Ukrainian historical terminology designating social and military status in Old Rus': Examining their counterparts in English

Marina Vozna, Liudmyla Slavova*, Natalia Antonyuk

Department of Theory and Practice of Translation from English, Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, Kyiv 01033, Ukraine

* Corresponding author: Liudmyla Slavova, slavovall16@gmail.com

ABSTRACT: The article researches translators' challenges in rendering domain-specific terms which include culture-specific items. The study has been carried out using Old Rus' historical terminology employed to designate social and military status. It was selected en masse from academic texts, using monographs and academic articles in both languages. 82 language units representing culture-specific historical terms related to social, political and military organisation of the society of that period were chosen and described in terms of appropriate translation. Our hypothesis has been tested as to the unacceptability of approximation (analogous translation and generalisation) in rendering culture-related terms that designate highly specific concepts of the defined period in Ukrainian history. The research establishes that approximate translation fails to meet the requirements of strict definition and accuracy demanded by professional terminology. Our study underlines the importance of secondary term formation, descriptive translation, and the method called combined renomination (transcription and description combined). For a translation to be accurate, the shift in translation should follow the shift in concept. The specific term may have wider, more general semantics, and in each particular context it should be specified. The use of the description or combined renomination helps to make the meaning of the concept clearer. The study demonstrates that the most accurate and effective secondary term formation usually follows the pattern of term formation in the original language.

KEYWORDS: historical terminology, period terms, culture-specific units, academic text, translation technique, combined renomination

1. Introduction

In recent decades in linguistic and translation studies there has been an increased interest in domain-specific terminology used in academic texts, which serves as an impetus to the development of terminological systems that form the core of such texts in the relevant subject area. Terminological systems enable academics from different countries to reach a common understanding in their professional areas. New approaches in the field of translation studies and those areas that lie behind the general notion of "cultural linguistics" may contribute to resolving a number of issues connected with intercultural understanding, relying on studying the empirical basis of different languages, focusing on divergent and convergent features in languages and cultures, interlingual barriers, interlingual deviations, interlingual interference (Mizin et al., 2021). The importance of defining the appropriate counterpart to

designate a certain notion comes foremost in translation. When new or revised knowledge is transferred to another linguistic community (Sager, 1990), secondary term formation may be employed. Translators often become namers and/or neologists (Valeontis and Mantzari, 2006).

It should be noted that a lot of difficulties arise in translating Ukrainian historical terminology into English, deriving from such factors as: 1) the lack of comprehensive bilingual dictionaries in this domain; 2) vague definitions of a large number of terms that cause difficulty in their understanding by scholars representing different language communities. Here, secondary term formation becomes of paramount importance.

Historical studies can be defined as a culture-specific subject area. This is clearly evinced by Sager who states that terminology formation is "influenced by the subject area in which it occurs" (Sager, 1990). Linguistic and translation aspects of historical terminology in English were only sporadically researched for particular time periods and not necessarily in strictly academic contexts (Slyvka, 2016; Lazarev, 2016; Tomilenko, 2013; Kovalenko, 2011). The situation with translated texts is not conducive to easing the translator's task of finding translation equivalents either. The medieval period in Ukrainian history, specifically that of Old Rus', as evidenced by the renowned American historian Raffensperger, unfortunately belongs to less represented subjects in world academia (Raffensperger, 2017).

Academic texts, such as monographs and articles, and translations from Ukrainian to English (Hrushevsky, 1997, etc.) and from English to Ukrainian (Magocsi, 2012; Pritsak, 1997, etc.) served as the material of our research. The subject of the research is the study of Ukrainian terms denoting social and military status and rank in the Old Rus' period and their counterparts in English. Social and military status and rank in this period of Ukrainian history were considered together, as they were indeed inseparable at that stage of historical development.

2. Data and methods

The historical terms that signify the belonging of a particular individual or a whole group constituting a social and military stratum and rank to Old Rus' society were selected en masse from academic texts in both languages. These included monographs and academic articles translated in both directions written by English and Ukrainian academics on the subject of Old Rus' of the total of 3222 pages in Ukrainian and 2977 pages in English. Particular attention was given to those sections and paragraphs that covered social, political and military organisation of the society of the period. Though historical terminology includes both culture-specific and non-culture specific terms (Vozna and Slavova, 2022), particular attention was given to culture-specific terminology usually italicized in both Ukrainian and English texts. A total number of 82 language units representing culture-specific historical terms of this group was selected and described.

Scrupulous comparative study of terms in the selected texts, their definitions and context, enabled us to determine the semantic meaning ascribed to particular terms in historical academic discourse by English-speaking and Ukrainian-speaking academics. Semantic, contextual and comparative analyses allowed us to establish pairs of terms in English and Ukrainian that denote the same concepts. The semantic component analysis method was used to describe the complexity and, in certain instances, the divergence of semantic meanings ascribed by different authors to the same concepts. Further, the translation analysis method was used to identify general approaches and specific methods as used by the authors and translators to render Ukrainian historical terminology of this group into English.

Having analysed translation equivalents it was possible to conclude about unacceptability of

certain translation approaches for academic texts used, e.g., in the English translation of Hrushevsky's "History of Ukraine-Rus'", specifically that of approximation as described in the Editorial Preface to Volume 1 (Hrushevsky, 1997).

The approach used in the named translation correlates with at least two specific translation methods: analogous translation and generalisation. While admitting that approximation may be appropriate for popular style and historical fiction, the approach has its pitfalls for an academic context. In our research we have also identified the most common translation methods for the researched terminological group and their correlation with the "analogue rule" of secondary term formation formulated by Valeontis (Valeontis, 2004).

It has to be said that English naming of specific concepts by English-speaking academics is in fact their rendering from Ukrainian, i.e. translation, as the discussed terminology is of Slavic origin and is culture-specific. This does not apply to historical terms of non-culture specific nature as their equivalents are readily available in bilingual dictionaries. It has also to be added that selection of terminology and its alignment were undertaken manually, as no corpora of texts on history known to us exist in Ukrainian in the digital form.

3. Theoretical background

The close connection between history and language is indisputable. The discussion, which of them is primary, has been in the focus of academics for a long time, culminating in the second half of the 20th century. The trend in linguistic philosophy which came to be called "the linguistic turn" (Rorty, 1967) put language above history and proclaimed, as Popescu aptly noted, "the importance" and, according to some thinkers, "the hegemony" of language not only as a structuring agent, but also as a main condition to express something" (Popescu, 2009). The extreme understanding of history according to this theory is that history is created by words, and nothing else matters. Our research indeed showed a great reliance of historians on words, specifically, found in medieval chronicles and legal codifications, from which historians learn about the past. But any such written sources have their limitations: most of them were written 50 – 200 years after the events, chroniclers may often have been biased as they were always close to their contemporary royal court and expressed viewpoints favourable for certain monarch and policies, and sided with certain parties. The subject matter of their description was also arbitrary: they wrote about what they knew about and deemed important, leaving many aspects of medieval life out. Their use of words was often inconsistent and not strict, naming somewhat different groups of people and phenomena with the same words. Modern historians working with such sources have to analyse and compare different contexts that use the same wording, and try to ascribe specific and accurate meaning to such words, thus turning them into terminological units. And as this process also involves archaeology and other disciplines, they do not rely exclusively on words.

This research supported Popescu's point of view, which criticised the overvaluing of words and equalling them to history. He wrote in this respect: "… History is not about interpretations, meanings, preconceived ideas and rhetorical constructions. History is created by human facts and these facts make history to be a particular human science, which is different from other human sciences." (Popescu, 2009).

Our study acknowledged both the importance of medieval wording, rethought by modern historians, and the limitations of recreating an accurate picture of life in medieval Ukraine centred around Kyiv springing from such wording. We also paid attention to somewhat different semantic

meanings ascribed to certain terms by different academics, as such meanings are relevant for translation. Most of the researched terminology is highly specific for the period and culture and as such represents the biggest challenge for translators. Different groups of these terms and the most common methods of their translation were described in our earlier article on the subject (Vozna and Slavova, 2022). Based on earlier findings the conclusion was made on the differentiation between two big groups, into which historical terms can be divided from the translation point of view: culture-specific historical terms and non-culture-specific historical terms, i.e. designations of universal concepts of history (Vozna and Slavova, 2022). This broad classification was the starting point of our current research.

Our understanding of culture-specific vocabulary stems from the ground-breaking work in Ukrainian translation studies by Zorivchak on "realia", i.e., culture-specific word, described by her as a category which "contains, as a binary opposition, a whole complex of traditionally ethic and cultural information ascribed to it, alien for the objective reality of the target language" (here and further the translation is ours) (Zorivchak, 1989). The scholar underlines the nature of this term as such that denotes a concept of translatology, and "exists only in the binary opposition of two languages, i.e., the source language and the target language (ibid.)". She also acknowledges the existence of the culture-specific term or "realia-term" (Zorivchak, 1989) as professional terminology.

Further research into this lexical stratum was undertaken by Ukrainian academics primarily from a linguistic point of view and when used in historical fiction (Tomilenko, 2013; Kovalenko, 2011), focusing on the nature and differentiation between terminology of historical science and historical words used in a non-academic context. Slyvka is the only researcher known to us, who studied Ukrainian-to-English translation of culture-specific terminology in an academic context for a much later period in Ukrainian history (Slyvka, 2016).

As pointed out by Ukrainian linguist Kochan, the notion of terminology is still under discussion, as this lexical layer cannot be easily defined (Kochan, 2009). At the same time linguists generally agree on the most important features that define a term. In relation to historical terminology, these features were summed up by Tomilenko: 1) they belong to a specific area of knowledge—history, 2) have a strict definition; 3) have restricted use in historical science and historical fiction; 4) within their system they tend to be monosemantic; 5) they do not have synonyms (Tomilenko, 2013). Kiyak describing terminology in general added such characteristics as systematic and conventional use, accuracy, and emotional neutrality (Kiyak et al., 2006).

All the named requirements also apply to translated terms and should be met in the process of secondary term formation. Meeting the requirements may be facilitated if the "analogue rule" is followed, a principle formulated by Valeontis who studied primary and secondary term formation (Valeontis, 2004). According to the analogue rule, "when forming a term in a target language in order to name a new concept that has been primarily named in the source language, the namer's first choice should be to apply a term-formation mechanism analogous to the term-formation mechanism used for the source language term" (Valeontis and Mantzari, 2006). According to Valeontis, this process is indeed called the "analogue rule" (ibid).

4. Results and discussion

Our study looked at general approaches and the specific translation methods that were used to meet requirements, including the use of the analogue rule, and whether such approaches were successful in achieving the goal. Culture-specific terms were the focus of our attention as they represent

the biggest challenge in the translation of Old Rus' historical terminology.

A hypothesis was formulated and proven about the unacceptability of approximation in rendering culture-related terms that designate highly specific concepts of this particular period in Ukrainian history. The research established that approximate translation fails to meet the requirement of strict definition and accuracy set forward for professional terminology. The analysis was undertaken using terminology designating social and military status and rank. The conducted research has also showed that the named requirements for secondary term formation are met by using either descriptive translation or the method called combined renomination, which represents transcription and description combined. The latter term was initially introduced by Zorivchak (Zorivchak, 1989) and is used by us with the same meaning.

The approximation approach was researched together with its specific implications. Understood broadly, it is based on an attempt to find similar nomenclature in European history. One such attempt resulted in the rendering in English of a key historical term in the Old Rus' history, i.e. of *князь*, a ruler of the land, as prince. This long-established tradition of using "prince" in English academic texts was originally based on analogous translation as a translation method. This tradition followed by most English-speaking historians (Vernadsky, 1948; Dimnik, 1981, 2003; Mogocsi, 2010; Pritsak, 1981), as well as the translator of Hrushevsky's history Marta Scorupsky (Hrushevsky, 1997) and many others. The same equivalent can be found in bilingual dictionaries (Popov and Balla, 2001). The concept in question though is not so simple: such rulers of that period were numerous and of different standing, which in original texts was reflected by adding such adjectival descriptors as: *удільний* (Kotlyar, 2008), literally meaning "holding a part/a share"; *служилий* (ibid.), naming a landless member of the Rurik dynasty in service of another king, a prince for "hire"; *осібний* (Hrushevsky, 1954), independent governor of his territory; and *світлий* (Hrushevsky, 1954), literally "illustrious", member of the royal dynasty. In Ukrainian academic texts on history a strict distinction is made between *великий князь*, who is otherwise described as *суверен* (sovereign), *монарх* (monarch) and other rulers of lower rank (Kotlyar, 2005). Semantic analysis of the meanings listed in the "Shorter Oxford English Dictionary on Historical Principles" (SOED) for the word "prince" shows that this meaning of top ruler, although present, is nevertheless archaic in modern English (SOED, 2002). In Ukrainian, on the contrary, it is present and marked as historical, but not archaic (Busel, 2004). Other currently used meanings for "prince" in SOED include "the ruler of a State actually, nominally, or originally, subject to a king or emperor", "a male member of the royal family other than a reigning king", "a nobleman" in Continental Europe, and a courtesy title (ibid.). Why then translate *князь* as prince? And not a king? The renowned American historian Raffensperger breaks this erroneous long-standing tradition in his monograph "The Kingdom of Rus'" (Raffensperger, 2017), where he gives ample historic and linguistic evidence of the same status enjoyed by Old Rus' rulers and other European kings of the period and comes to the conclusion that *князь* should be rendered as "king" (ibid.). He also refers to the vision of this title by Poppe, who earlier came to the same conclusion (ibid.). He quotes Poppe's view-point:

Since, in early Medieval Europe, the Slavic title kniaz' was equivalent to the Latin title rex, and since the Rus'ian rulers are constantly referred to in medieval sources as reges, I break here with the historiographic tradition of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries and return to the medieval usage and meaning of this title (ibid.).

This rethinking of history and revision of the traditional translation helps to uproot "an ahistorical

view of the medieval world" (Raffensperger, 2017), thus duly presenting Old Rus' rulers as kings equal to other European rulers of that time, and Rus' as a kingdom in its own right (ibid.). This a good example of "the linguistic turn" in action, when traditional approximate and inaccurate translation denigrated the status of Old Rus' rulers, thus creating a wrong historical picture. To sum up *великий князь* is a sovereign, *удільний князь*, although named by some as "appanaged prince" (Pritsak, 1981) or "regional prince" (Mogocsi, 2010), should really be translated by its equivalent as under-king (Raffensperger, 2017), or descriptively as a regional or provincial ruler (our translation). *Служилий князь* should be rendered by a description: a landless member of the Rurik dynasty in service of another king, a prince for "hire" (our translation). *Осібний князь* is best rendered also descriptively as an independent governor of his territory. And *світлий князь*, being mostly a title for a member of the royal family, may indeed by translated as "serene prince" (Vernadsky, 1959) (see **Table 1**). The complete list of items under analysis is displayed in **Appendix 1**.

Table 1. English counterparts of Ukrainian *князь* with different adjectival descriptors.

Ukrainian Terms	English Counterparts
князь	king, *kniaz'*
великий князь	a sovereign, *velikii kniaz'*
удільний князь	under-king a regional or provincial ruler (our translation)
служилий князь	a landless member of the Rurik dynasty in service of another king, a prince for "hire" (our translation)
осібний князь	an independent governor of a territory (our translation)
світлий князь	serene prince

This particular term, as well as others discussed below, if only rendered through correct equivalents or descriptive translation (which is, of course, a possible translation solution) loses its "charm". By providing translation with a phonetic form of the word we refer the potential reader to that time period of the land which had its own unique culture, language, and alphabet. For this reason, a combined approach of adaptive transcription together with a descriptive part (combined renomination) was so commonly used in English academic texts by English native speakers, for instance: the great prince (*velikii kniaz'*) (Pritsak, 1981), *velikiy knyaz'*—a grand prince (Dimnik, 1981), princes (*kniazi*) (Mogocsi, 2010), a *kniaz'*—a king in Ukrainian or Russian (Raffensperger, 2017). In fact, Raffensperger uses the transcription of the word with or without description in more than 130 instances throughout his book. He also notes:

Though making a *kniaz'* a king in Ukrainian or Russian (for example) would be a worthy endeavour and historically accurate, the shift would not necessarily be in translation of titulature but in conception of what *kniaz'* means in this period (ibid.).

Our belief is that for translation to be accurate the shift in translation should follow the shift in concept. It is also necessary to underline that the described translation method of combined renomination follows the "analogue rule" for secondary term formation repeating the structure of Ukrainian original terms: period name plus explanation.

Another key term of the researched group is that of *тисяцький*. In this instance approximation was also used by some historians (Vernadsky, 1959) with additional definition by some authors: the *tysiatskii* (literally 'thousander', 'chiliarch', the prince's man with the responsibility over the city

(Franklin and Shepard, 2013)) and in some translations, in particular, that of Hrushevsky's "History of Ukraine-Rus'" (Hrushevsky, 1997). In the editorial preface to the first volume the editors describe the reasoning for this approach:

Exact equivalents occur very rarely, so that most translated terms are approximations. For example, the term "chiliarch", used in reference to Greek and Byzantine armies, is used here for the military leader of the thousand (*tysiats'kyi*), in part because it is standard in the literature on Old Rus'. In contrast, *sots'kyi* is rendered as 'head of the hundred' rather than as 'centurion', which appears in some of the literature, because 'centurion' is too closely associated with the Roman army (Hrushevsky, 1997).

Our research demonstrated two points which disagree with the above reasoning. Firstly, the prevalent approach of treating this term in the studied sources (considering the number of instances of the use of a particular translation method) was description or its combination with transcription and not translation by analogue argued for above. For instance: the *tysiatskyi*, commander of the city militia (as distinct from the prince's retinue) (Mogocsi, 2010); *tysyatskiy*—the town judge, police chief, a military commander (literally "one in charge of a thousand men") (Dimnik, 1981); the offices of *tysiatskii* (Bushkovitch, 1980). Secondly, the use of this term in historical texts demonstrates its ambiguity and realisation of other than "the head of the thousand" meaning, which makes the analogy with Greek and Byzantine military organization totally irrelevant and conjuring wrong associations. This ambiguity is down to the evolution of the meaning throughout Old Rus' history and specificity of local usage in different parts of the Old Rus' state. The original military meaning indeed goes back to a time before a centralised Old Rus' state was formed. Eminent Ukrainian historian Hrushevsky described this organisation as *desiatnia* (a ten), *sotnia* (a hundred), and *tysiacha* (a thousand), the latter "headed by a chiliarch, or *voivode*, who was the highest military official of the land or the principality…" (Hrushevsky, 1997). He further wrote that "after the rise of the retinue system, which assumed all responsibility for defence, the thousand organization lost its purely military nature" (ibid.) and in some areas their leaders started to hold judicial and administrative posts.

This viewpoint is supported by our contemporary, the Ukrainian historian Kotlyar, who describes the evolution of the concept by saying that, though being a military office at the beginning, with time the original *desiatnia* in societal organisation acquired an administrative nature, and *tysiatskyi* became a king's appointee often still performing the function of the top military leader (called *voyevoda*) (Kotlyar, 2008). Kotlyar also acknowledges the existence of a different kind of *tysiatskyi* called *zemskyi*, independent of the king. This kind of office can be better traced in the north of the Old Rus' state, in Suzdal' and Novhorod lands (ibid.). Dimnik, for instance, lists *tysyatskiy* and *posadnik* among "the executive agents of the *veche* (popular assembly), whose functions were "to oversee the internal administration and the foreign affairs of the town"" (Dimnik, 1981). Thus, we could observe a different nature of the concept used in different contexts (see **Table 2**).

For this reason, the correct interpretation of a specific meaning ascribed by a historian to this term in a particular context becomes of paramount importance, and analogous translation, representing a method of approximation, does not meet the requirement of accuracy for professional terminology. In addition to transliteration, a descriptive part should be added that would ensure the rendering of the semantic distinction.

Table 2. The diverse nature of the concept *тисяцький* used in different contexts.

Concept	Translation
тисяцький	*tysiatskyi*, commander of the city militia (as distinct from the prince's retinue)
	tysyatskiy, the town judge, police chief, a military commander (literally "one in charge of a thousand men")
	tysiatskyi, a king's appointee often still performing the function of the top military leader (called *voyevoda*)
	lit. "thousander", the prince's man with the responsibility over the city (Franklin and Shepard, 2013)

The examples and quotations discussed above also show the origins of the dual nature (military and secular) of some terminology of the period. The function of *voyevoda*, which can only be described as military leader and nothing else, could have been performed by the king himself, by a *tysyatskiy, a dvorskiy* (one of the leading members of the royal court), or a *boyar* (a prominent land owner, member of the royal court) (Kotlyar, 2005).

The dual nature of key Old Rus' terminology is also clearly visible in the rendering of the term *дружинник*, a member of *дружина*. The bilingual dictionary of Popov and Balla correctly offers "armed force" marked "hist." as the translation for this term (Popov and Balla, 2001). However, in English academic sources and English translations the concept is often described by the word "retinue": "the *druzhyna*, or prince's retinue" (Mogocsi, 2010); "the army, that is, the princely retinue" (Hrushevsky, 1997), "the princely retinue (*druzhina*) (Vernadsky, 1959). This is not true for all English sources: Dimnik totally avoids this word and describes *druzhina* as "prince's private detachment of troops, bodyguard" (Dimnik, 2003). Franklin and Shepard apply "retinue" only to *malaia* (small) *drushina*, which they describe as "the core of the *druzhina*, the prince's permanent personal retinue" (Franklin and Shepard, 2013) (see **Table 3**). They also pointed out the flexibility of the term, whose "meaning and composition could vary" (ibid.) and that an expanded meaning of the term *druzhina* may include townspeople (Franklin and Shepard, 2013). The dual (military and secular) nature of the term and how it evolved in time was summed up by Kotlyar, who draws parallels with Western European history, where the same role was played by knights, formed into troops of the best warriors of a king, a duke, or a count, who were heavily armed, protected by armour horsemen. The senior members of the troop formed the closest circle of a sovereign, and some of them were the sovereign's advisors and administrators (Kotlyar, 2008). The author further concludes that the same is true about Old Rus' *druzhynniks,* especially their senior, more prominent members. He also believes that a royal court did not exist in Rus' in the 11th and 12th centuries: the land was ruled by the king and his senior druzhynniks who gathered taxes, administered justice and performed other administrative functions. The "*druzhyna* state", continues the author, ceases to exist under Volodymyr Svyatoslavich, and under his son continues to play an exclusively military role (Kotlyar, 2008). This research into the term shows the predominantly military nature of *druzhyna* and its members, who cannot be described as "retinue". The word appeared only in Late Middle English, starting from the middle of the 14th century, and currently means: "A number or body of people in the service of or accompanying someone, esp. an important person; a train, a suite; the members of such a body collectively" (SOED, 2002). As we can see, no military role is noted. We believe that the word came to signify a concept of a much later period in European history and was used as an analogue applied retrospectively to a much older concept. Hence, its inadequacy as it does not meet the requirement of accuracy set for professional terminology. All the examples described above bring us to the conclusion that the discussed terminological group denotes

highly specific concepts of the Old Rus' period that cannot be rendered by analogous translation.

Table 3. English counterparts of the Ukrainian period terms дружинник and дружина.

Ukrainian Terms	English Counterparts
дружинник	a member of *druzhina,* prince's private detachment of troops, bodyguard
дружина	the army, i.e., the princely retinue (Hrushevsky, 1991) the retinue of the great prince and the retinues of his subordinates and voivodes (Hrushevsky, 1991)
малая дружина	retinue, *malaia* (small) *drushina,* the core of the *druzhina,* the prince's permanent personal retinue

The other translation method, identified in researched sources, which is based on the approximation approach, is that of generalisation, when "a word with a narrower meaning is substituted for a word with a wider meaning, often a hyperonym" (Karaban, 2001). The use of generalization also may result in inaccuracy, sometimes leading to a mix-up of different original terms translated by the same word.

One of such interesting example is the rendering of at least three period terms *дворський, тіун* and *ключник/ключниця* (for a female) by the same word "steward": the stewards (*tiuny*) (Franklin and Shepard, 2013); the steward (*tiun*) (Vernadsky, 1947); *dvorskiy* – house-steward, major-domo, attendant in charge of the prince's residence, advisor of the prince (Dimnik, 1981); *kljucnica* (steward) (Hrushevsky, 1997). The SOED indeed lists, as one of the ten meanings of the word, an obsolete meaning, except in an historical context, of "an officer of a royal household with similar functions to the steward of an ordinary household. Later, an office in the household of an English medieval sovereign held only by a noble of the realm" (SOED, 2002). But it also lists other nine non-relevant meanings (ibid.). Obviously, the word has wider, more general semantics, and without a descriptive part specifying the volume of the concept in each particular context, does not render the meaning of the original term ascribed to it in each instance by the author. When the descriptive part is present, as in the usage by Dimnik above (ibid.), the concept becomes clearer.

The translation challenge is even greater as the Ukrainian original terms are (as often is the case with this period terminology) vague and changing with time. Kotlyar wrote in this respect that the functions of *dvorskiy* in the sources, such as chronicles, are either not specified or described too broadly. Chroniclers presented *dvorskiy* as individuals performing different roles (Kotlyar, 2008). Kotlyar believed that *dvorskiy* was at the head of the royal court and belonged to the circle of most trusted and best *voyevodas* (military leaders) of the sovereign (ibid). At the same time, he notes that *dvorskiy* and *klyuchnik* are different roles, as the chronicles differentiated between one of the top officers of the royal court and somebody in charge of the royal house-hold affairs (ibid). The term *tiun* also realizes different meanings in different contexts, as they were of two kinds: royal administrator, described by Franklin and Shepard as prince's senior servitor (Franklin and Shepard, 2013) and by Tolochko as a house-hold administrator of a king or other feudal lord (Tolochko, 1995), and a town official, administrator (Dimnik, 1981). Vernadsky pointed at the change in the concept throughout the Old Rus' period: "… it denoted at first a steward but later came to be used chiefly with the connotation of "judge." It may not be inappropriate to remark that a similar process of transformation of prince's servitors into state officials took place in England, France, and Germany in the early Middle Ages." (Vernadsky, 1948).

Table 4. English counterparts to the Ukrainian period terms дворський, тіун and ключник/ключниця.

Ukrainian Terms	English Counterparts
дворський	house-hold administrator of a king or other feudal lord (our translation) senior royal administrator (our translation) prince's senior servitor the major-domo (Dimnik, 1981)
тіун	tiun (tivun), a town official, administrator (Dimnik, 2003) tiun (steward or judge) (Vernadsky, 1948)
ключник/ключниця	steward (Hrushevsky, 1991)

Another example of generalisation, resulting in possible failure to meet the requirement of accuracy, is the rendering of the term *смерди* as peasants or serfs: *smerd* – peasant (Dimnik, 1981). Academics usually agree that peasants in the Old Rus' period were of two kinds: free-persons (*smerdy*) and half-free persons (*zakupy*) (Mogocsi, 2010). But even these descriptions are contentious. As for *smerdy*, their description varies with different historians. Ukrainian historian Tolochko describes them as "feudally dependent, who had their own homestead, but had to work for their lord for a certain time" (Tolochko, 1995), i.e. serfs, whereas Vernadsky believed that "serfdom as a legal institution did not exist in Kievan Russia" (Vernadsky, 1948) and described *smerdy* as "personally free, but their legal status was somewhat qualified…dependent on the prince in one way or another … may be called state peasants with due reservations" (Vernadsky, 1948). As for *zakupy* the descriptions also vary: "peasants temporarily deprived of their freedom" (Magocsi, 2010), "hired or indentured laborers unlike slaves" (Franklin and Shepard, 2013), "half-free people… not serfs, either, in the technical sense, since there was no element of non-economic pressure … in the process of their loss of freedom… Such a debtor (*zakup*) was in fact an indentured laborer" (Vernadsky, 1948). Bushkovitch pointed at the difficulty of defining the nature of the dependence of the *zakup* on his lord as the result of debt because of the scarcity of historical evidence to this effect (Bushkovitch, 1980) (see **Table 5**).

Table 5. English counterparts to the Ukrainian period terms *смерди, закупи*.

Ukrainian Terms	English Counterparts
смерди	*smerdy,* or rural free persons (Magocsi, 2010) *smerdy,* freemen of somewhat limited status (Vernadsky, 1948)
закупи	*zakupy,* hired and contracted workers (Franklin and Shepard, 2013) hired or indentured laborers unlike slaves (Franklin and Shepard, 2013) half-free persons (Magocsi, 2010) peasants temporarily deprived of their freedom (Magocsi, 2010) debtor (*zakup*), an indentured laborer (Vernadsky, 1948)

This discussion on the nature of the term brings us to the conclusion that no generalisation should be applied in translation to these terms without a description, which in its turn should reflect the understanding of these terms by individual historians. If a historian fails to provide such description immediately after or before the use of the term, their meaning should be judged by the translator from a wider context, i.e. a description of the same concept in a different place of the same academic work.

5. Conclusions

This study furthers the theory of translation for the Ukrainian-English language pair in the area of domain-specific terminology, by studying translation methods that can be applied to a specific genre – academic texts in the subject area of historical science. Historical professional terminology is highly

culture- and period-specific, which results in the necessity of using translation methods, often dissimilar to other areas of knowledge.

We have tested the hypothesis as to the unacceptability of approximation (analogous translation and generalisation) in rendering culture-related terms that designate highly specific concepts from the defined period in Ukrainian history. The research establishes that approximate translation fails to meet the requirement of strict definition and accuracy set forward for professional terminology. Our study underlines the importance of secondary term formation through descriptive translation, and combined renomination. It also confirms the hypothesis that the most accurate and efficient secondary term formation should follow the patterns of primary term formation. For the translation to be accurate, the shift in translation should follow the shift in concept. The specific term may have wider, more general semantics, and for each particular context it should be specified. The use of description or combined renomination helps to make the meaning of the concept clearer.

This research may find practical use in translating Ukrainian academic texts to share knowledge of Ukrainian history both within academia and the broader reading public. It also provides tools for compiling bilingual dictionaries of historical terms, as the results of the research are seen by us to be applicable to terminology of any period of Ukrainian history.

Author contributions

Conceptualization, MV; methodology, MV and LS; formal analysis, MV, LS and NA; investigation, MV, LS and NA; resources, MV and NA; writing—original draft preparation, MV; writing—review and editing, LS; visualization, LS and NA; supervision, MV and LS. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Conflict of interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

Busel V (2004). Big Dictionary of the Modern Ukrainian Language. Perun.

Bushkovitch P. Towns and Castles in Kievan Rus': Boiar Residence and Landownership in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries. Russian History. 1980, 7(1): 251-264. doi: 10.1163/187633180x00184

Dimnik M (1981). Mikhail, Prince of Chernigov and Grand Prince of Kiev. Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies. pp. 1224-1246.

Dimnik M (2003). The Dynasty of Chernigov, 1146-1246. Cambridge University Press.

Franklin S, Shepard J (2013). The Emergence of Rus 750-1200. Routledge.

Hrushevsky M (1954). Istoriya Ukrayiny-Rusy [History of Ukraine-Rus] Volume 1. Knyho-Spilka.

Hrushevsky M (1997). History of Ukraine-Rus. Volume 1. Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press.

Karaban V (2001). Translation of English Scientific and Technical Literature, Part 2. Nova Knyha.

Kiyak T, Ohuy O, Naumenko, A (2006). Theory and Practice of Translation (German). Nova Knyha.

Kochan I (2009). Ukrainian terms in the paradigm of modern academic thought. Ukrayinska terminolohiya i suchasnist' 8. Kyiv: KNEU 8: 30-34.

Kotlyar M (2005). Military Art of Old Rus'. Kyiv.

Kotlyar M (2008). The Royal Court of Halych. In: Kotlyar M, Rychka B. Royal Courts in Southern Rus' in X-XIII centuries. Naukova Dumka, pp. 184-355.

Kovalenko O (2011). The Use of Historical Words in Novels by W. Scott. Naukovy Visnyk Volynskoho Natsionalnoho Universytetu imeni Lesi Ukrainky. Filolohichni Nauky. Movoznavstvo 5: 60-64.

Lazarev O (2016). The Isssue of Rendering Ukrainian Historical Terminology in a French Text. Aktualni problemy filolohiyi ta perekladoznavstva 10: 90-92.

Magocsi P (2010). A History of Ukraine: The Land and Its Peoples. Toronto University.

Magocsi P (2012). A History of Ukraine: The Land and Its Peoples. V. Padyak Publishers.

Mizin K, Slavova L, Khmara V (2021). The equivalence of terms denoting the emotion concepts of Ger. angst and A.-S. fear: A corpus-based method. In Lege artis. Language yesterday, today, tomorrow. The journal of University of SS Cyril and Methodius in Trnava. Trnava: University of SS Cyril and Methodius in Trnava, 2021, VI (2), December 2021, pp. 69-104.

Popescu L (2009). Linguistic Turn and Historical Knowledge. In: Historical Knowledge in Western Civilization: Studies beyond the Sovereign View. Available online: https://www.academia.edu/8078570/Linguistic_Turn_and_Historical_Knowledge (accessed on 8 December 2023).

Popov Y, Balla M (2001). Big Ukrainian-English Dictionary. Chumatskyi Shlyakh.

Pritsak O (1981). The Origin of Rus'. Volume 1. Cambridge: Massachusetts: Harvard University Press for the Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute.

Pritsak O (1997). The Origin of Rus. Kyiv: Oberehy.

Raffensperger C (2017). The Kingdom of Rus'. Arc Humanities Press, Kalamazoo and Bradford.

Rorty R (1967). The lingustic turn: Recent essays in philosophical method. Chicago: the University of Chicago Press.

Sager J (1990). A Practical Course in Terminology Processing. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Shorter Oxford English Dictionary on Historical Principles (2002). Oxford University Press.

Slavova L, Vozna M (2022). Ethnic and Cultural Nature of Historical Terminology: the Comparative and Translation Aspects (based on historical terms of antiquity and Old Rus period). Movni i kontseptualni kartyny svitu 1(71): 115-131. doi: 10.17721/2520-6397.2022.1.10

Slavova L, Borysenko N (2021). Culture-specific information encoded in lacunae: The author's and translators' strategies of representation. Studies about Languages/Kalbų studijos, 38: 17-28. doi: 10.5755/j01.sal.1.38.27396

Slyvka M (2016). Culture-Specific Words and Terminology in Historical and Cultural Discourse. Suchasni doslidzhennya z inozemnoyi filolohiyi 14: 183-188.

Tolochko O, Tolochko P (1998). Kievan Rus'. Alternatyvy.

Tolochko P, et al. (1995). Old History of Ukraine. Part 2. Kyiv: Lybid.

Tomilenko L (2013). Historicisms and Historical Terminology: The Issue of Differentiation. Naukovi Zapysky Vinnytskoho Univesytetu imeni Mykhaila Kotsyubynskoho. Filolohiya. Movoznavstvo 17: 132-137.

Torchinsky M (2009). Onomastic Structure of the Ukrainian Language. Functioning of Proper Names. Khmelnytsky: Vydavnytstvo Khmelnytskoho Universitetu.

Valeontis K (2004). The "analogue rule"—a useful terminological tool in interlingual transfer of knowledge". In: 2nd Terminology Summit, Spain, Barcelona. 26-27 November 2004.

Valeontis K, Mantzari E (2006). The linguistic dimension of terminology: principles and methods of term formation. In: 1st Athens International Conference on Translation and Interpretation Translation: Between Art and Social Science, Athens, Greece. 13-14 October 2006.

Vernadsky G (1948). Kievan Russia. Yale University Press.

Vernadsky G (1959). The Origins of Russia. The Clarendon Press.

Vozna M, Slavova L (2022). Rendering Ukrainian Historical Terminology of The Old Rus' Period into English. English Studies at NBU 8(2): 183-202.

Zorivchak R (1989). Culture-Specific Words and Translation. Lviv: Vydavnytstvo Lvivskoho Universitetu.

Appendix

Table A1. The list of the language units under analysis.

бирич	*birich*, a servant in charge of royal proclamations
берладники	*berladnyky*, free settlers in the lower basin of the Dnieper and the Danube, with many exiles from the Old Rus' kingdom among them
бобровники	*bobrovniki*, beaver-breeders who owned land and paid duty in kind or money
боярин	*boyar*, a prominent land owner, member of the royal court
бродники	*brodniky*, ferrymen and fishermen who lived in the lower part of the Dnieper and Danube basins and participated in military campaigns of the Old Rus' kings
вдачи	*vdachi*, an indentured labourer who received a loan in bread or money
вірник	*virnyk*, a royal officer in charge of collecting fines (bloodwite) for murder of or injury to a *druzhinnik* or a servant of the royal court
воєвода	*voyevoda*, a top military leader appointed by the *kniaz'*
вої або ратники	1) *voyi*, people's militia at the time of war but not *druzhina* 2) *voyi*, all warriors summoned for a military campaign
волхв	*volkhv*, a pagan priest, a sorcerer
вотчинник	*votchinnyk*, a land owner who had qualified ownership rights in land in Old Rus'
гості	*gosti*, rich merchants
гречники	*grechniki*, traders in wine, oil and other agricultural produce and luxury goods who plied the "Greek" route
гридь	*grid'*, a member of a *druzhina*, royal troop
двірське жіноцтво	female attendants at a royal court
дворський	1) *dvorskiy*, a senior royal administrator or even the head of the royal court, who belonged to the circle of most trusted *voyevodas* (military leaders) of the sovereign 2) *dvorskiy*, a household administrator of a king or other feudal lord
дворяни	1) *dvoryany*, all courtiers with exception of the senior members of the court 2) *dvoryany*, warriors and servants at the royal court
дітський	*ditskyi*, the implementer of the punishments imposed by the royal court and one in charge of inheritance cases
дружина молодша	*druzhina molodsha*, junior members of the *druzhina*, its foot soldiers and oarsmen
дружина старша або мала	*druzhina starsha*, the core of the *druzhina*, the closest circle of a sovereign, some members of which were the sovereign's advisors and administrators
дружинник	*druzhinnik*, a member of a *druzhina*, king's private detachment of troops, bodyguard
житіє люди	*zhiti'i lyudi*, well-to-do people, who derived their status from the ownership of artisanal enterprises and might also be in the service at the royal court
закупи	1) *zakupy*, peasants temporarily deprived of their freedom 2) *zakupy*, hired or indentured laborers unlike slaves
залозники	*zalozniki*, wine-traders who travelled to and from Crimea
земський	*zemskyi*, an executive agent of the *veche*, a popular assembly
ізгой	1) *izgoi*, a person whose social status has changed 2) *izgoi*, an ousted member of the royal family, a debarred prince ineligible to rule a town

Table A1. (*Continued*).

каракалпаки або Чорні клобуки	*Kararalpaks or Chorni Klobuky,* lit."Black Caps", frontier military settlers of Turkish origin who were subjects of the Kyiv kniaz' and formed part of his troop
ключник	*klyuchnik,* lit. "one in charge of the keys", an officer of the court in charge of the royal house-hold affairs
книжник	chronicler at the royal court or a monastery
князь	*kniaz',* king in the Old Rus' kingdom
князь великий	*velikyi kniaz',* a sovereign in the Old Rus' kingdom
князь осібний	*kniaz' osibnyi,* an independent governor of a territory
князь світлий	*sviylyi kniaz',* serene prince (appellation)
князь служилий	*kniaz' sluzhilyi,* a landless member of the Rurik dynasty in the service of another king, a prince for "hire"
князь тубільний	*tubilnyi kniaz',* local or minor ruler
князь удільний	*kniaz' udilnyi,* under-king, a regional or provincial ruler
конюший	*koniushyi,* the master of the stables
кормильчич	*kormyl'chych,* a senior courtier, tutor to the heir of the throne
ловчий	*lovchiy,* master of the hunt
лучшиє люді	*luchshiye lyudi*, lit. "the best men", landed aristocracy
люди градскіє	*lyudi gradskiye*, townspeople
людин	*lyudin,* a middle-class person, member of a guild
меньшиє люди	*men'shiye lyudi,* lit. "lesser people", common people
мечник	*mechnik,* a senior officer; king's assistant in legal affairs responsible for the implementation of a punishment
милостниця	*milostnytsya,* favourite or relative of the queen at a royal court
митник	*mitnik,* a customs and excise collector in the Old Rus' kingdom
молодшиє люди	*molodshie lyudi,* lit. "younger people", artisans and workers of various kinds
мостник	*mostnik,* a road and bridge master who received a fee from public construction works
муж	*muzh,* a man from the upper classes
мужі нарочитиє/ліпшиє	*muzhi narochitiye/lipshiye,* prominent members of society
наложниця	*nalozhnitsya,* a harem member of some Old Rus' rulers
намісник	*namisnyk,* a king's appointee in charge of the town or area
огнищанин	*ognishchanin,* an executive in legal matters, a bailiff
отрок	*otrok,* a warrior, member of the royal bodyguard
пасинок	*pasynok,* lit. "step-son", a member of the royal family
печатник	*pechatnyk,* the keeper of the royal seal, a chancellor, a senior member of the royal court
підложниця	*pidlozhnytsya,* a concubine at the court of an Old Rus' king
пішці	infantry of the Old Rus' period
под'єздной	*podiezdnoy,* an adjutant to the king

Table A1. (*Continued*).

посадник	1) *posadnik,* an executive agent of the *veche* (popular assembly), whose functions were to oversee the internal administration and the foreign affairs of a town 2) *posadnik,* a king's appointee in charge of a town
простая чадь	*prostaya chad',* ordinary people
псарі	*psari,* royal servants in charge of hunting dogs
роб	*rob,* a bondsman
роба	*roba,* a bondswoman
робочич	*robochych,* son of a bondswoman
ролійний закуп	*roliyniy zakup,* a kind of indentured worker
рядович	*riadovich,* a hired or contracted worker
своєземець	*svoyezemets,* owner of land in his own right; descendant of the *lyudi* class
седельничий	*sedel'nychiy,* lit. "in charge of the saddle", a senior member of the royal court similar to *konyushiy*
смерди	*smerdy,* free peasants of a limited status
снузники	*snuzniki,* light cavalry of the Old Rus' period
сокольники	*sokol'nyky,* royal servants in charge of falconery
соцький	*sots'kyi,* a military leader in charge of a hundred men
староста	*starosta,* elder, senior man, elected head
старці градскіє	*startsi hradskiye,* town elders
стольник	*stol'nyk,* a senior member of the royal court or senior Church rulers' circle
стрільці	*stril'tsi,* bowmen of the Old Rus' period
тисяцький	1) *tysiatskiy,* lit. "thousander", a king's appointee with the responsibility over the city 2) *tysiatskiy,* a king's appointee performing the function of the top military leader (called *voyevoda*) 3) *tysiatskiy,* commander of the city militia 4) *tysyatskiy,* the town judge, police chief, a military commander
тіун	1) *tiun,* an administrator at the court of a king or other feudal lord 2) *tiun,* a town official, a judge
холоп	*kholop,* a male slave
чади нарочитиє	*chadi narochitiye,* children of prominent members of society
челядь	*cheliad',* household slaves
чорні люди	*chernye lyudi,* lit. "black people", common people
ястребники	*yastrebniki,* royal servants in charge of hawk hunting

Note: In many instances the transcription of Ukrainian terminology followed the usage of English-speaking academics in line with Russian and not Ukrainian pronunciation. This is highlighted by the use of "g" instead of "h" in words such as "gosti" which should actually be *hosti*.