

REPRESENTATION OF THE RUSSIAN-UKRAINIAN WAR IN ENGLISH PUBLICISTIC DISCOURSE: LINGUOSTYLISTIC AND TRANSLATION ASPECTS

Nataliia Tatsenko

Doctor of Philological Sciences, Professor,
Sumy State University, Ukraine

e-mail: n.tatsenko@el.sumdu.edu.ua, orcid.org/0000-0003-2604-2340

Vladyslav Khovanskyi

Student, Sumy State University, Ukraine

e-mail: vladhov2003@gmail.com, orcid.org/0009-0007-4287-1903

Summary

The article examines how English-language publicistic texts represent the Russian-Ukrainian war through lexical choice, metaphor, evaluation, narrative perspective and pragmatic framing. The study treats war journalism not only as a channel of information but also as a field where political meanings, ethical judgments and national identities are constantly negotiated. The analysis focuses on recurring naming patterns such as war, invasion, aggression, occupation, liberation, resistance and resilience; on metaphors that conceptualise Ukraine as a defending community and Russia as an aggressor; and on syntactic structures that may either clarify or blur agency. A separate part of the article discusses translation into Ukrainian. It is argued that Ukrainian translation should preserve factual precision, restore clear agency where English headlines compress responsibility, avoid uncritical transfer of euphemisms, and keep a balance between publicistic expressiveness and scholarly accuracy. The theoretical basis combines sociolinguistic views on language policy, language situation and linguistic landscape with discourse-oriented attention to public communication. The sources visible in the screenshots are used as the main bibliographic foundation, especially works on language policy, language situation, naming, linguistic landscapes and multilingual contexts. The article demonstrates that the translation of war discourse is not a mechanical replacement of words but a culturally responsible act of interpretation. A translator must understand both English media conventions and Ukrainian social sensitivity to occupation, state language, memory, trauma and security. The proposed observations may be useful for students of translation, journalists, editors and researchers of contemporary political discourse.

Key words: Russian-Ukrainian war; English-language publicistic texts; linguostylistics; media discourse; translation into Ukrainian; euphemism; metaphor; agency; language policy.

DOI <https://doi.org/10.23856/7629>

1. Introduction

The Russian-Ukrainian war has become one of the most visible subjects of contemporary English-language publicistic discourse. Newspapers, news agencies, magazines, analytical portals and opinion columns do not merely report military and political events; they organise them into narratives that readers can recognise and evaluate. This makes the language of publicistic

texts especially important. A headline may present the same event as an attack, a strike, a response, a setback, a liberation, a withdrawal or an escalation. Each of these words carries a different communicative weight. The difference is not ornamental: it shapes how agency, responsibility, suffering and resistance are understood.

The topic is also important for Ukrainian translation studies because English-language texts about the war are quickly translated, quoted, summarised and discussed in Ukrainian media, academic writing and civic communication. The translator is therefore not a neutral transmitter of ready-made meanings. The translator decides how to render compressed headlines, cautious diplomatic formulae, emotionally charged metaphors, euphemisms, idioms and culture-bound references. In war discourse, such decisions may influence whether the Ukrainian reader sees the aggressor clearly, whether civilians are represented as subjects rather than as statistics, and whether Ukrainian statehood is described in terms that correspond to the lived experience of society.

The aim of this article is to identify the main linguostylistic features through which English-language publicistic texts represent the Russian-Ukrainian war and to outline the principal problems that arise when these features are translated into Ukrainian. The object of the research is English-language publicistic discourse on the war. The subject is its lexical, stylistic, syntactic and pragmatic organisation, together with translation transformations used or required in Ukrainian versions. The methodological basis combines descriptive analysis, contextual interpretation, elements of discourse analysis and translation commentary.

The article uses the bibliographic sources visible in the provided screenshots as its theoretical foundation. These sources are not all devoted directly to war journalism; many of them concern language policy, language situation, linguistic landscape, naming and multilingual social contexts. Yet this background is relevant because war discourse is always connected with questions of language, identity, power and legitimacy. Studies of language policy and language situation help explain why the Ukrainian language in translations of war discourse is not a secondary medium but a symbolic space of public resistance and self-definition (*Masenko, 1999: 18-25; Spolsky, 2012: 3-12*)

2. Theoretical Background: Publicistic Discourse, Language Policy and Representation

Publicistic discourse occupies an intermediate position between institutional information and expressive interpretation. It is expected to be understandable, timely and socially meaningful. At the same time, it often includes evaluation, metaphor, contrast, irony, emphasis and narrative selection. This hybrid nature explains why publicistic texts about war are linguistically dense: they must inform the reader quickly but also create a moral frame in which events become intelligible. The same report can combine official statements, eyewitness voices, military terminology, humanitarian vocabulary and evaluative commentary.

Language policy research is useful for analysing such discourse because it shows that language is never separated from institutions and collective identity. Masenko's work on language and politics treats language as a factor of public power, cultural continuity and national self-identification (*Masenko, 1999: 18-25*). Spolsky's handbook similarly presents language policy as a broad field that includes explicit regulation, social practice and beliefs about language (*Spolsky, 2012: 3-12*). When these ideas are applied to media discourse on the war, they allow us to see that the choice between Russian-Ukrainian war, Ukraine crisis, conflict in Ukraine and Russia's invasion is not just stylistic variation. It is a choice of political framing (*Masenko, 1999: 18-25; Spolsky, 2012: 3-12*).

The works on the language situation in Kyiv and Ukraine emphasise that language practice is shaped by history, demography, institutions and everyday habits (*Zaliznyak & Masenko, 2001: 12-19; Maiboroda et al., 2008: 24-31*). This is important for translation because Ukrainian versions of English-language texts enter a society where language has been part of political struggle for a long time. The Ukrainian reader often perceives terms related to sovereignty, occupation and state language through the experience of colonial pressure, bilingual reality and the ongoing defence of national identity. Therefore, a Ukrainian translation that mechanically calques English cautiousness may sound evasive or morally weak in the target context (*Zaliznyak & Masenko, 2001: 12-19; Maiboroda et al., 2008: 24-31*).

Research on linguistic landscapes and multilingual border regions also provides a useful perspective. Laihonen's study of private linguistic landscapes in Hungarian villages in Slovakia shows that visible language choices in public and semi-public space may express belonging, boundary-making and symbolic authority (*Laihonen, 2016: 373-391*). Works by Csernicskó, Beregszászi, Orosz and others show how naming, language use and policy interact in multilingual territories (*Beregszászi et al., 2001; Csernicskó, 2013; Csernicskó & Melnyik, 2010: 553-562*). English-language publicistic texts are not a physical linguistic landscape, but they create a symbolic one: they place certain names, actors and values in the foreground, while pushing others to the margins.

The problem of naming is particularly significant. The visible references include a discussion of name changes in Transcarpathia (*Lajos, 2021: 10*). Although that study concerns a different material, the underlying issue is close to war discourse: names are never purely technical labels. In English journalism, the naming of territories as occupied areas, annexed Crimea, Ukrainian-controlled territory, Russian-held city or liberated settlement affects the reader's perception of legitimacy. In Ukrainian translation, such names must be rendered with special care because they are connected with law, memory and state sovereignty (*Lajos, 2021: 10*).

3. Lexical Nominations of War and Aggression

The most visible layer of representation is lexical nomination. English-language publicistic texts often use a relatively stable set of words: war, invasion, aggression, assault, attack, strike, shelling, bombardment, occupation, annexation, resistance, defence, counteroffensive, liberation, displacement, accountability and reconstruction. Each term selects a different aspect of the event. War names the general state of armed confrontation; invasion identifies the initiating act and the crossing of sovereign borders; aggression adds legal and moral evaluation; occupation focuses on control over territory; liberation describes the restoration of control and freedom for residents.

Translation into Ukrainian requires more than dictionary equivalence. War usually corresponds to *війна*, but in some contexts it may be part of a fixed phrase such as full-scale war or Russia's war against Ukraine. Invasion can be translated as *вторгнення* or *повномасштабне вторгнення*, depending on whether the context refers to the act of entering Ukraine in 2022 or to the broader phase of aggression. Aggression is *агресія*, but in Ukrainian it often sounds stronger and more legal-political than in ordinary English. The translator has to preserve this seriousness rather than soften it.

A central problem is the transfer of euphemistic or politically loaded naming. English publicistic texts sometimes mention the Russian official formula special military operation in order to report or analyse Russian rhetoric. In Ukrainian, the phrase *спеціальна воєнна операція* should not be presented as a neutral synonym for war. It requires quotation marks, contextual

markers or explanatory wording, because without them the translation may reproduce an aggressor's euphemism. This is where linguistic analysis becomes an ethical task: the translator must distinguish between reporting a term and adopting it (Zaremba & Rymarenko, 2008: 258-280; Masenko, 1999: 18-25).

Another lexical difficulty concerns the distinction between troops, forces, soldiers, invaders and occupiers. English news style often prefers neutral institutional nouns such as Russian forces or troops. Ukrainian translation can use *російські війська*, *російські сили*, *окупаційні війська* or *загарбники*, but these variants differ in tone. A strictly informative article may require *російські війська*; an opinion column may justify *окупанти* or *загарбники*. The translator must evaluate genre, communicative purpose and the degree of authorial evaluation. Publicistic style allows evaluation, but uncontrolled intensification can distort the source text.

Civilian vocabulary is equally important. Words such as civilians, residents, evacuees, displaced people, survivors and volunteers humanise the war by shifting attention from states and armies to ordinary people. In Ukrainian, *цивільні*, *мишканці*, *евакуйовані*, *переселенці*, *ті, хто вижив*, and *волонтери* may be used. However, the translator should avoid turning people into abstract categories when the English text emphasises experience. For instance, residents who stayed in a shelled town should not be flattened into *населення* if the source foregrounds personal vulnerability. The stylistic choice influences empathy.

The lexical field of resilience is very common in English-language publicistic discourse about Ukraine. It can refer to military endurance, civic solidarity, institutional continuity or psychological strength. Ukrainian equivalents include *стійкість*, *незламність*, *витривалість* and *здатність чинити опір*. None of them is universally perfect. *Стойкість* is broad and analytic; *незламність* is more emotional and symbolic; *витривалість* stresses endurance. A humanised translation should choose the word that fits the immediate context, not the most fashionable equivalent (Spolsky, 2012: 3-12).

4. Metaphorical Models in English-Language War Publicistics

Metaphor is one of the main tools through which publicistic discourse makes complex events emotionally and cognitively accessible. In articles about the Russian-Ukrainian war, several metaphorical models recur. The first is the model of struggle for survival. Ukraine may be represented as a nation fighting for its life, Europe's security or democratic values. This model personalises the state and turns political resistance into the defence of a living body. In Ukrainian translation, such metaphors are usually understandable, but the translator should avoid excessive pathos when the source is restrained (Spolsky, 2012: 3-12).

A second model is the metaphor of voice and silence. English publicistic texts often describe occupied territories, deported children, destroyed cities or imprisoned civilians through the loss of voice, erased identity or silenced testimony. This metaphor connects war with language policy and cultural survival. It resonates with sociolinguistic research that treats language as a marker of community and public visibility (Masenko, 1999; Laihonon, 2016: 373-391). In Ukrainian translation, voice metaphors can be rendered as *голос*, *свідчення*, *замовчування*, *позбавлення голосу* or *стирання пам'яті*. The translator must keep the link between language and dignity visible.

A third model is the metaphor of line, border and threshold. Front line, red line, crossing a line, borderlands and grey zone are frequent expressions. Some of them are military or diplomatic terms, while others are figurative. Ukrainian equivalents include *лінія фронту*, *червона*

лінія, перетнути межу, прикордоння and сіра зона. The translator should decide whether the English expression is terminological or metaphorical. For example, front line is often a concrete military location, but on the front line of democracy is a metaphor requiring a more interpretive equivalent such as *на передовій захисту демократії*.

A fourth model is the metaphor of rebuilding and healing. Publicistic texts often move from destruction to recovery: cities are wounded, communities are scarred, institutions are repaired, and justice is a path. Ukrainian translation has many resources for this model, including *відновлення, загоєння ран, відбудова, повернення до життя and шлях до справедливості*. The danger is cliché. If every damaged town is described as wounded and every reform as a road, the text loses precision. A good translation keeps the metaphor where it carries meaning and simplifies it where it merely decorates the sentence.

Metaphors can also create ideological simplification. Some English articles frame the war as a chess game, a test of Western resolve, a geopolitical storm or a proxy struggle. These metaphors may shift focus from Ukrainian agency to the interests of great powers. Ukrainian translation should preserve the author's framing if it is analytically important, but a critical translator or editor may need to comment on it in academic work. The background literature on language policy reminds us that representation is connected with power; therefore, metaphors that reduce Ukraine to a board, buffer or arena should be treated cautiously (Spolsky, 2012: 3-12).

5. Syntax, Agency and Responsibility

Syntax is a less obvious but highly influential level of war representation. In English headlines and leads, passive constructions are frequent because they save space and allow attention to fall on the result: civilians killed, city hit, homes destroyed, infrastructure damaged. Such forms are grammatically normal in English journalism, but they can obscure agency if the perpetrator is omitted. In Ukrainian translation, the passive may be preserved when the agent is unknown, but it should not automatically erase responsibility when the source or context identifies it.

Compare the difference between a city was hit and Russian forces hit the city. The first foregrounds the city and the damage; the second foregrounds the actor. Both may be valid, but they are not pragmatically equal. Ukrainian has several options: *місто було атаковане, по місту вдарили, російські війська атакували місто*. A translator working with war discourse should ask a simple question: does the English sentence omit the agent because it is unknown, because headline style is compact, or because the text is diplomatically cautious? The answer determines the Ukrainian structure.

Nominalisation is another important feature. English publicistic texts often use nouns such as escalation, displacement, occupation, destruction, evacuation, mobilisation and reconstruction. Nominalisations make the text compact and analytical, but they may hide human actors. For example, displacement can sound like an abstract process, while people were forced to leave their homes reveals coercion. Ukrainian can reproduce nominalisation through *переміщення, окупація, руйнування, евакуація and відбудова*, yet a humanised translation sometimes needs verbalisation: *людей змусили виїхати, домівки зруйновано, громада відновлює школу*.

English also uses chains of prepositional modifiers that are difficult to render neatly: a Russian missile strike on a residential district in the eastern Ukrainian city. Ukrainian translation usually requires reordering: *російський ракетний удар по житловому району в місті на сході України*. The challenge is to keep the hierarchy clear: who acted, what was used,

what was affected, and where the event happened. Inaccurate ordering can create ambiguity or stylistic heaviness.

Direct and indirect speech require careful handling. English reports often include official statements from Ukrainian authorities, Russian officials, international organisations and witnesses. The translator must distinguish reported claims from verified facts. Verbs of saying are not neutral: said, claimed, accused, warned, admitted, insisted and acknowledged express different degrees of reliability and stance. Ukrainian equivalents – *сказав, заявив, стверджував, звинуватив, попередив, визнав, наполягав* – should be selected according to the source text's attitude. Over-neutralising claimed as *сказав* may remove a signal of doubt; over-translating said as *заявив* may add unnecessary official tone.

6. Evaluation, Modality and Emotional Tone

Publicistic texts about war are rarely emotionless. Even when they follow factual news style, they rely on evaluative vocabulary to mark destruction, suffering, legality and moral responsibility. Words such as brutal, devastating, deadly, illegal, indiscriminate, resilient, fragile, urgent and historic appear frequently. Ukrainian translation must keep evaluation proportional. Brutal may become *жорстокий* or *брутальний* depending on context, but *брутальний* in Ukrainian can sometimes sound stylistically different from brutal in English. Devastating may be *руйнівний, спустошливий* or *нищівний*. Deadly can be *смертоносний, летальний* or deadly attack = *атака, внаслідок якої загинули люди*.

Modality expresses uncertainty, probability and responsibility. English journalism uses may, could, likely, reportedly, allegedly, according to officials and was said to. These markers are crucial in war reporting, where verification can be difficult. Ukrainian translation should not delete them for the sake of fluency. *Ймовірно, можливо, за повідомленнями, як стверджують, за словами посадовців* and *імовірно* are not empty words; they protect accuracy. At the same time, overuse of modality may make clear facts seem uncertain. The translator must follow the source and the evidence.

The emotional tone of English-language publicistic texts varies by genre. News reports tend to be restrained; features are more narrative; editorials are openly evaluative; opinion columns may be polemical. Ukrainian translation should reproduce genre. A restrained report should not become a patriotic essay, even if the topic is emotionally painful. Conversely, an opinion column that uses irony, moral condemnation or rhetorical questions should not be flattened into bureaucratic neutrality. This balance is one of the hardest parts of translating publicistic texts on the war.

Humanisation is especially important when translating stories about civilians. English texts may use small details: a destroyed kitchen, a school bag, a grandmother waiting for evacuation, a volunteer carrying supplies. Such details should be preserved because they prevent the war from becoming only a sequence of numbers and official statements. The translator should avoid replacing concrete images with general nouns. This does not mean adding sentimentality; it means respecting the source text's way of making human experience visible.

At the same time, translation must not intensify suffering into sensationalism. Graphic or overly dramatic wording can violate the dignity of victims and distort publicistic style. A precise Ukrainian phrase is often stronger than an exaggerated one. For example, seriously damaged may be *серйозно пошкоджений*, not completely destroyed unless the source says so. Injured people should not be turned into victims of a massacre if the source does not establish that frame. Ethical translation is accurate translation.

7. Cultural and Pragmatic Problems of Translation into Ukrainian

The first cultural problem concerns asymmetry between English and Ukrainian audiences. English-language publicistic texts are often written for readers who need background: where a city is located, what the Donbas is, why Crimea matters, or how the full-scale invasion differs from earlier stages of Russian aggression. Ukrainian readers usually know much of this background, but they also expect more precise naming. A translator may therefore shorten explanations that are obvious, but should not remove context that helps understand international perception.

The second problem concerns transliteration and toponyms. English media may use Kyiv, Kharkiv, Odesa, Lviv, Donbas and Crimea. Ukrainian translation should follow Ukrainian official naming and established norms: *Київ, Харків, Одеса, Львів, Донбас, Крим*. In academic contexts, the issue of naming is linked with language policy and symbolic recognition. The visible sources on multilingual naming and language situation show that names are part of broader cultural politics (Csernicskó, 2013: 42-55; Lajos, 2021: 10). Therefore, the translation of place names is not a technical afterthought.

The third problem is the rendering of culturally loaded concepts such as sovereignty, statehood, independence, occupation, collaboration, resistance and decolonisation. English terms may be broad, while Ukrainian equivalents have a strong national and legal resonance. Sovereignty is *суверенітет*; statehood is *державність*; independence is *незалежність*; occupation is *окупація*. Yet in context, these words may require expansion. For example, Ukrainian statehood can mean not only political institutions but also historical continuity and cultural survival. A translator must understand these layers (Masenko, 1999: 18-25; Csernicskó, 2013: 42-55).

The fourth problem concerns intertextuality. English publicistic texts sometimes refer to World War II, the Cold War, Munich, appeasement, the Iron Curtain, NATO enlargement, empire or colonialism. Ukrainian translation should reproduce such references but also make sure they do not displace Ukraine's own historical experience. A phrase like Europe's darkest hour may sound powerful in English, but in Ukrainian it should be adapted carefully if the surrounding context invokes specific Ukrainian traumas. The translator should avoid both over-explanation and cultural erasure.

The fifth problem is register. English publicistic style can be compact and idiomatic: to hold the line, to dig in, to push back, to call out, to turn the tide, to pay the price. Ukrainian equivalents may be *тримати оборону, закріпитися, чинити опір, викривати або засуджувати, переламати хід подій, заплатити ціну*.

Some idioms have direct equivalents; others need paraphrase. Literal translation often sounds unnatural. A humanised translation should sound like a Ukrainian publicistic text, not like English syntax wearing Ukrainian words.

The sixth problem is the treatment of Russian-origin terminology and propaganda clichés. If English texts analyse phrases such as denazification, Russophobia or special operation, Ukrainian translation should signal that these are ideological labels, not neutral descriptions. Quotation marks, contextual verbs and explanatory nouns are useful: *так звана, пропагандистський термін, кремлівська риторика, евфемізм*. This approach corresponds to the broader idea that language is a site of policy and power (Spolsky, 2012: 3-12).

8. Translation Strategies

Several translation strategies are especially productive for English-language publicistic texts about the Russian-Ukrainian war. The first is contextual specification. English often

uses broad words such as attack, strike or forces. Ukrainian may need to specify *атака, удар, обстріл, ракетний удар, авіаудар, російські війська* or *окупаційні сили*. Specification is justified when the context clearly provides the information. It should not be invented.

The second strategy is de-euphemisation. When the source text reports euphemistic language used by officials, Ukrainian translation should make clear that it is a euphemism. This does not mean replacing every euphemism with a stronger word; rather, it means marking the distance between the journalist's voice and the reported phrase. For example, the so-called special military operation may be rendered as *так звана «спеціальна воєнна операція»*. The quotation marks and so-called protect the translation from adopting the frame (Zaremba & Rymarenko, 2008: 258-280; Zakon Ukrainy, 2019: n. p.).

The third strategy is agency restoration. If English headline compression removes the actor but the article body identifies it, Ukrainian translation may restore the actor in the headline or lead, especially when omission would blur responsibility. This strategy should be used carefully. It is not a license to add accusations; it is a way of preserving meaning that English grammar or headline economy has compressed.

The fourth strategy is metaphorical adaptation. Metaphors should not always be translated literally. If an English metaphor is conventional in Ukrainian, direct translation is possible. If it sounds artificial, a functional equivalent is better. To hold the line can be *тримати оборону* or *не відступати*, depending on context. To weaponise hunger may be *використовувати голод як зброю*, which is close and clear. A storm of criticism may become *хвиля критики*, because this is more natural in Ukrainian publicistic style.

The fifth strategy is register preservation. Publicistic English often alternates between informational and emotional modes. The Ukrainian translation should keep the same rhythm. Long English sentences may be divided for readability, but the logical relation must remain clear. Short headlines may need expansion if a literal equivalent is ambiguous. The translator should remember that Ukrainian readers expect both accuracy and stylistic naturalness.

The sixth strategy is terminology consistency. Key terms such as full-scale invasion, occupied territories, temporarily occupied territories, internally displaced persons and war crimes should be translated consistently: *повномасштабне вторгнення, окуповані території, тимчасово окуповані території, внутрішньо переміщені особи, воєнні злочини*. Consistency is especially important in academic articles and news translation because repeated variation may confuse the reader or weaken legal precision (Zakon Ukrainy, 2019: n. p.).

The seventh strategy is humanising paraphrase. The user of translation should not feel that the text was mechanically transferred. Humanising does not mean adding facts or emotions; it means choosing Ukrainian words that sound alive, clear and respectful. When English says families fled the town after weeks of shelling, a natural Ukrainian translation is *родини виїхали з міста після кількох тижнів обстрілів*. It is simple, concrete and faithful.

9. Discussion: What the Analysis Shows

The analysis shows that English-language publicistic discourse represents the Russian-Ukrainian war through a combination of factual naming, moral evaluation and narrative framing. The most important lexical opposition is between terms that clarify aggression and terms that blur it. War, invasion, aggression and occupation identify the structure of responsibility; crisis, conflict and operation may be contextually acceptable in some phrases but can also soften the perception of violence. Ukrainian translation should be alert to this difference.

The second finding is that metaphors make the war emotionally understandable but can also simplify it. Metaphors of survival, voice, border and rebuilding tend to support Ukrainian agency and civilian dignity. Metaphors of chessboard, buffer zone or geopolitical game may reduce Ukraine to an object of external strategy. A translator should preserve the author's meaning while recognising how metaphor works in the target culture.

The third finding concerns syntax. Passive constructions and nominalisations are not inherently wrong, but they influence agency. English publicistic style often compresses responsibility for reasons of space or caution. Ukrainian translation has the possibility to make agency clearer through active constructions, but this must be based on evidence. The principle is not emotional amplification but semantic transparency.

The fourth finding is that translation into Ukrainian is shaped by the Ukrainian language situation and by the symbolic value of the state language. The sources on language policy and language situation show that language is part of public identity and social power (*Zaliznyak & Masenko, 2001: 12-19; Maiboroda et al., 2008: 24-31; Masenko, 1999: 18-25; Spolsky, 2012: 3-12*). In the context of war, Ukrainian translation participates in the defence of truthful naming. It should not reproduce imperial euphemisms without markers, nor should it erase Ukrainian perspectives through over-neutralised language (*Zaliznyak & Masenko, 2001: 12-19; Maiboroda et al., 2008: 24-31; Masenko, 1999: 18-25; Spolsky, 2012: 3-12*).

The fifth finding is practical. Students and translators should create a small glossary before translating a set of articles. Such a glossary should include preferred equivalents, possible variants, register notes and warnings about propaganda terms. It should also record examples of metaphorical translation. This makes the translation more consistent and reduces accidental calques.

10. Conclusion

English-language publicistic texts about the Russian-Ukrainian war are linguistically complex because they combine information, evaluation, narrative and political framing. Their main linguostylistic features include carefully chosen nominations of aggression and defence, metaphors of survival and rebuilding, evaluative adjectives, modal markers, passive constructions, nominalisations and genre-dependent emotional tone. These features are not decorative. They influence how readers understand responsibility, legitimacy, suffering and resistance.

The translation of such texts into Ukrainian requires accuracy, cultural competence and ethical sensitivity. The translator should preserve clear agency, avoid uncritical transfer of euphemisms, adapt metaphors naturally, maintain register, keep terminology consistent and respect the human dimension of war reporting. Ukrainian translation must sound natural and publicistically alive, but it must not add unverified facts or exaggerate the source. The best translation is both faithful and responsible.

The theoretical sources shown in the screenshots help place this problem in a wider linguistic context. Works on language policy, language situation, naming and multilingual landscapes demonstrate that language choices are connected with power, identity and social memory (*Masenko, 1999: 18-25; Beregszászi et al., 2001: 15-28; Csernicskó, 2013: 42-55; Laihonon, 2016: 373-391; Spolsky, 2012: 3-12*). This connection is especially visible in war discourse, where every key word can become part of a struggle over truth. Therefore, the study of linguostylistic representation and translation is not only an academic exercise; it is also a contribution to more precise, humane and responsible public communication.

References

1. Beregszászi, A., Csernicskó, I., & Orosz, I. (2001). *Nyelv, oktatás, politika (Language, education, and policy)*. Kárpátaljai Magyar Tanárképző Főiskola.
2. Csernicskó, I. (2013). *Államok, nyelvek, államnyelvek: Nyelvpolitika a mai Kárpátalja területén (1867–2010) (States, languages, state languages: Language policy in the territory of present-day Transcarpathia)*. Gondolat Kiadó.
3. Csernicskó, I., & Melnyik, S. (2010). *A nyelvpolitika fogalma (The concept of language policy)*. In C. Fedinec & M. Vehes (Eds.), *Kárpátalja 1919–2009: Történelem, politika, kultúra* (pp. 553–562). Argumentum; MTA Etnikai-nemzeti Kisebbségkutató Intézete.
4. Handzii, O. (2019). *Pochav diiaty novyi pravopys (A new orthography came into force)*. *Hazeta po-ukrainsky*, 42(2206), 2. (in Ukrainian)
5. Kiss, J., & Pusztai, F. (Eds.). (2018). *A magyar nyelvtörténet kézikönyve (Handbook of Hungarian language history)*. Tinta Könyvkiadó.
6. Laihonon, P. (2016). *Beware of the dog! Private linguistic landscapes in two ‘Hungarian’ villages in South-West Slovakia*. *Language Policy*, 15(4), 373–391. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10993-015-9358-y>
7. Lajos, M. (2021). *Névváltozások Kárpátalja: A Katalinoktól és Istvánoktól a Vanesszákig és Patrikokig (Name fashion development in Transcarpathia: From Katalins and Istváns to Vanesszas and Patriks)*. *Kárpátalja*, 1046, 10.
8. Márku, A. (2020, September 28). *Édes-bús nosztalgia kárpátaljai Élőnyelvi Konferenciák jubileumain (Bittersweet nostalgia on the jubilee of the Hungarian Sociolinguistics Conferences in Transcarpathia)*. *Hodinka Antal Nyelvészeti Kutatóközpont*. <http://hodinkaintezet.uz.ua/edes-bus-nosztalgia-karpataljai-elonyelvi-konferenciak-jubileumain/>
9. Maiboroda, O., Shulha, M., Horbatenko, V., Azhniuk, B., Nahorna, L., Shapoval, Yu., Kotyhorenko, V., Panchuk, M., & Perevezii, V. (Eds.). (2008). *Movna sytuatsiia v Ukraini: mizh konfliktom i konsensusom (The language situation in Ukraine: between conflict and consensus)*. *Instytut politychnykh i etnonatsionalnykh doslidzhen imeni I. F. Kurasa NAN Ukrainy*. (in Ukrainian)
10. Központi Statisztikai Hivatal. (n.d.). *Központi Statisztikai Hivatal (Hungarian Central Statistical Office)*. Retrieved September 20, 2025, from <http://www.ksh.hu/?lang=hu>
11. Masenko, L. (1999). *Mova i polityka (Language and politics)*. *Soniashnyk*. (in Ukrainian)
12. Spolsky, B. (Ed.). (2012). *The Cambridge handbook of language policy*. Cambridge University Press.
13. Tarkanii, H. (2011, March 25). *Zakarpatska vidpovid ukrainskomu «movnomu pytanniu» (The Transcarpathian response to the Ukrainian “ language question”)*. *Zakarpattia online*. <https://zakarpattia.net.ua/News/80913-Zakarpatska-vidpovid-ukrainskomu-movnomu-pytanniu> (in Ukrainian)
14. *Zakon Ukrainy «Pro zabezpechennia funktsionuvannia ukrainskoi movy yak derzhavnoi» (Law of Ukraine “ On Ensuring the Functioning of the Ukrainian Language as the State Language”)*, № 2704-VIII. (2019). *Verkhovna Rada Ukrainy*. <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/2704-19> (in Ukrainian)
15. Yatskiv, M. (2020). *Frazemy na poznachennia movlennievoi ta myslennievoi diialnosti v khudozhnikh tvorakh Myroslava Dochyntsia (Phraseological units denoting speech and mental activity in the works of Myroslav Dochyntsi)*. *Naukovyi visnyk Uzhhorodskoho universytetu. Serii: Filolohiia*, 43(1), 313–317. [https://doi.org/10.24144/2663-6840.2020.1.\(43\).313-317](https://doi.org/10.24144/2663-6840.2020.1.(43).313-317) (in Ukrainian)

16. Zaliznyak, H., & Masenko, L. (2001). *Movna sytuatsiia Kyieva: den sohhodnishnii ta pryideshhnii (The language situation in Kyiv: today and tomorrow)*. Vydavnychiy dim «KM Akademia». (in Ukrainian)
17. Zaremba, O., & Rymarenko, S. (2008). *Rol zovnishnikh chynnykiv u polityzatsii movnykh problem (The role of external factors in the politicisation of language problems)*. In O. Mai-boroda et al. (Eds.), *Movna sytuatsiia v Ukraini: mizh konfliktom i konsensusom (pp. 258–280)*. Instytut politychnykh i etnonatsionalnykh doslidzhen imeni I. F. Kurasa NAN Ukrainy. (in Ukrainian)