UDC 81'25:81'42:791.43
DOI https://doi.org/10.32782/tps2663-4880/2026.49.39

FROM TERMINOLOGICAL RECOGNITION TO CRITICAL MULTIMODAL RECONTEXTUALISATION: MILITARY-AVIATION DISCOURSE IN TOP GUN: MAVERICK

ВІД ТЕРМІНОЛОГІЧНОГО РОЗПІЗНАВАННЯ ДО КРИТИЧНОЇ МУЛЬТИМОДАЛЬНОЇ РЕКОНТЕКСТУАЛІЗАЦІЇ: ВІЙСЬКОВО-АВІАЦІЙНИЙ ДИСКУРС У TOP GUN: MAVERICK

Molchko O.O.,
orcid.org/0000-0003-3062-7640
Candidate of Philological Sciences, Associate Professor
Associate Professor at the Hryhoriy Kochur Department of Translation Studies and Contrastive Linguistics
Ivan Franko National University of Lviv

Brylenko I.O.,
orcid.org/0009-0005-8378-6516
Lecturer at the Hryhoriy Kochur Department of Translation Studies and Contrastive Linguistics
Ivan Franko National University of Lviv

The article examines specialised military-aviation discourse in Top Gun: Maverick as a bounded case for investigating how terminological meaning becomes multimodally situated and discursively consequential in audiovisual translation. It aims to establish how multimodal information expands specialised reference, identify the social and institutional functions that become relevant to translation, and determine how these dimensions condition target-context recontextualisation and audiovisual realisation. The study employs a qualitative case-study design and close analysis of four purposively selected audiovisual translation events: the bogey–bandit distinction, hard deck, the culturally marked expression kick the tyres and light the fires, and a high-pressure dogfight sequence. The analysis combines specialised-terminology interpretation, social-semiotic multimodality, a restricted translation-oriented use of Critical Discourse Analysis, translation as recontextualisation, and audiovisual-translation constraints. The cases demonstrate that lexical identification is only the initial stage of the translation problem. Bogey–bandit reveals how terminological differentiation performs institutional categorisation; hard deck combines technical designation with a behavioural boundary and prohibition; kick the tyres and light the fires foregrounds cultural-pragmatic meaning and professional identity; and the dogfight event shows how terminology, image, sound, urgency, institutional roles and subtitle constraints jointly determine translation priorities. Cross-case analysis identifies a recurrent relationship among terminological recognition, multimodal contextualisation, critical discourse interpretation, translational recontextualisation and audiovisually constrained re-expression. The relationship is recursive because target-mode constraints can trigger renewed interpretation and reprioritisation. Specialised audiovisual translation is therefore better understood as critical multimodal recontextualisation than as terminological transfer followed by technical adaptation. CDA is most productive here as an interpretive hinge between situated multimodal meaning and target-context reconstruction. The study proposes critical multimodal translation competence as an integrative analytical construct, while making no claim that the case study validates a universal cognitive sequence.

Key words: audiovisual translation, specialised terminology, institutional categorisation, translation event, target-context reconstruction, subtitle constraints, professional identity.

У статті спеціалізований військово-авіаційний дискурс фільму Top Gun: Maverick досліджено крізь призму взаємодії термінологічного значення, мультимодального контексту та дискурсивних чинників в аудіовізуальному перекладі. Мета дослідження – з'ясувати, як мультимодальна інформація конкретизує й розширює спеціалізоване референтне значення, визначити соціальні та інституційні функції, що набувають перекладацької релевантності, а також простежити, як взаємодія цих чинників впливає на реконтекстуалізацію та аудіовізуальне відтворення змісту в цільовому тексті. Застосовано якісний метод кейс-стаді та поглиблений аналіз чотирьох цілеспрямовано відібраних аудіовізуальних перекладацьких подій: опозиції bogey – bandit, терміна hard deck, культурно маркованого вислову kick the tyres and light the fires та напруженого епізоду повітряного бою. Аналітична рамка поєднує інтерпретацію спеціалізованої термінології, соціально-семіотичну мультимодальність, обмежене перекладознавчо зорієнтоване застосування критичного дискурс-аналізу, переклад як реконтекстуалізацію та обмеження аудіовізуального перекладу. Аналіз засвідчив, що лексико-термінологічна ідентифікація є лише початковим етапом перекладацької проблеми. Опозиція bogey – bandit демонструє інституційну категоризацію; hard deck поєднує технічне позначення з поведінковою межею та забороною; kick the tyres and light the fires актуалізує культурно-прагматичне значення й професійну ідентичність; епізод повітряного бою виявляє спільний вплив термінології, зображення, звуку, комунікативної терміновості, інституційних ролей і субтитрових обмежень на перекладацькі пріоритети. Міжкейсова інтерпретація виявляє повторюваний зв'язок між термінологічним розпізнаванням, мультимодальною контекстуалізацією, критичною дискурсивною інтерпретацією, перекладацькою реконтекстуалізацією та аудіовізуально обмеженим відтворенням. Цей зв'язок має рекурсивний характер, оскільки обмеження цільового аудіовізуального режиму можуть спричиняти повторну інтерпретацію й перепріоритизацію значень. Спеціалізований аудіовізуальний переклад доцільно розглядати як критичну мультимодальну реконтекстуалізацію, а не як термінологічне перенесення з подальшою технічною адаптацією. Критичний дискурс-аналіз виконує функцію інтерпретаційної ланки

між ситуативним мультимодальним значенням і його реконструкцією в цільовому контексті. Запропоновано поняття критичної мультимодальної перекладацької компетентності як інтегративного аналітичного конструкту без претензії на емпіричну верифікацію універсальної когнітивної послідовності.

Ключові слова: аудіовізуальний переклад, спеціалізована термінологія, інституційна категоризація, перекладацька подія, реконструкція цільового контексту, субтитрові обмеження, професійна ідентичність.

Problem Statement and Its Relation to Important Scholarly and Practical Tasks. Specialised audiovisual translation requires more than accurate domain-specific equivalents. In audiovisual discourse, specialised expressions interact with image, sound, movement, intonation, participant roles and institutional conventions; their translational significance is therefore simultaneously terminological, multimodal and discursive. Military-aviation discourse makes this interaction especially visible. The distinction between bogey and bandit, for instance, separates an unidentified aircraft from one positively identified as hostile and thus changes both reference and operational status.

Analysis of Recent Research and Publications. Specialised Terminology and Translation. Specialised translation begins with recognition of domain-specific concepts and communicative situations [1, p. 11–29]. Items such as bogey, bandit, hard deck, bingo fuel and RTB cannot be interpreted reliably through ordinary lexical meaning alone. In this study, Terminological Recognition denotes establishing the specialised conceptual meaning of an expression. It is an interpretive starting point: knowing what a term denotes does not yet establish what it means or does in a particular audiovisual event.

Multimodal Contextualisation. Social-semiotic multimodality treats meaning as distributed across interacting resources rather than confined to language [2, p. 21; 3, p. 257–269; 1, p. 181–224]. In audiovisual discourse, verbal expression interacts with visual representation, gesture, gaze, movement, intonation, sound and editing. Recent Ukrainian AVT research likewise emphasises how relations among multimodal elements influence translation strategies and tactics, including subtitling and the interaction of subtitles with other modes [4]. Multimodal Contextualisation therefore asks not only what a specialised expression means, but what it means here, within the particular semiotic configuration.

CDA and Institutional Meaning. Multimodal contextualisation does not fully explain the institutional work performed by specialised discourse. Drawing on Fairclough's relationship between text, discourse practice and social practice, CDA is used here in a restricted, translation-oriented sense [5, p. 73–74]. It directs attention to categorisation, agency, authority, hierarchy, professional identity, permission and obligation without presuming ideological significance in every technical expression. Critical Discourse Interpretation identifies those social and institutional relations that become consequential for translation. Thus bogey/bandit is not merely a terminological opposition: the shift assigns a new operational identity to the referent. CDA consequently functions as an interpretive hinge between situated meaning and translation.

Translation as Recontextualisation. Ieţcu-Fairclough conceptualises translation through recontextualisation: discourse enters a new linguistic, cultural and social environment in which meaning and function may require reconstruction [6, p. 67–72]. Ukrainian Translation Studies provides a useful specialised-translation development of this idea. Povorozniuk distinguishes recontextualisation as a global strategy from reformulation as a local tactic, placing it above isolated lexical replacement [7, c. 53–57]. Kovalchuk, Lesyk and Litkovych describe it as reconstruction of a communicative situation involving participants, relations and sociocultural knowledge [8, c. 91–97]. Cross-lingual multimodal recontextualisation likewise demonstrates that verbal and visual changes may jointly reshape meaning [9]. Translational Recontextualisation is therefore understood here as deciding which source-discourse meanings and functions should be preserved, modified, explicated or reconstructed in Ukrainian.

Audiovisual Re-expression. Recontextualisation must finally function within the target audiovisual mode. Subtitling imposes temporal and spatial restrictions and requires condensation, segmentation, readability and synchronisation; dubbing adds spoken naturalness, timing and performance [10, p. 145–175]. Romaniuk [4] similarly links multimodal relations with concrete AVT strategies. Audiovisually Constrained Re-expression thus denotes the viable realisation of a recontextualised decision. Importantly, constraint may feed back into interpretation when an otherwise adequate solution proves audiovisually unworkable.

Previously Unresolved Aspects of the General Problem. Existing research provides robust accounts of specialised terminology, multimodal meaning, Critical Discourse Analysis, translation as recontextualisation and audiovisual constraints. What remains insufficiently integrated is the relation among these dimensions within a single specialised audiovisual translation event. In particular, terminological recognition alone does not explain when a specialised

expression acquires institutionally consequential meaning, how that meaning is redistributed across verbal and non-verbal modes, or how target-mode constraints can force renewed interpretation. The unresolved problem addressed here is therefore how these analytical dimensions can be coordinated without reducing audiovisual translation either to lexical transfer or to an unrestricted ideological reading.

Aim and Objectives of the Article. This study examines selected military-aviation translation events in Top Gun: Maverick as a bounded qualitative case. The film is not treated as an object of comprehensive ideological critique or as evidence of pedagogical effectiveness, but as an audiovisual environment in which specialised terminology, professional roles, cultural-pragmatic meaning and target-mode constraints intersect. The purpose is to determine how terminological meaning becomes multimodally contextualised and discursively interpreted, and how these dimensions condition translational recontextualisation and audiovisual re-expression in Ukrainian.

The research tasks are to establish how multimodal information expands specialised meaning; identify social and institutional discourse functions that become translationally consequential; and determine how these dimensions interact in target-context recontextualisation and audiovisual realisation. Methodologically, four purposefully selected translation events are analysed through specialised terminology, social-semiotic multimodality, a translation-oriented use of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), recontextualisation and audiovisual translation. The novelty lies in positioning CDA-informed discourse interpretation as the analytical hinge between situated multimodal meaning and translational recontextualisation, while accounting for the recursive effect of audiovisual constraints on interpretation and target-text decision-making.

Main Material of the Study and Substantiation of the Results. Methodology. The study adopts a qualitative, exploratory case-study design. Its unit of analysis is the specialised audiovisual translation event: a segment in which a specialised verbal expression interacts with multimodal, institutional and/or cultural information in ways that condition interpretation and generate a translation problem. This unit is broader than the term itself because interpretation may depend on speaker identity, visual action, intonation, operational sequence and institutional knowledge.

Case Material and Selection. Four cases were selected purposefully from the translation material documented in the underlying MA case study of Top Gun: Maverick: bogey–bandit; hard deck; kick the tyres and light the fires; and specialised communication in a high-pressure dogfight sequence. The source material derives from student scene analysis, English–Ukrainian dialogue translation, subtitling, dubbing and glossary work. Accordingly, Ukrainian forms reproduced below are treated as attested student solutions only where they are explicitly documented in the study materials; where the records preserve discussion of alternative strategies but no final wording, the analysis does not reconstruct or invent a target text. The four cases foreground, respectively, institutional categorisation, regulated professional action, cultural-pragmatic recontextualisation, and the convergence of terminology, multimodality, discourse and audiovisual constraint. They are explanatory rather than statistically representative.

Analytical Procedure. Each case is examined through five analytical dimensions derived from the theoretical framework: Terminological Recognition establishes specialised conceptual content; Multimodal Contextualisation situates it across semiotic resources; Critical Discourse Interpretation identifies institutionally consequential categorisation, agency or relations; Translational Recontextualisation determines what requires reconstruction in the Ukrainian context; and Audiovisually Constrained Re-expression tests the viability of that reconstruction in the target mode. The dimensions are heuristic rather than a claim about fixed cognitive chronology.

CDA in Translation Analysis. The study is not a comprehensive CDA of Top Gun: Maverick. CDA is used only where discourse properties become translationally consequential. Broader questions of militarism, national identity, masculinity or geopolitical ideology fall outside the immediate scope unless they directly condition a selected translation event. The case study seeks analytical, not statistical, generalisation and does not claim that the five dimensions constitute a universal cognitive model.

Results and Discussion. The four cases reveal that specialised audiovisual translation problems do not arise exclusively from terminological complexity. In each case, the specialised expression acquires translational significance through its relationship with the communicative situation, other semiotic modes, institutional discourse and the constraints governing target-text production. At the same time, the cases differ in the point at which straightforward terminological transfer becomes insufficient. This variation makes it possible to examine whether a recurrent interpretive pattern emerges across the material.

Bogey–Bandit: Discursive Categorisation. The opposition between bogey and bandit initially presents itself as a terminological problem. The students'

glossary defines bogey as an unidentified aircraft and records the Ukrainian solution богі, accompanied by the explanation that the aircraft has not yet been identified as friend or foe. Bandit is defined as a positively identified enemy aircraft and rendered as бандит, ворог, with the corresponding explanation that the aircraft has been identified as hostile. The two expressions therefore cannot be treated as interchangeable items of military slang: their difference encodes a change in the operational status attributed to the referent.

At the level of terminological recognition, the translation problem appears relatively straightforward: the target text must distinguish an aircraft whose affiliation has not yet been established from one categorised as hostile. Yet the opposition becomes more significant when situated within the audiovisual event. Identification occurs as part of an unfolding operational sequence in which visual information, participant knowledge, verbal communication and subsequent action interact. The meaning of the lexical item is therefore inseparable from the point reached in that sequence.

Multimodal contextualisation consequently transforms a static terminological opposition into a dynamic process of identification. An aircraft does not possess the discourse status bogey or bandit independently of the communicative event. It is categorised through the participants' developing knowledge of the situation.

A CDA-informed reading exposes a further dimension: the transition from bogey to bandit is not merely a refinement of reference but a change in institutionally recognised status.

The lexical shift bogey → bandit can therefore be reconstructed as unidentified entity → identified hostile entity. The attested Ukrainian pair богі → бандит / ворог preserves the broad contrast, while the accompanying explanations make explicit the operational distinction on which the categorisation depends.

The lexical shift thus performs more than referential specification. It constitutes an act of institutional categorisation. Through specialised naming, the discourse assigns a participant a particular operational identity and thereby positions that participant within an institutionally regulated field of possible action.

This distinction is translationally consequential. A target-language solution may successfully refer to an aircraft while weakening the difference between uncertainty and confirmed hostility. Referential approximation would then result in discursive redistribution: the object remains identifiable, but its institutional status is altered.

The case therefore demonstrates the movement terminological difference → contextual status → discourse categorisation → translation consequence.

CDA is useful precisely at the third point. It explains why preserving the dictionary meanings of two terms may still be insufficient if the target choices fail to reconstruct the categorisation performed by the source discourse.

Hard Deck: Institutional Constraint. Hard deck presents a different translation problem. Unlike bogey/bandit, its principal difficulty does not arise from opposition between neighbouring specialised categories. Instead, the expression demonstrates the opacity of specialised meaning when removed from its professional context.

The source material defines hard deck as a predetermined altitude below which pilots are prohibited from descending during training and explicitly records students' difficulty in explaining the concept through ordinary language. Although hard deck was included in their contextualised glossary work, the available record does not preserve a single final Ukrainian wording. This absence is analytically important: the case documents the translation problem and the need for contextual reconstruction without licensing the present study to invent an attested TT solution.

At the lexical level, the ordinary meanings of hard and deck provide little assistance. Terminological recognition therefore requires a shift from lexical composition to domain-specific conceptualisation. The expression becomes interpretable only when related to the practice in which it functions.

Yet even the definition predetermined altitude remains incomplete from a discourse perspective. A hard deck is meaningful because it establishes a boundary on permitted behaviour. It consequently contains an institutional dimension: the expression simultaneously designates a spatial parameter and activates a norm governing participant action.

This case helps delimit our use of CDA. Nothing requires hard deck to be interpreted as ideologically loaded. Its relevance to critical discourse interpretation lies instead in the relationship between language and institutionally regulated action. Specialised discourse constructs what participants may, must or must not do.

For translation, the implication is significant. A target expression that conveys only altitude may preserve the technical domain while underrepresenting the regulatory function. Conversely, an extended explanatory rendering may recover that function while becoming unsuitable for rapid audiovisual communication.

The translation problem therefore involves determining which component is communicatively salient in the particular event: technical designation, spa-

tial boundary, prohibition or operational warning. Multimodal context becomes decisive in selecting among these possibilities.

The case thus modifies the pattern identified in 4.1. Critical discourse interpretation is not always concerned with participant categorisation. It may instead expose institutional constraint encoded in specialised terminology.

Cultural-Discursive Recontextualisation. The third case shifts the centre of the problem from specialised reference towards cultural and pragmatic meaning.

The source material explicitly records difficulty in translating kick the tyres and light the fires because its cultural connotations resisted direct transfer. Students discussed strategies including a brief explanatory solution and a comparable Ukrainian expression. No definitive Ukrainian TT wording is preserved in the available record; the evidence therefore supports analysis of the competing recontextualisation strategies, not the attribution of an invented final translation.

A literal semantic interpretation of the expression is readily recoverable, but its communicative value cannot be derived by combining the referential meanings of kick, tyres, light, and fires. The expression evokes readiness for action while simultaneously carrying informality, energy and aviation-associated cultural colouring.

The translation problem is therefore not simply "What does the expression denote?" but "Which dimensions of its discourse function make it this expression in this situation?"

Here multimodality becomes particularly important. Speaker identity, delivery, pace, visual action and interpersonal context can foreground different functions: command, humour, solidarity, bravado, readiness or characterisation. The verbal expression participates in a larger semiotic construction of professional identity.

The case consequently brings recontextualisation to the foreground. Once the source function has been interpreted, the translator must determine which elements can meaningfully enter the Ukrainian target context.

Literal reproduction may preserve imagery while losing pragmatic recognisability. Explication may preserve propositional meaning while neutralising tone and group identity. A culturally analogous expression may recreate pragmatic force while replacing source imagery and potentially altering its aviation associations.

The translation decision is therefore better represented as source expression → contextual function → discourse value → target-context prioritisation → TT realisation, rather than as a direct ST expression → TT equivalent relation.

This is where translation as recontextualisation becomes particularly explanatory. The translator is not merely transferring a linguistic object. The translator negotiates which aspects of a source-discourse configuration can and should be reconstructed under new linguistic and cultural conditions.

The case also demonstrates why recontextualisation cannot be predetermined by a fixed hierarchy of equivalence. What requires preservation depends upon what the expression is doing in that audiovisual event.

The Audiovisual Translation Event. The high-pressure dogfight material provides the most complex case because the analytical dimensions identified separately above converge within a single communicative environment.

The dogfight material derives from translation and dubbing tasks in which students worked with scenes from Top Gun: Maverick under explicit requirements to preserve military terminology, urgency, tone and audiovisual synchronisation. The wider glossary documents Ukrainian solutions for operational items such as Tally → попадання в приціл, No Joy → відсутність візуального контакту, Winchester → відсутність боєприпасів, RTB → повернення на базу, and Knock it off → вихід із бою. Other recorded solutions, including Spike → ворог на прицілі and Break → прорив, reveal how a formally concise rendering may alter or obscure the specialised relation encoded by the source term. The case therefore provides evidence of terminological transfer and the need to test each solution against the unfolding audiovisual event. The translation problem is therefore distributed across several simultaneous dimensions.

First, terminological precision remains necessary. Misidentification of an operational term can change the represented situation.

Second, meaning is multimodally distributed. Spoken dialogue interacts with rapid visual action, aircraft movement, sound, intonation and the developing tactical situation. Some information verbally compressed into specialised terminology may simultaneously be supported by what the viewer sees or hears.

Third, the discourse is institutionally structured. Speakers occupy professional roles; utterances may function as warnings, commands, reports or acknowledgements; lexical categorisation determines participant status; brevity itself constitutes part of the communicative practice.

Fourth, translation involves recontextualisation. The target text must provide sufficient access to specialised meaning without necessarily reproducing every source-discourse convention formally.

Finally, the translation must function within an audiovisual environment imposing its own restrictions. In subtitling, preservation of every lexical element may be incompatible with readability and exposure time. The translator therefore has to determine what can be condensed because another semiotic mode already supplies part of the information and what cannot be removed without altering the operational or discourse meaning.

This produces an important finding. Audiovisual constraint does not operate only after translation has taken place. It can force the translator to return to interpretation.

Under audiovisual constraint, the question shifts from "Which words can be deleted?" to a renewed assessment of what is already recoverable visually, which terminological distinctions are indispensable, which discourse functions must remain explicit, and which cultural information can be reduced without changing the event.

The resulting movement is recursive: constraint → renewed interpretation → reprioritisation → recontextualisation → revised expression.

This case most clearly supports the usefulness of the specialised audiovisual translation event as the unit of analysis. Neither the isolated term nor the isolated subtitle contains all the information necessary to explain the translation decision. The relevant object is the interaction among specialised language, multimodal information, institutional discourse, target-context conditions and audiovisual constraint.

Cross-Case Analysis. The cases do not all pose the same type of translation problem. Bogey/bandit foregrounds institutional categorisation; hard deck foregrounds domain-specific conceptualisation and regulatory meaning; kick the tyres and light the fires foregrounds cultural-pragmatic recontextualisation; and the dogfight sequence foregrounds the simultaneous negotiation of terminology, multimodality, discourse and audiovisual constraint.

This variation is theoretically useful. If all four cases exhibited precisely the same difficulty, the proposed framework would amount largely to a classification of one problem type. Instead, the cases suggest that different translation difficulties become salient at different points in a more general interpretive movement.

Across the material, five recurrent analytical operations can be reconstructed: Terminological Recognition → Multimodal Contextualisation → Critical Discourse Interpretation → Translational Recontextualisation → Audiovisually Constrained Re-expression.

The first establishes the specialised conceptual content required for interpretation. The second situates that content within the interaction of verbal and non-verbal semiotic resources. The third identifies the social or institutional work performed by the situated expression. The fourth determines what aspects of that configuration require reconstruction within the target linguistic-cultural context. The fifth realises the resulting decision within the affordances and constraints of the target audiovisual mode.

The cases also demonstrate that not every stage carries equal analytical weight in every translation event. Critical discourse interpretation is especially prominent in bogey/bandit, while cultural recontextualisation dominates kick the tyres and light the fires. This asymmetry should not be treated as a weakness of the model. On the contrary, it suggests that the five dimensions function as an analytical repertoire whose relative prominence is determined by the translation problem.

More importantly, the dogfight case challenges a strictly linear interpretation of the sequence. Audiovisual constraint can require reconsideration of an earlier interpretive decision. The model should therefore be represented recursively: Recognition → Contextualisation → Critical Interpretation → Recontextualisation ⇄ Re-expression with possible backward movement whenever the conditions of target-text realisation require renewed prioritisation of meaning.

At the macro-level, the five operations can be grouped as: the first three operations progressively construct a situated understanding of the source audiovisual event; the fourth negotiates its relocation into the target linguistic-cultural environment; the fifth gives that decision an audiovisually viable form.

This pattern allows us to return to the broader theoretical issue raised at the beginning of the study. Specialised audiovisual translation cannot be adequately represented as the transfer of terminological meaning supplemented by technical adaptation. The cases indicate a more complex movement: specialised reference becomes multimodally situated meaning; situated meaning becomes discourse function; discourse function becomes an object of translational recontextualisation; and recontextualisation becomes target audiovisual expression. We propose to conceptualise this movement as the process underlying critical multimodal translation competence.

The term critical refers here to the capacity to recognise the social and institutional consequences of discourse choices, not to an assumption that every specialised utterance requires ideological critique. Multimodal signals that interpretation emerges through interaction among semiotic resources. Translation competence concerns the capacity to

transform that situated interpretation into a functional target-text decision.

The case study's primary contribution is therefore an analytical model of critical multimodal recontextualisation. As a secondary theoretical implication, the recurring coordination of terminological, multimodal, discourse, recontextualising and audiovisual decisions suggests a provisional construct that may be termed critical multimodal translation competence. The present qualitative cases do not empirically validate a universal competence structure; they identify an analytically motivated hypothesis for further research.

The four cases do not empirically 'prove' the existence of such a competence or the purpose of the case study. They provide an analytical basis for proposing the construct by demonstrating recurrent dependencies among terminological, multimodal, discourse, translational and audiovisual dimensions.

Conclusions and Prospects for Further Research. The case study shows that specialised audiovisual translation cannot be reduced to terminological transfer followed by technical adaptation. Terminology supplies an interpretive starting point, but multimodal context determines situated meaning; CDA reveals institutionally consequential discourse functions; recontextualisation connects that interpretation with the target linguistic-cultural environment; and audiovisual conditions determine viable realisation. The principal theoretical contribution is therefore the positioning of CDA-informed interpretation as a mediating link between multimodal contextualisation and translational recontextualisation.

The analysis also clarifies the status of recontextualisation. What moves between source and target is not an isolated lexical meaning but a selectively reconstructed configuration of referential, multimodal, pragmatic, cultural and discourse meanings. Because information may already be recoverable through image, movement or sound, audiovisual constraints participate in meaning prioritisation and may initiate renewed interpretation. The proposed architecture is consequently recursive rather than strictly linear.

Critical multimodal translation competence is offered as an integrative conceptual construct, not as a replacement for established competence models or as an empirically validated cognitive mechanism. Its critical dimension denotes sensitivity to the social and institutional work of discourse choices; multimodal denotes the distributed semiotic environment in which meaning is constructed; and translation competence concerns converting that situated interpretation into a viable target-text decision. The explanatory scope remains bounded by one audiovisual work and one specialised domain. Further research should test the framework against medical, legal, technological and emergency-response audiovisual discourse and, where process evidence is available, examine how translators themselves verbalise the interaction among multimodal information, discourse function and target-mode constraints. Within the present case, however, the recurrent movement is clear: specialised audiovisual translation begins with what a term means, but becomes possible through understanding that meaning as situated, socially functional, recontextualisable and multimodally realisable.

REFERENCES:

1. Pérez-González L. Audiovisual Translation: Theories, Methods and Issues. London ; New York : Routledge, 2014. 356 p. DOI: 10.4324/9781315762975.
2. Kress G., van Leeuwen T. Multimodal Discourse: The Modes and Media of Contemporary Communication. London : Arnold, 2001. 142 p.
3. Kaindl K. Multimodality and translation. The Routledge Handbook of Translation Studies / ed. by C. Millán, F. Bartrina. London ; New York : Routledge, 2013. P. 257–269.
4. Романюк О. Ю. Роль мультимодальних елементів у процесі перекладу аудіовізуальних творів : дис. ... д-ра філософії : 035 Філологія. Львівський національний університет імені Івана Франка. Львів, 2025.
5. Fairclough N. Discourse and Social Change. Cambridge : Polity Press, 1992. 259 p.
6. Ieţcu-Fairclough I. Critical discourse analysis and translation studies: Translation, recontextualization, ideology. Bucharest Working Papers in Linguistics. 2008. Vol. X, No. 2. P. 67–72.
7. Поворознюк Р. Реконтекстуалізація в перекладацькому аналізі медичного тексту. Актуальні питання гуманітарних наук. 2018. Вип. 21. Т. 2. С. 53–57. DOI: 10.24919/2308-4863.2/21.167262.
8. Ковальчук Л., Лесик І., Літкович Ю. Реконтекстуалізація в перекладі студентського сленгу. Наукові записки Вінницького державного педагогічного університету імені Михайла Коцюбинського. Серія: Філологія (мовознавство). 2024. № 38. С. 91–97. DOI: 10.31652/2521-1307-2024-38-11.
9. Altahmazi T. Creating realities across languages and modalities: Multimodal recontextualization in the translation of online news reports. Discourse, Context & Media. 2020. Vol. 35. Article 100390. DOI: 10.1016/j.dcm.2020.100390.
10. Díaz Cintas J., Remael A. Subtitling: Concepts and Practices. London ; New York : Routledge, 2021. 292 p. DOI: 10.4324/9781315674278.

Стаття поширюється на умовах ліцензії відкритого доступу CC BY 4.0

Дата першого надходження статті до видання: 08.09.2026
Дата прийняття статті до друку після рецензування: 06.11.2026
Дата публікації (оприлюднення) статті: 24.11.2026