

*Serhiienko T. M.,*

*Candidate of Pedagogical Sciences,*

*Professor at the Department of Foreign Languages National Army Academy named after Hetman Petro Sahaidachny*

*<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5680-994X>*

*Shoptenko V. R.,*

*Lecturer at the Department of Foreign Languages*

*National Army Academy named after Hetman Petro Sahaidachny*

*<https://orcid.org/0009-0007-5976-7440>*

*Denysiuk Yu. I.,*

*Candidate of Philological Sciences,*

*Associate Professor at the Department of Foreign Languages*

*National Army Academy named after Hetman Petro Sahaidachny*

*<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0099-1572>*

## THE TRANSLATION IN MILITARY DISCOURSE AS A TOOL OF IDEOLOGICAL INFLUENCE: NARRATIVE MECHANISMS AND POLITICAL POSITIONING

**Summary.** This article examines translation in military discourse as a special form of socially communicative activity that is directly influenced by ideological, political, and media factors. It justifies the thesis that translation cannot be neutral in the context of military confrontation and information warfare, where language is an instrument of power and a means of constructing social reality. Translation is examined through the prism of socio-constructivist and discursive approaches, as well as within the framework of critical discourse analysis, which allows us to trace the relationship between linguistic decisions, ideology, and institutional context.

Specific attention is focused on journalistic translation as a mechanism for shaping and transmitting social and international discourses. Based on current research and examples of translation practices in the context of the Palestine-Israel conflict and the Russia-Ukraine war, the translation of politically marked terms and proper names, as well as the adaptation of media texts to the national information space, are analyzed. It has been shown that translation strategies are aimed not only at the transfer of meaning, but also at maintaining dominant interpretative frameworks, legitimizing certain positions, and consolidating society.

It has been proven that interpreters in military discourse are active agents of discourse creation and mediators between global and local information spaces. Translation in such conditions acquires strategic importance, performing interpretative, normative, and ideological functions at the same time.

**Key words:** military discourse, ideology, media translation, critical discourse analysis, narrative.

In today's highly globalized information space, where armed conflicts are frequently combined with intense information warfare, translation is no longer just a linguistic process of recreating a foreign-language document. Translation becomes a tool for political, ideological, and social influence, acquiring strategic importance.

Public opinion is shaped by foreign-language broadcasting, international support, and diplomatic decisions.

In wartime, translation directly affects how society interprets the conflict and the values highlighted in the collective consciousness. Studying translation in conflict situations allows us to gain a deeper understanding of the relationship between language, politics, and ideology. Translation can create a global vision of war and help maintain social morale.

**Problem overview.** The interest in situations of military conflict translation intensified after the 2000s, due to armed operations in Iraq and Afghanistan, as well as an increase in global information flow. During this period, translation began to be viewed not only as a tool for Interlingua communication but also as a component of military and political strategy [1].

In such conditions, translation creates political and cultural discourses that can promote intercultural understanding or deepen antagonism. Since interpreters are often involved in institutions with their own ideological interests, complete neutrality is impossible [2]. In the information warfare situations, language becomes a political resource and translation becomes a platform for ideological competition.

**The research methods.** The empirical basis of the study is a collection of translated media texts to Palestine – Israel conflict and Russian – Ukrainian war. The analysis includes among 10 publications from English-language media publications (2022–2024) and their Ukrainian translations published in national online media like as translated statements by political figures. The material was selected according to the following criteria, such as availability to the ordinal and translated texts, presence of politically or ideologically marked vocabulary; representativeness of the dominant narratives of the conflict parties.

The methodological basis of the study consists of critical discourse analysis (CDA), narrative analysis and bilingual com-

parative CDA. The analysis was done at the lexical, grammatical and pragmatic levels, taking account strategies of legitimization, delegitimization, euphemization and framing.

Analysis of Recent Studies and Publications. Within the narrative approach, translation is increasingly viewed as a mechanism for creating and sharing social narratives, especially in political tension and war situations. According to Baker translation is a form of narrative practice that influences collective memory, identity, and the ideological framework through which the events are perceived [3]. Studies of narratives in media discourse are also important because war is presented through established interpretive schemes, or frames, which are subsequently reproduced in translated texts [4]. Contemporary translation studies view translation in conflict and war contexts as an interdisciplinary phenomenon at the intersection of linguistics, political science, sociology, and media studies. Since the late 20th and early 21st centuries, researchers have increasingly rejected the idea of translation as a neutral transfer of meaning. Instead, they emphasize its discursive and ideological context.

The studies of L. Rosendo, A. Kamyants, A. Ayyad, and M. Baker form the theoretical basis of contemporary studies on translation in conflict situations. Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) occupies a central place in these studies, allowing us to examine the relationship between linguistic structures, power, and ideology. Applying CDA to translation studies has revealed that translation decisions are often the result of institutional pressure, political engagement, or the expectations of the target audience.

A. Kamyants focuses on journalistic translation in the context of military conflicts using a bilingual comparative critical discourse analysis (CDA) approach [6]. The scholar demonstrates that translation in the media acts as a form of “gatekeeping”, the selecting, reconstructing, and interpreting of information for the national information space. In this context, the interpreter effectively acts as an effective mediator between global and local discourses.

A. Ayyad analyzes the translation of politically fraught terms and toponyms in the Israel-Palestine conflict, proving that translation choice directly influences the legitimization or delegitimization of the parties’ political positions [5]. M. Baker and Ruiz Rosendo L. further develop the concept of interpreter positionality, emphasizing that interpreters in conflict actively construct narratives [1; 2]. They also highlight the ethical dilemmas, professional risks, and social vulnerability that interpreters face in war zones.

Thus, such research shows that translation in military conflict is a socially conditioned activity that reflects power asymmetries, ideological confrontations, and media strategies.

Results of the study. According to socioconstructivism and narrative approaches, translation in military discourse should be considered within the framework of which language reflects and constructs reality through dominant narratives and frames [2; 3]. In this aspect, translation acts as a mechanism for the secondary modeling of reality by adapting the events of war to the value orientations of a specific society. Military discourse is characterized by a high level of evaluativeness, polarization, and ideological marking, which directly influences translation strategies.

Within this discourse, the key categories are narrative, frame, ideology, positionality, and interpretation. Interpreters are forced to choose among alternative linguistic options, each of which may carry different political and emotional implications. This choice becomes the intersection point between language and ideology.

This agency transformation is evident in its translation of reports on military events. Replacing the construction “civilians were killed” with “Russian forces killed civilians” or removing the subject of the action significantly alters the distribution of responsibility and the event’s moral assessment. These grammatical changes seemingly neutral at first glance, actually align the message with a specific narrative of responsibility or its obfuscation consistent with M. Baker’s concept of renarration.

The following types of translation transformations were identified within the analysis collection:

Euphemization: invasion – special military operation.

Modification of agency: “civilian were killed” to Russian forces killed civilians”.

Zneutralization of evaluation (settlements – occupation settlements).

Tonym frame replacement (Judea and Samaria – West Bank).

Modalization of legal classification (war time – alleged war crime).

These strategies are systematic and correlate with the dominant political narratives of the respective information spaces.

According to critical discourse analysis, the translation of toponyms in conflict situations serves to mark space ideologically [5]. A. Ayyad’s research demonstrates that the translation of toponyms and politically sensitive terms in the Palestine-Israel conflict illustrates an example of ideologically marked language choice. The use of the names “Judea and Samaria” or “West Bank” reflects different historical and political narratives. A similar situation can be observed in the translation of the phrases “Israeli settlements” and “Israeli Separation Wall,” where semantic modification aims to soften or sharpen the assessment of the party’s actions.

A. Ayyad shows that translating terms such as the “West Bank”, “Israeli settlements”, and “Israeli Separation Wall” directly reflects the parties’ ideological position. Israeli political discourse appeals to biblical tradition (“Judea and Samaria”), while Arab uses the internationally recognized term “West Bank,” which legitimizes the Palestinian narrative. The softening or negativization of concepts (“settlements,” “wall/fence”) shows that even established terms in international discourse are not neutral. The choice of an equivalent translation can either legitimize or delegitimize one of the parties to the conflict.

Thus, the analyzed set reveals a recurring tendency toward ideological labeling of toponyms and politically sensitive vocabulary. In these cases, translation choices perform not only a nominative but also a normative function, shaping the interpretive framework of international perceptions of the conflict.

Similar ideological tensions are evident in the translation of the Arabic lexeme “martyr”, which has a positive connotation of sacrifice in Arabic political discourse. However, in English translations, it is often neutralized or replaced with “militant” or “killed fighter”. This substitution not only alters the meaning, but also transforms the moral framework through which the event is interpreted, demonstrating that translation can be a tool for delegitimization or heroization.

Such translation decisions create an interpretative framework through which the international audience perceives the conflict. In this case, translation performs a normative rather than a descriptive function.

Current studies on journalistic translation emphasize that media texts translated during wartime align with the expectations

of the national audience and the dominant political discourse [6]. A. Kamyanyets's research analyzes Ukrainian media translations of Western authors' publications. The results show how texts are adapted to the national information space to maintain the moral spirit of society and the national context. Translation is particularly significant in journalistic discourse, where the rapid dissemination of information is balanced with the requirement of ideological consistency.

Changes in the text structure, lexical choices, emotionally charged elements and authorial insertions aim to maintain social cohesion and morale during wartime. In this process, the translator effectively becomes a co-author, responsible for the text's pragmatic effect. Translated media texts, in particular, may undergo reduction or expansion of context. For example, fragments critical of Ukraine are sometimes shortened, while statements about international support receive additional emphasis. These changes demonstrate the role of gatekeeping through translation. Additionally, the inclusion of emotionally charged terms like "massive strike" or "heavy shelling" intensifies the text pragmatic effect and helps consolidate the audience.

The moral dilemma faced by interpreters in war zones is a popular topic in translation studies these days. Researchers emphasize the vulnerable position of these interpreters who must balance professional standards with the demands of military reality [1; 2]. Translation in a military context is accompanied by numerous ethical dilemmas. Interpreters find themselves caught between the requirements of professional standards, personal beliefs, and societal expectations. Additional factors include danger to life, low social status, and unclear boundaries of responsibility. These factors highlight the need to reconsider the role of translators in conflict discourse as both specialists and social actors.

In this context, the institutional dependence of military interpreters is indicative. They are forced to use terminology established by official discourse such as, "operation" instead of "invasion". Self-censorship can be a strategy for professional survival amid security threats, which underscores the interpreter's role as a social actor.

At the lexical level, such replacement is an example of euphemization, which reduces the level of aggressiveness of nomination. At the syntactic level, it is often accompanied by the use of passive constructions that blur the subject of the action. At the pragmatic level, this contributes to the formation of narrative of minimization of responsibility and positive self-representation.

Translations of Boris Johnson's articles in *Hromadske* and *Focus* maintain the original's general meaning, but through structural changes, highlighting key points, and emotional labeling, they reinforce the idea that the West supports Ukraine. In contrast, John Wolfsthal's translated article contains authorial insertions, irony and an honest evaluation of the US's role, indicating the translator's active position as a participant in media discourse.

Another example of ideological variability is the translation of phrases such as "war crime," "alleged war crime," or "incident." The addition of the word "alleged" can transform the legal and moral assessment of an event, shifting it from the category of established fact to the realm of assumption. These microstructural changes demonstrate translation's normative function in conflict situations.

Thus, journalistic translation in wartime serves as a form of interpretative tool that meets public expectations and the demands of the political context. In a military context, translation functions as a political and ideological tool. This is evident in both the Palestinian-Israeli conflict and the Russian-Ukrainian war.

**Conclusions.** The results are consistent with contemporary theories of translation as a social practice and with research on the translation of politically sensitive discourses.

The study revealed that translation in military discourse is a complex socially conditioned process that transcends traditional understanding of translation as merely a linguistic activity. In the context of military conflict, translation serves as an ideological tool that shapes political narratives and constructs social reality.

In such conditions, translation work is characterized by a lack of neutrality because every decision reflects a particular position and value system. Journalistic translation plays a key role in maintaining balance in society by providing accurate information and supporting morale and national identity.

Further research should focus on an in-depth analysis of the ethical standards of translation during wartime and the development of methodological approaches to studying translation as a social and political practice.

#### *Bibliography:*

1. Baker M. *Interpreters and Translators in the War Zone. The Translator.* 2010. Vol. 16, No. 2. P. 197–222. DOI: 10.1080/13556509.2010.10799469.
2. Ruiz Rosendo L. *Translation and Interpreting in Conflict. The Oxford Handbook of Translation and Social Practices.* Oxford : Oxford University Press, 2020. P. 45–65.
3. Baker M. *Translation and conflict: a narrative account.* London : Routledge, 2006.
4. Somers M. R. *The narrative constitution of identity: A relational and network approach. Theory and Society.* 1994. Vol. 23, No. 5. P. 605–649.
5. Ayyad A. *Contested naming practices in the Palestinian-Israeli conflict : a translation perspective. Translation Studies.* 2023. DOI: 10.1080/14781700.2023.2258133.
6. Kamyanyets A. *Constructing competing discourses on the Russo-Ukrainian war: journalistic translation in wartime. Cognition, communication, discourse.* 2024. № 29. P. 25–41. DOI: 10.26565/2218-2926-2024-29-02.

**Сергієнко Т., Денисюк Ю., Шоптенко В. Переклад у воєнному дискурсі як інструмент ідеологічного конструювання: наративні механізми та політична позиційність**

**Анотація.** У статті досліджується переклад у воєнному дискурсі як особлива форма соціально зумовленої комунікативної діяльності, що перебуває під безпосереднім впливом ідеологічних, політичних і медійних чинників. Обґрунтовано тезу про неможливість нейтральності перекладацької діяльності в умовах військового протистояння та інформаційної війни, де мова функціонує як інструмент влади й засіб конструювання соціальної реальності. Переклад розглянуто крізь призму соціоконструктивістського та наративного підходів, а також у межах критичного дискурсу-аналізу, що дозволяє простежити взаємозв'язок між мовними рішеннями, ідеологією та інституційним контекстом.

Особливу увагу приділено журналістському перекладу як механізму формування та трансляції суспільних і міжнародних наративів. На матеріалі сучасних досліджень

і прикладів перекладацьких практик у контексті палестинсько-ізраїльського конфлікту та російсько-української війни проаналізовано переклад політично маркованих термінів і топонімів, а також адаптацію медійних текстів до національного інформаційного простору. Встановлено, що перекладацькі стратегії спрямовані не лише на передачу змісту, а й на підтримання доміантних інтерпретаційних рамок, легітимацію певних позицій та консолідацію суспільства.

Доведено, що перекладач у воєнному дискурсі виступає активним суб'єктом наративотворення й медіатором між глобальним та локальним інформаційними просторами. Переклад у таких умовах набуває стратегічного зна-

чення, виконуючи водночас інтерпретаційну, нормативну та ідеологічну функції.

**Ключові слова:** воєнний дискурс, ідеологія, переклад у ЗМІ, критичний дискурс-аналіз, наратив.

Дата першого надходження статті до видання: 17.02.2026

Дата прийняття статті до друку після рецензування: 12.03.2026

Дата публікації (оприлюднення) статті: 29.04.2026