but not identical with the biological characteristics of a person. In most feministic studies, gender is understood as a socially constructed concept, connected to stereotypes that are mostly negative from a feminist’s viewpoint. Shapiro (1981) defines the difference as follows:

[Sex and gender] serve a useful analytic purpose in contrasting a set of biological facts with a set of cultural facts. Were I to be scrupulous in my use of terms, I would use the term “sex” only when I was speaking of biological differences between males and females and use “gender” whenever I was referring to the social, cultural, psychological constructs that are imposed upon these biological differences. (Shapiro 1981:111)

Shapiro’s interpretation has been criticized by several gender researchers because of its relations to the two biological sexes. Within the paradigm of early feminism, focus has been put upon “the social processes that turns young females into girls, and later into women” (von Flotow 1997:5). Later on, even the construction of male attributes and attitudes have been taken into account. For a more detailed discussion, see e.g. McElhinny (2003), Litosseliti & Sunderland (2002), Wodak (1997). The main ideas concerning sex, gender, and language in the contemporary writings may be (simplified; see references for a more nuanced debate) summarized as follows:

- the notion “gender” refers primarily to the social, cultural, and psychological constructs that are imposed upon the existing biological differences (Shapiro 1981),
- gender is a multiple, fluctuating variable shaped in part by language (Wodak 1997),
- the understanding of gender “changes from one generation to the next [...] between different racialized, ethnic, and religious groups, as well as for members of different social classes” (Wodak 1997, cited in Litosseliti & Sunderland 2002:6; Romaine 1999; Karoubi 2009),
- the notion of gender should not be restricted to the male-female duality; it should encompass “the gender complexities raised by homosexual contexts and practices such as cross-dressing or transvestism” (von Flotow 1997:6, based on Butler 1990).

4. LINGUISTIC GENDER AND SOCIOCULTURAL GENDER IN TRANSLATION

The question of translating gender and gender in translation has been treated from many points of view. In spite of the contemporary acknowledgement of the multiple, and not dual, notion of sociocultural gender, the literature on the subject is dominated by investigation of the male-female distinction. The following list of frequently investigated problems is partially based on von Flotow (1997) and Karoubi (2009):

1. How does the gender of the author affect the SL-text?
2. How does the gender of the author influence decisions about which texts are worth translating?
3. How does the gender of the translator, or her/his “gendered identity” affect the translation strategy?
4. Are there parallels between post-colonial issues and gender-related issues (minority vs. majority language)?
5. How to render culture-specific and language-specific gender complexities in translation?

Question 1 concerns the issue of “male language” and “female language”, discussed both in sociolinguistics and in translation theory. One of the perhaps extreme approaches is to be found in Duras (1980), who treats women’s writing as a translation of the female discourse into the dominating patriarchal code: “I think ‘feminine literature’ is an organic, translated writing... [...]. And when women write, they translate from darkness... Men don’t translate” (Duras 1980:174).

Questions 2-5 are obviously interconnected. They all concern problems like gender/ethnicity in translation policy, power asymmetry in communication, the notorious question of foreignization vs. domestication of the SL-text, and the visibility vs. invisibility of the translator. The translators’ approaches with regard to these issues range from almost literal translation to overt translation interventionism. Literal translation “stems from the desire not to lose even a scrap of information or connotation, and it is often completed by explanatory translator’s notes” (von Flotow 1997:21). As a consequence, the translated text is often a “heavy” reading; the reader is continuously sent back and forth between the fictional world and the “reality”. The translator’s explanations often erase the effect of puns, wordplays, and connotations present in the SL-text. At the same time, the translator remains loyal to the source language culture (though not necessarily loyal to the author), and he/she gives the TL-reader a possibility to get acquainted with a “foreign” world.

The opposite end of the scale – overt interventionism – is problematic from not only linguistic and aesthetic, but also from ethical points of view. As claimed by von Flotow (1997:24), certain feminist translators “have assumed the right to query their source texts from a feminist perspective, to intervene and make changes when the text departs from this perspective”. An illustrative example of the overt interventionist approach is to be found in the translator’s preface to *Lettres d’une autre* by Lise Gauvin (de Lobtinière Harwood 1989:9, cited by von Flotow 1997:29):

[...] this translation is a rewriting in the feminine of what I originally read in French. [...] My translation practice is a political activity aimed at making language speak for women. So my signature on a translation means: this translation has used every possible feminist strategy to make the feminine visible in language.

In the practice, feminist interventionists choose to avoid generic male terms (e.g. de Lobtinière Harwood tries to make the reference of the generic French

plural form *ils* clearly male or female, utilizes feminine neologisms as translations of generic male terms (e.g. the French term *Québécois*, referring to both sexes, is translated into *Québécois-e-s*). Similar strategy, although applied in the opposite direction, is used by Haugerud (1977), who chooses to neutralise masculine marked terms like *man* or *mankind* by translating them into *anybody* or *anyone*. Such choices are obviously inspired by ideological factors. However, structural differences between the linguistic gender systems in SL and TL may lead to similar solutions in translation. As Livia (2003:157, cited by Kharoubi 2009), formulates it, “when translating from a language in which there are many linguistic gender markers into a language which has fewer, either gender information is lost, or it is overstated, overtly asserted where in the original it is more subtly presupposed”. The present study aims at investigating what happens to the gender distinctions in translation of Michał Witkowskis *Lubiewo* from Polish into two languages with fewer overt gender markers: German and Swedish.

5. LUBIEWO – THE POLISH “HOMOSEXUAL DECAMERONE”

Lubiewo (“Lovetown”) by Michał Witkowski (1st edition 2006) has been called by one of its Polish reviewers “homosexual Decamerone”. This is a very adequate description: the atmosphere of the novel ranges from bright situational comic through bizarre tragicomic to serious reflection, and the narration structure resembles Boccaccio’s (although references to Witold Gombrowicz, especially his novels *Transatlantyk* and *Kosmos* are also noticeable).

The first part of the novel gives a picture of the homosexual subculture of the Communist Poland, while the second portrays the world of today’s Polish homosexuals, where the older generation still feels nostalgia for the 1980s, and remains in rather sceptical attitude toward the “Europeanized“, modern, socially and politically engaged gays. The different attitudes are mirrored by the language: the “traditionalists” (Polish *cioty*, German *Tunten*, Swedish *ffjollar*) use so-called “queer renaming” (Lucas 1994:32): they call themselves and each other by female names and nicknames (*Michalina* instead of *Michał*, *Patrycja* for *Piotr* ...) and use the feminine grammatical forms of verbs and adjectives for self-reference and second-person-reference. The style of their conversation varies between the one of old-fashioned male Central European intellectuals gathered around a café table and a stereotypical “girl talk” mixed with vulgarisms. Their variant of “girl talk” is what Harvey (1998/2004:405f.) and Lakoff (1975:11ff.) describe as a “parodic accumulation of stereotypical woman language features” and “camp’s construction of the theatricalized woman”. It is overloaded with diminutives, emotionally loaded adjectives, and high-pitch interjections. Other characteristic features are ritual insults in female forms, mostly involving sexual connotations, references to female representants of popular culture (cf. Harvey 1998/2004:407) as well as references to certain classics of Polish literature (Mickiewicz, Gombrowicz, Iwaszkiewicz, Różewicz, Wyspiański).

The new generation of the Polish homosexuals refuses to use the Polish words for persons with their sexual orientations; they are not *cioty* or *pedały*, but *geje* (a loan word formed from English *gay*), they express themselves in politically correct clichés, they use the language of the Internet rather than references to Polish literary classics. And the idea of using feminine grammatical gender with reference to themselves, or of using feminine nicknames would never cross their minds.

At the first glance, Witkowski's novel seems almost untranslatable, at least into non-Slavic languages. The challenges for the translators are enormous. Already the three central terms: *ciota*, *gej* and *luj* (the last one referring to the heterosexual type that is perceived as most attractive by a "ciota") are impossible to render without some loss of their connotative meaning. The translation of *luj* poses additional difficulties due to the fact that individuals belonging to this category – according to the narrator's definition – do not occur western of the Polish-German border. Another very complex source of translation difficulties is constituted by overt and covert allusions to the classics of Polish literature and to the popular culture of the Communist Poland. Still, the use of the grammatical gender, including gendered names and nicknames, is perhaps the most intricate problem from the linguistic and translation-theoretical point of view.

6. "GIRL TALK" – POLISH FEMALE VERB AND MODIFIER FORMS IN TRANSLATION

Female forms of verbs are in both translations – when it is grammatically possible – compensated by the use of German and Swedish female pronouns, which is a rather obvious solution. However, pronoun compensation is not possible in plural and in the 1st and 2nd grammatical person. The German translator compensates the loss by adding other features of "girl talk", especially diminutives with the suffix *-chen* (even if the source text equivalent is an augmentative); this strategy is not present in the Swedish translation, as shown in the following examples:

- (1) Pol. *torebka* (handbag) → Sw. *handväskan* / Ger. *Täschchen*
- (2) Pol. *baba* ((old) woman) → Sw. *käring* / Ger. *Weibchen*
- (3) Pol. *zadzieram kiecę i lecę* ('I lift my dress+augmentative and run')
→ Sw. *nu lyfter jag mina kjolar och går* ('now I lift my skirts and go')
Ger. *ich nehm mein Häubchen und mach mich aus dem Stäubchen* (lit. 'I take my hat+diminutive and disappear from dust+diminutive')
- (4) Pol. *stary, gruby dziad* ('old, fat bungler')
→ Sw. *en fet gammal gubbe* ('a fat, old man')
Ger. *ein dickes, altes Grossväterchen* ('a fat, old Granddaddy')

Another quite interesting way of compensating the loss of the effect of female grammatical markers is the use of high pitch exclamations in the German text; the “feminine” quality of the source text is hence transferred from the grammatical to the phonological level. Again, the Swedish translator prefers to refrain from this kind of compensation:

- (5) Pol. *Ba, ale dlaczego chcą?* (Exclamation – ‘but why do they want it?’)
 → Sw. *Men varför skulle de vilja det?* (‘But why should they want it?’)
 Ger. *Igittigitt, aber warum wollen die das bloss?* (High pitch exclamation – ‘But why do they want it anyway?’)

Switching and hesitation between female and male gender forms are mostly rendered by lexical compensation (“level shift” in Catford’s terminology). This is true about both the German and the Swedish translation:

- (6) Pol. *Dwie... dwóch panów* (‘two+female... two+male+human gentlemen’)
 → Sw. *Två tan... två gubbar*
 Ger. *zwei Da... Herren* (‘two la... gentlemen’)
- (7) Pol. *A gdzie to się wszystk... wszyscy tak w pary podobialiście?* (‘And how did you all+female... all+male+human become couples?’)
 → Sw. *Och hur har ni tje... grabbar parat ihop er så där?*
 Ger. *Und wo habt ihr Mäd... Jungs euch alle gefunden?* (‘And where have you gir... boys found each other?’)

7. GENDERED NAMES AND NICKNAMES – QUEER RENAMING

When confronted with the issue of proper names, the translator has to make a choice between the following options (the classification and some of the examples below are based on van Coillie 2006):

1. Non-translation (copying).
2. Non-translation + additional explanation (Pol. *Mickiewicz* – Eng. *the Polish poet Mickiewicz*).
3. Phonetic and/or graphic adaptation to TL (No. *Håkan* – Pol. *Haakan*).
4. Replacement by a counterpart in target language (“exonym”: Eng. *John* – Ger. *Johannes*).
5. Replacement by a more widely known name from the source culture or an internationally known name with a similar function (e.g. names of popular football players: Pol. *Lato* – Sp. *Ronaldo*).
6. Replacement by another name from TL-culture (Sw. *Emil* – Ger. *Michel*).
7. Replacement of a proper name by a common noun or an explanatory noun phrase (Pol. *Lato* – Eng. *a famous football player*).
8. Translation (especially in the case of “meaningful” names, e.g. Eng. *Mr. Wormwood* – Dutch: *meneer Wurmhout*).

In translations of *Lubiewo* into German and Swedish, almost all of the above enumerated translation strategies occur. Though, the two translators chose different distribution of the strategies, and different means of presenting them to the TL-reader. Table 2 gives an overview of the translators’ ways of handling proper nouns and nicknames.

Table 2: A comparison between the German and the Swedish translators' strategies with regard to Polish proper names and nicknames

TRANSLATION STRATEGY	GERMAN	comments / examples	SWEDISH	comments / examples
Non-translation (copying)	Most traditional Polish names, including diminutives. A few nicknames.	<i>Zdzisław, Zdzislawa, Michał, Goldzia, Tośka, Anna, Ania, Andzia, Maciejowa, Sucha Beskidzka</i>	Most traditional Polish names, including diminutives. No copied nicknames.	Diminutives often replaced by base forms (<i>Anna</i> instead of <i>Ania</i> or <i>Andzia</i>).
Non-translation + additional explanation	Detailed end-notes with information about Polish culture (Polish writers, pop-singers, fictional characters etc.).	<i>Sośnicka, Kunicka, Wisłocka</i>	Explanations in the text, no footnotes.	<i>Balladyna</i> → <i>Den mytiska drottningen Balladyna</i> ("the mythical queen Balladyna"), <i>Wisłocka</i> → <i>Den där sexuologen Wisłocka</i> ("this sexologist Wisłocka")
Phonetic and/or graphic adaptation to TL	Rather infrequent, only cases listed to the right.	<i>Dianka</i> → <i>Di</i> , <i>Michalina / Michaśka</i> → <i>Michalin</i> , <i>Dżessika / Dżesi</i> → <i>Jessica / Jessi</i> , <i>Żorzeta</i> → <i>Georgette</i>	More frequent than in the German version.	<i>Patrycja</i> → <i>Patricia</i> , <i>Lukrecja</i> → <i>Lukrecia</i> , <i>Gizela</i> → <i>Gisella</i> , <i>Goldzia</i> → <i>Golda</i> , <i>Mirejka</i> → <i>Mirran</i> , <i>Tośka</i> → <i>Tussan</i> , <i>Tola</i> → <i>Tullan</i> , <i>Elwira</i> → <i>Elvira</i> , <i>Jacka</i> → <i>Jackie</i>
Replacement by a proper name counterpart in target language	Restricted to one clear example (although the borderline between phonetic adaptation and exonym is fuzzy).	<i>Śnieżka</i> → <i>Schneewittchen</i>	Several examples on the borderline between phonetic adaptation, exonym and translation.	<i>Śnieżka</i> → <i>Snövit</i> , <i>Nadobna Cyncylija</i> → <i>Täcka Cecilia</i> , <i>Rolka</i> → <i>Rullan</i> , <i>Roleta</i> → <i>Raglan / Rullan</i>
Full translation	Applies to many meaning-bearing nicknames, especially to nicknames formed from common nouns. Overt gender markers in all translations.	<i>Aligatorzyca</i> → <i>die Alligator</i> , <i>Aptekarka</i> → <i>Apothekerin</i> , <i>Cyganka</i> → <i>die Zigeunerin</i> , <i>Cytra</i> → <i>(die) Zither</i> , <i>Hrabina</i> → <i>die Gräfin</i> , <i>Kangurzyca</i> → <i>die Känguruh</i> , <i>Sowa</i> → <i>(die) Eule</i> , <i>Beczka</i> → <i>(die) Tonne</i> , <i>Kaczka</i> → <i>(die) Ente</i> , <i>Kokarda</i> → <i>(die) Rosetta</i> , <i>Piórella / Piórcia</i> → <i>Federella / Feda</i> , <i>Pisuaressa</i> → <i>Urinella</i> , <i>Ta w Rajtuzach</i> → <i>sie mit den Strümpfen</i>	Similar domain as in German. When possible, the female derivational suffixes <i>-inna(n)</i> and <i>-ska(n)</i> are used. In other cases, the female gender markers disappear, as in translation of <i>ta</i> (female) as <i>den</i> (common gender).	<i>Aligatorzyca</i> → <i>Alligatorinnan</i> , <i>Aptekarka</i> → <i>Apothekerskan</i> , <i>Cyganka</i> → <i>Zigenerskan</i> , <i>Cytra</i> → <i>Cittran</i> , <i>Hrabina</i> → <i>Grevinnan</i> , <i>Kangurzyca</i> → <i>Kängurun</i> , <i>Kucharzyca</i> → <i>Kockerskan</i> , <i>Sowa</i> → <i>Ugglan</i> , <i>Beczka</i> → <i>Tunnan</i> , <i>Kaczka</i> → <i>Ankan</i> , <i>Kokarda</i> → <i>Rosettan</i> , <i>Lady Pomidorowa</i> → <i>lady Tomat</i> , <i>Ta w Rajtuzach</i> → <i>den med strumpbyxor</i> , <i>Łucja Kapielowa</i> → <i>Bastu-Lucia</i> , <i>Piękna Helena</i> → <i>Sköna Helena</i>

Between full translation and replacement by a common noun	Not present in the German translation.	–	A very frequent strategy.	<i>Jaśka od Ksiedza</i> → <i>Prästfrun</i> (“priest’s wife”), <i>Jońska Młynarzowa</i> → <i>Mjöhnares dotter</i> (“miller’s daughter”), <i>Jadźka z Krzywym Nosem</i> → <i>Snednäsan</i> (“twisted+ nose”), <i>Zdzicha Wężowa</i> → <i>Ormtjuserskan, Orm, Orman</i> (“serpent-charmer”, “snake”), <i>Maciczna</i> → <i>Moderkakan / Livmodern</i> (“placenta” / “uterus”), <i>Pizdenca</i> → <i>Muttan</i> (vulg. “vagina”), <i>Zdzicha Ejdsuwa</i> → <i>Ejdsan</i> (a neologism formed from “AIDS”), <i>Piórella / Piórcia</i> → <i>Fjäderboan / Boan</i> (“feather boa”)
Partial translation	Dominating in translation of nicknames consisting of a proper noun and an attribute.	<i>Bronka Ubeczka</i> → <i>Stasi-Bronka, Flora Restauracyjna</i> → <i>Restaurant-Flora, Zdzicha Ejdsuwa</i> → <i>Aids-Zdzicha, Roma Piekarzowa</i> → <i>Bäcker-Roma, Zdzicha Wężowa</i> → <i>Schlangen-Zdzicha, Lucja Kapielowa</i> → <i>Bader-Lucja, Katarzyna od Rzeźnika</i> → <i>Katarzyna vom Fleischer, Matka Joanna od Pedalów</i> → <i>Mutter Joanna der Schwulen</i>	Less frequent than in German; when present, displays similar patterns as the German translation, with one exception (addition of the proper name <i>Berta</i> in TL).	<i>Bronka Ubeczka</i> → <i>Bronka-pä-säkerhetstjänsten, Flora Restauracyjna</i> → <i>Restaurang-Flora, Zbyszek z Wąsami</i> → <i>Zbyszek-med-mustasch, Matka Joanna od Pedalów</i> → <i>moder Joanna av Bögarna, Roma Piekarzowa</i> → <i>Bagar-Roma, Oleśnicka</i> → <i>Oleśnica-Berta</i>
Replacement by another name from TL	Only one case, on the borderline between replacement and partial copying; very clear phonetic and semantic connections between the SL-form and the TL-form.	<i>Lady Pomidorowa</i> → <i>Lady Pomeranza</i>	More frequent than in German; no formal similarities between SL- and TL-forms.	<i>Radwanicka</i> → <i>Ettermajan, Maciejowa</i> → <i>Bondmoran, Katarzyna od Rzeźnika</i> → <i>Tjocka Margot, Sucha Beskidzka</i> → <i>Babette</i>

CONCLUSION

The German translator of “Lubiewo” employs a clearly foreignizing strategy – in Schleiermacher’s terms, he decides to move the reader towards the text instead of moving the text towards the reader. The translator is fully

visible: he uses translator's footnotes and provides an exhaustive list of explanations of culture-specific terms and names. His attitude to translation of names and nicknames is also rather foreignizing: almost all traditional Polish names, also in diminutive forms, are preserved with original spelling. Phonetic and/or graphic adaptations to TL are rare, and replacements by a proper name counterpart in target language or another TL-name occur only marginally (2 cases). Nicknames consisting of an attribute (adjective, noun or PP) and a proper name are consequently translated partially: translation of the attribute and copying of the proper name, while meaning-bearing nicknames formed from common nouns are as a rule translated, mostly by female nouns with the suffix *-in* or nouns provided (even against their correct grammatical gender) with the female article *die* (e.g. *die Känguruh* instead of the correct form *das Känguruh*, *die Alligator* instead of *der Alligator*).

The German translator utilizes a wide range of compensations when rendering the “girl talk” of the characters: lexical, morphological (derivational) and even phonological means (“female” exclamations) compensate the lack of overt grammatical gender markers on verbs and certain modifiers.

The approach of the Swedish translator is slightly more “domesticating”. He avoids footnotes and overt explanations – cultural explanations are camouflaged as appositional constructions, e.g. *Wislocka* → *Den där sexuologen Wislocka* (“this sexuologist Wislocka”). Handling of proper names also reveals a slightly higher degree of domestication than the German translation. Diminutive forms of Polish names are replaced by their basic forms; replacements of nicknames by common nouns or phonetically unrelated names are relatively frequent. The choice of the translation equivalents is often not based on the phonetic form, but rather on connotations and/or the features of the fictional character revealed by the context, e.g. *Maciejowa* (‘Maciej’s wife’, where the name ‘Maciej’ evokes associations to a traditional Polish farmer) → *Bondmoran* (lit. ‘farmer’s wife’, ‘crone’), *Katarzyna od Rzeźnika* (‘Butcher’s Katarzyna’) → *Tjocka Margot* (‘Fat Margot’).

The female features of camp talk, or “girl talk” are sometimes compensated by lexical means, but in general the “parodic accumulation of stereotypical woman language features” becomes neutralized. This is partially due to the Swedish derivational patterns (limited possibility of forming diminutives), but also to the social attitude towards female derivational suffixes *-inna* and *-ska*, which are regarded as old-fashioned and even derogatory.

The linguistic resources of the German language (productive diminutive suffixes, grammatical gender exponents, derivational strategies) seem to make German more suited for translation of “camp-talk” than the grammatical and lexical possibilities of Swedish. In addition, the German female derivational suffix *-in* has been promoted by feminists in the form spelled with capital “I” (forms like *KollegInnen*, *LehrerInnen* etc. referring to both males and females are recommended as politically correct), while the corresponding Swedish suffixes

have pejorative connotations. As a consequence, the picture of the Polish “ciota” becomes slightly more neutralized in the Swedish translation, while in the German version he/she preserves more features of the “camp’s construction of the theatricalized woman” (Lakoff 1975:14).

REFERENCES

PRIMARY SOURCES

- Witkowski, Michał. 2006. *Lubiewo*. Kraków: Korporacja Halart.
 — 2007. *Lubiewo*. Roman. Aus dem Polnischen von Christina Marie Hauptmeier. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp-Verlag.
 — 2008. *Lubiewo*. Översättning: Stefan Ingvarsson. Stockholm: Förlaget Modernista.

SECONDARY SOURCES

- Andersson, Erik. 2000. How many gender categories are there in Swedish? In Unterbeck, Barbara & Rissanen, Matti (eds.). *Gender in grammar and cognition*. Berlin – New York: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 545–559.
 Bloomfield, Leonard. 1933. *Language*. Revised from 1914 edition. New York: Holt.
 Butler, Judith. 1990. *Gender trouble: Feminism and the subversion of identity*. New York: Routledge.
 Corbett, Greville. 1991. *Gender*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
 Dahl, Östen. 2000. Elementary gender distinctions. In Unterbeck, Barbara & Rissanen, Matti (eds.). *Gender in grammar and cognition*. Berlin – New York: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 577–593.
 Duras, Marguerite. 1980. From an interview (by Susan Husserl-Kapit). In Marks, Elaine & de Courtivron, Isabelle (eds.). *New French feminisms. An anthology*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, pp. 174–175.
 von Flotow, Luise. 1997. *Translation and gender: Translating in the ‘era of feminism’ (Perspectives on translation)*. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.
 Harvey, Keith. 2004. Translating camp talk: Gay identities and cultural transfer. In Venuti, Lawrence (ed.). *The translation studies reader*. New York: Routledge, pp. 402–422.
 Hockett, Charles F. 1958. *A course in modern linguistics*. New York: The Macmillan.
 Karoubi, Behrouz. 2009. Gender and translation. <http://www.translationdirectory.com/article528.htm>. (30 July, 2010.)
 Kilarski Marcin. 2007. On grammatical gender as an arbitrary and redundant category. In Kibbee, Douglas A. (ed.). *History of Linguistics 2005: Selected papers from the Tenth International Conference on the History of the Language Sciences (ICHoLS X), 1-5 September 2005, Urbana-Champaign, Illinois*. Amsterdam – Philadelphia: John Benjamins, pp. 24–36.
 Köpcke, Klaus-Michael & Zubin, David A. 1984. Sechs Prinzipien für die Genuszuweisung im Deutschen: ein Beitrag zur natürlichen Klassifikation. *Linguistische Berichte* 93, pp. 26–50.
 Lakoff, Robin. 1975. *Language and woman’s place*. New York: Harper & Row.
 Litosseliti, Lia & Sunderland, Jane. 2002. Gender identity and discourse analysis: theoretical and empirical considerations. In Litosseliti, Lia. & Sunderland, Jane (eds.). *Gender identity and discourse analysis*. Philadelphia: PA John Benjamins Publishing co., pp. 1–39.
 de Lobtinière-Hartwood, Susanne. 1991. *Re-belle et infidèle/The body bilingual: Translation as a re-writing in the feminine*. Québec-Montreal: Les éditions du remue-ménage/Women’s Press.
 Lucas, Ian. 1994. *Impertinent decorum: Gay theatrical manoeuvres*. London: Cassell.
 McConnell-Ginet, Sally. 2003. What’s in a name? Social labeling and gender practices. In Holmes, Janet & Meyerhoff, Miriam (eds.). *The handbook of language and gender*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, pp. 67–97.

- McElhinny, Bonnie. 2003. Theorizing gender in sociolinguistics and linguistic anthropology. In Holmes, Janet & Meyerhoff, Miriam (eds.). *The handbook of language and gender*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, pp. 21–43.
- Mills, Anne. 1985. The acquisition of German. In Slobin, Dan Isaac (ed.). *The crosslinguistic study of language acquisition, vol. 1: The data*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum, pp. 141–246.
- Nissen, Uwe Kjær. 2002. Aspects of translating gender. *Linguistik online* 11, 2/02, pp. 25–37.
- Romaine, Suzanne. 1999. *Communicating gender*. London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Shapiro, Judith. 1981. Anthropology and the study of gender. In Langland, Elizabeth & Gove, Walter (eds.). *The feminist perspective in the academy. The difference it makes*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, pp. 110–129.
- Smoczyńska, Magdalena. 1985. The acquisition of Polish. In Slobin, Dan Isaac (ed.). *The crosslinguistic study of language acquisition, vol. 1: The data*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum, pp. 595–686.
- Stroh-Wollin, Ulla. 2005. Varför är det så svårt att veta hur många genus svenskan har? *Svenskans beskrivning* 28, Örebro universitet, Humanistiska institutionen, pp. 329–339.
- Wodak, Ruth. 1997. Introduction: Some important issues in the research of gender and discourse. In Wodak, Ruth (ed.). *Gender and discourse*. London: Sage, pp. 1–20.
- Zubin, David A. & Köpcke, Klaus-Michael. 1986. Gender and folk taxonomy: The indexical relation between grammatical and lexical categorization. In Craig, Colette G. (ed.). *Noun classes and categorization*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 139–180.