

Problem of National Identity in Ukrainian Military Terminology

Yaroslav Yaremko¹, Iryna Kharkavtsiv², Halyna Duchymynska², Mariana Aizenbart³ & Liubomyra Aizenbart⁴

¹Department of Ukrainian Language, Drohobych Ivan Franko State Pedagogical University, Drohobych, Ukraine

²Department of English Practice, Drohobych Ivan Franko State Pedagogical University, Drohobych, Ukraine

³Department of Linguistic and Intercultural Communication, Drohobych Ivan Franko State Pedagogical University, Drohobych, Ukraine

⁴Department of Romance Philology and Comparative Studies, Drohobych Ivan Franko State Pedagogical University, Drohobych, Ukraine

Correspondence: Yaroslav Yaremko, Department of Ukrainian Language, Drohobych Ivan Franko State Pedagogical University, 82100, 24 Ivan Franko Str., Drohobych, Ukraine.

Received: May 8, 2022

Accepted: November 30, 2022

Online Published: December 17, 2022

doi:10.11114/smc.v10i3.5853

URL: <https://doi.org/10.11114/smc.v10i3.5853>

Abstract

The study analyses the peculiarities of the national and language picture of the world based on “Russian and Ukrainian Dictionary for the Military” by A. Buriachok, M. Demskyi, B. Yakymovych. The article deals with the features of establishment of the national identity in terms of the development of the terminological system as the aspect to define notional and conceptual area in Ukrainian people’s perception. The study provides a wide range of lexicographic comparison between Russian and Ukrainian to represent the characteristic features of word formation processes taking place in Ukrainian military terminological system. It proves that the transformation of the Ukrainian military terminology into modern model as well as its prospects can serve a foundation for the national identity. Terminology plays a major role in the development of the lexicon of modern languages. Its significance is especially noticeable nowadays in the tendency of returning to anthropocentrism or if to be more precise ethnocentrism while each society perceives the reality as well as renders its phenomena by language means according to its peculiarities in perception.

Keywords: anthropocentric approach, military terms, national identity, national and language picture of the world, translatory dictionaries

1. Introduction

Concerning ideas of O. Potebnia (1993), I. Franko (1986) and their followers on spiritual connection between a human and language, on unique nature of each language as a representative of national outlook, the issue of revival of the national identity becomes relevant in the Ukrainian terminology as well as in military terminology (Hrytsenko, 1996). “Russian and Ukrainian Dictionary for the Military” by A. Buriachok, M. Demskyi, B. Yakymovych (1995) can serve a bright example of the mentioned methodological approach that became a piece of great Ukrainian lexicographical heritage. Despite the utility statement in the introduction – “to meet the need of the language practice of the Ukrainian militaries from a private to general”, its aim is much broader the information set in basic dictionary parts reveals its implicit meaning: a) in register of nominatives which point at “historical inheritance of the Ukrainian military service. b) in a rich source basis of the dictionary with “two-volume dictionaries published both in Ukraine and abroad that became the important contribution to the Ukrainian special vocabulary which underwent various deformations in Soviet Ukraine” (Buriachok et al., 1995); “military regulations from the liberation movement in Ukraine 1917-1921” (Buriachok et al., 1995); military law compilations etc; c) in providing Ukrainian equivalents to the Russian terms (often synonymic) which support the revival of the national identity on the different language levels (lexical, derivational, morphological) and the qualitative enrichment (neologization) of the Ukrainian military terminology (UMT) (Honcharenko & Shyhal, 2021; Tatsiy, 2021).

Realization of such conceptual approach goes far beyond the limits of the structural idea on term nature according to which terminology is “a group of terms functioning in a certain sphere of knowledge connected with the notion system: arts, technology, production etc.” (Symonenko, 2004). Post structural, anthropocentric dimension in semantic research based on the scheme “human – in language, language – in human” shows that terminology is a significant aspect in the national and cultural development, the reflection of its intellectual self-sufficiency (Faber and León-Araúz, 2019;

Saifnazarov et al., 2020). Different approach led to the shift in differentiation of term functions: from the formerly dominant nominative or defining to the cognitive and communicative ones (Biderkesen et al., 2019). It is important to regard the semantic evolution of the term “cognitive”: It broadened its basic meaning due to its lexical and semantic variants “internal”, “mental”, “interiorized” (Buriachok et al., 1995).

The inseparable prevalence of cognitive and communicative functions makes impossible to reveal cognitive abilities of a term without real communicative environment. Therefore, modern linguistic cognitology presents two types of meanings: lexicographic (systemic) displayed in dictionary according to the reduction principle and psycholinguistic (psychologically real) displayed in speaker’s consciousness (Popova & Sternin, 2007) that is the number of the semantic components (core and periphery ones) that trigger up the isolated word in human consciousness (Kostruba & Hyliaka, 2020). Notably, the bunch of semantic associations becomes actualized only if the language the speaker uses is the means of thinking with its typical ethnocultural stereotypes (Horodenska, 1998; Lukianov et al., 2020). To revive the national identity on the language level is in our opinion to check the structure and content of the Ukrainian terms according to the Ukrainian way of thinking.

2. The Examples of Linguistic Terms

The most relevant task of the modern dictionaries according to P. Hrytsenko (1996) is “to restore the Ukrainian character of the Ukrainian terminology”. “Russian and Ukrainian Dictionary for the Military” by A. Buriachok, M. Demskyi, B. Yakymovych (1995) represents national features of Ukrainian terminology. This lexicographic work proves that comparing even similar languages like Ukrainian and Russian provides an extensive layer of verbal peculiarities caused by intra and extra lingual aspects (historical development of languages their cooperation, contacts between the languages, genetic contacts etc.) (Lisitsa & Moroz, 2019). These features are traceable on each language level but on the lexical one, they are especially distinct as it is closely connected with extra lingual reality and is highly responsive to changes in sociocultural space.

National identity by means of reviving and establishing values, ideals, notions, cultural traditions the means that form an identity and reveals in language appears to be a distinguishing feature of current Ukrainian development (Kostruba & Vasylyeva, 2020). The examples of linguistic term revival that reflect historical reference of Ukrainian military traditions can serve: a) names of military subdivisions: курінь (kurin’) as the equivalent to Rus. батальон; чота (chota) Rus. взвод (vzvod), сотня (sotnia) Rus рота (rota); b) names of military ranks: осавул сотні (osavulsotni) Rus старшина роты (starshyna roty); підхорунжий (pidhorunzhyi) Rus прапорщик (praporshchik). The tendency to maintain the authentic basis is revealed in substitution of unmotivated borrowings by the Ukrainian equivalents: патрон (patron) – набій (nabiy), патронаш (patronash) – набійниця (nabiyntsia), ефес (efes) – держак (derzhak), караул (karaul) – варта (varta), екіпіровка (ekipirovka) – виряд (vyriad), спорядження (sporiadzhennia). Obviously, the inner language resources are not the only basis for the creation of new terms while the international practice inevitably has the impact on the process, which is definitely important for every naturally formed language (Zaitsev et al., 2020): Rus броня (bronia) – Укр панцир (pantyr), штик (shyk) – багнет (bahnet), пушка (pushka) – орудие (orudiye) – гармата (harmata). There we need to draw your attention to the fact that when a language borrows a term via mediator language (historical source) consequently the language borrower undergoes, according to theory of language contacts, double influence or double interference: from a language etymological source and language historical source.

Terms of historical and cultural kind determine the peculiar character of national and language picture of the world as they reflect the unique development of a nation. The words forming the background (non-equivalent) layers possess distinctive ethnocultural information (Aitymova et al., 2022). Military terms of this type emerged on different stages of the Ukrainian history: гетьман (hetman), кошовий (koshovyi), гайдамаки (haidamaky), отаманщина (otamanshchyna), пластун (plastun), повстанець (povstanets’), самостійник (samostiynyk). The translatory character of the dictionary brought about the absence of some non-equivalents in its register though some of them formed their correlative pairs as calques: сечевик (sechevik) – січовик (sichovyk), сечевой стрелец (sechevoy strelets) – січовий стрілець (sichovy strilets), Тризуб (Trizub) – Тризуб (Trizub).

Derivation type of terms in UMT plays a significant role in establishment of national identity. The point is in revival or returning “of the organic for Ukrainian derivational types which turned out to be restricted in scientific usage” (Horodenska, 1988), as each language possesses the unique “set” of derivational means. The basis of onomasiologically differentiated terms in Russian-Ukrainian Dictionary For The Military (1995) was formed as a result of concentration of derivational processes based on highly productive derivational types with the equivalent derivational formants: 1) in the Ukrainian language agentive polysemantic suffixes -ник, -ач, in Russian -тель, -чик, -щик to name people: зенітник (zenitnyk) – зенитчик (zenitchik), розвідник (rozvidnyk) – разведчик (razviedchik), навідник (navidnyk) – наводчик (navodchik), загарбник (zaharbynyk) – захватчик (zahvatchik), сигнальник (syhnal’nyk) – сигнальщик (signalshchik), підривник (pidryvnyk), висадник (vysadnyk) – взриватель (vzryvatel); a) to denote object-action performers: глушник

(hlushnyk) – глушитель (hlushytel), викидач (vykydach) – вибрасиватель (vybrasyvatel), прорывач (proryvach) (a mine trembler) – прорыватель (proryvatel); 2) in the Ukrainian language – suffixes -н'н-, т'т'-, in Russian – suffixes -овк-, -к- to denote action, processes, states: окуття (okuttia) – оковка (okovka), марширування (marshyruvannia) – маршировка (marshyrovka), наведення (navedennia) – наводка (navodka); usage tendencies: a) one-word derivatives in Ukrainian and composites in Russian: панцерник (pantsernyk) – броненосец (bronienosiets), торпедник (torpednyk) – торпедоносец (torpedonosets), літак (litak) – самолет (samolyot), військовик (viys'kovyk) – военнослужащий (voennosluzhashchiy); b) one-word terms-univerbs of the Ukrainian language as equivalents to the Russian terms-word-combinations: пороховой погреб (porokhovoу pogreb) – порохівня (porokhivnia), караульное помещение (karaulnoye pomieshcheniye) – вартівня (vartivnia). Univerbalization when a word combination contracts to one word reveals typical of the Ukrainian word formation law of language efficiency that consists in preserving language resources. This type of suffixation became popular in 20s of the XX century, compare: цукроварня (tsukrovarnia) – сахарный завод (saharny zavod), цегельня (tsehelnia) – кирпичный завод (kirpichny zavod), броварня (brovarnia) – пивной завод (pivnoy zavod), винокурня (vynokurnia) – винный завод (vinnyy zavod).

Terms with inner form play a significant role in the national and language picture of the world. While being a mediatory link between the onomasiological and semasiological aspects of a name, inner form according to O. Potebnia (1993), points at the integrity of thought and language. Regarding various languages as different ways of thinking the researcher referred language to visual skills: "as the smallest change in eye structure and visual nerves activity inevitably brings about new sense experience and thus has an impact on a human outlook, in the same way, each detail in language structure gives its peculiar combinations of thought without any voluntary effort" (Potebnia, 1993). Subsequently, the defining of the motivational basis, motivation direction (base word and derived word) enables to trace the connection between the content and form of a lexeme and on this basis to reveal differentiative nominations in the Ukrainian and Russian terms: a) word motivation is similar, though terms-correlations differ by certain semes: літак (від літати) (litak (from litaty)) – самолет (сам+летать) (samolyot (sam+lietat')), загарбник (загарбувати) (zaharbnyk (zaharbuyaty)) – захватчик (захватывать) (zahvatchik (zahvatyvat')), розбивач (розбивати) (rozbyvach (rozbuyaty)) – боек (бить) (beyok (bit')); b) motivation basis is different but there is some similarity in the seme structures of the correlated words: стрілянина (від стріляти) (strilianyna (from striliaty)) – пальба (палить) (pal'ba (palit')), вибух (вибухати) (vybukh (vybukhaty)) – взрыв (взрывать) (vzryv (vzryvat')), мірник (міряти) (mirnyk (miriaty)) – прицел (прицеливать) (pritsel (pritselivat')); c) motivation basis of the international equivalents formed according to different aspects: набійниця (набій) (nabiyntsia (nabiy)) – підсумок (сумка) (pidsumok (sumka)), вартовий (варта) (vartovy (varta)) – часовой (час) (chasovoy (chas)). These examples illustrate O. Potebnia's thought that "a foreign language word evokes in user's mind a different idea" (Potebnia, 1993) from the one of a native language.

The idea of the spiritual-dynamic character of a language insists that a living native word is a source to perceive the content of the national identity, "national spirit" (Volksgeist – according to Herder). Thus, "while a word exists only when pronounced..." but at the same time, "it differs on the psycholinguistic" level (Potebnia, 1993). It means that the character of content is not the same even for the representatives of the same language society. It depends on personal mentality mechanisms of perception and comprehension of the reality (personality mentality). This statement challenges the existing logical (normative) approach in modern linguistics to the understanding of term nature according to which terms appear to be special words or word with special terminological meaning, which correlate exclusively with a significant component, and is deprived of any axiological interpretations referred to the denoted word. An axiological (evaluative) component in a word meaning serves to be a language reflection of a national conceptual sphere, the compilation of mental and worldview guiding concepts formed in people's consciousness (Butyrskiy et al., 2019; Kostruba, 2018). In the worldview and axiological sphere, it is necessary to consider the source of the tendencies traceable in modern terminology. During the process of "cohesion of nations" and languages, the stereotypes gain considerable influence (Lohvynenko et al., 2019). It makes the Ukrainian scientific terminology develop chaotically and supports the establishment of the language deformations. Those aspects had an impact on the final content of "General Military Statutes of the Armed Forces of Ukraine" (1992). There are – according to the editor of the initial version of AFU and of "Russian and Ukrainian Dictionary for the Military" by A. Buriachok, M. Demskyi, B. Yakymovych (1995) – "Mushtrovyyi Statut" is called "Stroyovyyi Statut" and "Statut Zalohovoyi and Vartovoyi Sluzhby" – "Statut Harnizonnoyi i Vartovoyi Sluzhby" (Yakymovych, 1996).

"Russian and Ukrainian Dictionary for the Military" by A. Buriachok, M. Demskyi, B. Yakymovych (1995) demonstrates especially evident distancing from the fixed UMT nominations. It is necessary to trace the tendencies on the examples from the modern sources, where the name fixed in "General Military Statutes of the Armed Forces of Ukraine" (1992) goes first, and the term from "Russian and Ukrainian Dictionary for the Military" by A. Buriachok, M. Demskyi, B. Yakymovych (1995) goes second, comp.: names of military subdivisions: взвод/взвод (vzvod/vzvod) – чота, відділення/отделение (войсковое подразделение) (chota, viddilenia/otdeliniye (voyskovoye podrazdeleniye)) – рій,

відділ (riy, viddil); рота /рота (rota/rota) – сотня (в танковых частях рота) (sotnia (in tank subdivisions rota)); names of military ranks: військовослужбовець/военнослужащий (viyskovvosluzhbovets/voyennosluzhashchiy) – військовик (viys'kovyk); рядовий/рядовой (riadovyi/ryadovoy) – рядовик (ryadovyk); старшина/ старшина(роты) (starshyna/starshyna (roty)) (роты) – осавул (сотні) (osavul (sotni)); молодший лейтенант/ младший лейтенант (molodshyi leitenant/mladshiy lieutenant) – хорунжий (khorunzhyi), молодший лейтенант (molodshyi leitenant); старший лейтенант/старший лейтенант (starshyi leitenant/starshy lietenant) – поручник (poruchnyk); капітан/капитан (kapitan/kapitan) – сотник (sotnyk): офіцер/офицер (ofitser/ofitser) – старшина (starshyna), офіцер (ofitser); names of military location: стрій/строй (striy/story) – лад (lad); фланг/фланг (flanh/flang) – крило (krylo), бік (bik); names of weapon and ammunition,: патрон/патрон (patron/patron) – набій (nabiy); прицільна планка/прицельная планка (prytsilna planka/pritselnaya planka) – планка мірника (planka mirnyka); речовий мішок/вещевой мешок (rechovyi mishok/veshchevoy mieshok) – наплічник (naplichnyk), речова торба (rechova torba); сошка (кулеметна)/сошка (soshka (kulemetna)/soshka – підпора (pidpora); art. сішка (sishka).

3. The Establishment of the National Identity

A considerable number of the Ukrainian equivalents in "General Military Statutes of the Armed Forces of Ukraine" (1992) are nothing but Russian terms-calques. Y. Sheveliov (2008) admits "the extensive usage of them leads to assimilation processes in a language word-formation. As a consequence, language may lose its unique character." the term systems which were deprived of the necessary conditions for their establishment and functioning find themselves in danger. The weakness of the UMT was especially distinct on the backdrop of the development of the military sphere. Change cycles of modern weapon samples decreased by two-three comparing to the beginning of the XX century and comprise according to military experts approximately ten years (Yaroshenko, & Tomashevski, 2021). Thus, the authors of the "Practical Ukrainian-Russian Dictionary for the Military" (1924) had to deal not only with the problem of national identity but also to "enlighten" other "dark places" of the UMT, particularly to fill in the nominative-notional lacunas.

One of the solutions is to publish professional translator dictionaries. Their objective is to select the best equivalents to define notions nominated in a target language. The establishment of a mechanism of harmonious cooperation between national and international elements can't do without terminological practice in other languages. Our context implies Russian, which has better developed and ordered term system. Analogical Russian statutes served as a basis for "General Military Statutes of the Armed Forces of Ukraine" (1992). However, the full-fledged national terminology grows from traditions, language and cultural code heredity. Subsequently, the characteristic feature of the analysed dictionary is systemic use of nominations inherited from the Soviet lexicographic sources. We provide the following old pieces of the Ukrainian military terminology: the first statute of the Ukrainian Sichovi Striltsi "Pravylnyk Pikhotyntsyv. P. 1. Edited" (1914); based on it "Pravylnyk Pikhotyntsia", published by Central Council (1918); I. Ilnytskyi-Zankovych "German and Ukrainian Military Dictionary" (1939). Those works served the basis for the rehabilitation of those terms which had been unreasonably excluded or restricted in use on purpose.

The dictionary provides the equivalents to the Russian register word with a term fixed in the Ukrainian Soviet lexicography: амуниция (amunitsyu) – амуніція (amunitsiya), стріливо (strilyvo); авиация (aviatsyu) – авіація (aviatsiya), летунство (letunstvo); арсенал (arsenal) – арсенал (arsenal), зброївня (zbroyivnia); винтовка (vintovka) – кріс (khris), гвинтівка (hvyntivka); аэродром (aerodrome) – аеродром (aerodrome), летовище (letovyshche); гарнізон (harnizon) – залага (zaloga), гарнізон (harnizon); взвод (vzvod) – чота (chota); батальон (battalion) – курінь (kurin'), батальон (battalion); батальонный (batalionnyi) – курінний (kurinny), батальонний (batalionny); адъютант (adyutant) – ад'ютант (adyutant), значковий (znachkovy); лейтенант (lieutenant) – чотар (chotar), лейтенант (leitenant); прапорщик (praporshchik) – підхорунжий (pidkhirunzhy); бункер (партизанский) (bunker (partyzatsky)) – криївка (kryivka), бункер (bunker); шеренга (sherenga) – лава (lava); цепь (боевой порядок) (tser' (bovevoiporiadok)) – розстрільна (rozstrilna) and others.

The restoration of the historically approved terms does nothing with the mechanical modernization of "retro terminology": as it gives a signal that firstly, according to Y. Sheveliov (2008) "there is the necessity to rehabilitate the deleted units"; secondly to implement the terms taken from the sources "worked out in XX century in Galicia and Naddniprianshchyna" (Buriachok et al., 1995) challenges the statement about "two tendencies in the formation of military terminology: western and eastern" (Mykhailenko, 1996). This characteristic points out that the difference between the views on the formation of the model of the further development of UMT is caused by geographical aspects but not methodological ones. The dictionary editors focused their attention on terms formation process so that it wasn't limited or restricted by the "eastern" or "western" tendencies but directed the UMT to the modern language and culture sphere. Thus, dynamics and systemic growth of number of neologisms (both lexical and semantical) in the modern military discourse including borrowings (лазер, радар, стрингер, терміт, триплекс etc) implies the support of national self-identity of the speakers as the fundamental part of the formation of the whole organism: psychomental, cultural, linguistic. This approach supports the implementation of the currently "urgent considerable action task" which Franko (1986) set to the Ukrainian intelligence:

"to establish the Ukrainian nation from the mass of the Ukrainian people" (italicised by Franko). The nation functioning as one cultural organism capable of independent cultural and political life and resistant to assimilation from whatever it comes. And then: "however, it should be open for accepting the universal cultural heritage as a strong state can't do without" (Franko, 1986).

Obviously, "the search of the Ukrainian word" (Karavanskyi, 2001) is a challenging task. The emergence of the word does not guarantee its language prospect abilities. In the Ukrainian military terminology which development was quite fragmentary appeared the situation called terminological *deja vu*: the terms that had to function "yesterday" were implemented "today". Due to the communicative and informational retardation in certain fields (in particular military one) they lacked in language usage, therefore only their creators could understand their meaning. The editors of the "Russian and Ukrainian Dictionary for the Military" by A. Buriachok, M. Demskyi, B. Yakymovych (1995) couldn't avoid those obstacles, where some forms will unlikely, according to the authors, meet "the needs of the language practice of the Ukrainian militaries": світлиця (svitlyvets), підхоп'я (pidhopen'), поворозка (povorozka), загвіздок (zahvizdok), слізна речовина (slizna rečovyna), безбульбашкова стрільба (bezbulbashkova strilba), радіогідроакустична сучка (radiohidroakustychna suchka), цідлопровітрювальна устава (tsidyloprovitiivalna ustava), неостаточно споряджений гарматень (neostatatchno sporiadzheny harmaten) etc. S. Karavanskyi (2001) called neologisms of that type "the avant-garde ones".

The point is not in "a mere habit". Tradition in the selection of terms is not a prevailing aspect that defines the level of normativeness. The conditions of non-parity bilingualism, which is always asymmetrical, the prior status of this criterion distorted national identity in the Ukrainian terminology like in word-formation process of terms. Subsequently, the reasonable usage of derivatives in "Russian and Ukrainian Dictionary for the Military" by A. Buriachok, M. Demskyi, B. Yakymovych (1995) which had changed their names turned out to be calqued according to the examples in Russian (the so-called eastern Slavic words): 1) verbs offoreignorigin with suffix -ир- (-ir-): марширувати (marshyruvaty), пікірувати (pikiruvaty) in Russian-Ukrainian Dictionary for the Military (1995): маршировать (marshyrovat') – маршувати (marshuvaty), пикировать (pikirovat') – пікувати (pikuvaty); 2) substantivized adjectives (participles): рядовий (riadovy), днювальний (dniuvalny), командуючий (komanduyuchy) which correspond to nouns in "Russian and Ukrainian Dictionary for the Military" by A. Buriachok, M. Demskyi, B. Yakymovych (1995): рядовой (riadovoy – рядовик (riadovyk)), дневальный (dnievalny – днювальник (dniuvalnyk)), командующий (komanduyushchiy – командувач (komanduvach)), заряжающий (zariashayushchiy – заряджальник (zariadzhalnyk)); 3) terms-abbreviations often borrowed without necessary phonetic adaptation: ВВ (рос. взрывчатое вещество) VV (vzryvchatoye veshchestvo), ПВО (рос. противовоздушная оборона) (PVO (Ros. Protivovozdushnaya oborona)) instead of Ukrainian forms: ВР (вибухова речовина) (VR (vybukhova rečovyna), ППО (протиповітряна оборона) (PPO (protypovitriana oborona)); 4) distorted metaphoric nominatives (semanticcalques): ствол (зам. цівка зброї, жерло гармати) (stvol (instead of tsivka zbroyi, zherlo harmaty), while in the Ukrainian language there is no lexeme "stvol" with the main meaning "an on the ground part of a tree" that's why there is no its secondary nomination; 5) morphemic calques with suffixes -уч- (-yuch-) in term word combination, although or eveal typical feature of an object Ukrainian usually uses verbal adjectives with word forming suffixes -н-, -льн-, -івн-, -к- etc. Unlike Russian where attributive element in term word combination is rendered by Participles I of present tense: Рос. детонирующий шнур (dioniruyushchiy shnur) – Укр. детонаційний шнур (detonatsiyny shnur), заряд воспламеняющий (zariad vosplamieniayushchiy) – запалювальний заряд (zapaliivalny zariad), механизм выбрасывающий (mekhanizm vybrasyvayushchiy) – викидальний механізм (vykydalny mekhanizm).

However, the establishment of the national identity in verb derivatives term-adjectives is quite controversial. Thus, "Russian and Ukrainian Dictionary for the Military" by A. Buriachok, M. Demskyi, B. Yakymovych (1995) includes some less successful translation of the Russian Participles: мина плавающая (minaplavayushchaya) – пливуча міна (plyvuchamina), however плавающая техника (plavayushchayatekhnika) – водоплавна техніка (vodoplavnatekhnika). A bright example of the fact that the problem of searching for forms to render term notions remains relevant may serve the substitution of a term-word by descriptive constructions with link words *що* (shcho) *what* and *який* (yakyi) *which*: поражающий (porazhayushchiy) – який (що) уражає (yakyi (shcho) urazhaє), уразительный (urazhalny); пикирующий (pikiruyushchiy) – який (що) пікує (yakyi (shcho) pikuye), пікувальний (pikivalny); снаряд неразорвавшийся (snariadnierazorvavshyisia) – гарматень, який не вибухнув (harmaten' yakyi ne vybukhnuv), невибухлий гарматень (nevybukhlyi harmaten').

In terms of the actualized term гарматень: some Ukrainian dictionaries like "Russian and Ukrainian Dictionary of the Military Terminology" by S. Yakubski (1928), "German and Ukrainian Military Dictionary" by I. Pnytskyi-Zankovych (1939), suggest using a hybrid name гарматень as an equivalent to the Russian term снаряд. Indeed, the word снаряд in Russian is the last link in the word-formation raw снаряжать→снаряжение→снаряд in the meaning "the compilation of tools, instruments, devices for any craft activity. Four derived meanings emerged on the basis of this meaning employing

lexico-semantic ways. In modern Ukrainian, there are no derivational pre-conditions for the word *снаряд* therefore its usage doesn't correspond to the criterion for national identity. As well as this, it is doubtful to use the word *гарматень* because, if to consider systematics, the structural organization requires the continuation of the row to denote various kinds of ammunition according to the weapon names: if to use for *гармати* – *гарматень*, then for *кулемет* – *кулеметень*, for *бомбета* – *бомбетень* etc. This sequence seems to be unreasonable as in “Russian and Ukrainian Dictionary for the Military” by A. Buriachok, M. Demskyi, B. Yakymovych except for the word *гарматень* there is another term equivalent *стрільно* (stril'no) to the Russian *снаряд*.

4. Conclusions

The issue of national identity requires systemic and scientific-based criteria for restoration of the outlook that underwent drastic deformations due to the stateless period, as the branch term systems were strictly determined by the idea of “language integrity” in the Soviet times. Current sociocultural and language situation of the Ukrainian state establishment and its significant part National Armed Forces show the urgent need for modern Ukrainian military terminology and dictionary of terms.

Taking into account the tasks set to the modern Ukrainian terminology and particularly the military one there is no need to argue the existence of the mentioned tendencies: the new always comes from contraversions. The integral aspect should serve not only as artificial preservation of the "traditional" terms (interesternslavic words) and mechanical substitution of the terminological heritage of the Ukrainization period (the 20s XXc) but the transformation of the development of the Ukrainian military terminology into a modern role, the capability of which can support the basis of its national identity.

References

- Aitymova, A., Shaporeva, A., Kopnova, O., Kushumbayev, A., & Aitymov, Z. (2022). Development and modeling of combined components of the information environment. *Eastern-European Journal of Enterprise Technologies*, 2(2-116), 51-60. <https://doi.org/10.15587/1729-4061.2022.255084>
- Biderkesen, D., Ageeva, J. V., & Ucgul, S. (2019). Military vocabulary as a special element of a language lexical system. *Journal of Advanced Research in Dynamical and Control Systems*, 11(8 Special Issue), 467-471.
- Buriachok, A., Demskyi, M., & Yakymovych, B. (1995). *Russian and Ukrainian Dictionary for the Military*. Kyiv-Lviv: Varta.
- Butyrskyi, A., Nikolenko, L., Poliakov, B., Ivanyuta, N., Donchak, L., & Butyrskaya, I. (2019). Economic, investment and legal paradigm of shale gas development: World experience and prospects for Ukraine. *Montenegrin Journal of Economics*, 15(2), 165-179. <https://doi.org/10.14254/1800-5845/2019.15-2.13>
- Demskyi, M. (1992). *Linguistic characteristics of the dictionary of minimum military terms*. Ukrainian sports and military terminology. Lviv: Polytechnic National University.
- Evtymovych, V. (1918). *Moscovian and Ukrainian Dictionary for the Military*. Kyiv: Printing House of the Main School Board.
- Faber, P., & León-Araúz, P. (2019). Frame-based terminology applied to military sciencetransforming a glossary into a knowledge resource. *Lexicography*, 6(2), 105-131. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40607-019-00060-y>
- Franko, I. (1986). An open letter to the Galician Ukrainian youth. Franko I. Collection of works in 50 volumes. Retrieved from <http://www.management.com.ua/vision/vis011.html>
- General Military Statutes of the Armed Forces of Ukraine (1992). Retrieved from https://www.ifnmu.edu.ua/images/studentam/pidgotovka_oficeriv_zapasu/statuti_zsu.pdf
- Honcharenko, V. D., & Shyhal, D. A. (2021). Technique of generalization of results of comparative historical and legal research. *Journal of the National Academy of Legal Sciences of Ukraine*, 28(3), 74-84. [https://doi.org/10.37635/jnalsu.28\(3\).2021.74-84](https://doi.org/10.37635/jnalsu.28(3).2021.74-84)
- Horodenska, K. (1998). The problem of word-forming identity in Ukrainian terminology. *Ukrainian terminology and modernity*. Kyiv:Kyiv National Economic University named after Vadym Hetman.
- Hrytsenko, P. (1996). Terminological dictionary today. *Ukrainian terminology and modernity*. Kyiv: Nauka.
- Ilytskyi-Zankovych, I. (1939). *German and Ukrainian Military Dictionary*. Berlin: Bernard & Graefe Verlag.
- Karavanskyi, S. (2001). Search for the Ukrainian word, or the struggle for the national "I". Retrieved from https://chtyvo.org.ua/authors/Karavanskyi_Sviatoslav/Poshuk_ukrainskoho_slova_abo_borotba_za_natsionalne_Ya/
- Kostruba, A. V. (2018). Right deprivation in the legal regulation mechanism of civil property relations. *Journal of Legal*,

Ethical and Regulatory Issues, 21(Special Issue 1), 1-15.

- Kostruba, A. V., & Hyliaka, O. S. (2020). Designing of legal model of legal relations cessations. *Astra Salvensis*, 1, 69-86.
- Kostruba, A. V., & Vasylyeva, V. A. (2020). Termination of right in the mechanism of civil legal relations. *Rivista di Studi sulla Sostenibilita*, 2020(1), 287-300. <https://doi.org/10.3280/RISS2020-001017>
- Lisitsa, V., & Moroz, S. (2019). Legal regulation of public-private partnership in Russia and other countries of the Eurasian economic union. *Russian Law Journal*, 7(3), 53-81. <https://doi.org/10.17589/2309-8678-2019-7-3-53-81>
- Lohvynenko, B. O., Sezonov, V. S., & Frantsuz-Yakovets, T. A. (2019). Tendencies for the falsification of medicinal products in Ukraine: General analysis and areas of counteraction. *Wiadomosci lekarskie (Warsaw, Poland : 1960)*, 72(12), 2478-2483.
- Lukianov, D. V., Ponomarova, H. P., & Tahiev, A. S. (2020). The Quran in Shia jurisprudence. *Journal of the National Academy of Legal Sciences of Ukraine*, 27(4), 29-42. [https://doi.org/10.37635/jnalsu.27\(4\).2020.29-42](https://doi.org/10.37635/jnalsu.27(4).2020.29-42)
- Mykhailenko, T. (1996). Extra- and intralinguistic conditions of development of Ukrainian military terminology. *Ukrainian terminology and modernity*. Kyiv: In Jure.
- Popova, Z. D., & Sternin, I. A. (2007). *Cognitive linguistics*. Retrieved from http://sterninia.ru/files/757/4_Izbrannye_nauchnye_publicacii/Kognitivnaja_lingvistika/Kognitivnaja_lingvistika_2007.pdf
- Potebnia, A. A. (1993). *Thought and language*. Retrieved from https://www.gumer.info/bibliotek_Buks/Linguist/poteb/index.php
- Practical Ukrainian-Russian Dictionary for the Military*. (1924). Kharkiv: Publishing House of the School of Red Elders.
- Pravylnyk Pikhotyntsv P. I.* (1914). Lviv: Ukrainian Insurgent Army Printing House.
- Pravylnyk Pikhotyntsv*. (1918). Kyiv: Military Publishing House at the Foreign Representation of the Ukrainian Main Liberation Council.
- Saifnazarov, I., Muhtarov, A., Sultonov, T., & Tolibov, A. (2020). Religious tolerance, unity of knowledge and faith issues highlighting in Imam Bukhari Hadiths. *International Journal of Advanced Science and Technology*, 29(5), 1846-1853.
- Sheveliov, Y. (2008). In the shade of owl wings. Retrieved from <https://zbruc.eu/taxonomy/term/15450>
- Symonenko, L. O. (2004). *Terminology. Encyclopedia "Ukrainian language"*. Kyiv: Encyclopedia.
- Tatsiy, V. (2021). Re-codification of the civil law of Ukraine: On the way to European integration. *Global Journal of Comparative Law*, 10(1-2), 1-4. <https://doi.org/10.1163/2211906X-10010001>
- Yakubski, S. (1928). *Russian and Ukrainian Dictionary of the Military Terminology*. Kharkiv: Publishing House of the School of Red Elders.
- Yakymovych, B. (1996). Temporary statutes of the Armed Forces of Ukraine and problems of Ukrainian military terminology. *Ukrainian terminology and modernity*. Kyiv: Ukrainian Scientific Conference.
- Yaroshenko, O. M., & Tomashevski, K. L. (2021). The impact of COVID-19 on labour and social security relations: Rule-making experience of Belarus and Ukraine. *Journal of the National Academy of Legal Sciences of Ukraine*, 28(2), 211-221. [https://doi.org/10.37635/jnalsu.28\(2\).2021.211-221](https://doi.org/10.37635/jnalsu.28(2).2021.211-221)
- Zaitsev, O., Ducasse, S., Bergel, A., & Eveillard, M. (2020). Suggesting descriptive method names: An exploratory study of two machine learning approaches. *Communications in Computer and Information Science*, 1266 CCIS, 93-106. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-58793-2_8

Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the [Creative Commons Attribution license](#) which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.