SPECIAL VOCABULARY OF THE UKRAINIAN AND ENGLISH LANGUAGES AS AN OBJECT OF LINGUISTIC RESEARCH ON THE EXAMPLE OF MILITARY TERMINOLOGY

Oksana Romanova[1]

Abstract. In terminology, studies of the specifics of the formation and development of individual sectoral terminologies based on their own language resources or borrowings have been noticeably intensified, and the interest of scientists in the issue of clarifying the theoretical foundations of terminology as a whole has increased. This approach contributed to the articulation of language connections with various spheres of human activity, but did not completely exhaust the problem of organizing all terminological systems, their systematization and standardization, forecasting trends of future development. The study made an attempt to understand the complex issues of the theory of the term, the essence of the term as a linguistic unit. **The purpose** of the work is to analyze the issue of "term" as a linguistic unit. The difference between the term and the nomenclature is theoretically substantiated. A proposal for defining the nomenclature as a linguistic unit has been submitted. On the example of military terminology, professionalisms and their types are considered, definitions of professionalisms, synthetic and analytical terms are given. The study provides an overview of the linguistic works of Ukrainian and foreign scientists who considered the linguistic terminology of the 20th – early 21st centuries. **The subject** of the study is the structural and lexical-semantic parameters of language units in modern Ukrainian and English military terminology. The following **research methods** were used: descriptive-analytical, comparative-comparative and quantitative. Definitional analysis and methods of component analysis are used. The work also states that the lexical component of Ukrainian- and English-language

---
[1] Candidate of Philological Sciences, Associate Professor,
Associate Professor at the Department of Foreign Languages of the,
National Academy of the National Guard of Ukraine, Ukraine

scientific texts consists of terms, neologisms, and neonyms. Terms in the vocabulary of the language play a significant role. Professional vocabulary constitutes a significant part of the language fund; therefore, it is natural that linguists attach great importance to the study of the regularities of term formation, their structure and semantics, aspects of location, translation issues; consider terminology as an important component of modern literary language. **The results** of the research can be used in lexicographic work (compilation of terminological dictionaries), in the educational process (during the development and teaching of special courses on terminology). The generalizations, comments and recommendations presented in the work will be useful for further standardization and improvement of military terminology at the current stage.

1. Introduction

Language is a dynamic system, the components of which are in constant motion and development. The process of language formation, its improvement never stops, at the same time it retains signs of immanent stability, integrity.

In linguistics, it is generally recognized that language is directly connected with all spheres of human activity. At the time of radical changes in the life of society, the rapid development of science and technology, there are also significant changes in the language vocabulary. One of the most important layers of the vocabulary of the modern literary language is terminology. Without studying the composition of the terminological vocabulary and changes in it, it is impossible to understand the patterns of development of the language lexical system as a whole. The history of Ukrainian science testifies to constant attention to the problems of special vocabulary. With the approval of the Ukrainian language as the state language, the study and standardization of national terminology acquired world significance.

L. Symonenko emphasizes: "The end of the 20th century was marked by a "terminological explosion" caused by quantitative and qualitative changes that contributed to the emergence of both new term systems and the addition of old terms-neologisms" [32, p. 3].

In recent years, Ukrainian linguistics has been actively developing the general provisions of the theory of terminology and issues related to individual terminological systems. There have been works dedicated to

researching the terminologies of various fields of human knowledge and activity. The theoretical principles and peculiarities of branch terminology were substantiated in the publications of O. Semenog, O. Kobylynska, Yu. Boyka, E. Ogar, K. Panasyuk, S. Shevchuk, and others. O. Semenog, L. Pshenichna, V. Shevchenko and others raised separate problems of the formation of the terminological culture of specialists in various fields. The branch terminological system, in particular the military one, was covered in the work of N. Yatsenko, but as its development and formation.

The terminology studied is a certain system of verbal signs reflecting the system of military concepts and relations between them. Military affairs is an industry with a long history of development. This is a complex term that can have the following meanings: in a broad sense, it covers all issues of military theory and practice related to military construction, training and actions of the Armed Forces, in peacetime and wartime, preparation of the country's population in case of war. In a narrow sense, it is a system of knowledge necessary for military servicemen and conscripts to successfully perform their military duty.

It is known that the content of military affairs in a particular country in a specific historical era is influenced by many factors, primarily such as its socio-political system, the level of development of production, science and education, cultural traditions, the spiritual state of society, and others. In general, the content, main directions of development and improvement of military affairs in any state have common features that follow from the objective patterns of world development. At the same time, they have significant differences due to the geographical location of the state, its population, economic activity, the nature of external threats, etc.

Humanity seeks to understand the cause of those social contradictions, the necessary consequence of which, for thousands of years, have been large and small wars, general and local, such that destroyed the color of many generations. The improvement of various technologies is accompanied by the development of its terminology. With the disappearance of certain processes of battle, with the change of technology, military terms and nomen come out of use. Conversely, the appearance of new types of clothing, devices, equipment, weapons, etc., gives rise to new language units. Modern Ukrainian military terminology has undergone significant changes caused by the progress of science and technology and the change in

the political system of our country. Today, this is one of the most significant layers of special vocabulary.

Modern Ukrainian military terminology is developed and branched in accordance with the acquired knowledge in this professional field. The military industry, like every branch of human activity, has its own conceptual base and system of corresponding professional titles. It is built according to a heterogeneous model, that is, it arose as a result of the interaction of several fields of knowledge and human activity. Technical language units are quite clearly distinguished in military affairs. The formation of Ukrainian military terminology depends on many linguistic and non-linguistic factors. Non-linguistic factors include the development of the military industry, the emergence of new technologies in military production, as well as the socio-cultural and economic-political situation in society.

For a theoretical understanding of the state and development of modern national terminology, it is important to study each of its subsystems.

The theoretical significance of the work consists in the development of topical issues of the theory of the term, clarification of some concepts of terminology.

The scientific novelty of the work is that it specifies the terminological concepts "term", "analytical terms", "nomen", "professionalisms" for the first time.

The theoretical significance and relevance of the scientific work consists in the development of topical issues of the theory of the term, the clarification of individual terminological concepts that can be the basis for further research of industry terminologies, as well as for the resolution of debatable issues. terminology.

The purpose of our research is to clarify and supplement certain concepts of terminology ("term", "terminological phrase", "nomen", "professionalisms"). Several theoretical issues were raised in the tasks: 1) clarify some important concepts of terminology; 2) consider the relationship between the concepts of "terminology" and "terminological system", outline the requirements for the term; 3) find out the linguistic status of analytical terms and provide a special table in which the common and distinctive features of the compound term, free phrase and phraseology will be named; 4) theoretically substantiate the difference between a term and a nomen and propose a definition of a nomen as a linguistic unit. The

implementation of the tasks determines the logic of the presentation in the material considered in the work: the definition of the term is given, the relationship between the concepts of "terminology" and "terminological system" is considered, and the requirements for the term are put forward.

The natural environment for terminology as a component of a special vocabulary is an independent functional variety of general literary language, which is traditionally called the language of science. In the language, a twofold process is continuously taking place: special vocabulary is a constant source of enrichment of the general vocabulary of the Ukrainian language, and general language vocabulary acquires a special importance on the terminological basis.

2. The term as a component of the special vocabulary of the Ukrainian language

Terms are one of the main ways of linguistic expression of specialized knowledge, which appear to facilitate the process of communication in the course of professional and scientific activities. They consolidate the existing knowledge, explaining scientific concepts, categories and principles of their systematization, regularities of this or that field of knowledge and activity.

In the Ukrainian language, terms, like commonly used words, have certain meanings, grammatical categories, but they express special concepts, serve different fields of human knowledge and activity, and such their purpose could not fail to reflect on the nature of this rather large group of words. On the one hand, the term is a member of the lexical system of the literary language, and on the other hand, it is a sign approaching the elements of artificial semiotic systems. This dual nature of the term causes the existence of such scientific views on terminology: the latter is considered either a specific layer of literary vocabulary, or is excluded from the limits of the literary language in the same way as dialects, colloquialisms, where special linguistic norms operate. Supporters of the first view, to which we adhere, consider terminology as a subsystem of the general literary language, that is, within its limits, but as a separate independent branch. The term is subject to both terminological laws and the laws of the language as a whole, since it is both a sign of a special system and a unit of the lexical composition of a certain language. Therefore, in terminology, stability as a property of any sign system and

variation inherent in the vocabulary of the general literary language are combined and opposed to each other.

The basic concepts of our research are the following: "term", "terminology", "term system". Let us emphasize that it is quite difficult to provide a clear definition of the term, since there is currently no universally accepted definition in Ukrainian linguistics that would reflect the essence of the terms. Various definitions of the term given in scientific literature and dictionaries are not exhaustive. In the history of terminology, there was a change in ideas about the term: at first it was considered a "special word" [11; 21], then – "a word in a special function" [17; 27; 37], the basis of which is the "language substrate". Scientists have different approaches to this problem, and there is no agreement on the semantic features of the term. N. Stakhovska notes that this is "a unit of a historically formed terminological system that defines a concept and its place in the system of other concepts, is expressed by a word or a word combination, serves for communication between people connected by the unity of specialization, belongs to the vocabulary of the language and is subject to its laws" [34, p. 277]. A. Dyakov, T. Kyyak, Z. Kudelko in the work "Fundamentals of Terminology" point out that terms are not special words, but only words in a special function, namely in the function of a name [8, p. 15]. According to I. Dutsiak, the term is the name of those objects and their features that are the subject of certain specialized activities of people [7, p. 61].

Ukrainian terminologists are aware that the nature of the term is based on the dialectical duality of the universal and the specific. The question of the essence of the term was studied by K. Averbukh, O. Akhmanova, G. Vinokur, A. Herd, S. Hrynyov, V. Danylenko, R. Kobrin, N. Kotelova, A. Moiseyev. In foreign linguistics, there are many different attempts to find out the essence of the term as a linguistic unit. Thus, in V. Danylenko's monograph there are nineteen definitions of the term, and the author emphasizes that this list can be continued. According to the researcher, the term should be understood as a word or word combination of a special field of use, which is the name of a special concept and requires a definition, that is, the definitive function of the term is emphasized. E. Khanpira believes that the term is a word or phrase that describes a scientific concept or a concept of a special field of activity.

Scientists formulate the definition of the term depending on which criteria for distinguishing the term from a commonly used word are the main ones. The main ones are a connection with a scientific concept, a high level of abstraction, a logical connection with the meanings of other terms within a certain system, a connection with a certain scientific or professional activity. Attempts to find linguistic criteria for defining the term can also be found in the scientific literature. V. Leychyk includes the lack of synonyms, belonging to a certain system, ambiguity, semantic transparency, stylistic neutrality, lack of expression, etc. as such features of the term. The further development of terminology, determined by the law of opposition between the linguistic substrate and the terminological essence of the term, is aimed at revealing the contradictory essence of most terminological categories, and the finding of contradictions does not always imply the existence of a way to overcome them. As a concept belongs to a separate field of knowledge, so a term is an element of a fixed context and is used only within the limits of this context.

Important for understanding the essence of the term are its following two features: the fact that the terms are used as a means of securing the results of knowledge in special fields of knowledge and activity, and the fact that the terms contribute to the discovery of new knowledge. O. Reformatsky believed that terms reflect socially organized reality, therefore terms have a socially binding character. With the help of terms, scientific theories, laws, principles, provisions are formed. Each term has its own definition (clear scientific definition) along with other terms in the same field.

A relevant feature of a term that distinguishes it from a non-term is also a stricter possibility of sanctioning it by organizing the terminology of the modern literary language. A specific feature of terminology can be called the ease of penetration into the vocabulary of foreign language borrowings and the artificial creation of terms. But, despite a certain specificity and independence of terms in the lexical composition of the general literary language (they form the basis of the vocabulary of the language of science – a functional variety of the general literary language), these units should be considered as elements of the general literary vocabulary.

Today, linguists have identified two main features of the term. First, it is closely related to a certain scientific or technical field: the same word has different meanings in different fields (for example, *a reaction* in medicine,

chemistry, and politics). Secondly, the meaning of the term is revealed through a precise, logical definition, not the lexical meaning of the word. D. Lotte believed that a term, unlike an ordinary word, always expresses a strictly fixed concept and should be short, devoid of ambiguity, synonymy, homonymy.

Normative requirements for the term were first formulated by D. Lotte and laid the basis for further research into terminology. Ukrainian and foreign linguists propose the following requirements for the term:

1. Connection with a scientific concept.

2. The presence of a clear definition, that is, a short logical definition of the concept, which reflects the essential features of this object. A definition is a verbal description of a concept, its content (it is considered one of the most important signs of a term).

3. Systematicity. Any term belongs to the terminological system.

4. Special field of application.

5. The tendency to be unambiguous within one's terminological field, that is, the terminology of a certain field.

6. Relative independence from the context.

7. The term should be precise and clear.

8. The term should be short (concise), semantically transparent, although this requirement quite often conflicts with another requirement – accuracy, for which the term must sometimes be complete.

9. The term should not have synonyms and homonyms.

10. The plan of expression is a word or phrase.

11. Stylistic neutrality, i.e. lack of expression, modality, aesthetic characteristics.

12. The term should be melodious (requirement of euphony) [4; 8; 10; 11; 15; 16; 18; 20; 26; 27; 29; 30; 31; 32; 34].

Summarizing the requirements for the term proposed by the researchers, we consider the following to be the main ones: 1) the term must designate a scientific concept; 2) the term is characterized by definiteness, that is, the plan of the content of each term is oriented to the corresponding concept; 3) the term must be systemic; 4) the term must be unambiguous within its terminological field; 5) the term must comply with the rules and norms of the literary language; 6) the term is stylistically neutral (lack of emotional and expressive coloring). These signs are realized only within term systems,

beyond them the term loses its definitive and systemic characteristics – it becomes determinologized, that is, it becomes a commonly used vocabulary.

In principle, any term can become a word of general vocabulary. At the same time, the term is determinized. Determinologizing is a constant and active phenomenon for the modern state of the language. It reflects the constant process of interaction of terminological and commonly used vocabulary. A significant part of new word combinations consists of determinologized term units. They usually arise on the basis of nomenclature and technical terms.

In the works of recent years, pragmatic requirements are highlighted, due to the specifics of the functioning of the term, among which one can name modernity, internationality and attractiveness of the term.

Based on the established characteristics of the term, we formulate its definition: a term is a word or phrase that is a carrier of special information and a tool for learning about the surrounding world, has a certain scope of use and the meaning of which is revealed in the definition. Therefore, the term has such relevant features as the nomination of a scientific concept, a definition, a clearly defined place in the term system.

The term as a complex and multifaceted concept can be considered in different aspects. In terminology, there are attempts to provide a comprehensive description of the term both in terms of expression and content. For example, to the question, what is a term, the foreign researcher K. Averbukh gives the following answer: a lexical unit, a word combination, a syntagm, a phraseological unit, a nomen, a sign, a concept, a unit of nomination, a member of a system (a system object), a fraction (part from the division of the name into concepts) $T = D/N$. The concept of "term" is closely related to the concept of "terminology".

Terminology is "a set of terms serving a certain field of knowledge related to a system of concepts: art, technology, production, etc. This is a special layer of vocabulary that is amenable to conscious regulation and ordering" [36, p. 683]. The same definitions of terminology can be found in foreign dictionaries of linguistic terms. For example, in the dictionary of J. Maruso, it is defined as a system of terms used to express concepts inherent in this science.

Terminology as a branch of lexicology studies the patterns of creation and functioning of terms and their systems: it is a complex science

of terms; a set of all special words and phrases that designate scientific concepts of various fields of knowledge. Professional use of terminology ensures its informative quality, a certain stability of sign systems. The main shortcomings of the terminology, which must be eliminated: ambiguity of terms within the same terminology system; synonymy of terms and term elements; overloading with foreign language terms; overloading of terminology systems with professionalisms; non-uniformity in the spelling of terminological units, etc.

The term system is a system of terms of a certain field of science, technology, art, etc., which has lexical-semantic and word-forming connections between nominations-terms [9, p. 183]. If the terminological system is disordered, it inhibits the development of the science it serves and leads to errors in practical activities.

2.1. Terminology as industry terminology system.
Military terminology

Such scientists as I. Klymenko, L. Pshenichna, V. Shevchenko, N. Shishkina, S. Shevchuk, N. Yatsenko classify the terms into three groups: 1) general scientific (used in almost all branch terminology: *system, law, trend, theory, analysis*, etc.); 2) cross-industry (used in several related or distant industries: *environmental costs, private property*, etc.); 3) highly specialized (refer to concepts that reflect the specifics of a specific industry: *range*, *military formation, tactical training, combat mission, lieutenant colonel*, etc.). The industry terminology system, in particular the military terminology, consists of the terms of the specified groups, however, highly specialized (branch) terms – terminologies – make up a specific share. The military terminological system in historical retrospect developed taking into account socio-political, scientific-technical, educational factors that determined the semantic specificity of the terminological groups of the military vocabulary, their methods of creation, origin [39, p. 513, 517–518]. At one time, a thorough analysis of the process of the historical formation of the military terminology system was carried out by N. Yatsenko, who identified seven stages of its development [40].

At the current stage of the development of industry term systems in the context of preserving the traditions of term usage, as well as taking into account the leading factors of term formation (social-communicative,

165

production-technological, historical-political), the following aspects of the development of military terminology can be outlined. First of all, the following groups of terms and lexical units' function from the standpoint of the genesis of terms in the military sphere, which is determined by the activation of the process of term formation on a Ukrainian basis or borrowing from other languages [33]:

I. Words of actual Ukrainian origin: *strila, polk, viisko, druzhyna,* etc.

II. Borrowing from other languages: from German (*ofitser, soldat, shtraf, hauptvakhta, ranh, blitskryh, shturm,* etc.); from English (*straikbol, peintbol, bunker, snaiper, tank, tanker,* etc.); from Polish (*zhovnir, kapitan, polkovnyk,* etc.); from French (*rezhym, mina, ataka, batalion, partyzan, parashut, harnizon,* etc.); from Turkic (Turkish, Tatar, etc.: *kozak, bulava, khoruhva, otaman, orda, kaidany, kyndzhal,* etc.); from Russian (*kadet, chekist, bryhadyr, komisar, heneral, leitenant,* etc.) languages.

Secondly, in the context of the semantic delimitation of military terms, the following groups of them are defined:

– homonyms (from the Greek. same+name) – words that sound the same but have different meanings, for example: *wave* [sea or radio], *nose* [ship or peninsula]; *tank* [tracked combat vehicle or liquid storage tank]; *raid* [coastal water space, suitable for the parking of ships or the penetration of military units into the rear of enemy territory]; *traverse* [hydrotechnical structure] – *traverse* [direction perpendicular to the course of the vessel];

– synonyms – words belonging to the same part of the language, different in sound, characterized by similarity of meanings, having the same or close meaning, for example: *pledge – garrison*, *troop – army*, *cavalry – horse*, *serviceman – soldier, steering wheel – rudder, sail – canvas*, etc.;

– antonyms (from Greek – against + name) – words that belong to the same part of the language and have opposite meanings, for example: *arming – disarming, masking – unmasking, attack – retreat, favorable situation – unfavorable situation, evidential – unproven, safety – danger, order – disorder*, etc.;

– paronyms are words (pairs of words) that are similar in morphological structure (close in phonetic composition), but differ in meaning, for example: *attacking* (one who attacks) – *attacked* (one who is attacked); *disinfectant* (disinfection chamber) – *disinfectant* (disinfectant); *special* (preparation,

tactics, operation) – *specialized* (council); *tactical* (plan, reception, success, strategy) – *tactful* (polite), etc.

Thirdly, from the point of view of the use of passive/active vocabulary in the military environment, the following groups of words and terms are distinguished:

– historicisms (names of objects of old culture, life or social order) and archaisms (outdated words that have fallen out of use, but the phenomena, objects named by them remain and have modern equivalents), for example: *rat, voi (voiny), voievoda, arkan, bran (bytva), hetman, mushket, ratusha, kniaz, velmozha, pistol,* etc. Many archaic words return to active use, including: *sotnia, osavul, sotnyk, khorunzhyi, bulava, bunchuk, pirat, korsar, piratskyi choven,* etc.;

– neologisms are new words called to life by the needs of society, for example: *raketna zbroia, aviadesant, kasetni bomby-konteinery, hrafitovi bomby, prylad nichnoho bachennia, zakhysni biokhimichni kostiumy, terlonovi bronezhylety, portatyvna oslipliuiucha lazerna zbroia, SVCh-zbroia,* etc.

Among the main methods of term formation in the military environment, the following are distinguished: prefix (*military – anti-military*), suffix (*conquer – conqueror*), prefix-suffix (*convoy – sub-convoy*), word formation (*missile-torpedo lieutenant general*), composition (*helmet – Noretsky helmet, cosmonaut helmet, aviator helmet, steel helmet, thermohelmet; vest – compensatory vest, bulletproof vest, rescue vest; kit – emergency and rescue kit, combat kit, ammunition kit, individual kit, parachute kit, portable test kit, aircraft kit; suit – summer suit, camouflage suit, thermal regulation suit*), abbreviation (*VMS (Navy), BMP (Infantry Combat Vehicle)*).

O. Kobylynska, O. Pylypenko note that "military vocabulary includes military terminology, which includes scientific and technical terms used in connection with military concepts, and emotionally colored elements of the military lexicon, which are mainly stylistic synonyms of the corresponding military terms" [12]. It is about professional military slang – a set of words that are characterized by non-normativeness, stylistic inferiority, familiarity, and functional limitations, used within a narrowly professional environment in order to ensure intensive, concise communication related to the specifics of the military profession. K. Panasyuk believes that "moderate use of slang by cadets brings a certain color to their speech, sometimes makes

communication easier... However, current and future officers do not think that their language should be image-oriented... An officer, commander or teacher does not have the right to speak in a "low style" [25].

3. Synthetic and analytical term

Modern Ukrainian terminology contains a large number of words and phrases that designate various objects and phenomena related to this type of human activity. In terminology, a formal criterion is used to distinguish between integral and separate structures of language units of special communication: "Integrated terms are those that consist of one component and are formed as one word. Separately formed terms are those that are formed in writing as a group of words, that is, phrase-terms" [14, p. 12].

It should be noted that it is the terms-words that have gained considerable popularity in the professional language of military specialists. Compared to other terminologies, this is a feature of the Ukrainian terminology of military affairs, since analytical terminological constructions prevail in modern national terminological systems, which is explained by both lingual and extralingual reasons.

In professional communication, synthetic terms denote objects, phenomena, actions, processes, etc. A word is the main smallest meaningful unit of language, which is freely reproduced in it to construct expressions and determines its special character among other semiotic systems. According to P. Dudyk, "a word is the most common unit of language and speech with a certain lexical meaning (full-valued words) or with a relative meaning (official words), words with the ability to express a certain expression of a person's will, his feeling, which is not called (exclamations)" [6, p. 364]. All words – both terms and non-terms – are meaningful units of language in contrast to phonemes and syllables; are freely reproduced in the language, i.e. do not require a mandatory combination with individual units; have integrity and selection, unlike morphemes; statements are built with the help of words, that is, they are used for the purpose of communication, in particular professional.

Like terms-words, terminological phrases are able to nominate objects, phenomena, processes, that is, they can have a semantic and structural-grammatical unity. In this regard, the method of separate nomination is distinguished, or the syntactic method of creating language units. In Ukrainian terminology, the structural and semantic features of analytical terms have been analyzed on the

basis of many terminologies: grammatical (O. Medved), ecological (O. Bondar, L. Kozlovska, S. Ovseichyk, V. Chumak), economic (O. Chuyeshkova), electrical engineering (L. Kozak), cardiology (R. Stetsyuk), medical radiology (I. Korneyko), music (S. Bulyk-Verhola), scientific and technical (O. Ivashyshin, T. Mykhailova), organic chemistry (N. Tsymbal), programming (A. Nikolayeva), psychological (L. Veklynets), market (B. Mykhailyshyn), financial and accounting (O. Chumak), etc. Let's consider examples from military terminology. Military terminology is an ordered collection of military language terms that reflect the conceptual apparatus of military science and are related to the forms and methods of waging war, to issues of strategic use of the armed forces, as well as operational-tactical use of associations, compounds, units and units, with their organization, armament and technical equipment. It contains a fairly large number of compound terms and provides interesting material for studying the patterns of formation of analytical terms, their semantic analysis, and the identification of structural and grammatical types of such terms.

Different names of these units are used in the linguistic literature: *analytical term, multi-word term, super-word term, nominal unity, non-synonymous term, separate term, compound name, compound name, compound term, complex term, verbal unity, word combination, terminological phrase, terminological inversion, term combinations*, etc. During a rather long period of studying problems related to analytical terms, there were attempts to introduce a single name for the analyzed language units. The Bulgarian researcher M. Martonova expressed the opinion that the most successful can be only those names that in their linguistic form reflect the sign of terminological naming. She proposed the name "compound term" as the one that most accurately corresponds to the essence of this linguistic concept [38]. Modern terminologists also actively use the nominations "term-phrase", "terminological phrase", "analytical term", which gives us the right to use them as synonyms, although we are aware that this contradicts the requirement for the term. At the same time, we join the opinion of those scientists who believe that when a scientific concept receives several names, over time, this makes it possible to find the most appropriate language means for designating this concept through selection, which would correspond to its essence and normative requirements, which, in turn, contributes to the development of the terminology system as a whole.

Analyzing terminological phrases, it should be emphasized that they are not related to the concept by the values of individual components, but only by their common meaning, which is not derived directly from the semantics of each component, that is, the formation as a whole is related to the concept that it nominates [23, p. 22]. This is, for example, the meaning of the phrases *dvofiuzeliazhnyi litak* ("an aircraft that has two complete fuselages with cabins, center wings and (as a rule) tail fins"); *podviina diia* ("principle of operation of the shock-trigger mechanism of the weapon"); *bahatostupeneva raketa* ("an aircraft consisting of two or more mechanically connected rockets, called stages, which are separated in flight"); *odnokilove operennia* ("type of plumage of an aircraft, rocket") and others. The signs given in the definitions of these linguistic units cannot be divided between the values of their components, which are characteristic of them in free use. Thus, in the phrase *multi-stage rocket* (in its special meaning), the component *multi-stage* has no separate meaning and therefore cannot be considered as an independent linguistic sign. This makes it impossible to recognize the *rocket* component as an independent language sign. Therefore, terminological phrases in the military sublanguage are semantically complete linguistic units, the meanings of which do not consist of the meanings of the components, and the entire analytical unit is correlated with a special concept.

Modern terminology systems are replenished with a large number of analytical nominations since terms-phrases are preferred because they are able to most fully reflect the necessary distinguishing features of the concept that is called. The question of the place of compound terms in the language system has been of interest to linguists for a long time, but until now it has not received a final solution. In the scientific literature, it is an established opinion that a word combination can nominate a special concept (provided stability, reproducibility and a fixed order of components), however, the problem of the status of compound terms as linguistic units remains unresolved.

Analyzing terminological phrases, it should be emphasized that they are not related to the concept by the values of individual components, but only by their common meaning, which is not derived directly from the semantics of each component, that is, the formation as a whole is related to the concept that it nominates [24, p. 22].

Note that the most controversial issue regarding the status of analytical terms is the distinction between them and phraseological units, which has repeatedly been the object of attention of Ukrainian and foreign researchers. Today, there are two opposing views on the essence of such a linguistic unit as a term-word combination: some linguists attribute compound terms to a special group of phraseological units (Ukrainian researchers I. Bilodid, I. Kucherenko etc.), however, the majority of scientists deny the legality of considering terminological phrases as an object of phraseology and opposes them to phraseology (Ukrainian scientists L. Avksentiev, M. Alefirenko, B. Mykhailyshyn, T. Panko, L. Skrypnyk, O. Chuyeshkova etc.). These scientists believe that analytical nominations are only outwardly close to phraseological units, but in the structural and semantic plan are units of another level – nominations of a special field of use. Proponents of this view emphasize that compound terms are mistakenly classified as phraseological units.

We will remind you that a military term is a word or a phrase used to denote a certain special concept that belongs to one or another section of military science or military technology.

Some innovations may be incomprehensible to many non-military English speakers. It is possible to understand the phraseology based on the context and analysis of its structure. For example, the phrase "*fireworks display*" [firework-s + display] meant "fireworks" (feiierverk). During the war in the Persian Gulf, it acquired another metaphorical meaning – "the first reports of the bombing of Baghdad". The structure of the verb "*weaponize*" [weapon + ize] and the context help to understand this word as "to equip a missile carrier with weapons"; "*warfighter*" [war + fighter], which means a person who participates in war, a soldier. The term "*warfighter*" is often used in the mass media, on newspaper websites on the Internet, but it has not yet been codified by modern dictionaries. The currently popular term "*embed*" [em + bed] has the meaning "a journalist who covers the events taking place in a military unit"; "*dead soldier*" – "empty bottle"; "*milk run*" – "ordinary departure"; "*egg beater*" – "helicopter"; "*green apple*" – "button to start oxygen to the airplane cabin" and others.

The relationship between phraseological units and compound terms is considered in depth by M. Alefirenko, who, based on a systematic approach to linguistic phenomena, solves this issue from the point of view of the interaction of phraseological units with different structural levels of language – lexical,

171

morphological and syntactic. The scientist understands the peculiarity of phraseological meaning: the components of phraseological associations partially or completely lose their lexical meaning, forming the general metaphorical semantics of phraseology, for example: *cast the last anchor* – "to be killed, to die", *hit the silk* – "to jump with a parachute" (the first parachutes were made of silk), *zoom bag* – "pilot suit", *axis of evil* – "vis zla", *land battleship* – "tank", *bomb alley* – "bombing", *dirty bomb* – "nuclear bomb". M. Alefirenko emphasizes that terminological phrases cannot be attributed to phraseological units, and also notes: "<...> Analytical terms and phrasemes formed from them must also be demarcated lexicographically, presenting them in dictionary articles as homonymous formations" [2, p. 89]. The scientist emphasizes that terminological phrases, unlike phraseological units, perform a logical-nominative function, and the structural-grammatical differences of these two language units are due to the fact that the analytical term is strictly limited by the composition of term elements and is not capable of syntactic changes in its structure. M. Alefirenko also notes the non-phraseological properties of analytical terms: a) lack of lexicalization process; b) their modeling; c) the presence of a nominative function; d) the ability of compound terms to be lexically divided.

Like M. Alefirenko, L. Skrypnyk, O. Tolikina, O. Chueshkova and other scientists, we believe that only those terminological phrases that have developed a figurative meaning and began to be used with it in the national language can be classified as phraseological units. Analytical terms are not an object of phraseology, but an object of terminology and should be considered during the analysis of individual terminologies. Summarizing what has been said, we present in the table the similarities and differences between a compound term, a free phrase, and a phraseological unit:

Property	Compound term	Free word combination	Phraseologism
Formal decomposition	+	+	+
Rearranging components	–	+	+ / –
Reproducibility	+	–	+
Integrity of meaning	+	–	+
Nominative-definitive function	+	–	–
Expressiveness	–	–	+
The presence of archaic forms	–	–	+

Therefore, compound terms differ from free phrases and come close to phraseological units, but at the same time they have specificity: they are a means of expressing logical concepts, and therefore are systematic, precise, neutral in the scientific style of language.

Several definitions of compound terms have been proposed in the scientific literature, in particular V. Ovcharenko, O. Chueshkova. "Analytical we call such a way of expressing concepts, according to which individual components of a language formation expressing a concept are correlated with individual features of this concept (species, or species, and generic). The meaning of such a language formation is a set of values of its components, the connections between which reflect the relations between the features of the corresponding concept, which are called separate components of the language formation. The activity of syntactic derivation is due to the need to clarify scientific concepts, and term compounds, unlike single-word terms, show a greater ability to specify meanings thanks to dependent words" [23, p. 21]. In her dissertation, O. Chuyeshkova considers an analytical term as a grammatical combination of two or more words based on a subordinating conjunction, which is a means of nominating special concepts, has a definition, is characterized by stability, reproducibility and semantic integrity [38, p. 102]. We offer the following definition of a terminological phrase: it is a semantically coherent and reproducible linguistic unit that nominates a scientific concept, has a definition and consists of two or more components, which in free use are words.

The structural difference between a term-word and a term-phrase puts forward a number of additional requirements for an analytical term:

1. A constant order of components, the change of which causes a loss of stability and, as a result, determinization.

2. Functioning of terminological phrases in special texts, fixing them as conceptual and verbal complexes in the asset of specialists of a specific field of knowledge.

3. The spread of such formations from the sphere of functioning to the sphere of fixation and their consolidation [38, p. 43].

A terminological phrase can consist of mandatory and optional components. Let's consider the example of some industry terminology, for example, *military*. So, in the phrase *submarine*, the military component can be an optional component, if there is no need to describe exactly the type of

military boats. A multi-component term is the result of combining two or more terminological phrases in one compound name. In this case, these are the phrases *submarine* and *military boat*.

In some cases, several terminological phrases are built on the basis of one component: *combat weapons, artillery weapons, small arms, offensive weapons, strategic weapons, ground weapons, heavy infantry weapons*. If one component is part of several terminological phrases, complex abbreviated variants may not exist in all these analytical terms, but only in the most important ones. Thus, of the two composite language units *engineering vehicle* and *infantry fighting vehicle* with a common component machine, only one of them has a complex abbreviated version: IFV – infantry fighting vehicle. Also, from the phrases *chat post* and *central command post*, only the second phrase has an abbreviation – TsCP.

The military terminology system is obviously large in scope and multifaceted in content. It can be studied in the context of various fields, given the different semantic and functional load. Such diversity of military terminology reflects the changes that have occurred in the methods of waging war as a result of technological progress. *Melee weapons* (*arrows, swords*, etc.) were first replaced by *firearms,* and now the latest *electronic technologies* are used.

Analysis of military terminology has shown its heterogeneity. Along with unambiguous terms that have precise and clear semantic boundaries, there are ambiguous terms, for example, the term "*security*" means "*guard, provision, combat support; security secrecy; counterintelligence*"; the term "*armour*" – "*armor, armored troops; tanks*"; the terms "*unit*" and "*command*" have up to ten or more meanings. It can be concluded that the ambiguity of even single-component terms complicates their correct translation.

Let us emphasize that in the terminological system mainly compound noun term's function (according to the lexical-grammatical nature of the root word), which can be explained by the special role of nouns in the field of special vocabulary. For the Ukrainian terminology of the military field, non-prepositional and prepositional analytical nominations are typical, among which we distinguish two-component (*zadnii prozirnyk, nekerovana raketa, torpednyi aparat*) and multi-component (*blok perednoho detonatora, shkala dlia vazhkoi kuli, systema protypovitrianoi oborony na blyzkykh pidstupakh*). Analytical nominations are mostly formed on the basis of

174

word terms, reflecting the logical division of special concepts into generic and specific: *aviation – transport aviation, civil aviation, bomber aviation, fighter aviation, military aviation.*

Among the main grammatical and semantic parameters of analytical terminological nominations, we name the following:

a) non-synonymous terms are mostly substantive phrases (we also single out verbal phrases, motivating this by the fact that the term can be represented by two nominations: the nomination of a feature of the process in statics and the nomination of a feature of the process in dynamics);

b) constituent components of a terminological phrase are connected to each other by means of one of the types of connection – agreement, control, adjacency, nominal adjacency or correlation.

So, the modern Ukrainian term system is represented by two types of linguistic units – single-word and non-synonymous, with a quantitative predominance of single-word units. All the requirements that scientists put forward to terms in general also apply to terminological phrases. But, taking into account the fact that an analytical term is a linguistic construction that consists of two or more components, we are talking about the presence of a structural difference between these two classes of terminological units, which causes the appearance of an additional list of those features that a terminological phrase must have. The compound term performs not only a nominative function, but also helps to determine the scope of the concept it denotes, to understand its place in the system of military concepts. It is in the combinations of terms that the entire complex and structural complexity of the relevant scientific field is reflected.

4. Term among other types of special vocabulary

The professional sphere of communication of specialists is served by vocabulary, which scientists traditionally call special [3]. In terminology, one of the most pressing issues is the selection of a term from among adjacent categories of special vocabulary, which is combined into one layer of the vocabulary of the language on the grounds that it differs from commonly used words by the specialization of meanings, the scope of use, and the limited number of users. According to V. Vashchenko, the selection of this group of language units in the composition of the language "<...> is determined by both scientific and educational interests that arise in

the process of analyzing and clarifying the characteristics of each word and determining its functional scope" [3, p. 92–93].

The special vocabulary includes terms, as well as nomen and professionalism. All these varieties of language units' function in professional communication. According to the object of our study, the terms should be distinguished from other language units in military terminology.

4.1. Term and nomenclature

The special vocabulary of the military affairs includes not only terms, but also nomenclature units. That is why one of the issues relevant both for general terminology and in the context of our work is the identification of those parameters by which the named units can be differentiated, identifying the core for the terminology system, that is, the actual terms.

In modern terminology, nomenclature is considered to be a system of specific names related to a separate specialist area. The nomenclature can be represented by conventional symbols, graphic symbols, which often consist of numbers and letters, it may include international Greek-Latin names for species and elements in various fields of knowledge.

Any term usually functions within a system of nomen. The relationship between a term and a nomen is a debatable issue in several aspects. This is evidenced by the presence of conflicting views on this problem in linguistics. On the one hand, there is a scientific opinion about the inexpediency of clearly distinguishing these concepts. This is explained by the fact that the boundary between nomenclature units and terms is very flexible, because any nomenclature sign can become a term. On the other hand, some scientists distance terminological units and nomenclature.

In addition to terms, a significant number of so-called nomenclature names are used in scientific and technical literature. The opposition "term – nomen" is extremely important for understanding the essence of the term. To date, clear criteria for distinguishing these two language units have not been developed, most of the branch nomenclature, in particular, the Swedish one, has not been researched. In the scientific literature, there is no established term for this unit: nomenclature sign (A. Khayutin, etc.), nomenclature name (T. Kandelaki, A. Moiseev, etc.), nomen (A. Herd, V. Leychyk, etc.).

In Ukrainian linguistics, P. Dudyk, A. Dyakov, T. Kyyak, Z. Kudelko, B. Mykhailyshyn, T. Mykhaylova, V. Ovcharenko, P. Stakhiv and others

paid attention to the issue of distinguishing terms and nomen. To date, several views have been expressed regarding these linguistic units: 1) terms and nomen should not be distinguished, since they are used in the professional sphere and are presented in most lexicographic works [30, p. 10–11]; 2) nomenclature signs are varieties of proper names [23, p. 61]; 3) nomenclature should be considered those language units that name the objects and means of research in a separate scientific field, and actually terms – units that nominate phenomena that accompany the research process (D. Ganych, I. Oliinyk, T. Panko). So, in scientific literature, a term and a nomen are identified or distinguished both in terms of content and in terms of expression (a term is opposed to a nomen as a sign, the possibilities of which can be materially expressed are much wider /numbers, symbols, graphic signs/).

As N. Nikulina notes, nomenclature as a term for a certain field of knowledge appeared in French in the 18th century. It spread in science in connection with the classification of plants by the Swedish botanist K. Linnaeus and became so widely used that in some languages (for example, Italian) it completely replaced the concept of terminology. For the first time, the concepts of terminology and nomenclature were distinguished in the middle of the 19th century by the English scientist V. Wavell [22, p. 47].

V. Ovcharenko emphasized: "<...> Nomenclature signs are not terms, because they do not express termed concepts and denote only individual objects or their groups that are included in the scope of the corresponding concept" [23, p. 61]. In his opinion, nomenclature signs should be distinguished from so-called nomenclature terms that denote concepts of objects and phenomena of objective reality. These are, for example, the names of objects used in military affairs – linguistic units are nomenclature machine gun, tank, car.

P. Dudyk notes that the common in terms and nomen prevails over the specific [5, p. 84]. Nomen refer to narrower concepts that are related to specific realities. A nomen is described using specific properties of the subject, the term has a definition with a certain degree of abstraction, without specifying any specific parameters. For example, nomen *cars* "*Volga Gaz-3102*", *IZH 2715, UAZ 469*, *Lexus, tanks* "*Bars*", "*Pantera*".

B. Mykhailyshyn and P. Stakhiv hold the view that terms and nomenclature signs are names of the same nature, but differ in the scope of mean-

ings (nomens refer to concepts related to concrete realities and are therefore narrower than scientific concepts nominated by terms) [19, p. 89–90]. Scientists proposed to nominate the first "terms-concepts", and the second – "terms-names".

In foreign linguistics, the problem of "term – nomen" is quite relevant, and in recent decades many works have appeared, dedicated to the distinction between the concepts of "terminology" and "nomenclature". These scientific explorations are based on the works of predecessors, which have already become classics (H. Vynokur, O. Reformatskyi). H. Vinokur emphasized: as for nomenclature, in contrast to terminology, it should be understood as a system of abstract and conventional symbols, the sole purpose of which is to provide the most convenient from a practical point of view means for designating objects, things, without direct relation to the needs of theoretical thought that operates on these things. The scientist separated the concepts of "terminology" and "nomenclature", this distinction has been established and with some changes is accepted by modern terminologists. This opinion was supported by O. Reformatskyi, who also investigated the differences between term and nomen. Nomenclature words are more nominative, and the terms are related to the concepts of science, because they verbally reflect the system of concepts of this science. The meaning of nomenclature words is more specific and more accurate than the meaning of terms, nomenclature words often refer to single objects, and therefore can be proper names. According to O. Reformatskyi, *sea, river, mountain* are terms, and *Black, Dnipro, Everest* are nomenclature words. So, the main property of terms is conceptuality (direct connection with the concept), and nomenes – objectivity (the nomen is connected to the concept indirectly, through an object). Nomen can be related to concepts, but single concepts, and terms – to generalized ones. There are a large number of nomen, they function in the field of special communication; nomenclature as a part of special vocabulary is the most subject to change, therefore, nomenclature is a collection of nomen. Terminological field or terminological context is important for a term. Nomen are freely used out of context, since the qualities of the things named do not change from the use of their names in scientific or everyday communication. Nomen outside the nomenclature systems easily become household words, keeping their substance or objectivity (*arsenal, bomb, armor, cannon, howitzer, weapon, trench*).

Naming single objects, nomens are a low level of the terminological hierarchy, if we proceed from the point of view according to which the main function of terms is to name professional special concepts, while the function of nomenclature is "to name" or "label" a whole system of species and subspecies of basic terms-concepts.

We share the opinion of those scientists who include terms, nomen and onymes as part of a special vocabulary. Nomenclature means a set of special names used in a certain field; names of objects in this field, which are correlated with certain concepts and actualize subject connections. Linguists distinguish between technical and commercial nomen [1; 35].

Nomenclature units of the military sphere are represented by verbal signs, symbols in the form of individual letters, numbers, graphic signs, combinations of words and symbols that serve to name certain types of military weapons and equipment, display their sizes, design features, belonging to certain models, etc.: *FA-18 – "American fighter jet"*, *Predator – "anti-tank missile"*.

Those belonging to the military terminology system are proper names (words or compounds) that serve to distinguish the objects named by them from other objects, their individualization and identification. The meaning of onyms is related to a certain referent (a person, an animal, animate or inanimate being). In the military terminology, onyms are mostly the names of military units, equipment, military operations: Desert Storm – operation "Desert Storm". Terms form the basis of a professional resume. The multifacetedness of the term, associated with its functioning as a unit of scientific knowledge and as a unit of common language, causes different approaches to its understanding. Contrasting the (lexical) meaning of the term with the concept that the term denotes remains a debatable issue. The main views on this issue are as follows: 1) terms have a lexical meaning, but it is not equal to the concepts denoted by them; 2) the terms have a lexical meaning equal to the concepts denoted by them; 3) the meaning of the terms is a concept, but they do not have a lexical meaning; 4) terms denote scientific concepts, while general literary words denote naive, everyday concepts.

Based on the research of many linguists, we believe that there is no absolute boundary between common and military vocabulary. Military terminology, which belongs to one of the oldest branches of human knowledge, is closely related to common vocabulary. Terminology ensures the nomina-

tion of professional concepts. The terminological meaning develops on the basis of the nominative. Therefore, the scientific definition is richer in terms of content. The terminological meaning takes the word beyond the general literary language and includes it in the system of terms of military science.

A defining feature of special terminologies, including military terminologies, is their open nature, which means that in these systems there is a constant movement due to the introduction of new terms and the decline of others due to the loss of relevance of certain concepts. This is a prerequisite for constant work on terminologies, especially in their standardization and codification. It is also worth noting that the systematic nature of certain areas of the indicated industry can be heterogeneous. If we take military terminology as an example, it becomes obvious that such a hotly debated group as clothing names is different from job nominations. In the first case, the disappearance of one of the nominations does not affect the content of the other titles. An excellent picture emerges when in a terminological group separate nominations are connected with each other, as, for example, in the names of positions, when the meaning of the term major is correlated with two other names of this group – captain and lieutenant colonel. Removing the word major would change the meaning of captain and lieutenant colonel. Accordingly, adding a new term to such a group would also result in a reformulation of the conceptual (semantic) scope of the other components of the group. Sometimes such a characteristic of the term system as its ability to serve a scientific theory or a scientific concept is noted.

Having analyzed the views of Ukrainian and foreign linguists on the essence of nomenclature units, we offer the following definition: a nomen is the name of a concrete reality, through which it is correlated with the concept of a certain field of human activity.

T. Mykhaylova in her dissertation work, devoted to semantic relations in scientific and technical terminology, came to the conclusion that nomenclature is a constituent part of the language of science, the "lower link" of special vocabulary, since its understanding is impossible without understanding the actual terminological nominations of this very field of knowledge. Nomenclature is a system of designations of classes of objects belonging to one homogeneous series on the basis of deliberately chosen external features of these objects. The researcher singled out two main types among nomenclature units [20, p. 41]:

1. Names of machines, devices, devices, parts, tools and their parts, substances and materials (listed in dictionaries). For example: *fighter, rifle, weapon, plane, tank*.

2. Names of series, models, types of structures, brands of machines, devices, devices, parts, brand names, conventional names of certain types of products, which are mostly commercial and advertising in nature, as well as names of factories and other manufacturers. This type is not usually presented in lexicographic works. Terms and names of this type should be clearly distinguished. Let's note that B. Mykhailyshyn proposed to include this type of nomenclature units in dictionaries. In the analyzed terminological system, these are the following names: *AK-74 rifle, F-4 "Phantom" aircraft, "Leopard 2" tank*.

Summarizing the opinions of scientists regarding nomen, we present the main features of these language units:

1. Nomen are proper names or occupy an intermediate position between terms and proper names.

2. Nomenes are a low link of special vocabulary (their understanding is impossible without correlation with other terminological units).

3. Nomen have enhanced denotativeness due to the fact that they are the result of an artificial nomination, which is intended to name a special human activity, and therefore received the name of pragonyms.

4. Nomen are part of such a system, which belongs to the number of simple ones and is a list of homogeneous concepts that are at the same level of abstraction and reflect classes of homogeneous objects.

5. The main thing for nomen is materiality and objectivity, depending on the nature of the objects they denote [20].

The set of these criteria makes it possible to select a nomenclature from a special vocabulary. From all the judgments and opinions about nomenclature, we can draw the following conclusion: if the term designates a specific concept of a certain field of activity, then the nomen means any subject, without expressing the concept of it, or expresses the concept of lower species.

In modern terminology, nomenclature and nomen are opposed to the terminological system, and terms or nomenclature are included in terminology, but as a lower, peripheral part of it. We consider nomenclature units (nomens) to be special types of terms that correlate with specific concepts and actualize subject relationships. Nomenclature is the same terminology

that is used not in the epistemological, as terms, but in the ontological plan. We propose to divide the special vocabulary used in military affairs into two classes – terminology with its unit (term) and nomenclature with its unit (nomen).

4.2. Term and professionalism

The Russian invasion of Ukraine caused a new burst of word creation. Military professionalism (jargon) has become entrenched in everyday speech, new words appear, and this process continues all the time.

Words characteristic of military personnel penetrated into the language of civilians before, but especially actively – in moments of aggravation of conflicts. This was also the case in 2014, when "*separs*", "*claps*" and "*cyborgs*" appeared, and this was also the case after February 24, 2022. For example, "*200*" and "*300*" mean dead and wounded, as do the words "*two hundred*" and "*three hundred*". Accordingly, the verbs "*zadvokhsotity*" and "*zatryohsotity*" mean to eliminate or injure. It is noteworthy that the derogatory terms "*five hundredth*" (refusal or deserter) and "*avatar*" (alcohol abuser) are also used for the Russian military.

The following words are no less often used: *arta – artillery, gunners*; *banderomobile* – a car for the Armed Forces, as a rule, modified by volunteers; *bayractarites, javelinites, stingerites* and *highmarsites* – destroy the enemy depending on the weapon; *disco* – fighting; *green – bushes, shrubs, wooded area*; *tape* – a column of military equipment; *to suckle* – not to perform simple actions to save life; *minus* – projectiles that are launched in the direction of the enemy; *minusuvaty* – eliminate the enemy; *moped* – Iranian kamikaze drone; *arrival* and *SMS* – hit by an enemy missile or projectile; *pixel or digit* – Ukrainian military uniform; *the ghost of Kyiv* is a collective image of Ukrainian pilots; *front* – front line; *a bird* is an unmanned aerial vehicle.

It is logical that in the conditions of war, new words appear with which Ukrainians express their attitude towards the enemy. For example, Russia is often called "*mordor*" or "*orkostan*", and the enemy army is called "*orcs*". The latter term identifies Russians with a fictional race of barbarians with animal features.

Over the last year, a number of definitions have been established in the language, including those that appeared since the Soviet-Afghan war.

In mass culture, these words became popular thanks to the Lord of the Rings universe of the English writer J.R.R. Tolkien.

Russians are also contemptuously called "*Russians*", "*Rashists*" and "*Chmonia*". The latter arose as a mockery of the enemy's equipment and was associated with Andriy Ryazantsev, a captured native of Horlivka (Donetsk region). And it is used to level the image of the soldier of the supposedly "second army of the world". And the professionalism of "*Chmobik*" emphasizes the poor training of the mobilized Russians.

Non-established military terminology includes: professionalisms (*trunk* – the barrel of a tank gun, *kashlo* /food/, *samovol* /go without permission/), professional jargons (*bolvanka* /shell without explosives/, *barrel* /firearm/, *lychky* /ribbons on the epaulettes of the sergeant), and terminoids, that is, military terms-neologisms not yet established in the language (*sole* /fabric hemmed according to shape/, *foundling* /grenade VOG 25/). Terminoids are professionalisms that, due to the lack of a normative terminological equivalent, occupy this semantic niche, and strive to become terms. Example: *drinks* – uniform, *runner* "Ignition distributor rotor".

Ukrainian researchers consistently express the opinion that terms should be separated from professionalism. A. Dyakov, T. Kyyak, and Z. Kudelko noted: "It is appropriate to distinguish between professionalisms and terms, which together constitute the concept of a special sublanguage" [8, p. 15]. All scientists emphasize that the terms and professionalisms have common and distinctive features. A common feature is that these two language units are used in the professional field of human activity. However, there are many more differences, which gives reason to talk about the distinction between terms and professionalism. T. Mykhaylova, after analyzing the works of Ukrainian scientists, provided a fairly complete list of the differences between these language units:

1. Professionalisms are local abbreviated and simplified names that duplicate terms, they are secondary in formation to terms. The terms cannot have a narrow local character.

2. Terms are standardized lexical units, and professionalisms are semi-official.

3. The terms function both in oral and written communication of specialists in a certain field, professionalisms are used in colloquial speech.

183

4. Professionalisms are characterized by connotative elements (expressive-colored) in their semantic structure. The term should not have an emotional and expressive color.

5. The terms function in all areas of scientific and industrial human activity, professionalisms are most often found in certain professions, crafts, trades (for example, there are no professionalisms in the special language of philosophy).

6. Terms can be formed by means of national and foreign languages, professionalisms – on the basis of the national language, foreign language elements occur only in certain units.

7. Systematicity is the most important feature of terminology, systemic connections between professionalisms are weaker, because they name separate subjects and specific concepts [20, p. 44–45].

In our opinion, professionalisms and terms differ in the following features: professionalisms have a wider sphere of special activity (they may be known to people who are not directly employed in one or another production); in terms, there is a great specialization of word-forming means, in contrast to professionalisms; in the case of terms, the signs of nomination are significant, in the case of professionalism, they are mostly insignificant; the terms have a greater degree of normativity and codification.

Based on the above, we believe that professionalism is a semi-official stylistically marked linguistic unit (words or word combinations) used in professional speech by a narrow circle of specialists to denote a known concept. Example: *Bitovka* (*a room for household affairs*), *salaga* (*green, a person inept in military affairs*), *bratok* (*best friend*), *capterka* (*a room for storing personal belongings*), *vzletka* (*the central passage in the barracks*), *roba* (*work clothes*), *saldophon* (*soldier*).

Since professionalisms are used to designate certain concepts only in the field of a particular profession, craft, industry, they do not always correspond to the norms of the literary language. Professionalisms are unofficial synonyms for terms, they are quite diverse in terms of semantic characteristics. Professionalisms arise spontaneously on their own linguistic basis, and branch terms are mostly created consciously, often using foreign words and word-forming devices.

Unlike terms, professionalisms do not have a clear scientific definition and do not constitute a complete system. If terms are, as a rule, abstract

concepts, then professionalisms are concrete, because they differentiate in detail those subjects, actions, qualities that are directly related to the field of activity of the respective profession. Professionalisms are mostly used in oral informal speech of people of a certain profession. Performing an important nominative-communicative function, they accurately name a product detail, a technological process link or a certain concept and in this way contribute to better mutual understanding. Some of the professions are becoming outdated, undergoing structural changes at the same time; some of them, without becoming terms, are still used in scientific language with certain caveats (mostly they are separated by quotation marks, while the terms are usually used without quotation marks).

The appearance of military professionalisms (neologisms) speaks of both the richness of the Ukrainian language and the intellectual wit of Ukrainians, who try to maintain a high fighting spirit in the conditions of war. Each new word reflects the will to win, humor and the ability to notice details, and is also an important component of the development of the language and the country as a whole.

We are of the opinion that terms should be separated from professionalisms due to the non-normative nature of the latter, and dictionaries should provide colloquial names of professional concepts that can potentially become terminological units.

5. Conclusions

The analysis of the Ukrainian terminology of the military branch, the clarification of its structural and grammatical structure, lexical and semantic parameters make it possible to draw the following conclusions:

1. The semantic core of military terminology is formed by quantitatively predominant terms-words. Along with single-word term units, compound terms are used that have certain structural and semantic characteristics in the studied industry term system. In the special language of the military industry there are commonly used terms, nomen and professionalisms.

In the analyzed terminology system, the following parts of speech are terminologically permissible: nouns, adjectives, adverbs, verbs, adverbs. Most of the terms-words are nouns according to part-language belonging.

2. The variety of ways of formation and the heterogeneity of the vocabulary of the military language is explained by the interaction of

the analyzed term system with the commonly used vocabulary of the Ukrainian literary language, with general scientific terminology and with the term systems of related fields of activity. An important way to replenish the vocabulary of the military sphere is the assimilation of foreign term units. The terms-words are borrowed mainly from Latin, French, English, German, and Greek languages. To a lesser extent, they were learned from Italian, Polish, Spanish and Dutch languages. The peculiarity of the analyzed terminology is that it is dominated by specific language units.

To date, it has been established: a) a term can be both a word and a phrase; b) the term is related to a scientific concept; c) the term functions in a special field, can exist only within one terminological field; d) the term is systemic, that is, it occupies a clearly defined place in the term system; e) the term is characterized by a significant functional load; e) the meaning of a term and the lexical meaning of a word are homogeneous categories with certain differences, in particular because the meaning of the terms is established as a result of a conscious agreement. Controversial issues remain: a) which functions are defining for the term; b) how exactly the term is related to the concept; c) part-linguistic characteristics of terminological units; e) what definition the term should have.

In the scientific study, certain concepts of terminology ("term", "analytical terms", "nomen", "professionalisms") were clarified and supplemented. So, a term is a word or word combination that is a carrier of special information and a means of knowing the surrounding world, has a certain sphere of use and the meaning of which is revealed in the definition.

The modern Ukrainian term system of military affairs is represented by two types of language units – one-word and multi-word units with a quantitative advantage of one-word units. There is no fundamental difference in content between synthetic and analytical terms. There is every reason to claim that it is incorrect to equate analytical terms and phraseological units, since the defining feature of phrase-terms is their connection with a scientific concept.

References:

1. Akulenko V. V. (1972). *Voprosi internatsionalizatsii slovarnogo sostava yazika* [Issues of internationalization of language vocabulary]. Kharkov: Izd-vo Khark. un-ta. (in Russian)

2. Alefirenko M. F. (1987). *Teoretychni pytannia frazeolohii* [Theoretical questions of phraseology]. Kharkiv: Vyd-vo pry KhDU "Vyshcha shkola". (in Ukrainian)

3. Vashchenko V. S. (1979). *Ukrainska leksykolohiia: semantyko-stylistychna typolohiia sliv* [Ukrainian lexicology: semantic and stylistic typology of words]. Dnipropetrovsk: Vyd-vo DDU. (in Ukrainian)

4. Hanych D. I., Oliinyk I. S. (1985). *Slovnyk linhvistychnykh terminiv* [Dictionary of linguistic terms]. Kyiv: Vyshcha shkola. (in Ukrainian)

5. Dudyk P. S. (1980). Termin, nomenklaturna nazva i kontekst [Term, nomenclatural name and context]. *Naukovo-tekhnichnyi prohres i problemy terminolohii*: Tezy dop. respubl. konf. Kyiv: Nauk. Dumka, pp. 83–85.

6. Dudyk P. S. (2005). *Stylistyka ukrainskoi movy*: navchalnyi posibnyk [Stylistics of the Ukrainian language]. Kyiv: Vyd. tsentr "Akademiia". (in Ukrainian)

7. Dutsiak I. (2000). Spetsyfichni oznaky termina i normatyvni vymohy do noho [Specific features of the term and regulatory requirements for it]. *Problemy ukrainskoi terminolohii:* materialy 6-i Mizhnar. nauk. konf. Visnyk derzh. un-tu "Lviv. politekhnika", no. 402, pp. 59–62. (in Ukrainian)

8. Diakov A. S., Kyiak T. R., Kudelko Z. B. (2000). *Osnovy terminotvorennia: Semantychni ta sotsiolinhvistychni aspekty* [Basics of term formation: Semantic and sociolinguistic aspects]. Kyiv: KM Asademiia. (in Ukrainian)

9. Yermolenko S., Bybyk S., Todor O. (2001). *Ukrainska mova. Korotkyi tlumachnyi slovnyk linhvistychnykh terminiv* [Ukrainian language. A brief explanatory dictionary of linguistic terms]. Kyiv. (in Ukrainian)

10. Ivashchyshyn O. M. (1996). Strukturni osoblyvosti ta semantychna dyferentsiatsiia terminiv-slovospoluchen u naukovo-tekhnichnykh tekstakh [Structural features and semantic differentiation of terms-phrases in scientific and technical texts]. *Inozemna filolohiia*, vol. 109, pp. 41–44.

11. Kovalyk I. I. (1961). *Vchennia pro slovotvir* [The doctrine of word creation]. Lviv: Vyd-vo Lviv. un-tu, vol. 2. (in Ukrainian)

12. Kobylynska O.V., Pylypenko O.P. *Neolohizmy v fakhovomu movlenni (na materiali viiskovoi leksyky)* [Neologisms in professional speech (on the material of military vocabulary)]. Available at: http://elibrary. nubip.edu.ua/10658/3.pdf

13. Kozak L. (2007). Zapozychennia yak skladova chastyna ukrainskoi tekhnichnoi terminolohii [Borrowing as a constituent part of Ukrainian technical terminology]. *Ukrainska terminolohiia i suchasnist: zb. nauk. prats*. Kyiv: KNEU, vol. VII, pp. 63–65.

14. Korneiko I. V. (1996). *Stanovlennia terminolohii medychnoi radiolohii v ukrainskii movi* [Formation of the terminology of medical radiology in the Ukrainian language]: avtoref. dys. … kand. filol. nauk: 10.02.01. Kharkiv. (in Ukrainian)

15. Kochan I. M. (2001). Shche raz pro systemnist u terminolohii [Once again about systematicity in terminology]. *Ukrainska terminolohiia i suchasnist: zb. nauk. prats*. Kyiv: Vyd-vo KNEU, vol. IV, pp. 67–70.

16. Krizhanovskaia A. V., Symonenko L. A. (1987). *Aktualnie problemi uporiadocheniya nauchnoi terminologii* [Current problems of organizing scientific terminology]. AN USSR, In-t yazikovedeniya ym. A. A. Potebny. Kyiv: Nauk. dumka. (in Russian)

17. Liutsynsky K. (1998). Lynhvystycheskye kharakterystyky termyna [Linguistic characteristics of the term]. *Visnyk Derzh. un-tu "Lvivska politekhnika"*, no. 336, pp. 17–22.

18. Matsiuk H. P. (1986). Spetsyalyzatsyia znachenyi obshcheupotrebytelnыkh slov v systeme termynolohyy [Specialization of meanings of commonly used words in the terminology system]. *Vestnyk Lvovskoho unyversyteta*, vol. 17, pp. 32–35.

19. Mykhailyshyn B., Stakhiv P. (1994). Terminy ta profesionalizmy: problemy dyferentsiatsii spetsialnoi leksyky [Terms and professionalisms: problems of differentiation of special vocabulary]. *Problemy ukrainskoi naukovo-tekhnichnoi terminolohii*: Tezy dop. 3-oi Mizhnar. nauk. konf. Lviv, pp. 89–90. (in Ukrainian)

20. Mykhailova T. V. (2001). *Semantychni vidnoshennia v ukrainskii naukovo-tekhnichnii terminolohii* [Semantic relationships in Ukrainian scientific and technical terminology]: dys. … kand. filol. nauk: 10.02.01. Kharkiv. (in Ukrainian)

21. Nepyivoda N. F. (1997). *Mova ukrainskoi naukovo-tekhnichnoi literatury (funktsionalno-stylistychnyi aspekt)* [The language of Ukrainian scientific and technical literature (functional and stylistic aspect)]. Kyiv: TOV "Mizhnar. fin. ahentsiia". (in Ukrainian)

22. Nikulina N. V. (2009). Teoretychne osmyslennia zahalnykh poniat suchasnoho terminoznavstva u kontseptsiiakh vydatnykh linhvistiv [Theoretical understanding of general concepts of modern terminology in the concepts of outstanding linguists]. *Ukrainska terminolohiia i suchasnist*: Zb. nauk. prats, vol. VIII / vidp. red. prof. L. O. Symonenko. Kyiv: KNEU, pp. 45–49. (in Ukrainian)

23. Ovcharenko V. M. (1968). *Struktura i semantyka naukovo-tekhnichnoho termina* [The structure and semantics of the scientific and technical term]. Kharkiv: Vyd-vo KhDU. (in Ukrainian)

24. Onufriienko H. S. (2000). Synonimichni dominanty zi spilnym korenem inshomovnoho pokhodzhennia u sferi natsionalnoi terminolohii [Synonymous dominants with a common root of foreign origin in the field of national terminology]. *Movoznavstvo,* no. 2–3, pp. 73–76. (in Ukrainian)

25. Panasiuk K. V. (2015). Formuvannia movnoi osobystosti u vyshchomu viiskovomu navchalnomu zakladi [Formation of a linguistic personality in a higher military educational institution]. *Viiskova osvita*: zb. nauk. pr. Natsionalnoho universytetu oborony Ukrainy imeni Ivana Cherniakhovskoho, no. 1 (31), p. 171. (in Ukrainian)

26. Panko T. I., Kochan I. M., Matsiuk H. P. (1994). *Ukrainske terminoznavstvo*: Pidruchnyk [Ukrainian terminology]. Lviv: Svit. (in Ukrainian)

27. Pokrovska O. A. (1996). *Ukrainska terminolohiia rynkovykh vidnosyn* [Ukrainian terminology of market relations]: dys. … kand. filol. nauk: 10.02.01. Kharkiv. (in Ukrainian)

28. Pshenychna L., Shevchenko V., Shyshkina N. *Terminolohichna kultura fakhivtsia – osvitno-navchalnyi proekt* [The terminological culture of a specialist is an educational project]. Available at: http://tc.terminology.lp.edu.ua/TK_Wisnyk733/TK_wisnyk733_1_pshenychna_shevchenko_.htm

29. Radchenko O. I. (2000). *Movna norma i variantnist v ukrainskii naukovii terminolohii* [Linguistic norms and variants in Ukrainian scientific terminology]: dys. … kand. filol. nauk: 10.02.01. Kharkiv. (in Ukrainian)

30. Rodzevych N. S. (1963). Poniattia termin, terminolohiia i nomenklatura v pratsiakh radianskykh i zarubizhnykh uchenykh [The concept of the term, terminology

and nomenclature in the works of Soviet and foreign scientists]. *Leksykohrafichnyi biuleten*. Kyiv: Vyd-vo AN URSR, vol. 9, pp. 6–12. (in Ukrainian)

31. Rudenko S. M. (2000). Zakonomirnosti ta osoblyvosti terminotvorennia u pidmovi hromadskoho kharchuvannia: (Na materiali ukrainskoi terminosystemy "Zmishani napoi") [Regularities and peculiarities of term formation in the context of public catering: (Based on the material of the Ukrainian terminology system "Mixed drinks")]: avtoref. dys. … kand. filol. nauk: 10.02.01. (in Ukrainian)

32. Symonenko L. O. (2001). Ukrainska naukova terminolohiia: stan ta pers-pektyvy rozvytku [Ukrainian scientific terminology: state and prospects of deve-lopment]. *Ukrainska terminolohiia i suchasnist*: zb. nauk. prats. Kyiv: KNEU, vol. IV, pp. 3–8. (in Ukrainian)

33. *Slovnyk profesiinoi terminolohii dlia maibutnikh fakhivtsiv Natsionalnoi hvardii Ukrainy* (do kursu "Ukrainska mova za profesiinym spriamuvanniam") (2016) [Dictionary of professional terminology for future specialists of the National Guard of Ukraine]. Uklad.: M. P. Vovk, R. S. Trotskyi, V. S. Moldavchuk, O. V. Chupryna, O. A. Blinov, S. I. Shepel / za red. A. O. Pozhydaieva. Kyiv: NAVS Ukrainy. (in Ukrainian)

34. Stakhovska N. (2001). Termin yak element systemy movnoho vyrazhennia spetsialnykh poniat [The term as an element of the system of language expres-sion of special concepts]. *Ukrainska terminolohiia i suchasnist*: zb. nauk. prats / Vidp. red. L. O. Symonenko. Kyiv: KNEU, vol. IV, pp. 277–280. (in Ukrainian)

35. Turovska L. V. (2005). Terminy ta nomeny v naukovo-tekhnichnii sferi [Terms and names in the scientific and technical sphere]. *Ukrainska terminolohiia i suchasnist*: Zb. nauk. prats / vidp. red. prof. L. O. Symonenko. Kyiv: KNEU, vol. VI, pp. 225–229. (in Ukrainian)

36. *Ukrainska mova: Entsyklopediia* [Ukrainian language: Encyclopedia] (2004) / redkol.: Rusanivskyi V. M. (spivholova), Taranenko O. O. (spiv-hol.), Ziabliuk M. P. ta in. 2-he vyd., vypr. i dop. Kyiv: Vyd-vo "Ukr.entsykl." im. M. P. Bazhana. (in Ukrainian)

37. Khudolieieva S. P. (1978). Pro pryrodu terminiv-synonimiv [About the nature of synonymous terms]. *Movoznavstvo*, no. 4, pp. 49–52. (in Ukrainian)

38. Chuieshkova O. V. (2002). *Analitychni nominatsii v ekonomichnii termino-systemi (strukturno-typolohichnyi aspekt)* [Analytical nominations in the economic terminology (structural-typological aspect)]: dys. … kand. filol. nauk: 10.02.01. Kharkiv. (in Ukrainian)

39. Shevchuk S. V., Klymenko I. V. (2014). *Ukrainska mova za profesiinym spriamuvanniam*: pidr. [Ukrainian language for professional direction]. 4-te vyd., vyprav. i dop. Kyiv: Alerta. (in Ukrainian)

40. Yatsenko N. *Osnovni etapy stanovlennia viiskovoi terminolohii* [The main stages of formation of military terminology]. Available at: http://term-in.org/goods/15-1-1-1/category/id78/

41. Yatsenko N. (2007) Semantychni protsesy v ukrainskii viiskovii terminolo-hii (nazvy odiahu) [Semantic processes in Ukrainian military terminology (names of clothing)]. *Ukrainska terminolohiia i suchasnist*: zb. nauk. prats / Vidp. red. L. O. Symonenko. Kyiv: KNEU, vol. VII, pp. 317–321. (in Ukrainian)