Equivalence in Ukrainian-English translation of institutional academic terminology

Marina Vozna[*1], and *Natalia* Antonyuk[1]

[1] Institute of Philology of Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, 01601, Kyiv, Taras Shevchenko Boulevard, 14, Ukraine

Abstract. The article looks into the issue of translation equivalence based on semantic and pragmatic approaches to specialised terminology as used in institutional academic settings. The relations of full, near and partial equivalence and no-equivalence were analysed for pairs of Ukrainian and English terms and semi-terms selected from texts on Ukrainian university sites, representing examples of Ukrainian translation from English. Parallels were made with specialised English institutional terminology used on original British university sites. The material analysed demonstrated a low degree of homogeneity of the two terminological systems resulting from different approaches to understanding the objectives of university tuition, its principles and procedures. Conclusions were drawn as to the translator's success or failure in achieving equivalence, which was shown to depend on taking into account a number of linguistic and extra-linguistic factors. The importance of semantic structure analysis of terminology in both languages was demonstrated to facilitate the avoidance of translation failures, the task being unduly complex given the absence of comprehensive specialised bilingual dictionaries.

1 Introduction

The notion of equivalence in translation introduced by Roman Jakobson in 1959 [1] and significantly researched by many other eminent theorists, such as Vinay and Darbelnet [2], Nida and Taber, Catford, House, and finally Baker [3], continues to be one of the focal points in translation studies. There is a common understanding among linguists that in recent decades the notion of translation equivalence has shifted from a purely linguistic approach to pragmatic and semantic approaches, or to a reasoned combination of these as exhibited by Mona Baker, whose holistic approach includes understanding the translation process at different levels. This combines the linguistic and the communicative aspects [3]. We are fully in accord with this distinguished linguist, that equivalence at a word level is the first element to be taken into consideration by the translator in a bottom-up approach to translation, as the translator analyzes words as single units to find a direct "equivalent" terminological unit in the target language [3, pp.11-12].

---

[*] Corresponding author: voznamarina2129@gmail.com

Both those who practice translation and those who develop its theory have long been aware that the search for a direct equivalent in many instances does not necessarily bring a positive result, especially if we share a combined pragmatic and semantic approach that is functionally oriented. Such an approach demands considering factors that exist beyond language systems and bilingual dictionaries, in order to see lexical units in context with the consideration of the communicative situation. Such factors may include (but are not limited to): the intention of the speaker, characteristics of the target audience (whether it is professional or not, adult or not, male or female), whether communicants belong to close or distant cultures, and whether the communication is formal or informal. All these factors, as well as lexical connotations which are not necessarily reflected in dictionaries, and the frequency of use of a particular lexical unit in both languages, must be constantly in the focus of the translator's attention.

The need to consider the often complex semantic and lexical nature of a linguistic unit and the pragmatic considerations surrounding it, have led to the appearance of the theory of partial/relative equivalence of lexical units. In Russian linguistics, the notion was first introduced by Yevgeniy Vereschagin and Vitaliy Kostomarov, who as early as in the 1980s spoke about "lexical background information" that represents those "semes that are left in a sememe after all notional semes have been taken out" [4, p.239]. The notion of "lexical background information" of these academics is directly linked to the notion of background knowledge widely used both in sociolinguistics and translation studies. In 21st century Ukrainian translation studies, the issue of full and partial equivalence was developed by Bohdan Stasyuk [5], among other linguists, who suggested that such lexical background information should not be separated from the key semantic components of the word as fixed by dictionaries. He further used such lexical background information for the classification of relative equivalents into two major groups: 1) lexicographical relative equivalents when the correspondence of the scope of lexical meaning can be verified by dictionaries; 2) contextual relative equivalents when relative equivalence is context dependent [5, p.156].

Hence, the category of partial/relative equivalence is declared by him to be of a comparative nature. Partial lexical equivalence is consequently defined as non-correspondence in the set of key lexical meanings, obvious when equivalents belonging to two different languages are compared and contrasted, based on the lexicographical sources or communicative context [5, p.160]. We accepted this definition of partial equivalence for the purposes of our research as a translation category of a comparative nature, where we compared and contrasted a particular stratum of lexis, i.e. field terminology in one specific area, based on their lexical meanings fixed by dictionaries and their contextual meanings dependent on a number of linguistic and non-linguistic factors.

The issue of relative equivalence applies to the field or professional terminology, perhaps, even more than to any other lexical strata. Professional terms of science, technology, or, in fact, any area of human activity where professional or specialized knowledge is involved, may be represented not only by single words, but also by word combinations (complex terms). Such terms, irrespective of their structure, ideally but not necessarily, refer to a single notion in the specialized field where they are found. Such complex terms are functionally equal to one-word terms, though their semantic structure may be more complex. At the same time, although terms aim at being definitive and not ambivalent, in practice this may not always be true. They may only have one meaning in a very narrow field, but the broader the professional field, the higher the possibility of polysemy becomes. This was stressed upon by Taras Kiyak [6]: "At the level of several professional sublanguages terminological polysemy is quite a frequent phenomenon"[6, p.38]. He also underlined the fact that professional or field terminology, representing a particular stratum of the general language, still is its integral part, where words have the

same characteristics, but such characteristics are more prominent and defined to meet the demands of professional communication and understanding [6, p.39]. This infers that professional terminology is subject to all general language findings, including the theory of translation equivalence, which became a focus of attention in field translation studies both in Ukraine and abroad [5-14].

One of the key avenues to studying translation equivalence of professional terminology for a particular pair of languages involves the determination of its degree, i.e. whether such equivalence is absolute, partial or non-existent. The research into terminology that does not have any equivalents in the target language has a much longer history than that of partial equivalence terminology. The existence of both kinds was acknowledged as early as the middle of the 20th century by Jakobson, the founder of structural linguistics, who when speaking about general versus specialized language, wrote that in the case of interlingual translation, the translator makes use of synonyms in order to get the ST message across. According to Jakobson, this means that in interlingual translations there is no full equivalence between code units [1, p.233], the term he used to describe words and phrases. After having acknowledged the possibility of such non-equivalence, he further stated that "whenever there is deficiency, terminology may be qualified and amplified by loanwords or loan-translations, neologisms or semantic shifts, and finally, by circumlocutions" [1, p.234], thus demonstrating the main methods which may help the translator to overcome this non-equivalence.

After Jakobson's work, the various techniques of providing such equivalents for non-equivalent or partially equivalent terminology have already been discussed for many decades [2, 15, 16, 17, 6, 18]. In addition to those named by Jakobson, and also currently known under different names, the following commonly accepted techniques must be mentioned: phonological adaptations, descriptions and definitions, the broadening or narrowing of the semantics, Latin-based and otherwise-based word coinage, functional/contextual equivalents, modified functional equivalents, calques or literal translation, and formal negation, i.e. translation via antonyms. Even borrowings from another language may be made in different ways: by borrowing words with no morphological or phonological changes, which results in exotic words, by adapting them in one or both of the mentioned ways to the TL norms, or by translating them or their components (either separate words or their morphemes) literally, which results in calques or various hybrids if only some components were translated and others were not. Borrowing is inevitably linked to one very important group of borrowed words known as international vocabulary, which were also taken from one language into another at some distant or not-so-distant periods in the past. They form the so-called International Scientific Vocabulary (ISV), which in translation may often form equivalent or near equivalent relations.

ISV words often originate in Latin and Greek and were loaned into modern languages to render similar, often more complicated notions serving modern science and retaining fully or partially their phonetic form. Tom McArthur characterizes ISV words as translinguistic [19, p.3-4]. He writes in this respect: "They operate (with appropriate phonological and orthographic adaptations) in many languages that serve as mediums for education, culture, science, and technology… In effect, such words have no ultimate canonical forms: their embodiments in any language are all equally valid as citation forms. Because no language-specific version of such a term has primacy, an ISV word is truly international, transcending individual languages … ISV words would appear to be – both in their own right and through any loan translations that may have been made from them – the most universal set of lexical items on earth" (ibid). Such international words are mostly fixed by bilingual dictionaries and represent the less troublesome terminological stratum for translators, as for language pairs their relations are those of either full or near equivalence.

The lesser the degree of equivalence, the more problematic the translation of terminology becomes.

The degree of equivalence issue has, thus, both theoretical and practical values which have a concrete bearing on the existing translation practices, as exact rendering of specific field notions is of paramount importance to specialized translation. This was demonstrated by the introduction of formalized Standard Degrees of Equivalence, defined by ISO, the International Organization for Standardization [20]. This classification comprises five degree types: 1) of exact equivalence, when terms are identical in their meaning and volume in both languages, irrespective of being morphologically related or not, or when they may express the same concept from different perspectives; 2) of near equivalence, i.e. the meanings of the respective terms are not absolutely equal; 3) of partial equivalence, when exact or near equivalent is lacking and a near translation can be achieved by selecting a term with a slightly broader or narrower scope of meaning; 4) of single-to-multiple term equivalence, when the SL term cannot be matched with a TL term, but the concept to which the SL term refers can be expressed by a combination of two or more existing TL terms; and 5) of non-equivalence, when no match can be found with either partially or approximately corresponding meaning; then the term may refer to a culture-dependent concept, uncommon for the users of the TL [20, p. 8].

Similar classifications were offered by theoreticians of specialized translation. The terms of near, partial and non-equivalence are used, for instance, by Susan Saracević (21, pp.238–239), who compares legal terminology and law systems in civil law and common law jurisdictions and describes legal terms using the notions of inclusion, intersection and exclusion of characteristics pertaining to a particular concept in a compared pair of languages. This author describes near equivalence as the case when concepts A and B share all of their essential and most of their accidental characteristics (intersection) or when concept A contains all of the characteristics of concept B, and concept B all of the essential and most of the accidental characteristics of concept A (inclusion) (ibid).

Saracević develops this by describing how in the majority of cases functional equivalents are only partially equivalent. Partial equivalence takes place when concepts A and B share most of their essential and some of their accidental characteristics (intersection) or when concept A contains all of the characteristics of concept B but concept B only contains most of the essential and some of the accidental characteristics of concept A (inclusion). The situation of non-equivalence occurs when only a few or none of the essential features of concepts A and B coincide (intersection) or when concept A contains all of the characteristics of concept B but concept B only contains a few or none of the essential features of concept A (inclusion). Such non-equivalent functional equivalents should not, according to the author, be considered acceptable. She adds that non-equivalence also occurs where no functional equivalent can be found in the target legal system for a particular source concept (exclusion) (ibid).

Aleksandra Matulewska also uses the same terms of near, partial and non-equivalence when studying equivalence in legal terminology for the language pair Polish-English in this case [11]. She used the method of parameterization of legal reality (a set of dimensions of both linguistic and non-linguistic nature) to determine differences in meaning of the compared source and target language terms. The convergence and divergence of such dimensions have been studied. When two terms are sufficiently convergent, it is assumed that the relation of near equivalence is maintained between them. If they are permissibly complementary then the relation of partial equivalence exists between them. And if none of those relations holds, then the relationship between the two terms is non-equivalence [11, p.171]. The study was undertaken using a pragmatic/semantic approach, as the dimensions used for comparison included a holistic evaluation of the communicative situation, to

include the characteristics of the text's author and target audience, form of delivery, text legal status, text language variety, and text legal reality [11, p.177].

The three classifications discussed above show that for professional terminology at least four degrees of equivalence can be established: those of exact, near and partial equivalence and non-equivalence, keeping in mind that exact equivalence can be a rare phenomenon for certain professional fields, especially if the pragmatic factor is to be fully taken into consideration. The nature of the professional area is also to be factored in. The above mentioned research into legal terminology proves that for legal terms no exact equivalence terms can be determined as a category, as the semantic volumes of their notions either do not coincide or coincide only partially, reflecting a complex convergence/divergence of concepts that exist in different professional environments.

There are, on the other hand, areas of knowledge where terminological systems achieve a high degree of homogeneity, for instance, in the natural sciences, as the notions which they signify in different languages are either identical or very similar. Thus, such terminological systems can have exact equivalents in compared language pairs. This particular aspect of the degree of homogeneity of a specific professional field should always stay in the focus of the translator's attention when deciding on the strategies and methods of translation. Further, the issue is complicated by the fact that many lexical units may function simultaneously as terminology when used in a professional environment, and as general language lexical units in everyday communication beyond shop-talk. Sometimes such words that double their function are called either semi-technical [22] or semi-terms [6, p.29].

Institutional academic English, undoubtedly, belongs to the areas of professional communication with a low degree of homogeneity due to different political, cultural and academic traditions of the nations who employ it. The fact is reflected in its terminology, which even in one separate language has a degree of variation, as has been shown in terminology studies of the 21st century. In terms of descriptive terminology, concepts can be expressed by more than one term and vice-versa, their variation being the issue to be taken into consideration [8]. It was shown that in specialized contexts term variation is pervasive, and that it can be motivated by cognitive, linguistic and situational factors [23]. In multilingual settings, term variation has been also studied, with the conclusion that such variation should be taken into account in translation practice in order to avoid unnecessary standardization [24]. Much research has been using a method involving a multi-parallel corpus of translated texts to see how terminological variants are rendered by professional translators [25]. It is logical to assume that the less homogeneous professional fields are, the more terminology variation may be observed, both at the intra-linguistic and inter-linguistic levels. The situation gets even more complicated when translators deal with semi-terms, as the volume of their lexical meanings may not coincide when used in professional and non-professional settings. Much of the terminology employed by institutional academic English is in fact used in general English aiming at non-professional audiences and may be classified as semi-technical, preserving at the same time all or most of the characteristics pertaining to professional vocabulary.

The objective of our research was to study the influence of linguistic and non-linguistic contextual factors on the translation of terminology in the field of university institutional language for the language pair of Ukrainian-English, with a special focus on partially equivalent terminology. A hypothesis was put forward that the use of partially equivalent terminology for terminological systems with low homogeneity, such as institutional academic English, may result in the translator's success or failure, depending on how such factors are taken into account.

Institutional academic English studies in the recent decades have been tightly linked to the Bologna Process aimed at harmonizing educational processes and systems used by

nations across the world. The European Higher Education Area (EHEA) was created with participation of 48 countries which committed to adopting reforms in higher education to make their higher education systems more compatible. The English language plays a pivotal role in this process due to its commonly recognized role as the lingua franca in this area. In this respect Silvia Bernardini wrote: "As part of this process, universities have been under considerable pressure to increase their degree of internationalization, most notably by removing barriers that hamper student and staff mobility. Communication in a vehicular language features prominently among the means to pursue such an objective" [26]. Ukraine has been a full EHEA member since 2005, and has long been using English to attract students from other countries, who are mostly non-native speakers but use English as a communication means in the process of choosing a country and a university for their higher education. Thus, presenting our country and the achievements of Ukrainian universities in good English is a task of utmost practical importance for university administrations and the translators into English who help with this task. The task becomes even more complicated as no substantial bilingual dictionaries exist in this field. And those that can be found have an insufficient number of entries [27]. There are also, to the best of our knowledge, no digital corpora of texts in Ukrainian in this area, which makes the comparison of usage of preferred institutional terminology even more difficult. The use of non-strict terminology may also be tricky, as one may automatically assume that international words in this field are fully or nearly equivalent, which is often not the case, as this study has shown.

2 Methods

The material for this research, i.e. institutional academic terminology, was selected from texts in Ukrainian and their English translations on Ukrainian university sites, and their subsequent comparison with terminology selected from English university sites. For the purposes of this study, Ukrainian and English original texts were considered as parallel texts, understood here as the texts in the two languages that perform the same function and represent similar contexts. A corpus-based approach was applied to parallel texts, i.e. matching of terminological units that are translations of one another in similar contexts. Other methods of research included semantic component analysis, used to analyze the semantic structure of terms and semi-terms, and contextual and comparative analysis to study additional lexical meanings not necessarily present in the sematic structure of terms and related to the culture, tradition and mentality of the two nations. In addition, translation analysis was applied to demonstrate how relations of partial or non-equivalence may be overcome in rendering Ukrainian institutional terminology into English.

3 Research Results

Semantic component analysis of aligned terminological units together with broad comparative contextual analysis, involving both linguistic and non-linguistic factors, enabled us to make conclusions on the degree of equivalence between the studied terms and semi-terms in two languages, as well as to research the methods used by translators to achieve different degrees of equivalence in Ukrainian-English translation. On the whole, more than 30 terminological units were analyzed, of which full or near equivalence was exhibited mostly by international words, and the majority cases showed only partial equivalence, which in certain, but not all, instances led to failed translation.

One such Ukrainian terminological unit that occurs frequently in Ukrainian institutional language, and may be found on almost every university site, is "підготовка спеціалістів"

or "підготовка високо-кваліфікованих кадрів" or "підготовка науково-педагогічних та наукових кадрів вищої кваліфікації" [28], a phrase literally describing one of the primary objectives of every Ukrainian university. The last terminological unit is used, for instance, in the Rector's Introductory Word found on one of the leading Ukrainian Universities' official sites. The Rector mentions the President of Ukraine's Decree of 2008 enacted to provide measures to raise the status of the University and creating preconditions to transform the University into the principal educational and academic centre of Ukraine that "produces experts at the highest level" [28].

"Підготовка кадрів" or its variation "підготовка спеціалістів" is a Ukrainian institutional terminological unit that is also used in general Ukrainian, and thus technically is a semi-term. But the practical importance of such double function terminology is significantly higher that any strict narrow field terminology, as is exemplified above by the Rector's Introduction, where he presents the University to the general public, trying to attract young people to study there. Hence the importance of quality translation of such terminology, since the terms used are found beyond the areas of professional communication.

Let us establish the degree of equivalence between the Ukrainian original terminological unit "підготовка кадрів" and its translation on the same site "producing experts"[28]. The semantic analysis of the first element of the Ukrainian terminological unit "підготовка" gives us three principal semantic components: 1) ensuring implementation of something by undertaking preliminary work; 2) giving necessary knowledge, skills and experience in the process of education or practical activities; 3) forewarning somebody, teaching somebody in advance [29, p.767]. The English word "producing" is the gerundial form of the verb "to produce". The semantic analysis of the latter gives us the following components: 1) bring forward for inspection or consideration; 2) extend in length; 3) a. bring (a thing) into existence, effect, cause (an action, result), b. give birth to (offspring), bear (fruit), c. (of a country) yield or supply a commodity; d. compose, make (a material object); e. administer or supervise the making of (a play, film etc.) [30, p.2357].

Semantic analysis shows us that the first meaning of the Ukrainian word partly coincides with the last meaning of the English word. If taken separately out of the linguistic and non-linguistic context, they are partially equivalent. But as elements of the terminological units, they are non-equivalent for two reasons: firstly, the second semantic component of the original Ukrainian term, realized in the institutional context on the Ukrainian site, does not coincide with any component of the discussed English element; secondly, the collocability, i.e. immediate linguistic context, of the English word tells us that if the verb is used as transitive, the object of the action is usually inanimate. The only case when the action may be directed at a person is when its first semantic component is realized, as in "He produced me to all his friends". Hence, for the first pair of compared elements, we observe the relations of non-equivalence.

Now, let us compare the second elements: the original Ukrainian word "кадри" and its translation "experts". The Ukrainian word has two principal meanings: 1) the principal staff of an organisation, enterprise or an institution; 2) career officers and soldiers as opposed to the conscripts [29, p.409]. The English word "expert" has three semantic components: 1) a person with the status of an authority (in a subject) by reason of skill, training, or knowledge; a specialist; 2) a person who gained skill from experience; 3) a person who looks after or maintains machinery [30, p. 894]. It is necessary to observe that neither from dictionary definitions, nor from usage "expertise" in English is directly related to higher education. We should not also be misled by the English word "specialist" used in the description of the first component, as this international word is a "false translator's friend", its semantic volumes being non-identical in the two languages [3, pp.72-74]. The above described semantic analysis shows us the relations of non-equivalence between the second

elements as well as between the two units on the whole. The conclusion is that the translator has failed to take into account the semantic structure and the collocability of elements. This has resulted in non-equivalence between the two units, the first being a legitimate Ukrainian term, the second being just a failed translation.

But the suggested explanation for the translation failure would be too simplistic in this case, where we should seek a broader consideration of the problem at hand beyond the linguistic factors. Why, after all, was it so difficult to render a simple message of what is one of the most important objectives for Ukrainian universities, as exemplified by the above example? Here the issue of non-homogeneity of terminological fields comes to the fore as terminology reflects the concepts existing in a particular professional area and society on the whole, when such terminology is used in non-professional settings.

These concepts reflect in general the attitudes of particular societies to education and universities and their objectives, in particular. Even if we try to search the Internet for the use of a better translation such as "educating professionals", offered by the authors of this article, for "підготовка кадрів", the results show only vocational and further training and education sites. It seems that what is a legitimate Ukrainian terminological unit reflecting a particular concept, widely used in the Ukrainian educational arena, as well as in general Ukrainian, does not exist as a specific term in English. Here the disparity of concepts and ideas belying this area of education may be held responsible.

If we describe education from a Western point of view, then we regard the job of educators as those who direct the education of students rather than teach. They may draw on many subjects, which are seen as tools for education rather than subjects. The western attitude to education is obvious from this line found on the site of Harvard University: "Harvard University is devoted to excellence in teaching, learning, and research, and to developing leaders in many disciplines who make a difference globally [32]. Similarly, the mission of the University of Cambridge is "to contribute to society through education, learning and research at the highest international level" [33].

Ukraine seems to still linger under the burden of the Soviet legacy, where training staff for particular jobs was viewed as the primary task of all educational establishments, including universities. Ukraine still has to move closer to the understanding of university education as academic education, leaving specialized education in fields for those who want specific vocational skills to other types of educational establishments which provide training rather than education. For instance, in England those wanting to be a school teacher need to attend a teacher's training college to study for a PGCE (Post-Graduate Certificate in Education), training following any higher education that resulted in a degree. In Ukraine, a university degree will allow you to teach immediately, without any additional training.

Syllabi and curricula in Western universities are geared to a much wider choice of subjects for a student, as diverse as literature, chemistry, media studies and critical thinking, whereas in Ukraine subjects that may be chosen are usually from one area of knowledge, and those subjects which do not go along with your specialization, such as IT, philosophy, physical education, etc. are part of a mandatory list for all students to attend. Thus, we can see that overcoming translation hurdles is directly related to the university education objectives, processes, and curricula, which in Ukraine needs to be further harmonized with the Bologna process. Then, achieving full or near equivalence in translation will become a less arduous task. Such translation failures are not unique, and although no direct terminological equivalent exists in those instances, at least partial equivalence in translation can be achieved by using a combination of English terms, which though not forming a legitimate terminological unit in institutional English, may still render the necessary message when used together in translation.

More frequent than non-equivalence though, are the cases when partial equivalence was achieved in Ukrainian-English translation of institutional academic texts. A good example

of such relations can be demonstrated by the indiscriminate use of the term "scientific" as translation for "науковий" in all or almost all contexts, for instance:

"Year by year the University strengthens its leading role in the educational, <u>scientific</u> and cultural spheres, with Ukraine building up an innovative economy and reforming its education and science," or

"Today the University provides for the development of new modern styles of <u>scientific</u> thinking and involves talented creative youth in pioneering research programs," or

"…. national and foreign awards are given to the University scholars for their educational and <u>scientific</u> achievements," or

"… professional, *scientific* and cultural elite of Ukraine"[34].

The term "scientific" as translation for "науковий" was also used in such terminological multi-component units as "scientific groups", "scientific journals", "scientific conferences", and "scientific schools" (ibid).

The semantic analysis based on the definition of "scientific" in Shorter Oxford English Dictionary clearly indicates that the word generally correlates with natural science: "occupied in or concerned with (esp.) natural science" [30, p.2698]. The concept behind the term becomes even more clear if we read the definition of "scientific method" as one of the special collocations in the Dictionary article: "a method of procedure that has characterized natural science since the 17th cent., consisting in systematic observation, measurement, and experiment, and the formulation, testing, and modification of hypothesis" [30, p.2699]. This semantic analysis, as well as the usage of this word observed in original English texts indicates that only natural sciences and some other sciences traditionally classified as such, for instance, social sciences to a degree, may be referred to as "scientific", with the stress on the objective nature of their findings which are supported by experiment, measurement and quantification.

In Ukrainian the term "науковий" refers to any kind of "наука", the latter being described as "a form of social consciousness that objectively reflects the world, the system of knowledge about the regularities in the development of nature and society and the methods of influencing the environment" [29, p.586]. Although the notion of objectivity is present in this definition, it is clear that the term applies to any academic discipline or branch of knowledge, which is also proved by its usage in all academic and other contexts, irrespective of whether the Arts/Humanities or natural sciences are meant. This term "наука" considered in a broader historical and ideological context may be seen as an attempt to objectivise and make valid any academic or applied discipline or area of human knowledge, to give it more gravitas and to steer further away from religion, which was disapproved in the Soviet Union, of which Ukraine used to be part. This attitude clearly shows a tendency to scientism, currently viewed critically and often negatively by Western academics. Thus, reviewing the references to scientism in the works of contemporary scholars, Gregory R. Peterson wrote:

"It (scientism) is used to criticize a totalizing view of science as if it were capable of describing all reality and knowledge, or as if it were the only true way to acquire knowledge about reality and the nature of things;

It is used, often pejoratively, to denote a border-crossing violation in which the theories and methods of one (scientific) discipline are inappropriately applied to another (scientific or non-scientific) discipline and its domain. An example of this second usage is to label as scientism any attempt to claim science as the only or primary source of human values (a traditional domain of ethics) or as the source of meaning and purpose (a traditional domain of religion and related worldviews)" [35].

This quotation demonstrates yet again the difference between scientific and non-scientific disciplines, which should be observed by the translator when dealing with the term "науковий". In most contexts "academic" would be a far better choice, although the

rows of equivalents for choosing from in on-line and paper dictionaries do not always provide us with this option [36, p.307]. Other translation options provided by dictionaries include "scholarly" and/or "learned", which may not be the best choice in certain contexts and should include "theoretical", in the authors' point of view. These adjectives may provide us with successful translation, as they help to form legitimate academic terminology in English, for instance, academic journal, academic library, theoretical and practical conference, or scientific analysis (when speaking about natural sciences). The relations described of partial equivalence in these instances are context dependent, meaning both broader context (whether the sentence, paragraph, or text refers to the Humanities or natural sciences) and the immediate linguistic context, i.e. collocability. And depending on the context the translation of "науковий" by its partial equivalent "scientific" may or may not achieve its purpose.

Another example of partial equivalence which may result in failed translation is the on-going persistent use of "philology" on many Ukrainian university sites where "linguistics" or "languages and literature" are meant [37]. Many general bilingual dictionaries provide us with only one option for "філологія" and that is of "philology" [36, p.599]. According to the Shorter Oxford English Dictionary, the term has two semantic components: 1) love of learning and literature, the branch of knowledge that deals with the linguistic, historic, interpretative, and critical aspects of literature... Now chiefly US; 2) the branch of knowledge that deals with the structure, historical development, and relationship of a language or languages [30, p.2183]. Another definition found on a Wikipedia site tells that: "Philology is the study of language in oral and written historical sources; it is the intersection of textual criticism, literary criticism, history, and linguistics. Philology is more commonly defined as the study of literary texts as well as oral and written records, the establishment of their authenticity and their original form, and the determination of their meaning"[38]. As we can see an emphasis is laid on literature studies in the US, and on historical development of languages, i.e. diachronic analysis, in contrast to linguistics which has its focus on synchronic analysis, in Great Britain. A philologist in both the US and the UK would be commonly understood as an academic, who studies ancient, often dead languages, and the texts written in such languages, i.e. respective ancient literature.

In Ukrainian dictionaries "філологія" is defined as "the multitude of disciplines that study the language and literature of a particular people, languages and literature on the whole" [29, p.1322]. No additional focus is ascribed to historical studies or ancient languages. In fact, this particular hurdle was overcome in the "Ukrainian-English Dictionary of Linguistic Terminology", which offers "language(s) and literature studies; philology (rare)" as possible translation for "філологія" [39, p.424]. Thus, the use of the international word as a linguistic term in this particular instance is misleading and inaccurate, establishing only partial equivalence between the English and Ukrainian terms. This can be further proved by the results of a Google search on Western University sites, which often produces no results at all for "Philology" and more than a dozen or dozens of courses for entry for "Linguistics" or "Languages and Literature" [40].

The use of the international word "rector" in English translations of this job title in Ukrainian institutional academic texts to designate "a person, who heads a higher educational establishment" [29, p.1024] represents another case of relations of partial equivalence between the Ukrainian and English terms. The semantic analysis of the English word "rector", in addition to the obsolete meanings of a ruler or a governor, and the religious meanings of "the leader of a team ministry" or "a priest in charge of a church" shows also several semantic components, which can be realised in institutional academic English: 1) the head of certain universities, colleges, schools, and religious institutions; 2) one of the senior officers of Scottish universities, now an elected representative of students on its governing body; 3) the acting head and president of the administrative body, in a

university in Continental Europe [30, p. 2495]. In the US and the UK the latter meaning is usually denoted by other terms. For instance, in Manchester University there are two key figures: the Chancellor and the President. In the named university "the Chancellor is the University's ceremonial head and one of its most prominent ambassadors" and the President, who is at the same time Vice-Chancellor, is the principal academic and administrative officer of the University" [41].

Thus, we can see that the Ukrainian term "ректор" in its meaning is equal to the English term "President". And there is no separate Ukrainian job title to correspond to "the Chancellor". So, the use of this partially equivalent term "Rector" in the context of European universities, of which Ukraine is part, results in successful translation. For some English-speaking audiences this title is even more closely based on their tradition, for instance, the highest elected official in Edinburgh University is called "Lord Rector" or simply "The Rector" [42].

The relations of full or near full equivalence are often observed in institutional academic terminology naming subjects and disciplines that use International Scientific Vocabulary, for instance, mathematics, chemistry, botany, etc., or other not necessarily ISV terminology related to education organizational procedures and structures, for instance: навчальна програма – syllabus, навчальний план – curriculum, курс – course, навчальний рік – academic year, професорська посада – chair, кафедра – department, декан – dean, факультет – faculty, магістр – master student, etc. Even for such equivalent or near equivalent terminology specific translation choices may vary, as the result of considering a wider context of extra-linguistic factors. These include organizational structure, job titles, disciplines categories et al. in a particular university, as well as linguistic factors, such as the target audience (whether addressing educationalists or wider public, native speakers or not, an American or British audience), formal or informal communicative situation, oral or written communication and other such factors.

4 Conclusions

Analysis of the selected Ukrainian institutional academic terminology and its translations into English has demonstrated the existence of at least four degrees of equivalence between the pairs of Ukrainian and English terms and semi-terms, which are the relations of (a) full, (b) near equivalence, (c) partial equivalence and (d) non-equivalence. Whereas the first two degrees of equivalence between terms always ensure successful translation, the hypothesis was confirmed about the use of partially equivalent terminology, where successful translation is dependent on taking into account linguistic and non-linguistic factors. Such semantic and pragmatic factors become even more important for low homogeneity terminological systems, to which institutional academic English and Ukrainian belong. The discussed systems demonstrated a significant degree of partial equivalence and non-equivalence in their terminology. Translators' use of dictionary equivalents, provided by non-specialized dictionaries, without the undertaking of proper semantic structure analysis and factoring in a broader linguistic and non-linguistic context, may result in translation failure. Thorough study of parallel original English texts employing institutional academic terminology is strongly recommended. The development of corpus linguistics and the creation of specialized bi-lingual dictionaries of institutional academic language for the language pair English-Ukrainian appear to be a promising avenue to pursue in achieving a fuller degree of equivalence in translation.

References

1. R. Jakobson, On Translation, 232-39 (Harvard University Press, 1959)

2. J.P. Vinay, J. Darbelnet, Readings in Transl. Theory, 61-69 (1989)

3. M. Baker, *In Other Words: a Coursebook on Transl.* (Routledge, London,1992).

4. Y. Vereschagin, V. Kostomarov, *Word Theory in Linguistics and Country Studies* (Russkiy Yazik, Moscow,1980)

5. B. Stasyuk, Movni ta contseptualni kartyny svity, **13**, 156-160 (2004)

6. T. Kiyak, O. Ohuiy, A. Naumemko, *Transl. Theory and Practice (German)*(Nova Knyha, Vinnytsia, 2006)

7. A. Ferraresi, *Terminology In European University Settings. The Case Of Course Unit Descriptions,* https://www.academia. edu/14078997/

8. C. Cabré, M. Teresa, *Terminology*, **9(2),** 163-19 (2003)

9. L. Bowker, S. Hawkins, *Terminology*, **12 (1),** 79-110 (2006)

10. S. Rackevičienė, J. Šliogerienė, *Eng. for Specific Purposes World*, **42 (15)** (2014)

11. A. Matulewska, *Studies in logic, grammar and rhetoric,* **38 (51)** (2014)

12. S. Vlachopoulos, *The Routledge Handbook of Transl. Studies and Linguistics,* 425-440 (*Routledge, 2018)

13. J. Fecušová, *Intern. Journal of Eng. Language and Transl.* Studies, **5 (2),** 103-107(2017)

14. M. A. Kharmandar, *Can Equivalence Theoretically Explain Terminology Translation? The Case of Vinay and Darbelnet* https://www.academia.edu/31813119

15. P. Newmark, *Approaches to translation* (Prentice Hall, 1981)

16. R. Zorivchak, *Culture-specific Words and Translation* (Lviv University Press, 1989)

17. V. Karaban, *Translation of Scientific and Technical Texts* (Nova Knyha, Vinnytsia, 2001)

18. A. Matulewska, *Lingua Legis in Translation* (Peter Lang Publishing House, Frankfurt am Main, Germany, 2007)

19. T. McArthur, *Asian Lexicography: Past, Present, and Prospective* (Password Publishers Limited, 1998)

20. *International Organization for Standardization. Guidelines for the Establishment and Development of Multilingual Thesauri (ISO Standard No. 5964)* (1985), https://www.iso.org/standard/12159.html

21. S. Saracević, *New Approach to Legal Translation* (Kluwer Law International, 2000)

22. H. Terauchi, J.Noguchi, and G.Poole. *Semi-Technical Vocabulary Issues in ESP: an OCHA Approach and Study Tools.* https://www.scribd.com/doc/7057725/Terauchi

23. J. Freixa, *Terminology,* **12 (1),** 51-77 (2006)

24. L. Bowker, S. Hawkins, *Terminology*, **12 (1),** 79-110 (2006)

25. K. Kerremans, Reconceptualizing LSP, 1-14 (2010)

26. S. Bernardini, A. Ferraresi, and F.Gaspari, Professional English in the European Context*,* 27-53 (Peter Lang, 2010)

27. V. Korbutyak, M. Malinovska, *Ukrainian-English and English-Ukrainian Dictionary of Higher Education Terminology* (2018)

28. Rector's Introduction, http://www.univ.kiev.ua/ua/geninf/slovo/

29. *Comprehensive Dictionary of the Ukrainian Language* (Perun, Kyiv, 2004)

30. *Shorter Oxford Dictionary on Historical Principles* (Oxford University Press, 2002)

31. M.Vozna, *Seme Analysis in Translator Training* (Sotsiokulturni ta etnolingvistychni problemy haluzevoho perekladu, 70-76, Kyiv 2010)

32. Harvard University, http.://www. harvard.edu

33. Cambridge University, http.://www.cam.ak.uk.

34. Research Department. Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, http://science.univ.kiev.ua/en/news/

35. D. Peterson, *Scientism* (2004), https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Scientism

36. Y. Popov, M. Balla, *Comprehensive Ukrainian-English Dictionary* (Chumatsky Shlyakh, Kyiv, 2001)

37. Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv. University Units, http://www.univ.kiev.ua/en/departments

38. Philology, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Philology

39. L. Kolomiyets, O. Palamarchuk et al., Ukrainian-English Dictionary of Linguistic Terminology (Osvita Ukrayiny, Kyiv, 2013)

40. Undergraduate Courses for Entry in 2021, https://www.manchester.ac.uk/study/undergraduate/courses/2021/?k=linguistics

41. Role of the President and Vice-Chancellor of The University of Manchester, https://www.manchester.ac.uk/discover/people/senior-officer-profiles/president-vice-chancellor

42. The University of Edinburgh. The Rector, https://www.ed.ac.uk/about/people/officials/rector