

# RENDERING UKRAINIAN HISTORICAL TERMINOLOGY OF THE OLD RUS' PERIOD INTO ENGLISH

Marina Vozna<sup>1</sup> and Liudmyla Slavova<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1,2</sup> Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, Ukraine



## Abstract

The article presents a study that focuses on approaches to rendering Ukrainian historical terminology related to the Old Rus' period into English selected *en masse* from Ukrainian and English academic texts on history, with a special focus on culture-specific terminology. Historical terms for translation purposes are categorised into non-culture-specific historical terminology reflecting universal concepts of historical science, and culture-specific historical terminology. The purpose of the article is to determine specific methods for Ukrainian-English translation of historical terminology of the Old Rus' period. The paper discusses approaches and methods used by English-speaking academics to secondary term formation, taking place when rendering concepts denoting Ukrainian original culture-specific terminology into English. Different groups of historical terms are described with a special focus on onomastic terminology. It is demonstrated that the historical context should be taken into account for the correct designation of a historical concept. Non-culture-specific historical terminology is predominantly rendered by existing equivalents, which were formed through phonological adaptation and/or calque translation. The most appropriate technique for rendering culture-specific Ukrainian historical terminology is shown to be combined renomination, the method that uses both a transcription and a description of a historical concept.

**Keywords:** historical terminology, translation techniques, culture-specific historical terms, secondary term formation, historical concept, onomastic terminology

### Article history:

Received: 16 May 2022  
Reviewed: 30 October 2022  
Accepted: 05 November 2022  
Published: 20 December 2022

### Contributor roles

Conceptualization, Writing - original draft, Validation, Formal Analysis M.V. (lead); Supervision, Project Administration, Writing - review and editing, Methodology L.S. (lead), Visualization, Data Curation, Investigation M.V, L.S. (equal)

Copyright © 2022 Marina Vozna and Liudmyla Slavova



This open access article is published and distributed under a [CC BY-NC 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/) which permits non-commercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited. Permissions beyond the scope of this license may be available at [slavovall16@gmail.com](mailto:slavovall16@gmail.com). If you want to use the work commercially, you must first get the authors' permission.

**Citation:** Vozna, M. & Slavova, L. (2022). Rendering Ukrainian Historical Terminology of the Old Rus' Period into English. *English Studies at NBU*, 8(2), 183-202. <https://doi.org/10.33919/esnbu.22.2.2>

**Marina Vozna** is an Associate Professor at the Department of Theory and Practice of Translation from English at Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv. Author and co-author of seven textbooks in English, Country Studies, Translation, and Terminology and more than 100 articles on theoretical and practical issues of translation and teaching methodology. The areas of her research interest include specialized translation, terminology, translation of culture-specific and ideologically loaded lexis, and teaching methods.

E-mail: [voznamarina2129@gmail.com](mailto:voznamarina2129@gmail.com)

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6339-9387>

**Liudmyla Slavova**, Doctor of Sciences (Linguistics), is the Head of the Department of Theory and Practice of Translation from English at Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv. She is the author and co-author of more than 130 journal articles, book chapters, and textbooks. The scope of her research interests includes translation studies, political discourse, linguistic personality, communicative linguistics, comparative linguistics, methods of teaching.

E-mail: [slavovall16@gmail.com](mailto:slavovall16@gmail.com)

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8035-1801>

The issues of specialised terminology and its translation have gained greater interest among scholars recently: (Sager, 1990; Nagy, 2014; Hutchinson & Waters, 1987; Hoffman, 1985; McArthur, 1998; Raffensperger, 2017; Kiyak et al., 2006; Slyvka, 2016; Panko, 1994; Kovalenko, 2011; Tomilenko, 2013). Their relevance to the topic can be explained by rapid scientific and technological progress. Terminology exists on the borderline of two academic disciplines, firstly linguistics, and secondly, the specific academic discipline or professional area which it serves. It is the latter that ascribes a certain semantic volume to each specific term, providing its strict definition that corresponds to a particular concept in this field. The development of field terminological systems is impossible without taking into account the changes in the system of concepts of the specialised field. Dealing with such changes is not exclusively a task for field specialists, but also for translators. This process was described by Sager as secondary term formation, which takes place when new or revised knowledge must be transferred to another linguistic community (Sager, 1990, p. 80). The linguistic aspects of term formation become even more important for translators as they very often become namers and/or neologists (Valeontis & Mantzari, 2006, p. 3).

Ukrainian medieval history in English translations unfortunately belongs to less represented subjects in world academia (Raffensperger, 2017, p.44). In this respect, the comparative translation analysis of historical terminology in Ukrainian and English academic texts is relevant for both the theory and practice of translation studies in field terminology, specifically that of historical science. Such comparative analysis of the designation of historical concepts in original academic texts in both languages helps to understand the correlation between the primary term formation, including the revision of concepts designated by such terms, and secondary term formation, which may be otherwise described as translation methods used for translating terminology. Focus on the categorisation of historical terms helps to understand its nature and the prevalence of certain translation methods for certain terminological groups.

The purpose of the article is to determine the basic approaches and specific methods to Ukrainian-English translation of historical terminology by comparing designations of the same historical concepts in the original Ukrainian and English academic texts covering a specific period in history, i.e. the Old Rus' period.

## **The Present Study and its Methods**

Historical terms selected en masse from Ukrainian and English academic texts on history describing a single period in Ukrainian history, specifically that of Old Rus' period served as material for our research (Davies N., 1997, 2001; Dimnik, 1981, 2003; Magocsi, 2010, 2012; Raffensperger, 2012, 2017; Nahaylo, 1999; Wilson, 2002; Hrushensky, 1994, 2009; Kotlyar & Rychka, 2008; Kotlyar, 1991, Slavova & Vozna, 2022; Tolochko & Tolochko, 1998; Tolochko, 1997). The total number of pages of academic texts from which terminology was selected amounts to 1017 pages in Ukrainian and 958 pages in English. The total number of non-repeated linguistic units identified by us as historical terminology in Ukrainian texts is 260 with 230 instances of use of corresponding English terminology in English texts. Corresponding terminology is understood as being either translated terms in those instances, where translations were available, or terms designating the same or similar concepts identified by the method of alignment, i.e. matching of terminological units that may be considered as translations of one another in similar contexts. The procedure took place manually as neither a digital form corpus on Ukrainian history or processing software are available. Other methods of research included descriptive and comparative methods, as well as elements of translation analysis.

A descriptive method allowed determining theoretical aspects of specialized terminology, either culture-specific or non-culture-specific. The techniques that were used to render historical terminology of the given period were established through comparison of the Ukrainian and English historical terms in the relevant texts. The translation techniques were identified for translating culture-specific and non-culture-specific historical terms.

It should be admitted that for the language pair of English-Ukrainian and Ukrainian-English there exist significantly less translated academic texts on history than for any other academic field. Ukrainian translations of substantial English language works (Davies, 2001; Magocsi, 2012) and from Ukrainian into English (Hrushensky, 1994) in this area are infrequent. It should also be noted there is an insignificant amount of linguistic works devoted to the nature of historical terms and principles of their classification (Poteryayeva, 2009), and historical discourse (Pleknova, 2016). Translation issues for the discussed pair of languages related to this stratum of lexis were also only partially researched (Slyvka, 2016; Lazarev, 2016).

## Theoretical Background

Historical terminology is understood as being a system of lexical and semantic units of a certain language to designate concepts which are specific for the historical science. In our research we differentiate between historical terminology as a system of lexical units of a certain language to designate specific concepts of this discipline, and historical culture-specific words as a concept of translation studies. The latter is understood through the binary opposition of the source and target language and not related to single-language academic texts on history. From the translation point of view, the corpus of historical terms was divided into two groups: non-culture-specific historical terms and culture-specific historical terms.

The requirements of term neutrality, strict definition and accuracy put forward by many academics (Kiyak et al., 2006, p.38) are to be met in the use of historical terms. Failure to display accuracy is demonstrated by the example of the historical concept “князь” (knyaz), which is traditionally translated as “prince” or “duke”. An eminent American historian Christian Raffensperger discusses the origins of the traditional wrongful designation of “князь” as “prince”, showing how the concept of medieval kings, who were a multitude in each particular land, transformed into that of a monarch, i.e. a single supreme ruler with others subordinate to him in later history, thus prompting the wrong translation based on later understanding of “князь” as a subordinate or member of a royal dynasty, where “king” should be used for rulers in the Old Rus lands (2017, p. 79). This revision in traditional translation helps to uproot “an ahistorical view of the medieval world” (Raffensperger, 2017, p. 77), thus duly presenting Old Rus’ rulers as kings equal to others European rulers of that time, and Rus’ as a kingdom in its own right (ibid.). This view has long been a cornerstone in understanding the Kievan Rus’ status on the world arena of the time by Ukrainian academics, who, along with “князь”, have long been using “король” (king), “государь” (sovereign), and “суверен” (sovereign) (Kotlyar, 1991, p.125; Kotlyar & Rychka, 2008, p. 229), as titlature for Old Rus’ rulers. The discussed example shows to what extent secondary term formation (its translation into another language) should strive to achieve accuracy with the concept behind the original term, taking into account the specifics of the historical and linguistic context.

Neutrality as another requirement to terminology is not always observed in regard to certain historical terms either. One of such examples is the term “Old Rus”

(Pritzak, 1990), and its variations “Old Russia” or “Kievan Russia (Franklin, 2002, p.528; Shepard, 1973, p. 74), the last two being simply offensive for Ukrainian people as they attempt to appropriate Ukrainian medieval history centered around Kyiv by Russia-leaning historians. These examples may be used to demonstrate the theory of “Linguistic Turn” in action, which lays great emphasis on language, and in its extreme equals history lived to history written, i.e. expressed with words (Popescu, 2009, p. 185). “We can confer a plurality of meanings to a subject or to a concept and these meanings change our perceptions concerning the relations between reality and discourses, but the historical reality remains the same” (ibid.). In terms of translation, we must strive to reflect the historical reality in secondary term formation in its contemporary vision as accurately and in as neutral a manner as possible, after having researched all appropriate theoretical linguistic and historical sources.

From the translation perspective, the first big grouping of historical terminology in our study is ‘non-culture specific’ and this includes designations of universal concepts of history, in particular international words, proper names, which refer to concepts known not only to Ukrainian history, but also that of Western Europe and the world. The interconnectedness of European history is reflected in the existence of names common not only for one nation, but for a broader geographic area, for instance, that of the Eastern Slavs, Western Europe, or the Mediterranean. International Scientific Vocabulary (ISV) as a part of this group of historical terms includes words originating in Latin and Greek, as well as other languages, that were borrowed into modern languages to render similar, often more complicated concepts and retaining fully or partially their phonetic form. ISV words are characterized as translinguistic (McArthur, 2007, p. 3-4). Their examples and translation methods are described further down.

Particular focus in our research was given to culture-specific terminology. The concept of culture-specific words or “realia” in Ukrainian is not unambiguous and may be interpreted differently for different purposes. Ukrainian academics in the field of translation studies commonly believe the concept of culture-specific words or “realia” to be a category of translatology, which exists only in the binary opposition of two languages, i.e. the source language and the target language (Zorivchak, 1989)<sup>1</sup>. “Realia” (a culture-specific word) is a one-word or many-word lexical unit, the principle lexical meaning of which

---

<sup>1</sup> Unless otherwise noted, all translations into English are our own.

contains, as a binary apposition, a whole complex of traditionally ethnic and cultural information ascribed to it, alien for the objective reality of the target language (Zorivchak, 1989, p.58). The scholar also introduces the concept of a culture-specific term or “realia-term” (Zorivchak, 1989, p.69), which points at the existing correlation between culture-specific words and professional terminology both being language signs. Their correlation is down to the fact that sometimes terms may coincide with “realia”, i.e. the existence of culture-specific professional terms (Zorivchak, 1989, p.69). Other terms to denote culture-specific concepts include cultural words (Newmark, 1988), culture-specific concepts (Baker, 1992), culture-specific references (Davies E., 2003), etc.

Culture-specific terms, along with non-culture-specific terms, were identified in the biggest group of historical terminology formed by onomastic terms (approximately 65%). Onomastics is both a linguistic and a historical discipline, as it studies proper names that constitute an inalienable and significant part of the cultural and language heritage of each nation. Proper names carry information on the history of ethnic groups and nations, historical periods and geographic areas where such names appeared, the languages in which they appeared, as well as international relations at certain historical periods. This interconnectedness of European history is reflected in the existence of names common not only for one nation, but for a broader geographic area, for instance, that of the Eastern Slavs, Western Europe, or the Mediterranean.

According to the translation-oriented categorization of historical terms, proper names “inherent to a certain language” referring to culture-specific concepts of Ukrainian history, constitute a part of culture-specific onomastic historical terminology. Various “non-inherent” proper names refer to concepts known not only to Ukrainian history, but also that of Western Europe and the world, and have been borrowed into Ukrainian at different historical periods. They designate commonly known concepts of onym nature, at least for certain geographical areas and regions. From the translational point of view, they are not culture-specific and form the other major group of onomastic historical terminology.

Onomastic historical terminology can be grouped based on the categories of onyms that were named as accepted by many academics studying onyms (Kocherhan, 2005, p.187; Torchinsky, 2009, p.117). The majority of such classes is represented in historical terminology. The most numerous ones are historical toponyms, anthroponyms,

and ethnonyms. Less numerous are chrononyms - names for periods of time, theonyms and mythonyms - names for deities and mythical creatures, ideonyms and chrematonyms - names for objects of spiritual and material culture respectively, as well as sovereignonyms - names for states, federations of states, etc.

### Results and Discussion

The whole corpus of historical terminology was divided into two major groups (Slavova & Vozna, 2022): 1) non-culture-specific historical terms, which include names to designate universal concepts of historical science, in particular ISV, and 2) culture-specific historical terms.

Among non-culture specific groups we have differentiated: 1) terms denoting universal concepts and often represented by ISV words: *християнство* - Christianity, *античність* - antiquity, *феодальний* - feudal, *поліс* - polis; 2) terms designating social and religious phenomena and processes, and objects of material culture: *удільна роздробленість* - feudal fragmentation, *вотчина* - fiefdom, *тризна* - funeral feast, *артефакт* - artefact, *кревна помста* - blood feud, *скарб* - hoard, *погребальна камера* - burial chamber, *поховання* - burial site, *вівтар для жертвоприношень* - sacrificial altar, *святилище* - shrine, etc; 3) onyms: *Папа Іннокентій IV* - Pope Innocent IV, *хозари* - Caspians, etc.

Non-culture-specific onomastic historical terminology can be generally found in bilingual dictionaries. Such proper names have a traditional form in many languages and refer to commonly known historical concepts. The examples include: toponyms *Візантія* - Byzantium, *Мала Азія* - Asia Minor, *ethnonyms половці* - Pololvtsians or Cumans, *монголо-татари* - Mongols, anthroponyms *Тамерлан* - Tamerlane, *Карл Великий* - Charlemagne, sovereignonyms *Золота Орда* - Golden Horde, *Візантійський світ* (Рапа, 2013, p. 372) - Byzantine Commonwealth (Raffenspeger, 2012, p. 2). Here we may also add names for trade association and similar unions, for instance: *Ганзейський Союз* - the Hanseatic League. This non-culture-specific group of historical terms is predominantly rendered by existing equivalents, which were formed through phonological adaptation and/or calque translation. Such equivalents can often, but not always, be found in bilingual dictionaries and texts on history. Tradition in translation plays an important role for this group of onyms and should not be neglected.

Translation of culture-specific historical terms represents an area of special interest for our study. Types of culture-specific historical terms and the basic techniques for their rendering are shown in Table 1.

**Table 1**

*Types of culture-specific historical terms and the basic translation techniques*

Groups of culture-specific historical terms	Techniques of translation	Examples
1. Onyms	Calquing	<i>чорні клобуки</i> - the Black Coats
	phonological and/or morphological adaptation	<i>Данило Галицький</i> - Danylo of Halych
	Descriptive translation	<i>Північне Причорномор'я</i> - Northern Black Sea Coast, Circum-Pontic Region, North Pontic area
2. Terms denoting the social status of different members of society, their military role, titles and positions at the royal court	combined renomination	<i>служилий князь</i> - "sluzhily" prince, a landless member of the Rurik dynasty in service of another prince, a prince for "hire"
	analogous translation	<i>боярин</i> - feudal lord
	Descriptive translation	<i>раби-відпущеники</i> - slaves who had bought their freedom
	calque translation + transcription	<i>напіввільні (закупи)</i> - half freepersons ( <i>zakupy</i> )
	equivalent translation + transcription	<i>раби (челядь/холопи)</i> - slaves ( <i>chelyad'/kholopy</i> )
3. Terms designating social and religious phenomena and processes, and objects of material culture	descriptive translation	<i>береста</i> - birch bark document
	combined renomination	<i>віче</i> - viche, or public town meeting

The research into this major group of culture-specific terms demonstrated the importance of one of its key concepts, namely "князівство", the traditional translations of which as "principality" or "princely state" and respectively "князь" as "prince" were convincingly proved by Raffensperger to be incorrect (Raffensperger, 2017, pp.25-29). Despite the abundant use of traditional and incorrect translation by many English-speaking academics (Dimnik, 2003, Magocsi, 2010, Davies, 1997), the derivatives of the term "князь"



found in English academic sources and in bilingual dictionaries, in fact, often contain other than “prince” morphemes, for instance: *князювання* - reign (Dimnik, 2003, p. 241), *князівство* - kingdom (Raffensperger, 2017), *княжий двір* - royal court, *князівська династія* - royal dynasty or royal house (Wilson, p. 5, p.17), and *княжий палац* - royal palace (Raffensperger, 2017, p. 43). For other such derivatives the realignment method suggests that equivalent or descriptive translation was applied: *вокняжіння* (as the result) - enthronement, *вокзаяжіння* (as a ceremony) - inauguration, *великий князь* - high king (Raffensperger, 2017, p. 34), *княжич* - crown prince or heir apparent, *удільний князь* (Kotlyar & Rychka, 2008, p. 298) - under king (Raffensperger, 2017, p.34) or regional ruler (our translation), *племінний князь* - tribal chief (our translation).

For other culture-specific historical terminology the translation method called combined renomination (Zorivchak, 1989) adequately serves the task. It represents a combination of transcribed or transliterated original word with an explanation of its meaning, for instance: *служилий князь* (Kotlyar & Rychka, p. 299) - “sluzhily” prince, a landless member of the Rurik dynasty in service of another ruler (our translation). The appropriateness of this method can be supported by its extensive use by English-speaking historians: *druzhina*, or prince’s retinue (Magocsi, 2019, p.91); *warband* (*druzhina*) (Raffensperger, 2012, p.47); rich merchants (*gosti*) of local Rus’ or foreign origin (Magocsi, 2019, p.92); *viche*, or public town meeting (Magocsi, 2019, p.93); *veche* (assembly) (Dimnik, 1981, p.16), the *viche* system (gathering of nobles) (Wilson, 2002, p.12). It is worth mentioning that the explanatory part of combined renomination may have variations within the same work by the same author: execution of tribute (*poliudie*) (Magocsi, 2019, p.67), foraging trip for tribute (Magocsi, 2019, p. 68); the leading urban official, the *tysiatskyi* (Magocsi, 2019, p. 93), *tysiatskyi*, the commander of the city militia (Magocsi, 2019, p. 93), hereditary possession (*votchina*), land as personal property (Magocsi, 2019, p. 91). In fact, some historians find it necessary not only to provide description in combination with transcription of culture-specific terminology in the text itself but also to supply the reader with a glossary of such terminology used in the text (Dimnik, 2003; Dimnik. 1981). Such explanations are sometimes long and many-fold reflecting a complex nature of job functions which were not codified, for instance: *posadnik* mayor, chief executive official in a town, a prince’s lieutenant (Dimnik, 2003, p.32).

Onyms as the largest group in our research may be both culture-specific to different degrees and non-culture specific. An example of the former is discussed below and has demonstrated that the narrower the geographic area to which certain historical concepts and their designations relate, the more difficult their rendering becomes. It is mostly achieved through the combination of descriptive and calqued translations, sometimes using ISV morphemes. The toponym “*Північне Причорномор'я*”, important not only for the Ukrainian antiquity and Middle Ages, but also for the whole Mediterranean region, was found to be translated in a variety of ways: Northern Black Sea Coast (Wilson, 2002, p.34), Circum-Pontic Region (Wilson, 2002, p.34), North Pontic area (Kazakevich, 2006, p.257). Its derivatives tend to be rendered through the Old Greek-borrowing Pontic, for instance: Pontic colonies, Pontic Steppe. A descriptive translation was also found for this concept, for instance: “the lands to the North of Asia Minor” (Wilson, 2002, p.23). Another onym of regional importance is the famous trade route “*із варяг у греки*”, which has a traditional calqued translation “the route from the Varangians to the Greeks” (Raffensperger, 2012, p.12).

The more culture-specific onomastic terminology is, the more variable its rendering becomes. An interesting example is represented by the sovereignonym “*Київська Русь*” (Kievan Rus’) and the related onym of “*Давня Русь*” (Old Rus’). The former term was formed by the combination of a Slavic root morpheme and an English suffix. The root morpheme was transcribed using the Russian spelling of Kiev, and not the Ukrainian formally accepted one of Kyiv. This can be explained, firstly, by tradition in translation, and, secondly, by the fact that the latter spelling appeared relatively recently and according to some native speakers is read with a diphthong [ai], and not the monophthong [i], the former not matching its Ukrainian phonological form. The variation Kyivan Rus’ was only found in English texts by some Ukrainian academics (Tolochko O. & Tolochko P., 1998, p.345; Zalizniak, 2013, p.40). The research also showed that some English-speaking academics tend to use either Kievan Rus’ or Rus’ to match both “*Київська Русь*” and “*Давня Русь*”, not differentiating between the two, as the concept behind them is perceived to be more of the time period than geographic reference. Thus, speaking about Kievan Rus’ Robert Magocsi includes the territory and history of the Galicia-Volhynian state (Magocsi, 2010, p.89), and Martin Dimnik equals the notions of Rus’ to Kievan state (Dimnik, 1981, p.19, p.191). Ukrainian academics use “Kievan Rus’” to designate the concept of a medieval state, that emerged in the 9<sup>th</sup> century in the middle

Dnipro river valley and existed to the middle of the 13<sup>th</sup> century featuring characteristics of a unified state with the centre in Kiev (Tolochko & Tolochko, 1998, pp. 9-11). The preferred spelling option for native English speakers is Rus' with a diacritic at the end (Davies, 1997; Dimnik, 2003; Magocsi, 2010).

“Rus' is a label that requires an explanation. It even has an odd diacritic at the end that some, but not all, scholars use in English to represent an Old East Slavic character (a “soft sign”) that does not exist in English. Even more confusingly, the adjectival form of Rus' is “Rusian”, which most people, and most spell-check software, want to convert to “Russian” (Raffensberger, 2017, p. 3).

Other variations of this adjectival derivative can also be found, for instance: Rus'sian (Dimnik, 1981, p. 114) and Ruthenian (Davies, 1997, p. 591). The latter adjective Davies derives from the word “Ruthenia”, when he speaks about “White Ruthenia (now Belarus)” and “Red Ruthenia (or Galicia)” (Davies, 1997, p. 591). He also calls the populace “rusini” or “Ruthenes” (Davies, 1997, p. 592), which from our point of view, is inappropriate, as this Latinised name was applied throughout history not only to the populace of the Kievan Rus' but was associated in Western Europe with all East Slavs well beyond the discussed historical period. In addition, modern “*русини*” or Rusyn people is a name for a particular ethnic group also known as Carpatho-Ruthenians living mostly in a particular region of Western Ukraine called Zakarpattia.

Another culture-specific sovereignonym of “Галицько-Волинське князівство” usually follows the same secondary term formation pattern where the Slavic roots may be transcribed based either on the Ukrainian phonological form Halych-Volynia (Raffensperger, 2017, p. 30) or the Russian phonological form Galicia-Volynia (Raffensperger, 2017, p. 17). The second element is rendered depending on the preferred author's approach as either “principality” (Dimnik, 2003, p. 20) or “kingdom” (Wilson, 2002, p. 17).

Anthroponyms together with anthropomorphic formulars and ethnonyms constitute the biggest group of onomastic terminology (77%), with the described toponyms being the second largest (23%). Anthroponyms in academic texts name either single individuals or whole royal dynasties. Names for individuals who left their trace in history are comprised of usually two elements, the first being their given name and the second that of the land where they ruled, for instance Danylo of Galicia (Magocsi, 2010,

p.87) or Danylo of Halych (Wilson, 2002, p. 17) or their ascribed characteristic, for instance Yaroslav the Wise (Wilson, 2002, p. 12). Historical characters may also be referred to by their first name and family name, for instance Volodymyr Monomakh (Magocsi, 2010, p. 70) and their first name and patronymic, for instance, king Vsevolod Olgovich (Raffensperger, 2017, p. 18). Names and patronymics are always transcribed, not without inconsistency and mistakes. The Slavic name “Володимир”, a favourite of Slavic rulers, obviously because of its semantic meaning of “the ruler of the word”, may be found in its Russian form “Vladimir” (Raffensperger, 2012, p.34) and its Ukrainian form Volodimer (Raffensperger, 2017, p. 13) even with the same author, or sometimes in other transcriptions based on its Ukrainian form, for instance Volodymyr the Great (Magocsi, 2010 p.70). Certain sounds of Ukrainian and Russian have turned out to be of difficulty in transcribing for some authors of English academic texts. The difference between the [i] sound and [j] sounds seems to have escaped the attention of many known academics, who write Iurii Dolgorukii (Raffensperger, 2017, p.17) instead of Yurii, or Evpraksia (Raffensperger, 2017, p. 17) instead of Yevpraksia, or Iaropolk (Raffensperger, 2017, p. 15) instead of Yaropolk, or Iaroslav (Magocsi, 2010, p.70) instead of Yaroslav. The [tʃ] sound is also sometimes wrongly transcribed: Halicz (Davies, 1997, p. 507) instead of Halych, and Daniel Romanowicz (Davies, 1997, p.1939) instead of Romanovich. Some historians may add a Westernised form of the name in addition to its Slavic transcription, for instance: Oleg, also known as Helgi (Raffensperger, 2017, p. 13), Sveinald/Sviatoslav (Magocsi, 2010, p. 68) to bring Rus' rulers closer to the English-speaking audience. The diacritic signalling the softening of a consonant is usually neglected, but sometimes still may be found, for instance: Askol'd (Magocsi, 2010, p.60), the Ol'govichi (Dimnik, 2003, p. 9). Traditional dynastic names (often given in the forms of a patronymic as “sons of”) may also be given either according to the Western tradition or purely Slavic naming, or sometimes even both, for instance: the Riurikids or Volodimerovichi (Raffensperger, 2017, p. 13). This somewhat chaotic transcribing is an understandable result of no single-transcription rules applied by English academics and their individual preferred approaches based on either Russian or Ukrainian pronunciation, and possible lack of language and linguistic knowledge in certain rare instances. This problem can be easily overcome by Ukrainian translators who should base their transcription of existing transcription rules and Ukrainian forms in an attempt to achieve consistency.

Rendering anthropomorphic formulae is almost always achieved through combined renomination, which is the best possible approach, for instance, Volodymyr the Great (Magocsi, 2010, p. 70), Mstislav Mstislavich “The Bold” of Galich (Dimnik, 2003, p. 30). In certain cases, the descriptive second element may be also transcribed to give readers the flavour of the described period, for instance: Vsevolod ‘the Red’ (Chermnyi) of Chenigov (Dimnik, 2003, p.29), Vsevolod Bol’shoe Gnezdo, (Dimnik, 2003, p. 29).

Slavic ethnonyms when translated into English undergo morphological adaptation through the addition of English suffixes to Slavic root morphemes, for instance: *слов’янські племена* - Slavic or Slavonic tribes (Wilson, 2002, p. 10), *деревляни* - Derevlans (Raffensperger, 2017, p. 50), *уличі* - Ulichians (Magocsi, 2010, p. 67), *в’ятичі* - Viaticians ((Magocsi, 2010, p. 68), *половці* - Polovtsians (Wilson, 2002, p. 3), *поляни* - Polianians (Wilson, 2002, p. 9), *дрезовичі* - Drehovichians (ibid.), *волжські булгари* - the Volga Bulgars (Magocsi, 2010, p. 68). Occasionally instances are found of morphologically non-adapted forms of ethnonyms, for instance: Polovtsy (Raffensperger, 2017, p. 15). Combined renomination may also be applied to certain ethnonyms if the name carries in it a certain semantic meaning. For instance, Magocsi writes: “Referred to in the Rus’ chronicles as Chorni Klobuky (Black Caps), the Karakalpaks ...” (2010, p. 79), whereas the same ethnonym was rendered as “the Black Coats” by Wilson (2002, p. 28).

Different combinations of literal translation, transcription and description are applied to render ideonyms naming works of spiritual culture, which include unique and the most important historical written sources and, in particular, literary work, for instance “*Слово о полку Ігоревім*”, for which different translations were found: “The Song of Ihor’s Campaign” (Wilson, 2002, p.336) or a more poetic version using obsolete words: “The Lay of Ihor’s Host” (Wilson, 2002, p.1). Other examples of this group include law codes and chronicles of the period in different redactions: “*Повість временних літ*” - the Rus’ Primary Chronicle (also known by its opening phrase as the “*Povest’ vremennykh liet*, “Tale of Bygone Years”) (Magocsi, 2010, p.56), “*Руська правда*” - “Law of Rus” (Ruska Pravda) (Wilson, 2002, p.9), “*Іпатський літопис*” - “The Hypatian Codex” chronicle (Wilson, 2002, p.9) or the Hypatian redaction (Raffensperger, 2012, p.6), “the Laurentian redaction of the PVL (*Povist’ Vremennykh liet*), dating from the later 14<sup>th</sup> century and named for its copyist, the monk Lavrentii, who worked for Dmitrii Konstantinovich of Suzdal (Wilson, 2002, p.9).

For instances where no specific semantic meaning is carried by an onomastic term, phonologically adapted transcription is used for different groups of onyms, for instance: toponyms of historical towns of “Тмуторокань” - Tmutorokan (Wilson, 2002, p.3) or T'mutorakan/Tamartarka (Davies, 1997, p. 976), “Галич” - Halych, “Путівль” - Putivl, “Владімір” - Vladimir(city), ethnonyms “чудь” - Chud, “весь” - Ves, “мурома” - Muroma (Wilson, 2002, p. 11), Khazars (Magocsi, 2010, p. 55), teonyms “Перун” - Perun (Wilson, 2002, p. 32), “Хорс” - Khors, “Дажбог” - Dazhboh, “Стрибог” - Striboh, “Мокоша” - Mokosh (Magocsi, 2010, p. 74), mythonyms “Кий” - Kyi, “Щек” - Shchtek, “Хорув” - Khoryv, and “Либідь” - Lybid (Wilson, 2002, p. 32).

Research into non-onomastic historical terminology has demonstrated a preference of combined renomination in translation. One such big group identified in our study was terminology behind social and military concepts, specifically to refer to the social status of different members of society, their military role, titles and positions at the royal court, which is essential for any historical description. Given the nature of the period described in the researched texts, the concepts of a title, position or a job held at the royal court, and a social status are inseparable from military roles played at such societies, which prompted us to combine such terms into one group. For instance, close ties between “the druzhina” (royal troop) and the ruler of the Old Rus' state at its earlier stages were reflected in the special term “дружинна форма держави” (Kotlyar & Rychka, 2008, p. 187), which may be translated as “the druzhina State organisation”. The existence of this Ukrainian term substantiates the idiosyncratic nature of military and social status concepts for the described period. The approach favoured in English academic texts for rendering this group of terminology is to give both the phonetic form and a description of the concept, often a very detailed one. For instance: warband (druzhina) (Raffensperger, 2012, p. 47) or “druzhina”, a prince’s private detachment of troops, bodyguard” (Dimnik, 2003, p.32). Sometimes the description may be quite extended, for instance: “The druzhyna, or prince’s retinue, was made of the leading Varangian warriors, who were closely connected with the Kievan realm” (Magocsi, 2010, p.92). Then the author describes in detail the composition of the “druzhina” in a whole paragraph. The analogous translation as “militias (druzhyna)” (Wilson, 2002, p.9), which can be found in some English academic texts, is, in our opinion, incorrect, as in English the word “militia” mostly signifies quasi-military formations, unauthorised by the central authorities, as opposed to the regular army.

The length of the description may vary depending on the author's purposes, which can be demonstrated by the rendering of the concept "бояри", from very short when the concept is just mentioned - "boyars (noblemen)" (Dimnik, 2003, p.21), to a whole definition provided in the glossary attached to the text: "boyar - nobleman, landowner, senior advisor of the prince" (Dimnik, 1986, p.165). To define the same concept Magocsi uses transcribed original phrasing verbatim and its literal translation. He writes: "The boyars are described in the early sources as the "luchshie liudu", "better people" or "muzhi narochitie", "prominent men" (Magocsi, 2010, p.91), thus enabling the reading public to see how the status of boyars was understood by their contemporaries. Some descriptions may be more general, for instance, the concept of "смерд" is explained by Dimnik simply "smerd, a peasant" (Dimnik, 1986, p.162), whereas Magocsi gives a more accurate definition: "smerdy, or rural freepersons" (Magocsi, 2010, p.93), as opposed to half freepersons called "zakup" (Magocsi, 2010, p.93).

The concepts designated by many terms belonging to this group are often complex, and even vague. For instance, "тисяцький" is described by Dimnik as "tysyatskiy - commander of a town militia, police chief (2003, p.34) and by Magocsi as "the leading urban official, the tysiats'kyi, commander of the city militia" (2010, p.93). The prominent Ukrainian historian of that period Kotlyar underlines the existence of two kinds of administrators bearing this title: one is called "zemsky", independent of the king, the role and the title appearing even before the royal administration was formed, the military commander in his land or town, and the other called "knyazhy", appointed by the king and fulfilling the duties of both civil and military administration (2008, p. 271-272). Kotlyar also underscores the insufficiency of written evidence in Rus' historical sources and somewhat different nature of this job in various Rus' kingdoms and time periods (2008, p. 271-272). Another example of the complexity and non-specificity of certain concepts may be "тиун", described by Dimnik as "tiun (tivun) town official, administrator" (2003, p.32). Kotlyar describes "tiun", first of all, as a senior member of the royal household, who may be pointed by the ruler to govern a city or a land (2008, p.313). Kotlyar writes in this respect: "The lack of definition can be explained by the non-specificity of the concept itself, as well as by the fact that tiuns were of different rank and had different job functions" (ibid). This should be kept in mind by translators, who should try to achieve as much accuracy as possible in the descriptive part of their translation depending on the specific understanding of the concept by the author of the original.

Some Ukrainian historical terms, which are included in our corpus, have not been represented in relevant English academic texts. The authors applied the method of combined renomination, and offered their own translation: “*грьдъ - княжий воїн, член княжої дружини*” (Kotlyar & Rychka, 2008, p. 307) - hryd, a member of the royal troop, “*отрок - особиста охорона государя*” (Kotlyar & Rychka, 2008, p. 308) - otrok, a personal royal guard, “*міністеріали - нижчі службовці, члени княжого двору*” (Kotlyar & Rychka, 2008, p. 192) - ministerials, junior members of the royal court, “*снузники - звичайна легка кавалерія*” (Kotlyar & Rychka, 2008, p. 305) - snuznyk, a member of the cavalry, “*печатник - хранитель княжої печатки, канцлер*” (Kotlyar & Rychka, 2008, p.278) - pechatnyk, the keeper of the royal seal, a chancellor. The analogous translation by the term “chancellor” seems acceptable in this case given the interpretation of this term by the author of the text, who describes this highest-ranking officer at the royal court as such (Kotlyar & Rychka, 2008).

Translation by analogue though is not always the best approach, as it may be misleading. The latter can be demonstrated by the term “*воевода*”. We suggest translating it exclusively as “the military leader”, as any attempts to apply analogous translation, for instance, using the word “warlord”, inevitably results in misrepresentation of the concept of “*воевода*”. “A warlord” in Middle Ages meant a feudal lord who had absolute military, economic and political control on his lands and might have often been in conflict with the central authorities, which is not the case for “*воевода*” who always acted on behalf of the king and was not necessarily a landowner, just a military leader. In addition, the functions of “*воевода*” could have been performed by at least several high-ranking officers, including the king himself (Kotlyar & Rychka, 2008, p. 293).

Other groups of historical terminology of this period include terms designating social and religious phenomena and processes, and objects of material culture. Much of such terminology is culture-specific. Historians prefer to give descriptions in each case to render such specific concepts. The institute of “*посадництво*” in Rus’ was defined by the Ukrainian historian Rychka as governance of certain territories by persons authorised by the supreme ruler (2008, p.53). In English academic texts the person holding this position is sometimes described as “*posadnik*” - mayor, chief executive official in a town, a prince’s lieutenant” (Dimnik, 2003, p.32). Rendering of the concept as “*posadnik*” - mayor (Dimnik, 1986, p.162), achieved through analogue, seems to be misleading, as mayor is commonly



understood as an elected official, and not an appointed one. The term “governor” would be a better option. Another concept of “*полюддя*” described by Rychka as “gathering of gifts - contributions” (2008, p.27) was rendered in English academic texts by combined renomination: “The East Slavic tribes began to resent the manner in which the Varangian rulers exacted tribute (*poliudie*) from them” (Magocsi, 2010, p.67). In certain instances, the transcribed part may be omitted, for instance: *собор* - a church council, *віче* - local assembly, gathering of nobles (Wilson, 2002, p.9), *шійна гривна* - torc. For certain Rus’ terminology not identified by us in English academic texts we offer our translations by combined renomination: *племінне князівство* - *pleminne knyazivstvo*, tribal chiefdom, *береста* - *beresta*, a birch bark document, *змійовик* - *zmiyovuk*, an amulet charm of a round shape, *наручник (збруї)* - *naruchnyk*, an armllet (part of warrior’s protection).

### Conclusions

Categorisation of the researched terminology was attempted from the translation point of view, which showed the possibility of splitting the whole bulk of the historical terms into two major groups: non-culture-specific historical terminology reflecting universal concepts of historical science and culture-specific historical terminology. All these terminological groups for the Old Rus’ period were identified in original Ukrainian and English texts and analysed in terms of secondary term formation, which is a major task for translators where bilingual dictionaries are not available.

The first group of terms irrespective of the group of designated concepts uses predominantly translation through traditional equivalents irrespective of the historical methods of their coinage and includes International Scientific Vocabulary, terms designating social and religious phenomena and processes, objects of material culture, and certain onyms.

The culture-specific group includes: 1) onyms translated through calquing, phonological and/or morphological adaptation, combined renomination; 2) terms denoting the social status of different members of the society, their military role, titles and positions at the royal court translated through combined renomination and analogous translation; 3) terms designating social and religious phenomena and processes, and objects of material culture translated through descriptive translation, and combined renomination.

Onomastic terminology (65%) prevails over all other groups of terms. This group of Ukrainian historical terminology, being varied, employs many translation methods, transcription with phonological and/or morphological adaptation and/or combined renomination being the most common. The research also demonstrated the necessity of taking into account the historic and linguistic context in the process of secondary term formation to meet the requirement of accuracy. The requirement of neutrality in secondary term formation was found to be difficult to meet for a number of instances. Attempts at analogous translation in the researched material were rare, and in some cases unsuccessful. This method can be considered only for closely related languages and cultures, which cannot be said about the researched language pair.

### References

- Baker, M. (1992). *In Other Words. A Coursebook on Translation*. Routledge.  
<https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203327579>
- Davies, E. E. (2003). A goblin or a dirty nose? The treatment of culture-specific references in translations of the Harry Potter book. *The Translator*, 9(1), 65-100.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13556509.2003.10799146>
- Davies, N. (1997). *Europe. A History*. Pimlico.
- Davies, N. (2001). *Yevropa. Istoriya* [Europe. History]. Solomiya Pavlichko "Osnovy" Publishers.
- Dimnik, M. (1981). *Mikhail, Prince of Chernigov and Grand Prince of Kiev. 1224-1246*. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies.
- Dimnik, M. (2003). *The Dynasty of Chernigov, 1146-1246*. Cambridge University Press.  
<https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511496479>
- Franklin, S. (2002). The Empire of the "Rhomaioi" as Viewed from Kievan Russia: Aspects of Byzantino-Russian Cultural Relations. *Byzanton*, 5(2), 507-537. Ashgate. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/44170831>
- Hoffmann, L. (1985). *Communication Means of the Technical Language. Introduction*. Gunter Narr Verlag.
- Hrushevsky, M. (1994). *Istoriya Ukrayiny-Rusy*. Tom 1 [History of Ukraine-Rus'. Vol.1]. Naukova Dumka.
- Hrushevsky, M. (2009). *History of Ukraine-Rus'. Volume 1*. University of Alberta.
- Hutchinson, T., & Waters, A. (1987). *Developments in ESP. A Multidisciplinary Approach*. Cambridge University Press.
- Kazakevich, H. (2006). *Kelty: Traditsiyna kultura ta sotsialni instituty* [Celts: Traditional Culture and Social Institutions]. Fitosotsiotsentr.
- Kiyak T., Ohuy O., & Naumenko, A. (2006). *Teoriya ta praktyka perekladu (nimetska mova)* [Theory and Practice of Translation (German)]. Nova Knyha.
- Kocherhan, M. (2005). *Vstup do movoznavstva* [Introduction to Linguistics]. Akademiya.

- Kotlyar M., & Rychka B. (2008). *Knyazhiy Dvir Pivdennoyi Russi X-XIII st.* [Royal Courts in Southern Rus in X-XIII centuries]. Naukova Dumka.
- Kotlyar, M. (1991). *Polkovodtsi Davnyoyi Rusy* [Military Leaders of the Old Rus']. Ukrayina.
- Kovalenko, O. (2011). Ispolzovaniye istorizmov v romanakh V. Skotta [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). Problema vidtvorenniia ukrayinskoyi istorychnoyi terminolohiyi u frantsuzkomu teksti [The Issue 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: Toronto University.
- Magocsi, P. (2012). *Ukrayina. Istoryia yiyi zemel ta narodiv* [A History of Ukraine: The Land and Its Peoples]. Uzhhorod: V. Padyak Publishers.
- McArthur, T. (1998). Asian Lexicography: Past, Present, and Prospective. In *Lexicography in Asia. Selected papers from the Dictionaries in Asia Conference, Hong Kong University of Science and Technology, 1997, and other papers*. Tom McArthur and Ilan Kernerman (Eds.), pp. 9-20. Tel Aviv: Password Publishers
- Nagy, I. (2014). English for Special Purposes: Specialized Languages and Problems of Terminology. *Acta Universitatis Sapientiae, Philologica* 6(2), 261-273. <https://doi.org/10.1515/ausp-2015-0018>
- Nahaylo, B. (1999). *The Ukrainian Resurgence*. Hurst & Company.
- Newmark, P. (1988). *A Textbook of Translation*. Prentice Hall.
- Panko, T., Kochan I., & Matsuyk H. (1994). *Ukrayinske terminoznavstvo* [Ukrainian Terminology]. Svit.
- Papa, I. (2013). Pereuyavlennia Starokyivskoyi Derzhavy [Re-imagining of the Old Rus' State]. *Kniazha Doba: istoriya i kultura*, 7, 372-376.
- Plekhova, O. (2016). Istoricheskiiy diskurs: institutsionalniye kharakteristiki [Historical Discourse: Institutional Characteristics]. *Izvestiya Volgogradskogo Universiteta*, 2, 99-105. <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/istoricheskiiy-diskurs-institutsionalnye-harakteristiki/viewer>
- Popescu, L. (2009). *Historical Knowledge in Western Civilization: Studies beyond the Sovereign View*. VDM Verlag.
- Poteryayeva, Y. (2009). Osobennosti prepodavaniya distsypliny angliyskiy yazyk na istoricheskikh fakultetakh universitetov [Teaching English at Historical Departments of Universities], 1-2. Zbornik materialov konferentsyi, Yekaterinburg, Russia. <http://rudocs.exdat.com/docs/index-7446.html?page=5>
- Pritsak, O. (1990). *The Old Rus' Kievan and Galician-Volhynian Chronicles: The Ostroz'kyj (Xlebnikov) and četvertyns'kyj (Pogodin) Codices*. Harvard University Press.

- Raffensperger, C. (2012). Reimagining Europe: Kievan Rus' in the Medieval World. *Harvard Historical Studies*, 177, 329-339. <https://doi.org/10.4159/harvard.9780674065468>
- Raffensperger, C. (2017). *The Kingdom of Rus'*. Arc Humanities Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781942401322>
- Sager, J. (1990). *A Practical Course in Terminology Processing*. John Benjamins Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1075/z.44>
- Shepard, J. (1973). *Byzantium and Russia in the Eleventh Century: A Study in Political and Ecclesiastical Relations* [Unpublished doctoral Dissertation]. University of Oxford.
- Slavova, L. & Vozna, M. (2022) Etnokulturna spetsyfika istorychnoi terminolohii: zistavnyi ta perekladoznachnyi aspekty (na materialy istorychnykh terminiv antychnosti ta davnoruskoho periodu) [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. <https://doi.org/10.17721/2520-6397.2022.1.10>
- Slyvka, M. (2016). Realiya i termin v istoryko-kulturnomu dyskursi [Culture-Specific Words and Terminology in Historical and Cultural Discourse]. *Suchasni doslidzhennya z inozemnoyi filolohiyi*, 14, 183-188.
- Tolochko O., & Tolochko P. (1998). *Kyivska Rus'* [Kievan Rus']. Alternatyvy.
- Tolochko P. (1997). *Vid Rusy do Ukrayiny* [From Rus' to Ukraine]. Abris.
- Tomilenko, L. (2013). Istoryzmy i istorichni terminy: do problemy rozmezhoovannya [Historicisms and Historical Terminology: The Issue of Differentiation]. *Naukovi Zapysky Vinnytskoho Univesytetu imeni Mykhaila Kotsyubynskoho. Filolohiya. Movoznavstvo*, 17, 132-137. [http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/Nzvdpu\\_filol\\_2013\\_17\\_28](http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/Nzvdpu_filol_2013_17_28)
- Torchinsky, M. (2009). *Struktura Onimnoho Prostory Ukrayinskoyi Movy. Funktsionuvannya vlasnykh nazv* [Onomastic Structure of the Ukrainian Language. Functioning of Proper Names]. Khmelnytsky: Vydavnytstvo Khmelnytskoho Universitetu.
- Valeontis, K., Mantzari, E. (2006, October). *The linguistic dimension of terminology: principles and methods of term formation*. 1st Athens International Conference on Translation and Interpretation Translation: Between Art and Social Science, Athens. [https://www.academia.edu/2317735/THE\\_LINGUISTIC\\_DIMENSION\\_OF\\_TERMINOLOGY\\_PRINCIPLES\\_AND\\_METHODS\\_OF\\_TERM\\_FORMATION\\_Kostas\\_Valeontis\\_Elena\\_Mantzari\\_2006](https://www.academia.edu/2317735/THE_LINGUISTIC_DIMENSION_OF_TERMINOLOGY_PRINCIPLES_AND_METHODS_OF_TERM_FORMATION_Kostas_Valeontis_Elena_Mantzari_2006)
- Wilson, A. (2002). *The Ukrainians. Unexpected Nation*. Yale University Press.
- Zalizniak, L. (2013, January). Kyivan Rus' as an Ancient Ukrainian State. *The Ukrainian Week*, 44, 40-43.
- Zorivchak, R. (1989). *Realiya i Pereklad* [Culture-Specific Words and Translation]. Vydavnytstvo Lvivskoho Universitetu.

**Reviewers:**

1. Anonymous
2. Anonymous

**Handling Editor:**

Boris Naimushin, PhD,  
New Bulgarian University