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Abstract. The article highlights the verbalization peculiarities of the concept WAR in diplomatic, journalistic and poetic discourses as specific culture-historical milieus with respect to its adequate rendering by means of the English language. International relations and world’s geopolitical environment were dramatically changed at the beginning of the XXI century. Within this framework, military-to-military cooperation Ukraine – NATO has been significantly extended. As the result, in the course of cooperation among military forces of different states various situations of misunderstandings are possible. Bearers of diverse worldviews can comprehend particular military notions in a different way. It is emphasized that the concepts being strongly subjective and largely variant in distinct languages for similar denotata give rise to controversial scholar’s definitions and have ambiguous consequences for translation equivalents. And the solution to this difficult problem of ambiguity requires a detailed study of the manner of any given military concept’s understanding by different linguistic communities in various contexts.
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Introduction

At the present stage of humanitarian knowledge the term “concept” is one of the most widely used and controversial in philosophy, linguistics, translation and interpreting studies, psychological studies, cultural studies. Any science possesses its own definition of the abovementioned term; this is due to the fact of a great disparity in the understanding of the term “concept”, which is of the paramount importance in worldview’s researches.

The term “concept” in linguistics is not new but over the past few decades it got a new interpretation. Just a while ago it was apprehended as an equivalent to the term “notion”. In linguistics, in particular with regard to translation aspect, the concept, in contrast to a notion, has a more multivariable structure.

In modern linguistics, a great variety of research approaches to the concept understanding is distinguished. In our article, based on the study of the linguistic and cultural concept WAR, the most relevant is cultural meaning according to the Russian scientist J. Stepanov. This approach considers the concept as a bunch of culture in the mental world of individual person; it is something in the form of which the culture enters the consciousness of the entire linguistic community (Stepanov, 2007).

Linguistic and cultural approach of the text analysis is aimed at specifics’ coverage of national mentality, based on the history of the nation and reflected in the cultural concepts. Thus the concept is also can be understood as a unit of the collective consciousness, which is stored in the national memory of native speakers in verbally determined form.

V. Karasik states that concept is a multidimensional formation where the notional, figurative and value sides are distinguished. The scholar points out that the notional aspect of a concept is the linguistic fixation of a concept, its name, description, definition, comparative characteristics of this concept with respect to other sets of concepts. The figurative side of a concept is its visual, auditory, tactile, taste characteristics of objects, represented mostly by conceptual metaphors. The value side of a concept describes the importance of this mental formation, both for an individual person and for the entire linguistic community (Karasik, 2004).

V. Demetska considers the concept as a unit with cultural semantics, where the evaluative element predominates. Evaluative elements with explicit/implicit negative/positive connotations “escort” a concept in a text and accumulate around it emotions and associations, which sometimes are not verbalized in certain
culture, but apprehended by the bearers of this linguistic culture. In the narrow sense of our study it means that a translator works with two types of information in a text – factual and evaluative. Consequently in the process of translation according to different types of information adaptive or reproductive translations are produced (Demetska, 2010).

Worldview of military sphere in any culture has its own content and set of concepts. The concept WAR belongs to the universal concepts, as it appears in all cultures and languages. The relatively regular set of associations is sometimes different in different languages. This fact might affect the choice of translation equivalents. Further on these theoretical underpinnings will be illustrated by the analysis of the concept WAR with the reference to poetic (further PD), journalistic (further JD) and diplomatic discourses (further DD).

**Method.** In our study we use the methods of linguistic, translation and comparative analyses, thesaurus and definitive methods, distinctive method, synthesis, induction and deduction. The comparative method was chosen as the principal one, it was used to study the level of adequacy while reproducing the concept WAR by means of target language.

**Results**

The concept WAR is one of the basic concepts of any culture and has a great axiological value. Every language has a word “war", which has a meaning “a conflict among political groups involving hostilities of considerable duration and magnitude” (Britannica).

Thus, according to the abovementioned definition of war the following semes were distinguished: conflict, political groups, hostilities. In fact, the conceptual field of the concept WAR is composed by such essential verbally determinate forms as participants of warfare, combat operations, hardware, aftermath of war, synonyms for military conflict’s denotation.

There are universal and culture-bound features in verbal manifestation of the concept WAR, where culture-historically determinate world language pictures of both nations are reflected. In any language concept can be verbalized by separate words, phrases, sentences or the whole texts, this depends on the concept itself. We singled the words and phrases relating to the associative-semantic field of the concept WAR out of three discourses (Table 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Seme</th>
<th>Diplomatic discourse</th>
<th>Journalistic discourse</th>
<th>Poetic discourse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conflict</td>
<td>Zona konflikt/conflict zone</td>
<td>Poboishche/carnage Kotel/trap</td>
<td>Krovavaia zhatva/bloody harvest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hostilities</td>
<td>Primeniat oruzhie/ Use weapons</td>
<td>Kherachit/fire Streliat/shoot</td>
<td>Gotuvaty svyncevu kashy/feed lead casha Prevratat v resheto/ fire with rifle-sized holes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political groups</td>
<td>Nezakonnye gruppy/illegal groups</td>
<td>Vooruzhennye formirovaniia/ illegal armed groups Miaso/Cannon fodder</td>
<td>Okupanty/invaders Banditskaia kodla/Criminal gang Vbyvci/ butchers or murderers Pushechnoe miaso/Fodder for cannons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukrainskie voiska/Ukrainian troops</td>
<td>Ukrainskie siloviki/Ukrainian security forces Banderovtsy/Banderites Ukry/Ukres</td>
<td>«Khokhly»/Ukrainians Soldaty Stepana Bandery/Soldiers Of Stepan Bandera</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 1**
As far as modern theory of war considers “war” as social and political process, which is characterized by the turf war of geopolitical constituents, modern English concept WAR and Ukrainian VIYNA possess common nature “war – is a struggle to capture prey”. At the core of the discursive creation and implementation of stereotypes and prejudices in readers’ consciousness is the choice of vocabulary, which forms the conceptual framework of the concept WAR.

The analysis of three discourses allowed singling out a large number of stylistic tools used for the explication of figurative component of the concept WAR. The most striking stylistic means used in JD and PD more often than in DD. In this case in the structure of the analyzed concept verbal elements, represented in descriptive way without any reference to the name of the concept WAR, were allocated. Thus, semantic and stylistic connotations comport with additional non-relevant features of the denotata, which are appropriate to a particular discourse (in our study JD and PD). It is related to the fact that every author of either article or poem serves as a bearer of the specific ethnic values and figurative perception of the world, represented mostly in (individual) conceptual metaphors.

Metaphor is a figure of speech that takes a concept out of its regular or common use and places it into another use to which it is somewhat related to provide a new view to the concept. The purpose of a conceptual metaphor lies not only in naming an object or phenomenon but in its expressive characteristics. The analysis of linguistic realization of the concept WAR in JD and PD revealed such conceptual metaphors as:

1. JD: poboishche/carnage, kotel/trap, miaso/cannon fodder;
2. PD: krovavaia zhatva/bloody harvest, gotuvaty svynevku kashu/ feed lead casha, prevratit v resheto/lay with rifle-sized holes, na pidstupi/ boots on throats, idti smerti v zherlo/face into the mouth of death, zahlynutysia kroviu/drown in blood or drench smbd in lead from one’s bores, pushchehnoe miaso/fodder for cannons.

Analyzing the reproduction of the concept WAR in three discourses brought to the following results: firstly, the stylistic tools such as conceptual metaphors used by the authors in source texts were rendered closely by means of its’ direct equivalents or partially resorted to the use of various translation methods. In some cases we observed adaptive (descriptive) translation due to the translator’s aiming to prevent reader’s misunderstanding (Ex.: resheto (sieve) – rifle-sized holes), which led to the conceptual metaphor’s elimination and reduction of emotional intensity. Secondly, while reproducing the lexical item “casha” (porridge) translator used the method of transliteration that mutilates the content of the source text as in English the word “cash” has definitions which do not correspond with original meaning: “the kind of girl who attracts all the men” (Urban dictionary); “a soft woolen fabric similar to flannel, with an admixture of Cashmere goat's hair (What does that mean?)”. We should put emphasis that poetry translation is more challenging than other types of translation due to the importance of both form and content in the type of interpretation and response, evoked in the audience. Thus, in this situation the translation was not adequate and served no purpose of target culture. Thirdly, such dysphemisms as “kherachit (ram on)”, “sdokhnut (turn one’s toes)”, “kodla (mob)”, “khokhly (it is commonly used as a pejorative term for ethnic Ukrainians)” in target texts were transferred by means of neutral equivalents (generalization) “fire”, “vanish”, “gang”, “Ukrainians”, relatively. Hence it appears that negative assessment of the concept WAR sinks in Ukrainian linguistic culture. Finally, during the analysis of the concept WAR manifestation in DD there was revealed the fact that rendering of military documents demands reproductive (accurate) translation. As it has been mentioned above, mistakes or adaptive (free) translation may cause misunderstandings in the course of negotiations or in the worst possible case death of innocent people.

Discussion

The study revealed some specific character and a wide scale of perception of the concept WAR that is inherent to the native Ukrainian and English speakers. The analysis presented the peculiarities of explication and rendering of the words and phrases relating to the associative-semantic field of the concept WAR (case study of diplomatic, journalistic and poetic discourses). Thus, if we consider concept WAR as an armed conflict between different countries or different groups within a country, so it is associated with a struggle for both linguistic cultures (Ukrainian, English). It needs to be defined that in the consciousness of the English the notion “war” means collision, struggle and warfare. Such associations as bloodshed, destruction, suffering and defense of Motherland are in the Ukrainian worldview. A cultural specifics of both national languages manifests itself in metaphors. Motivational basis of these figures is mostly associated with the world of traditional people’s images and conceptualization.
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