



## RENDERING THE PARTICIPLE IN THE TRANSLATION OF ENGLISH AND UKRAINIAN MILITARY TEXTS: A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS

**Leshchenko A. V.**

*Lecturer at the Department of Philology and Military Translation  
Kyiv Institute of the National Guard of Ukraine  
Oborony Kyieva str., 7, Kyiv, Ukraine  
orcid.org/0000-0001-5871-0871  
leshchenko.anzhelika@gmail.com*

**Key words:** *participle, military discourse, military translation, translation transformations, English-Ukrainian translation, Ukrainian-English translation, syntactic compression.*

The article examines the rendering of the participle and participial constructions in the translation of English and Ukrainian military texts. The relevance of the study is determined by the growing role of military translation and by the structural asymmetry of English and Ukrainian in expressing processual features. The aim of the research is to identify the main models and translation transformations used in rendering the participle in English-Ukrainian and Ukrainian-English translation of military texts. The object of the study is the participle and participial constructions as grammatical means of expressing processual features in English and Ukrainian military discourse, whereas the subject is the ways, models, and translation transformations involved in their rendering in English-Ukrainian and Ukrainian-English translation. The material of the study comprises English-language and Ukrainian-language military texts selected from open-access official, doctrinal, and analytical sources. The research employs contrastive, contextual-interpretive, and translation analysis. It has been established that in English the participle is a productive means of syntactic compression, while in Ukrainian its functioning is more limited and often requires syntactic expansion. It is proved that the choice of a translation strategy depends not only on the grammatical form itself, but also on the genre of the text, its pragmatic orientation, terminological environment, and the requirement for accuracy and unambiguity. The most common translation solutions include rendering by means of a participle, an adjective, a finite verb form, a subordinate clause, a verbal adverbial construction, or a descriptive structure. The study shows that English-Ukrainian translation is characterized mainly by segmentation, substitution, and subordinate expansion, whereas Ukrainian-English translation tends to compress meaning through participial forms. The scientific novelty lies in substantiating a functional-pragmatic approach to participle translation in military discourse, according to which priority should be given not to the formal preservation of a grammatical pattern, but to the adequate rendering of logical-semantic relations and the communicative function of the utterance. The practical value of the results lies in their applicability to the training of military translators and the teaching of translation-oriented disciplines.

## ВІДТВОРЕННЯ ДІЄПРИКМЕТНИКА В ПЕРЕКЛАДІ АНГЛІЙСЬКИХ ТА УКРАЇНСЬКИХ ВІЙСЬКОВИХ ТЕКСТІВ: ПОРІВНЯЛЬНИЙ АНАЛІЗ

**Лещенко А. В.**

*викладач кафедри філології та військового перекладу*

*Київський інститут Національної гвардії України*

*вул. Оборони Києва, 7, Київ, Україна*

*orcid.org/0000-0001-5871-0871*

*leshchenko.anzhelika@gmail.com*

**Ключові слова:**

*дієприкметник, військовий дискурс, військовий переклад, перекладацькі трансформації, англо-український переклад, українсько-англійський переклад, синтаксична компресія.*

У статті досліджено особливості відтворення дієприкметника та дієприкметникових конструкцій у перекладі англійських і українських військових текстів. Актуальність теми зумовлена зростанням ролі військового перекладу та структурною асиметрією англійської й української мов у сфері вираження процесуальної ознаки. Метою дослідження є виявлення основних моделей і перекладацьких трансформацій, що застосовуються під час відтворення дієприкметника в англо-українському та українсько-англійському перекладі військових текстів. Об'єктом дослідження є дієприкметник і дієприкметникові конструкції як граматичні засоби вираження процесуальної ознаки в англійському й українському військовому дискурсі, а предметом – способи, моделі та перекладацькі трансформації їх відтворення в англо-українському та українсько-англійському перекладі. Матеріал дослідження становлять англійські й українські військові тексти, відібрані з відкритих офіційних, доктринальних та аналітичних джерел. У роботі використано методи зіставного, контекстуально-інтерпретаційного та перекладознавчого аналізу. Встановлено, що в англійській мові дієприкметник є продуктивним засобом синтаксичної компресії, тоді як в українській мові його функціонування є обмеженішим і часто потребує синтаксичного розгортання. Доведено, що вибір способу відтворення дієприкметника залежить не лише від граматичної форми, а й від жанру тексту, прагматичної настанови, термінологічного оточення та вимоги до точності повідомлення. Виокремлено найтиповіші способи перекладу: передача дієприкметником, прикметником, особовою дієслівною формою, підрядним реченням, дієприслівниковим зворотом і описовою конструкцією. З'ясовано, що в англо-українському перекладі переважають трансформації членування, заміни та підрядного розгортання, тоді як в українсько-англійському перекладі спостерігається тенденція до компресії змісту за допомогою дієприкметникових форм. Наукова новизна полягає в обґрунтуванні функційно-прагматичного підходу до перекладу дієприкметника у військовому дискурсі, за яким визначальним є не формальне збереження моделі, а адекватне відтворення логіко-сміслових відношень і комунікативної функції висловлення. Практичне значення результатів полягає у можливості їх використання під час підготовки військових перекладачів та у викладанні перекладознавчих дисциплін.

**Problem Statement.** In contemporary translation studies, the problem of rendering the participle occupies a special place, since this grammatical form lies at the intersection of verbal and adjectival semantics and therefore displays heightened sensitivity to interlingual asymmetries. For English and Ukrainian, this problem is especially relevant because English actively employs participial forms and participial constructions as a means of syntactic compression,

whereas Ukrainian much more often unfolds the corresponding meaning into a subordinate clause, a finite verb form, an adjective, an adverbial participle, or a descriptive construction. L. Statkevych and T. Korzh-Ikaieva rightly emphasize that these grammatical units “have no clear equivalents in Ukrainian and English” [Статкевич, Корж-Ікаєва, 2020, р. 170]. It is precisely this mismatch that gives rise to translation difficulties which, under the conditions of mili-

tary discourse, become not merely a linguistic issue but also a communicative and pragmatic one.

The relevance of the topic is reinforced by the specificity of military texts. In such texts, concise presentation, precision, unambiguity, preservation of action logic, temporal sequence, cause-and-effect relations, and the functional load of each unit are of paramount importance. O. Push and N. Hasiuk stress the “relevance of military translation,” which in present-day conditions must ensure prompt and accurate interaction between Ukrainian military personnel and international partners [Пуш, Гасюк, 2022, p. 306]. M. Kolisnyk, in turn, notes that one of the key challenges in translating military texts is the “lack of equivalent terminology” [Kolisnyk, 2022, p. 486]; however, in practice, the lack of equivalence concerns not only terminological systems, but also the grammatical means used to organize content, participles in particular.

An analysis of recent studies and publications demonstrates that the problem of translating the participle has already been addressed both in Ukrainian and in English-language linguistics, though mostly on the material of general-language or literary discourse. L. Statkevych and T. Korzh-Ikaieva investigated the functional and structural differences between the Ukrainian participle, the English participle, and the gerund, focusing on the comparative aspect of this issue [Статкевич, Корж-Ікаєва, 2020, pp. 167-170]. S. Ostapenko examined the practical principles of rendering the participle into Ukrainian and showed that, in Ukrainian, the participle has “no exact equivalent” [Ostapenko, 2020, p. 315]. N. Ababilova and V. Volkova, on the basis of the Ukrainian translation of Dan Brown's novel, proved that English participial constructions were “most often translated as part of a complex sentence” [Абабілова, Волкова, 2023, p. 46]. Thus, linguistics has already laid the groundwork for understanding the translation of the participle as an interlingual problem, yet this groundwork has largely been formed outside military discourse.

At the same time, studies devoted to military discourse focus primarily on military terminology, translation transformations, pragmatics, and the structure of military communication. R. Sorich, T. Koroliova, and O. Aleksandrova emphasize that “military discourse is institutional discourse” [Корольова, Соріч, Александрова, 2021, p. 370], and therefore it is governed by the norms of professional communication, where grammatical choice is closely linked to the function of the text. O. Yemelyanova and O. Shkurko underline that the military-political sphere rapidly produces new denominations and therefore “requires further systematization” [Yemelyanova, Shkurko, 2024, p. 230]. S. Fedorenko, V. Doroshenko, and S. Honcharenko show that the reproduction of Eng-

lish military vocabulary is a multilevel process that presupposes consideration of the “pragmatic potential” of units and “a balance between terminological accuracy and clarity” [Fedorenko, Doroshenko, Honcharenko, 2025, p. 188]. However, in these works the grammatical level, particularly the translation of the participle, is not the central object of analysis.

Accordingly, the previously unresolved part of the broader problem is the absence of a specialized study devoted specifically to rendering the participle and participial constructions in the translation of English and Ukrainian military texts. In other words, we are dealing with two relatively developed but insufficiently integrated lines of scholarly inquiry: the first concerns the translation of the participle as a grammatical category, while the second concerns military translation as a specialized form of interlingual communication. It is precisely at the intersection of these two directions that the need arises to formulate an integral model for the translation rendering of the participle in military discourse. In our view, such an approach supplements existing ideas about the problem, since it shifts the focus from morphological description to a functional and pragmatic analysis within a specialized text.

**The main purpose** of the article is to identify the regularities governing the rendering of the participle and participial constructions in the translation of English and Ukrainian military texts, as well as to develop a functional and pragmatic model of their translation interpretation.

To achieve this purpose, the following tasks were set: to clarify the linguistic nature of the participle in English and Ukrainian; to outline the principal genre and stylistic features of military texts that affect translation; to determine the typical ways of rendering English participles into Ukrainian and Ukrainian participial forms into English; to establish in which cases it is expedient to preserve the participial structure and in which cases grammatical transformation should be employed; and to formulate practical recommendations for translating military documents, instructions, reports, and news items. The theoretical basis for accomplishing these tasks is provided by studies on the translation of the participle, military discourse, military terminology, and the pragmatics of military translation. The material of the study comprises English-language and Ukrainian-language military texts selected from open-access official, doctrinal, and analytical sources. The source base includes U.S. Army professional and doctrinal publications, Army University Press materials, official publications of the UK Ministry of Defence, official materials of the Ministry of Defence of Ukraine, and analytical assessments of the Institute for the Study of War. The examples discussed in the analytical part were selected from this source base and, where nec-

essary, minimally adapted for contrastive translation commentary while preserving the relevant participial structure and military-semantic context. Alongside exact or closely source-based examples, the article also uses generalized model collocations derived from the same discourse base and intended to illustrate recurrent participial patterns in military communication.

The object of the research is the participle and participial constructions as a grammatical category and as a means of syntactic compression in English and Ukrainian military discourse. The subject of the research is the ways, models, and translation transformations involved in rendering participial forms and constructions in English-Ukrainian and Ukrainian-English military translation.

**Results and Findings.** The participle in English and Ukrainian occupies a common peripheral position between the verb and the adjective, yet their functional capabilities do not coincide. In English, the participle is an extremely productive means of concisely expressing quality, action, cause, attendant circumstance, and anteriority or simultaneity. In Ukrainian, the participle is less frequent in live usage; as S. Ostapenko notes, the Ukrainian participle is used less often because it has a “bookish character” [Ostapenko, 2020, p. 315]. The scholar also stresses that it can express only an action simultaneous with or prior to the action of the predicate [Ostapenko, 2020, p. 315]. This means that, even given formal similarity, English participial forms and Ukrainian participles are not interchangeable. For that reason, direct grammatical calquing does not ensure an adequate result in most cases.

From the translational perspective, English Participle I and Participle II require differentiated treatment. Participle I usually expresses an active, processual, simultaneous, or adverbial meaning and, in English-Ukrainian translation, is more often rendered by a finite verb form, an adverbial participial construction, or a subordinate clause. This tendency can be illustrated by examples such as *Having secured Namji-ri, Murch began an advance up the road toward Yongsan* [Robertson, 1986], where the participial form is more naturally translated into Ukrainian through syntactic expansion or adverbial restructuring: *Після того як Мерч забезпечив контроль над Намджі-рі, він розпочав просування дорогою до Йонгсана* or *Закріпившись у Намджі-рі, Мерч розпочав просування дорогою до Йонгсана*. Likewise, in combinations such as *forces operating in northwestern Myrnohrad* [ISW, 2025] or *a Ukrainian drone battalion operating in the Slovyansk direction* [ISW, 2026], Participle I is more naturally rendered by a relative clause in Ukrainian: *сили, що діють..., батальйон, який діє...* Participle II, by contrast, more often conveys a passive, resultative, or com-

pleted feature and therefore more readily preserves compact attributive structure in Ukrainian translation. This is evident in combinations such as *captured documents, wounded personnel, secured area, and damaged infrastructure*, which can be rendered as *захоплені документи, поранений особовий склад / поранені військовослужбовці, убезпечений район, пошкоджена інфраструктура* [МОУ, 2026]. Thus, Participle I more often triggers syntactic expansion in Ukrainian, whereas Participle II more often preserves compact attributive or resultative meaning.

Against this background, the military text acquires special significance, since participial forms in it perform not only a descriptive but also a structural and organizing function. As scholars emphasize, military discourse is professionally oriented, institutionally regulated, and pragmatically loaded [Корольова, Соріч, Александрова, 2021, pp. 370-371]. In it, linguistic economy is not a stylistic embellishment but a means of increasing the efficiency of perception. This is why English participial constructions in orders, briefings, or after-action reports often serve to compress the message: they allow a background action, state, or circumstance to be moved to the periphery of the sentence without loss of meaning. Ukrainian translation, however, must take into account not only the requirement of concision but also the requirement of unambiguity. In military communication, any grammatical obscurity may lead to a shift in emphasis, the incorrect identification of the doer of the action, a misinterpretation of temporal relations, or a distortion of the logic of the operation.

It is significant that, in the study of military discourse conducted by R. Sorich, T. Koroliova, and O. Aleksandrova, among 230 cases of translation transformations, lexical transformations proved to be the most frequent, including calquing, transliteration, lexical and semantic substitutions, concretization, generalization, and modulation [Корольова, Соріч, Александрова, 2021, pp. 370, 378]. This indicates the strong dependence of military translation on the terminological level, yet it does not negate the importance of the grammatical level. On the contrary, it is precisely the combination of terminological precision and grammatical adequacy that ensures the normativity of translation. Contemporary works on military translation increasingly testify to the need for a comprehensive approach under which the translator must control both specialized vocabulary and the grammatical structures that organize professional meaning.

The examples discussed below are drawn from the source base specified above and, in some cases, minimally adapted for contrastive translation analysis.

In this context, it is expedient to propose a functional and pragmatic typology of rendering the participle in military translation. In our opinion, four principal groups of participial uses may be distinguished

in military texts. The first group comprises **attributive participles** that specify the status, state, or result of an action with respect to an object: *damaged infrastructure, deployed forces, reinforced position, captured documents*. The second group comprises **adverbial participial** forms that convey an accompanying or preceding action: *having secured Namji-ri, Murch began an advance up the road toward Yongsan* [Robertson, 1986]. The third group includes **resultative or passive forms** in which the participle actualizes the state of an object after a certain action: *wounded personnel, secured area, a bridge destroyed by Coalition air strikes*. The fourth group covers background constructions close to **absolute structures**, for example: *with the bridge destroyed where RTE CONDOR crossed PL ORANGE, the primary threat of mechanized movement was along that path* [CALL, 2023].

Attributive participles constitute one of the most frequent types in military texts, especially in analytical reports, doctrinal materials, and descriptions of forces, assets, and battlefield conditions. When dealing with stable attributive combinations such as *damaged infrastructure, deployed forces, wounded personnel*, or *secured area*, Ukrainian translation often preserves the attributive structure: *пошкоджена інфраструктура, розгорнуті сили, поранені військовослужбовці / поранений особовий склад, забезпечений район* [МОУ, 2026]. In such cases, formal correspondence is possible and expedient because the Ukrainian participial or adjectival form does not reduce clarity and accords with the norms of military and official style. However, in constructions such as *forces operating in northwestern Myrnohrad* [ISW, 2025] or *a battalion operating in the Slovyansk direction* [ISW, 2026], literal rendering by means of an active Ukrainian participial form would sound stylistically unnatural; therefore, a more adequate solution is a subordinate attributive structure: *сили, що діють..., батальйон, який діє...*. Consequently, in attributive use the principal criterion of choice is not the grammatical form as such, but the degree of normativity and naturalness in the target language. This regularity is consistent with S. Ostapenko's conclusion that the participle may be rendered by an adjective, noun, adverb, adverbial participle, or the predicative part of a subordinate clause [Ostapenko, 2020, pp. 314-315].

In adverbial position, the English participle reveals an even greater asymmetry in relation to Ukrainian. A representative example is *Having secured Namji-ri, Murch began an advance up the road toward Yongsan* [Robertson, 1986]. In Ukrainian translation, such a structure is more naturally rendered through syntactic expansion or adverbial restructuring: *Після того як було забезпечено контроль над Намджі-рі, Мерч розпочав просування дорогою до Йонгсана* or *Закріпившись у Намджі-рі, Мерч*

*розпочав просування дорогою до Йонгсана*. The choice between a subordinate construction and an adverbial participial phrase depends on genre: in a formal report or doctrinal text, the expanded variant is usually clearer; in a concise operational message, the adverbial variant may also be acceptable. What matters here is not formal imitation of the participial structure, but adequate reproduction of temporal and causal relations and of the operational logic of the action. S. Ostapenko rightly relates this to the fact that the translator is compelled to apply grammatical transformations, since there is only partial commonality between English and Ukrainian [Ostapenko, 2020, p. 315].

Passive and resultative participles in English-language military texts are especially important for describing the consequences or status of an action. Combinations such as *captured documents, wounded personnel, secured area, and damaged infrastructure* may be translated by Ukrainian participles or adjectives provided that unambiguity is preserved: *захоплені документи, поранені військовослужбовці / поранений особовий склад, забезпечений район, пошкоджена інфраструктура*. However, when the participle is accompanied by additional modifiers or embedded in a broader syntactic sequence, translation may require reformatting. This is especially evident in backgrounded resultative patterns such as *with the bridge destroyed...* [CALL, 2023], where Ukrainian usually makes the predicative relation explicit. Thus, Participle II more readily preserves compact attributive semantics than Participle I, but it may still require syntactic restructuring when the logical relation needs to be made more transparent.

Background constructions close to absolute participial patterns require separate consideration because they most clearly demonstrate the difference between English compression and the Ukrainian tendency toward explicit predication. A representative example is *With the bridge destroyed where RTE CONDOR crossed PL ORANGE, the primary threat of mechanized movement was along that path* [CALL, 2023]. In Ukrainian translation, such a structure is more naturally unfolded into an explicit clause: *Оскільки міст у місці перетину маршруту CONDOR з рубежем PL ORANGE був зруйнований, основна загроза механізованого просування пролягала саме цим напрямком*. Such cases show that formally compact English constructions often encode secondary predication which Ukrainian military style tends to express more overtly. Therefore, in translating absolute or semi-absolute constructions, priority should be given not to formal replication, but to the clear rendering of causal, temporal, or circumstantial relations.

At the same time, the rule of obligatory expansion should not be absolutized. In some cases, preserving

a concise structure is fully appropriate in Ukrainian as well, especially in technical or descriptive fragments. For example, the phrase *vehicle equipped with a remote weapon station* [Duke N., 2014] may be translated as *машина, оснащена дистанційно керованим бойовим модулем*, and such a form is normative, compact, and informative. Therefore, in translation it is important to distinguish between cases where the participle denotes a stable attributive characteristic and cases where it conceals more complex logical and syntactic relations. In the former case, partial preservation of the compact form is acceptable; in the latter, functional expansion is required.

If we turn to the reverse direction of translation, from Ukrainian into English, the situation is no less interesting. Ukrainian military texts are much less saturated with participial constructions, especially in operational communication, yet they widely use adjectives and participles to denote state, result, or official characteristic: *залучені сили, поранені військовослужбовці, посилений підрозділ, ушкоджений об'єкт, визначені цілі* [МОУ, 2026]. In English translation, such units often receive compact participial correspondences: *engaged forces, wounded personnel, reinforced unit, damaged facility, designated targets*. Here, English, on the contrary, makes it possible to condense the expression. In many cases, the English translation even strives for greater compression than the Ukrainian original, since English professional communication in LSP-texts (Language for Specific Purposes) traditionally tends toward compact attributive structures. This tendency is consistent with M. Kolisnyk's conclusion that military texts are a form of LSP texts and that the translator must possess not only linguistic but also subject-matter competence [Kolisnyk, 2022, p. 486].

However, the translation of Ukrainian forms into English is likewise not reduced to the mechanical substitution of a participle. For example, the Ukrainian phrase *підрозділ, який виконує завдання в районі відповідальності* may be rendered as *the unit operating in the area of responsibility*, but in another context as *the unit that is operating in the area of responsibility*. The choice is determined by genre and pragmatics. If we are dealing with an analytical report or memorandum, participial compression is quite natural. If, however, the translated text is intended for an oral briefing, where maximum transparency is crucial, a full predicative form may be more appropriate. Thus, English provides broader opportunities for the participation of the participle in sentence structure, but the translator must ensure that compression does not undermine unambiguity.

Particular attention should be paid to the interrelation of grammatical and terminological precision. In a military text, the participle rarely exists in isolation; most often, it forms part of a terminological or

semi-terminological word combination. For example, *guided missile, mounted patrol, secured area, and suppressed enemy fire* combine lexical specialization with grammatical compactness. Here, an incorrect rendering of the participle can alter not only the form, but also the very professional meaning. This is why S. Fedorenko, V. Doroshenko, and S. Honcharenko emphasize the need to take into account the pragmatic potential of units and to ensure the “accuracy of content transfer” [Fedorenko, Doroshenko, Honcharenko, 2025, p. 188]. For the translator, this means that the decision concerning the way of rendering a participle cannot be made without analyzing the terminological environment. In military translation, grammar and terminology are interdependent.

On the basis of the literature reviewed and the comparative analysis conducted, several principal regularities in rendering the participle in English and Ukrainian military texts may be formulated. First, in military discourse the English participle most often performs a compressive function, and therefore Ukrainian translation naturally tends toward syntactic expansion whenever clarity requires it. Second, participial forms that are part of stable attributive combinations, technical descriptions, or terminological groups are preserved to the greatest extent. Third, absolute and complex adverbial constructions should be translated primarily according to the logic of the relations between events rather than according to the formal model of the source text. Fourth, in the Ukrainian-English direction, English, on the contrary, often allows a higher degree of compression without loss of meaning, although such compression must be motivated by genre and pragmatics.

To summarize, it is worth proposing the following model of translation choice. If the participle forms part of a stable military word combination and denotes a permanent or nomination-relevant feature, a compact equivalent should be sought. If the participle conveys a temporal, causal, conditional, or attendant relation, the dominant type of logical connection should first be determined, and only then should the translator choose between a subordinate clause, an adverbial participial phrase, a finite verb form, or a simple sentence. If the participle is part of an absolute construction, priority should be given to expansion, because it is precisely here that a formal calque most often generates obscurity. If, however, the translation is from Ukrainian into English, a higher degree of participial compression is admissible, but only on condition that it does not impede the recipient's decoding of the message. This constitutes the principal scholarly result of the present article: the translation of the participle in military discourse should be functional and pragmatic rather than formally morphological.

The practical significance of this approach is evident. It may be used in the training of military trans-

lators, in the drafting of methodological guidelines for translating military documents, in the standardization of translation in the English-Ukrainian and Ukrainian-English language pairs, and in the development of training courses in military translation. Under current conditions, when, as scholars observe, military vocabulary is actively entering the sphere of news reporting, analytics, and public communication, control over grammatical precision becomes no less important than control over terminology [Сокаль, Оскирко, Зінченко, 2023, р. 178]. Therefore, attention to the translation of the participle is not a narrowly grammatical issue, but a strategically communicative one.

#### Conclusions and prospects for further research.

The analysis carried out gives grounds for asserting that rendering the participle in the translation of English and Ukrainian military texts is a complex multi-level problem caused by the structural asymmetry of English and Ukrainian, the genre and stylistic specificity of military discourse, and the pragmatic requirements of professional communication. A comparison of contemporary studies has shown that works on the translation of the participle are concentrated mainly on general-language or literary material, whereas studies of military translation predominantly examine terminology, vocabulary, and general translation transformations. A separate result of the study is the establishment of a functional difference between the translation behavior of Participle I and Participle II in military discourse.

It has been established that, in English-Ukrainian translation, the participle and participial constructions most often require grammatical transformations, above all segmentation, subordinate expansion, replacement by a finite verb form, an adjective, or an adverbial participial construction. Attributive participial forms within terminological combinations and technical descriptions are preserved most consistently. Absolute and complex adverbial constructions prove least amenable to direct formal rendering, since for them the reproduction of logical and semantic relations is the priority. In translation from Ukrainian into English, English, on the contrary, often permits a higher degree of syntactic compression by means of the participle, though such compression must be functionally and generically justified.

Prospects for further research in this field are seen in the creation of a corpus of English-language and Ukrainian-language military texts annotated for participial forms and for the ways of their translation; in the study of rendering participial constructions in NATO documents, operational summaries, instructions, after-action review reports, and military-analytical news; and in the development of recommendations for automated and computer-assisted translation of military texts. A separate promising direction is

the comparison of grammatical compression in English-language military documents with the norms of the Ukrainian official style, which will make it possible to define even more precisely the limits of preservation and transformation of participial structures in translation.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Абабілова Н. М., Волкова В. О. Особливості реалізації дієприкметникових конструкцій в українському перекладі роману Д. Брауна «Код да Вінчі». Вісник науки та освіти. 2023. № 4 (10). С. 37–48. DOI: [http://doi.org/10.52058/2786-6165-2023-4\(10\)-37-48](http://doi.org/10.52058/2786-6165-2023-4(10)-37-48).
2. Корольова Т. В., Соріч Р. О., Александрова О. С. Військовий дискурс та особливості його перекладу. Науковий вісник ПНПУ імені К. Д. Ушинського. 2021. № 33. С. 369–384. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24195/2616-5317-2021-33-26>.
3. Міністерство оборони України. Хто оплачує лікування поранених військових і що гарантує держава. 19.02.2026. URL: <https://mod.gov.ua/news/hto-oplachuye-likuvannya-poranenih-vijskovih-i-shho-garantuye-derzhava> (дата звернення: 20.03.2026).
4. Пуш О. М., Гасюк Н. В. Особливості перекладу військової термінології. Науковий вісник Міжнародного гуманітарного університету. Серія: Філологія. 2022. № 58. С. 305–308. DOI: <http://doi.org/10.32841/2409-1154.2022.58.68>.
5. Сокаль М., Оскирко О., Зінченко О. Особливості перекладу військової термінології. Актуальні питання гуманітарних наук. 2023. № 62, ч. 2. С. 173–179. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24919/2308-4863/62-2-28>.
6. Статкевич Л. П., Корж-Ікаєва Т. Г. Особливості перекладу дієприкметника і герундія в українській та англійській мовах. Науковий вісник Дрогобицького державного педагогічного університету імені Івана Франка. Серія: Філологічні науки (мовознавство). 2020. № 14. С. 167–172. DOI: <http://doi.org/10.24919/2663-6042.14.2020.223488>.
7. Center for Army Lessons Learned. Musicians of Mars. Vol. IV: The Mustangs' War: Tactical Vignettes for Professional Discussion. Fort Leavenworth, KS : CALL, 2023. URL: <https://api.army.mil/e2/c/downloads/2023/01/31/dff1903b/20-08-musicians-of-mars-iv-the-mustangs-war-deliberate-attack-public.pdf> (accessed: 22.03.2026).
8. Duke N. Stryker demonstrates potential for increased lethality. The United States Army. 26 Feb. 2014. URL: [https://www.army.mil/article/120848/stryker\\_demonstrates\\_potential\\_for\\_increased\\_lethality](https://www.army.mil/article/120848/stryker_demonstrates_potential_for_increased_lethality) (accessed: 21.03.2026).

9. Fedorenko S., Doroshenko V., Honcharenko S. Pragmatic aspect of reproducing English military vocabulary in Ukrainian. *Науковий вісник ПНПУ імені К. Д. Ушинського*. 2025. № 41. С. 175–190. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24195/2616-5317-2025-41.11>.
10. Institute for the Study of War. Russian Offensive Campaign Assessment, December 21, 2025. URL: <https://understandingwar.org/research/russia-ukraine/russian-offensive-campaign-assessment-december-21-2025/> (accessed: 20.04.2026).
11. Institute for the Study of War. Russian Offensive Campaign Assessment, March 23, 2026. URL: <https://understandingwar.org/research/russia-ukraine/russian-offensive-campaign-assessment-march-23-2026/> (accessed: 21.04.2026).
12. Kolisnyk M. Aspects of Military-Related Text Translation from English into Ukrainian. *Multidisciplinary Academic Notes. Science Research and Practice*. Madrid, 2022. P. 486–489. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.46299/ISG.2022.1.15>.
13. Ostapenko S. A. Practical Principles of Participle Usage and Rendering into Ukrainian in the Process of Literary Texts Translation. *Вісник Університету імені Альфреда Нобеля. Серія «Філологічні науки»*. 2020. № 2 (20). С. 311–317. DOI: <http://doi.org/10.32342/2523-4463-2020-2-20-33>.
14. Robertson W. G. Counterattack on the Naktong, 1950. *Leavenworth Papers*. No. 13. Fort Leavenworth, KS : Army University Press, 1986. URL: <https://www.armyupress.army.mil/Portals/7/combat-studies-institute/csi-books/Robertson-Nakton-LP13.pdf> (accessed: 20.04.2026).
15. Yemelyanova O. V., Shkurko O. V. Features of Translating English-Language Military Discourse. *Науковий вісник Міжнародного гуманітарного університету. Серія: Філологія*. 2024. № 67. С. 229–233. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32782/2409-1154.2024.67.51>.
3. Ministry of Defence of Ukraine. (2026). Khto oplachuie likuvannia poranenykh viiskovykh i shcho harantuie derzhava [Who pays for the treatment of wounded military personnel and what the state guarantees]. URL: <https://mod.gov.ua/news/hto-oplachuye-likuvannya-poranenih-vijskovih-i-shho-garantuye-derzhava> (accessed: 21 April 2026).
4. Push O. M., Hasiuk N. V. (2022). Osoblyvosti perekladu viiskovoi terminologii [Special Considerations in Translating Military Terminology]. *Naukovyi visnyk Mizhnarodnoho humanitarnoho universytetu. Seria: Filolohiia*, vol. 58, pp. 305–308. DOI: <http://doi.org/10.32841/2409-1154.2022.58.68>.
5. Sokal M., Oskyrko O., Zinchenko O. (2023). Osoblyvosti perekladu viiskovoi terminologii [Peculiarities of Translating Military Terminology]. *Aktualni pytannia humanitarnykh nauk*, vol. 62, pp. 173–179. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24919/2308-4863/62-2-28>.
6. Statkevych L. P., Korzh-Ikaieva T. H. (2020). Osoblyvosti perekladu diieprykmetnyka i herundiia v ukrainskii ta anhliiskii movakh [Peculiarities of translating participles and gerunds in Ukrainian and English]. *Naukovyi visnyk Drohobyt'skoho derzhavnoho pedahohichnoho universytetu imeni Ivana Franka. Seria: Filolohichni nauky (movoznavstvo)*, vol. 14, pp. 167–172. DOI: <http://doi.org/10.24919/2663-6042.14.2020.223488>.
7. Center for Army Lessons Learned. *Musicians of Mars. Vol. IV: The Mustangs' War: Tactical Vignettes for Professional Discussion*. Fort Leavenworth, KS : CALL, 2023. URL: <https://api.army.mil/e2/c/downloads/2023/01/31/df1903b/20-08-musicians-of-mars-iv-the-mustangs-war-deliberate-attack-public.pdf> (accessed: 22.03.2026).
8. Duke N. Stryker demonstrates potential for increased lethality. *The United States Army*. 26 Feb. 2014. URL: [https://www.army.mil/article/120848/stryker\\_demonstrates\\_potential\\_for\\_increased\\_lethality](https://www.army.mil/article/120848/stryker_demonstrates_potential_for_increased_lethality) (accessed: 21.03.2026).

## REFERENCES

1. Ababilova N. M., Volkova V. O. (2023). Osoblyvosti realizatsii diieprykmetnykovykh konstruktiv v ukrainskomu perekladi romanu D. Brauna «Kod da Vinchi» [Peculiarities of the particular constructions in the Ukrainian translation of Dan Brown's novel *The Da Vinci Code*] *Visnyk nauky ta osvity*, vol 4 (10), pp. 37–48. DOI: [http://doi.org/10.52058/2786-6165-2023-4\(10\)-37-48](http://doi.org/10.52058/2786-6165-2023-4(10)-37-48).
2. Korolova T. V., Sorich R. O., Aleksandrova O. S. (2021). Viiskovy dyskurs ta osoblyvosti yoho perekladu [Military Discourse and the Challenges of Its Translation]. *Naukovyi visnyk PNPUI imeni K. D. Ushynskoho*, vol. 33, pp. 369–384. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24195/2616-5317-2021-33-26>.
9. Fedorenko S., Doroshenko V., Honcharenko S. (2025). Pragmatic aspect of reproducing English military vocabulary in Ukrainian. *Naukovyi visnyk PNPUI imeni K. D. Ushynskoho*, vol. 41, pp. 175–190. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24195/2616-5317-2025-41.11>.
10. Institute for the Study of War. Russian Offensive Campaign Assessment, December 21, 2025. URL: <https://understandingwar.org/research/russia-ukraine/russian-offensive-campaign-assessment-december-21-2025/> (accessed: 20.04.2026).
11. Institute for the Study of War. Russian Offensive Campaign Assessment, March 23, 2026. URL: <https://understandingwar.org/research/russia-ukraine/russian-offensive-campaign-assessment-march-23-2026/> (accessed: 21.04.2026).

- ukraine/russian-offensive-campaign-assessment-march-23-2026/ (accessed: 21.04.2026).
12. Kolisnyk M. (2022). Aspects of Military-Related Text Translation from English into Ukrainian. Multidisciplinary Academic Notes. Science Research and Practice. *Madrid*, pp. 486–489. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.46299/ISG.2022.1.15>.
  13. Ostapenko S. A. (2020). Practical Principles of Participle Usage and Rendering into Ukrainian in the Process of Literary Texts Translation. *Visnyk Universytetu imeni Alfreda Nobelia. Seriiia "Filolohichni nauky"*, vol. 2 (20), pp. 311–317. DOI: <http://10.32342/2523-4463-2020-2-20-33>.
  14. Robertson W. G. Counterattack on the Naktong, 1950. *Leavenworth Papers. No. 13*. Fort Leavenworth, KS : Army University Press, 1986. URL: <https://www.armyupress.army.mil/Portals/7/combat-studies-institute/csi-books/Robertson-Nakton-LP13.pdf> (accessed: 20.04.2026).
  15. Yemelyanova O. V., Shkurko O. V. (2024). Features of Translating English-Language Military Discourse. *Naukovyi visnyk Mizhnarodnoho humanitarnoho universytetu. Seriiia: Filolohiia*, vol. 67, pp. 229–233. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32782/2409-1154.2024.67.51>.

Дата першого надходження статті до видання: 21.03.2026

Дата прийняття статті до друку після рецензування: 24.04.2026

Дата публікації (оприлюднення) статті: 12.05.2026