Dennis Scheller-Boltz
Leopold-Franzens-Universität Innsbruck

ON GENDER AWARENESS IN GERMAN, RUSSIAN, AND POLISH

1. GENDER IN LINGUISTICS AND TRANSLATION STUDIES

Dealing with gender and identity has become very popular in a lot of academic disciplines. The mere number of articles and papers published each year suggests that trying to give a detailed and exhaustive overview of gender studies would be a futile endeavour. In the *Interdisciplinary Bibliography on Language, Gender and Sexuality* from 2000 till 2011, Motschenbacher (2012) tries to represent the state of gender studies as comprehensively as possible. In spite of the 3.454 listed positions — primarily monographs, edited volumes/proceedings, and papers — we may, however, legitimately doubt that this definitely praiseworthy, extensive, and interdisciplinary Sisyphus project really contains the (complete) research from the period 2000–2011. Motschenbacher's bibliography — and this merits our appreciation — reflects the broad scope of gender research. It shows the development, dimensions, and effects on and within this research area during the past few years and illustrates the significance of gender research in a lot of (sub)disciplines.

Furthermore, an extensive representation of gender research seems to be problematic because of the great variety of research approaches, research fields, research possibilities, and relevant questions in each (sub)discipline. Within a single academic discipline, we may observe such a great diversity of gender research that it would be a challenge to create a comprehensive portrait of the state and development of gender studies.

Today, gender linguistics is an established subdiscipline within linguistics. Yet, its history differs tremendously across nations and cultures. In English, American, or German studies, for example, the subdiscipline gender linguistics — at the beginning: feminist linguistics — was established in the (late) 1970s. In Slavonic studies, in contrast, "concrete", "real", and "research-relevant" gender linguistics — a discipline "in its own right" — cannot be found until considerably later. In Russian studies, for instance, gender

linguistics in its current state — that means a) following a feminist-emancipatory approach, which is critical of language, b) questioning ideology in language and society, and c) focussing on patriarchal and androcentric, and, therefore, sexist structures — did not become relevant and, in particular, noteworthy before the early 1990s.

This is not to imply that the research on language and gender in Polish and Russian linguistics could be summarised in a compact way. There are too many options and diverse approaches to investigate the relation between language and gender (e.g. word formation, semantics, discourse, pragmatics, lexicography, phonetics etc.). Therefore, I will restrict myself to presenting selected questions, problems, and themes that are currently debated in Russian and Polish studies or that await discussion. The later point is of particular relevance as it serves to show the potential diversity of gender themes in Russian and Polish studies.

Gender and morphology:

Which inventory of gender-specific or gender-related morphemes — and, consequently, which inventory of morphemes for the construction of gender — is, in fact, available in the Russian and Polish languages, is a question of great import. Equally relevant is the question of how often speakers make use of this inventory, in order to mark and construct gender. These questions become even more important if one considers explicitly morpho-pragmatic factors, which illustrate the use of a morpheme or the intention of its use (What can be said? shown? provoked? intended? by using a morpheme?), and if one includes morpho-cognitive factors — i.e. one analyses mental processes that show factors, structures, and processes of perception, data processing, and understanding, when a morpheme is activated (What does occur in the mind when a motion suffix is activated? when do we use generic masculine forms? etc.).

Further questions are: what is the grammatical and cognitive (!) gender of pronouns (e.g. Russ. *кто* [who], Pol. *nikt* [noone])? Can pronouns vary in order to mark gender? Are there (new) tendencies to observe in this area? In Polish studies, moreover, the *genus virile* remains a controversial, albeit debatable topic from a gender perspective.

↑*word formation* ↑*semantics* ↑*pragmatics* ↑*cognition*

Gender and word formation:

Not only is it interesting to examine current patterns of word formation that are available in order to express — primarily — the feminine gender, but also the question of their current use and frequency. This leads immediately to the question of the acceptance not only of the patterns of word

formation but also of the products of word formation (units of designation). The example of German *Sekretärin* [female secretary] → *Sekretär* [male secretary] illustrates this. Today, *Sekretär* is a common masculine name of profession. In the past, however, it was used exclusively for "(Davenport) desk", "bureau". This is a problem which can be observed in modern Polish, too (cf. *stolarz* [male carpenter] — *ᵗstolarka* [carpentry, ᵗfemale carpenter]). Word formation causing discrimination (e.g. racism, sexism etc.) plays an important role in this context.

↑*semantics* ↑*pragmatics* ↑*cognition* ↑*language norms* ↑*lexicology*

Gender and lexicology:

An analysis of the lexis can show which units of designation are available for constructing gender, how they have to be assessed and categorised. We can analyse insufficient and inadequate units of designation that can lead to new units which are, for instance, more neutral. Forms of political correctness play an important role in this context, too.

↑*word formation* ↑*semantics* ↑*pragmatics* ↑*cognition* ↑*discourse* ↑*lexicography*

Gender and semantics:

Why does the German word *Casanova* [womaniser] have a (relatively) positive meaning — at least, it is not categorically negative — whereas the feminine counterpart *Schlampe* [slut], considering the same (situational and contextual) factors and (social) circumstances, is always categorically negative, pejorative, and excluding, remains a question to be answered. Yet, analyses in the field of semantics can help to solve this seemingly illogical problem. It is interesting to investigate — especially in a queer-linguistic context — to which extent meanings, traditionally embedded in a heteronormative context, or, as Butler (2004: 79) says, in a "heterosexual matrix", may reveal themselves to be variable and fluid (e.g. Pol. *rodzina* [family], *mąż* [husband], *żona* [wife]), or, respectively, to which extent a queer life style requires new meanings which could lead to semantic differentiation or semantic diversity (e.g. Pol. *związek₁* "zależność między czymś" [connection] → *związek₂* "współżycie jak mąż z żoną", też: *związek partnerski*, *związek homoseksualny* [union, cf. civil union] ≠ *małżeństwo* "związek heteroseksualny między kobietą i mężczyzną, zawierany w kościele" [marriage]).

↑*word formation* ↑*pragmatics* ↑*lexicography* ↑*cognition* ↑*discourse*

Gender and pragmatics:

In-group- and out-group-perspectives can reveal contrasts in the perception and understanding of gender. What do men express, when using the Polish

noun *baba* [crone]? How do women use this noun in an in-group-conversa-tion? What do I do, when I use *содомиты* [sodomites] in Russian to refer to the homosexual community? And what effects does the use of *тетка* [fairy] cause, when we use it to refer to an effeminate man? In a gender context, intentional speech or intentions of speakers, influenced by gender, play an important role. More studies are required, especially studies considering discursive elements.

↑*semantics* ↑*lexicology* ↑*lexicography* ↑*cognition* ↑*discourse*

Gender and language norm:
Language norm usually relies exclusively on language systematic rules and conventions and is often discussed within these contexts. When ana-lysing this norm, we have to investigate the gender and, especially, the sex of pronouns. Do they have a (cognitive) sex? Dealing with this question points to possible gender-specific syntactic agreements as an interesting field of study (e.g. Russ. *кто пришла* [who $_{fem}$came] or, in general, e.g. *наша/ наш врач пришла/ пришел* [$_{fem}$our/ $_{masc}$our doctor $_{fem}$came/ $_{masc}$came]). The process of feminising words by using suffixes (e.g. Pol. *psycholożka* [$_{fem}$psychologist]) or even more the (possible) ways of using feminine forms often collide with normative principles and rules (e.g. Pol. *?pani rektorka* [$_{fem}$headmaster]). Further analyses are necessary to falsify or verify ap-proaches and assumptions.

↑*morphology* ↑*word formation* ↑*pragmatics* ↑*cognition*

Gender and language use/corpus analysis:
The representation and the treatment of gender in language (language use) reveal new tendencies (e.g. in word formation, semantics), sociolinguistic phenomena (e.g. groups/speakers), text linguistic influence (e.g. text type) and discursive or discourse-specific patterns. Corpus analyses may help to illustrate and verify these new tendencies and the ways and approaches of language use.

↑*word formation* ↑*lexicology* ↑*conversational analysis* ↑*discourse* ↑*pragmatics*

Gender and conversational analysis:
How a word choice or intonation can influence the performance of gender during a talk or a conversation and how the performed gender is perceived by a group, i.e. by the persons taking part in the conversation, is not only an interesting question with regard to a group of women or men (with a cis-identity) or to the staging of one's own gender within a group. It becomes important in a queer context, too (e.g. in a trans-context with trans-identi-

ties). Gender and identity, especially the play with gender roles and identity patterns, and, not least, the fluid nature of gender(s) itself (gender as a continuum), provide us with interesting questions and approaches.

↑*lexicology* ↑*corpus* ↑*discourse* ↑*pragmatics*

Gender and lexicography:

Can we find criteria today to describe and define words that make it possible to overcome the principle of androcentrism in dictionaries (e.g. Russ. *тот, кто* [$_{masc}$s.o. who]? Must descriptions and definitions still be based exclusively on the principle of heteronormativity? Or can we create dictionary entries based on a hetero-deconstructive approach (e.g. Pol. *wesele* [wedding], *flirtować* [to flirt], Russ. *свадьба* [wedding], *муж* [husband], *семья* [family])? How far do queer-oriented definitions and approaches enter? Or can they enter dictionaries at all? Is the proportion of person nouns and names of professions for men and women in a dictionary balanced? And what about the lexicographical entries of gender-specific, especially feminine names?

↑*word formation* ↑*semantics* ↑*pragmatics* ↑*lexicology* ↑*discourse*

Gender and phonetics/phonology:

The question of whether men and women speak differently, stress differently, intone differently is without doubt a relatively old chapter in gender linguistics which, however, has not lost its topicality and popularity up to now. A more diverse approach can guarantee interesting and further research results.

↑*conversational analysis* ↑*pragmatics*

Gender and discourse:

Discourse analyses can help to ask about methods and circumstances which govern the ways in which we create and perform our identity and the way we construct our gender. Also, the perception and acceptance of gender and gender identity can be made visible by analysing discourses. Discourses influence and affect us and our understanding of gender, identity and, consequently, gender identity. Heteronormative frames which are very common and seemingly necessary in almost all socio-cultures, make it interesting to analyse queer identities, their construction and perception.

↑*word formation* ↑*lexicology* ↑*corpus analysis* ↑*conversational analysis* ↑*pragmatics*

Gender and psycholinguistics/cognition:

Within cognitive linguistics, we have to focus on the question of how gender is perceived, under which circumstances gender is ignored or excluded,

and how people categorise different genders. Cognitive research on generic masculine forms can be cited here as an illustrative example. The respective studies are based on the hypothesis: If women are not visible in language and are not made visible through language, women as a whole elude perception and, hence, will not receive the attention they deserve.

↑*morphology* ↑*word formation* ↑*conversational analysis* ↑*discourse* ↑*semantics* ↑*pragmatics*

Gender and language learning/teaching:

The fact that textbooks and other didactic materials are consistently based on heteronormative and patriarchal patterns of thought merits discussion. Assignments of tasks, guidelines for works in pairs or groups which are based on such patterns, using texts with sexist illustrations and stereotypical activities need to be questioned and discussed. New didactic concepts in a queer context should be developed, because traditional approaches seem to be a little outdated by now. Or is a romantic dinner of a man and a woman really the only imaginable scenario? Can a woman only be introduced by a man? Teaching methods need to be questioned, too. Or can only a man and a woman form an adequate and acceptable pair in certain situations?

↑*conversational analysis* ↑*discourse* ↑*cognition*

Gender and translation studies:

The fact that language and gender are combined in different ways and dependent on each other turns gender studies also into an interesting and meaningful subject for translation studies as an applied linguistic discipline. Linguistic observations, questions and results have an immediate influence on translation and are made useful and applicable for translation studies. Starting with (written and/or oral) texts in a source language, translation studies addresses the problem of rendering those texts in a target language. The direct connection between language and translation becomes obvious here.

If gender plays an important role within linguistics, translation studies also has to deal in more detail with the phenomenon and concept of gender. Not only is a translation addressed to a special person and/or group, bound to this person and/or group and, therefore, oriented to this person and/or group — which underlines the gender aspect within translation already. Many texts also contain a confrontation with gender. We construct gender in and by language. Consequently, we have to deal with gender in texts in its diverse conceptions (*sexus*, *genus*, *gender*).

2. GENDER IN TRANSLATION STUDIES

Nowadays, dealing with gender in very different disciplines is a popular topic. After such disciplines like, predominantly, sociology, cultural studies, and economy have focused on gender and dealt in different ways and from different perspectives with gender-specific questions, today these research interests have entered other disciplines (e.g. pedagogics, psychology, medicine) in which the role of gender is discussed and elaborated, among them also linguistics. Recently, we can observe a gender focus also in translation studies. Indeed, translatorical gender research, especially translation-oriented considerations of gender, cannot be described as a *novum* at all, but one has to admit that gender research in translation studies has not reached up to now a noteworthy dimension, for translatorical studies on gender are still not that numerous. Gender in translation studies is still a relatively hidden research area that will probably get developed and elaborated in future. It seems as if it is a secret consensus among translators to consider and respect gender in texts. And maybe, this consensus neither needs any comment nor research investigation. Yet, an unconscious perception or an unconscious using of structures is not the same as a conscious acceptance and a conscious positioning. A conscious action leads not only to a conscious performance, but also to a conscious explanation.

In the year 2000 Katharina Reiß focuses on gender and gender identity within the bible translation. At first glance, dealing with gender and bible translation does not seem very optimal. And this is, to be honest, a little bit notable, when one reads Reiß' paper: It is mostly a linguistic work in which the author recapitulates gender linguistic tendencies, works, and research tasks. The translatorical chapter in this paper is in comparison to the linguistic part relatively short and, relating to the results, a little bit fruitless. Nevertheless, the paper contains some sensitising aspects for translation studies and interesting approaches that can be made fruitful for this discipline in future. In her edited volume *Translating Gender* the editor Eleonora Federici gives an overview of gender and translation and illustrates the confrontation of gender — language — translation on different levels. Scheller-Boltz (2013) embeds the theme gender and translation in the field of political correctness. He discusses in a socio-cultural comparison possibilities to translate gender in different situations. Above all, he shows linguistic structures of discrimination which are caused mostly by sociocultural patterns. On the example of Finnish-German-English, Braun (1997) focuses on the MAN-principle (male-as-norm-principle) in translation. She discusses the use of the generic masculinity, investigates approaches of translating texts considering a gender-neutral language and

focuses, amongst others, on pronouns (e.g. he/she). In the year 2013 the key aspect of the journal *MDÜ — Fachzeitschrift für Dolmetscher und Übersetzer* was dedicated to the interconnection between gender and translation. However, the main aim was merely to sum up some basic understandings and to clarify some gender-related questions. So, in translation studies this theme still needs a serious discussion with regard to content and has to gain in importance with regard to research.

3. GENDER — IDENTITY — TRANSLATION: PERSON NOUNS AND NAMES OF PROFESSIONS

Translators encounter person nouns and names of professions all the time — in addresses and speeches or to refer to persons in general. The use of these nouns is governed by certain rules which must be heeded in translation. While in English, for example, person nouns and names of professions are mainly genderless or gender-neutral — which relegates the problem of gender to the level of pronouns (e.g. *his*, *her*, *its*) — the German language contains some difficulties with regard to such nouns (e.g. *Arbeiter* vs. *Arbeiterin* [male worker vs. female worker], *Bankkaufmann* vs. *Bankkauffrau* [male banker vs. female banker] *Krankenpfleger* (!) vs. *Krankenschwester* [male nurse vs. female nurse] — as compared to *Altenpfleger* vs. *Altenpflegerin* [male caregiver vs. female caregiver], ? vs. *Zimmermädchen* [maid], ? vs. *Hebamme* [midwife], *Frau* vs. **Fräulein* [Mrs vs. Miss]).

But what exactly is complicated here? We can see, on the one hand, that person nouns and especially names of professions are based on the traditional gender dichotomy. Consequently, there are only established forms for ("real") men and ("real") women in the German language. Furthermore, each oppositional pair implies an obligatory heteronormativity, which is based on the assumption of a cis-identity. Thus, it is necessary or even mandatory that people categorise and position themselves either as a woman or as a man. From the perspective of gender analysis, some units of designation show, above all, a mismatch with regard to semantics but especially to pragmatic and semanto-cognitive factors. For instance, the name of profession *Krankenpfleger* [male nurse] is — in comparison to *Krankenschwester* [female nurse] — an ameliorative noun, because the verb *pflegen* [to care] implies more responsibility and a higher status. The exact (denotative) equivalent *Krankenbruder* [male nurse] can be found, but it is very rare. For some professions, there are no corresponding gendered nouns. The *Zimmermädchen* [maid] has no established male counterpart. In the sec-

tor of erotic services and sex work, the job title *Prostituierte* [prostitute] is usually reserved for women. Possible nouns for men are *Callboy* or *Stricher* [hustler]. Their direct female equivalents — with regard to denotation and connotation — are *Callgirl* or *Nutte* [whore]. In comparison to the male nouns, the female nouns sound more pejorative. Moreover, women's job titles can be created by using numerous motion suffixes (suffixes deriving female person nouns). Yet, these suffixes impart less prestige on women (cf. e.g. *Friseur* vs. *Friseuse* (today the norm is: *Friseurin* or alternatively: *Stylist* vs. *Stylistin*) [hairdresser], *Purser* vs. *Purserette*). We can observe a similar phenomenon with regard to nouns that refer to people or to civil status. Consequently, the *Junggeselle* [bachelor] is a neutral term for the civil status of an unmarried man. However, a neutral female equivalent is missing. The noun *Jungfer* [spinster] differs from a semantic perspective and, above all, contrasts sharply with the male form as to connotation and can only produce negative and pejorative contexts. Today, the loan word *Single* is widely used to refer to unmarried people of both genders. This unit guarantees gender neutrality.

A quite new noun is in this context the word *Bachelor*. This noun is not widely used presently and has been publicised for a few years predominantly by lowbrow media, television in particular (series: *Der Bachelor*). This year, a similar show with a female lead, *Die Bachelorette*, has aired for the first time. It is evident from the motion suffix and the way the "bachelorette" is portrayed that the woman is less valuable than the man, the "bachelor", and that she must not be taken as seriously as he.

In the 1970s, German linguists started to criticise nouns that refer to persons (e.g. *Friseuse*) and debated the necessity of pointing out the gender or civil status of a person (e.g. *Fräulein*) (cf. in particular Pusch 1984, papers of Guentherodt/Pusch/Hellinger/Trömel-Plötz in *Linguistische Berichte* 69/1980). The word *Tippse*, for instance, is a pejorative noun for "typist". Using derivational feminine suffixes like *-euse* (e.g. **Masseuse*, currently: *Masseurin*) [female masseur], *-esse* (e.g. **Politesse*) [female parking enforcement officer] oder *-ette* (e.g. **Chansonnette*, currently: *Chansonsängerin*) [female chanson singer] provokes pejorative and demoting nouns. The neutral feminine motion suffix is *-in*. Do we really need the word *Fräulein* [miss]? Why is a masculine counterpart missing here?

The extreme feminist claims were at the beginning quite chaotic and less structured, but they presented a good overview on some linguistic mismatches and drew attention to forthcoming questions and challenges. Antidiscrimination, equal treatment, and equal status in and throughout language were the goal of feminism; sexist language structures and misogynist nouns were revealed and criticised.

During the last few decades, the German language has undergone a profound process of development in different areas. The language has changed with regard to language which is equal to gender, to women in particular. We can observe these changes, when we analyse forms of address, titles, names of professions, and the use of person nouns. Numerous guidelines for gender-neutral and gender-oriented language use are published each year. Due to the unmanageable volume of these guidelines, it is not possible to name them — or even some of them — in the following. All these guidelines criticise the generic masculinity in particular. In academic papers or studies, the generic masculinity is still used very often, although in these text types the use of gender-sensitive and gender-neutral forms becomes more and more popular. This tendency is absolutely comprehensible. For it strikes us as a little bit odd when we refer to a (male) linguist with a masculine noun, but, for example, the author of a quoted book or in a quotation of a text passage to who this masculine noun refers to is a woman. In general, however, one has to avoid the use of the generic masculinity and should seek for other possibilities to refer to persons.

While at first, the debates focused on questioning the exclusive use of masculine nouns and increasing the visibility of women, this binary approach to gender was criticised again because of its insufficient character after the establishment of queer studies in the 1990s. The new field of queer studies focused increasingly on gender identities beyond the gender dichotomy man-woman. Considering phenomena like desire and sexual orientation led to the conclusion that we are surrounded by more gender identities. Consequently, we cannot assume that the gender diversity ends with a binarity which consists of a (prototypical) woman and a (prototypical) man. Not only is the meaning of *Mann* [man] and *Frau* [woman] discussed in a way that criticises and questions heteronormativity, it is also assumed that there are more than two genders. Trans-identities and intersexuality entered the debate and, by deconstructing gender, enabled a new vision of gender. Consequently, queer linguistic criticism does not stop with the use of generic masculine forms, but also addresses that it is not sufficient to make women visible alongside men and that it is necessary to find ways in which to include everyone, to make everyone visible in and throughout language. *Studentinnen und Studenten* [female and male students], *Sehr geehrte Damen und Herren* [Dear Madam or Sir, Ladies and Gentlemen], *Angestellte/r* [female/ male employee], *Bankkauffrau/-mann* [female/ male banker] oder *WissenschaftlerInnen* [female/male scholars] are currently not completely accepted as gender-neutral forms and strategies, because they are still based on an implicit heteronormative pattern and maintain the gender binary. This suggests the gender opposition man-woman, whereas other

genders beyond this bipolar gender constellation are completely ignored and hidden in and by language. Transsexual and intersexual persons do not feel adequately included by these forms of address. Language is not able to make those gender identities visible so that they are not perceived in language and in society. Consequently, during the last few years scholars have created new forms of address which are meant to enable a more gender-neutral language use. The aim of this is to include persons who do not or cannot consider themselves as a man or a woman due to their biological-anatomical make-up or who do not categorise themselves and do not want to be categorised by others as a man or a woman for social reasons.

4. REFLECTING GENDER IN WRITTEN GERMAN VS. SPOKEN GERMAN: AN INESCAPABLE DILEMMA?

In the following, I will list different forms of address and person nouns which are more or less established in current German. Some of them are founded on the gender binarity (e.g. *Liebe Studentinnen und Studenten* — [dear (female and male) students]). They have attained a level of general acceptance and are regularly used in public correspondence, independently of the text type. The use of these forms is wide-spread and popular because it is not complicated in spoken language to address the female and male members of an audience by using the appropriate motion suffix (formation of female person nouns). Other forms and strategies to address people are derived from the queer gender model which is based on the idea of de-constructing heteronormativity, gender ambiguity, and diversity. They are only used in special text types which have an intentional function. They are not general forms, yet, but they accommodate the multidimensional and diverse gender model. Mostly, these queered forms are used in written texts, because in spoken language it seems to be difficult and problematic, (yet?), to consider all genders and gender identities in and by language. So in written German, gender identities can be made visible whereas in spoken language the same genders disappear.

Both strategies — a) the traditional form, based on gender binarity, and b) the queer form, based on the idea of genders beyond the gender dichotomy — do not address the problem that gender identities which can be made visible in written German cannot be made immediately visible in spoken German. Just how difficult bridging the gap between written and spoken language is, is determined by the strategy chosen to make gender visible. For example, the choice of addressing men and women separately in writ-ten language can be directly translated into spoken language. In contrast

to this, condensed forms can be used only in written language and have no direct equivalent in spoken language. In this case, one has to transform the condensed form into a separate addressing of men and women. Yet, it is in both cases possible to make men and women visible.

Following a queer approach of addressing persons, it is currently still unclear — and I cannot provide any solution in this paper — to which extent a) established, b) optionally used or c) possible and suggested forms in written language can be used in spoken language, too. The different forms of written address are meant to point out the existing diversity of gender. These forms are to guarantee that all persons feel included by the used forms of address, regardless of their identity. An exception is the *x*-variant, recently suggested by Lann Hornscheidt (see below)[1]. To which extent this suggestion can prevail, remains to be seen. Up to now, this suggestion has met only little acceptance, in particular in the media and in different internet forums.

In the following, I will present the different strategies and provide selected examples.

4.1. GERMAN NOUNS WITHIN THE TRADITIONAL GENDER BINARITY

4.1.1. EQUIVALENT FORMS IN WRITTEN AND SPOKEN LANGUAGE

Addressing men and women explicitly

Addressing men and women (explicitly) means that both forms, the masculine and the feminine, are used together — the feminine form at first, followed by the masculine. As a rule, they are linked with the conjunction *und* [and]. This written form can directly be translated into a spoken variant.

Examples
Sehr geehrte Damen und Herren [Ladies and gentlemen]
Liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen [Dear (female and male) colleagues]
Die Leserinnen und Leser entschieden ... [The (female and male) readers decided …]
...sind die Bürgerinnen und Bürger aufgefordert... […the (female and male) citizens are requested to…]
Die Forderung seitens der Studentinnen und Studenten [The claim from the (female and male) students…]
Jede Studentin und jeder Student kann sich... [Every female and every male student can…]

---

[1] Online at <http://www.spiegel.de/unispiegel/wunderbar/gendertheorie-studierx-lann-hornscheidt-ueber-gerechte-sprache-a-965843.html> (10.07.2014).

Neutralisation

The strategy of neutralisation consists of using substitutes which are meant to maintain gender neutrality. These substitutes are abstract and have no markers as to gender. A lot of these forms have currently become established in German. However, other forms of address are possible. For instance, one can choose not to use a neutral form and opt for addressing men and women separately, instead. Neutral forms are the same in written and spoken language.

Examples

Studierende (e.g. die Studierenden haben…) (also: *die Studentinnen und Studenten*) [students]
   Reinigungskraft [cleaner]
   Lehrkraft [teacher]
   Servicekraft [member of a service team]
   Bedienung [waiter]
   Die Leitung hat beschlossen… [The management has decided…]
   Der Chair hat beschlossen… [The chair has decided…]
   Das Ordnungsamt hat beschlossen… [The regulatory agency has decided…]

4.1.2. FORMS DIVERGING IN WRITTEN AND SPOKEN LANGUAGE

There are forms that combine masculine and feminine forms in one word, but which can be used almost exclusively in written texts, because they cannot be rendered in spoken language due to their compactness. Some native speakers of German have suggested to render the written forms in spoken language by using special phonetic features — this statement is based on my own observations — however, this phonetic variant is not popular and wide-spread (see below). The compact forms have different variants that I will list below.

Capitalisation inside the word

Using the strategy of capitalisation inside the word (Germ. *Binnen-I*) the German motion suffix *-in* is directly linked to the masculine form, however, the *-i-* in the motion suffix will be capitalised so that the whole word becomes a mixed gendered, gender neutral, or gender abstract noun (e.g. *StudentIn* [student] *LeserIn* [reader], *ReferentInnen* [consultant] *AssistentInnen* [assistent]).

Examples

Schüler und Schülerin → SchülerIn [pupil] (as compared to the feminine form *Schülerin*)

MitarbeiterIn (Mitarbeiter + Mitarbeiterin) [colleague]

StudiendekanIn (Studiendekan + Studiendekanin) [dean]

RektorInnen (Rektoren + Rektorinnen) [principals]

SlawistInnen (Slawisten + Slawistinnen) [slavists]

A problem occurs when a vowel within a noun changes as a consequence of using motion suffixes. A different procedure has to be applied when using these pairs.

Example

Arzt/Ärztin (*ArztIn) [doctor]

The rule of capitalisation by using the "Binnen-I" can be applied only when a noun referring to a male job title or a male person can be combined with the motion suffix *-in* in order to create the feminine form. Where the feminine form is derived by using other morphological means, e.g. such as replacing Mann/-mann by Frau/-frau, it is not possible to use the rule of capitalisation.

Examples:

Bankkaufmann/frau, Bankkaufmann/-frau, Bankkaufmann/Bankkauffrau (*BankkaufmannFrau, *BankkauffrauMann, …) [banker]

Splitting

When splitting, one writes the masculine form at first, followed by a slash which is followed by the feminine motion suffix. Two forms are acceptable: the motion suffix either follows the slash directly or is preceded by a hyphen (as illustrated by the first example).

Examples

*Schüler und Schülerin → Schüler/in (*also: *Schüler/-in)* [pupil]

Mitarbeiter/in (Mitarbeiter + Mitarbeiterin) [employee, worker]

Studiendekan/in (Studiendekan + Studiendekanin) [dean]

Rektor/innen — also: *Rektor/inn/en (Rektoren + Rektorinnen)* [principals]

Slawist/innen — also: *Slawist/inn/en (Slawisten + Slawistinnen)* [slavists]

Der Pfleger/die Pflegerin [caregiver]

Again, this variant can only be used with nouns that do not change a vowel in order to form the feminine form.

Example:
Arzt/Ärztin (*Arzt/in) [doctor]

Yet, the approach of writing words with a slash enables us to combine *-mann* and *-frau* for some names of professions — which is not possible when one uses the rule of internal capitalisation.

Examples:
*Bürokauffrau/mann (*or: *Bürokauffrau/-mann) ← Bürokauffrau + Bürokaufmann* [office worker]
Obmann/frau ← Obmann + Obfrau [umpire]

Job advertisements are a frequent and even typical text type in which one can encounter this approach regularly. Using slashes enables the authors of these ads to combine and to separate the masculine and feminine form at the same time (e.g. *Bankkaufmann/-frau* [banker], *Stylist/-in* [stylist, hairdresser], *Kindergärtner/in* [kindergarden worker], *Architekt/in* [architect]). This approach underlines the aspect that the respective employer is not looking exclusively for candidates of one sex (which is forbidden in Germany).

Parantheses
A similar approach is the usage of parantheses which enable writers to condense the masculine and feminine form of a noun into one word.

Examples:
Schüler(in) [pupil]
Angestellte(r) [employee]
mit den Autor(inn)en [with the authors]
für die Sänger(innen) [for the singers]
mit den Spieler(inne)n [with the players]

It can be seen that writing a noun with a slash, with parantheses, or with a capital I means that the feminine form of the noun is graphically interrupted (compare *SchülerIn* with *Schülerin*, *Pilot(in)* with *Pilotin*, *Verkäufer/in* with *Verkäuferin*). Some speakers of German claim that one could overemphasise or exaggerate the internal capital *I* or the i contained in the motion suffix when speaking or make a little pause before it in order to underline that one is not using the feminine form of a noun but its gender-neutral vari-

ant. In spoken language, a speaker thus needs to rely on shifting the stress when using gender-neutral forms because usually the stress is never on the motion suffix (compare fem. *Schülerin* vs. gender-neutral: *Schülerin*, fem. *Managerin* vs. gender-neutral: *Managerin*). However, the variants — despite following a logical argumentation — have so far appeared only rarely and spontaneously. They are far from being used regularly.

The generic femininity

In some instances, one can observe the usage of the generic femininity, an approach which is becoming increasingly popular in various fields (e.g. *liebe Leserinnen* [dear ₍fem₎readers], *liebe Zuhörerinnen* [dear ₍fem₎listeners]). Mira Kadrić, Klaus Kaindl, and Michèle Kaiser-Cooke, for example, use the generic femininity consistently in their monograph *Translatorische Methodik* (Wien: Facultas, 2007). They justify this by stating that most students of translation studies and most translators are women. With a touch of humour, they add that of course, men are also included by the generic feminine. This statement satirises the condescending way in which women are expected to feel included by the generic masculine form. The University of Leipzig uses the generic femininity in its charter[2].

4.2. GERMAN FORMS OF ADDRESS GROUNDED IN QUEER THEORY

The forms of address which I have described so far follow the traditional model of gender binarity. They are meant to prevent discrimination and to make women visible. These forms of address, however, have been increasingly criticised following the establishment of queer linguistics. Of course, traditional attempts at using gender-sensitive language succeeded in making women visible. Yet, they were still based on a heteronormative perception of the world which is grounded in the idea of gender binarity. Consequently, queer theory argues that genders outside the traditional gender dichotomy are still subject to discrimination. These genders are not mentioned, they remain invisible. This applies particularly in the case of cis-identities and trans-identities. While persons with a cis-identity live with the gender and/ or sex to which they were assigned at birth, persons with a trans-identity reject their assigned gender and/or sex. Frequently, they find themselves in a place which is between the traditional genders and sexes, both from a psychological and a biological perspective. One should mention the example of Norrie May-Welby here, who won the right in court in Australia not to

---

[2] Online at <http://www.zv.uni-leipzig.de/fileadmin/user_upload/UniStadt/akademische_angelegenheiten/pdf/Grundordnung_UL_130806.pdf> (02.07.2014).

have to identify herself as a man or a woman. The sex of Norrie May-Welby is considered as not specified now. India has introduced a third category: here, the category „transgender" (*hijiras*) exists alongside the categories of man and woman (see e.g. also *fa'afafine*, *kathoey*, *Muxes*/*Marimachas*).

Another form of trans-identity is embodied by the (biologically male) model Andrej Pejić, who due to his/her (?) androgynous appearance presents both men's and women's fashion and is booked even outside fashion for men's and women's roles (e.g. the director Sofia Coppola is said to have considered Pejić recently for the role of Arielle in a remake of The Little Mermaid)[3].

These few examples show already that there are other identities and gender constellations beyond the traditional gender dichotomy which escape attempts at including them in the traditional view of gender.

If we examine nouns referring to persons or names of professions from a queer point of view, we must conclude that it is justified to criticise traditional approaches to gender-neutral language. Feminist approaches to gender-sensitive language have succeeded in creating a balanced treatment of both genders, yet, only in so far as these approaches reflect a heteronormative vision of gender and sex. Consequently, new forms of gender-sensitive language were discussed and invented which are meant to support a comprehensive non-discriminatory treatment of people and consider not only cis-identities but also trans-identities. However, such comprehensive approaches provoke the question in which areas their usage is appropriate and feasible and which factors restrict their usage.

4.2.1. QUEER FORMS OF ADDRESS IN GERMAN

For the German language, many solutions — e.g. for names of professions — have been suggested with which people can identify who do not want to or who cannot fit into the traditional model of gender binarity. A way of spelling which has become relatively popular in recent years is the "gender gap", a static underline character which is inserted between the masculine base of the noun and the feminine motion suffix. Underline characters are meant to make readers aware of identities and genders beyond the traditional model of gender binarity. Inserting these characters aims at helping people feel included who do not want to or cannot identify themselves either as a woman or as a man.

---

[3] Online at <http://www.news.com.au/entertainment/movies/andrej-pejic-androgynous-australian-model-set-for-sofia-coppolas-the-little-mermaid-remake/story-fnk850z8-1226957308745> (10.07.2014).

Examples
Schauspieler_in [actor/ actress]
Sänger_innen [singer]
mit den Schüler_inne_n [with the pupils]
Auszubildende_r [trainee]

In contrast to this, the dynamic underline character is used flexibly. Its purpose is to create awareness of the dynamic nature of gender. The static underline character is grounded in the traditional thinking of gender binarity into which other genders are simply inserted. The dynamic underline character, however, deconstructs and destroys gender binarity. It is firmly grounded in the idea that gender diversity is a given. (for detailed and illustrative examples see *Sprachhandeln — aber wie? W_Ortungen statt Tatenlosigkeit*)[4].

Example
Stu_dentin — Stu_dentinnen [students]

Another way to spell gender-neutral words from a queer perspective is to use an asterisk. The asterisk symbolises gender diversity and rejects the idea of gender binarity. Like the underline character, the asterisk represents a gender and/or sex or an identity which cannot be defined exactly.

Examples
*Student*in* [student]
*Lehrer*in* [teacher]
*Helfer*innen* [assistant]

4.2.2. QUEER FORMS OF ADDRESS IN SPOKEN LANGUAGE

It cannot be denied that queer forms of address are destined to be used exclusively in written texts. Their written form aims at destroying the model of gender binarity visibly and to replace it with a vision of gender which is based on viewing gender as a complex, fluid, and diverse phenomenon. As there are numerous genders and gender identities, all of them must be made visible or should be considered if possible. Dynamic and static underline characters and asterisks, however, cannot be translated into spoken language. Hence, they can be regarded as successful possibilities to realise

---

[4] Online at <www.feministisch-sprachhandeln.org> (23.07.2014).

gender-neutrality in written language. In spoken language, it is not possible to make gender diversity visible because underline characters and asterisks cannot be vocalised in everyday conversation.

In order to address this grievance, Professor Lann Hornscheidt of Humboldt University Berlin suggested introducing the ending -*x* (interview with Spiegel, 24.04.2014)[5]. According to Hornscheidt, the gender-specific and thus restrictive ending which usually follows the root of the noun should be replaced by -*x*, which indicates gender but does not specify it. The plural form could then take the regular plural -*s*, too.

For instance, the gender-specific forms *Absolvent-Absolventin* [(male-female) graduate] consist morphologically of the root *Absolv-* and the ending -*ent*, which in this case indicates that the person concerned is male. In its feminine form, the motion suffix -*in* is added after the masculine ending. If the ending of the corresponding verb that forms the basis of that kind of derivation is erased and replaced by the gender-neutral *x*, the corresponding singular form of the noun would be *Absolvier* + *x* = *Absolvierx* (spoken: Absolvierix). For the plural form, the neutral ending -*s* is used: *Absolvierxs* (spoken: Absolvierixes).

Further examples:
*Professx (*spoken: *professix) — Professxs (*spoken: *professixes)* [professor]
*Studierx (*spoken: *studierix) — Studierxs (*spoken: *studierixes)* [student]
Verkäufx — Verkäufxs [salesperson]
Angestelltx — Angestelltxs [employee]
Personalleitx — Personalleitxs [HR manager]

Lann Hornscheidt's suggestion met with harsh criticism after its publication in an interview with the renowned news magazine *Der Spiegel*. People who had never before dealt with gender studies or gender stereotypes ridiculed the unusual form instead of questioning the motive behind it. One must mention here that Lann Hornscheidt did not suggest that usage of these forms should be mandatory. These forms were rather presented as just another possibility to counter sexist language and to raise awareness for gender diversity. Moreover, this way of spelling can be used for both, written and spoken language.

I presented the *x*-variant proposed by Professor (or Professx) Hornscheidt in my course "Introduction to Russian gender linguistics" during the summer semester of 2014. The students accepted it rather eagerly. Some even started

---

[5] Online at <http://www.spiegel.de/unispiegel/wunderbar/gendertheorie-studierx-lann-hornscheidt-ueber-gerechte-sprache-a-965843.html> (10.07.2014).

using the -*x* — I do not know the exact reasons in every single case. In some cases, it was argued that the -*x* should be used explicitly when speaking about Professor (Professx) Hornscheidt because Lann Hornscheidt does not want to be categorised within the prevalent gender dichotomy. The debate did not stop here: Not only did the native speakers of German in the course start using the -*x* — a Russian student also started to analyse ways in which the -*x* could be used in Russian. Thus, the -*x* is a possibility which should be pondered neutrally and objectively. Above all, one should consider the underlying concept without ridiculing or mocking it a priori.

5. WHERE ARE THE RUSSIAN AND POLISH WOMEN? — ON THEIR VISIBILITY IN LANGUAGE

As to the German language, there has been a lot of activity concerning the visibility of women and of people with a gender identity outside the traditional gender binarity. Yet, to study gender-neutral language is by far neither a new nor an exclusively German subject.

Swedish linguistics, for example, deals with this topic frequently. In Sweden, it is an objective of social policies to promote gender diversity. Recent studies and research approaches in Swedish linguistics originate in social policies and communal life and enter the Swedish language immediately (Hornscheidt 2006).

Gender-neutral language and gender diversity are subjects with a fine tradition in Great Britain, the U.S., and Canada, too. It is thus evident that I could make a long list of works dealing with these topics but this is not the purpose of this paper (cf. exemplary Jule 2008).

The situation in Russia and Poland is different from the countries I have mentioned. Both nations share a similar communist past but have evolved differently after the fall of the wall and the collapse of communism. While Poland has embraced reform and democracy, Russia has emphasised moral and traditional values — in particular in recent years. Religion has influenced policies and society — in some instances to an almost frightening extent. The vision of the family with three children which Vladimir Putin in the year 2013 propagates reflects a traditional concept of gender with a binary structure and very traditional and conservative roles for men and women.[6] Not only does this exclude those persons which for biological or anatomical reasons do not fit into this model. It also demonstrates that gender diversity is currently a subject opposed by the Russian government. The so-called

---

[6] Online at <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/vladimir-putin/9739678/Vladimir-Putin-calls-on-Russian-families-to-have-three-children.html> (10.07.2014).

propaganda laws, which caused an international uproar particularly during the Olympics and the sharp — moreover, despising — criticism on this year's winner of the Eurovision Song Contest Conchita Wurst, paint a very conservative picture of gender. In some instances, gender and gender identities are the very reason for oppression by the state.

This concept of gender is also reflected by language. The Russian ways of addressing another person and of referring to job titles remind us a lot of the language used in Western Europe in the 1970s. As a rule, the generic masculine form is the form which must be used and is accepted. This general rule applies to all text types. Exceptions like addressing both genders separately are seldom. For instance, it is normal for the Russian president to address his people during his New Year's speech using the generic masculine form. The generic masculine form is also used consistently for other forms of address like *дорогие читатели* [dear $_{masc}$readers], *дорогие слушатели* [dear $_{masc}$listeners], *дорогие зрители* [dear $_{masc}$spectators]. Even women are directly addressed in the masculine form. The masculine form is also used for all entries in official documents. Job titles on name tags in shops, for example, use a masculine form even when the bearer of the tag is a woman.

The patriarchal structure with its androcentric focus is rarely questioned. It is a relic from the era of communism during which the inequality of man and woman was said to have been overcome (Tafel 1997). Equality and non-discrimination were propagated for political reasons. They were reflected by the generic masculine form. From this point of view, women did not need to be made visible because they were equal. To be sure: neither had the Soviet Union accomplished gender equality nor could its approach to language policy be qualified as non-sexist. To use the generic masculine form means to subject all genders to the male gender. From this perspective, masculinity is the ideal which is able to comprise and represent all genders — an idea which reminds us of the one-gender-model proposed by Laqueur (1992).

The situation differs in Poland. This is the result of the country's orientation towards Western Europe and democracy, but also of its public life and media. Gender roles are still considered according to the traditional model of gender binarity. Gender diversity is still not accepted or even mentioned in some areas. Yet, the concept of gender and the dualism of gender are criticised much more often in Poland than in Russia. Queer lifestyles and identities are visible and the object of coverage in the media — in particular in the big cities. The transsexual politician Anna Grodzka is an activist against sexist discrimination and for gender diversity. She has become a figurehead for queer identity in Poland. Her presence in the media promotes acceptance and tolerance of gender diversity.

To be sure: there are not as many suggestions as to forms of address for the Polish language as there are for the German language. In Polish, too, the generic masculine form is still predominant. Similarly to Russian, the masculine form is used to address women, e.g. in documents, on name tags, and business cards. However, two important differences have begun to emerge. The first one is that some Polish media have started to propagate the usage of feminine forms (e.g. *-łożka — biolożka* [$_{fem}$biologist], *psycholożka* [$_{fem}$psychologist], *ekolożka* [$_{fem}$ecologist]). This form is not used everywhere and sometimes it is even criticised, but it has a remarkable following nevertheless. In other cases, it is said that some forms are not possible or acceptable because they already have a semantic meaning. For instance, it is generally accepted that one cannot create a feminine form for *stolarz* [carpenter] by using the usual motion suffixes (*stolarka* [female carpenter]) because this noun already has the meaning "carpentry". However, one should mention here that words are capable of evolving semantically and of expanding their meaning. The German word *Sekretär* [male secretary], for instance, referred to "desk" or "bureau" exclusively for a long time. When the number of men holding the position of an office secretary began to rise, the obvious adaptation was to take the motion suffix out of *Sekretärin* [female secretary] and to start calling these men *Sekretäre* — up to this point, this word had only existed in compound words (e.g. *Staatssekretär* [state secretary], *Generalsekretär* [general secretary]). Having met with scepticism initially, the word is well established today and an accepted term. Hence, there is no real obstacle to the feminisation of masculine names of professions in Polish.

The second difference is that when addressing others people pay attention to address both, men and women. One still encounters the form *drodzy rodacy* [dear $_{masc}$citizens] in New Year's speeches. Yet, many speakers are already aware of the need of addressing both genders (e.g. *Polki i Polacy* [dear (female and male) citizens of Poland]. This approach is not consistently found with all speakers. It is very individual and depends on the respective situation. Yet, it is evident that sensitivity for gender-neutral and non-sexist language is on the rise in Poland.

6. FORMS OF ADDRESS AND THEIR RELEVANCE FOR TRANSLATION

What do these considerations mean for translation? Respecting conventions is one of the most important principles a translator needs to observe. Considering sociocultural factors — if one regards translation as a sociocultural process that is — is even more important. While translating, translators frequently interpret sociocultural factors on the basis of their own perception,

their own upbringing, and their own familiar surroundings, without applying methods of intercultural comparison. This way of approaching translation can lead to fatal errors. Making a wrong interpretation or an interpretation which results from factors in the source language can lead to a translated text which contains contraventions against target language conventions and which can thus produce an inadequate, inacceptable text. As to gender, one runs the (inadvertent) risk of producing discriminatory or disrespectful texts. German translations of Russian or Polish nouns frequently reflect the requirements shaping these words in their source languages. From the perspective of the target language German, however, they fall short of the requirements in the target language. *Wenn unsere Studenten…* [if our ₘₐₛ𝒸students] is not really acceptable in German because it is considered disrespectful to use the generic masculine form *Studenten* for including women. Yet, in Russian or Polish *Если наши студенты…* resp. *Jeśli nasi studenci…* [if our ₘₐₛ𝒸students] is grammatically, pragmatically and socio-culturally correct, even though one could question this as to political correctness and equality in general.

If one is to translate into German, one must know the possibilities which exist in the area of gender-sensitive language. Not only does this mean that one needs to know the different methods which exist to be gender-sensitive within the traditional gender dichotomy of male and female. It also means that one needs to consider the possibilities which have evolved and are still evolving from queer theory.

And what about vice versa? Up to this point, I am not aware of queer approaches to the issue of addressing people for Russian or Polish. Considering the current socio-political and social situation in Russia, it is unlikely that such approaches can be identified for Russian. Further studies are needed for Polish. In German texts, however, one can use a queer approach. In some situations, one must even use a form of address which reflects gender-diversity and avoids sexist discrimination.

One must be attentive to the fact, however, that in German one needs to make at least the male and the female gender visible. Generic forms should be avoided in German. Consequently, *drodzy klienci* [dear ₘₐₛ𝒸clients] should be rendered in German as *liebe Kundinnen und Kunden* [dear (female and male) clients]. When writing patient information, one should always be careful to speak of *Patientinnen und Patienten*. In official documents, all functions should be written in the feminine form when they refer to women — e.g. *Frau Nowak ist die Institutsleiterin* (**Institutsleiter*) [Mrs Nowak is the (female) director of the department], *Frau Schewtschenko ist die Lehrstuhlinhaberin* (**Lehrstuhlinhaber*) [Mrs Shevchenko is the (female) director of the chair], *Frau Michalewska ist Sachbearbeiterin* (**Sachbearbeiter*) [Mrs Mikhalevska is a (female) administrator]. To be sure: some text types still

use the generic masculine form in German. This approach is often criticised. Moreover, the usage of the generic masculine form is a controversial issue in German academia because even authors of academic texts could opt for non-discriminatory language, such as always using the masculine and the feminine form together or using the internal capital I. (Both variants are not wrong and completely acceptable.)

In German, there are many options for a language usage which is gender-sensitive, gender neutral, and abstract. This paper lists some of these options and raises awareness for them. It is important to know and understand concepts of gender, in order to prevent texts from becoming discriminatory.

When dealing with Polish or Russian texts, one should answer the question of how visible gender must be made based on the text at hand. In some texts, it might be a good solution to address both, men and women. In other texts, one should use the generic masculine form. Up to now, this is the accepted standard. Further studies are required in order to determine whether change is on the horizon. There are no queer forms of address in both languages so far. Consequently, forms of address follow the androcentric model or the model of gender binarity up to this point.

7. CONCLUSION

Using the example of the German language, the current paper described that gender-neutral written and spoken language reflects a socio-cultural background. Whenever a society deals critically with gender and recognises gender(s) beyond the traditional man-woman dichotomy, this will be reflected in and by the respective language in the long run. Yet, language is not a passive object of social evolution. It can also be a means to raise awareness of gender diversity within a given society. In the German language, gender-neutral approaches are spreading increasingly. This includes approaches to reflect queer lifestyles and gender identities in language. To which extent variants are established which are independent of text type remains to be seen. Moreover, time will tell whether queer designations can cross the barrier into spoken language in the long run.

Other cultures may not have reached the point yet where a critical focus on gender and gender identities is possible. Consequently, their languages offer a traditional and conservative picture of gender which leaves only little room for gender neutrality.

It is important for translators in this context to develop and cultivate a sensitivity for culture and language. In German texts, for instance, they are expected to designate persons and groups adequately, correctly, and in such

a fashion as to avoid any form of discrimination. This requires knowledge of strategies with which to maintain gender neutrality. (One needs to be careful here because the chosen form should not infringe upon the conventions of the text type at hand.)

The situation differs in Polish and Russian. However, we can observe tendencies to use gender-sensitive language in Polish at least.

Bibliography

Braun, Friederike (1997): Making men out of people. The MAN principle in translating genderless forms. In: Kotthoff, Helga/ Wodak, Ruth (eds.) (1997): *Communicating Gender in Context*. (= Pragmatics & Beyond, New Series, vol. 42). Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 3–29.

Butler, Judith (2004): *Undoing Gender*. New York/ London: Routledge.

Federici, Eleonora (ed.) (2011): *Translating Gender*. (= Ricerche di cultura europea/ Forschungen zur europäischen Kultur, vol. 25). Bern [et al.]: Peter Lang.

Hornscheidt, Antje (2006): *Die sprachliche Benennung von Personen aus konstruktivistischer Sicht. Genderspezifizierung und ihre diskursive Verhandlung im heutigen Schwedisch*. (= Linguistik — Impulse & Tendenzen, vol. 15). Berlin/ New York: de Gruyter.

Jule, Allyson (2008): *A Beginner's Guide to Language and Gender*. Clevedon [et al.]: Multilingual Matters.

Laqueur, Thomas (1992): *Making sex. Body and Gender from the Greeks to Freud*. Cambridge [et al.]: Harvard University Press.

Linguistische Berichte. Forschung, Information, Diskussion. (Schwerpunktthema: *Geschlecht und Macht I*, ed. by Pusch, Luise/ Trömel-Plötz, Senta). Wiesbaden: Vieweg, vol. 69, 1980.

MDÜ — Fachzeitschrift für Dolmetscher und Übersetzer (= Mitteilungsblatt für Dolmetscher und Übersetzer). Berlin: BDÜ, vol. 6/ 2013.

Motschenbacher, Heiko (2012): *An Interdisciplinary Bibliography on Language, Gender and Sexuality (2000–2011)*. Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Pusch, Luise (1984): *Das Deutsche als Männersprache. Aufsätze und Glossen zur feministischen Linguistik*. (= Edition Suhrkamp 1217). Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp.

Reiß, Katharina (2000): Frauengerechte Sprache und Übersetzen oder: Wie man die Tassen im Schrank läßt. In: Kadric, Mira/ Kaindl, Klaus/ Pöchhacker, Franz (eds.) (2000): *Translationswissenschaft*. Festschrift für Mary Snell-Hornby zum 60. Geburtstag. Tübingen: Stauffenburg, 241–256.

Scheller-Boltz, Dennis (2013): Politische Korrektheit und Translation im Lichte des *postcolonial turn* (an deutschem, polnischem und russischem Material). In: Lukas, Katarzyna/ Olszewska, Izabela/ Turska, Marta (eds.) (2013): *Translation im Spannungsfeld der cultural turns*. (= Studien zur Germanis-

tik, Skandinavistik und Übersetzungskultur, vol. 7). Frankfurt a.M.: Peter Lang, 167–182.

Tafel, Karin (1997): *Die Frau im Spiegel der russischen Sprache*. (= Slavistische Studienbücher, Neue Folge, vol. 7). Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Деннис Шеллер-Больтз

О ГЕНДЕРНОМ СОЗНАНИИ
В НЕМЕЦКОМ, ПОЛЬСКОМ И РУССКОМ ЯЗЫКАХ

Р е з ю м е

Статья сосредоточивается на проблеме грамматического рода и языковом идентитете в переводе. В немецком языке существуют системные способы обозначения рода или определенные способы гендерной дифференциации, или же методы проведения экспериментов с формами без определенного грамматического рода и нейтральными с этой точки зрения формами. В русском языке преобладают в таких случаях мужские формы. В Польше проводится широкая дискуссия, касающаяся возможностей конструирования женских форм, которые должны заменить мужские. В статье рассматривается тенденция развития в немецком языке форм нейтральных с точки зрения гендерных различий или же развития форм существительных лишенных грамматического рода. Автор сопоставляет их с возможностью построения похожих форм в польском и русском языках. Поскольку использование личных имен существительных обычно находится в тесной зависимости с общественно-культурными нормами, целью статьи является раскрытия, что такой подход может внести в теоретическое переводоведение и переводческую практику.

Dennis Scheller-Boltz

O ŚWIADOMOŚCI PŁCIOWEJ W JĘZYKU NIEMIECKIM, ROSYJSKIM I POLSKIM

S t r e s z c z e n i e

Artykuł koncentruje się na pytaniu o kwestię rodzaju gramatycznego i tożsamości językowej w przekładzie. W języku niemieckim istnieją ustalone sposoby oznaczania rodzaju czy też wyraźnego tworzenia rozróżnienia genderowego, a nawet eksperymentowania z formami bezrodzajowymi lub rodzajowo neutralnymi. W języku rosyjskim natomiast formy męskie rzeczowników są w zdecydowanej przewadze. W przypadku języka polskiego prowadzona jest gorąca debata na temat możliwości konstruowania form żeńskich, które mogłyby zastąpić dawne nazwy męskie. Artykuł rozważa tendencję do genderowo neutralnego albo nawet bezrodzajowego rozwoju form rzeczownikowych w języku niemieckim i zestawia je z możliwościami konstruowania podobnych form w języku polskim i rosyjskim. Ponieważ użycie rzeczowników osobowych jest zwykle zanurzone w normach społeczno-kulturowych, celem autora jest pokazanie co tego typu podejście może zaoferować translatologii zarówno od strony teoretycznej, jak i praktycznej.