

# Una genealogía femenina del conocimiento medieval a través de la traducción: una nueva propuesta ejemplificada por la transmisión de los manuscritos de Trotula<sup>1</sup>

Elena Castellano Ortola\*

**Resumen:** Partiendo de la praxis traductológica médica en la Inglaterra tardomedieval, el presente artículo discute las premisas en que debe asentarse una historia de la traducción atenta a los constructos de género. Conocimiento esencial para la perpetuación humana, la ginecología ha mantenido, no obstante, una relación compleja con el avance del conocimiento médico, especialmente por la privacidad y el pudor exigidos en el tratamiento del cuerpo femenino. Dada la importancia histórica de la traducción para la transmisión de dicho conocimiento, en las siguientes páginas se examinan posibles cauces metodológicos para estudiar la representación discursiva de la feminidad en la traducción de tratados medievales. Esto implica necesariamente una crítica del discurso académico contemporáneo en este campo, quizás no lo suficientemente consciente del androcentrismo que aún domina en la epistemología actual. Con fines ilustrativos, se emplearán constantes referencias a las traducciones conservadas actualmente de los llamados *Trotula* al inglés tardomedieval (Green, 1997), así como de los discursos académicos relacionados con su estudio.

**Palabras clave:** arqueología del conocimiento, feminismo, historia de la traducción, mediadores medievales, tratados de ginecología.

**A Woman-Centred Genealogy of Medieval Knowledge through Translation: A Novel Proposal Exemplified by the Transmission of the Trotula Manuscripts**

**Abstract:** Exploring the transmission of gynaecological treatises in late medieval England, this paper aims to reflect on the premises underpinning a gender-informed, discourse-driven history of translation. Gynaecology provides essential knowledge for the perpetuation of humankind yet has traditionally had a complex relationship with the advancement of medical knowledge due to considerations of female pudicity and privacy. Given the importance of translation in the transmission of medical knowledge, this article surveys potential methodolog-

ical approaches to the study of the discursive portrayal of female subjects in late medieval gynaecology treatises in translation. Crucially, the prevailing academic discourses surrounding this portrayal are problematised as failing to sufficiently acknowledge the male-centred structures that continue to dominate in contemporary epistemology. For illustration purposes, the currently available Late Middle English versions of the so-called Trotula ensemble (Green, 1997), as well academic studies of these manuscripts, will be used as a case study.

**Key words:** archaeology of knowledge, feminism, gynaecological treatises, medieval mediators, translation history.

*Panace@* 2021; XXII (53): 47-57

Recibido: 31.I.2021. Aceptado: 10.V.2021.

## 1. Introduction

As I draft this paper, I in no way intend to conceal the fact that I am not a specialist in Middle English. However, I certainly am a translation scholar doing my best to act in a gender-conscious manner and attempting to reflect on my stance as I enact it, as difficult as that may be on some occasions.

Some time ago, I began to take an interest in translation history, joining a complex and largely inconclusive debate on several crucial issues: when did the history of translation originate? Should we instead focus on the role of translation in history? How long have we been discussing a historical periodisation of translation, sometimes under other, apparently distinct conceptualisations? (see Bastin & Bandia, 2006: 1). Unlike most scholars engaged in this task, however, the allegedly new field of Translation Studies did not catch my attention in and of itself; rather, it was a necessary step in my quest for something substantially more elusive: the multiple political, social, economic, and intimate identities of the translator. It appeared to me that gender, a primary source of identity, intersected with the aforementioned categories and was therefore inevitably sensitive to contextual and historical shifts, just like the concept

\* Universidad de Valencia (España). Dirección para correspondencia: [Elena.Castellano@uv.es](mailto:Elena.Castellano@uv.es).

of translation itself, as descriptivists in our field have sought to demonstrate. In fact, the commonalities between the traditional dichotomies of translation/original and feminine/masculine have been extensively discussed from a historical, or at least a historically-intended, perspective (see, for instance, Chamberlain's seminal work, 1988).

In short, as soon as we accept that gender, just like translation, is an epistemological and social construct, history, and more precisely translation history, must be studied in order to explain its evolution. Since intellectual progress requires socialisation, translation, broadly understood as dialogue in difference, is essential to the study of the epistemological history of humankind. Women have seldom been present(ed) in historical discourse. At best, they have been displaced/misplaced from their rightful positions. Nevertheless, I do not consider it futile to address such discourses critically, nor do I believe we can content ourselves with the fact that increasing numbers of women have recently been acknowledged or noticed by patriarchal thought. On the contrary: at the present time, I very much doubt that our focus should remain on making feminine archaeological discoveries (in Foucauldian terms) as in previous decades. At this point, we are well aware that many past women's thoughts, words, and actions can be rescued from oblivion with hard work and patience. What is truly difficult to change in terms of women's history and knowledge is the highly powerful discursive tissue interweaving facts in intentionally misleading ways (genealogy), as well as the moral conclusions extracted from such discourse practices (ethics).

Drawing on Foucault's three phases in the organisation of human knowledge, namely archaeology, genealogy, and ethics (1969), I would like to present some relevant methodological and analytical reflections on translation history in the specific context of medical translation into English in the Late Middle Ages. Given the ambitious nature of this task, I will narrow my scope to the transmission of medical treatises relating to women in English society during the period in question and to one example in particular: the Trotula manuscripts, five Middle English versions of which have survived: Oxford MS Douce 37; Oxford MS Bodley 483; Cambridge University Library MS li. 6. 33; British Library MS Sloane 421A; and British Library MS Additional 12195 (Barratt, 2001: 1).

One may argue that there is little left to say about Trota of Salerno (c. 12th century) and her alleged contributions to gynaecology and obstetrics. However, her exact dates of birth and death, the total number of works she influenced, and the extent of her contribution to her alleged treatises remain unknown. Admittedly, a considerable number of papers and books have been written about her, especially by Monica Green (1997; 2000<sup>a</sup>; 2000<sup>b</sup>; 2002; 2008<sup>a</sup>; 2008<sup>b</sup>, etc.). However, like the copies and translations of the treatises attributed to her, these works seem to reveal more about the mediators (translators, doctors, chroniclers, historians, and scholars) and their prejudices than about Trota herself or her valuable contribution to human knowledge. As it is my intention to prove throughout this paper, this is precisely the reason why such well-known case studies should be chosen for illustrative purposes.

## 2. Theoretical and methodological background

The theoretical and methodological basis for my work on a gender-focused translation history is rather atypical in its selection and composition. As hinted at in the introduction, this is not due to a lack of previous attempts at building a history of translation from a gender perspective. Indeed, scholars from multiple disciplines have produced contributions that would enrich the field of Feminist Translation History and its many potential sub-fields. In my view, a comprehensive summary of such contributions to date should focus on three dimensions in particular: epistemology; feminist linguistics and feminist critical discourse analysis (Lazar, 2005); and Translation Studies (Toury, 2012). Providing essential knowledge for the perpetuation of humankind yet shaped by considerations of female pudicity and privacy, gynaecology has traditionally had a complex relationship with the advancement of medical knowledge, a task that is hugely indebted to translation. In the following sub-sections, the intersections between the three dimensions identified and the transmission of medieval gynaecological knowledge are discussed. A subsequent analysis of potential points of interest in this regard will follow the same threefold approach.

### 2.1. Epistemology

From an interlinguistic, intralinguistic, and intersemiotic perspective (Jakobson, 1959), translation has always been an excellent medium for the transmission and mediation of knowledge between social groups and cultures, and has been consistently used by patriarchal institutions for political gain and the exertion of authority (for an overview, see Simon 1996 and Flotow 2016, among others). Preserving the exclusive use of translation as a means of power throughout history has nevertheless required the deployment of a vehement discourse on fidelity by the patriarchy (see again Chamberlain, 1988); this is treacherously exemplified by Bible translations (Tymoczko, 2009; 2014), probably the most powerful and therefore the least faithful translation projects ever completed, with subjugated groups denied access to this potential source of empowerment.

This is the same discourse that has articulated history as we know it and misleadingly preceptive uses of language, both of which are responsible for women's subjugation<sup>2</sup>. In 1969, Foucault proposed a revolutionary approach to historical epistemology: an agent-sensitive reconstruction of history, which is perfectly compatible with his later deconstruction of textual authority and linguistic univocality. His method is composed of three phases: archaeology, genealogy, and ethics.

As I aim to argue in the next section, archaeology is a preliminary step in any research seeking to reconstruct lost identities and social contexts. It refers to the (as) neutral (as possible) process of gathering information stemming from the object of study, as well as compiling supplementary data accounting for its features. It is my opinion that most scholars, including feminist ones, have seldom gone further than this in their otherwise praiseworthy pursuit of a more democratic history of knowledge. Sometimes, there is little to be obtained from the

sources currently at our disposal for reconstructing erased female identities, so the main goal of this phase should perhaps be to expose an intentionally oblivious, treacherous historical discourse on female achievement<sup>3</sup>. Only once that has been done can we undertake the more complicated task of joining the dots and re-establishing lost connections, most of them private, between women with a view to building a more realistic and fairer genealogy of knowledge free from an omnipresent gender bias. The very final phase in this process is the consolidation of an ethical code taking women's plurality, transnationality, and solidarity into consideration, with notable attempts made by feminist scholars like Olga Castro and Emek Ergun (see Castro and Ergun, 2017), or Luise von Flotow (see Flotow, 2016).

## 2.2. Feminist linguistics and feminist critical discourse analysis

Between the late 1970s and the 1990s, classic feminist translation studies underscored women's discrimination through language as a major source for challenging gender inequalities (for an overview, see Andone, 2002; Castro, 2012). As far as I am concerned, this is a compulsory starting point for feminist translato-logists: although not dealing explicitly with translation, the wide variety of feminist positions, identities and proposals converging in the linguistic arena (Cameron, 1995: 1), severely conditioned by cultural, political, and ethnic factors as well as personal experiences, requires the establishment of a transnational dialogue with a multilateral reception of different perspectives. This is the main point of departure for the brand-new Transnational Feminist Translation Studies (see Castro and Ergun, 2017, or Castro, Ergun, Flotow, and Spottur-no, 2020).

The classic positioning of mainstream linguistic feminism between the 1970s and 80s evolved from an original understanding of linguistic relations as gender-differentiated (Lakoff, 1975) to one of male dominance (see Spender, 1985), where considerable emphasis was placed on the etymological and metaphorical aspects of women's subjugation through semantics. For instance, Schulz's work (1995) offers an overview of the "semantic derogation" suffered by originally-neutral, women-applied nouns and adjectives. Daly (1978), on her part, goes as far as to embrace such degrading terminology as a liberating act for women. Especially relevant to this paper are studies focusing on the naming practices and metaphorical strategies applied to the female body and its processes (see Martin, 2020; Swann, 2014; Keller, 2006), a number of which draw on ancient and modern medical literature to survey context-specific, lexicon-embodied beliefs regarding female inferiority.

Finally, another key contribution of feminist linguistics lies in textuality, and particularly in critical discourse analysis (generally known as CDA, see Fairclough 2013 for an overview). Feminist approaches to this field (FCDA; Lazar, 2005) aim to underscore the surprisingly neglected importance of gender as a crucial dimension of social identity, without which the context-sensitive textual analysis encouraged by classical CDA remains incomplete. Here I follow Clare Walsh's FCDA

methodology (2001). In Walsh's contribution, a context-specific interpretation of textual products by an empowered, overtly ideological reader constitutes the so-called macro-level of FCDA, while the micro-textual dimension encompasses both the interpersonal and the ideational metafunctions, which I believe to be very useful for the sort of practices that allow women's knowledge to be structured. While the interpersonal metafunction focuses on both the identities present in the text and the relationships established between them, the ideational metafunction comprises the ideas, knowledge and beliefs contained in textual products, as well as their evaluation by both producer(s) and reader(s).

## 2.3. (Feminist) Translation studies and their relationship with translation history

From a chiefly historical perspective, several incursions have been made into translation (Gillman, 2017), knowledge (Foucault, 1969) and gender politics (Scott, 1999), illustrating the multidisciplinary approach to translation advocated by some translation scholars, as well as, in the particular case of translation history, the need to find a balance between the historian's methodological principles and the research interests characterising Translation Studies (see Rundle, 2012: 232).

In the 1990s, a branch of Canadian Translation Studies led by Jean Delisle made the first attempts to periodise translation, coinciding approximately with the institutionalisation of the discipline. More specifically, alongside Judith Woodsworth, Delisle edited *Translators through History* in 1995. Initially a francophone initiative, this new historiographical genre was soon emulated by English-speaking Canadian scholars such as Agnes Whitfield, who edited *Writing between the Lines: Portraits of Canadian Anglophone Translators* (2006), and feminist scholar Sherry Simon, who compiled the more intimate, almost biographic *In Translation: Honouring Sheila Fischman* (2013). Indeed, Simon's interest in female translators' biographies may also be observed in her well-known book *Gender in Translation: Cultural Identity and the Politics of Transmission* (1996: 39-82), which explains several female translators' work throughout history in terms of its links to their political, professional and emotional milieu. This trend was soon mediated by the same gender perspective that was crucial to the consolidation of Translation Studies (Karpinski, 2015: 23) taking place in Canada at that time. Thus, Delisle and Woodsworth's general positioning on history and translation gradually gave way to gendered perspectives in works such as *Portraits de traducteurs* (Delisle, 1999) and *Portraits de traductrices* (Delisle, 2002). Albeit less ambitious, Delisle's earlier article "Traducteurs médiévaux, traductrices féministes: une même éthique de la traduction?" (1993) is of particular interest to this paper given its pioneering role in comparing empowered medieval translation strategies and feminist ones. Five common traits between both sets of principles were identified:

1. The appropriation of the source text
2. The search for legitimation through translation

- 3. Explanatory, didactic prefaces
- 4. Linguistic interventionism
- 5. The translator’s visibility

In medieval times, both the physical production of manuscript copies and the mediation and reception of the original contents were dependent upon the hegemonic institution of the Church, and given the lack of opposition from a vastly illiterate population, knowledge filtering was monopolised by patriarchal/religious interests. Although Delisle does not discuss the dubious ethical stances held by most medieval translators, endangering the legitimacy of similar ideological strategies, his survey of the principles underpinning an empowered translation practice seem to point to a grey area between translation and editing practices, *transediting* (see Schäffner, 2012), and clearly reinforce the need for a gender-orientated history of translation to revisit our common assumptions about medieval women, medieval texts, and, of course, medieval knowledge transmission.

As this overview has shown, Canadian translato­logists acted as pioneers of feminist translation and were precocious in developing translation history, persisting in their inquiry with frequent updates such as Bastin and Bandia’s 2006 *Charting the Future of Translation History*, which played a crucial role in consolidating this area of study as a potential discipline. However, Anthony Pym’s 2014 work *Method in Translation History* may be viewed as equally essential to this consolidation. An expert in medieval translation who has consistently refuted the existence of the so-called School of Toledo, one of the main translation myths of medieval times, Pym draws again on Foucault’s archaeology (1969) to meticulously dissect previous contributions by Delisle, as well the foundational works of Descriptive Translation Studies (for instance, Toury, 2012) on the basis of their methodological limitations. Pym also lays the groundwork for the concept of translation regime, a notion taken from Political Studies (Ruggie, 1975) which transcends rigid systemic notions to reflect the fluidity of translational relations.

I would contend that Feminist Translation Studies (Castro and Ergun, 2017), a recently-coined term referring to contributions that accord the intersection between feminism and translation its rightful place in Translatology, has functioned as a critical branch of Translation History, albeit implicitly. Indeed, as Rundle argues, much of the progress made from broader perspectives on Translation Studies may equally be understood as a series of attempts to historicise translation (2012) and legitimise it as a science, as James Holmes, the founder of Descriptive Translation Studies, put it in a seminal article (see Holmes, 1975). I would even go as far as to state that, since the need to justify the term ‘science’ lies in the apparent lack of historical discourse on this practice, some scholars systematically mistake Translation History for Translation Studies. Others, as is unfortunately the case of some feminist translato­logists, believe that they can re-write textual tradition through vague applications of Foucault’s archaeology, devoid of methodology and clear objectives beyond the mere circulation of anti-canonic authors and texts. This certainly serves to explain the frequent critique

of anecdotalism aimed at feminist translation, with the struggle to establish periodisations based primarily on case studies and impressionist accounts of translation experiences (Robinson, 1999). It also accounts for the limited choice of periods in the historicisation of feminist translation practice. Inexplicably, our discipline has thus far disregarded the Late Middle Ages as a period of interest, despite it witnessing the invention of printing, the consolidation of European vernaculars, and the emergence of nationalisms, which were fundamental to individual identities and transnational exchanges.

**3. Key questions informing the historical (re-)construction of women’s knowledge: preliminary proposals for analysis based on the transmission and translation of the *Trotula* ensemble**

If we consider the contingency, historicity, and multiplicity of gender more deeply, there is a clear need to revisit textual conventions through a translational lens. Translation has been defined by feminists as a fruitful trope for the type of critical, intertextual discourse that brings consolidated voices and traditions under debate (Godard, 1989: 42). As an illustrative metaphor of feminist discourse, translation may create a revolutionary space for “new insights and subjects in process” (Godard, *op. cit.* 1989: 42), two key elements of this paper. Knowledge and (female) subjects, continuously reinventing themselves, may converge through language and textuality with several aspects relevant to my research: education and professional training in the Middle Ages, as well as medieval notions of corporal identity, maternity, and health. For the sake of clarity, I will narrow down these very complex topics to the following two questions and their related aspects:

- 1. The role of women in medieval times as voices of authority: female authors, translators, and editors. A fair recovery of these voices, as well as a proper dose of self-critique regarding existing attempts, requires comprehensive implementation of the frequently praised (but seldom applied) Foucauldian method in order to strive for a legitimising translation history.
- 2. Communication, gender, and sanitary professionals in late medieval England. There are serious limitations to an accurate, gender-centred discursive analysis of medieval textuality given the impossibility of fully recovering the linguistic habits, customs, and social constructs prevailing in past times, which are blurred to this day by the dominant, patriarchal discourses on history and knowledge (see, for instance, Gruwell, 2015; Ahl, 2004). Besides this, the fact that late-medieval originals were usually drafted/copied/compiled in Latin, often by multiple authors/editors, makes textual identities even more elusive due to a certain stiffness of language, used as a private code for the clergy. However, I consider it pertinent to apply the aforementioned FCDA metafunctions to struc-



ture a coherent study of voices, identities, and insights into gynaecological treatises.

In the following section, the methodological framework presented above will be interwoven with these three dimensions of the selected textual typologies, exemplified by five Middle English translations of the Trotula ensemble and their contemporary analysis. However, as I have stated from the outset, the goal of this paper is not to provide an exhaustive analysis of the manuscripts but rather to underscore the potential of my methodological proposal in developing an effective, gender-informed history of translation.

#### 4. Preliminary steps toward a feminist textual archaeology of the *Trotula* ensemble

##### 4.1. The role of women in medieval times as voices of authority: female authors, translators, editors

Gathering evidence on women's intellectual and professional practices has been identified by several feminist translator scholars as an important exercise in their revision of Foucault's method of the archaeology of knowledge (Godayol, 2011; Vidal Claramonte, 1998). It involves challenging the belief that women have failed to achieve cultural prominence in their societies because they have traditionally been expected to stay away from knowledge and books. Indeed, much of the damage to Trota's legacy was unconsciously inflicted by the very same works attempting to unveil it, conditioned by the still-prevailing, condescending tone of all scientific discourse aimed at constructing so-called *feminist epistemologies* (for the original concept, see Alcoff and Potter, 1993).

During the Late Middle Ages and the early Renaissance, misleading acts of tolerance toward affluent women's intellectuality were exerted precisely through translation. At the time, the slow but steady consolidation of vernacular languages and the emergence of the first national identities encouraged translational activity. However, given a predominant, Bible-inspired fidelity to the source text as the basis for interlinguistic equivalence (Tymoczko, 2009: 34) and the preference for pious works as a harmless source of personal growth, women's translational activity was intended to reinforce the gender constructs prevailing at the time (Simon, 1996: 47).

Editing was a slightly different practice. Like translation, it was a theoretically reproductive activity initially conceived of as devoid of corruption until crucial differences between the two activities were identified. Unlike women's translating, which was mostly a hobby, editing was a financially beneficial operation requiring means of production, a respectable, and therefore visible name, and a solid reputation (see Hurley and Goodblatt, 2014: xi). It also conferred a certain power over the author, which was obviously missing in women's translation practice. This triggered second thoughts among the patriarchal elites about tolerating women-run printing houses and periodicals (see Convoy, 2004: 118). Women continued to work under their fathers', husbands', brothers', or sons' publishing

names, but their work, as in most professions, remained invisible.

Much of what we believe to know about ancient texts is based on the intuitions of the first (mostly male) editors and commentators in early modern times (see Long, 2010: 63), who engaged in the onerous task of organising medieval knowledge, which was often the only source available for recovering Greco-Roman epistemologies. In this regard, González-Gutiérrez (2018) identifies two distinct sources of gender prejudice in her analysis of the androcentric bias of the Trotula commentators, which, surprisingly, remain active even in recent works. The first is the "fallacy of exception" (2018: 58), implying that the archaeological obsession with seeking out the very first woman to operate in male-dominated fields has actually prevented researchers from documenting the existence of female genealogies of knowledge in ancient times. There must have been a considerable number of women professionals devoted to prestigious activities in the Late Middle Ages, who, nevertheless, operated on the margins of their fields. In the case of female medical practitioners, they even acquired a degree of vertebration, as epistemological networks like the one Trota de Ruggiero belonged to suggest. Her community of praxis was often referred to as the *mulieres salernitane*, based at the prestigious Medical School of Salerno, and despite Green's assertion that theirs was a merely practical, nursing-profile skill (1997: 58), there is reason to believe they were reasonably prepared practitioners, occasionally encountering challenging medical cases.

The second source of androcentric bias mentioned by González-Gutiérrez is the "Matilda Complex" (2018: 60, a term coined by Rossiter 1993), which mirrors the male-centred "Matthew Effect" (Merton 1968). While the latter has been defined as the tendency to attribute relevant scientific contributions to each generation's most celebrated scientists, the former refers not only to this same perception of female-authored advancements (the obsession with the "first woman" in every discipline causes others to be overlooked), but also to the attribution of women's work to men in their entourage. In Trota of Salerno's case, absurd as it may seem, it was common for commentators to deny her historical existence until quite recently. The winning strategy used by patriarchal historiographers has been to constantly question the authorship of her treatises on the grounds that, in a profoundly misogynistic society like hers, women's access to knowledge and its transmission was difficult. Surprisingly, the evidence for certain statements provided by scholars today is often not much more solid. For instance, in what she calls a "search for the 'authentic' Women's medicine" (2008<sup>a</sup>), Green presents a reasonable hypothesis on the potentially distinct authorship observed in the three manuscripts composing the Trotula ensemble, namely *Conditions of Women (Liber de Sinthomatibus Mulierum)*; *Treatments for Women (De Curis Mulierum)*; and *Women's Cosmetics (De Ornatu Mulierum)*. However, a radical statement follows without further clarification: according to the scholar, only *De curis mulieribus* can be considered Trota's work, although she is extremely cautious in her affirmation: "According to my analyses, one of the three Trotula texts (pace Benton) does [original

italics] derive from the work of the historic Trota” (1999: 50, in González-Gutiérrez, 2018: 62).

Like other female names captured by textual history, such as those of Hildegard von Bingen (1098-1179) and Perreta Peronne (dates unknown)<sup>4</sup>, Trota’s creative identity and direct authorship were deliberately condemned to oblivion. It is believed that the original material composing what is known as the Trotula ensemble was produced by the end of the 12th century and compiled around the beginning of the 13th century. According to Green (1998), the first ensemble was composed of three different works of apparently separate origin. The main work, also known as *Trotula Maior*, was *Conditions of Women (De Pasionibus mulierum curandorum)*, while the other two, *Treatments for Women (De Curis Mulierum)*, and *Women’s Cosmetics (De Ornato Mulierum)*, are usually referred to as *Trotula Minor*. While the other two manuscripts were considered anonymous, relying on ancient sources from well-known male physicians and consolidated medical traditions from ancient times, only *Treatments for Women* was presented by earlier mediators as Trota’s work. It is believed to have stemmed from *Practica secundum Trotam*, which Benton (1985) identified as a third-person account by someone in Trota’s entourage. The author of this *Practica* is generally assumed to be a male physician (Green, 1998), although none of the evidence presented in the available sources backs this assumption.

What remains clear is that both medieval editors and translators held considerable responsibility for the huge task of anonymising female authorship in the dominant discourse. Indeed, they were the main articulators of this discourse through their prefaces, footnotes, and sets of glosses, where much of the linguistic evolution perpetuating gender inequality took place. *Treatments for Women* explicitly presents Trota of Salerno as the source of the knowledge gathered by this unknown hand. It even makes reference to Trota’s expertise by deeming her “quasi magistra” and praising her ability to solve cases for which her male peers had found no remedy (Green, 2008<sup>b</sup>: 58). However, an effective process of derogation operating on female intellectual identities, deliberately mixing truth with legend, was launched by medieval and modern mediators, and closely followed by contemporary scholars, whose archaeological, genealogical, and therefore ethical considerations have been contaminated by patriarchal notions of (authorial) identity, disguised, nevertheless, as methodological neutrality. One example thereof can be found in *Making Women’s Medicine Masculine: The Rise of Male Authority in Pre-Modern Gynaecology* (Green, 2008<sup>b</sup>), which pursues the most respectable goal of establishing lost genealogical connections between female professionals. According to this work, in late medieval France, Charles V, who possessed a Latin original of the Trotula ensemble, requested a French translation to be produced and added to the royal collection of medical treatises, perhaps due to the monarch’s infertility, a topic dealt with in detail in the manuscripts. At best, this constitutes a preliminary line of research towards an archaeological approach to translation history. However, it is my belief that several crucial aspects have been overlooked in the account of this archival addition. Firstly,

a rather sparse, anecdotal introduction to the status of female practitioners in late medieval France is provided, which leaves patriarchal claims against them mostly undisputed. Thus, the “evidence” of female surgeon Perretta Petone’s illiteracy and medical ignorance, for which she stood trial against the Parisian corporation of surgeons, is simply accepted without challenge. Secondly, given the consideration of infertility and reproduction as “women’s subjects” (see Green, 2008) of dubious scientific importance, the implications of the king’s personal interest in this book should have been further explored. Although his offspring were a state matter, serious doubts arise as to whether the translation of this treatise was for personal consumption. Given that the king of France was surely capable of reading the original in Latin, the translation of the Trotula ensemble could have been requested for his wife, to whom reproductive difficulties may have been attributed to avoid casting doubt on royal masculinity.

In conclusion, as several studies across different historical periods demonstrate (see Wei, 2010; Dagbovie, 2004; and Maidment, 1990), “neutral” academic discourse and methodology have been systematically defined and controlled by the patriarchy, due in particular to the major role played by male editors and translators in crucial periods of language formation and knowledge consolidation such as the one addressed here. Besides the inevitable limitations put in place by patriarchal transmission channels, which appear to grant many the perfect excuse for inaction, a fundamental step toward the revision of textual archaeology, genealogy, and ethics where women are concerned requires a parallel reconsideration of scholarly principles and research standards, as I have argued in this subsection.

#### 4.2. Communication, gender, and sanitary professionals in late medieval England

This section presents some potential lines of inquiry for the application of a more contemporary, gender-focused method, enabling the study of medieval textuality from a more enriching perspective: FCDA (see subsection 2.2.). Given the difficulties experienced by discourse analysis experts in drawing solid conclusions on contemporary textual matter, the problems are all the more severe when reconstructing the distant communicative context of the medieval treatises, when writing, editing, and translating were a privilege of patriarchal institutions and texts were subjected to constant reworking, granting little or no credit to previous sources. Further complexities lie in the fact that, at least in Trota of Salerno’s times, culture was still exclusively transmitted in Latin, with the exception of anonymous explanatory/translational glosses. Understandably, it is an even more difficult task to identify the identities, voices and profiles operating a consolidation of knowledge (and linguistic use) in the original treatises through late medieval translations.

Given these issues, why is a methodology like feminist critical discourse analysis appropriate? In my view, the key to the applicability of FCDA in this context is its conception of an empowered reader/exegete, explicitly stating his/her identity and reflecting on the repercussions of this identity for the pur-

pose of textual analysis. In the particular case of late medieval translations of gynaecological treatises, a Foucauldian deconstruction of textual meaning makes particular sense, as the limitations to full understanding of the agents operating in the treatises are already too high. Therefore, an ideologically explicit reconstruction of the object of study appears to be more appropriate for the archaeological phase than claiming an impossible neutrality when describing the object of study. Similarly, the contemporary scholar's ideological attitudes and research goals prove crucial in the genealogical and ethical stages.

A falsely optimistic search for historical truth is typical of patriarchal epistemology (see Canning 1994). As we have contended, traditional academic discourse and methodology have been based on the misleading, prescriptive standards promoted by the patriarchy to guarantee its survival, presenting their biased outcome as universal and true beyond any reasonable doubt. By contrast, when patriarchal authorities operate on knowledge, interventionism and manipulation are clearly observed to have predominated (see 4.2.). As a result, according to Delisle (1993), the empowering principles espoused by feminist translation scholars have echoed many of the operating premises of patriarchal epistemological reconstruction. One example may be found in Flotow's classification of feminist translation strategies (1991: 74-80). Like late medieval authors, feminists shall mediate knowledge through supplementations (and omissions). Similarly to patriarchal interventions on female-related discourse, they shall overtly interfere in discourse and terminology, this time in favour of feminist interests. In the case of medieval female medical treatises, special attention shall be paid to the female body and its processes. Just as any scientific progress potentially threatening patriarchal supremacy was obscured through pedagogical/indoctrinating prefacing and footnoting (glosses), the opposite shall be true of feminist translators, acting as subversive commentators of patriarchal epistemological beliefs. Finally, as the patriarchy has appropriated women authors' work, feminists may consider a full re-appropriation of gathered sources through hijacking.

In the following lines, I will apply the aforementioned FCDA methodology (Walsh 2001) to my survey of potentially research-relevant aspects of the intersections between gender/professional realities and gender/communication at the macro-(co-/con-text) and micro-textual level (interpersonal/ ideational meta-functions) respectively. This will be exemplified by a number of dimensions of the Trotula ensemble and compared with existing studies addressing them. As the paper observes, the intersections mentioned cannot be analysed without constant reference to the "originals" (if they can be considered so, since the degree of intertextuality hampers such consideration) and their progressive consolidation.

Regarding the macro-textual level, the contextual dimension must be considered for one very powerful reason: our knowledge of late medieval society stems from the historical perceptions of patriarchal commentators, most of whom have pieced together non-contemporary, biased accounts, re-establishing the connections between gender and knowledge, gender and education, and gender and reproduction. Despite the lack of

substantial evidence for or against them, some statements are presented as self-sufficient truths on the nature of gender relations and their relationship with the healthcare professions. In the public network of medical knowledge in Trotula's time, gynaecological matters were generally considered to be of little relevance to medieval experts given the low number of treatises devoted to them in full. As a result, the unique nature of the Trotula ensemble as a monothematic handbook on reproductive health has been frequently underscored (see Green, 2002). Yet, if this subject was only of interest to old, ignorant midwives unable to read or write, why would contemporary and subsequent commentators try to anonymise it or even disguise its authorship as male? Why would Hans Caspar Wolf (16th century) change the explicit feminine identity of the name Trotula for the masculine Eros (the name of a very peculiar male god devoted to love), entitling it *The book of women's matters of Eros, physician and freedman of Julia, whom some have absurdly named 'Trotula'*? Why would medical students in 15th-century England and Central Europe use it as a reference in their education (Green, 2008<sup>b</sup>: 279)? Why would Charles V of France, as explained above, care to hold two copies in his archive, one Latin original and one translation, and trust old witches' tales to improve his chances of reproduction? Although it was essentially women's business, was reproduction not a matter over which the patriarchy had to exercise control to ensure its perpetuation?

If we examine the source texts and the late medieval English versions, the co-textual dimension is also crucial in order to appreciate the positioning of different societies on the matter during different periods. It is also illustrative of how editing procedures mediate in ideologies, supplementing empowered translation practices. On the one hand, the Latin originals, whose evolution has been surveyed by Green (1997), display several gender-relevant anomalies. As explained above (see subsection 4.1.), an unknown editor was responsible for compiling three apparently autonomous texts, only one of which had previously been attributed to Trotula of Salerno, under the titles of *Trotula Maior* and *Trotula Minor*. Throughout the evolution of the manuscript, the notion that the title related to its alleged author's name was progressively blurred, to the extent that the prologue to one variant of the ensemble portrayed *Trotula Maior* and *Trotula Minor* as a mother and a daughter, both prostitutes, whose knowledge of female reproductive health had been obtained through dishonourable practices during trips around the world. Co-text as the result of active mediation strategies has also been neglected in the characterisation of some of the Middle English translations commissioned by physicians. A relevant example is that of John Twyne, a physician born in Canterbury, who ordered a new translation of the manuscripts to be combined with other documents of a less scientific nature regarding astrology, among other pseudo-sciences. The doctor's request makes co-text indispensable to interpret the nature of his disregard for the scientificity of the Trotula, which he probably believed useful in predicting the gender of unborn children (Barratt, 2001: 12). As stated above, reproduction is indispensable for the perpetuation of the patriarchy and



its interest in male-gendered offspring might account for much of the curiosity around conception.

With regard to the micro-textual level, I have mentioned two relevant sub-functions from Welsh's methodology in the previous section: the interpersonal and the ideational. The interpersonal sub-function appears relevant to a thorough analysis of the identities present in the text, whatever their contribution to the communicative situation created. An important trait of translators' intentionality in existing late medieval translations into English is their portrayal of a multiplicity of female readers from a professional and socioeconomic perspective. As Barratt indicates (2001: 4), explicit vocatives addressed to midwives appear to suggest that this knowledge was specifically intended to assist them in deliveries, as well as indicating that they were literate, regardless of the image that the dominant discourse has endeavoured to convey. Are these then the same ignorant, dangerous domestic practitioners mocked and sued by surgeon unions, when translated treatises of this complexity were aimed at them? A second aspect mentioned by the same author (Barratt, 2001: 16) relates to the translation of *Women's Cosmetics* in the Oxford MS Bodley 483 version. Here, the translator applies a supplementation strategy in order to provide low-cost alternatives to cosmetic recipes originally conceived for high-class women, which, again, suggests that not all 15th-century English women who read or had access to these treatises were aristocrats. Indeed, with this observation, Barratt appears to confirm my suspicion that a private, domestic network for the transmission of female knowledge between different social groups of women existed, from the exchange of this type of manuscripts as gifts between aristocratic women (whose names are frequently listed in the prologues) to reading sessions among more and less educated practitioners, who would carry portable versions of the Trotula with them (Barratt, 2001: 12).

To conclude this survey of potential lines of analysis, I would like to briefly reflect on the ideational sub-function, which encompasses the set of beliefs and insights developed by different mediators as faithful representatives of their time. Here I must refer to the differences between the hundreds of Latin versions disseminated throughout Europe. Translation does not only take place between different languages. Otherwise, given the status of Latin as a language of culture throughout the more than ten centuries of the Middle Ages, one would not be able to appreciate any shifts in the linguistic, social, political or ideological dimensions of the constantly reappropriated material. The 'original' Trotula ensemble contained a series of contraceptive methods that were feasible at that time, which were subject to censorship by some of the mediators of the manuscript, almost certainly for ideological reasons. A second source of censorship, which was applied in the English and other vernacular translations of the ensemble, were the metaphorical euphemisms employed to discuss menstruation (plainly expressed in the Latin word *menses*) through feminine images based on nature such as *flour/floure/flower*, the late medieval form of 'flower' (see Barratt, 2001: 151). If analysed in depth, this terminological dimension of gynaecological knowledge may considerably clarify the attitudes of medical-trained individuals

Apunte. Carboncillo, 15 cm x 18 cm



toward female secretions and corporal processes considered impious, any potential deviations from which might be significant of a gender-related positioning over time.

## 5. Conclusion

As a scholarly activity, feminist discourse has been defined by Barbara Godard as "(...) une pratique émancipatoire, un discours politique orientée autour de la construction de nouveaux savoirs et des sujets en procès" (1989: 42). The goal of the discussion presented here is deconstructive, aiming to portray scholarly efforts as a virtually never-ending source of enquiry that can never be fully neutral. In mainstream academia, there is a tendency to delegitimise explicitly subjective approaches such as feminism on account of their blatant refusal of scientific neutrality. By virtue of this alleged neutrality, of which only hegemonic voices are seemingly capable, academic discourses are conceived as the transparent frame of truth, disavowing any form of knowledge that contradicts dominant social values. In my personal academic experience, taking a feminist stance on matters widely discussed in well-established disciplines, such as the discipline selected for this paper, is still sometimes perceived as excessively subjective and *personal*. On one occasion, my proposal for a volume on medieval history and translation was sent to a reviewer who, despite ultimately recommending its publication, saw fit to discuss why he took issue with my agency, drawing conclusions and passing judgement on matters of personal rather than academic identity, including, surprisingly enough, efforts to determine whether or not I was a woman. While he viewed feminism as a "paranoid tendency" towards knowledge, this very personal understanding of research led him to ultimately rule himself out as an appropriate reviewer for my work, since, as he explained, he was "a man".



This anecdote, which could easily be 40 years old, is nevertheless a recollection from 2019. It demonstrates how certain assessments, which constantly conflate personal identities with academic positions, are often no less subjective than the feminist attitudes under scrutiny.

As the final step in a Foucauldian quest for knowledge, “ethics” is aimed at questioning the previous two stages, “archaeology” and “genealogy”, traditionally believed to involve a search for and impartial organisation of self-evident data. As recently suggested, a shift from Translation to *Translator Studies* (Chessterman, 2009), or, from a broader perspective, perhaps *Mediator Studies*, may be due in order to problematise the subtle traces of past mediation procedures, the social and ideological contextualisation of which remains a challenge. Such an approach would also allow for increasing self-critique of our own scientific attitudes towards certain objects of study. Epistemic methodologies developed by dominant institutions, especially in prestigious and long-established fields, continue to operate under outdated regimes of intolerance towards difference in its multiple forms (ethnic, social, economic, educational, political, ideological, etc.). In this regard, as I have argued, gender may act as an intersectional space of enquiry, questioning even those academic procedures that often fall off the radar of political correctness due to their anonymous, subsidiary nature. May this paper at least suggest to its readers the need to systematically revise the considerations, principles, and methods applied to our constant mediation of inherited knowledge and textuality. In this way, our task as scrutinisers of other academic texts may fruitfully enrich the present, still burdened by patriarchal rules of transfer.

### Notes

1. I would like to thank the Conselleria d' Educació, Cultura i Esport (Generalitat Valenciana) for enabling this research to take place through a predoctoral fellowship (ACIF, Val+ID programme) funded by the European Social Fund.
2. Since the late 20th century, feminist historians have adopted a Foucauldian approach to history. Their revisionism views official historiographic sources not as a universal truth, but as a politicised set of discourses uttered by different patriarchal societies across time and space. For more details, see Canning 1994.
3. For a historian's perspective on this matter, see Scott 1999. In our field, both Simon (1996) and Flotow (2016) have made relevant contributions, while Godayol 2011 writes more specifically on the implementation of Foucauldian archaeology in feminist translation.
4. Comprehensive reviews of these figures may be found in Green 1989 and Brooke 1993, among others.

### References

Ahl, Helene (2004): *The scientific reproduction of gender inequality: A discourse analysis of research texts on women's entrepreneurship*. Stockholm: Liber.

Alcoff, Linda, and Elizabeth Potter (1993): *Feminist Epistemologies*: New York [etc.]: Routledge.

Andone, Oana-Helena (2002): «Gender issues in translation», *Perspectives: studies in translatology*, 10 (2): 135-150. <<https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/0907676X.2002.9961439>> [accessed: 21.v.2021].

Barratt, Alexandra (2001): “*The Knowing of Woman's Kind in Childing*”: A Middle English Version of Material Derived from the Trotula and Other Sources (Medieval Women: Texts and Contexts 4). Turnhout: Brepols.

Beer, Jeanette (ed.) (1997): *Translation Theory and Practice in the Middle Ages* (Studies in Medieval Culture 38). Kalamazoo: Western Michigan University.

Belle, M. A. and Brenda M. Hosington (2017): «Translation, History and Print: A Model for the Study of Printed Translations in Early Modern Britain», *Translation Studies*, 10 (1): 2-21. <<https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/14781700.2016.1213184>> [accessed: 21.v.2021].

Benton, J. F. (1985): «Trotula, Women's Problems, and the Professionalization of Medicine in the Middle Ages», *Bulletin of the history of medicine*, 59 (1): 30-53. <<https://www.jstor.org/stable/44452036>> [accessed: 21.v.2021].

Blamires, Alcuin; C.W. Marx, and Karen Pratt (1992): *Woman Defamed and Woman Defended: An Anthology of Medieval Text*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Brooke, Elisabeth (1993): *Women healers through history*. Toronto: Women's Press.

Brown, Hilary (2018): «Rethinking Agency and Creativity: Translation, Collaboration and Gender in Early Modern Germany», *Translation Studies*, 11 (1): 84-102. <<https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/14781700.2017.1300103>> [accessed: 21.v.2021].

Cabré i Pairet, M. Montserrat (1996): *La Cura Del Cos Femení i La Medicina Medieval De Tradició Llatina* (Doctoral Thesis). Barcelona: Publicacions Universitat de Barcelona.

Cameron, Deborah (1995): *The Feminist Critique of Language: A Reader*. London; New York: Routledge.

Campbell, Julie (2007): *Literary Circles and Gender in Early Modern Europe: A Cross-Cultural Approach*. Farmham: Ashgate Publishing Ltd.

Canning, Kathleen (1994): «Feminist history after the linguistic turn: Historicizing discourse and experience», *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 19 (2): 368-404. <<https://www.journals.uchicago.edu/doi/abs/10.1086/494888>> [accessed: 21.v.2021].

Castro, Olga (2012): «Introduction: Gender, language and translation at the crossroads of disciplines», *Gender and Language*, 7 (1): 5-12. <<https://journal.equinoxpub.com/GL/article/view/11524>> [accessed: 21.v.2021].

Castro, Olga and Emek Ergun (eds.) (2017): *Feminist translation studies: Local and transnational perspectives*. Taylor & Francis.

Castro, Olga, et al. (2020): «Towards transnational feminist translation studies», *Mutatis Mutandis*, 13 (1): 2-10. <<https://revistas.udea.edu.co/index.php/mutatismutandis/article/view/341249/0>> [accessed: 21.v.2021].

- Chamberlain, Lori (1988): «Gender and the Metaphorics of Translation», *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 13 (3): 454-472. <[https://www.jstor.org/stable/3174168?seq=1#metadata\\_info\\_tab\\_contents](https://www.jstor.org/stable/3174168?seq=1#metadata_info_tab_contents)> [accessed: 21. v. 2021].
- Chance, Jane (2007): *The Literary Subversions of Medieval Women*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Chedzoy, Kate; Melanie Hansen, and Suzanne Trill (1998): *Voicing Women: Gender and Sexuality in Early Modern Writing*. Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press.
- Chesterman, A. (2009): «The Name and Nature of Translator Studies», *HERMES - Journal of Language and Communication in Business*, 22 (42): 13-22. <<https://tidsskrift.dk/her/article/view/96844>> [accessed: 21. v. 2021].
- Classen, Albrecht (2012): *The Power of Woman's Voice in Medieval and Early Modern Literatures: New Approaches to German and European Women Writers and to Violence Against Women in Premodern Times*. Berlin; New York: De Gruyter.
- Conboy, Martin (2004): *Journalism: A Critical History*. Sage.
- Dagbovie, Pero Gaglo (2004): «Black women historians from the late 19th century to the dawning of the civil rights movement», *The Journal of African American History*, 89(3): 241-261. <[https://www.jstor.org/stable/4134077?seq=1#metadata\\_info\\_tab\\_contents](https://www.jstor.org/stable/4134077?seq=1#metadata_info_tab_contents)> [accessed: 21. v. 2021].
- Daly, Mary (1978): *Gyn/ecology: The metaethics of radical feminism*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Delisle, Jean (1993) : «Traducteurs médiévaux, traductrices féministes : une même éthique de la traduction ?», *TTR : traduction, terminologie, rédaction* 6 (1): 203-230. <<https://www.erudit.org/fr/revues/ttr/1993-v6-n1-ttr1478/0371444ar/>> [accessed: 21. v. 2021].
- Delisle, Jean and Judith Woodsworth (eds.) (1995): *Translators through History*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Delisle, Jean (1999): *Portraits de traducteurs*. University of Ottawa Press.
- Delisle, Jean (2002): *Portraits de traductrices*. University of Ottawa Press.
- Downs, Laura Lee (2004): *Writing Gender History*. London: Hodder Arnold.
- Fairclough, Norman (2013): «Critical discourse analysis», in James Paul Gee and Michael Handford (eds.): *The Routledge Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. London; New York: Routledge.
- Gillman, Susan (2017): «Translation as History/History as Failure», *American Literary History*, 29 (3): 592-601. <<https://academic.oup.com/alh/article-abstract/29/3/592/4037331?redirectedFrom=fulltext>> [accessed: 21. v. 2021].
- Godard, Barbara (1989): «Theorizing feminist discourse/translation», *Tessera*. <<https://tessera.journals.yorku.ca/index.php/tessera/article/view/23583>> [accessed: 21. v. 2021].
- Godayol-Nogué, Pilar (2011): «Gender and translation in Catalan: archaeological groundwork for assessing the state of affairs», *MonTI. Monografías de Traducción e Interpretación*, 3: 53-73. <<http://repositori.uji.es/xmlui/handle/10234/38282>> [accessed: 21. v. 2021].
- Green, Monica H. (1989): «Women's medical practice and health care in Medieval Europe», *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 14 (2): 434-473. <[https://www.jstor.org/stable/3174557?seq=1#metadata\\_info\\_tab\\_contents](https://www.jstor.org/stable/3174557?seq=1#metadata_info_tab_contents)> [accessed: 21. v. 2021].
- Green, Monica H. (1997): «A Handlist of Latin and Vernacular Manuscripts of the so-Called Trotula Texts, II, Vernacular Manuscripts», *Scriptorium*, 51 (1): 80-104. <[https://www.academia.edu/5987673/Monica\\_H\\_Green\\_A\\_Handlist\\_of\\_the\\_Latin\\_and\\_Vernacular\\_Manuscripts\\_of\\_the\\_So\\_Called\\_Trotula\\_Texts\\_Part\\_II\\_The\\_Vernacular\\_Texts\\_and\\_Latin\\_Re\\_Writings\\_Scriptorium\\_51\\_1997\\_80\\_104](https://www.academia.edu/5987673/Monica_H_Green_A_Handlist_of_the_Latin_and_Vernacular_Manuscripts_of_the_So_Called_Trotula_Texts_Part_II_The_Vernacular_Texts_and_Latin_Re_Writings_Scriptorium_51_1997_80_104)> [accessed: 21. v. 2021].
- Green, Monica H. (2000): «From 'Diseases of Women' to 'Secrets of Women': The Transformation of Gynecological Literature in the Later Middle Ages», *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies*, 30 (1): 5-39. <<https://muse.jhu.edu/article/16454>> [accessed: 21. v. 2021].
- Green, Monica H. (2000<sup>b</sup>): *The Trotula: An English Translation of the Medieval Compendium of Women's Medicine*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Green, Monica H. (2008<sup>a</sup>): «In Search of an 'Authentic' women's medicine: the strange fates of Trota of Salerno and Hildegard of Bingen», *Dynamis: Acta Hispanica ad Medicinae Scientiarumque Historiam Illustrandam*, 19: 25-54. <<https://ddd.uab.cat/pub/dynamis/02119536v19/02119536v19p25.pdf>> [accessed: 21. v. 2021].
- Green, Monica H. (2008<sup>b</sup>): *Making Women's Medicine Masculine: The Rise of Male Authority in Pre-Modern Gynaecology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gruwell, Leigh (2015): «Wikipedia's politics of exclusion: Gender, epistemology, and feminist rhetorical (in) action», *Computers and Composition*, 37: 117-131. <<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S875546151000547>> [accessed: 21. v. 2021].
- González Gutiérrez, Patricia (2018): «Cuando solo nos queda enseñar las cartas: sesgos androcéntricos en el análisis de la vida de Trota de Ruggiero», *Nomadias.Feminista*, 25: 55-67. <<https://nomadias.uchile.cl/index.php/NO/article/view/51505>> [accessed: 21. v. 2021].
- Holmes, James S. (1975): «The name and nature of translation studies». Amsterdam: Translation Studies Section, Department of General Literary Studies, University of Amsterdam. <<https://www.tau.ac.il/tarbut/tirgum/holmes75.htm>> [accessed: 21. v. 2021].
- Hurley, Ann Hollinshead and Chanita Goodblatt (2009): *Women Editing/Editing Women: Early Modern Women Writers and the New Textualism*. Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Jakobson, Roman (1959): «On Linguistic Aspects of Translation», *Harvard Studies in Comparative Literature*, 23: 232. <<https://web.stanford.edu/~eckert/PDF/jakobson.pdf>> [accessed: 21. v. 2021].

- Joan, de R.; Manuel Dies de Calataiud, and Pope John XXI (xvth century) and Miquel i Planas (ed.): *Trotula De Mestre Johan: Speculum Al Foderi. Flos Del Tresor De Beutat. Thesaurus Pauperum*. Barcelona.
- Karpinski, Eva C. (2015): «Gender, genetics, translation: Encounters in the Feminist Translator's Archive of Barbara Godard», *Linguistica Antverpiensia, New Series-Themes in Translation Studies*, 14: 19-39. <<https://lans-tts.uantwerpen.be/index.php/LANS-TTS/article/view/365>> [accessed: 21. v. 2021].
- Keller, Eve (2006): *Generating Bodies and Gendered Selves: The Rhetoric of Reproduction in Early Modern England*. Seattle: University of Washington Press.
- Lakoff, Robin (1975): «Linguistic theory and the real world», *Language Learning*, 25 (2): 309-338. <<https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/j.1467-1770.1975.tb00249.x>> [accessed: 21. v. 2021].
- Lazar, Michelle (ed.) (2005): *Feminist critical discourse analysis: Gender, power and ideology in discourse*. Springer.
- Long, L. (2010): «Medieval Literature through the Lens of Translation Theory Bridging the Interpretive Gap», *Translation Studies*, 3 (1): 61-77. <<https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/14781700903338680?journalCode=rtrs20>> [accessed: 21. v. 2021].
- Maidment, Brian E. (1990): «Victorian periodicals and academic discourse», in Laurel Brake, Aled Jones, and Lionel Madden (eds.): *Investigating Victorian Journalism*. Springer.
- Martin, Emily (2020): «Medical metaphors of women's bodies: menstruation and menopause», in Elizabeth Fee and Nancy Krieger (eds.): *Women's health, politics, and power: Essays on sex/gender, medicine, and public health*. London; New York: Routledge.
- Merton, Robert K. (1968): «The Matthew effect in science: The reward and communication systems of science are considered», *Science*, 159 (3810): 56-63. <<https://science.sciencemag.org/content/159/3810/56>> [accessed: 21. v. 2021].
- Pym, Anthony (2014): *Method in translation history*. London; New York: Routledge.
- Robinson, D. (1999): «Nine Theses About Anecdotalism in the Study of Translation (With Special Reference to Sherry Simon, Ed., Culture in Transit)», *Meta*, 44 (2): 402-408. <<https://www.erudit.org/fr/revues/meta/1999-v44-n2-meta167/003966ar.pdf>> [accessed: 21. v. 2021].
- Ruggie, John G. (1975): «International responses to technology: concepts and trends», *International organization*, 29 (3): 557-583. <[https://scholar.harvard.edu/files/john-ruggie/files/international\\_responses\\_to\\_technology.pdf](https://scholar.harvard.edu/files/john-ruggie/files/international_responses_to_technology.pdf)> [accessed: 21. v. 2021].
- Rundle, C. (2012): «Translation as an Approach to History», *Translation Studies*, 5 (2): 232-40. <<https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/14781700.2012.663615>> [accessed: 21. v. 2021].
- Schäffner, Christina (2012): «Rethinking transediting», *Meta*, 57 (4): 866-883. <<https://www.erudit.org/fr/revues/meta/2012-v57-n4-meta01064/1021222ar.pdf>> [accessed: 21. v. 2021].
- Schaus, Margaret (2006): *Women and Gender in Medieval Europe: An Encyclopedia*. London; New York: Routledge.
- Schulz, Muriel (1995): «The semantic derogation of women», in Deborah Cameron (ed.): *The Feminist Critique of Language: A Reader*. London; New York: Routledge.
- Scott, Joan W. (1999): *Gender and the Politics of History*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Simon, Sherry (1996): *Gender in translation: Cultural identity and the politics of transmission*. London; New York: Routledge.
- Simon, Sherry (ed.) (2013): *In Translation: Honouring Sheila Fischman*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's Press-MQUP.
- Spender, Dale (1985): *Man Made Language*. London; New York: Routledge.
- Swann, Alaya (2014): *Childbirth and Midwifery in the Religious Rhetoric of England, 1300-1450* (Doctoral Thesis). Arizona: Arizona State University.
- Tannen, Deborah (1994): *Gender and discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Toury, Gideon (2012): *Descriptive translation studies—and beyond: Revised Edition* (Vol. 100). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Tymoczko, Maria (2009): «Translation, ethics and ideology in a violent globalizing world», in Esperanza Bielsa (ed.): *Globalization, political violence and translation*: London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Tymoczko, Maria (2010<sup>a</sup>): *Enlarging Translation, Empowering Translators*. Manchester: St. Jerome.
- Tymoczko, Maria (2010<sup>b</sup>): «Western metaphorical discourses implicit in translation studies», in James St. André (ed.): *Thinking through translation with metaphors*. London; New York: Routledge.
- Vidal Claramonte, Carmen África (1998): *El futuro de la traducción: últimas teorías, nuevas aplicaciones*. Valencia: Alfons el Magnànim.
- Von Flotow, Luise (1991): «Feminist translation: contexts, practices and theories», *TR: traduction, terminologie, rédaction*, 4 (2): 69-84. <<https://www.erudit.org/en/journals/ttr/1991-v4-n2-ttr1475/037094ar/>> [accessed: 21. v. 2021].
- Von Flotow, Luise (2016): *Translation and Gender: Translating in the 'era of Feminism'*. London; New York: Routledge.
- Walsh, Clare (2001): *Gender and discourse: Language and power in politics, the church and organisations*. London; New York: Routledge.
- Wei, Ian P. (2010): «Gender and sexuality in medieval academic discourse: marriage problems in Parisian quodlibets», *Mediaevalia*, 31: 5-34. <<http://www.sunypress.edu/p-5261-mediaevalia-volume-31-issue-1-72011.aspx>> [Accessed 21. v. 2021].
- Whitfield, Agnes (ed.) (2006): *Writing Between the Lines: Portraits of Canadian Anglophone Translators*. Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier Univ. Press.