

TRANSLATING CONTEMPORARY MILITARY VOCABULARY IN THE CONTEXT OF MODERN WARFARE: EDUCATIONAL AND METHODOLOGICAL ASPECT FOR HIGHER EDUCATION STUDENTS

ПЕРЕКЛАД СУЧАСНОЇ ВІЙСЬКОВОЇ ЛЕКСИКИ В УМОВАХ НОВІТНЬОЇ ВІЙНИ: НАВЧАЛЬНО-МЕТОДИЧНИЙ АСПЕКТ ДЛЯ ЗДОБУВАЧІВ ВИЩОЇ ОСВІТИ

Hurko O.V.,

orcid.org/0000-0002-2839-2400

Doctor of Philological Sciences, Professor,

*Head of Department of English Language for Non-Philological Specialities
Oles Honchar Dnipro national university*

Suima I.P.,

orcid.org/0000-0002-2209-8614

Candidate of Philological Sciences, Associate Professor,

*Associate Professor at the Department of English Language for Non-Philological Specialities
Oles Honchar Dnipro national university*

The article deals with consideration of the lexical, grammatical, and pragmatic features of translating modern military vocabulary in the context of contemporary warfare. Active hostilities, the rapid development of military technologies, weaponry, tactics, and methods of warfare lead to the constant renewal of terminology and the emergence of neologisms, borrowings, abbreviations, and professional slang. Military vocabulary functions actively in mass media texts, official statements, analytical reports, publicistic writings, and social media, thus shaping the modern information space. The accuracy and adequacy of its translation are of fundamental importance, as they directly affect the perception of events, the interpretation of the military and political situation, and the level of audience trust in the source of information.

The purpose of the article is to provide a comprehensive analysis of the main translation transformations used in rendering modern military vocabulary from English into Ukrainian under the conditions of contemporary warfare, as well as to identify the most effective strategies for translating such linguistic units.

The translation of military terminology is complicated by a number of factors, including the lack of established equivalents in the target language, the polysemy of terms, the specificity of their contextual use, and the pragmatic load of military-related texts. Stylistic and functional factors also play a significant role. Therefore, the translator must take into account sociocultural realities, the background knowledge of the target audience, and the communicative purpose of the source message.

The article analyzes such translation strategies as direct translation, calquing, transcription and transliteration, descriptive translation, and pragmatic adaptation. Direct translation is applied when terminological equivalence exists and allows for maximum preservation of the content and form of the original. At the same time, pragmatic adaptation is necessary when translating military realia, neologisms, and slang units that cannot be rendered literally and require semantic development or complete substitution.

Thus, adequate translation of modern military vocabulary is possible only through a combination of linguistic analysis, consideration of pragmatic factors, and a deep understanding of the realities of contemporary warfare.

Key words: military vocabulary, translation, lexical transformations, grammatical transformations, pragmatic adaptation, neologisms, military terminology.

У статті репрезентовано лексико-граматичні та прагматичні особливості перекладу сучасної військової лексики в умовах новітньої війни. Активні бойові дії, інтенсивний розвиток військових технологій, озброєння, тактики та способів ведення війни спричиняють постійне оновлення термінології, появу неологізмів, запозичень, аббревіатур і професійного сленгу. Військова лексика активно функціонує у текстах засобів масової інформації, офіційних повідомленнях, аналітичних звітах, публіцистиці та соціальних мережах, формуючи сучасний інформаційний простір. Точність й адекватність її перекладу мають принципове значення, оскільки безпосередньо впливають на сприйняття подій, інтерпретацію військово-політичної ситуації та рівень довіри аудиторії до джерела інформації.

Мета статті полягає у комплексному аналізі основних перекладацьких трансформацій, що застосовують під час відтворення сучасної військової лексики з англійської мови українською в умовах новітньої війни, а також у визначенні найефективніших стратегій перекладу таких мовних одиниць.

Переклад військової термінології ускладнюється низкою чинників, серед яких – менше усталених еквівалентів у мові перекладу, багатозначність термінів, специфіка контексту їхнього уживання, а також прагматичне навантаження текстів воєнної тематики. Особливу роль відіграють стилістичні та функційні параметри. Зважаючи на це, перекладач має урахувувати соціокультурні реалії, фонові знання адресата та комунікативну мету оригінального повідомлення.

У статті проаналізовано такі перекладацькі стратегії, як прямий переклад, калькування, транскрипція і транслітерація, описовий переклад, а також прагматична адаптація. Прямий переклад застосовують за наявності усталених

ної термінологічної відповідності щоб зберегти змістову і формальну структуру оригіналу. Натомість прагматична адаптація є необхідною під час перекладу військових реалій, неологізмів та сленгових одиниць, що не підлягають буквальному перекладові та потребують семантичного розгортання, уточнення або повної заміни з урахуванням комунікативної ситуації.

Отже, адекватний переклад сучасної військової лексики можливий лише за умови поєднання лінгвістичного аналізу, урахування прагматичних чинників та глибокого розуміння реалій новітньої війни.

Ключові слова: військова лексика, переклад, лексичні трансформації, граматичні трансформації, прагматична адаптація, неологізми, військова термінологія.

Introduction. The rapid transformation of warfare in the twenty-first century has profoundly influenced not only military strategy and technology but also language. Contemporary armed conflicts are characterized by the intensive use of advanced weaponry, unmanned systems, cyber technologies, information operations, and hybrid forms of warfare. These developments have led to a significant expansion and constant renewal of military vocabulary, resulting in the emergence of new terms, neologisms, abbreviations, acronyms, and professional slang. As a consequence, military discourse has become increasingly complex and dynamic, posing considerable challenges for translators working with military-related texts.

In the context of modern warfare, military vocabulary extends far beyond strictly specialized terminology. It actively penetrates mass media, political discourse, analytical reports, official statements, and social media, where it often acquires additional pragmatic, evaluative, or ideological meanings. The translation of such vocabulary therefore requires not only linguistic competence but also a deep understanding of the extralinguistic factors that shape military communication. Inaccurate or inadequate translation may lead to misinterpretation of events, distortion of strategic intentions, or manipulation of public opinion, which underscores the critical role of translation in the contemporary information space.

One of the key difficulties in translating contemporary military vocabulary lies in the absence of stable equivalents in the target language. Many terms emerge as a direct response to new technologies, tactics, or operational realities and have not yet undergone standardization. In addition, military terminology is often polysemous and highly context-dependent, with meanings that vary depending on the communicative situation, genre, or target audience. These factors necessitate the use of various translation transformations, including lexical, grammatical, and pragmatic strategies, aimed at achieving functional and semantic equivalence rather than formal correspondence.

Particular attention should be paid to the pragmatic dimension of military translation. Military texts frequently perform persuasive, evaluative, or

strategic functions and are designed to influence the recipient's perception of military actions and political decisions. As a result, translators must take into account sociocultural realities, background knowledge of the target audience, and the communicative purpose of the source text. In many cases, literal translation proves insufficient or even misleading, making pragmatic adaptation an essential strategy in rendering military realia, neologisms, and informal vocabulary.

Despite the growing relevance of military translation in the context of modern warfare, the issue of translating contemporary military vocabulary remains insufficiently explored in translation studies. Existing research often focuses on traditional military terminology, while less attention is paid to newly emerging lexical units and their pragmatic potential. This gap highlights the need for a comprehensive analysis of translation strategies used in the transfer of contemporary military vocabulary, particularly from English into Ukrainian, given the current geopolitical realities.

Analysis of contemporary scientific papers. Contemporary research on the translation of military vocabulary has developed at the intersection of translation studies, terminology studies, discourse analysis, and military communication [1, p. 81-85]. Recent scientific papers demonstrate a growing interest in the linguistic and pragmatic aspects of military discourse, particularly in the context of globalization, information warfare, and hybrid conflicts. Scholars emphasize that modern military vocabulary is no longer limited to narrowly specialized terminology but increasingly incorporates elements of political, media, and evaluative discourse.

A significant body of research focuses on the classification and systematization of military terminology [2, p. 103-106]. Researchers note that military terms are characterized by a high degree of standardization, precision, and institutional regulation; however, contemporary warfare generates lexical units that do not always conform to these traditional criteria. Studies highlight the growing role of neologisms, acronyms, and blended forms, especially in English-language military discourse, which often serves as a source language for international communication. As

a result, translators face the challenge of rendering unstable and rapidly evolving terminology into target languages that may lack codified equivalents.

Another important direction in recent scholarship concerns translation transformations used in military texts [4, p. 76-78]. Numerous studies analyze lexical and grammatical transformations such as borrowing, calquing, modulation, transposition, and descriptive translation. Scholars generally agree that direct translation is effective only when clear terminological equivalence exists between the source and target languages. In cases involving culture-specific military realia or newly coined terms, researchers advocate for descriptive or adaptive strategies that ensure semantic clarity and functional adequacy [3, p. 93-99]. This approach aligns with functionalist theories of translation, which prioritize communicative purpose over formal equivalence.

The pragmatic dimension of military translation has received increasing attention in contemporary scientific papers. Researchers emphasize that military texts often perform persuasive, evaluative, or strategic functions, particularly in media and political contexts [7, p. 1-15]. Consequently, translation choices may influence the perception of military actions, power relations, and ideological positions. Studies in this area draw on discourse analysis and pragmatics to examine how meaning is constructed and transformed in translation, highlighting the translator's role as an active mediator rather than a neutral transmitter of information [6, p. 627-632].

Several scholars also address the issue of military slang and informal vocabulary, which has become more visible in modern warfare discourse, especially in social media and journalistic texts [5, p. 23-30]. These lexical units pose particular difficulties due to their expressive nature, cultural specificity, and rapid obsolescence. Research suggests that pragmatic adaptation and contextual interpretation are essential when translating such elements, as literal translation often fails to convey their connotative meaning or communicative effect [9].

Despite the growing number of studies devoted to military translation, contemporary scientific literature reveals certain gaps. Many papers focus primarily on established military terminology or on theoretical models without sufficient attention to newly emerging lexical units shaped by current armed conflicts. Furthermore, there is limited research on the translation of military vocabulary into Ukrainian, especially in the context of ongoing warfare, which creates an urgent need for applied studies that combine theoretical insight with empirical analysis [8, p. 51-60].

Thus, the analysis of contemporary scientific papers demonstrates that translating modern military vocabulary requires an integrated approach that combines terminological accuracy, pragmatic awareness, and sensitivity to sociocultural and communicative factors. This overview of current research provides the theoretical foundation for the present study and justifies the need for further investigation into effective translation strategies in the context of modern warfare.

The purpose of the article is to analyze the lexical, grammatical, and pragmatic features of translating contemporary military vocabulary in the context of modern warfare and to identify the most effective translation strategies that ensure accuracy, adequacy, and communicative effectiveness. The findings of this study may contribute to further research in military translation and serve as practical guidance for translators, linguists, and specialists working with military and security-related texts. Such **methods** over the course of this work are used: descriptive, comparative, analysis, experiment and the method of linguistic interpretation of the results obtained.

Presenting of main material. The translation of contemporary military vocabulary in the context of modern warfare represents one of the most complex and dynamic areas of modern translation studies. Rapid technological progress, the emergence of new forms of armed conflict, and the expansion of military discourse into media, political communication, and digital platforms have significantly transformed the lexical system of military language. Modern warfare is no longer limited to traditional battlefield operations but includes cyber warfare, information operations, psychological influence, and hybrid strategies, all of which generate new terminological units and reshape existing ones. As a result, military vocabulary is constantly evolving, creating considerable challenges for translators who must ensure accuracy, adequacy, and pragmatic relevance under conditions of terminological instability.

In contemporary military communication, English occupies a dominant position as the primary language of international cooperation, strategic documentation, and media coverage. Many new military terms, abbreviations, and informal expressions originate in English and subsequently enter other languages through translation. This process often occurs before such lexical units become standardized, which complicates the task of finding appropriate equivalents in the target language. Translators are required to work with neologisms, borrowings, acronyms, and professional slang that may lack clear definitions or stable usage norms. Consequently, the translation of

military vocabulary increasingly relies on contextual interpretation and pragmatic decision-making rather than on fixed lexical correspondences.

Modern military vocabulary functions across a wide range of text types, including official documents, analytical reports, journalistic articles, expert commentary, and social media content. Each of these genres imposes specific communicative requirements and pragmatic constraints. In official and technical texts, terminological precision and consistency are of primary importance, whereas in media and public discourse military terms often acquire evaluative, emotional, or ideological connotations. The same lexical unit may therefore perform different functions depending on context, which necessitates flexible translation strategies. Inaccurate translation in this domain may result not only in semantic distortion but also in misinterpretation of military actions and political intentions, affecting public perception and international understanding.

One of the most frequently used strategies in translating military vocabulary is direct translation, which is effective when a stable terminological equivalent exists in the target language. For example, *missile defense system* can be translated directly without loss of meaning, as the concept is well established and standardized in military terminology. This approach allows the translator to preserve both semantic content and technical precision. However, direct translation becomes problematic when applied to newly coined terms or metaphorical expressions that reflect emerging realities of warfare. In such cases, literal rendering may fail to convey the full scope of meaning or may produce ambiguous interpretations.

Loan translation is another common strategy, particularly in the translation of compound terms and conceptual innovations. The internal structure of the source term is preserved, allowing the target language to incorporate new concepts while maintaining semantic transparency. An example is *hybrid warfare*, which reflects a complex combination of conventional and non-conventional military methods. While loan translation helps introduce the concept into the target language, it may require additional contextual explanation, especially for non-specialist audiences, as the metaphorical nature of the term is not always immediately clear.

Transcription and transliteration are widely used when translating abbreviations, acronyms, and names of military equipment. These strategies are particularly common for internationally recognized systems and technologies. For instance, *NATO* or *HIMARS* are typically transferred through transliteration, preserving their original form. Although this

approach ensures formal consistency, it does not provide semantic information and may limit comprehension for readers unfamiliar with the term. Therefore, transliteration is often accompanied by descriptive elements, especially in explanatory or educational texts.

Descriptive translation plays a crucial role in rendering military realia and neologisms that have no direct equivalents in the target language. This strategy focuses on explicating the function or characteristics of the object or concept rather than reproducing its linguistic form. The term *loitering munition* illustrates this approach, as its descriptive translation explains the operational behavior of the weapon. Although descriptive translation increases text length and may reduce terminological compactness, it significantly enhances clarity and communicative effectiveness, particularly in analytical and journalistic contexts.

Pragmatic adaptation is one of the most complex and flexible strategies used in translating contemporary military vocabulary. It involves modifying or replacing a lexical unit in order to preserve its communicative effect, emotional coloring, or ideological implications. Military discourse often employs euphemisms and evaluative expressions that require careful handling in translation. For example, the expression *friendly fire* carries a mitigated and euphemistic meaning that softens the tragic nature of the event. Literal translation may fail to convey this pragmatic function, whereas adaptive strategies allow the translator to maintain the intended effect while ensuring cultural and contextual appropriateness.

The translation of military slang and informal vocabulary presents additional challenges. Such lexical units often emerge from frontline communication and reflect subjective experiences, emotional states, and group identity. An expression like *combat fatigue* may function as an informal substitute for clinical terminology, carrying implicit emotional and experiential meanings. Translating such expressions requires sensitivity to register and audience expectations, as overly technical equivalents may neutralize their expressive impact. Similarly, metaphorical expressions such as *fog of war* have become widely used beyond strictly military contexts. Preserving the metaphor in translation is essential for maintaining its cognitive and stylistic effect, provided that the metaphor is accessible within the target culture.

One of the central difficulties in translating contemporary military vocabulary lies in the lack of standardization. Many terms enter public discourse before being officially codified, forcing translators to rely on contextual clues, parallel texts, and expert

knowledge. This situation is further complicated by the rapid pace of lexical change, which may render certain translations obsolete within a short period of time. Additionally, military vocabulary is often embedded in ideological framing, particularly in media discourse. Translation choices can therefore influence the representation of events, either reinforcing or mitigating evaluative and persuasive elements present in the source text. This underscores the translator's role as an active mediator rather than a neutral transmitter of information.

Polysemy also constitutes a significant challenge, as many military terms acquire different meanings across technical, political, and journalistic contexts. Accurate translation requires careful contextual analysis and awareness of genre-specific conventions. A term that functions neutrally in a technical document may carry strong evaluative connotations in a media report, necessitating different translation solutions. Failure to account for such variation may lead to semantic distortion or pragmatic misalignment.

In conclusion, the translation of contemporary military vocabulary in the context of modern warfare is a multifaceted task that extends beyond traditional notions of terminological equivalence. The dynamic nature of modern military discourse, combined with its pragmatic and ideological dimensions, demands a flexible and context-sensitive approach. Effective translation requires the integration of various strategies, including direct translation, calquing, transcription, descriptive translation, and pragmatic adaptation. The choice of strategy should be guided by communicative purpose, target audience, and sociocultural context. Adequate translation is achievable only through the combination of linguistic competence, pragmatic awareness, and deep understanding of modern warfare realities. Further research in this field should focus on empirical analysis of newly emerging military terms and their translation practices, contributing to the development of more effective and adaptable translation models.

A clearer understanding of translation strategies can be achieved by examining specific examples alongside their possible Ukrainian renderings. This approach makes it possible to demonstrate how different translation solutions affect meaning, pragmatics, and communicative impact.

The term *information operation* is commonly translated into Ukrainian as *інформаційна операція*. This variant represents a direct translation that preserves the structural and semantic components of the original term. However, in analytical or explanatory contexts, especially for a non-specialist audience, translators may opt for an expanded version such as

інформаційна операція з метою впливу на громадську думку. This descriptive addition helps clarify the strategic and manipulative dimension implied in the source term, illustrating how direct translation may be supplemented by contextual explanation to enhance comprehension.

Similarly, *psychological warfare* is typically rendered as *психологічна війна*. While this equivalent is terminologically accurate, its pragmatic interpretation may vary depending on context. In media discourse, where the emphasis is placed on influence and manipulation rather than formal military doctrine, an adapted variant such as *психологічний вплив на противника* may be more effective. This example demonstrates how pragmatic adaptation can shift focus from institutional terminology to communicative effect.

Cyber-related terminology also provides illustrative examples. The term *cyberattack* is most often translated as *кібератака*, which has become a widely accepted equivalent in Ukrainian. Nevertheless, in journalistic texts describing non-technical incidents, translators sometimes choose a more descriptive option such as *атака в кіберпросторі* or *цифрова атака*. The choice between these variants depends on whether the text aims at technical precision or broader accessibility. Thus, translation decisions are guided by genre and target audience.

The expression *hybrid warfare* is commonly translated through calquing as *гібридна війна*. This variant has been firmly established in Ukrainian public discourse and effectively conveys the conceptual structure of the term. However, in educational or analytical texts, translators may expand it to *гібридна війна, що поєднує військові та невійськові методи*. Such expansion does not replace the calque but complements it, ensuring that the conceptual complexity of the term is fully understood.

A particularly sensitive example is *collateral damage*, which is usually rendered as *супутні втрати* or *побічні втрати*. Both variants preserve the euphemistic nature of the original expression, avoiding explicit reference to civilian casualties. At the same time, translators working in human rights or investigative journalism may deliberately choose a more explicit option such as *жертви серед цивільного населення* to foreground ethical considerations. This illustrates how translation choices may reflect not only linguistic but also ideological positioning.

The military directive *rules of engagement* is most often translated as *правила застосування сили*. This variant conveys the regulatory function of the term and is widely used in official and analytical texts. In explanatory contexts, translators may add clari-

fication, resulting in правила застосування сили в бойових умовах. Such descriptive adaptation helps non-specialist readers grasp the legal and procedural implications of the concept.

Metaphorical terminology also requires careful handling. The term *force multiplier* is frequently translated as *множник сили*, which preserves the metaphor but may remain abstract for some readers. An alternative adapted variant such as *чинник підвищення бойової ефективності* makes the meaning more explicit while partially neutralizing the metaphor. The choice between these options depends on whether the translator prioritizes stylistic fidelity or conceptual clarity.

Informal and experience-based expressions present additional challenges. The phrase *combat fatigue* may be translated as *бойова втома*, which reflects its informal and experiential nature. In medical or official contexts, however, a more technical equivalent such as *психологічне виснаження військовослужбовців* may be preferred. This contrast highlights the importance of register sensitivity in military translation.

The metaphorical expression *fog of war* is typically rendered as *туман війни*, a direct equivalent that successfully preserves the metaphor and has become conventional in Ukrainian. This example demonstrates a case where literal translation is both semantically and pragmatically effective due to shared cognitive imagery across cultures.

Finally, technologically advanced terms such as *autonomous weapon systems* are usually translated descriptively as *автономні системи озброєння*. In analytical texts addressing ethical or legal issues, translators may further specify the term as *автономні системи озброєння, здатні діяти без безпосереднього контролю людини*. This expanded variant ensures precision and prevents ambiguity, which is essential in academic and policy-oriented discourse.

These examples clearly demonstrate that translating contemporary military vocabulary involves continuous negotiation between accuracy, clarity, pragmatics, and sociocultural relevance. Providing multiple translation variants allows translators to adapt their choices to specific communicative situations while maintaining terminological coherence. Such flexibility is a defining feature of effective military translation in the context of modern warfare and underscores the need for context-aware, analytically grounded translation practices.

Conclusions. The conducted analysis demonstrates that the translation of contemporary military vocabulary in the context of modern warfare repre-

sents a highly complex and multidimensional process that extends far beyond the mechanical substitution of lexical units from one language into another. Rapid transformations in the nature of warfare, driven by technological innovation, hybrid strategies, and the increasing role of information and cyber domains, have resulted in continuous changes to military discourse. These changes generate new terms, redefine existing concepts, and introduce informal and semi-formal lexical units that challenge traditional translation models. The study confirms that no single translation strategy can be considered universally applicable to contemporary military vocabulary. Direct translation and calquing remain effective in cases where stable terminological equivalents exist and where conceptual alignment between the source and target languages has already been established. Such strategies ensure terminological consistency and are particularly important in official documents, analytical reports, and academic texts. At the same time, reliance on literal solutions alone often proves insufficient when dealing with neologisms, military slang, metaphorical expressions, or culture-specific realities that emerge in the context of modern conflict.

A key conclusion of the article is the decisive role of pragmatic adaptation in achieving an adequate translation of military texts. The pragmatic dimension determines not only how information is conveyed, but also how it is interpreted by the target audience. Translators must take into account the communicative purpose of the text, its genre, the level of expertise of the intended readership, and the broader sociopolitical context in which the message functions. In many cases, descriptive translation, semantic development, or partial explicitation becomes necessary to ensure clarity, prevent misinterpretation, and preserve the intended impact of the original message.

The analysis further highlights that military vocabulary is characterized by a high degree of evaluative and ideological loading, particularly in media and public discourse. Euphemisms, metaphors, and strategically neutralized terms are often used to shape perception and influence public opinion. Translators therefore bear significant responsibility, as their choices may either reinforce or mitigate such effects. This underscores the ethical dimension of military translation and the need for critical awareness alongside linguistic competence.

Another important finding is the growing interdependence between military terminology and adjacent domains such as information technology, law, psychology, and political science. As a result, translators working with contemporary military texts must possess interdisciplinary knowledge and continuously

update their professional expertise. Familiarity with current military doctrines, operational practices, and emerging technologies becomes a prerequisite for producing accurate and contextually appropriate translations.

In conclusion, the article demonstrates that the adequacy of translating contemporary military vocabulary can only be achieved through the integration of linguistic analysis, pragmatic considerations,

and a deep understanding of the realities of modern warfare. Effective translation in this field requires flexibility, analytical thinking, and strategic decision-making rather than rigid adherence to predefined rules. The findings of the study may contribute to further research in military translation studies and can be applied in translator training, particularly in developing context-sensitive strategies for working with rapidly evolving military discourse.

СПИСОК ВИКОРИСТАНИХ ДЖЕРЕЛ:

1. Avyasova I. The Specificity of the Functioning and Translation of Abbreviations in the English Military Discourse. *World Bulletin of Social Sciences*. 2023, Vol. 20. P. 81–85. URL: <https://scholarexpress.net/index.php/wbss/article/view/2356>
2. Bîrsan A. Teaching Military Terminology by Means of Translations. *International Conference KNOWLEDGE-BASED ORGANIZATION*. 2024, Volume 30, Issue 2, P. 103–106. DOI:10.2478/kbo-2024-0059
3. Gao Y., Tao Y., Chen Y. Comparative Study on English Translation Strategies of Military Terms in Zuo zhuan. *China Terminology*. 2025, Vol. 27, Issue 2. P. 93–99. DOI: 10.12339/j.issn.1673-8578.2025.02.012
4. Imomova S. P. Translation of Military Terms in Military Texts. *American Journal of Science and Learning for Development*. 2024. Vol. 3, No. 1. P. 76–78. URL: <https://inter-publishing.com/index.php/AJSLD/article/view/3363>
5. Normatov K. Z. The significance of phonology and phono pragmatics in military discourse and oral translation theory. *Web of Technology: Multidimensional Research Journal*. 2025, Vol. 3, No. 8. P. 23–30. URL: <https://webof-journals.com/index.php/4/article/view/4983>
6. Soatova S. M. Linguistic features of military discourse in official texts. *Central Asian Journal of Literature, Philosophy and Culture*. 2025, Vol. 6, No. 4. P. 627–632. DOI:10.51699/cajlpс.v6i4.1313
7. Soatova S. M. Ukrainian historical terminology designating social and military status in Old Rus': Examining their counterparts in English. *Forum for Linguistic Studies*. 2025, Vol. 6, No. 1. P. 1–15. DOI:10.59400/fls.v6i1.1989
8. Udovichenko H., Chvanova B. Ways to cover the difficulties of translating military terminology. *Modern Engineering and Innovative Technologies*. 2025, No. 37-03. P. 51–60. DOI:10.30890/2567-5273.2025-37-03-051
9. Yemelyanova O. V., Shkurko O. V. Features of translating English-language military discourse. *Scientific Bulletin of International Humanitarian University*. 2024, No. 67. URL: <https://vestnik-philology.mgu.od.ua/archive/v67/53.pdf>



Стаття поширюється на умовах ліцензії відкритого доступу CC BY 4.0

Дата першого надходження статті до видання: 25.02.2026

Дата прийняття статті до друку після рецензування: 30.03.2026

Дата публікації (оприлюднення) статті: 07.05.2026