LINGUISTIC AND CULTURAL PECULIARITIES OF THE CONCEPT OF "WAR" IN ENGLISH AND UKRAINIAN LANGUAGES

[a]SVITLANA KHARCHENKO, [b]TETIANA BURENKO, [c]TETIANA KYRYCHENKO, [d]TETIANA ALEKSAKHINA [e]VLADYSLAV PTUKHA

[a]*National University of Life and Environmental Sciences of Ukraine, Kyiv, Ukraine.*
[b]*Sumy A.S. Makarenko State Pedagogical University, Sumy, Ukraine,*
[c]*Sumy National Agrarian University, Sumy, Ukraine*
[d]*Sumy State University, Sumy, Ukraine*
[e] *Kyiv National Linguistic University, Kyiv, Ukraine*
email: [a]lucynka@ukr.net, [b]tbur29@gmail.com,
[c]*honey11t@ukr.net, [d]t.aleksakhina@el.sumdu.edu.ua*
[e]*vladyslav.ptukha@knlu.edu.ua*

Abstract: The aim of the article was realized by analyzing peculiarities and the role of linguistic and cultural features of the concept of "war" in English and Ukrainian languages. The examined examples allowed the formulation of the following conclusions. First, mental representations may differ due to linguistic and cultural features. In a particular language and culture, the historical experience of its speakers is concentrated, and the mental representations of these speakers may differ from those of speakers of another language and culture. Secondly, the linguistic picture of the world is the leading research object in modern linguistics. It is a complex process, the study of which is dictated by both the development of linguistics and its specific directions, including linguoculturology. It has been proven that the concept serves as the central unit of this research, defining the historical component of the linguistic picture of the world and intending to explore the English language in conjunction with the culture and consciousness of the people. It is noted that in society, the linguistic and cultural concept of war plays a vital role as it occupies one of the central positions in the life of any nation. The historical-etymological and etymological analysis of words that appeared in the English language during the XXth century during armed conflicts allows identifying additional, previously unnoticed lexical-semantic features in the content of the key lexeme of the linguistic and cultural concept of war. The conclusion is drawn that the English language is undergoing another stage of development and enrichment with new words due to current armed conflicts. As this process still needs to be completed, it will continue attracting special attention from linguists to track changes in vocabulary in real time. Thus, the conceptual characteristics of the concept of war in Ukrainian and English language consciousness are a branching multitude of features, the central part of which is reflected with a significant degree of completeness in the definitions of explanatory dictionaries. Beyond these definitions, there remain characteristics of two types - etymological characteristics of concepts, on the one hand, and the most significant emotionally evaluative representations of war for the bearers of linguistic and cultural, on the other hand. The analysis of definitions in explanatory dictionaries, thesauri, and synonym dictionaries shows that the content of the conceptual component of the concept of war largely coincides with the mass and professional consciousness of Ukrainian and English speakers. The significant civilizational similarity between them can explain it. Differences are secondary and additional in nature, established in the associative field of concepts, and mainly come down to two points: the idea of eradicating the enemy in case of war in Ukrainian language consciousness (which is determined by the concentrated collective memory of the Ukrainian people regarding wars with ethnic groups that did not take prisoners of war, but exterminated them) and the idea of competitiveness as one of the characteristics of war in English consciousness (this understanding corresponds to the medieval knightly code of conduct).

Keywords: concept, war, English linguistic culture, Ukrainian linguistic culture, language consciousness.

1 Introduction

At the present stage of humanitarian knowledge, the term "concept" is one of the most widely used and controversial in linguistics, cultural studies, philosophy, and psychology. Each of these disciplines has its own definition of this term. It is due to numerous differences in understanding the term "concept" and its primary significance in the worldview of scientific research.

The term "concept" is not new in linguistics, but in recent decades it has received a new interpretation, as it was once considered equivalent to the term "notion." In linguistics, unlike "notion," the concept has a multidimensional structure. There is a great variety of research approaches to understanding the concept in modern linguistics. The linguistic and cultural approach to concept analysis aims to highlight the peculiarities of national mentality that have been formed over centuries and are reflected in cultural concepts. Thus, the concept can be understood as a unit of collective consciousness preserved in the national memory of language speakers in an objectified form.

According to a group of scholars, a concept is a multidimensional formation that distinguishes between conceptual, figurative, and evaluative aspects. The semantic part of the concept involves its linguistic fixation, including naming, description, and definition. In other words, it is a comparative characteristic of the concept concerning different sets of concepts. The concept's figurative aspect encompasses objects' sensory characteristics, mainly represented through conceptual metaphors. Finally, the evaluative part describes this mental education's importance for the individual and the entire linguistic community.

Other scholars consider the concept as a unit of cultural semantics, where its evaluative element predominates, along with explicit (or implicit) negative (or positive) connotations. In addition, it encompasses emotions and associations related to the concept, which are sometimes not directly expressed in certain cultures but are still perceived by language users. In a narrow sense, when analyzing any linguistic culture concept, we encounter two types of information: factual and evaluative.

The worldview of the military sphere in any culture has its own meaning and set of concepts. For example, the linguistic and cultural concept of war belongs to general concepts, as it is found in all cultures and languages, and thus has a wide range of correlative concepts, i.e., correlates.

This article aims to explore the understanding of the linguistic and cultural concept of war in the historical context of armed conflicts from the beginning of the XXth century to the present day, using the example of the United States of America. Considering the scale and volume of linguistic material related to the military sphere, it is necessary to select words that already existed at that time but with altered meanings or new words that emerged during each significant armed conflict for the United States.

2 Literature Review

The basis for this article is the scientific works of both national and foreign researchers in the field of the theory of language picture of the world (Trosborg, 2011), (Albrecht, 2013), (Arntz, 2003), (Bowyer, 2007), (Dickson, 2003), as well as studies in the field of linguoculturology, specifically linguistic-cultural concept, etc. (Funk, 1950), (Inghilleri, 2012), (Lerer, 2007).

In this research, the authors employed the method of purposive sampling, historical-etymological and semantic analyses, as well as analysis of dictionary definitions.

The linguistic and cultural concept of war is one concept that defines our lives, regulating everyday life down to the most trivial details. Such concepts structure how we perceive the surrounding world and comprehend the acquired information. Thus, a particular conceptual system is central to defining everyday reality.

Many contemporary researchers believe that any language, even far from war, eventually succumbs to its influence, which is necessary to resist escalating violent conflicts and promote moral-immoral behavior (Bohdan, 2014), (Boiko, 2021).

Thus, the role of the English language in armed conflicts (Inghilleri, 2012) and its relationship with the linguistic and cultural concept of war is currently the subject of works by such linguists as (Bondar, 2012), (Verovkin, 2012), (Bartashuk O., Nikolaieva A., Tarasiuk M., 2020), (Ohar, 2019), (Vasianovych, 2020), etc.

While studying this issue, the authors primarily referred to the English language's historical-etymological, etymological, and military dictionaries. However, this process initially encountered specific difficulties - with each war, a set of particular words peculiar to that armed conflict emerges in the language. At the same time, according to the authors' observations, most of such

terms either change their meaning at the onset of the war or gradually fall out of use by language speakers as the war ends.

3 Materials and Methods

While working on this research, the authors used the following general scientific methods: comparative, correlative, analytical, and historical.

4 Results and Discussion

The entire history of humanity is a chronicle of armed conflicts. Unfortunately, the concept of war and its components have become commonplace in people's lives.

Any war is not only a war of people but also a war of words. No one takes pride in the consequences of war, yet they take pride in the might of the armed forces. Whenever war breaks out, words like demagogy, duplicity, confrontation, conflict, and so on come into play.

Every language is a dictionary of words, and each war has its own vocabulary. For example, during the American Civil War (1861-1865), growing facial hair on the cheeks was named after General Ambrose Burnside, who had quite thick facial hair in that style. Later, the word order was reversed, resulting in *"sideburns."* (Burnside URL: https://www.civilwar.org/about/contact).

Before the Civil War, the term *'bushwhacker'* referred to *a rural inhabitant living in remote wooded areas*, but after the war, it came to be mentioned as *someone lying in ambush, a guerrilla fighter.*

General Thomas Jackson, also known as "Stonewall" Jackson, received this nickname during the Watergate scandal, where the verb *"stonewall"* took on the meaning of *maintaining silence* (Jackson, 1895).

The term "camouflage" first entered English in the late 1800s and gained popularity during World War I. It refers to an action or means of disguising objects or individuals to deceive the enemy (Bowyer, 2007). Interestingly, from a zoological perspective, camouflage means the coloring or masking of animals to hide from predators.

The main topographical feature of World War I was the complex system of trenches that ran along the Western Front in Belgium and France. When soldiers received the order to go "over the top," they were required to climb out of the trench and launch an attack on the enemy.

In the case of a loose-fitting coat with a belt (trench coat), the form follows function - during World War I, a special coat was created, the convenient form suitable for staying in trenches. Essentially, the name of this type of outerwear derives from the base word "trench." After the war, this practical military style became quite popular among civilians, as servicemen continued to wear it in civilian life.

Before the First World War, confidential documents were marked with the term "hush-hush," which actually meant *"strictly confidential," "confidential," or "secret."* It emerged in the English language in the 1910s, and its frequency of usage increased during the Second World War.

The term "shell shock" was first recorded in English in 1915 when soldiers began to show signs of moral breakdown on the front lines during combat operations. However, the term "post-traumatic stress disorder" (PTSD) did not appear in the English language until the 1980s, although "post-traumatic syndrome" already existed in the 1960s.

The term "cushy" (meaning easy, simple) was widely used by soldiers during World War I to describe minimal effort in exchange for a sufficient reward. This term existed before the

1910s, but during World War I, "cushy" also came to be used to describe a sufficiently severe injury that would send a soldier home but not one that would cause long-term health disorder or death. In Great Britain, such an injury was referred to as a "blighty" - a term derived from the Hindi word "bilayati," which means *"foreign."* It was the name given to British soldiers in India (Simpson, Weiner, 2006).

The verb "mock-up" (to create a full-scale model for educational purposes) entered the English language during World War I to describe actions used for studying, testing, or teaching. The origin of this verb is attributed to Winston Churchill in 1914 (BBC - iWonder - Sir Winston Churchill: The greatest Briton? URL: www.bbc.co.uk/timelines/z363gk7). However, the etymology of the noun "mock-up" dates a few years later, in 1920.

Many new words and phrases in the English language were created during World War II: nose dive, blitz(krieg), stormtrooper, or Nazi. These words are widely used nowadays, and no one thinks about their origin. However, the most significant change occurred in 1947, when the Department of War was renamed the Department of Defense (Bowyer, 2007). Also, we should not forget about the atmosphere of the Cold War, which means the political and ideological confrontation between the two major world powers after World War II (Cold War/Causes, Facts, & Summary. URL: https:// www.britannica.com/event/Cold-War).

The Korean War (1950-1953) introduced the English concept of "brainwashing." The only explanation at the time for the sudden health disorders experienced by soldiers in this conflict was that the Koreans possessed a secret psychological weapon that affected the minds of American military personnel at all levels of training (Korean War—Facts & Summary. URL: http://www.history.com/topics/korean-war).

No other war has inflicted as much damage on the United States as the Vietnam War. This war introduced several terms into the English language, such as *"friendly fire," "carpet bombing," "Domino Theory,"* and many others. Unfortunately, most of the words from the time of the Vietnam War have become euphemisms due to that war's personal and vicious nature (Ten facts about the war in Vietnam. URL: http://warspot.ru).

Furthermore, it was found that during that period of history, the word "to kill" became particularly rich in synonyms: "to waste," "to blow away," "to smoke," and "to eliminate assets" - any attempts to reduce the anxiety of battles were employed. Terms such as "assets" and "collateral damage" are merely instruments for expanding this array of euphemisms (Simpson, Weiner, 2006). The considered facts lead to the conclusion that these terms always refer to something lifeless. In other words, no one wants to think about killing another person, even if it is supposedly necessary.

Until the Vietnam War, the names of military operations remained classified until their completion. For example, the overall title for the amphibious assault operation on the coast of Normandy on June 6, 1944, was Overlord (Operation Overlord: www.historylearningsite.co.uk/.../operation-overlord/).

Starting from the first days of the Gulf War, the names of operations Desert Shield and Desert Storm were created to advertise the hostilities (Desert Shield, Desert Storm: www.usar.army.mil/About.../Desert-Shield-Desert-Storm/).

Likewise, Operation Enduring Freedom and Operation Iraqi Freedom were named to support the war in Iraq. (Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation New: http://edition.cnn.com/2013/10/30/world/meast/operation-iraqi-freedom-and-operation-new-dawn-fast-facts).

War in the Persian Gulf gave the English language the terms "smart bombs," "surgical strike," "precision bombing," and

"collateral damage." In modern armed conflicts, chemical and biological weapons have become "weapons of mass destruction." Thus, these terms focus more on the horrific outcomes of war rather than its content, as war only intensifies tension, perhaps because the stakes are higher.

Language, like the entire world around us, is in constant motion. How different wars and armed conflicts reshape the world also transforms the language and thinking patterns. For example, during both World Wars, the English language primarily evolved in line with the technological progress of the time, requiring the creation of new words to denote and describe new inventions.
The defining characteristic of the provided definition is the struggle, which denotes an active action against anyone or anything to overcome, defeat, or resist them. Analyzing dictionary definitions allows us to envision the conceptual component of the explored concept as comprising the following feature:

1)   An active hostility,
2)   Between (large) groups of people,
3)   Arising from conflicting interests,
4)   Involving the use of weapons,
5)   Aimed at achieving victory over the opponent,
6)   Up to their destruction,
7)   Accompanied by a feeling of hostility towards the opponent.

In English explanatory dictionaries, the main name of a given concept (war) is defined as follows:

1)   when there is fighting between two or more countries or between opposing groups within a country, involving large numbers of soldiers and weapons
2)   fighting over a long time to bring some of the damage under control;
3)   an issue over which a person or group combats for power, influence, or control (LDCE);
4)   armed hostilities between esp. nations: conflict; a specific conflict or the time during which such conflict exists; suspension of international law etc. during such a conflict;
5)   (as the War) a war in progress or preliminary ended; the most recent major war;
6)   hostility or contention between people, groups, etc. (war of words); a sustained campaign leading to crime, disease, poverty, etc. (COD).

The idea of struggle, fighting, i.e., mutual attacks, appears as a generic feature in the given definitions. The conceptual component of the *war* concept, according to English explanatory dictionaries, can be represented as the following set of features:

1)   an active campaign;
2)   action between (large) groups of people;
3)   caused by a clash of interests.

Active signs of concepts are revealed through informant surveys. In this regard, the most frequent reactions recorded in the dictionary are indicative: the world (svit) - 92 (out of 638), the worlds (svitiv) - 51, and the world (svit) - 41, the death (smert) - 28, Patriotic (Vitchyzniana) - 18, dreadful (strashna) - 17, horror (zhakh)- 14, World (svitova) - 13, cruel (zhorstoka) - 12. In the active layer of the Ukrainian linguistic consciousness, war is seen as a juxtaposition of peaceful life (the most common reaction) and something dreadful and cruel. The active layer of the concept is not fully definable, as it is not a rational understanding of a fragment of reality but primarily an emotional response to the associated experience. However, such a reaction can also be rationally interpreted.

The concept of war is highly significant to people and is therefore considered a finely segmented semantic formation.

In the ideographic dictionary of the English language by P. Roger, the concept of war is categorized under *antagonism* in the domain of "Volitional Expressions."

Understanding the concept of "war" in the professional mindset of military personnel takes place in different directions. The horrors of war take precedence for the civilian population, while for soldiers and officers, it is a matter of being executed honestly and efficiently. The peculiarities of the linguistic consciousness of professional military personnel are manifested, on the one hand, in the pursuit of utmost informativeness in expressions, and on the other hand, in the cognitive compression of existing societal perceptions. Everyday attitudes towards war in the consciousness of a professional military correlate with the concept of "battle," which encompasses goals, preparation, initiation, middle, end, and outcome. The peculiarities of combat are manifested in the following:

1)   Inherent motivation of the idea of battle, which serves as the prototypical unit within the thematic conceptual field of "war";
2)   Semiotics that explicates the symbolic essence of battle and war as a whole (signal rocket as the beginning of fighting, flag as a sign of victory or capitulation);
3)   The language of battle, characterized by utmost brevity, expressiveness, and the syntactic compression of concise predicate forms of commands: action! (to the battle!), left action! (to fight from the left flank!), right action! (to fight from the right flank!), action rear! (to fight from the rear!), action front! (to fight from the front!);
4)   Special reference to the battle, which also holds a deeply symbolic essence (blood, sword, shield);
5)   Discreteness of battle;
6)   Priority of the value factor, absolute spiritual values, and the actualization of ethical norms ("valor," "courage," "heroism," "sacrifice").

At the same time, for contemporary speakers of the Ukrainian language, the meanings of the word "war" the familiar and traditional will be those outlined in explanatory dictionaries (the 11-volume and 20-volume " Ukrainian Language Dictionaries" contain identical definitions):

1)   An organized armed conflict between states, social classes, etc.
2)   Figuratively: A state of hostility between someone; a dispute, an argument with someone, a struggle. [2, c. 669; 3].

It is quite sufficient within the basic semantics of such a definition of war. However, an undeniable fact is that war is a phenomenon associated with numerous events, their conditions, consequences, and participants, whose states and feelings are reflected in the linguistic worldview by much more units than those recorded in dictionaries. Therefore, studying the concept of "war" in its various linguistic manifestations is extremely interesting for scientists.

Most often, Ukrainian linguists study the concept of war based on fiction. Bohdan S. identifies the connections of this concept in Lesya Ukrainka's epistolary texts with the concepts of the BATTLE, ENEMY, WAR, and the opposite in meaning and assessment - a PEACE. Boiko N. investigates the specifics of the lexical and semantic field of the concept "war" in Alexander Dovzhenko's film story "Ukraine on Fire" and concludes that the structure of the war concept includes a certain number of other full-fledged concepts... [5, c. 121], and names the following among them: WEAPONS, BATTLE, DEATH, BLOODSHOT, LOSS, TEARS, SORROR, ENEMY, FEAR, SEPARATION, FAITH, VICTORY, ARMY, PAIN, BLOOD, etc. Bondar N. traces the connection between war and the archetypal concepts of WATER and FIRE in the writings of the Tiutiunnyk brothers. Finally, Verovkin V., analyzing Ukrainian folk songs, connects the concept of war with the images of ENEMY, STRANGER, VALOR, KNIGHTSHIP, CAPTIVITY/SLAVERY, DEFEAT, WOUND, DISHONOR, and DEATH. Bartashuk O., Nikolaieva A., Tarasiuk M., and Ohar A. study the peculiarities of war concept representation in the texts of contemporary writers. Linguists pay attention to new connections, in addition to those

mentioned above, with the concepts of dirt, lies, money, volunteers, and veterans. As we can see, the perceptions of war recorded in texts from ancient times revealed associations with a basic set of terms such as enemy, battle, blood, pain, fear, etc., but underwent modifications depending on circumstances. Until recently, the linguistic image of war was captured in the study *Psycholinguistic Analysis Of The Associative Field War: A Fragment Of Linguistic Picture Of The World Of Ukrainian Humanities Students* by Vasianovych Ye. A. *(2020)*. This research is of great value to us as it demonstrates the associations with the stimuli of war leading to a full-scale invasion. Thus, it allows us to compare how the perceptions of young Ukrainians about war have changed before and during active combat operations.

In April 2022, a free-associative experiment was conducted among Ukrainian youth aged 15 to 30 to achieve this goal. A total of 1049 individuals participated in the experiment, and 1009 questionnaires that met the condition of providing verbal associations rather than definitions were selected for analysis. This experiment had a comprehensive nature. Besides the stimuli of war, the questionnaire included 15 additional stimuli related to current realities, allowing for a better understanding of the peculiarities of graphic and foreign language elements used by specific respondents (accidental or intentional).

In total, 1522 associations were received in response to the stimuli of war, with the most frequent ones being death (243 - frequency of association indicated in parentheses here and below), pain (145), fear (99), blood (66), horror (53). 265 associations were singular, meaning they occurred only once. 15 respondents did not mention any associations to this stimulus, which can be explained by the complexity of emotions and the impossibility of encapsulating the entire spectrum of thoughts about war during its active phase in a single word or a few words.

In the structure of the associative field, the core, near-core zone, semi-periphery, and periphery can be clearly identified. The core is condensed and consists of reactions that embody the most typical perceptions of war: death (243), pain (145), fear (99), blood (66), and horror (53), as indicated by the aforementioned studies on the concept of war in Ukrainian literature. Meanwhile, in Vasianovych's research, the near-core associations were death (48), tears (31), pain (29), fear (24), and weapons (20). In our study, we classify the reaction of tears (35) as part of the near-core zone and weapons (5) as part of the semi-periphery. Such a movement of reactions from the core to the periphery can be attributed, firstly, to a more significant number of participants and collected responses in our experiment (100 and 565 responses, respectively, in the Vasianovych experiment) and secondly, to the dominance of emotional over visual aspects in the consciousness of young Ukrainians when they became direct participants or victims of war, rather than mere observers. The near-core zone of the associative field is formed by the following reactions: tears (35), losses (26), grief (26), russia (24), evil (22), hatred (21), suffering (19), explosions (16), genocide (16), victory (16), will end (14), destruction (14), killings (13), Bucha (11), horror (11), crime (11), devastation (11), hunger (10), peace (10), ruin (10). Most of these reactions are universal and can be associated with any conflict or war, but particular attention is drawn to russia (24) and Bucha (11).
The toponym "russia" was also an anticipated association, with particular attention drawn to its graphic representation: 11 out of 24 reactions were written in lowercase, indicating the personal attitude of the respondents towards the aggressor country. This spelling could have also emerged under the influence of the media and public figures who started using lowercase letters. For example, Avramenko O. openly suggested not capitalizing words that provoke contempt and condemnation. There was one instance of a specific variant - "roSSiya," which stands out due to synthesizing orthographic features inherent in both languages simultaneously: Russian and Ukrainian.

First, here we see the assessment of the country indicated by the lowercase initial letter. Secondly, the respondent used the

elongation of sibilant sounds, present in the Russian language - "Rossiya," intentionally emphasizing it to create an additional comedy effect. However, the graphical highlighting of the letters "SS" may also indicate drawing parallels with the Nazi paramilitary organization Schutzstaffel, which used the double sigel rune as its symbol, resembling the letters "ZZ" when inverted - the symbols of the current armed aggression.

The composition of the near-core zone attests to another distinction in the results of our experiment compared to the study by Ye. Vasianovych. In particular, the linguist notes that *the recipients hardly resorted to positive connotations in their associations. The stimulus "war" elicited only two such associations - a victory with a response frequency and dignity.*
In our experiment, respondents named the following reactions with positive connotations: victory (16), it will be over (14), peace (10), Ukraine (6), life (4), freedom (3), will (2), for independence (2), we will win (2), ours (2), our victory (2), we will win (2), courage (2), greatness (1), faith (1), I believe in our Armed Forces (ZSU) (1), heroes (1), unity (1), for freedom (1), unity (1), patriotism (1), loved ones (1), sacred (1), phoenix (1).
It should be noted that one of the questionnaires also recorded a reaction of "this is peace," which, unlike the association of peace that can act as an antonym to war and indicate the aspirations of young Ukrainians, shows a connection to George Orwell's novel 1984, as it may be part of the quote: *"War is peace, freedom is slavery, ignorance is strength."* Therefore, it has a negative connotation. However, the rest of the associations are entirely positive, so we can conclude that during active hostilities, specific positive associations with war are developed in the consciousness of Ukrainian youth, primarily directed toward the belief in its victorious conclusion. However, the overall share of such reactions in the associative field constitutes only 5%, which confirms the results of previous studies where the associative field of the war concept was negatively connotated. We also want to challenge the definition of associations with military attributes as neutrally connotated, mainly as Vasianovych includes reactions such as tanks, gunshots, and heavy transport. In a non-war context, such objects can be associated with neutrality: for example, a tank might be imagined as a decoration in a city square, a gunshot, or military transport as parade elements. However, in the context of war, they become symbols of death and destruction, which definitely carry negative connotations. This thesis is confirmed by the respondents' associative chains, which included the attributes of war:

1) blood, Bucha, tank, sorrow, fear;
2) blood, Chernihiv, tanks, corpses;
3) death, tank;
4) missiles, fighter jets, explosions, massacres;
5) missiles, blood;
6) death, despair, pain, airplane, explosion, missile;
7) explosions, blood, devastation;
8) explosions, fear;
9) horror, explosions;
10) Russia, death, explosions, fear, etc.

While analyzing the association is worth considering its context, as it indicates a person's attitude toward the stimulus word. The overall emotion of the mentioned chains lies in the negative spectrum. Hence attributions of war acquire negative connotations. Within the structure of the associative field of the war concept, the most represented micro field is the reactions that characterize a person's physical, psychological, and moral states, as well as their emotions: death (243), pain (145), fear (99), horror (53), tears (35), grief (26), hatred (21), suffering (19), hunger (10), frightening (8), scream (7), anger (6), despair (6), alarm (6) – although this reaction can also be counted among the attributes of war due to the phenomenon of homonymy (anxiety as a mental state and air alarm), crying (5), depression (4), desperation (4), anger (4), aggression (2), fury (2), uncertainty (2), sadness (2), hope (2), agony (1), helplessness (1), sorrow (1), loneliness (1), insult (1), disgust (1), condemnation (1).

It is quite expected that most reactions denote negative emotions and states, which are associated with experiencing pain from losses and, on the other hand, are directed towards condemnation and hatred towards the enemy.

Another quantitatively significant micro field of the war reality characterizes the civilian population's everyday life, soldiers' lives, war attributes, and military actions' peculiarities. It includes the following reactions: death (243), blood (66), losses (26), explosions (16), genocide (16), destruction (14), killings (13), devastation (11), hunger (10), ruins (10), victims (7), reality (6), anxiety (6), weapons (5), rape (5), bombs (4), tanks (4), rocket (3), shelling (3), battle (3), corpses (3), airplanes (2), basement (2), shots (2), bombing (1), bomb shelter (1), cannons (1), fighters (1), spear (1), Armed Forces of Ukraine (ZSU)(1). This micro field can be divided into several directions of association: 1) military equipment - nominations of military machinery and weapons; 2) military actions; 3) consequences of military actions. One particular association stands out - a bomb shelter (in Ukrainian - bomboskhovyshche), as its lexical meaning refers to *a specially equipped protection against aerial bombs and artillery projectiles*. However, in the context of the Russian invasion, it has acquired an additional purpose - it became a second home where people can safely reside, as they began to live in bomb shelters during ground combat or missile attacks.

An important place in the structure of the associative field of the "war" concept is occupied by proper names, among which respondents mentioned the following: russia (24), Ukraine (12), Bucha (11), putin (5), Mariupol (4), Donbas (2), Syria (2), Arestovych (1), Chechnya (1), Muscovy (1), Hostomel (1), putler (name combination of Putin and Hitler) (1), rashka (derogatory name for Russia) (1), Kharkiv (1), USSR (1). Bucha, Hostomel, Donbas, Kharkiv, and Mariupol became centers of military operations and war crimes, so these place names have acquired symbolic significance since the beginning of the full-scale invasion: for Ukrainian society, they embody mass shootings, rapes, hunger, ruins, and even genocide.

The reaction "putin" is worth noting, as, similar to the association with "russia," the participants violated the spelling rules by writing the president's surname in lowercase 4 out of 5 times to demonstrate a negative assessment. The reinforcement of the negative evaluation and comparing the Russian president to Hitler was realized in the association "putler." The reaction *"rashka"* also carries negative and derogatory connotations. The respondents' toponyms, Syria and Chechnya, came to mind due to the armed conflicts involving Russia: the two Russo-Chechen wars (1994-1996, 1999-2009) and Russia's intervention in Syria (2015-present). Muscovy and USSR could have emerged as alternative names for the Russian Federation, which, on the one hand, indicate its imperial and totalitarian past, and on the other hand, challenge the right of this country to use a name with the word root rus-/ros-.

Low-frequency associations in the associative field are verbally complex associations: the worst in the world (3), destroyed cities and villages (2), we will win (2), the scariest in life (2), our victory (2), innocent people (2), it will soon end (2), death of the innocent (1), death of innocent people (1), deep pain (1), emotional pain (1), Pain, pain, pain, pain, pain. Trillions of times pain (1), never again (1), mass grave (1), dirty trenches (1), fear for the lives of loved ones (1), much bloodshed (1), bloodshed in vain (1), Ukraine's victory (1), the battle for existence (1), the struggle for sovereignty (1), etc. Like the song associations, they vividly illustrate and complement the verbal image of war in the minds of young Ukrainians, detailing their experiences, evaluations, aspirations, and impressions of war.

The specificity of the semantic structure of the critical lexical-semantic unit within the concept of "war" is seen in the fact that it can encompass a significant number of contextually activated components reflecting various negative aspects of war. Moreover, these components exhibit a wide range of expressions, indirectly objectifying the core concept through

intensified semantic and metaphorical (metonymic) representations of the emotional and sensory sphere of human experience.

At the same time, we want to emphasize that all units within the conceptual field can be divided into two groups, depending on whether they are directed toward the enemy or oneself. Associations related to the enemy exclusively carry negative connotations, indicating aggression and hatred towards the enemy. They employ graphical vividness, transformations, and quotations to expose and condemn its dreadful actions. Associations directed towards oneself can be classified into several groups. The largest group has a negative connotation as it documents the painful experiences, feelings, conditions, and consequences of war for Ukrainians. However, the associative experiment also revealed specific positive associations that attest to the belief in Ukraine's victory and its ability to defend its territorial integrity and sovereignty.

The following associative experiments are a promising way to track changes in the verbal image of the 'war' concept in the minds of young Ukrainians as it progresses and hopefully comes to an end.

5 Conclusion

The considered examples allowed the formulation of the following findings. Firstly, mental perceptions can differ due to linguistic and cultural peculiarities. For instance, in a particular language and culture, the historical experience of its speakers is concentrated, and the mental perceptions of these speakers may differ from those of speakers of another language and culture. Secondly, the linguistic worldview is a central object of research in modern linguistics and is a complex process, the study of which is driven by both the development of linguistics as a whole and its individual directions, including linguoculturology. Thirdly, the central unit of this study, defining the historical component of the linguistic worldview and intended for the study of the English language in conjunction with the culture and consciousness of the people, is the concept. Fourthly, within society, the linguistic and cultural concept of war plays a vital role as it occupies an important place in the life of any nation. Finally, historical-etymological and etymological analyses of words that emerged in the English language during the XXth century in the course of armed conflicts allow determining additional, previously unidentified lexical-semantic features in the content of the critical lexeme of the linguistic and cultural concept of war.

Currently, due to ongoing armed conflicts, the English language is undergoing another stage of development and enrichment with new words. However, since this process is incomplete, it will continue attracting special attention from linguists to trace lexical changes in real-time.

Thus, the conceptual characteristics of the war concept in Ukrainian and English languages consciousness represent a diverse set of features. Its central part is reflected with a significant degree of completeness in the definitions of explanatory dictionaries. Beyond these definitions, there remain two types of components:

Etymological characteristics of concepts;

Non-discrete, emotionally evaluative understandings of war relevant to the bearers of linguistics and culture.

The analysis of definitions in explanatory dictionaries, thesauri, and synonym dictionaries shows that the content of the conceptual component of the "war" largely coincides with the mass and professional consciousness of Ukrainian and English language bearers. Significant civilization similarities between them can explain this. Differences are of secondary and additional nature, primarily established within the associative field of concepts, and can be reduced to two points: the idea of the destruction of the enemy in case of war in Ukrainian

language consciousness (due to the concentrated collective memory of the Ukrainian people regarding battles with ethnic groups who did not take prisoners but exterminated them) and the idea of competition as one of the characteristics of war in English consciousness (which corresponds to the medieval chivalric code of conduct).

Literature:

1. Trosborg, A. (ed.): *Text typology and translation. Amsterdam/Philadelphia*: John Benjamins Publishing Company, P. 67-83.
2. Albrecht, J.: *nÜbersetzung und Linguistik. 2.* Aufl. – Narr Francke Attempto Verlag GmbH + Co.KG, Tübingen, 2013. 328 p.
3. Arntz, R.: *Spraxhvergleich, Rechtsvergleich und Übersetzen im Sprachenpaar Spanisch-Deutsch*. Übersetzen und Dolmetschen: Modelle, Methoden, Technologie. Hrsg. K. Schubert. Tübingen : Narr, Bd. 2003. 1; 4.pp. 1-14.
4. Bowyer, R.:*Dictionary of military terms.* Third edition. A&C Black. London, 2007. 289 p.
5. BBC-iWonder — Sir Winston Churchill: The greatest Briton? URL: www. bbc.co.uk/timelines/z363gk7
6. Burnside, A. Civil War Trust https://www.civilwar.org/abou t/contact
7. Cold War: Causes, Facts, & Summary. https://www.brit annica.com/ event/Cold-War
8. Desert Shield Desert Storm — U.S. Army Reserve www.usar.army.mil/ About.../Desert-Shield-Desert-Storm/
9. Dickson P. *War Slang: American Fighting Words & Phrases Since the Civil War.* Brassey's, Inc., 2003. 432 p.
10. Funk, W.: *Word origins and their romantic stories*. New York: Funk & Wagnalls, Cop, 1950. 432 p.
11. Inghilleri, M.: *Interpreting justice: ethics, politics, and language* (Routledge advances in translation and interpreting studies). Routledge: Taylor&Francis, 2012. 170 p.
12. Jackson, M. A.: *Memoirs of Stonewall Jackson by his widow, Mary Anna Jackson. Louisville, Ky*., The Prentice press, Courier-Journal job printing company, 1895. 457 p.
13. Korean War — Facts & Summary. http://www.hist ory.com/topics/ korean-war
14. Lerer, S.: *Inventing English: a Portable History of the Language.* Columbia University Press: New York, 2007. 316 p.
15. Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation New Dawn Fast Facts - CNN. http://edition.cnn.com/2013/10/30/world/meast/ operation-iraqi-freedom-and-operation-new-dawn-fast-facts
16. Operation Overlord - History Learning Site. www.histor ylearningsite. co.uk/.../operation-overlord/
17. Ruark, R. C. http://www.robertruark.org/home.html
18. Simpson, J., Weiner, E.: *The Oxford English Dictionary.* 20 Volume Set. A Clarendon Press Publication, 2006. 1104 p.
19. Collins Concise Thesaurus. Harper Collins Publishers, 1997.
20. COD - The Concise Oxford Dictionary. 9th Edition. 1995.
21. EDEE - The Oxford Dictionary of English Etymology / Ed. by C. T. Onions. Oxford, 1996.
22. Roget's Thesaurus of English words and phrases. Penguin, 1979.
23. Webster's New World Thesaurus / By Ch. Laird. Meridian, 1975.
24. Melnychuk, O. S. (chief editor), Bilodid, I. K., Kolomiets, V. T., Tkachenko, O. B. (eds.).: *Etymological dictionary of the Ukrainian language.* Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR Institute of Linguistics named after O. O. Potebny, Kyiv, Naukova Dumka, 1982. Volume 7 - Volume 1, 632 p.
25. Bilodid, I. K., Horetskyi, P. Y. (eds.): *Ukrainian language dictionary*: in 11 Volumes. Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR Institute of Linguistics named after O. O. Potebny, Kyiv, Naukova Dumka, 1970. 799 p.
26. Bohdan, S.: *Verbalization Of The Concept of War In Lesya Ukrainka's Epistolary Texts*. The Scientific Issues of Ternopil National Pedagogical University named after Volodymyr Hnatiuk, Series: Pedagogy, Ternopil, TNPU, 2014. No. 2 (24), P. 43-49.
27. Boiko, N.: *The specifics of the lexical and semantic field of the concept "war" in Alexander Dovzhenko's film story "Ukraine on Fire."* Literature and Culture of Polissya, No. 102, Series Philological Sciences," 2021. No. 17, P. 116–130.
28. Bondar, N.: *Typified Imagery Modifications Of The Concept War In Tiutiunnk's Texts.* Philological science, 2016. No. 23, P. 111–118.
29. Verovkin, V. *Ukrainskyi pisennyi folklor yak sfera verbalizatsii kontseptu VIINA* [Ukrainian folk songs as a sphere of the WAR concept verbalization]. Ukrainian literature in a secondary school, 2012. No. 12, P. 42–45.
30. Bartashuk, O., Nikolaieva, A., Tarasiuk, M.: *Verbalization of the «War» Concept in the Novel of H. Vdovychenko "Mariupol's Process." Collection of research papers "Philological Discourse,"* chief editor Vitaliy Matsko, Khmelnytskyi: KhHPA, 2020. No. 11, P.78–91.
31. Ohar, A.: *Verbalization Of The WAR Concept In Modern Art Discourse.* Native Word in Ethnocultural Dimension, Drohobych State Pedagogical University named after Ivan Franko, 2019. P.38–47.
32. Vasianovych, Ye. A.: *Psycholinguistic Analysis Of The Associative Field War As A Fragment Of Linguistic Picture Of The World Of Ukrainian Humanities Students*. Scientific notes of V. I. Vernadsky Taurida National University, Series: Philology. Social Communications, 2020. Vol. 31 (70), No. 1(1), P. 13–17.
33. Chy isnuie pravylo, yake dozvoliaie pysaty «rosiia» z malenkoi bukvy: poiasnyv movoznavets Oleksandr Avramenko [Is there a rule that allows writing "russia" with a small letter: explained by the linguist Oleksandr Avramenko] 2022. 1+1 channel website. https://1plus1.ua/snidanok-z-1-1/novyny/ci-isnue-pravilo-ake-dozvolae-pisati-rosia-z-malenkoi-bukvi-poas niv-movoznavec-oleksandr-avramenko