Feminist Translation Strategies Revisited

Eivor Jordà Mathiasen, Universitat de Valéncia – IULMA

Abstract
The aim of this work is to present an overview of feminist translation strategies, to carry out a comparative analysis and to offer a unified proposal of classification. The existence of multiple proposals for feminist translation strategies seems to call for a comparative analysis and a unifying classification. The study will focus on the classical theories from the North American schools (Flotow 1991; Lotbinière-Harwood 1991; Levine 1991; Simon 1996; Massardier-Kenney 1997, and Maier 1998) which set the trend and are most frequently cited, but also on other later proposals that have tried to present some kind of systematic classification and that involve a type of innovative contribution (Flotow 2019; Wallmach 2007; Pas & Zaborowska 2017, and Lee 2023). What has been observed in the results is both a terminological confusion (with overlapping or partially synonymous terms) and also a confusion revolving around the different linguistic levels to be considered. This study can help translators obtain an overview of the different feminist translation strategies described in the past, as well as to understand the different moments throughout the translation process in which they can be applied.

Keywords: *gender and translation; feminist translation; translation strategies*

1. Introduction

Discussing feminist translation is inherently complex, as it should not be regarded as a singular, unified movement but rather as a field encompassing multiple perspectives and ongoing debate, paralleling the diverse ways in which feminism itself is understood. Nevertheless, certain common objectives can be identified, including the recovery and valorization of works authored by women, the critique of distorted translations of feminist texts, and the transformation of sexist language to contribute to the construction of a non-patriarchal society. In this regard, Castro's (2008: 288) definition remains particularly useful, characterizing feminist translation as a current of intellectual and practical work that advocates for the integration of feminist ideology into translation processes, arising from the necessity to articulate new modes of expression aimed at dismantling the patriarchal structures embedded within language and society.

To date, feminist translation theory has addressed a number of issues of great relevance for an understanding of the relationship between gender and translation, such as the *universal woman subject* (construct of a universal category of *woman*), *womanhandling* (active manipulation of a text by a woman translator) or *intersectionality* (particular experience of privilege/oppression of individuals by the confluence of their race, gender, class, etc.). However, the analysis of more practical issues, such as the possible strategies applicable to feminist translation, also seems indispensable, since the conversion from theory into practice is not always so evident. With a simple reading of the different proposals for feminist translation strategies drawn from the classical theories of the North American schools (Flotow 1991; Lotbinière-Harwood 1991; Levine 1991; Simon 1996; Massardier-Kenney 1997, or

Maier 1998), and from more recent proposals that aim at a certain systematisation (Wallmach 2007; Pas & Zaborowska 2017; Flotow 2019, or Lee 2023), we realize that there is a remarkable disparity of proposals and also a certain terminological dispersion. In our opinion, translators could benefit from a new proposal for the definition and classification of feminist translation strategies that brings together all the proposals mentioned above. In this respect we follow the work of Molina & Hurtado (2002: 506–07), who came to the same conclusion as regards general translation strategies.

Therefore, the aim of this paper is to review the main proposals for the classification of feminist translation strategies in order to establish a comparative analysis and offer a unified proposal that provides translators with an overview of feminist translation strategies; at the same time, it will allow them to obtain an overall idea and understand the different applications of these strategies depending on the linguistic level or the perspective from which the translation is approached. To this end, after an introduction to feminist translation, the paper is divided into two parts. In the first part, each proposal is outlined, including the corresponding denomination, definition and examples of the strategies proposed. In the second part, a comparative analysis of the proposals is carried out, and a unified classification proposal is presented in which the strategies have been grouped into four general categories: *intratextual strategies, peritextual strategies, procedural strategies* and *publishing strategies*.

2.   Feminist translation

European history has provided us with remarkable examples of translators who, in some way, rebelled against the misogyny present in patriarchal language and who contributed towards developing a literary culture with a feminist touch. In this regard, Simon (1996) offers a comprehensive account of experiences of women from different periods who managed to enter the literary world through translation, due to the secondary role traditionally assigned both to women and translation, which led to the assumption that these two terms were somehow synergic. On the one hand, women were not allowed to be authors but were "confined to a subordinate writing role" (39). On the other hand, translation could work as a "strong mode of expression for women" (3). In the English of the 16th and 17th centuries, Robinson (1995) sees a process of "feminisation" of translation, as women used translation to obtain a public voice. Here we find figures such as Mary Sidney or Margaret Tyler, who stated "it is all one for a woman to pen a storie, as for a man to addresse his storie to a woman" (Tyler 1578: Aii). Aphra Behn stood out among the 17th century English women translators for her sophisticated work and comments on the right of women to be part of literature as *translatresses*. In the 18th and 19th centuries, women translators used translation in the service of political causes, as was the case of Madame de Staël, Margaret Fuller or Eleanor Marx, who also demonstrated their commitment to equality for women. The passage from the 19th to the 20th century leaves us with the names of women translators such as Constance Garnett and Jean Starr Untermeyer. So, although translation has traditionally been seen as a marginal activity, women have often perceived it as a means of self-expression since their access to original authorship was limited at best.

Feminist translation as a different way of understanding writing and translation owes its inspiration to the patriarchal and phallocentric perspective that has shaped the concept of translation, mainly in the Western world. Gender-based power relations have always occupied a central place in the imagery of translation theory, where the reproductive work of women/translators has been seen as an undervalued activity. This has been the case from the very first mention of the notion of fidelity by Horace (18 B.C.); through Drant (1567), who justified the hijacking and penetration of the original text; via Florio (1603: A2), who stated that all translations are defective, since they are *reputed femalls*, *delivered at second hand*, to Gilles Ménage's recurring expression *les belles infidèles*, coined in the 17th century, to Schleiermacher (1813: 8) and his plea to honour *der Muttersprache* ('the mother tongue'). This tradition continues with Steiner (1975: 298), who identifies the translator with a man who has to "penetrate" the translation (obviously a woman) violently. Most of these metaphors have been excellently discussed by Chamberlain (1988). Fortunately, in response to all this, a new rhetoric of translation has been developed, one with new metaphors that displace all those that are based on a patriarchal perspective of translation (Castro 2009: 6).

Meanwhile, an interdisciplinary movement emerged in Quebec at the end of the 1970s which, as part of the cultural turn in translation studies, sought to link ideology studies in translation with those focusing on gender and translation, with a clear holistic intention in search of justice and equality. As Castro & Ergun (2017: 15) explain, this movement started with "women writers whose experimental texts attempted to reinscribe femininity in language and deconstruct hegemonic male-centric discourses through conscious manipulation of language". More specifically, Simon (1996: vii) establishes the moment in 1986 when the idea of feminist translation first emerged in the context of the Canadian cultural dialogue during a panel discussion on "feminist poetics" organised in 1986. It was then that something that had been brewing from the late 1970s and the 1980s onwards in Quebec had come into existence, namely a practice we could call Canadian feminist translation. This happened at a time when a strong movement of English to French experimental feminist translation was taking place.

Since then, feminist translation has been written about prolifically, many of the discussions focusing on the concepts of particularity and universality. As Tissot (2017: 27) points out, transnational feminist movements have questioned the so-called "universal woman subject", as well as the numerous attempts of women of the First World "to talk on behalf of every woman". So, instead of constructing a theory of hegemonic oppression under a unified category of gender, Crenshaw (1991), for instance, coined the term *intersectionality* to denote multiple systems of domination in which other factors such as race, social class, religion, sexual identity and so on play important roles as well. Others, such as Grewal & Kaplan (1994: 17), have argued for the need to unmask the multiple, overlapping and discrete oppressions. Therefore, Tissot (2017: 34) highlights that "the meaning of 'the universal' proves to be culturally variable and the specific cultural articulations of 'the universal' work against its claim to a transcultural status".

The main trend in feminist translation theories has been to stand up for a kind of hospitality (a concept from deconstruction meaning that translators embrace the other) far from the classical sense of authorship (where authors impose the meaning), taking the perspective of the subject/object of the translation (when feminist translators assume an active role), and defending the diversity of sexual orientation and gender in the face of the antithetical identities of "man" and "woman" (Flotow 2007: 93). On the other hand, there are also other conceptions of the translation process, as the one that understands it as an "enabler of multi-directional communication" (Reimóndez 2017: 51), both as a means of connecting us "in ways that do not

pursue homogeneity, assimilation or annihilation" (Lugones 2010: 750) and as a means of "understanding and explaining the unfamiliar but also refamiliarizing the familiar in more productive and enriching ways" (Nnaemeka 2004: 381).

There has been criticism of these feminist translation movements. Arrojo (1994, 1995), for instance, focuses on feminist translation theories, particularly those that refer to deconstruction as the basis of their work to defend their visibility of women translators and their right to transform the original text based on notions such as the Derridean *différance*. This notion underlines the provisional nature of the linguistic sign, as regards both signifier and signified, inasmuch as any element which is present is always connected to what is absent, to everything it defers or everything from which it differs (see Derrida [1972] 1982). Arrojo (1994: 158) argues that accepting that no meaning can ever be stable or "original" does not entitle feminist translators to be "unfaithful" or to "abuse" the original. Thus, the impossibility of capturing the essence of the original is not a right but "every translator's and every reader's inevitable fate". In this regard, Arrojo (1994: 157) wonders why intervention, or "hijacking", is fair in the case of Levine or Lotbinière-Harwood, but not for Drant, and she asks "on what grounds can one justify that 'womanhandling' texts is objectively positive while 'manhandling' them is to be despised". One important aspect of so-called feminist translation theories of the 1990s that Arrojo conveniently disregards is the importance that feminist translators ascribe to their drawing attention to and explaining the changes they make in the texts. Conventional/traditional translators conceal such changes; feminist translators celebrate them as a sign of the power they wield.

3.   Feminist translation strategies

The history of Anglo-American and European feminist translation shows that it was the translators and translation theorists of the 1980s and 1990s from the North American schools who laid the foundations both for the theory and the practice of feminist translation. That was the context which gave rise to the first descriptions of feminist translation strategies, which set the standard for later proposals. The following comparative analysis will focus on the classical theories of the North American schools (Flotow 1991; Lotbinière-Harwood 1991; Levine 1991; Simon 1996; Massardier-Kenney 1997, and Maier 1998) which are most frequently cited, but it will also present other, later proposals that have tried to create a systematic classification and also constitute an innovative contribution (Wallmach 2007; Pas & Zaborowska 2017; Flotow 2019, and Lee 2023). Prior to the comparative analysis, the proposals will be presented in chronological order and grouped into schools. It is important to highlight that, we will use the terminology, definitions and examples deployed by the respective authors for subsequent comparison. For this very reason (using the terminology employed by the authors mentioned), we will preferably use the term *translation strategies* rather than *translation techniques* in this paper, even though we agree with Molina & Hurtado (2002: 508) that translation strategies are procedures to solve general problems when undertaking a translation and translation techniques are referred to particular problems that arise during the translation process.

3.1. Canadian school

From the Canadian school, Luise von Flotow was the first to describe strategies for feminist translation by reviewing the theory and practice of the recent feminist translation movement in Canada developed by Barbara Godard, Marlene Wildeman, Fiona Strachan, Howard Scott and Susanne de Lotbinière-Harwood. Based on the analysis of the work of these translators, Flotow (1991: 74–80) established a first classification of three strategies.

1. ***Supplementing*** is defined as a "voluntarist action" (75) on the text by which the translator compensates for the differences between languages, so when the target language invisibilises women, the translator transforms the text to let them emerge. The example Flotow provides in this case is Scott's translation of Bersianik's *L'Euguélionne*, where *Le ou la coupable doit être punie* ('The guilty party must be punished') transforms into *The guilty one must be punished, whether she is a man or a woman*. By adding the expression *whether she is a man or a woman*, the focus in English is on gender as it is in the French participial agreement of *punie* ('punished'), which would otherwise have been neutralised.

2. ***Prefacing and footnoting*** are strategies through which the translator visibilises herself to communicate what is "lost in translation" (76) and thus manage to overcome the barriers that the target language might impose, something that would otherwise be insurmountable. An example is the preface to Nicole Brossard's *These Our Mothers* by Barbara Godard, in which she explains the wordgames that could not be translated. Translator footnotes also serve to demonstrate how and when the translator deliberately intervenes to change some aspect of the text.

3. ***Hijacking*** implies some kind of "correction" (79) or feminisation of the target text such as, for instance, converting the generic masculine grammar of the original into feminine form or putting the female element first. Susanne de Lotbinière-Harwood's avoidance of male generic terms in her English translation of *Letters from Another* by Lise Gauvin, despite the fact that they appear in French, e.g. *la victoire de l'homme* ('the victory of man') becomes *our victory [...] over the elements*, can be labelled hijacking.

Susanne de Lotbinière-Harwood (1991: 113–19) focused her study of feminist translations into English and into French on examining the differences between both languages. In conclusion, she set out the following strategies.

1. ***Neutralisation***, replacing a gender-marked expression with a seemingly neutral one (e.g. replacing *stewardess* by *flight attendant*).

2. ***Desexisation***, replacing a generic expression with another one marked by the feminine or masculine gender (e.g. using *he* or *she* instead of the generic *he*).

3. ***Feminisation or gender-marking***, a strategy that goes beyond neutralisation and desexisation as it includes strategies such as putting the feminine first, avoiding derogatory words to designate women, encoding new meaning in existing words and coining new words which empower women (e.g. replacing *incest victim* by *incest survivor*).

Within this group of pioneers of feminist translation theory, it is also worth mentioning Sherry Simon (1996), who provided an exhaustive review of feminist translation strategies used throughout the ages (as mentioned in section 2). However, the aim of her study is not so much to elaborate a classification of translation strategies as to highlight the relevance of gender in translation from the perspective of cultural studies. In her study, she alludes to the strategies defined by authors, such as Luise von Flotow, Howard Scott, Susanne de Lotbinière-Harwood, Nicole Brossard, Barbara Godard and Carol Maier, along with a long list of feminist translators and translation theorists. But her exposition is unsystematic and, therefore, cannot be reproduced here. However, all the strategies that Simon (1996) mentions are already part of the classifications of the other authors presented here.

3.2. USA school

In the USA, Suzanne Jill Levine (1991) reflects deeply on the decision-making process involved in her own translation of Guillermo Cabrera Infante's novel *Tres Tristes Tigres*, focusing on the relationship between author and translator. Levine calls herself a "subversive scribe" (7) for the subversive character with which she approaches the translation of a text whose misogynistic character she clearly does not share. In her book, Levine describes the translation challenges she had to face, such as paranomasia, alliteration, intertextuality, onomastics, partial inequivalences of meaning, as well as the techniques she used to overcome those difficulties; of these techniques, she mentions (albeit again in an unsystematic way) *compensation*, *substitution* (*free play*), *linguistic variation*, *addition*, *supplementation*, "rhetorical displacements" or "cultural metamorphoses" (176). Although the strategies she discusses are not new, her examples and accompanying analysis are of great value for feminist translation.

Françoise Massardier-Kenney (1997) initiates a critique of the earlier theories of feminist translation strategies based on two main arguments. Firstly, she questions the Eurocentric and imperialistic view of the feminine subject visible in texts that come from a cultural context in which "feminism is not a viable strategy" (57). Secondly, she points to the need to change the perspective by highlighting that "it is not the strategies themselves that are feminist, assuming the notion of feminist itself is clear and non-controversial, but rather the use to which these strategies are put" (57). Her argument is based on the finding that these translation strategies themselves have already been used before for other purposes (e.g. she points out that "supplementing" is the old "compensation"). Thus, Massardier-Kenney's (1997: 58) critique of the different proposals for a classification of feminist translation strategies, such as Flotow's (1991), seeks to redefine the term *feminist*. She offers an alternative categorisation of feminist translation strategies, distinguishing between *author-centred* and *translator-centred* strategies.

Author-centred strategies seek to make the reader understand the source text and highlight the importance of women as producers of texts (be it as authors or translators). In this regard, Massardier-Kenney (1997: 59–61) mentions the following three strategies:

1. ***Recovery*** consists of widening and reshaping the canon, an archaeological task of finding, publishing and translating texts by women authors who were previously excluded. As an example, Massardier-Kenney offers up the rediscovery of Germaine de Staël and George Sand, as well as that of many other women authors previously excluded from the canon.

2. ***Commentary*** involves using the metadiscourse accompanying the translation to clarify the importance of the feminine (or of woman/women) in order to counteract the immediacy of the translated text and the danger of a false sense of familiarity with a foreign text or author (as Spivak (1992) has also pointed out). In this case, the example could be the afterword to Carol Maier's (1994) translation of Rosa Chacel's *Memoirs of Leticia Valle* which served to introduce Chacel to the contemporary reader and to establish her position by discussing her views on gender.

3. ***Resistancy*** entails the visibility of the translation through linguistic means that have a defamiliarising effect and that work against easy fluency (e.g. through a reworking of grammar). Massardier-Kenney considers resistancy as an appropriate strategy for the translation of experimental feminist writers like Monique Wittig, who reworks French grammatical gender, for example, in subject pronouns and male/female endings of substantives. This effect could also be achieved by reworking the English language in the translation.

Among the translator-centred strategies, Massardier-Kenney (1997: 63–5) mentions:

1. ***Commentary***, when the feminist translator must describe her/his motives and the way they affect the translated text so as to avoid reproducing a male textual power structure (the original text as primary and the translation as secondary); this is a way of including the feminist questioning of universal categories in the translation project and examining how the factor of gender affects her/his decisions. An example of this could be Chamberlain's (1988) demonstration of how the metaphorics of translation are deeply marked by gender differences.

2. ***Use of parallel texts***, when the feminist translator is inspired by texts in the target language with a feminine voice that were produced in a similar situation, or that belong to the same genre as that of the source text. This is the case, for example, in Richard's preface to *Crossing the Mangrove*, where he explains that he found Virginia Woolf rather than Faulkner, Naipaul and Garcia Márquez to be the most parallel to Maryse Condé.

3. ***Collaboration***, when the feminist translator works with one or more translators and/or with the author on a given text, thus connecting the interest in understanding how the discourse constructs/deconstructs gender and the idea of negotiation, and avoiding a strict separation between author/translator, writer/reader, translator/scholar and source text/target text. Diaz-Diocaretz (1985) and Levine (1991) provide good examples of the kind of collaboration the translator and the author can share.

Carol Maier (1998) starts from her own experience in translating María Zambrano's *Delirio y destino* to maintain that there is a continuum of strategies when translating in terms of gender, and, in this sense, she establishes two extremes. At one end of the continuum would be what she calls literal translation, i.e. a "no deliberate approach" or "null strategy" of the translator that implies "the absence of a deliberately formulated method" (98). The second would be the "feminist approach", the interventionist one, which would imply both the translation of only explicitly feminist texts and the application of all kinds of strategies, both at the lexical level of a text and in terms of the text as a whole, where feminist strategies concern footnotes and commentary, inserting translator's remarks in the text itself or even eliminating passages the translator considers non-feminist (99).

3.3. Further contributions

Both the Canadian and USA schools have played an important role in defining feminist translation strategies. Nevertheless, other proposals for the classification of feminist translation strategies have been put forward. For the present research we are interested in highlighting those of Kim Wallmach (2007), Justine Pas and Magdalena Zaborowska (2017), the redefinition of Luise von Flotow's (2019) own first approach and the most recent work by Sang-Bin Lee (2023), because these are proposals which are innovative or add something to those of the Canadian and USA schools of the 1990s.

An interesting contribution is that of Kim Wallmach (2007), who uses Delabastita's (1993) categories of translation strategies (*substitution, repetition, deletion, addition* and *permutation*) as umbrella strategies that could be further subdivided into more detailed subcategories by a combination with Vinay & Darbelnet's (1995) categories (*literal translation, transposition, modulation, equivalence and adaptation, borrowing and calque, compensation, addition* and *deletion*). Furthermore, Wallmach (2007) carries out a comparative study of four translations by Patricia Claxton and Barbara Goddard to verify whether feminist translation uses different translation strategies or just the classical ones in a different way. Her conclusion is that, apart from metatextual comments, the differences between translations are not due to a feminist approach, but to different ways of using "the most conservative of existing translation strategies" (23). As a result of her research, Wallmach (2007: 15–19) establishes the following classification of translation strategies.

1. **Substitution**, by which a relevant source text item is replaced by a relevant target text item, i.e. translation in its strictest sense without any transformation or adaptation (e.g. *dans les bras de ma mère* translated into *in my mother's arms*).

2. **Repetition** (borrowing and calque), by which a relevant source text item is replaced or transferred directly from the source text into the translation (e.g. *kleenex* translated into *kleenex*).

3. **Deletion**, by which a source text item is not rendered in the target text at all (e.g. *nous dansons très collées* ('we dance very close together'), where the silent *e* indicates that the subjects are women, translated into *we dance very close together*).

4. **Addition**, by which the target text contains linguistic, cultural or textual component features which have no apparent antecedent in the source text (e.g. the use of a wordplay like *histoire* ['history'] translated into his*tory*).

5. **Permutation** (compensation), by which the target text does not reflect the relative position of its source text counterpart (by means of the use of footnotes, parentheses, italics, prefaces and so on).

Justine Pas and Magdalena Zaborowska (2017) conduct research in which they synthesise the strategies used in the English translations from Polish, Mandarin, Chinese, Hindi and Tamil for a translational oral history project initiated in 2001 at the University of Michigan. The aim of the research was "to demonstrate the value of specific feminist translation strategies in making visible the differently situated participants' voices and narratives, as well as acknowledging the creative and political agency of the translators" (140). As a result, the strategies found useful for feminist translation were:

1. The rendering of source language phrases literally or use of unidiomatic phrases in the target language.

2. The addition of in-text parenthetical explanations when transferring local idioms disrupting the transcript's narrative flow and visually signalling the translator's presence.

3. The use of grammatical gender structures in order to make women or gender relationships visible.

4. The transfer of non-English words and phrases and the offering of an explanation instead.

5. Footnoting to add explanations of gender issues that cannot be expressed in the text itself.

Pas & Zaborowska (2017: 149) conclude that putting into practice the findings of the Canadian school of feminist translation "helps create a praxis of resistance to transparent equivalence, fluid readability and translatese that works against assimilationist and homogenising Anglo-American publishing market trends". In their view, the feminist translation strategies of supplementing and footnoting are particularly helpful in revealing the complexities of translation.

After receiving copious commentary, Luise von Flotow (2019) retraces the early developments of feminist translation, redefines the feminist translation strategies as observed and described in 1991 and classifies these strategies into two categories: *Macro-strategies* and *micro-strategies*.

1. **Macro-strategies** would be translator's notes, prefaces, explanations (which provide the space for a discussion of feminist principles, histories and ideas as well as specific translation problems), but also non-translation, re-translation and strategic text selection, as well as feminist publishing, reviewing, gratis translation or critiquing.

2. **Micro-strategies** would be stylistic and grammatical adjustments (making the feminine visible in language by using only feminine plural forms or devising odd juxtapositions of masculine/feminine forms, such as women and men), but also creative and neologistic translation, as well as omission, addition, supplementing and the development of various stylistic, grammatical or neologistic innovations that work on the details of the text itself.

One of the most recent contributions to the classification of feminist translation strategies is by Sang-Bin Lee (2023), who analyses the strategies used by the translators of Yeolda Books, a Korean independent publishing house. Lee asserts the need to decentre from the Anglo-European structure of thought. He starts by distinguishing between "translation peritexts" (106) (commentary, preface/postface) and translation strategies, which he calls "radical feminist translation strategies (techniques)" (107) and lists the following from among these strategies.

1. *Fanning*: Using words (especially pronouns) on a "female-as-norm" (108) (FAN) basis. As an example, Lee gives the use of feminine pronouns instead of the gender-neutral which are more common in Korean.

2. *Mirroring*: Creating female or male words that have countervailing effects on conventional words. Lee offers the example of using words signifying 'wife' or 'married

woman' in Korean and not the usual ones signifying 'home person' or 'the person in the house', as correspondence for 'husband' or 'married man'.

3. *Tagging*: Adding lexical and/or grammatical markers to conventional words to show that the words are, in effect, misogynistic. For example, the use of quotation marks for the names of places where women are denigrated as "geisha venues" (110).

4. *Reversing*: Reversing the order of two successive words or characters to increase women's visibility and/or degrade men's sexuality, as when we say *women and men*.

5. *Normalising*: Replacing a misogynistic element of a word with a women-friendly one. The example Lee provides is the translation of *uterus* into an expression in Korean meaning 'the palace for cells' instead of the frequently used expression *the palace for sons* (as if daughters were excluded from there, he adds).

6. *Unpacking*: Explaining terms in a way that emphasises the dire conditions of women's lives, as when translating the English expression *prostitution buyers* for an expression meaning 'men who sexually exploit women' in Korean.

7. *Footnoting*: Providing explanatory notes for readers.

4.   Comparison of feminist translation strategies

Given the diversity of the proposals for feminist translation strategies that we have just presented here, it seems necessary both to carry out a comparative analysis and to put forward a proposal for their synthesis. What first catches the eye are the different perspectives from which the various authors approach their proposals. Thus, while many of them only consider the classification of grammatical or lexical strategies applicable to the text itself (such as changing the gender of words or creating neologisms), others comment on strategies that go beyond the text (such as adding prefaces or notes to the translation) or even editorial policy (such as the deliberate selection of texts by unrecognised or forgotten women writers). In addition, a certain disorder may be observed within the proposals themselves, as they do not distinguish between different linguistic levels, since writing a preface is not the same as creating a neologism. For example, Flotow (1991) structures her article in three sections: supplementing, prefacing and footnoting and hijacking; or Massardier-Kenney (1997), who groups resistancy (which is an intervention of the translator in the text at the lexical or grammatical level) or recovery (which is an editorial decision) under the same umbrella of author-centred strategies. Finally, although some authors use the terminology of previous proposals, very often they baptise the same strategy with another name, as is the case of supplementing (Flotow 1991), addition (Wallmach 2007), in-text parenthetical explanations (Pas & Zaborowska 2017) and unpacking (Lee 2023), which come to the same thing.

Thus, the first step in the analysis of the different proposals for feminist translation strategies should be to establish different categories in correspondence to the different linguistic levels. The revision that Flotow (2019) carried out of her first proposal from 1991 points in this direction, thereby establishing a classification between macro-strategies and micro-strategies. However, a more detailed classification could still be established, which is the one proposed here. We distinguish between intratextual strategies, peritextual strategies, procedural strategies and publishing strategies. Intratextual strategies are those techniques applicable to specific problems that arise during the translation process at the grammatical or lexical level. By

peritextual strategies, we refer to all the information that surrounds the text itself in order to express everything that could not be conveyed in the translation itself. Procedural strategies are those actions of the translator that are not visible in the translation itself but have helped in the decision-making process. Finally, publishing strategies are all those decisions external to the text regarding which works to translate and which not to translate, or regarding the actual edition of the texts (such as the elimination or addition of fragments or the choice of the cover).

For a better visualisation of the analysis of the different feminist translation proposals, we have created a comparative table (see Table 1). First of all, it should be noted that the proposals we will analyse in greater depth are those that present a certain degree of systematisation. For this reason, proposals such as those of Levine (1991) or Maier (1998) are not included. In the first case, this is because although Levine discusses many of the strategies used in her translations (such as compensation, substitution, linguistic variation, addition or supplementation) and explains them with very illustrative examples, they are well-known strategies. Furthermore, her explanations are subordinated to a deep reflection on the translation process, decision-making and the relationship with the author, leaving systematisation aside. In the second case, the reason is that Maier focuses on the question of the general approach that every translator takes when faced with a new translation as to whether she/he should take into account the precepts of feminist translation and under what conditions to apply it, but the author does not provide further specification. The last proposal by Flotow (2019) is only implicitly included in the table, since the distinction between macro-strategies and micro-strategies that she puts forward has been taken into account.

If we look at Table 1, the first thing that strikes us is the number of empty symbols (Ø) that have been included to show all those cases in which the strategy proposed by an author is not included in other classifications. Some of these authors focus on intratextual strategies, ignoring many other moments that are also part of a translation. As mentioned above, Table 1 clearly shows a certain confusion caused by the diversity in nomenclature. Although some terms have been quite successful in the literature on feminist translation (such as Flotow's hijacking), almost all of the authors choose to rename the strategies. In some cases, such as Massardier-Kenney's, the same term (*commentary*) is used for two strategies that are part of different sections (author-centred and translator-centred). Furthermore, it has been observed that on many occasions the equivalence is not complete, but rather that the different definitions offered for what is supposedly the same strategy, include more assumptions than in others. It can also be seen in Table 1 that some authors are more precise or detailed in their classification and subcategorise some strategies (as is the case in Lee, who considers four different assumptions for hijacking or feminisation: fanning, mirroring, reversing and normalising).

We will begin the comparative analysis with the macro-strategies (those that exceed the text itself). In the case of the publishing strategies, few are the authors who take them into account, while Flotow (2019) mentions them as feminist translation strategies of great relevance: non-translation, strategic text selection, feminist publishing, reviewing, critiquing, re-translation and gratis translation. Editorial issues are often at the centre of the feminist translation debate, but except in the case of Flotow (and Massardier-Kenney (1997), in which recovery is also included) they are not usually part of the classifications of feminist translation strategies. However, publishing strategies are clearly a fundamental starting point for feminist translation and should be included in any classification in order to complete an overall picture of the whole translation process beyond the text itself.

As can be seen in Table 1, procedural strategies, which we have defined as those actions of the translator that are not visible in the translation itself but that help in the decision-making

process, are hardly taken into account when reflecting on the possible translation strategies applicable to feminist translation. The exception in this case is Massardier-Kenney (1997), who highlights two strategies among those she calls translator-centred strategies: use of parallel texts and collaboration both with the author of the text and with other translators. It should be recalled that women translators, such as Levine (1991), have used this type of strategy widely and have commented on them in their works. Due to the great influence they can exert on the final result of a feminist translation, it seems appropriate to consider these two strategies as a separate category of feminist translation strategies.

Table 1: Comparison of translation strategies

Flotow (1991, 2019)	Lotbinière-Harwood (1991)	Massardier-Kenney (1997)	Wallmach (2007)	Pas & Zaborowska (2017)	Lee (2023)
Intratextual Strategies					
Supplementing	Ø	Ø	Addition	In-text parenthetical explanations	Unpacking
					Tagging
Ø	Neutralisation	Ø	Deletion	Ø	Ø
Hijacking	Desexisation	Ø	Ø	Use of grammatical gender	Ø
	Feminisation	Ø	Ø	Ø	Fanning
					Mirroring
					Reversing
					Normalising
Ø	Ø	Resistancy	Repetition	Literalness / unidiomatic phrases	Ø
				Non-English expressions	
Peritextual Strategies					
Prefacing	Ø	Ø	Permutation	Ø	Ø
Footnoting / explanations	Ø	Ø		Ø	Footnoting
Ø	Ø	Comments about author / translator	Ø	Ø	Ø
Ø	Ø	Comments about translator's motivation	Ø	Ø	Ø
Procedural Strategies					
Ø	Ø	Collaboration with author / translator	Ø	Ø	Ø
Ø	Ø	Use of parallel texts		Ø	Ø
Publishing Strategies					
Text selection	Ø	Recovery	Ø	Ø	Ø
Re-translation	Ø	Ø	Ø	Ø	Ø
Non-translation	Ø	Ø	Ø	Ø	Ø
Critiquing	Ø	Ø	Ø	Ø	Ø

The last category of macro-strategies is the one we have called peritextual strategies. These strategies, although they do not apply to the text itself, do accompany it and are part of it in some way. In general, as we have defined them, they are strategies whose objective is to explain issues related to genre that could not be included in the text itself during the translation process, in many cases due to the linguistic characteristics of the target language. Flotow (1991) was the first to highlight the importance of these strategies and, since then, this has been a very important resource in feminist translation. Within this category, Flotow (1991) discusses the strategies of prefacing, footnoting and explanations, to which two other authors add some more strategies. Firstly, Massardier-Kenney (1997) points out the importance of comments, both on the author/translator and on the translator's motivations. This is, in fact, a strategy that is often part of prefacing or footnoting, but which points to issues that are sometimes overlooked. Wallmach (2007), on the other hand, introduces the term *permutation* into this category; this is actually Delabastita's (1993) compensation but is defined as the strategy by which the translator compensates for gaps in her/his translation by means of comments in prefaces or footnotes.

The category considered most often is that of intratextual strategies. These strategies address both grammatical and lexical translation problems. However, it does not seem practical to make a distinction between these two linguistic levels, nor do the authors do so with the examples they provide in their explanations. When comparing the strategies of the different proposals, it is clear that (although known by different names) the authors consider four fundamental strategies. Given the diversity of nomenclature with which these authors refer to these categories, we believe some kind of unification to be appropriate. In this sense, we propose the use of terms that are most commonly used or that make most references to feminist translation. Thus, four fundamental intratextual strategies for feminist translation would be: supplementing, neutralisation, hijacking and resistancy.

The first intratextual strategy would be what Flotow (1991) called supplementing, which she defined as the strategy by which some type of grammatical or lexical information is added to a translation in order to make women more visible. It is a strategy that seeks above all to compensate for linguistic differences, in many cases due to their sexist nature, and with which the translator shows that she/he is aware of her/his role as mediator. This same strategy is called addition by Wallmach (2007), who offers a definition and some examples that are very similar to those of Flotow's (1991) supplementing. For this strategy, other proposals present more specific contributions. Pas & Zaborowska (2017) speak of in-text parenthetical explanations, which in reality would be one of the many possible applications of supplementing. Lee (2023) contemplates unpacking, with a definition similar to supplementing, but adds tagging, as a specific addition of grammatical or lexical markers to conventional words to highlight their misogynistic character. In short, supplementing can be applied whenever the grammar or lexicon of languages make women invisible.

As a counterpart strategy to supplementing there is deletion, contributed by Wallmach (2007); this consists of eliminating or deleting a lexical or grammatical element that is part of the original text so that it does not appear in the translated text when a masculinised original text makes women invisible or denigrates women in some way. In Table 1, we have included the neutralisation strategy provided by Lotbinière-Harwood (1991) as being equivalent to deletion, although in her case it has a much narrower meaning, since it refers exclusively to the replacement of a gender-marked expression by one that is not gender-marked. However, for a unified approach to translation strategies, it would be preferable to call this strategy neutralisation and use Wallmach's (2007) definition of deletion, since it is more evident

in the context of feminist translation (as opposed to *deletion*, which is the classic term in translation studies).

Hijacking is undoubtedly the feminist translation strategy par excellence since Flotow (1991) defined it as an intentional feminisation of the translation that corrects the original. However, if we compare the definition and the examples proposed for this strategy, we will see that they are easily confused with those of the supplementing strategy, for which, Flotow (1991: 75) herself employs the much-used example of the translation of *Ce soir j'entre dans l'histoire sans relever ma jupe* ('This evening I'm entering history without lifting my skirt') into *This evening I'm entering history without opening my legs*, which would fit the concept of hijacking perfectly. Wallmach (2007) also uses the example of the translation of *solidarité* ('solidarity') as *sisterhood* for the strategy of addition (her equivalent of supplementing), although it could equally well be understood as hijacking. On her part, Lotbinière-Harwood (1991) establishes a distinction between feminisation (placing the feminine first, avoiding derogatory words for women, or creating neologisms) and desexisation (substituting a generic word for another marked by gender) within the framework of hijacking. On the other hand, Lee (2023) offers a more detailed classification of this strategy by subdividing it into four possible cases: fanning (preferential use of the feminine), mirroring (creation of compensatory feminine or masculine equivalents), reversing (reversal of the usual masculine/feminine order) and normalising (substitution of a misogynistic term).

The last fundamental intratextual feminist strategy is resistancy, contributed by Massardier-Kenney (1997); this consists of maintaining traces of the original text in the translation, traces that surprise in order to call attention to some sexist aspect of the content of the original text or of the source language. Wallmach (2007) calls the same strategy repetition and relates it to the classic strategies of borrowing and calque. For their part, Pas & Zaborowska (2017) raise several assumptions within the spectrum of this strategy: literalness, use of unidiomatic phrases or transfer of non-English words and phrases. In general, this strategy is useful when the aim of the translation is to transfer a specific misogynistic or patriarchal expression from the original text.

5.   Final considerations

We have been able to observe that the proposals for the classification of feminist translation strategies are rather disparate in nature; some focus on more general aspects, such as the selection of texts in the editorial field (Flotow 2019), others on everything that surrounds the translation itself, such as collaboration with the author or other translators, or comments on the translation process in prefaces and notes (Massardier-Kenney 1997), and others target very specific translation techniques at the grammatical and lexical level (Lee 2023). We have also observed a certain hesitation both in the terminology used to name the strategies (with overlapping or partially synonymous terms), and in the definitions and examples used. Finally, it seems that the difference between the translation process and the resulting translated text is sometimes confused as well as the fact that different linguistic levels require different strategies. In this sense, the conclusions we reach are similar to those of Molina & Hurtado (2002: 506–7) as regards general translation strategies. These authors concluded that there are terminological, conceptual and classification confusions in the existing definitions and classifications of translation techniques (mainly because of (1) terminological confusion and over-lapping terms, (2) confusion between translation process and translation result, and (3)

confusion between issues related to language pairs and text pairs), and therefore a new classification of translation techniques was needed. However, it should not be forgotten that the aim of many of the proposals discussed above was not to establish a strict classification but to explore possibilities within feminist translation.

For all these reasons, this paper has attempted to provide a comparison of the different proposals for the classification of feminist translation strategies in order to offer an overall view. It is clear from this comparison that the grouping of strategies according to the different linguistic levels or perspectives from which feminist translation is undertaken or analysed is appropriate because it allows us to deal more comprehensively with the strategies available in each case. Furthermore, the comparative approach allows us to rule out multiplicities in the nomenclature and to complement the different proposals. On this basis, a new unified classification proposal of a more exhaustive nature could be created, choosing the most appropriate name for each strategy when it refers specifically to feminist translation. This could have the following structure:

1. **Intratextual strategies**: Supplementing, neutralisation, hijacking and resistancy

2. **Peritextual strategies**: Prefacing, footnoting and explanation

3. **Procedural strategies**: Collaboration (with the author or other translators) and use of parallel texts

4. **Publishing strategies**: Text selection, editing and critiquing

In view of the comparative analysis we have undertaken in this paper, it might seem that Wallmach's (2007) conclusion that feminist translation makes use of the same strategies as general translation is correct. However, establishing a classification exclusively oriented towards feminist translation, including only those strategies useful for this purpose and where the examples refer to gender-related aspects will undoubtedly serve to improve feminist translation practice. Many of us believe that translation has been under patriarchal sway for a long time and to achieve new levels of equality in terms of gender, a neutral positioning is not possible (in fact, it is never possible). Everybody "abuses" the original text (as Arrojo states (1994: 157)), precisely because we cannot capture the essence of the original and we are obliged to intervene. The question is: "What is the purpose of our strategy?" and "Are we being honest and consistent in our approach?".

References

Arrojo, Rosemary. 1994. Fidelity and the gendered translation. *TTR* 7(2): 147–63. Doi: 10.7202/037184ar .

Arrojo, Rosemary. 1995. Feminist, 'orgasmic' theories of translation and their contradictions. *TradTerm* 2: 67–75. Doi: 10.11606/issn.2317-9511.tradterm.1995.49916 .

Castro, Olga, Ergun, Emek (eds). 2017. *Feminist translation studies. Local and transnational perspectives*. London/New York: Routledge.

Castro, Olga. 2008. Género y traducción: elementos discursivos para una reescritura feminista. *Lectora* 14: 285–301.

Castro, Olga. 2009. (Re-)examining horizons in feminist translation studies. Towards a third wave? *MonTI* 1: 59–86.

Chamberlain, Lori. 1988. Gender and the metaphorics of translation. *Signs* 13(3): 454–72. Doi: 10.1086/494428.

Crenshaw, Kiberlé. 1991. Mapping the margins. Intersectionality, identity politics, and violence against women of color. *Stanford Law Review* 43(6): 1241–99. Doi: 10.2307/1229039.

Delabastita, Dirk. 1993. *There's a double tongue. An investigation into the translation of Shakespeare's wordplay, with special reference to Hamlet*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Derrida, Jacques. 1982 [1972]. Différance. In Derrida, Jacques (eds.), *Margins of Philosophy*, translated by Alan Bass. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 1–28.

Diaz-Diocaretz, Myriam. 1985. *Translating poetic discourse. Questions on feminist strategies in Adrienne Rich*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Drant, Thomas. 1567. *Horace his Arte of Poetrie, Pistles, and Satyrs Englished and to the Earle of Ormounte*.

Florio, John. 1603. Translator's preface. In Montaigne, *Essays*. London. A2–A3.

Flotow, Luise von. 1991. Feminist translation. Contexts, practices and theories. *TTR* 4(2): 69–84. Doi: 10.7202/037094ar.

Flotow, Luise von. 2007. Gender and translation. In Kuhiwczak, Piotr & Littau, Karin (eds.), *A companion to translation studies.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters. 92–105.

Flotow, Luise von. 2019. Translation. In Truth Goodman, Robin (ed.), *The Bloomsbury handbook of 21st-century feminist theory*. London: Bloomsbury. 229–43.

Grewal, Inderpal & Kaplan, Caren. 1994. *Scattered hegemonies*. Minneapolis: University of Minneapolis Press.

Horace. 18 B.C. *Ars Poetica*.

Lee, Sang-Bin. 2023. Radical feminist translations and strategies. A South Korean case. *Translation Studies* 16(1): 101–17. Doi: 10.1080/14781700.2022.2147582.

Levine, Susanne Jill. 1991. *The subversive scribe. Translating Latin American fiction*. Champaign/London: Dalkey Archive Press.

Lotbinière-Harwood, Susanne de. 1991. *Re-Belle et Infidèle/The Body Bilingual*. Toronto/Montréal: Women's Press/Les éditions du Remue-ménage.

Lugones, Maria. 2010. Toward a decolonial feminism. *Hypatia* 25(4): 742–50. Doi: 10.1111/j.1527-2001.2010.01137.x.

Maier, Carol. 1994. Afterword. *Memoirs of Leticia Valle by Rosa Chacel*, translated by Carol Maier. Lincoln/Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press.

Maier, Carol. 1998. Issues in the practice of translating women's fiction. *Bulletin of Hispanic Studies* 75(1): 95–108. Doi: 10.1080/000749098760110657.

Massardier-Kenney, Françoise. 1997. Towards a redefinition of feminist translation practice. *The Translator* 3(1): 55–69. Doi: 10.1080/13556509.1997.10798988.

Molina, Lucía & Hurtado Albir, Amparo. 2002. Translation techniques revised. A dynamic and functionalist approach. *Meta* 47(4): 498–512.

Nnaemeka, Obioma. 2004. Nego-feminism: Theorizing, practicing, and pruning Africa's way. *Signs* 29(2): 357–85. Doi: 10.1086/378553.

Pas, Justine M. & Zaborowska, Magdalena J. 2017. The other women's lives. Translation strategies in the Global Feminisms Project. In Castro, Olga & Ergun, Emek (eds.), *Feminist translation studies. Local and transnational perspectives*. London/New York: Routledge. 139–150.

Reimóndez, María. 2017. We need to talk... to each other. On polyphony, postcolonial, feminism and translation. In Castro, Olga & Ergun, Emek (eds.), *Feminist translation studies. Local and transnational perspectives*. London/New York: Routledge. 42–55.

Robinson, Douglas. 1995. Theorizing translation in a woman's voice. Subverting the rhetoric of patronage, courtly love and morality. *The Translator* 1(2): 153–75. Doi: 10.1080/13556509.1995.10798955.

Schleiermacher, Friedrich. 1813. *Ueber die verschiedenen Methoden des Uebersetzen*. Königlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften.

Simon, Sherry. 1996. *Gender in translation. Cultural identity and the politics of transmission*. London/New York: Routledge.

Spivak, Gayatri. 1992. The politics of translation. In Barrett, Michele & Philipps, Anne (eds.), *Destabilizing theory. Contemporary feminist debate*. Stanford: Stanford University Press. 312–30.

Steiner, George. 1975. *After Babel*. London: Oxford University Press.

Tissot, Damien. 2017. Translational feminist solidarities and the ethics of translation. In Castro, Olga & Ergun, Emek (eds.), *Feminist translation studies. Local and transnational perspectives*. London/New York: Routledge. 29–41.

Tyler, Margaret. 1578. A mirrour of princely deedes and knighthood. London: Thomas East.

Vinay, Jean Paul & Darbelnet, Jean. 1995. *Comparative stylistic of French and English*, translated and edited by Juan C. Sager and M. J. Hamel. Amsterdam: John Benamins.

Wallmach, Kim. 2007. Feminist translation strategies. Different or derived? *Journal of Literary Studies* 22(1/2): 1–26. Doi: 10.1080/02564710608530388.

Eivor Jordà Mathiasen
Universitat de València
Department of English and German
Av. Blasco Ibáñez 32
46010 Valencia, Spain
Email: eivor@uv.es