

Unmatched Femininitives in a Corpus of Bulgarian and Ukrainian Parallel Texts

Olena Siruk

Institute of Mathematics
and Informatics
Bulgarian Academy of Sciences
olebosi@gmail.com

Ivan Derzhanski

Institute of Mathematics
and Informatics
Bulgarian Academy of Sciences
iad58g@gmail.com

Abstract

Femininitives are formed and used in all Slavic languages, but the productivity of their formation and the intensity of their use are not the same everywhere. They are often subject to various intralinguistic and extralinguistic restrictions. In this paper we present a study of femininitives based on a parallel Bulgarian–Ukrainian corpus, with a focus on those occasions on which a feminine in one language corresponds to a masculine (rarely neuter) noun in the other. The experiment shows that Bulgarian uses femininitives with considerably greater regularity than Ukrainian does, and we discuss the semantic classes of nouns that fail to form femininitives most often and the effect of the source language in translated text and of the author’s and translator’s individual preferences.

1. Introduction

The late 19th and the early 20th centuries saw a great increase of the representation of women in various social roles outside the family as a result of diverse objective causes of historical development, among them the industrialisation of production in the leading countries of Europe and North America and female emancipation. In the course of the 20th century women gained access to education at all levels and to a broad spectrum of professions, the opportunity to participate in elections and to be economically independent. Such profound changes in public life and culture could not but find their mark in many languages. In both Bulgarian and Ukrainian, one such process has been the intensification of the use of the mechanism of formation of **femininitives**, especially terms for denoting women by trade, social rank and role and political views, following the older models for deriving feminine correlates of masculine nouns expressing nationality, place of residence or individual characteristics. This process is ongoing, because the question of gender equality has not yet found its definitive social and linguistic resolution, and particularly dynamic in periods of intense social shake-up, as in the early 21st century in Ukraine.

This paper presents a comparative bilingual study of Bulgarian and Ukrainian femininitives based on a parallel corpus, with a focus on the cases where only one of the matching sentences contains a feminine. We are not aware of other similar corpus-based cross-linguistic studies on femininitives.

2. The Corpus

The working Bulgarian–Ukrainian parallel corpus is composed entirely of fiction (mostly novels, but also short stories), including both original Bulgarian and Ukrainian texts and translations from other languages. The material has been obtained from electronic libraries or from paper editions through scanning, optical character recognition and error correction by *ad hoc* software tools and by hand. (See Siruk and Derzhanski (2013) for more details on the general make-up of the corpus, and Siruk (2017) on

Keywords: femininitives, parallel corpora, lexical semantics, translation equivalents, Bulgarian, Ukrainian

its use in several earlier projects.) The current version is made of ten sectors, each composed of texts with the same original language and counting approximately 800,000 words on the Bulgarian and 700,000 words on the Ukrainian side. This amounts to a total size close to 15 million words. Two sectors contain translations from Russian and two from English (because of the larger amount of text available); the remaining original languages are Bulgarian, French, German, Italian, Polish and Ukrainian. All texts are aligned at sentence level.

The parallel analysis of translations into closely related languages reveals challenges for translations that these languages both share and differ in. Among these challenges are culturally marked signs, by which scholars of translation studies (Nekryach and Chala, 2013: 8–9) understand such lexical units that may have equivalents in the target language and be understandable to readers of the translation but evoke a different train of association (a combination of socio-cultural and historical associations that a certain concept comes with for representatives of a particular culture at a particular historical stage) than the readers of the original get. Femininitives may fall under this definition as items having socio-cultural peculiarities, which gives rise to divergence between the original and the translation, as well as between parallel translations: the translator sacrifices the formal and factual precision of the translation in order to recreate the associations of the original text.

3. Femininitives in Bulgarian and Ukrainian

Both Bulgarian and Ukrainian have several productive mechanisms for deriving femininitives, some shared (and going back to their common ancestor), some not: *student-k-a* ‘female student’ is both Bulgarian and Ukrainian; Bulgarian *glez-l-a* and Ukrainian *kapryz-ulj-a* ‘fickle woman’ each contain morphology that is not found in the other language. However, in both languages masculine terms are also often used for women, both because of lexical gaps and because of certain stylistic limitations on the use of femininitives, in part due to foreign influence (mostly of Russian and, more recently, English).

This affects the two languages to different degrees. Whereas the Bulgarian femininitives are declared to have the same stylistic characteristics, as well as the same lexical meanings, as the masculine nouns from which they are derived (Stoyanov, 1983: 55) and the avoidance of their use to be at variance with normative grammar (ibid.: 103), traditional Ukrainian grammar places the emphasis on the fact that ‘it is far from every noun for a person of male sex that a term for a person of female sex can be formed from’ (Moisiyenko, 2013: 176). Which is true in general, but is too categorical: the nouns *faxivec* ‘specialist’, *naukovec* ‘scientist’, *službovec* ‘employee’ are given as examples but form femininitives in fact; *faxivčynja* and *naukovka* or *naukovycja* are used in colloquial and journalistic speech, *službovka* is registered by lexicography (SUM) and is present in our corpus as well. Attempts to classify femininitives as potential but unrealised risk meeting the opposition of usage: the examples *spikerka* ‘(female) speaker’ and *medijnycja* ‘woman from the mass media’ (Moisiyenko, 2013: 178) have already been ‘realised’, are used in the press and thrive on the Net. But examples given by Bulgarian grammarians have similar problems: some of (Stoyanov, 1983: 113)’s examples of masculine nouns that form no femininitives (*profesor* ‘professor’, *docent* ‘associate professor’, *ministăr* ‘minister’, and especially *šofjor* ‘driver’) can no longer be called that (if they could at the time of writing).

4. Unmatched femininitives

The corpus was searched for occurrences of nouns with one of the feminine suffixes *-an(a)*, *-ic(a)*, *-inj(a)*, *-k(a)*, *-l(a)*, *-ušč(a)* on the Bulgarian side and of nouns marked in SUM as *žin. do* ‘fem. to’ on the Ukrainian side. The results were proofread and sentences with false femininitives (i. e., their homographs, such as Bulgarian *špionka* ‘spyhole’ not ‘female spy’, Ukrainian *cukernycja* ‘sugar bowl’ not ‘woman sweets maker/seller’, or *zemljanka* ‘dugout, earth house’ not ‘Terran woman’ in both languages; also individual word forms, as Ukrainian *korolevi* dat. sg. of *korol* ‘king’ or nom. pl. of *korolevyj* ‘royal’ not dat. sg. of *koroleva* ‘queen’) were filtered out.

In the Bulgarian texts 292 femininitives were counted that had Ukrainian masculine nouns as their counterparts. In the Ukrainian texts 57 femininitives were found to which masculine nouns correspond on the Bulgarian side. Table 1 presents their distribution by original language.

language of the original	Bg	De	En	Fr	It	Pl	Ru	Uk	total
Bg m : Uk f	12	4	18	4	8	3	5	3	57
Bg f : Uk m	20	16	92	26	12	3	112	11	292
total	32	20	110	30	20	6	117	14	349

Table 1: Number of unmatched feminines by original language

Bearing in mind that there was twice as much text translated from English as written originally in Bulgarian, one has to conclude that the texts by Bulgarian authors were startlingly rich in masculine nouns applied to women, for which the Ukrainian translators chose to substitute feminines. On the other hand, the occasions on which the Bulgarian translators were more eager to use feminines were mostly in the texts by English and Russian authors. Note that these are the two most ‘feminine-hostile’ languages of the eight, in spite of the great differences in their grammatical structure. Contrariwise, the translations from Polish, a ‘feminine-friendly’ Slavic language, show the least discrepancy.

The numbers given above do not include cases where the translator who used the masculine noun appears not to have had a woman in mind. For example, in (1) there is a chambermaid in the Bulgarian translation but a stableman in the Ukrainian one:

- (1) Bg: *Kogato se vărnaš na slednata sutrin, mene veče me čakaše kamerierkata na mistār Kandi i tutaksi me otvede v stajata na svoja gospodar.*
 Uk: *Koly ja povernuvšja na druhyj ranok, mene vže čekav bilja dverej pereljakanyj konjux mistera Kendi j vidrazu ž poviv mene v kimnatu svoho xazjajina.*
 En: *When I got back the next morning, I found Mr. Candy's groom waiting in great alarm to take me to his master's room.*

(Wilkie Collins, *The Moonstone*)

In (2) the Bulgarian translator has understood the fellow-passenger to be a man and the Ukrainian has imagined a woman:

- (2) Bg: *Po pătja ot London do Hampšār misis Klemānts razbrala, če edin ot spātnicite ì dobre poznava okolnostite na Blakuotār [...]*
 Uk: *Dorohoju vid Londona do Hempširu z"yasuvalos', ščo odna jixnja susidka po kupe čudovo znaje Blekvoter ta joho okolyci [...]*
 En: *On the journey from London to Hampshire Mrs. Clements discovered that one of their fellow-passengers was well acquainted with the neighbourhood of Blackwater [...]*

(Wilkie Collins, *Woman in White*)

In (3) the Ukrainian translator has altered the gist of Tutmosis' words from ‘if you knew Jewish girls, you wouldn't try to ingratiate yourself with one of them by talking nonsense about Jews before her’ to ‘if you knew Jews, you'd realise that what you're saying about them isn't true’:

- (3) Bg: *Vižda se, če ti nikak ne poznavas' evrejkite!...*
 Uk: *Odrazu vydno, ščo ty zovsim ne znaješ jevrejiv.*
 Pl: *Jak to widać, że nie znasz Żydówek!...*
 “How evident it is that thou knowest not Jewesses!”

(Bolesław Prus, *The Priest and the Pharaoh* [English tr. by Alexander Glovatski])

Also excluded are pairs of sentences in which the different genders are caused by linguistic reasons, as when Baloo, who is a she-bear in the Bulgarian translation of *The Jungle Book* by Rudyard Kipling because the default word for ‘bear’ – *mečka* – is feminine, is accordingly referred to as *učitelka* ‘(female) teacher’ of the Law and chastises himself (that is, herself) as a *glupačka* ‘(female) fool’ for having let

Mowgli off with the Bandar-log; in Ukrainian *vedmid'* 'bear' is masculine, making Baloo a *včytel'* '(male) teacher' and a *duren'* '(male) fool'. But we include examples where no such reasons are in sight, as in (4), where the words for 'teacher' are the same (feminine in Bulgarian as in the German original, masculine in Ukrainian by default), although the word for 'passion for power' is neuter in both languages:

- (4) Bg: *Vlastoljubie: strašnata učitelka na velikoto prezrenie [...]*
 Uk: *Vlastoljubstvo — hriznyj učitel' velykoji znevahy [...]*
 De: *Herrschaft: die furchtbare Lehrerin der grossen Verachtung [...]*
 "Passion for power: the terrible teacher of great contempt [...]"
 (Friedrich Nietzsche, *Thus Spake Zarathustra* [English tr. by Thomas Common])

4.1. Cross-unmatched terms

The numbers given above confirm the fact that Ukrainian eschews femininitives more often than Bulgarian does. In those semantic fields where both do, however, the patterns can be complex.

Table 2 demonstrates several lexical items of the field 'friend, comrade', with the Bulgarian ones labelling the rows and the Ukrainian ones the columns, and each field showing the number of occasions in the corpus on which they match. The masculine and the feminine words are separated by double lines. (The following tables are organised in the same way.) Because of the way the experiment was set up, we did not count how many times a Bulgarian masculine noun corresponds to a Ukrainian masculine one.

	<i>tovaryš</i>	<i>pryjatel'</i>	<i>druh</i>	<i>tovaryška</i>	<i>pryjatel'ka</i>	<i>podruha</i>	<i>podružka</i>
<i>drugar</i>				4	1		
<i>prijatel</i>				1	1		
<i>družka</i>				3	1	14	6
<i>drugarka</i>	1		1	18	3	28	1
<i>prijatelka</i>	1	3	71	8	155	156	6

Table 2: Words for 'friend, comrade'

We see that, although the most frequent Ukrainian correspondences of Bulgarian *prijatelka* are the feminine nouns *pryjatel'ka* and *podruha*, the masculine *druh* also has a significant presence. At the same time Bulgarian *drugar* and *prijatel* can also be found to refer to women. The reason for this complexity is to be sought in the many associations that the concept of friendship comes with, including its numerous varieties (comradeship, friendship between women or across sexes, etc.).

The field 'enemy' is less ramified, but still not simple, in part because in Bulgarian no femininitive is formed from *vrag* 'enemy, foe', but as Table 3 shows, Ukrainian *voroh*, which has no such limitation, can also denote a woman.

	<i>voroh</i>	<i>vorohynja</i>	<i>nepryjatel'ka</i>	<i>suprotyvnycja</i>	<i>nenavysnycja</i>
<i>vrag</i>		5	1	1	
<i>nepryjatelka</i>	2			3	1
<i>protivnička</i>			1		

Table 3: Words for 'enemy'

For ‘witness’ both languages can be seen to use a masculine as well as a feminine word, though with different frequency. The middle column in Table 4 corresponds to the instrumental plural, which the two Ukrainian words share.

	<i>svidok</i>	<i>svidkamy</i>	<i>svidka</i>
<i>svidetel</i>	1	2	1
<i>svidetelka</i>	16	2	2
<i>očevidka</i>	1		

Table 4: Words for ‘witness’

We see that Bulgarian usually uses the feminine whilst Ukrainian usually does not. The 1 in the top left cell of Table 4 reflects (5).

(5) Bg: *Tja čaka samo edna дума ot men, za da dojde v Jorkšir i prisăstvuvu v kačestvoto si na svidetel [...]*

Uk: *Vona žde lyše vidpovidi vid mene, ščob pojixaty v Jorkšir i buty prysutn'oju jak svidok [...]*

En: *She only waits a word of reply from me to make the journey to Yorkshire, and to be present as one of the witnesses [...]*

(Wilkie Collins, *The Moonstone*)

This is one of two registered occasions on which neither text uses a feminine, although both might; the other is (6):

(6) Bg: *Stanala li e veče voljata svoja sobstvena izbavitelka i blagovestitel?*

Uk: *Xiba volja vže stala sobi spasytelem i visnykom radosti?*

De: *Wurde der Wille sich selber schon Erlöser und Freudebringer?*

“Has the Will become its own deliverer and joy-bringer?”

(Friedrich Nietzsche, *Thus Spake Zarathustra* [English tr. by Thomas Common])

What is remarkable about the last example is that, whereas ‘will’ is feminine in both target languages (though the German word is masculine), the Bulgarian translator has chosen to make ‘deliverer’ feminine and ‘joy-bringer’ masculine and in the Ukrainian text both are masculine.

Finally, the word for ‘teacher’ is 2 times masculine in Bulgarian and feminine in Ukrainian and 3 times the other way around, and the word for ‘disciple, pupil’ is 4 times masculine in Bulgarian and feminine in Ukrainian and 2 times the other way around.

4.2. Bulgarian masculine, Ukrainian feminine

With ‘enemy’ having been mentioned already, the remaining words in this subsection show no room for generalisation, nor can any be called frequent, unless we count the 5 times on which Bulgarian *pomošnik* ‘helper, assistant’ corresponds to Ukrainian *pomičnyca*, the 3 times on which *beglec* ‘fugitive’ is used where the other side has *vtikačka*, and the 3 times when *maneken* ‘mannequin’ in a Bulgarian original (by Bogomil Rainov) is translated into Ukrainian as *manekennycja*. On all these occasions a feminine could have been used in Bulgarian as well. The only two exceptions – actually one, occurring twice – are *doktor* used before a female doctor’s name, as is usual in Bulgarian, where the Ukrainian has *likarka* in the same position:

(7) Bg: *Doktor Anna Georgievna săšto e mogla da pronikne.*

Uk: *Likarka Hanna Heorhijivna tež mohla probratysja.*

Ru: *Doktor Anna Georgiyevna tože mogla probrat'sja.*

‘Doctor Anna Georgievna might also have got in.’

(Alexander Mirer, *Chief Noon*)

Note that the use of a generic masculine form of the title *doktor* in Bulgarian but a feminine in Ukrainian correlates with the fact that the vast majority of the Bulgarian surnames have an ending which indicates gender, whereas a significant portion of the Ukrainian surnames do not, so the frequent formula ‘*doktor* [initials] <surname>’ (ditto with other similar titles) tends to be more informative in Bulgarian. Absence of information often leads to failed stereotypical expectations and thence to misunderstandings, so one might see in this a strong stimulus for the use of feminines in Ukrainian, but it interacts with the conflicting requirements of the official and the colloquial style.

The other lexical items appear no more than twice and seem arbitrary.

4.3. Bulgarian feminine, Ukrainian masculine

Most words in this subsection denote professions. Some of the most frequent ones are in translations from Russian and reflect a general avoidance of feminines in that language (especially in the scientific, and by extension the science fictional, genre) which has been copied in the Ukrainian translations. Thus the Bulgarian feminine nouns *lekarka* ‘physician’ (20 times) and *astronavigatorka* ‘astronaut’ (7) correspond to masculine nouns in the Ukrainian text. So do *istorička* ‘historian’ (17), *bioložka* ‘biologist’ (7), *geoložka* ‘geologist’ (6) and *sekretarka* ‘secretary’ (5), whose feminine counterparts in Ukrainian (resp. *istorikynja*, *biolohynja*, *heolohynja*, *sekretarka*) are not accepted by all speakers. The same is true of Bulgarian *členka* ‘member’ (6), which (unlike the ones listed hereto) occurs mostly in texts outside the Russian sector. The Ukrainian correspondences *členka* and *členkynja* are actively used by the diaspora. Close to this semantic field is *poznavačka* ‘connoisseur’, Ukrainian *znavec* with no feminine in common use (*znavčynja* is rare at present).

An intriguing example which does not fit this paradigm is (7):

(8) Bg: *Bezdelnički, lůžkini... kljukarki... shte kaža na majka-igumenka...*

Uk: *Darmoždky, brexunky... jazykodzvonny... nexaj on matušci-ihumeni skažu...*

‘Spongers, liars ... twaddlers ... just let me tell Mother Abbess’

(Mykhailo Kotsiubynsky, *Into the Sinful World*)

The word *jazykodzvin* seems to be the author’s neologism, from the set expression *dzvonyty jazykom* lit. ‘to ring with one’s tongue’, i. e., ‘to wag one’s tongue [as a bell’s clapper]’, so the presumed meaning is ‘idle talker’. Words with this pattern are technically harder to form a feminine from, but anyway the use of a masculine noun (after the hesitation pause marked by dots) makes the statement more abstract.

Terms denoting women by nationality or place of residence are conspicuously absent from both the preceding subsection’s material and this one’s. So are kinship terms and other words from the oldest layer of feminines.

4.4. Feminines with non-masculine counterparts

It happens that Bulgarian uses a neuter noun where Ukrainian has a feminine, especially due to a lexical gap. For example, there is no word for ‘female dwarf’ in Bulgarian, only *džudže* ‘dwarf’, which is neuter.

(9) Bg: *Izvikaše li majmunata, vsemi pāt izkreštjavaše i džudžeto, i negovijat glas beše mnogo po-životinski.*

Uk: *Koly mavpa vereščala, skrykuvala ščorazu j karlycja, i holos jiji buv šče menše sxožyj na lyuds’kyj.*

De: *Schrie der Affe, schrie jedesmal die Zwergerin mit, und ihre Stimme war tierischer.*

‘When the monkey screamed, the dwarf screamed too, and her voice was far more beast-like.’

(Heinrich Mann, *Young Henry of Navarre* [English tr. by Eric Sutton])

Or there are no single words in standard Bulgarian corresponding to Ukrainian *odynak* ‘single son’, *odynachka* ‘single daughter’, so two-word expressions have to be used, often based on *dete* (n.) ‘child’.

(10) Bg: *Edinstveno dete li e mis Havišam?*

Uk: *Mis Hevišem bula odynačkoju?*

En: *Miss Havisham was an only child?*

(Charles Dickens, *Great Expectations*)

Lastly, Bulgarian diminutives (especially from masculine nouns) are often neuter and gender-neutral.

- (11) Bg: *Eto ja, malkoto drugarče [n], čieto štastie trjabvaše da osiguri, dokolkoto možeše [...]*
 Uk: *Os' vona, joho malen'ka tovaryška [f], i vin doklade vsix zusyl', ščob vona bula jakomoha ščaslyviša [...]*
 En: *There she was, his little companion, to be made as happy as ever he could make her [...]*
 (John Galsworthy, *The Forsyte Saga*)

4.5. Gender-unmarked forms

In both Bulgarian and Ukrainian it is common (pun intended) for nouns or their forms to be able to belong to both the masculine and the feminine gender and refer to men or women. This may be because the lexical item is of the so-called common gender, as Bulgarian *rodnina* 'relative' or Ukrainian *susida* 'neighbour', or because a masculine and a feminine lexeme overlap in part of their paradigms, as was said about Ukrainian *svidok* (m.) and *svidka* (f.) 'witness' above. The overlap may be restricted to the written form, as in Ukrainian *hostěj* gen./acc. pl. of *hist'* '(male) guest' ~ *hóstej* ditto of *hostja* '(female) guest'; since it is written text we are dealing with, such syncretism is as good as complete.

We did not count such forms as part of this experiment, because their interpretation as feminine is a possibility at least, but we mention them here because they are significant as a potential factor of change. In Bulgarian, for example, masculine nouns with the suffix *-nik* have female correlates in *-nica* or *-nička*, and whether one or both are formed and used depends, largely idiosyncratically, on the noun: 'deceased, late (woman)' is always *pokojnica*, 'woman worker' always *rabotnička*, and '(female) fellow traveller' can be *spātnica* or *spātnička*. But the plural forms of the femininitives in *-nica* coincide with the plurals of the masculine nouns (*spātnici* is plural of *spātnik* as well as *spātnica*), which may have one (or both) of two effects: make speakers prefer the derivatives in *-nička* (first in the plural and then in the singular as well) or enhance the acceptability of the use of the same terms for men and women. Time, as well as separate studies, will show if this is the case.

4.6. Femininitives referring to men

On very rare occasions a feminine noun may have a male referent. Two such involve strong censure:

- (12) Bg: *Ti si naj-lošijat meždu ricarite, a ne naj-dobrijat. Ti, vaša milost, si prosto razvratnik [m], kojto tǎrguva s devstvenostta si!*
 Uk: *Ty najhiršyj sered rycariv, a ne najlipšyj, poljubovnycja [f], ščo prodaje cnotu.*
 Pl: *Najgorszyś między rycerstwem nie najlepszy, po prostu gamratka z waszmości, która cnotą handluje!*
 "You are the worst among knights, not the best, — simply a drab, trading in virtue."
 (Henryk Senkiewicz, *With Fire and Sword* [English tr. by Jeremiah Curtin])

—and a similar example (with a feminine noun in the Bulgarian translation and a masculine one in the Ukrainian) in Thomas Mann's *Doctor Faustus*. And on two occasions the somewhat disdainful feminine noun *pehotinka* 'infantryman, foot soldier' appears in the Bulgarian texts of Erich Maria Remark's novels, corresponding to *rjadovyj* 'private' and *soldat* 'soldier' in the Ukrainian. Either way one sees that the feminine gender is associated with lesser worth. The widespread feeling that femininitives are best avoided scores another point here.

5. Conclusions

Being a phenomenon characteristic of all Slavic languages, femininitives are present in Bulgarian as well as Ukrainian. Both languages have centuries-old but still active models for forming femininitives, and they are very much alive in the colloquial style. Historical circumstances at the end of the 19th and at the start of the 20th century (industrialisation, female and social emancipation) have increased the demand for them, a process which continues, with varying intensity, to this day.

One would think that there is no obstacle to their functioning and development. What we see instead is a conflict between intralinguistic and extralinguistic factors. On one hand, the wealth of derivational mechanisms offers all possibilities for creating and using femininitives (particularly in Ukrainian, with its

greater variety of feminine suffixes in common nouns), and the demand for them is undeniable (again, especially in Ukrainian, whose frequent gender-neutral surnames increase the need for alternative ways of expressing gender). On the other hand, in practice their derivation and employment is thwarted by the expansive influence of the geographically close Russian (constant upon Ukrainian and episodic upon Bulgarian) and the globally pervasive English (especially in the last two decades), in which femininitives are severely restricted, be it by social opposition (in Russian to the point of banning the use of suffixal models analogous to the closely related Ukrainian ones) or structural traits (the levelling of the distinction between masculine and feminine being an unwavering tendency in English).

This contradiction is unambiguously reflected by the material of the parallel corpus: the pair 'Bulgarian femininitive ~ Ukrainian masculine' is substantially more frequent than the pair 'Bulgarian masculine ~ Ukrainian femininitive'. This despite the fact that suffixation as a typical derivational model for femininitives has a larger number of formal manifestations in Ukrainian: Bulgarian has fewer femininitive suffixes but applies them with greater regularity.

In translated texts the frequency of the use of femininitives appears to depend on the source language. Translations from Russian to Ukrainian are considerably poorer in femininitives than translations from Polish. Similarly, translations from German to Bulgarian are richer in femininitives than translations from English (although the correlation is predictably weaker). This is a typical situation when there is a choice of translation variants but no conscious choice of translation strategies.

The employment of femininitives may also be a marker of the author's or the translator's style. Characteristically, whilst in Ukrainian it is the enhanced use of femininitives (as by authors P. Zahrebelny and V. Drozd and translator M. Lukash) that is marked, in Bulgarian it is their avoidance in typical contexts (e. g., by B. Rainov).

A question which remains open, due to the peculiarities of the parallel corpus, is the correlation between the use of femininitives of various semantic classes and the genre and time of writing of the text. A comparison of the results of our investigations with observations made on large monolingual corpora of Bulgarian and Ukrainian may shed light on this matter.

References

- Moisiyenko, A., Ed. (2013). *Sučasna ukrajins'ka mova. Morfolohija*. Kyjiv: Znannja.
- Nekryach, T. and Chala, Yu. (2013). *Viktorians'ka doba v ukrajins'komu xudožn'omu perekladi*. Kyjiv: Kondor.
- Siruk, O. B. (2017). Kul'turno markovani realiji v ukrajins'kyx ta bolhars'kyx paralel'nyx perekladax. In *Multikulturalizăm i mnogoezičie. Sbornik s dokladi ot Trinadesetite meždunarodni slavistični četenija – Sofija, 21–23 april 2016 g. Tom I. Lingvistika*. Veliko Tărnovo: Faber, pp. 649–659.
- Siruk, O. and Derzhanski, I. (2013). Linguistic Corpora as International Cultural Heritage: The Corpus of Bulgarian and Ukrainian Parallel Texts. In *Digital Presentation and Preservation of Cultural and Scientific Heritage (III/2013)*, pp. 91–98.
- Stoyanov, S., Ed.-in-Chief (1983). *Gramatika na săvremennija bălgarski knižoven ezik. Tom 2: Morfolohija*. Sofia: Bulgarian Academy of Sciences.
- SUM (1970–1980). *Slovnyk ukrajins'koji movy v 11 tomax*. Kyjiv: Naukova dumka, 1970–1980, <http://sum.in.ua> (consulted on 4 February 2018).

Proceedings of the
Third International Conference
*Computational Linguistics in
Bulgaria*



Sofia, Bulgaria
28-29 May 2018

Table of Contents

Ruslan Mitkov <i>With a little help from NLP: My Language Technology applications with impact on society</i>	1
Vito Pirrelli <i>NLP-based Assessment of Reading Efficiency in Early Grade Children</i>	5
Mila Vulchanova and Valentin Vulchanov <i>Figurative language processing: A developmental and NLP Perspective</i>	7
Nikola Taushanov, Ivan Koychev and Preslav Nakov <i>Abstractive Text Summarization with Application to Bulgarian News Articles</i>	15
Maria Gritz <i>Towards Lexical Meaning Formal Representation by virtue of the NL-DL Definition Transformation Method</i>	23
Junya Morita <i>Narrow Productivity, Competition, and Blocking in Word Formation</i>	34
Cvetana Krstev, Ranka Stanković and Duško Vitas <i>Knowledge and Rule-Based Diacritic Restoration in Serbian</i>	41
Anton Zinoviev <i>Perfect Bulgarian Hyphenation, or How not to Stutter at End-of-line</i>	52
Anna Roitberg and Denis Khachko <i>Russian Bridging Anaphora Corpus</i>	62
Ekaterina Tarpomanova <i>Aspectual and Temporal Characteristics of the Past Active Participles in Bulgarian – a Corpus-based Study</i>	69
Olena Siruk and Ivan Derzhanski <i>Unmatched Femininitives in a Corpus of Bulgarian and Ukrainian Parallel Texts</i>	77
Viktoriya Petrova <i>The Bulgarian Summaries Corpus</i>	85
Natalia Loukachevitch and Boris Dobrov <i>Ontologies for Natural Language Processing: Case of Russian</i>	93
Ranka Stanković, Miljana Mladenović, Ivan Obradović, Marko Vitas and Cvetana Krstev <i>Resource-based WordNet Augmentation and Enrichment</i>	104
Svetlozara Leseva, Ivelina Stoyanova and Maria Todorova <i>Classifying Verbs in WordNet by Harnessing Semantic Resources</i>	115