Mykhaylenko V. V.,
Doctor of Philology, Prof., Dept. of Translation and Philology
Ivano-Frankivsk King Danylo Galytskiy University of Law

CONGRUENT: INCONGRUENT GENDER NOUNS IN THE SL AND TL

Summary. The grammatical gender system is not merely a morphological system, but it has also a semantic basis which becomes obvious, particularly, in gender assignment to animate (agent) nouns, where most nouns referring to women are feminine, and those referring to men are masculine. We are planning to start with the gender paradigm in George Orwell's discourse represented by his novel "Animal Farm" and its Ukrainian translation by Ivan Cherniatyskiy. The Source Language refers to our "–" Gender Language classification and the Target Language Ukrainian refers to "+" Gender Language classification aimed to reveal the congruent and incongruent gender-marked nouns denoting domestic animals which form a common gender conceptual system in the speaker's/reader's consciousness.

Key words: grammatical, biological, socio-cultural gender, translation, transformation, differentiation, paradigm, source language, target language, discourse.

INTRODUCTION. There has been a great deal of research on language and gender, despite this proliferation of resources, it is hardly possible to distinguish between "+" Gender Languages and "–" Gender Languages. There must be an extensive corpus analysis on all levels of the language structure but we are planning to start with the gender paradigm in George Orwell's discourse represented by his novel "Animal Farm". The Source Language – English – refers to our "–" Gender Language classification and the Target Language – Ukrainian – refers to "+" Gender Language classification to reveal the congruent and incongruent gender-marked nouns denoting domestic animals which form a common gender conceptual system in the speaker's consciousness. The English noun gender goes back to c. 1300, "kind, sort, class," borrowed from Old French *gendre, genre* "kind, species; character; gender" which developed from the stem of Latin *genus* (*genitive generis*) "race, stock, family; kind, rank, order; species," also "(male or female) sex," from PIE root *gene-* (see: *genus*). The Latin term was used to translate Aristotle's Greek grammatical term *genos*. The view that grammatical gender mirrors natural gender has been widespread since antiquity and is still evident in the terms "masculine," "feminine," and "neuter" (historically meaning "neither") used to name individual gender distinctions, especially in Indo-European languages [20, p. 192]. Suzanne Romaine maintains Latin ← Greek which goes back to the 15th century when Protagoras divided the two noun classes of Greek in groups tagged by them. She asserts that "the grammatical term is derived from the Latin *genus*, which meant "race" or "kind" and had nothing to do with "sex" [23, p. 67]. Grammatical gender is a noun class system, composed of two or three classes, whose nouns that have human male and female referents tend to be in separate classes. Other nouns that are classified in the same way in the language may not be classed by any correlation with natural sex distinctions. According to Anne Pauwels, languages with a "grammatical gender" system categorize nouns into gender classes on the basis of morphological or phonological features [21, p. 557]. How-

ever, while many linguists believe that a grammatical gender system does not have connection with 'extralinguistic category of sex' Greville G. Corbett acknowledges that grammatical gender system is not merely a morphological system, but it has also a semantic basis which becomes obvious, particularly, in gender assignment to human (agent) nouns, where most nouns referring to women are feminine, and those referring to men are masculine [6].

The view that grammatical gender mirrors natural gender has been widespread since antiquity and is still evident in the terms "masculine," "feminine," and "neuter" (historically meaning "neither") used to label individual gender distinctions, especially in Indo-European.

The gender can be expressed in various ways: finite verbs (subject and object agreement in Ukrainian; noun grammatical flections in Ukrainian; noun gender-marked in English, Ukrainian; noun derivational suffixes in Ukrainian and English (rare cases); adjective grammatical flections in Ukrainian; demonstrative pronouns in Ukrainian; possessive pronouns in English (3-rd person sg.) and Ukrainian; indefinite/quantitative pronouns in Ukrainian; numerals in Ukrainian; question words in Ukrainian [cf. Russian: 2; and German:19, p. 141f]. The translation of character names and their 'foreignizing' and 'nativizing' will be in focus of another paper [5].

B. Pattersson stresses that for some decades of late the term "gender" has been used in different senses: its biological and linguistic interpretation has more frequently been replaced by the socio-cultural one due to the feminist movement [23, p. 57; 28, p. 1–26]. The major point under research is the gender translation strategies [see: 11, p. 132–139]. We would like to reveal the translators' choice of full or partial, or zero translations and the type of marker – either grammatical, or lexical, or syntactical, or semantic, or socio-cultural is given a priority to [see also:26, p. 468–486]. Grammatical, semantic and socio-cultural genders are entangled in the creation of stereotypes.

The present paper will highlight how the question of gender and translation is approached in various contexts by theoreticians and practitioners in the field of translation. The Source and Target Languages make different distinctions in meaning. The target language may make more or fewer distinctions in meaning than the source language. What one language regards as an important distinction in meaning another language may not perceive as relevant [3, p. 22f.].

STATE OF THE ART. Translation theory and practice need an interdisciplinary approach involving various areas of research: sociolinguistics, pragmatics, literary studies, media studies, semiotics, cultural studies [27] and feminist studies [8, p. 163–164] among others. The question of translating gender and gender in translation has been treated from many points of view [23, p. 61–63]. In spite of the contemporary acknowledgement of the multiple, and not dual, notion of socio-cultural gender, the literature on the subject is dominated by investigation of the male-female distinction. Gender and translation is a very active, increasingly diverse field. One

of the main theoretical assumptions for synergic concepts is rooted in a modified two-level approach to semantics which assumes that there is an intra-linguistic level of abstract semantic representations distinct from the extra-linguistic level of conceptual representations [15, p. 30]. As opposed to this assumption, the one-level theory which is predominant in cognitive and computational linguistics, considers semantic representations as part of the conceptual system. Syntactic representations are directly mapped onto conceptual structures. The two-level theory of semantic interpretation claims that the interpretation of a linguistic expression in a linguistic context involves the construction of a conceptual representation constrained by semantic representation of the expression. As a consequence there is no distinction in principle between genuine linguistic knowledge about meanings and extra-linguistic conceptually encoded knowledge. However, semantic and conceptual representations are distinct levels of mental representation governed by the principles of two separate cognitive modules – linguistic and conceptual knowledge systems.

The traditional conception of translation is that it is not a simple transfer, but the continuation of a process of meaning creation, the circulation of meaning within a contingent network of texts and social discourses. This idea clearly allows translation to be viewed as a form of re-writing within a specific historical, social, and cultural context, a re-writing that always also implicates the translator's subjectivity. It conflates writing with translation and, as a result, challenges the long dominant theory of translation creating some kind of equivalence of fixed meanings.

The grammatical level has long stood in the background of bilingual research, which is dominated by studies concentrating on parallel activation and interaction of the two systems at the semantic level [6] and at the phonological level [for exploration of the cognate facilitation effect, see, for example [6, p. 141–142]. We must answer the question whether representations associated with translation equivalents in a bilingual person's two languages overlap or diverge [see translatability: 20, p. 477–478]. Our corpus analysis of the SL and the TL proves that the speaker of L1 and L2 has a shared conceptual system with common and distinctive features of the languages. Compare: Wendy S. Francis finds the evidence supporting a single, integrated concept view [10, p. 251–267]. Recently, however, several studies have been conducted that address bilingual processing at the grammatical level.

INVESTIGATION. Grammatical gender is a unique lexical-syntactic feature present in some languages that is not deducible from the meaning of the noun [see: 6].This feature serves to classify the nouns of the language into two or more gender values and is integral in computing agreement. Ukrainian nouns are classified into gender groups according to two features: (a) semantic based on the spekers' language world view; or (b) on the both semantic and formal. The major principle is the correlation of the category og gender and the category of living being (sex and age features, e.g.: English *gander-goose-gosling*, Ukrainian *гусак-гуска-гусеня*): non-living-being). From a semantic point of view G. Corbett classifies English as a language with the pronominal gender system and largely 'covert' noun gender system [6, p. 12, 63]. Accordingly, gender nominations of living-beings and of non-living-beings may be presented as a semantic and a semantic opposition [1, p. 3: 50]. Though, the given classification is debatable for other languages [25, p. 104]. Gender classifications are not water-tight, e.g.: the referent of the lexeme *pig* can be both sexes in the general (or fiction) discourse, in the professional discourse it distinguishes English

boar (male), sow (female) and *piglet* 'a small usually young swine' [Merriam-Webster], cf.: Ukrainian *хряк* (male), *льоха* (female) and *порося* (neuter).

The question of the influence of the L1 (Ukrainian) gender upon the L2 (English) gender in the process of learning is important, scholars and instructors must work out certain leverage to avoid negative interference of Ukrainian upon English. In the process of translation from English into Ukrainian it is very important not to anglicize the Target text. We consider that the efficient leverage against negative interference modeling a conceptual system of gender with its further verbalizing in the L1/SL world view and the L2/L1 to reveal common and distinctive features of gender expression and verify their usage in the context or their distributive characteristics. When the gender is revealed by the noun itself here is the case of overt expression, e.g.: *drake::duck:duckling* "качур:качка:каченя", *bull:cow:calf* , "бугай:корова:теля".

There are two covert ways – pronominalization, i.e the correlation of the noun with the corresponding 3-rd person pronoun singular, e.g.:

Old Major → Middle White boar→ Old Major →he→he→he, e.g.:

1. Word had gone round during the day that **old Major**, the prize **Middle White boar**, had had a strange dream on the previous night and wished to communicate it to the other animals. **Old Major** (so **he** was always called, though the name under which **he** had been exhibited was Willingdon Beauty) was so highly regarded on the farm that everyone was quite ready to lose an hour's sleep in order to hear what **he** had to say. "Ще в день розійшлася чутка про те, що старому **Маркові**, премійованому **кнурові** середньої білої породи, останньої ночі приснився дивний сон, та що **він** бажає розповісти про **нього** іншим тваринам. **Старого Марка** (так **його** завжди всі називали, хоч на виставці виступав **він** під іменем «**Краса Вілінгдону**», так глибоко поважали на хуторі, що кожна тварина радо погодилася втратити годину сну, аби тільки почути **його** слова". Here is a nomination chain wth pronomilisation in the SL and the TL [see: 20, p. 437, 463]: **Old Major** → Middle White boar→ Old Major →he→he→he → Маркові → кнурові→ він→ нього→ Старого Марка→ його→ він «Краса Вілінгдону»→ його.

In languages that are said to have a pronominal gender system, "gender is marked solely on personal pronouns" [20, p. 389]. English has a pronominal gender system based on semantic criteria that is reflected only in personal possessive and reflexive third-person pronouns. The use of he, she and it is determined by simple principles: "male humans are masculine (he), female humans are feminine (she) and anything else is neuter (it)" [6, 1991: 12]. Thus, the following genders can be differentiated: traditional (Feminine, Masculine, Neuter) or Animate, Inanimate and General. Many languages have a predominantly semantic gender assignment system, where assignment of nouns to some genders, or some nouns to genders, is semantically transparent, but there are exceptions for which there is no readily available explanation.

In the discourse structure the English noun gender classification mainly depended on the pronominalisation: the classification motivated by the agreement between antecedent nouns and anaphoric pronouns. In Ukraininan pronominalisation is an additional marker. Marion Kremer writes that in morphosyntactic sense English does not have nominal пender but different sets of 3p.sg. pronouns. Descriptions of gender as a linguistic category in English tend to focus on semantic pronoun agreement ("natural gender") and its "deviations" [16, p.65].

2. After the horses came **Muriel,** the white **goat,** and **Benjamin**, the donkey. **Benjamin** was the oldest animal on the farm, and the worst tempered. **He** seldom talked, and when **he** did, it was usually to make some cynical remark--for instance, **he** would say that God had given him a tail to keep the flies off, but that he would sooner have had no tail and no flies. "За кіньми прийш-**ла** біла **коза Дереза** із **ослом Беніяміном**. Беніямін бу-в найстаршою твариною на хуторі, з найгіршим від усіх настроєм. **Він** зрідка відзива-**вся**, хіба тільки на те, щоб висловити якесь цинічне завввження; так, наприклад, часто каза-**в**, що дійсно Господь дав йому хвіст на те, щоб відганятися від мух, але що **він** би бу-**в** більш рад-**ий**, коли б **міг** обійтись без хвоста і без мух".

The property that sets gender apart from other types of noun classification is agreement, the morphological expression on words other than the noun. While languages can mark gender on the noun itself – such systems are called *overt* gender systems – this is not a necessary characteristic. Marking on associated words, however, is required: without agreement, we have no evidence for gender [9] for a number of key references from the extensive literature on gender agreement). Common places where gender agreement shows up are adjectives, verbs, and pronouns, and many languages also mark gender on articles, numerals, and question words.

The main question was whether the gender information of one language influences the processing or assignment of gender in the other language [25, p. 104]. In all studies the critical manipulation concerned relation between the gender of the target responses and their translation in the other language. In some cases the source language and the target language share the gender characteristics due to the existence of noun equivalents, while in other cases the source language nouns have different genders from their translations. We shall test the SL nouns representing domestic animals and fowls and their translation in the TL as for their gender characteristics either sharing or differing.

Human nouns correlate in language-specific ways with the category of gender, as Marion Kremer points out; fulfilling I. Fodor's condition – the presence of gender at least two sentence elements are required to be brought into agreement by morphological means [9, p. 207], gender undoubtedly exists as a morphosyntactic category in German which does not contradict the argument that noun gender as such is lexically determined [14, p. 64]. Newer studies on pronominalization, especially those with a pragmatic, cognitive and/or feminist orientation have led to further differentiation [6, p. 151]. Mona Baker suggests in her book that a number of languages have gender as a grammatical category, i.e. nouns governing the inflectional forms of various parts of speech. English, it is explained, doues not have a grammatical gender but the gender distinction exists in some semantic areas and in the person system. … In small number of nouns which refer to professions have masculine and feminine forms, with the suffix – ess indicating feminine gender: actor – actress, manager- manageress, steward – stewardess, host – hostess [3, p. 90]. But we believe that the base form (actor, manager, host, steward) are gender-neutral words.

There is no general agreement about the term 'pronoun' and its functional subclassification (anaphors vs pronominals, syntactic vs anaphoric referential pronouns vs. deictic referential pronouns, deictic vs. true pronouns proforms, etc. [14, p. 30–31, 37]. The term 'pronominalization' is considered debatable, writes Barbara Pettersson [23, p. 58–59]. Following C.Hockett [12], Greville G. Corbett takes the presence/absence of widely understood **agreement** (phrase agreement, sentence internal agreement and anaphoric relations) as the criterion for presence/absence of grammatical gender [6]. As a consequence of this approach, pronominal systems of the English type are regarded as semantic systems, the classification motivated by the agreement between antecedent nouns and anaphoric pronouns. An extremely interesting discussion of the notion of equivalence can be found in Mona Baker (1992) who seems to offer a more detailed list of conditions upon which the concept of equivalence can be defined. She explores the notion of equivalence at different levels, in relation to the translation process, including all different aspects of translation and hence putting together the linguistic and the communicative approach.. She gives a definition of the term *word* since it should be remembered that a single word can sometimes be assigned different meanings in different languages and might be regarded as being a more complex unit or morpheme: animportant difference between morphemes and words is that a morpheme cannot contain more than one element of meaning and cannot be further analysed. And the translator should pay attention to a number of factors when considering a single word, such as number, gender and tense [3, p. 11–12]. In fact, M. Baker claims that different grammatical structures in the SL and TL may cause remarkable changes in the way the information or message is carried across. These changes may induce the translator either to add or to omit information in the TT because of the lack of particular grammatical devices in the TL itself. There is textual equivalence, when referring to the equivalence between a SL text and a TL text in terms of information and cohesion. Texture is a very important feature in translation since it provides useful guidelines for the comprehension and analysis of the SL which can help the translator in his/her attempt to produce a cohesive and coherent text for the TL audience in a specific context. It is up to the translator to decide whether or not to maintain the cohesive ties as well as the coherence of the SL text. His/her decision will be guided by three main factors, that is, the target audience, the purpose of the translation and the text type.

There is pragmatic equivalence, when referring to implicatures and strategies of avoidance during the translation process. Implicature is not about what is explicitly said but what is implied. Therefore, the translator needs to work out implied meanings in translation in order to get the ST message across. The role of the translator is to recreate the author's intention in another culture in such a way that enables the TC reader to understand it clearly [14, p. 64–65, 247]. In translation of congruent gender nouns we shall follow the traditional exchange of SL nouns and TL nouns which share the common category of gender or using equivalents. In paragraphs A and B we shall consider the retaining of the gender in the process of translation from English into Ukrainian [see "translation equivalence": 12, p. 77–80;17].

Cockerel (n., M.) → півень (n., M.), e.g.:

3. *When he did appear, he was attended not only by his retinue of dogs but by a black cockerel who marched in front of him and acted as a kind of trumpeter, letting out a loud "cock-a-doodle-doo" before Napoleon spoke. "Коли він появлявся, супроводив його вже не тільки почет із собак, а й чорний півень, що крокував перед ним і виконував обов'язки сурмача, бо трубив голосне «к у к р і к у» заки Наполеон брав слово".*

Cockerel (n., M.): "young cock," mid-15c. (late 12c. as a surname), apparently a diminutive of cock (n.1). Despite the form, no evidence that it is from French.a young cock (=male chicken). Півень (n., M.): свійський птах з червоним гребенем на голові, пишним хвостом і шпорами на ногах; самець курки [Слв. Укр. м.].

Gander (n., M.)→ гусак (n., M.) it must have been but the translator used the other formula, e.g.: **Gander (n., M.)→Гуска (n,, F.)**

4. *A gander who had been privy to the plot had confessed his guilt to Squealer and immediately committed suicide by swallowing deadly nightshade berries.* "*Далі виступила гуска і посвідчила, що затаїла шість колосків у жнива в минулому році та з'їла їх ніччю*". The translator gives a "free" paraphrasation and substituted *male goose* for *female goose* as well as the cause of the gander's death. He used so-called "domestication" or "nativisation" reflecting the Soviet Russian reality.

Gander: a male goose [Merriam-Webster]. Гусáк (n.,M.) →[Grammatical gender]

PIG (n., M./F.) → кабан(n., M.), e.g.:

5. *Among them was a small fat pig named Squealer, with very round cheeks, twinkling eyes, nimble movements, and a shrill voice. He was a brilliant talker.* "*Найбільш відомий між ними був малий товстий кабан на ім'я Квікун; був він круглощокий і кліпав щораз очима; рухи в нього були меткі, голос-пронизливий. Він був блискучий промовець*".Pig → Squealer →he → he →he →his → Squealer →he → кабан →Квікун → він→ нього →він → він →Квікун.

Pig (n., M./F.):the young of swine, young sow or boar; British a male pig; US also hog a large pink, brown, or black farm animal [Cambridge]; hog (chiefly US) - a male pig that has had its sex organs removed and that is raised for meat [Merriam-Webster]. Pig, M./F. Pig, noun M./F. → кабан. Свиня, парнокопитий ссавець родини свинячих. Кабан: самець свині (звичайно кастрований) [Слв. Укр. м.].

We can differentiate congruent gender nouns in the SL and TL, first, when the both nouns share the same gender component gender noun component. Sometimes this transformation is called 'full', e. g.:

A. SL NOUN, M. →TL NOUN, M.

Cockerel (n., M.): → півень (n., M.), e.g.:

6. *He had made arrangements with the cockerel to call him three-quarters of an hour earlier in the mornings instead of half an hour.* "*Він домовився з півнем, щоб той будив його вранці на три чверті години раніше, а не, як досі, на пів години.*" Cockerel (n.M.): "young cock," mid-15c. (late 12c. as a surname), apparently a diminutive of cock (n.N). (n., M..): свійський птах з червоним гребенем на голові, пишним хвостом і шпорами на ногах; самець курки [Слв. укр. м.].

Cockerel → півень → *той*.

Gander (n., M.) → гусак (n., M.), e.g.:

7. *A gander who had been privy to the plot had confessed his guilt to Squealer and immediately committed suicide by swallowing deadly nightshade berries.* "*Гусак, що був полигачем у цій змові, визнав свою вину перед Квікуном і негайно покінчив самогубством, проковтнувши дев'ять ягід пасльону*".

Gander : a male goose [Merriam-Webster]. Гусáк (N.M.): самець гуски [Слв.укр.м.]. Gander →>his →гусак →полигач.

Ram (n., М.)→ баран (n., М.),

8. Two other sheep confessed to having murdered an old ram, an especially devoted follower of Napoleon, by chasing him round and round a bonfire when he was suffering from a cough. "Дві інші вівці виявили, як погубили душу чорного барана, особливого прихильника Наполеона: помітивши що той слабує на кашель, вони примусили його бігати довкола ватри поки не загнали його на смерть"**.** Ram → follower →him →he, e.g.:

Ram (n., M.): a male sheep, in domestication one kept for breeding purposes, a tup [Merriam-Webster]. Баран(n.,M.): самець вівці [Слв.укр.м.]. Ram → follower →him →he → баран→ прихильника → його.

Boar (n., M.) →boar (n., M.)
Napoleon→ boar, e.g.:

9. Napoleon was now a mature boar of twenty-four stone. "Наполеон змінився в дозрілого десятипудового кнура". Napoleon→ boar→ Наполеон→кнур

Boar (n., M) →boar (n., M), e.g.:

10. *Napoleon was a large, rather fierce-looking Berkshire boar, the only Berkshire on the farm, not much of a talker, but with a reputation for getting his own way.* "*Наполеон був великий, досить лютий на вигляд бакширський кнур, одинокий бакшерець на хуторі; не дуже то говірливий, зате (така йшла про нього слава) дуже рішучий*". Boar (n., M.): male of the swine, whether wild or tame (but not uncastrated)[Merriam-Webster]. Кнур (n., M.): самець свині [Слв. укр. м.]. Napoleon → boar → Berkshire→ talker→ Наполеон→ кнур→ бакшерець.

B. SL NOUN, F.→TL NOUN, F.

11. **Mare (n., F.) →кобила (n., F.),** e.g.:

At the last moment Mollie, the foolish, pretty white mare who drew Mr. Jones's trap, came mincing daintily in, chewing at a lump of sugar. "*В останню хвилину увійшла, дрібуючи манірно, зі шматком цукру в зубах Марічка, дурненька гарна кобила білої масти, що тягала бідку пана Джонса*". Mare (n., F): the female of any equine animal but especially applied to the female of the domestic horse. амка жеребця; лошиця. Кобила- самка жеребця, лошиця [Слв. укр. м.]. Mollie → mare → Марічка → кобила.

In the following paragraphs we shall consider geder shifts under the influence of the context [see also:23, p.9-28; 33, p.25f.].

C. SL NOUN, (F./M.) →TL NOUN (n., M.)

PIG (n., M./F.) — кабан (n., M.), e. g.:

12. *Among them was a small fat pig named Squealer, with very round cheeks, twinkling eyes, nimble movements, and a shrill voice.* "*Найбільш відомий між ними був малий товстий кабан на ім'я Квікун; був він круглощокий і кліпав щораз очима; рухи в нього були меткі, голос-пронизливий*".

Pig → кабан → Квікун → він→ нього.

Pig (n., F./M.) →свиня (n., Grammatical F.) → (n., Contextual M.)

13. *He was twelve years old and had lately grown rather stout, but he was still a majestic-looking pig, with a wise and benevolent appearance in spite of the fact that his tushes had never been cut.* "*Було йому дванадцять років і за останній час він дуже потовщав, та все ж був ще свинею величньої постави, з розумним та доброзичливим виглядом, незважаючи на те, що йому ніколи не спилювали іклів*". He (Major→he→pig→his → йому → свиня →йому (старий Марк, Майор)

Raven (n., M./F.)→ . крук (n., M.)

Moses → raven →he, e.g.:

14. *In the middle of the summer **Moses** the **raven** suddenly reappeared on the farm, after an absence of several years. He was quite unchanged,..* "*В середині літа крук Мойсей раптом знов появився в колгоспі, після кількарічної відсутности. Він ні в чому не змінився,..*"

Raven (n. F./M.): A widely distributed corvine bird (Corvus Corax) of Europe and Asia, of large size, with black lustrous plumage and raucous voice, feeding chiefly on carrion or other flesh. The name has also been extended to birds belonging to various other species of Corvus, esp. the American Raven (Corvus carnivorus).

Крук (n.M): – найбільший представник родини воронових; ворон [Слв.укр.м.]. Moses – raven – he → крук – Мойсей – Він.

D. SL NOUN, F./M.→TL NOUN, F.

15. **Goose (n., F./M.) → гуска(n., F.)**

Then a goose came forward and confessed to having secreted six ears of corn during the last year's harvest and eaten them in the night. "Далі виступила гуска і посвідчила, що затаїла шість колосків у жнива в минулому році та з'їла їх ніччю". Goose (n., F): a general name for the large web-footed birds. Female – goose, male – gander [Merriam-Webster].. Гуска (n., F): великий водоплавний свійський і дикий птах з довгою шиєю; самка гусака [Слв. укр. м.]. Goose → гуска.

16. **Pig (n., F./M.)→ свиня Grammatical (n., F.) → Contextual (n., M.)**

He was twelve years old and had lately grown rather stout, but he was still a majestic-looking pig, with a wise and benevolent appearance in spite of the fact that his tushes had never been cut. "Було йому дванадцять років і за останній час він дуже потовщав, та все ж був ще свинею величньої постави, з розумним та доброзичливим виглядом, не зважаючи на те, що йому ніколи не спилювали іклів". He (Major→he→pig→his → йому → свиня →йому (старий Марк, Майор).

Goat (n.F/M) →коза (n.F)

17. *Muriel, the goat, could read somewhat better than the dogs, and sometimes used to read to the others in the evenings from scraps of newspaper which she found on the rubbish heap. "Коза Дереза вміла читати трохи ліпше за собак, і нераз увечері прочитувала іншим клаптики часопису, що їх находила на смітнику".* Goat (n., M/F): ruminant quadruped of the genus Capra. Коза (n.,F); самиця козла [Слв. укр. м.]. Muriel → goat → she → Коза →Дереза

18. **Raven (n., F/M) – крук (**n., M)

The pigs had an even harder struggle to counteract the lies put about by Moses, the tame raven. Moses, who was Mr. Jones's especial pet, was a spy and a tale-bearer, but he was also a clever talker. "Ще важчу боротьбу довелося свиням звести з брехнями, що їх поширював освоєний крук Мойсей. Мойсей, особливий пестун п. Джонса, був шпик і наклепник, але й розумний промовець". Moses → raven → pet→spy →tale-bearer →talker → крук →Мойсей → пестун→шпик → наклепник → промовець.

 Personal name Мойсей refers to Masculine gender of the noun, then all other nominations must be also in the Masculine gender, the attributes *освоєний, особливий, розумний* correlating with the masculine nouns have also masculine flections I the TL.

CONCLUSION AND PERSPECTIVES. The thesis that the grammatical gender was ousted in Early Middle English and does not exist in Modern English is debatable, because there is a regular pronominalisation in discourse – a correlation of gender noun with the corresponding 3-rd person pronoun. In the reader's or speaker's subconsciousness there is a gender conceptual system including congruent and incongruent gender nouns which helps the language user to choose the correct gender. The translator or speaker resorts to the conceptual system and meanders between "foreignisation" and "domestication" or "nativisation," like between Scylla and Charybdis which both can distort the author's intended meaning.

References:
1. Загнітко А.П. Функції граматичних форм роду іменників / А.П. Загнітко // УМЛШ. – 1990. – № 6. – С. 50–54.
2. Плунгян В.А. Общая морфология. Ведение в проблематику / В.А. Плунгян – М.: МГУ, 2000. – 383 с.
3. Baker Mona. In Other Words. Coursebook on Translation / Mona Baker. – London. New York: Routledge, 1992. – 304 p.
4. Bordag Denisa, Pechmann Thomas. Grammatical gender in translation / Denisa Bordag, Thomas Pechmann // Second Language Research. – 2008. – Vol.24. – Issue 2. – Pp. 139–166.
5. Coillie Jan Van. Character Names in Translation: A Functional Approach / J. Van Coillie // J. Van Coillie (ed.). Children's Literature in Translation: Challenges and Strategies. – London and New York: Routledge, 2006. – Pp. 123–140.
6. Corbett Greville G. Gender /G. G. Corbett.– Cambridge: CUP, 1991. – 363 p.
7. Cruse D. A. Lexical Semantics / D.A.Cruse. – Cambridge: CUP, 1986. – 422 p.
8. Flotow Luise von. Gender and Translation, and Translation Studies: An Ongoing Affair / Luise Von Flotow // Eleonora Fredericci, Vanessa Leonardi (eds.). Bridging the Gap between Theory and Practice in Translation and Gender Studies. – Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2013. – Pp. 163–164.
9. Fodor Istvan. The Origin of Grammatical Gender I, II / Istvan Fodor // Lingua. –1959. – Vol.8. – Pp.1–41; 186–214.
10. Francis Wendy S. Bilingual Semantic and Conceptual Representation / Wendy S. Francis // J. F. Kroll, A. M. B de Groot (eds.). Handbook of bilingualism: Psycholinguistic approaches. –New York, NY: OU P, 2005. – Pp. 251–267.
11. Jakobson Roman. On Linguistic Aspects of Translation / Roman Jakobson // R. A. Brower (ed.). OnTranslation. – Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1959. – Pp. 132-9.
12. Hockett Charles F. A Course in Modern Linguistics / Charles F. Hockett. – New York: Macmillan, 1958. – 621 p.
13. Kenny Dorothy. Equivalence / Dorothy Kenny // Mona Baker (ed.). Routledge Encyclopaedia of Translation Studies. – London and New York: Routledge, 1998. – Pp. 77–80.
14. Kremer Marion. Person Reference and Gender in Translation: A Contrastive Investigation of English and German / Marion Kremer. – Tubingen: Gunter Narr Verlag, 1997. – 302 p.
15. Kecskes Istvan. Synergic Concepts in the Bilingual Mind // Istvan Kecskes, Liliana Albertazzi (eds.). Cognitive Aspects of Bilingualism. – Dordrecht: Springer Science & Business Media, 2007. –Pp.29-62.
16. Kremer Marion. Person Reference and Gender in Translation: A Contrastive Investigation of English and German / Marion Kremer – Tubingen: Gunter Narr Verlag, 1997. – 302 p.
17. Leonardi Vanessa. Equivalence in Translation: Between Myth and Reality/ Vanessa Leonardi // Translation Journal (online). – 2000. – Vol. 4. – Issue 4.
18. Litosseliti L., Sunderland J. Gender Identity and Discourse Analysis: Theoretical and Empirical Considerations / L.Litosseliti, J.Sunderland // L. Litosseliti, J. Sunderland (eds.). Gender Identity and Discourse Analysis. – Philadelphia PA.: John Benjamins Publishing Co., 2002. – Pp. 1–39.
19. Mills Anne.The Acquisition of German / Anne Mills // Isaac Dan Slobin (ed.). The Crosslinguistic Study of Language Acquisition. – Vol.1: The Data. – Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum, 1985. – Pp.141–246.
20. Mykhaylenko Valery V. A Glossary of Linguistics and Translation Studies: English-Ukrainian / Valery V. Mykhaylenko. – Ivano-Frankivsk: King Danylo Galytskiy University of Law, 2015. – 528 p.
21. Nissen Uwe Kjaer. Aspects of Translating Gender / Uwe Kjaer Nissen // Linguistik Online. – 2002. – Vol. 11. – Issue 2/02. – Pp.25–37.
22. Pauwels Anne. Linguistic Sexism and Feminist Linguistic Activism/ Anne Pauwels // J. Holmes, M. Meyerhoff (eds.). The Handbook of Language and Gender. – Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2003. – Pp. 550–570.
23. Pettersson Gawronska Barbara. Gender in Culture and Gender in Language. On Translation of the Novel Lubiewo by Michal Witkowski into German and Swedish / Barbara Gawronska Pettersson // Folia Scandinavica (Poznan). – 2011. –Vol. 12. – Pp. 57–70.
24. Romaine Suzanne. Communicating Gender / S. Romaine. – London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers, 1999. – 406 p.

25. Salamoura Angeliki. Grammatical Gender in the Bilingual Lexicon / Angeliki Salamoura // Istvan Kecskes, Liliana Albertazzi (eds.). Cognitive Aspects of Bilingualism. – Dordrecht: Springer, 2007. – Pp. 99–151.

26. Talbot M. Gender Stereotypes: Reproduction and Challenge / M. Talbot // J. Holmes, M. Meyerhoff (eds.).The Handbook of Language and Gender. – Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2003. – Pp. 468–486.

27. Toury G. Translation Across Cultures / G. Toury.–N.-D.: Bahri, 1987. – 117 p.

28. Wallmach K. Feminist Translation Strategies: Different or Derived? // JLS/TLW. – 2006. – Vol. 22. – Issue 1–2. – Pp. 1–26.

Михайленко В. В. Іменники з ідентичним: неідентичним родовим маркером у мові оригіналу і мові перекладу

Анотація. Система граматичного роду не є виключно морфологічною, бо вона ґрунтується на семантиці і виокремлює іменники чоловічого і жіночого родів. Ми плануємо почати з гендерної парадигми у дискурсі Джорджа Оруелла, представленому його романом «Animal Farm» (1945) і його українським перекладом Івана Чернятинського (1947). Основне завдання роботи – виокремити іменники на позначення свійських тварин з ідентичним і неідентичним родовим маркером у мові оригіналу і мові перекладу, які формують спільну концептуальну систему роду у підсвідомості мовця.

Ключові слова: граматичний, біологічний, соціокультурний рід, переклад, трансформація, диференціація, парадигма, мова оригіналу, мова перекладу, дискурс.

Михайленко В. В. Существительные с идентичным: неидентичным родовым маркером в языке оригинала и языке перевода

Аннотация. Система грамматического рода не является исключительно морфологической, ибо она базируется также на семантическом факторе и выделяет существительные мужского и женского родов. Мы планируем начать наше иследование с родовой парадигмы в дискурсе Дж. Оруэлла, представленном его романом «Animal Farm» (1945) и его украинским переводом Ивана Чернятинского. Основное задание исследования – выделить существительные, обозначающие домашних животных с идентичным и неидентичным родовым маркером в обоих языках.

Ключевые слова: грамматический, биологический, социокультурный род, перевод, трансформация, дифференциация, парадигма, язык оригинала, язык перевода, дискурс.