

FALSE EQUIVALENCE OF RUSSIAN AND KOREAN MILITARY-LEGAL TERMS

Indira Rustam-qizi Narkulova

indi977@mail.ru

University of Public Safety of Republic of Uzbekistan

Abstract: The article examines the phenomenon of false equivalence in Russian and Korean military-legal terminology as a significant source of semantic distortion in professional discourse. Particular attention is paid to terminological units that demonstrate formal, lexical, or contextual similarity but differ in their conceptual scope, normative function, institutional status, or conditions of use. The study proceeds from the assumption that military-legal terminology is formed at the intersection of military and legal discourse and therefore requires a high degree of semantic precision. The analysis focuses on cases in which apparent equivalence between Russian and Korean terms may lead to an inaccurate transfer of professional meaning, especially in translation, interpretation, and AI-generated texts. The paper identifies the main types of false equivalence, including partial semantic overlap, divergence in normative meaning, differences in subject-reference relations, and mismatches in functional and contextual usage. It is argued that terminological equivalence should be assessed not only at the lexical level but also with regard to institutional, pragmatic, and legal context. The findings demonstrate that false equivalence may preserve the external linguistic correctness of a text while simultaneously transforming its professional and normative content. The study therefore proposes a semantic-functional approach to the comparative analysis of Russian and Korean military-legal terms and emphasizes the need to distinguish formal similarity from genuine professional equivalence.

Keywords: military-legal terminology; false equivalence; Russian language; Korean language; professional discourse; legal discourse; military discourse; terminological semantics; semantic distortion; terminological equivalence; comparative linguistics; institutional context; AI-generated texts

The growing intensity of international military cooperation, legal harmonization, multilingual professional communication, and the use of artificial intelligence in translation and text generation has significantly increased the importance of terminological accuracy in specialized discourse. This issue is particularly relevant to military-legal communication, where lexical choices are not merely stylistic or descriptive but may directly affect the interpretation of rights, obligations, authority, responsibility, permissible conduct, and procedural limits. In such contexts, even a seemingly minor terminological mismatch may result in substantial semantic distortion.

One of the most complex problems in comparative terminology is the phenomenon of false equivalence. In the broadest sense, false equivalence arises when lexical units in two languages appear to correspond to each other but differ in their semantic scope, functional characteristics, institutional meaning, pragmatic value, or normative status. In general vocabulary, such discrepancies may cause misunderstanding or stylistic inaccuracy. In military-legal discourse, however, they may lead to a more serious transformation of professional meaning, because terminological units are embedded in systems of legal regulation, military hierarchy, competence, subordination, and institutional responsibility.

The problem becomes particularly significant in the comparison of Russian and Korean military-legal terminology. Russian and Korean belong to typologically and structurally different language systems and have developed within different legal traditions, institutional cultures, military

practices, and conceptual frameworks. As a result, direct lexical correspondence does not always imply conceptual or functional equivalence. A term that appears to have an obvious counterpart in another language may differ in the scope of reference, degree of obligation, legal force, hierarchical status, or contextual restrictions. Therefore, the identification of terminological equivalents requires analysis not only at the lexical level but also at the semantic, functional, institutional, and pragmatic levels.

The relevance of this problem is further strengthened by the widespread use of machine translation systems and large language models. Modern AI-based systems are capable of producing fluent and grammatically correct professional texts; however, formal linguistic correctness does not necessarily guarantee semantic and terminological accuracy. In the case of military-legal discourse, an AI system may select a lexically plausible equivalent while failing to preserve the original normative function, institutional reference, or scope of a professional concept. This creates a specific risk of hidden semantic distortion: the generated text may appear natural and professionally marked while containing a terminological substitution that changes the intended meaning.

From a linguistic perspective, false equivalence in military-legal terminology should therefore be regarded as more than a translation error. It is a manifestation of asymmetry between professional conceptual systems. Such asymmetry may involve partial semantic overlap, differences in legal classification, variation in the status of institutional actors, unequal scope of professional notions, or divergence in pragmatic and normative functions. Consequently, the analysis of false equivalents requires a multidimensional approach that takes into account the interaction between lexical meaning, professional concepts, discourse function, and institutional context.

The present study proceeds from the assumption that genuine terminological equivalence in military-legal discourse can be established only when the compared units demonstrate correspondence not only in their general lexical meaning but also in their conceptual scope, normative function, subject-reference relations, conditions of use, and institutional significance. Accordingly, formal similarity or dictionary correspondence should not be treated as sufficient evidence of equivalence.

The aim of this article is to identify and analyze the main types of false equivalence between Russian and Korean military-legal terms and to determine the linguistic and functional factors that cause semantic divergence between apparently corresponding units. Particular attention is paid to cases of partial semantic coincidence, differences in normative meaning, mismatches in subject and institutional reference, and context-dependent functional asymmetry. The study also considers the risks associated with false equivalence in translation and AI-generated military-legal texts.

The scientific significance of the research lies in the attempt to approach Russian-Korean military-legal terminology as an interconnected semantic and institutional system rather than as a set of isolated lexical correspondences. Such an approach makes it possible to distinguish superficial lexical similarity from genuine professional equivalence and to identify those semantic components whose loss or transformation may lead to distortion of military-legal meaning.

Thus, the study of false equivalence in Russian and Korean military-legal terminology is important not only for comparative linguistics and terminology studies, but also for translation theory, legal linguistics, military discourse analysis, and the linguistic evaluation of AI-generated professional texts.

False equivalence in Russian and Korean military-legal terminology emerges when formally corresponding lexical units differ in their professional meaning, normative function, or institutional use. In such cases, dictionary similarity may create the impression of full equivalence, although the

compared terms actually refer to different scopes of authority, responsibility, legal status, or procedural conditions.

One of the most common types of false equivalence is partial semantic overlap. A Russian and a Korean term may share a general conceptual core but differ in semantic scope. One term may have a broader meaning, while the other is limited to a specific institutional or legal context. Such asymmetry is especially important in military-legal discourse, where semantic narrowing or expansion can alter the interpretation of a norm.

Another significant type is functional and normative divergence. Terms denoting authority, obligation, permission, prohibition, command, or responsibility may appear lexically similar but perform different functions within Russian and Korean military and legal systems. Therefore, equivalence should be established not only by comparing dictionary definitions but also by examining the institutional role of the term in a particular professional context.

False equivalence may also result from differences in subject-reference relations. A term can formally designate a similar action or status in both languages, but the range of persons or institutions to which it applies may differ. In military-legal communication, this distinction is crucial because the meaning of a term is often connected with hierarchy, competence, and responsibility.

Particular attention should also be paid to context-dependent terminology. The meaning of some military-legal units becomes clear only in combination with other elements of the text, such as the subject, legal basis, conditions, limitations, and possible consequences. For this reason, isolated lexical comparison is insufficient.

From this perspective, genuine equivalence between Russian and Korean military-legal terms should be evaluated according to several parameters: conceptual scope, normative function, institutional reference, contextual restrictions, and professional usage. If one of these components differs significantly, the terms should be treated as partial equivalents or false equivalents rather than complete equivalents.

This problem becomes especially relevant in AI-generated and machine-translated texts. Artificial intelligence may select a formally appropriate lexical counterpart while failing to preserve the professional relations embedded in the original term. As a result, the generated text can remain grammatically correct and stylistically convincing while containing hidden semantic distortion.

The analysis shows that false equivalence in Russian and Korean military-legal terminology is caused not only by lexical differences between the two languages but also by asymmetry between their professional, legal, and institutional conceptual systems.

Full terminological equivalence should therefore be established on the basis of semantic, functional, normative, and contextual correspondence. Formal similarity or dictionary matching alone cannot guarantee accurate transfer of military-legal meaning.

The most significant risks are associated with partial semantic overlap, differences in normative function, mismatches in subject reference, and context-dependent use. These factors can lead to hidden semantic distortion, particularly in translation and AI-generated professional texts.

Thus, the comparative study of Russian and Korean military-legal terminology requires a semantic-functional approach that distinguishes external lexical similarity from genuine professional equivalence. Such an approach can contribute to more accurate translation, interpretation, and automated processing of military-legal texts.

References

1. Cabré, M. T. *Terminology: Theory, Methods and Applications*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1999.

2. Cao, D. Translating Law. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 2007.
3. Leichik, V. M. Terminology Studies: Subject, Methods and Structure. Moscow: URSS, 2007.
4. Šarčević, S. New Approach to Legal Translation. The Hague: Kluwer Law International, 1997.
5. Superanskaya, A. V., Podolskaya, N. V., & Vasilyeva, N. V. General Terminology: Theoretical Issues. Moscow: Librokom, 2012.
6. Temmerman, R. Towards New Ways of Terminology Description: The Sociocognitive Approach. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2000.