

3. Beast. (2025, October 23). ЦЕ ПРОСТО ЖЕСТЬ! РЕБАЛАНС ВСІХ 10 ПІВНІВ - ДЕТАЛЬНИЙ РОЗБІР  WoT Blitz. [Video]. *YouTube*. <https://youtu.be/zyqHYGC0Fpg?si=0-pYBV5E3TcZlc9v>

UDC: 81'37:81'42:32

Semantic field as a cornerstone of modern linguistics

Radzivon, Anna

National University of “Kyiv Mohyla Academy”

a.radzivon@ukma.edu.ua

The concept of the semantic field (or lexical field) is essential for full understanding of modern linguistics. It makes such abstract notion as language a structured and obtainable science. Semantic field refers to a group of words that share the same meaning, that are related to a common specific object or notion. One word can simultaneously belong to different fields. “For example, the bulb shares the semantic field with the candle, but unlike the candle, it also intersects with artificial light or electricity, which is the same semantic field as the fire (Panjjeva, Jumayeva, 2022, p.62).”

Furthermore, semantic field enables the communication process by providing speakers with an inventory of different words in different fields. This allows for the ability to choose the most suitable lexeme from the variety of words that share the same meaning. That particular feature is crucial for translation process, as its goal is to find the most functionally appropriate analogue in the target language. That is why the best way to analyse peculiarities of the Ukrainian translation it is to concentrate on the specific semantic field.

Semantic field is typically organised in a hierarchical structure that shows the relationship between various lexical units. The nucleus is the core word or concept that defines the entire field, as in my research is the concept “authority”. The center consists of words that are most synonymous with the core, for example power, control. The periphery contains specialized or stylistic words that specify the main meaning of the field (Heshko, 2014, p.76). “Usually, peripheral elements are connected with other semantic fields, thereby forming the lexical-semantic integrity of the language system (Heshko, 2014, p.76).”

In the context of *The Economist*, the field of the concept “authority” is particularly complex. Studying the field allows for a deep understanding of how British discourse is reconstructed in Ukrainian, ensuring that the translated text has the same degree of conceptual weight and precision as the original.

References

1. Panjjeva, N., & Jumayeva, M. A. (2022). The theory of semantic field. *European Scholar Journal (ESJ)*, 3(4), 62-64. <https://www.scholarzest.com>

2. Heshko, N. (2014). Lexico-semantic field as the structural unit and methods of its investigation. *Current Issues of Social Sciences and History of Medicine*, (2), 73–78. <https://doi.org/10.24061/2411-6181.2.2014.27>

UDC 81'255.4:327:32.019.5

Foreignization in Translating Political Realia within Diplomatic Discourse

Sichevyi, Andrii; Statkevych, Larysa

National University of Kyiv Mohyla Academy

a.sichevyi@ukma.edu.ua lstatkevych@ukma.edu.ua

Diplomatic discourse is one of the most institutionally regulated forms of political communication. Translation methods within it are inextricably linked with government regulation and the creation of international narratives. In this field, translation is more than just a tool – it's an instrument for ideological mediation.

Representation of political realia is always connected with the possibility of its positioning. If it can be positioned to promote certain political interests, translation becomes a channel of narrative representation on an international level (Bánhegyi, 2013, p.4). Diplomatic translation comes as a mechanism of political perception framing. It relates to different political realia – terms, institutions' names, historical events or concepts that carry a certain ideological idea embedded in context. During the process those elements are being interpreted, adapted, or kept in the original way.

Contemporary empirical papers show that translation may amplify (or reduce) ideological polarization in international media. Therefore, we can consider interpreters as «ideological» agents (Yahiaoui et al., 2025, p.10). Lexical changes shape the audience's interpretation of events, actors and the motives of conflict.

In this dimension it's important to choose between a right strategy – domestication and foreignization (Venuti, 2008).

Domestication may mitigate cultural and political differences by adapting political realities to the expectations of the target audience. That may help in smoothing out or neutralizing the tension. On the other hand, foreignization preserves the «alienation» of the text and maintains the foreignness of ideologically charged terms, emphasizing their cultural specifics and potential dissonance with the norms of the host culture. Neither strategy is neutral. Each of them shapes different models of international perception of political reality.

Within the analysis of political realia, the case of the terminological contrast between «reunification with Russia» and «annexation of Crimea» in the context of the events of 2014 is illustrative. Russian official discourse uses the term reunification, which appeals to historical unity