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ABSTRACT

*This study investigates explicitation in the translation of military terminology from English into Vietnamese, focusing on a selection of military texts including: Corps Operations FM 3-92, Division Operations ATP 3-91, and Brigade Combat Team FM 3-90.6. The research is motivated by the growing need for accurate and effective communication in joint military operations, where misinterpretation of technical terms can lead to operational failure. Additionally, the increasing engagement of Vietnamese forces in international peacekeeping and military cooperation underscores the importance of high-quality translation of military documents. Employing a framework informed by the theories of Eugene Nida (1964) and Anna Klaudy (2009), the research analyzes how explicitation strategies enhance comprehension and preserve the integrity of military discourse. The methodology encompasses both qualitative and quantitative analyses, beginning with frequency and collocation analyses of key military terms. Subsequently, the study identifies instances of explicitation, categorizing them into strategies such as amplification, obligatory explicitation, register markedness, and pragmatic explicitation. The findings indicate that* ***obligatory explicitation*** *emerged as the most utilized strategy in the translation of military terminology from English to Vietnamese. This strategy is crucial for addressing terms and phrases that do not have direct equivalents in Vietnamese, requiring translators to provide additional explanations to ensure operational clarity. By acknowledging the structural differences between the two languages, obligatory explicitation allows for the accurate communication of specific military concepts, which is vital in high-stakes environments. This strategy not only enhances understanding among military personnel but also minimizes the risk of misinterpretation, thereby contributing to effective decision-making and coordination. The prevalence of obligatory explicitation highlights its significance in ensuring that translated materials meet the precise needs of the Vietnamese military context, ultimately facilitating clearer communication and operational effectiveness in joint operations. Limitations of the study are acknowledged, including a focus solely on military manuals and the exclusion of interviews with military translators. Suggestions for further research include expanding the corpus to include a wider range of military texts and exploring additional language pairs to enrich the understanding of explicitation in military translation. This research contributes to the field of translation studies by providing insights into the nuances of military language and enhancing cross-cultural communication in military contexts.*

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

[**STATEMENT OF AUTHORSHIP** i](#_Toc181969765)

[**ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS** ii](#_Toc181969766)

[**ABSTRACT** iv](#_Toc181969767)

[**ABBREVIATIONS** viii](#_Toc181969768)

[**LIST OF TABLES** 1](#_Toc181969779)

[**LIST OF CHARTS** 2](#_Toc181969780)

[**CHAPTER** 1: INTRODUCTION 3](#_Toc181969781)

[1.1. Rationale of the study 3](#_Toc181969782)

[1.2. Research aim, objectives and research questions 6](#_Toc181969794)

[1.3. Scope of the study 7](#_Toc181969807)

[1.4. Methodology of the study 9](#_Toc181969814)

[1.5. The contributions of the study 9](#_Toc181969815)

[1.6. Structure of the study 11](#_Toc181969816)

[**CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW** 13](#_Toc181969817)

[2.1. Military texts and military terminology 13](#_Toc181969818)

[2.1.1. Military texts 13](#_Toc181969820)

[2.1.2. Military terminology 20](#_Toc181969821)

[2.2. Equivalence in Translation and Translation Strategies 22](#_Toc181969828)

[2.2. Explicitation in translation 25](#_Toc181969829)

[2.2.1. Definition of explicitation 25](#_Toc181969830)

[2.2.2. Categories of Explicitation 28](#_Toc181969842)

[2.3. Deployment and functions of explicitation in translation of military terminology from English into Vietnamese 37](#_Toc181969843)

[2.3.1. Obligatory Explicitation in Military Translation 39](#_Toc181969844)

[2.3.2. Amplification in Military Translation 44](#_Toc181969845)

[2.3.3. Pragmatic explicitation 46](#_Toc181969846)

[2.3.4. Register markedness 49](#_Toc181969847)

[2.4. Corpus-based approach 52](#_Toc181969848)

[2.4.1. Corpus-based translation studies 53](#_Toc181969849)

[2.4.2. Corpus types 58](#_Toc181969850)

[2.5. Previous Studies on Explicitation 62](#_Toc181969857)

[**CHAPTER SUMMARY** 69](#_Toc181969858)

[**CHAPTER 3: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY** 70](#_Toc181969859)

[3.1. Research paradigm 70](#_Toc181969860)

[3.1.1. Epistemology: Relational 71](#_Toc181969861)

[3.1.2. Ontology: Non-Singular Reality 72](#_Toc181969862)

[3.1.3. Axiology: Value-Laden 73](#_Toc181969863)

[3.2. Research Design 74](#_Toc181969864)

[3.3. Research Method 77](#_Toc181969865)

[3.3.1. Corpus-based quantitative method 78](#_Toc181969866)

[3.3.2. Qualitative method 80](#_Toc181969867)

[3.4. Analytical framework of the study 82](#_Toc181969868)

[3.5. Data collection procedures 84](#_Toc181969869)

[3.5.1. Corpus construction 85](#_Toc181969870)

[3.5.2. Key Term Identification 89](#_Toc181969871)

[3.6. Data Analysis Procedures 91](#_Toc181969872)

[**CHAPTER SUMMARY** 99](#_Toc181969873)

[**CHAPTER 4: FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION** 101](#_Toc181969874)

[4.1. Explicitation strategies used in the corpus and their frequency 102](#_Toc181969877)

[4.1.1. Explicitation in translation of Term “Defense” 106](#_Toc181969878)

[4.1.2. Explicitation in translation of Term “Forces” 108](#_Toc181969879)

[4.1.3. Explicitation in translation of Term “Operations” 111](#_Toc181969880)

[4.1.4. Explicitation in traslation of Term “ Fire” 114](#_Toc181969881)

[4.1.5. Explicitation in translation of Term “ Combat’ 116](#_Toc181969882)

[4.1.6. Explicitation in translation of Term “ battle” 118](#_Toc181969883)

[4.2. Deployment and fuctions of explicitation strategies in translation of military terminology 121](#_Toc181969884)

[4.2.1. Obligatory Explicitation 121](#_Toc181969885)

[4.2.2. Amplification 134](#_Toc181969886)

[4.2.3. Pragmatic explicitation 154](#_Toc181969887)

[4.2.4 Register Markedness 169](#_Toc181969888)

[**CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION** 184](#_Toc181969889)

[5.1. Recapitulation of the study 184](#_Toc181969890)

[5.2. Contributions of the study 185](#_Toc181969891)

[5.3. Implications 186](#_Toc181969892)

[5.3. Limitations of the study 192](#_Toc181969893)

[5.4. Suggestions for further research 193](#_Toc181969899)

[5.5. Concluding remarks 195](#_Toc181969900)

[**REFERENCES** 197](#_Toc181969901)

ABBREVIATIONS

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| SL | Source Language  |
| TL | Target Language  |
| ST | Source Text  |
| TT | Target Text  |
| CTS | Corpus-based Transalation Study |

LIST OF TABLES

[Table 2.1](#_Toc181969971) [Corpus Type 59](#_Toc181969972)

[Table 2.2](#_Toc181969973) [Previous Studies on Explicitation 63](#_Toc181969974)

[Table 3.1. Research design 75](#_Toc181969975)

[Table 3.2](#_Toc181969976) [How Analytical framework work 83](#_Toc181969977)

[Table 3.3](#_Toc181969978) [Coding Sheet with "Defense" 93](#_Toc181969979)

[Table 3.4](#_Toc181969980) [Percentage of Total Instances 95](#_Toc181969981)

[Table 4.1](#_Toc181969982) [Distribution of Explicitation Strategies Applied to Key Military Terms in Translation 103](#_Toc181969983)

[Table 4.2](#_Toc181969984) [Distribution of Explicitation Strategies Applied to Key Military Terms in Translation 104](#_Toc181969985)

[Table 4.3](#_Toc181969986) [Explicitation Strategies Applied to the Translation of "Defense" 106](#_Toc181969987)

[Table 4.4](#_Toc181969988) [Explicitation Strategies Applied to the Translation of “Forces” 108](#_Toc181969989)

[Table 4.5](#_Toc181969990) [Explicitation Strategies Applied to the Translation of "Operation" 111](#_Toc181969991)

[Table 4.6](#_Toc181969992) [Explicitation Strategies Applied to the Translation of "Firing 114](#_Toc181969993)

[Table 4.7](#_Toc181969994) [Explicitation Strategies Applied to the Translation of "Combat" 116](#_Toc181969995)

[Table 4.8](#_Toc181969998) [Explicitation Strategies Applied to the Translation of "Battle" 118](#_Toc181969999)

LIST OF CHARTS

[Chart 3.1](#_Toc181970136) [Analytical Framework of the study 83](#_Toc181970137)

[Chart 3.2](#_Toc181970138) [The process of corpus construction 85](#_Toc181970139)

[Chart 3.3](#_Toc181970140) [The Data Analysis Procedures 91](#_Toc181970141)

[Chart 4.1](#_Toc181970142) [Percentage Distribution of Explicitation Strategies Applied to Key Military Terms in Translation 104](#_Toc181970143)

[Chart 4.2](#_Toc181970144) [Explicitation Strategies Applied to the Translation of "Defense" 106](#_Toc181970145)

[Chart 4.3](#_Toc181970146) [Explicitation Strategies Applied to the Translation of “Forces” 109](#_Toc181970147)

[Chart 4.4](#_Toc181970148) [Explicitation Strategies Applied to the Translation of "Operation" 111](#_Toc181970149)

[Chart 4.5](#_Toc181970150) [Explicitation Strategies Applied to the Translation of "Combat" 116](#_Toc181970151)

[Chart 4.6](#_Toc181970152) [Explicitation Strategies Applied to the Translation of "Battle" 119](#_Toc181970153)

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

1.1. Rationale of the study

In an increasingly interconnected world, effective communication among nations is paramount, particularly in the context of military cooperation and collaboration. Vietnam has actively engaged in numerous international military partnerships that underscore its commitment to regional stability and security. Notably, Vietnam participates in the ASEAN Defense Ministers' Meeting Plus (ADMM-Plus), which fosters dialogue and cooperation among defense ministers from ASEAN member states and key partner nations. Additionally, Vietnam has contributed to United Nations Peacekeeping Operations, reflecting its dedication to global peace efforts and international norms. Bilateral defense agreements with countries such as the United States, India, and Japan further illustrate Vietnam's strategic military collaborations. These agreements facilitate information sharing, joint exercises, and capacity building, all of which are essential for enhancing operational readiness.

In this context, the importance of precise and contextually relevant translations of military texts cannot be overstated. Given the complex and specialized nature of military terminology, the translation process demands a keen understanding of both linguistic nuances and cultural contexts. Effective translation is critical to ensuring that military personnel across different nations comprehend directives, protocols, and operational strategies without ambiguity. Misinterpretations in this high-stakes environment could lead to serious operational failures, underscoring the necessity for accurate and clear communication.

Numerous empirical studies highlight the importance of clarity in military communication. Ahrens (2009) found that ambiguous translations in military contexts can lead to critical misunderstandings, affecting mission success. Similarly, Hu and Kuo (2018) emphasized that effective communication in multinational military operations is vital for interoperability. These findings underscore the necessity of precise and contextually appropriate translations in the military domain.

Military terminology often reflects the cultural values and historical experiences of a nation. As Pöchhacker (2016) terms, translation is not merely a linguistic act but a cultural one. This study aims to analyze explicitation strategies used in translations to reveal how cultural contexts shape the understanding and interpretation of military concepts in Vietnam. For example, the term “national security” may carry different connotations depending on a country’s historical context and geopolitical concerns (Nguyễn, 2017). In Vietnam, the historical legacy of conflict and the ongoing emphasis on sovereignty inform a distinct understanding of national security, contrasting with interpretations in other countries.

In military settings, precise communication is critical. Explicitation can help mitigate misunderstandings that may arise from ambiguous translations, ensuring that the intended meanings of military terms are conveyed accurately. Tournier (2015) found that explicitation improved the comprehension of complex military directives among non-native speakers. This is particularly important in joint operations or multinational exercises, where clear communication can determine the success of a mission.

The complexities of translating military terminology require a systematic approach to explicitation. Baker (2011) asserts that explicitness in translation is necessary when dealing with specialized language that lacks direct equivalents in the target language. For instance, the term "combat readiness" may be translated differently depending on local military doctrine, illustrating the need for contextual sensitivity (Harrison, 2020). This adaptability is crucial for ensuring that translations align with both the linguistic and operational frameworks of the Vietnamese military.

While some exploration of translation practices in military discourse has occurred, there remains a significant gap in understanding the role of explicitation in the translation of military terminology from English to Vietnamese. Dinh (2019) indicates that inadequate attention has been paid to this area, hampering both academic inquiry and practical application. This study aims to fill that gap by providing a comprehensive analysis that can inform both scholars and practitioners in military translation.

Effective translation of military terminology fosters better collaboration among diverse military forces. Göpferich and M. H. (2019) show that explicitation strategies enhance mutual understanding and operational effectiveness in multinational environments. By utilizing these strategies, translators can adapt military language to fit cultural norms and communication styles, ultimately contributing to smoother operations and reduced friction among allied forces.

The need for clarity in communication is heightened in military operations, where ambiguity can lead to fatal consequences. Freedman (2013) emphasizes this critical importance in Strategy: A History. Given the complexities involved in rendering technical language across cultures, this study highlights the necessity of explicitation in military translations. English military texts often favor strategic ambiguity, as discussed by Howard (1983) and Gray (1999). In contrast, Vietnamese military texts prioritize clarity and precision, as termd by Thayer (1994) and General Nguyễn Quốc Thước (2002). This contrast underscores the necessity for explicitation to bridge these differences, ensuring that translations meet the operational needs of the Vietnamese military while aligning with international standards.

The implications of this research extend beyond linguistic concerns; they touch upon the broader aspects of operational effectiveness and international collaboration. In the context of Vietnam's growing military engagement on the global stage, understanding how to effectively translate military terminology is essential for ensuring that all parties involved in joint operations are on the same page. The results of this study are expected to contribute not only to academic discussions in translation studies but also to practical applications in military training and cooperation.

From what has been presented above, it is clear that there is a strong need for in-depth studies on the explicitation in the translation of military terminology in military texts from English into Vietnamese.

 1.2. Research aim, objectives and research questions

The primary aim of this study is to explore explicitation in the translation of military terminology from English into Vietnamese within the context of military texts. By focusing on explicitation, the research sets specific objectives to uncover the explicitation strategies used and the underlying reasons for their application.

To achieve this aim, the research will pursue the following objectives:

1. To find out the specific explicitation strategies employed in translating military terminology in military texts from English into Vietnamese.
2. To investigate the contexts in which these strategies are applied, drawing on examples from selected military texts
3. To explore the underlining reasons behind the use of explicitation strategies, examining factors such as audience comprehension, and the nature of military communication.

In line with these objectives, the research addresses two key questions:

In line with these objectives, the research addresses two key questions:

*1. What explicitation strategies are employed in the translation of military terminology in military texts from English into Vietnamese?*

*2. How and why are these explicitation strategies used?*

To answer Research Question 1—"What explicitation strategies are used in translating military terminology from English into Vietnamese? —the corresponding Research Objective 1 must be carried out. This objective involves cataloging and analyzing the specific explicitation strategies employed in the translation of military terms.

Once Research Question 1 is answered, the next step is to address Research Question 2: "How and why are these explicitation strategies used?" To answer this, it is important to examine the contexts in which each explicitation strategy is applied, understanding when and why specific strategies are chosen based on factors like the type of military text, the target audience, and the translator’s goals.

Additionally, it's crucial to explore the underlying reasons for using these strategies. This includes considering factors such as enhancing comprehension, addressing cultural differences, and meeting the specific needs of the target context. By analyzing the translator’s decisions, we gain deeper insights into why certain strategies are favored and how they impact military communication in cross-cultural contexts.

1.3. Scope of the study

This study investigates explicitation in the translation of military terminology from English to Vietnamese, focusing on military texts within the manual genre. The aim is to analyze how explicitation strategies enhance the translation of complex military concepts and improve clarity in military communications.

The research concentrates on a selection of military manuals, which include a total of 115 texts relevant to the Vietnamese Armed Forces. These manuals include *FM 3-92: Corps Operations* (U.S. Department of the Army, 2010, November 26), *ATP 3-91: Division Operations* (U.S. Department of the Army, n.d.), and *FM 3-90.6: Brigade Combat Team* (U.S. Department of the Army, 2010, September 14). These doctrinal materials, published by the U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command serve as foundational texts for understanding military operational concepts and provide the source corpus for the analysis of translation strategies. These texts provide essential operational guidelines, making them critical sources for analyzing military terminology translation. The study examines a representative sample of military terminology, focusing on key terms based on their frequency in the selected texts. A corpus-based frequency analysis was conducted using three doctrinal military manuals comprising a combined total of approximately 350,000 words. The results show that the terms *operations* (1,132 occurrences), *forces* (924 occurrences), *defense* (697 occurrences), *combat* (623 occurrences), *battle* (482 occurrences), and *fire* (417 occurrences) were among the most frequently appearing content words across the corpus. These terms were chosen not only for their high statistical frequency but also for their centrality in conveying key operational concepts in military discourse. Their recurrence reflects the thematic focus of the manuals on planning, executing, and analyzing military engagements. By concentrating on these high-frequency terms, the study aims to reveal how translators navigate complex semantic fields, account for cultural and linguistic discrepancies, and apply explicitation strategies to maintain operational clarity in Vietnamese translations.

To effectively investigate the translation strategies employed, the study adopts a mixed-method research approach, combining both corpus-based quantitative analysis and qualitative textual analysis. The quantitative component facilitates the identification of explicitation patterns across a large volume of translated text, allowing for the recognition of trends and statistical significance. Meanwhile, the qualitative analysis enables in-depth examination of specific translation choices and explicitation strategies, such as obligatory explicitation, amplification, pragmatic explicitation, and register markedness. This methodological combination is particularly appropriate for military translation, where both terminological precision and contextual adaptation are essential. The integration of these methods ensures a robust and balanced analysis that captures both the systematic and interpretive dimensions of translation in high-stakes environments.

1.4. Methodology of the study

The study adopts a mixed-methods approach, embracing the Pragmatic paradigm, which supports the integration of both quantitative and qualitative methods. Specifically, the research utilizes an Explanatory Sequential Design, employing a three-phase mixed methods approach. This design begins with qualitative analysis to identify patterns and trends, followed by quantitative analysis to determine the most and least frequently used explicitation strategies. It concludes with a final qualitative phase that delves deeper into the findings, offering further insights and explanations, thus providing a comprehensive understanding of explicitation in the translation of military texts.

1.5. Significance of the study

Exploring the Explicitation of Military Terminology in English-Vietnamese Translation of Military Texts offers several significant contributions to the field of translation studies, particularly within the specialized domain of military translation. Here, we delineate these contributions in a coherent and logical manner:

Firstly, the study enhances our comprehension of translation strategies by delving into the explicitation techniques used in military translation. Through an in-depth analysis of these strategies, the research illuminates the nuanced decision-making processes involved in accurately conveying military terminology across languages and cultures. This deeper understanding fosters insights into the complexities of translation within the military domain. Moreover, the study makes a valuable contribution to the broader field of military translation studies by focusing specifically on the explicitation of military terminology in the English-Vietnamese language pair. This specialized investigation addresses a notable gap in the existing literature, enriching our knowledge of the challenges and strategies inherent in translating military texts between these languages.

Furthermore, the research informs translation practice by identifying effective explicitation strategies and contextual factors influencing translation decisions. By offering practical guidance for translators working with military terminology, the study enhances the quality and accuracy of translated military texts, thus ensuring effective communication within military contexts. Additionally, the study provides insights into cross-cultural communication dynamics by conducting a comparative analysis between English and Vietnamese military texts. This comparative approach sheds light on how linguistic and cultural disparities impact the translation process, thereby facilitating clearer communication and collaboration between English and Vietnamese-speaking military personnel.

Lastly, by facilitating clearer and more accurate communication between English and Vietnamese-speaking military personnel, the study contributes to stronger cross-cultural collaboration and mutual understanding within military contexts. This has tangible implications for enhancing operational readiness, efficiency, and effectiveness in multinational military operations.

In conclusion, the contributions of this study extend beyond the academic realm to practical implications for translation practice and cross-cultural communication within military contexts. By addressing the intricacies of translating military terminology between English and Vietnamese, the research aims to promote clearer communication, improve translation quality, and ultimately contribute to the success of military operations and international cooperation efforts.

1.6. Structure of the study

This thesis is organized into five chapters, each addressing a specific aspect of the research on explicitation in the translation of military texts. The structure is designed to systematically guide the readers through the different stages of the research, starting with the rationale and proceeding with the theoretical grounding, the methodology, the discussion of findings, and culminating with the implications for translation studies as well as the practice of translation.

The introductory chapter – **Chapter One**, sets the stage for the research by introducing the key concepts of military translation and explicitation. It outlines the objectives, scope, and significance of the study, emphasizing its contribution to both translation studies and military communication. The chapter also presents the research questions that guide the investigation and situates the study within the broader field of corpus-based translation research.

**Chapter 2** - **Literature Review** provides a comprehensive overview of literature relevant to explicitation in translation studies and the specific challenges of translating military texts. It revisits the definitions, classifications, and functions of explicitation and highlights existing research on corpus-based approaches in translation. The chapter also critically examines prior studies on military terminology translation and explicitation strategies, identifying gaps that this research aims to fill.

**Chapter 3** outlines **the research methodology** employed in this study, detailing the corpus-based approach used to investigate explicitation in military texts. It explains the rationale behind using a mixed-methods design, incorporating both quantitative and qualitative analyses. The chapter describes the corpus construction, including the selection criteria for military texts, data collection procedures, and analytical tools used to identify and measure explicitation patterns. This section also addresses the limitations and challenges encountered during the research process.

**Chapter 4** – **Findings and Discussion**, presents the results of the corpus analysis, focusing on the frequency and distribution of key military terms such as "defense," "operations," and "combat," alongside their explicitation strategies. The chapter discusses in length the patterns of explicitation observed in the English-Vietnamese translations and offers statistical evidence of how these patterns vary across different types of military texts. The findings are presented in the form of tables, charts, and graphs, providing both quantitative data and interpretative insights into the explicitness of translated military terminology.

The final chapter, **Conclusion**, provides a summary of the main findings and reaffirms the research’s contributions to the field of military translation. It concludes by restating the significance of explicitation as a strategic tool for improving the translation of military texts. The chapter also reflects on the practical applications of the study for professional translators and suggests potential avenues for future research, particularly in exploring explicitation across other specialized fields of translation.

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter explores the existing body of knowledge relevant to explicitation in translation, particularly within the context of military texts. The aim is to establish a comprehensive theoretical foundation for the research by providing an overview of the key concepts, frameworks, and studies that have shaped the understanding of explicitation in translation studies from corpus-based approach. The literature starts with the military texts and military terminology; theory of explicitation in translation and corpus-based translation studies.

2.1. Military texts and military terminology

Military texts and terminology are deeply interconnected, serving as the foundation of military communication. Military texts, such as strategic reports, operational directives, and training materials, rely on specialized terminology to convey complex ideas with precision and clarity. Military terminology, in turn, reflects the specific strategies, structures, and technologies inherent to military operations. The accuracy and consistency of this language are vital for ensuring that commands and strategies are understood and executed effectively. This section explores the characteristics of military texts, focusing on both English and Vietnamese examples, and then discusses the defining traits of military terminology, providing a basis for successful military translation.

2.1.1. Military texts

Military communication, by nature, requires precision, efficiency, and at times, ambiguity to navigate the complexities of warfare and diplomacy. However, the ways in which these strategies are utilized vary between English and Vietnamese due to cultural, historical, and linguistic differences. English military texts are often characterized by their use of technical jargon, acronyms, and strategic ambiguity, which allows for flexibility and adaptability, especially within multinational coalitions like NATO. In contrast, Vietnamese military texts, while also technical, tend to emphasize clarity and directness, shaped by Vietnam’s military history and the need for explicit communication in critical situations. This introduction will explore the linguistic features and communication styles in both English and Vietnamese military texts.

Howard (1983), a renowned military historian and strategist, emphasizes the importance of both flexibility and ambiguity in military strategy. In his works, such as *The Causes of Wars* and *Studies in War and Peace*, Howard analyzes how military communications and strategies are shaped by geopolitical complexities, particularly within alliances like NATO. His key insight is the need to maintain strategic ambiguity to allow for flexible responses, especially in international alliances where rigid communication could limit options.

Similarly, Freedman (2013), in his book *Strategy: A History*, explores how military discourse and communication are shaped by the need for brevity and flexibility, particularly in modern conflicts. Freedman highlights how military leaders, especially in multinational contexts, rely on concise and sometimes ambiguous communication to keep their options open in uncertain situations.

In line with these views, Gray (1999), in *Modern Strategy*, also explores the intersection of military discourse and international strategy. He focuses on how English-speaking military leaders utilize ambiguity in their communications to preserve strategic flexibility, especially within coalitions like NATO. His analysis emphasizes the importance of brevity and ambiguity in avoiding commitments that may constrain future actions.

Moreover, the English language often utilizes abstraction and technical jargon, especially in specialized fields like the military. This abstraction allows for generalizations that can be strategically beneficial. For instance, terms like "defense" or "operations" can be vague by design, allowing flexibility to adapt to different contexts without being confined to specific actions or details (Chilton, 1996). Such vagueness serves both political and operational purposes. Phrases such as "mission accomplished" or "defensive actions" are intentionally broad, thus enabling military leaders and policymakers to adjust tactics or rhetoric without contradicting prior statements (Leech, 1983).

Similarly, Cameron (1995) discusses how technical jargon in English allows the manipulation of meanings, which is particularly useful in military contexts for maintaining strategic ambiguity. This flexibility in communication helps leaders navigate complex geopolitical scenarios without committing to rigid positions (Cameron, 1995).

In international diplomacy and military operations, ambiguity can also be a tool for strategic advantage. Schelling (1960) explains that keeping military communication vague leaves room for maneuvering and interpretation, allowing for a range of responses depending on the situation. For example, a statement like "strengthening regional defense" allows for both diplomatic and military actions without committing to a specific course (Schelling, 1960).

Howard (1983) reiterates the importance of ambiguity in public military statements, particularly in alliances such as NATO, where flexibility is crucial to maintaining diplomatic options without over-committing to any one action. This approach helps prevent the unnecessary escalation of conflicts (Howard, 1983). In a similar vein, Freedman (2013) discusses how military leaders use strategic ambiguity to ensure that their responses remain adaptable to evolving geopolitical circumstances, thus preventing them from being locked into a rigid course of action (Freedman, 2013).

In many English-speaking militaries, particularly those operating within multinational coalitions, there is an assumption that the audience possesses a shared professional knowledge base. This allows for the use of vague or undefined terms because the audience is expected to understand the context. For instance, the term "defense readiness" does not require detailed elaboration, as military professionals are presumed to be familiar with the associated activities and procedures (Katzenstein, 1996). Collins (2010) explains that the reliance on a shared knowledge base facilitates streamlined communication among military personnel, enabling the use of generalized terms without additional clarification.

Additionally, Crenshaw (2001) highlights how the assumption of shared knowledge within military contexts helps reduce the need for explicit explanations, thereby enhancing communication efficiency in complex or coalition environments. This approach is beneficial in maintaining flexibility and adapting to dynamic geopolitical situations without over-explaining concepts that are already understood by the audience (Collins, 2010).

English military communication is also marked by its extensive use of abbreviations and technical jargon. According to Gill (2020), the frequent reliance on acronyms and specialized terms in English military texts assumes that the audience possesses a shared base of knowledge. This practice aims to streamline communication among professionals who are well-versed in the terminology. However, this can create significant challenges for translators and non-specialist readers who may struggle to understand the intended meaning without additional context.

Finally, Massey (2019) further elucidates this issue by examining the strategic use of acronyms in English military discourse. While these abbreviations facilitate efficient communication among military personnel, they also pose difficulties when translating these terms into other languages. The condensed nature of acronyms can lead to ambiguities and misunderstandings if not properly explained in the target language.

In conclusion, the strategic use of ambiguity and abstraction in military communication plays a crucial role in ensuring flexibility and adaptability, especially within complex alliances such as NATO. Scholars (e.g., Howard, 1983); Gray, 1999; Freedman, 2013) highlight how vagueness allows military leaders to respond to evolving geopolitical circumstances without being constrained by rigid commitments. Additionally, the use of technical jargon and acronyms, common in English military discourse, facilitates efficient communication among professionals who share a common knowledge base. However, this reliance on abstraction poses significant challenges for translators and non-specialists, who may struggle to interpret the intended meaning without the necessary context. Ultimately, maintaining ambiguity serves both political and operational purposes, allowing military leaders to navigate complex scenarios, adjust strategies, and avoid escalation, while preserving diplomatic flexibility.

Thayer (1994), an expert on Vietnam’s military and foreign policy, provides valuable insights into how Vietnamese military communication evolved, particularly during the Vietnam War. In *The Vietnam People’s Army under Doi Moi*, he emphasizes the importance of clear and precise communication at all levels of command, especially in the context of asymmetric warfare and limited resources. Thayer terms that Vietnam’s defensive strategies necessitated such clarity to ensure effective execution of military operations.

Similarly, Turley (1986), in *The Second Indochina War: A Concise Political and Military History*, explores Vietnam’s military strategies during the Vietnam War. He highlights the need for unambiguous and direct communication in a war of attrition and asymmetric conflict. Turley discusses how the Vietnamese military’s communication style developed out of necessity, ensuring that orders were clearly understood to prevent operational failures.

In addition, General Nguyễn Quốc Thước (2002), a Vietnamese military strategist, writes extensively on the importance of clear communication in Vietnam’s military history. His works on leadership during the Vietnam War underscore the value of precision in military discourse, particularly in mobilizing militia and civilians. General Thước emphasizes that Vietnam’s military communication style, shaped by asymmetric warfare, required clarity to ensure that orders were effectively carried out, especially when decentralized forces like militias were involved.

Furthermore, the Vietnamese language, particularly in military contexts, tends to favor explicit and detailed language. This ensures that messages are fully understood by all members of the military hierarchy (Nguyễn, 1997). For example, Vietnamese military communication often expands key terms to clarify their meaning. A term like "phòng thủ" (defense) is commonly expanded to "phòng thủ quốc gia" (national defense) to specify what is being defended (Nguyễn, 1997).

Thayer (1994) explains that Vietnam’s historical context, particularly its asymmetric warfare strategy, necessitated clear and precise communication to avoid any potential misinterpretation of orders. This focus on precision ensured that directives were understood and executed correctly, especially in hierarchical military structures. Additionally, Balaban (2003) illustrates how Vietnamese compound words and phrases help communicate meanings explicitly and unambiguously, thereby reducing the risk of operational errors.

In contrast to some Western approaches, Vietnamese military strategy has traditionally prioritized clear and unambiguous communication. Thayer (1994) terms that precision in orders and coordination is critical to ensuring that both military personnel and civilians fully understand their roles and responsibilities in national defense efforts. This clarity is particularly necessary given Vietnam's historical reliance on defensive strategies and the large-scale mobilization of the population.

Similarly, Turley (2009) explains that during the Vietnam War, Vietnamese military communication required a high level of detail to avoid operational failures. Precision was essential in directing both military forces and civilian militias. Likewise, General Nguyễn Quốc Thước has written about the importance of clear communication in Vietnam’s military history, where every member of the defense forces needed to fully understand their responsibilities to avoid misinterpretations that could lead to disastrous consequences (Nguyễn, 1985).

Moreover, Vietnamese military communication is characterized by a hierarchical and detailed command structure, where precise and clear orders are essential to prevent confusion at various levels of the military hierarchy. Pike (1966) terms that detailed communication ensures that all levels, from high-ranking officers to local commanders, understand the full context of the orders they receive, which is crucial for effective command and control.

Finally, Scott (1985) explores how the Vietnamese military's emphasis on detailed and explicit communication is vital for maintaining operational discipline and avoiding misunderstandings. This detail-oriented approach is particularly important in hierarchical systems where accurate execution of orders is critical for successful operations. Likewise, Nguyễn (1989) emphasizes the importance of clear communication in the Vietnamese military, arguing that precision in orders is necessary to ensure that all personnel fully understand their roles and responsibilities, which is essential for maintaining effectiveness within a structured command environment.

In conclusion, the emphasis on clear and precise communication in Vietnamese military texts reflects the country’s historical and strategic needs, particularly during the Vietnam War. Scholars such as Thayer, Turley, and General Nguyễn Quốc Thước have highlighted the necessity of unambiguous language to ensure that orders are properly understood and executed within the context of asymmetric warfare. The detailed and expanded terminology used in Vietnamese military discourse serves to eliminate misunderstandings, which is critical for the successful coordination of military forces and civilian militias alike. Moreover, the hierarchical structure of Vietnamese military communication ensures that precise directives reach all levels of command, from high-ranking officers to local units, thereby maintaining operational discipline and preventing errors. This structured approach, focusing on clarity and explicitness, plays a vital role in ensuring that all personnel fully understand their roles and responsibilities, ultimately enhancing the overall effectiveness of Vietnam’s military operations.

This understanding of communication practices forms the basis for the working definition of military texts, which are formal written documents produced by armed forces to convey operational doctrines, strategic guidance, command instructions, and tactical procedures. These texts are characterized by specialized terminology and reflect linguistic styles shaped by cultural and historical contexts. For instance, English military texts typically use technical jargon, acronyms, and strategic ambiguity to allow flexibility and rely on a shared professional knowledge base. In contrast, Vietnamese military texts emphasize clarity, precision, and explicit communication to ensure unambiguous understanding across hierarchical command structures. Consequently, military texts function as culturally and linguistically situated artifacts that require careful interpretation and translation in order to preserve their intended operational meaning.

2.1.2. Military terminology

Military terminology plays a crucial role in communication within the armed forces, serving as a specialized language designed to ensure precision and clarity in the transmission of vital operational information. According to Sager (1990), terminology refers to a set of designations specific to a particular field, emphasizing its function in minimizing ambiguity in high-stakes contexts. Military terminology, therefore, encompasses not merely isolated vocabulary items but an interconnected system of concepts and expressions that facilitate the effective exchange of tactical and strategic information.

Linguistic Forms of Military Terminology

Military terminology exhibits several linguistic forms that reflect its technical, functional, and operational nature. These include simple terms, compound terms, multi-word terminological phrases, and specialized collocations. Each form contributes to the precision and clarity essential in military communication and translation.

Simple terms refer to single lexical units that represent concrete or abstract military concepts. Examples in English include fire, attack, and tank, while their Vietnamese equivalents include pháo (artillery), mục tiêu (target), and lệnh (command). As noted by Sager (1990), such terms form the foundational layer of technical vocabulary in specialized discourse, allowing for efficient information transfer in high-pressure environments.

Compound terms consist of two or more morphemes or words combined to denote a specific concept, such as firepower, airstrike, or battlefield in English, and phòng ngự chủ động (active defense) or chiến dịch phản công (counteroffensive campaign) in Vietnamese. According to Valeontis and Mantzari (2006), compound terms often encapsulate complex operational meanings, necessitating careful contextual interpretation to avoid semantic distortion during translation.

Multi-word Terminological Phrases are fixed or semi-fixed lexical phrases conveying more nuanced military ideas. Phrases such as rules of engagement, forward operating base, and combined arms operation are typical in English texts. Their Vietnamese counterparts include mệnh lệnh tác chiến (combat orders) and kế hoạch hành quân chiến lược (strategic deployment plan). As Warburton (2007) observes, such expressions demand familiarity with doctrinal frameworks and institutional language norms to be effectively interpreted.

Specialized collocations refer to frequent, domain-specific word pairings such as launch an attack, secure the perimeter, mở cuộc tấn công, or bảo vệ vòng ngoài. These lexical combinations are deeply embedded in professional military usage and often carry meanings that extend beyond their individual components. Rakhimov (2021) emphasizes that translating such collocations requires both linguistic sensitivity and subject-matter expertise, particularly in multilingual coalition settings.

These linguistic structures not only serve to maintain terminological stability across military organizations but also ensure that communication remains unambiguous and actionable under time-sensitive and mission-critical conditions (Sager, 1990; Warburton, 2007). In translation, recognizing and preserving these forms is essential to maintaining operational integrity and semantic fidelity.

Key Characteristics of Military Terminology

Military terminology possesses several defining features that distinguish it from general vocabulary. One of the most prominent characteristics is precision. Each term is designed to convey a specific, unambiguous meaning. In military contexts, even slight misinterpretations—such as confusing retreat with withdraw—can result in serious operational consequences. The function of precision is to eliminate interpretive flexibility in favor of command clarity and operational reliability (Sager, 1990).

Another key feature is stability. Military terms are typically standardized and regulated to ensure uniform usage across various branches of the armed forces and among allied nations. As Rakhimov (2021) emphasizes, the regulation of terms facilitates interoperability and cohesive action, particularly in joint or multinational operations. Terminological consistency enables forces from different linguistic and cultural backgrounds to coordinate effectively under unified command structures.

Military terminology also demonstrates systematicity, forming part of a structured conceptual network. For example, the term attack may operate at multiple levels of discourse—it could refer to a tactical maneuver or a broader strategic campaign depending on the context. This hierarchical organization supports efficient knowledge transmission and allows terms to be categorized by function, scope, and operational level (Warburton, 2007).

A fourth characteristic is contextual and historical embeddedness. Military terms are often shaped by historical events, doctrines, and strategic traditions. Therefore, understanding the evolution of such terms requires attention to national defense histories and ideological orientations. Translators must be particularly sensitive to these embedded nuances, as failure to grasp cultural connotations may lead to incorrect interpretation or inadequate localization (Thayer, 1994; Turley, 1986).

Finally, military terminology is marked by a high degree of technicality. It belongs to a domain-specific register that may be largely inaccessible to non-specialists. As noted by Valeontis and Mantzari (2006), this technical nature requires specialized knowledge for accurate interpretation and usage, particularly in multilingual environments where operational terms carry critical weight.

 Comparison of English and Vietnamese Military Terminology

Military terminology in English and Vietnamese reflects distinct communicative norms and structural conventions, shaped by divergent historical, cultural, and strategic contexts.

English military terminology frequently employs acronyms and abbreviations such as ROE (Rules of Engagement) and FOB (Forward Operating Base). These shorthand expressions are based on the assumption that the audience possesses a shared professional knowledge base (Gill, 2020). Additionally, English military texts often utilize strategic ambiguity. As observed by Howard (1983) and Freedman (2013), this deliberate vagueness provides flexibility in planning and diplomacy, particularly in multinational coalitions where rigid statements could limit tactical or political maneuverability.

Another distinctive feature of English military terminology is its preference for concise and abstract expressions. This style allows for the encapsulation of complex operational procedures into brief statements, as seen in terms like force projection or combat readiness. Chilton (1996) and Cameron (1995) argue that such abstraction serves both rhetorical and functional purposes, enabling broad applicability while reducing the cognitive load on the reader.

By contrast, Vietnamese military terminology is characterized by semantic clarity and explicitness. Vietnamese often expands compound terms to clarify meaning and avoid misinterpretation. For example, phòng thủ (defense) may be elaborated as phòng thủ quốc gia (national defense) to ensure specificity (Nguyễn, 1997). This linguistic tendency reflects the historical reliance on clear, direct orders, particularly during asymmetric warfare. Moreover, Vietnamese military terminology is rooted in historical and strategic experience, especially from the resistance wars. Thayer (1994) and Turley (1986) note that during the Vietnam War, the success of operations depended on the clarity of communication across all command levels. Thus, terms were designed to be understood unambiguously by both trained soldiers and local militias.

Vietnamese military communication also mirrors a hierarchical command structure; wherein detailed instructions must be clearly articulated from high-ranking officials down to grassroots units. Pike (1966) and Nguyễn (1989) emphasize that such clarity is crucial to prevent operational missteps, particularly in decentralized formations involving civilian mobilization.

Working Definition of Military Terminology

Military terminology refers to the structured set of specialized terms and expressions used within armed forces to convey operational, tactical, strategic, and doctrinal information with precision and consistency. It encompasses not only individual words but also compound terms, collocations, and multi-word expressions that are context-specific and often regulated to maintain uniformity across branches and allied forces (Sager, 1990; Rakhimov, 2021). Military terminology serves the primary function of ensuring unambiguous communication in high-stakes environments, where misinterpretation can lead to operational failure.

This terminology is characterized by five key features: precision, stability, systematicity, technicality, and contextual embeddedness. It is often domain-specific, interdisciplinary, and culturally bound, with linguistic forms that include simple terms (e.g., tank, fire), compound terms (e.g., firepower, airstrike), and specialized collocations (e.g., launch an attack, secure the perimeter) (Warburton, 2007; Valeontis & Mantzari, 2006). In English, military terminology frequently relies on acronyms, abstract expressions, and strategic ambiguity, assuming a shared professional knowledge base (Freedman, 2013; Cameron, 1995). In contrast, Vietnamese military terminology emphasizes semantic clarity, detailed phrasing, and hierarchical comprehensibility, shaped by the country’s experience with asymmetric warfare (Thayer, 1994; Nguyễn, 1997).

For the purpose of this study, military terminology is treated as a communicative system embedded in doctrinal and operational discourse, whose accurate translation requires both linguistic and cultural competence. It is examined not only as a lexical set but as a dynamic semiotic resource shaped by military needs, historical context, and strategic priorities.

2.2. Equivalence in Translation and Translation Strategies

Equivalence serves as a cornerstone in translation theory, guiding translators in rendering the intended meaning of a source text while adapting it to the linguistic and cultural context of the target language. This concept manifests in multiple forms, including formal equivalence, which emphasizes a word-for-word correspondence (Nida, 1964), and dynamic equivalence, which aims to achieve a similar communicative effect on the target audience as the original had on its readers (Nida & Taber, 1969).

In this theoretical framework, the concept of the translational equivalent becomes central. A translational equivalent refers to a unit in the target language that accurately corresponds to a unit in the source language in terms of meaning, usage, and communicative function (Pym, 2010). While equivalence represents the broader theoretical principle, translational equivalents are its practical manifestations—specific lexical, phrasal, or structural choices made by translators in particular contexts to fulfill the aim of equivalence. In other words, equivalence is the goal, and translational equivalents are the linguistic tools used to achieve that goal.

In military translation, where clarity, accuracy, and operational functionality are paramount, establishing reliable translational equivalents poses significant challenges. Military terminology is highly specialized and often lacks direct counterparts in other languages (Meyer, 2010). As a result, translators must navigate lexical gaps, cultural differences, and doctrinal variations when selecting appropriate equivalents. Several strategies are employed to achieve effective equivalence in translation:

**Literal Translation**

This approach retains the source text's structure and vocabulary as closely as possible (Vinay & Darbelnet, 1995). For example, the English term "command post" is literally rendered as "trụ sở chỉ huy" in Vietnamese. While this may serve as a translational equivalent that preserves the denotative meaning, it may require further contextualization to align with Vietnamese military doctrine.

**Adaptation**

Adaptation modifies the source text to better resonate with the cultural expectations of the target audience (Munday, 2016). A term like "air force" translated as "Không quân" in Vietnamese functions as a translational equivalent; however, the effectiveness of this equivalence depends on the recipient’s understanding of the air force’s operational scope within the Vietnamese defense system.

**Borrowing**

Borrowing is employed when no existing equivalent exists in the target language (Baker, 2018). For instance, "drone" may be borrowed directly into Vietnamese as "drone". While this borrowed term serves as a provisional translational equivalent, it may introduce ambiguity if not accompanied by further explanation or localization.

**Explicitation**

Explicitation involves making implicit information in the source text explicit in the target language (Blum-Kulka, 1986). For example, "logistics" may be explicated as "hậu cần quân sự" (military logistics) to clarify its domain-specific meaning in Vietnamese. Here, explicitation not only enhances the translational equivalent but also ensures functional equivalence in a critical military context.

Among these strategies, explicitation plays a particularly important role in military translation. It helps bridge the communicative gap between English’s strategic ambiguity (Howard, 1983; Freedman, 2013) and Vietnamese’s preference for explicit clarity (Nguyễn, 1997; Thayer, 1994). For example, the phrase "take the hill" may be translated as "chiếm lĩnh đồi", an explicitation that clarifies both the action and its operational implications for Vietnamese readers.

However, achieving equivalence is not without compromise. While adaptation may improve cultural resonance, it can potentially dilute the source term’s operational intent (Kämpfer, 2019). Conversely, borrowing may preserve originality but risks misunderstanding among target audiences unfamiliar with the term (Baker, 2018). Therefore, a balanced approach—often involving explicitation—is required to ensure that the translational equivalent upholds both semantic and pragmatic integrity.

The selection of translational equivalents is context-sensitive and depends on textual genre, communicative purpose, and target audience familiarity (Munday, 2016). In military texts, where miscommunication can have serious consequences, the translator's ability to identify and implement effective translational equivalents becomes a core competency.

In summary, equivalence in translation provides the theoretical foundation for achieving communicative parity between languages, while translational equivalents represent the practical, context-driven solutions that fulfill this goal. The interplay between these two concepts is especially critical in military translation, where the accuracy of terminology is directly linked to operational success and international collaboration.

2.2. Explicitation in translation

Explicitation in translation studies refers to the process by which implicit information in the source text is made explicit in the target text. This technique serves to enhance clarity and comprehension, particularly in contexts where cultural or linguistic differences might obscure meaning. Explicitation is not merely a stylistic choice but a strategic approach that can significantly affect the effectiveness of communication, especially in specialized fields such as military translation. This section delves into the defitions and categories of explicitation, providing a comprehensive understanding of how they function within the translation process. By examining specific examples, we illustrate the importance of explicitation in achieving precision and clarity in translation, ultimately highlighting its role as a fundamental strategy in effective cross-cultural communication.

2.2.1. Definition of explicitation

 Explicitation has emerged as a complex and evolving concept within translation studies, reflecting its multifaceted nature. Understanding this concept is crucial for grasping its function in the translation of military terminology from English into Vietnamese.

The foundational work on explicitation originated with Vinay and Darbelnet (1958), who described it as a "procedure" involving the addition of contextually inferred information in the source text (ST). Their definition positioned explicitation within a broader framework of translation techniques, such as borrowing and literal translation, which laid the groundwork for subsequent developments. They articulated explicitation as a stylistic technique aimed at making implicit information in the target language (TL) explicit. This process enhances clarity and specificity in translation, illustrating that explicitation serves to clarify meanings that might otherwise rely heavily on context. While the French term "précisions" suggests clarity derived from nuanced meanings, an examination of their examples reveals that explicitation often yields a more informative meaning in the TL, rather than merely spelling out recoverable meaning. This approach encompasses pragmatic meanings, accommodating readership needs and rendering sentences more self-sufficient by reducing dependency on contextual references.

As the concept evolved, interpretations of explicitation grew. Sager and Hamer (1995) defined it within the English translation of Vinay and Darbelnet’s work, emphasizing that explicitation makes implicit information in the ST explicit in the TL. This interpretation suggests that explicitation may lead to more generalized expressions in the TL compared to the ST, framing explicitness as a category of meaning. This nuanced shift from Vinay and Darbelnet’s original conceptualization highlights the evolving nature of the term.

Further developments came from Shuttleworth and Cowie (1997), who described explicitation as a phenomenon where information in the target text is presented more explicitly than in the source text. This perspective focuses on observable outcomes, emphasizing how the TL often clarifies or elaborates on the ST’s content. Baker (1996) expanded this notion, suggesting that explicitation represents a universal tendency in translation to "spell things out." This reinforces the idea that explicitation is not merely a procedural choice but a fundamental aspect that enhances clarity across languages.

Delisle, Lee-Jahnke, and Cormier (1999) further characterized explicitation as a translation procedure that introduces semantic details into the TL for greater precision. Their approach emphasizes explicitation's role in addressing the constraints of the target language while adding information based on the translator’s knowledge, effectively bridging linguistic and cultural gaps.

The concept has also been advanced by scholars like Saldanha (2008) and Molina (2002), who emphasize explicitation as a conscious strategy employed by translators to tackle specific challenges. This strategic view acknowledges the active role of translators in shaping the final text, guided by their assessment of the target audience’s needs. Heltai (2005) introduced a cognitive dimension, defining explicitation as a strategy that provides a linguistically coded form for implicit information in the ST. This approach aims for clarity while recognizing the risk of creating complex circumlocutions that might complicate the translation process.

Pápai (2004) refined the understanding of explicitation by distinguishing between explicitation as a process and explicitness as a product. This distinction clarifies that explicitation involves shifts during the translation process to resolve ambiguity and enhance cohesiveness, ultimately addressing the expectations of the target audience.

Hansen-Schirra et al. (2007) further differentiated between explicitness as a textual property and explicitation as a relational process, highlighting how explicitness pertains to clarity while explicitation represents the process through which meanings in the TL become clearer than in the ST. This distinction aids in understanding explicitation's operation at different levels within the translation process.

Dimitrova (2003) underscored the importance of metacognitive awareness in explicitation, noting that professional translators utilize cognitive resources more strategically than novices. This perspective emphasizes the cognitive aspects of translation, including the use of explicitation as a deliberate strategy.

The diverse interpretations of explicitation hold significant implications for translating military terminology from English into Vietnamese. Given the specialized nature of military texts, explicitation becomes essential for ensuring clarity and accuracy in the target language. The translator’s cognitive processes, strategic choices, and understanding of the audience’s needs are pivotal in this endeavor.

To conclude, explicitation is a complex and evolving concept that intersects various aspects of translation studies. Its application in translating military terminology requires balancing the integrity of the original text with clarity for target readers. By understanding the cognitive and procedural dimensions of explicitation, translators can enhance the effectiveness of translations in this specialized field.

2.2.2. Categories of Explicitation

The concept of explicitation in translation studies not only highlights the process of making implicit information explicit but also encompasses various categories that delineate how this phenomenon manifests in practice. Understanding these categories is essential for analyzing how explicitation operates in the translation of military terminology, particularly when translating from English to Vietnamese, where cultural and linguistic differences can significantly influence the interpretation of terms and phrases.

Moreover, scholars have identified different dimensions of explicitation that reflect its varied applications in translation. These categories provide a framework for examining the specific strategies that translators employ to clarify meaning, enhance coherence, and adapt the SL text to meet the expectations of the target audience. Consequently, by categorizing explicitation, researchers can better assess its role in conveying specialized military concepts and ensuring effective communication in the TL text.

*2.2.2.1. Eugene Nida’s Approach to Explicitation*

Nida (1964) introduced the term 'Addition' to signify the incorporation of elements that are considered permissible in a translation, akin to the concept of explicitation. This usage parallels Vinay and Darbelnet's use of 'gain', reflecting fidelity's association with the form of the source text (ST). Nida's notion of additions extends beyond mere "simple additions," encompassing information readily inferable from the text or context. Such additions may involve grammatical adjustments, like completing elliptical expressions, or employing classifiers and connectives to effect "structural alteration." Additionally, Nida discusses "amplification from implicit to explicit status" as another form of addition, clarifying meaning inferred from context, particularly concerning the socio-cultural context of the text, to enhance readability or prevent ambiguity. Overall, akin to Vinay and Darbelnet (1958), Nida's concept, resembling explicitation, revolves around a limited amalgamation of meaning-level and textual forms of explicitness. While this shift has to be motivated by an appropriate interpretation of ST, the scholar only focuses on it as a gain. Nida's notion of additions goes beyond simple lexical or syntactic additions. It encompasses various types of additions, including:

*(i) Filling out elliptical expressions:* Completing expressions that are elliptical or incomplete in the source text to ensure clarity in the translation. For example, when translating the abbreviation "RPG," which stands for "Rocket-Propelled Grenade" in English, it may be expanded in Vietnamese to "Vụ phóng hỏa có đạn dẫn động bằng tên lửa." This explicitation helps clarify the term for readers unfamiliar with military jargon. Additionally, in Vietnamese, it is important to specify the grammatical gender of nouns, which may not be necessary in English. For instance, the English phrase "the soldier" can be translated into Vietnamese as "người lính" for a general reference or "nữ quân nhân" when specifically referring to a female soldier, ensuring that the gender of the individual is clearly conveyed.

*(ii) Additions required because of grammatical restructuring:* Making additions to accommodate grammatical differences between English and Vietnamese. This may involve adjusting word order or adding particles like "đã" (already) or "đang" (currently) to convey tense or aspect in Vietnamese.

*(iii) Amplification from implicit to explicit status:* Clarifying implicit meanings from the context of the source text to make them explicit in the translation, especially concerning socio-cultural context. This includes adding explanatory phrases or context to ensure understanding, such as elaborating on the purpose or function of military equipment or procedures.

*(iv) Answers to rhetorical questions:* Providing explicit answers to rhetorical questions posed in the source text to maintain coherence and clarity in the translation. This involves adding responses to rhetorical questions to ensure comprehensibility in Vietnamese.

*(v) Classifiers:* Using classifiers in Vietnamese to specify nouns or provide additional information. This may involve adding classifiers to military terms to convey precise meanings, such as using "chiếc" for vehicles or "viên" for ammunition.

*(vi) Connectives:* Adding connectives or transitional words in Vietnamese to improve the flow and coherence of translated military texts. This includes adding conjunctions like "và" (and), "hoặc" (or), or "tuy nhiên" (however) to link ideas or clauses.

*(vii) Categories of the receptor language not existing in the source language:* Introducing or adapting Vietnamese-specific categories or concepts in the translation that do not exist in English military terminology. An example of this can be found in incorporating Vietnamese terms for military ranks or organizational structures.

*(viii) Doublets:* Including redundant expressions or repetitions for emphasis or clarity in Vietnamese military texts. This may involve repeating key terms or phrases for emphasis or reinforcement.

*2.2.2.2. Blum-Kulka’s Explication Hypothesis*

Blum-Kulka (1986/2000) conducted what is often regarded as the first systematic examination of explicitation, distinct from the approaches of Vinay and Darbelnet (1958/1995) as well as Nida (1964). In order to elucidate the situation, it seems reasonable to start with a discussion of the statement probably quoted most often in this context– the so-called explicitation hypothesis, first formulated by Blum-Kulka in 1986:

The process of translation, particularly if successful, necessitates a complex text and discourse processing. The process of interpretation performed by the translator on the source text might lead to a TL text which is more redundant than the SL text. This redundancy can be expressed by a rise in the level of cohesive explicitness in the TL text. This argument may be stated as “the explicitation hypothesis”, which postulates an observed cohesive explicitness from SL to TL texts regardless of the increase traceable to differences between the two linguistic and textual systems involved. It follows that explicitation is viewed here as inherent in the process of translation. (Blum-Kulka, 1986, p. 19)

She introduces the 'explicitation hypothesis', defining it as "an observed cohesive explicitness from SL to TL texts regardless of the increase traceable to differences between the two linguistic and textual systems involved" (1986/2000, p. 300). According to her, explicitation arises from "the translation process itself," specifically from "the process of interpretation performed by the translator on the source text" (p. 300). Blum-Kulka suggests that explicitation may be a "universal strategy inherent" in the translation process (p. 302). However, there is ambiguity surrounding her characterization of explicitation as a strategy, as her focus leans more towards the augmentation of textual explicitness resulting from translation shifts rather than the translator's deliberate employment of such shifts.

Blum-Kulka proposes that to determine if there is explicitation of cohesion and coherence in translation, only 'optional' shifts should be taken into account, rather than 'obligatory' ones (p. 312). Optional shifts are defined as those stemming from stylistic preferences, while obligatory shifts are dictated by the grammatical systems of the two languages (p. 312). Furthermore, Blum-Kulka further asserts that the optional shifts considered for the Explicitation Hypothesis should exclude "reader-based" information, which is added to cater to the target reader. Instead, emphasis should be placed on text-based shifts resulting from the translator's "diagnosis" of the source text (p. 309).

Blum-Kulka suggests that since text-based shifts may also be influenced by well-known differences between linguistic systems, there is a need for a "large-scale contrastive stylistic study" to validate her hypothesis (p. 309). This study would involve examining stylistic information to analyze the patterns of selected optional shifts, which may align with the ST and TT, or neither. When the shifts do not align with either text, it indicates explicitation in the translation. Although this comparative method can be inferred from a thorough reading of her article, Blum-Kulka does not explicitly explain it. As a result, it has been interpreted in various ways within explicitation research.

*2.2.2.3. Séguinot’s Typology of Explication*

As research on explicitation has progressed, concerns have emerged regarding the necessity for explicitation typologies or, at the very least, a clear distinction between its various realizations. One of the earliest attempts to classify explicitation was made by Séguinot (1988), who categorized it based on surface manifestations. According to his proposal, there are three ways in which explicitation is manifested: “something is expressed in the translation which was not in the original, something which was implied or understood through presupposition in the source text is overtly expressed in the translation, or an element in the source text is given greater importance in the translation through focus, emphasis, or lexical choice” (1988, p. 108). Séguinot (1988) proposed a classification of explicitation based on surface manifestations, identifying three ways in which it is manifested:

*(i) Addition:* In this manifestation, something is expressed in the translation that was not present in the original text. This could involve adding information, details, or explanations to ensure clarity or completeness in the target language.

*(ii) Clarification:* This occurs when something that was implied or understood through presupposition in the source text is overtly expressed in the translation. Translators may clarify ambiguous or implicit information to ensure that the intended meaning is fully conveyed to the target audience.

*(iii) Emphasis:* In this manifestation, an element in the source text is given greater importance in the translation through focus, emphasis, or lexical choice. Translators may highlight certain aspects of the text to draw attention to key points or to reflect the emphasis present in the original text.

*2.2.2.4 Vanderauwera’s Procedure of Explicitation*

Vanderauwera (1985) categorizes explicitation techniques and other translation procedures as follows:

*(i) Use of interjections:* This technique involves incorporating interjections or exclamations into the translated text to convey characters' thoughts, emotions, or attitudes more vividly. By including interjections, translators can add depth to the characters' expressions and highlight specific nuances that may be present in the original language but not readily apparent in the target language.

*(ii) Expansion of condensed passages:* Translators may encounter passages in the original text that are condensed or succinct. To ensure that the meaning is fully conveyed in the translation, they may expand upon these passages by adding additional information, descriptions, or explanations. This expansion helps to elucidate the content and provide readers with a more comprehensive understanding of the text.

*(iii) Addition of modifiers, qualifiers, and conjunctions:* In some cases, the original text may lack modifiers, qualifiers, or conjunctions that contribute to clarity or coherence in the target language. Translators may choose to insert these linguistic elements to enhance the readability and flow of the translation, making it easier for readers to follow the narrative or argument presented in the text.

*(iv) Addition of extra information:* Translators may supplement the original text with additional information that serves to enrich the content or provide context for the target audience. This extra information may include background details, explanations of cultural references, or relevant historical facts that help readers better understand the text and its implications.

*(v) Insertion of explanations:* When translating complex or obscure passages, translators may insert explanations or interpretations to clarify the meaning for the target audience. These explanations can help readers navigate difficult concepts or cultural references that may be unfamiliar to them, ensuring that they grasp the intended message of the text.

*(vi) Repetition of previous details:* Repetition can be employed strategically in translation to reinforce important information or concepts. By repeating key details from earlier in the text, translators can ensure that readers understand and remember crucial points, thus enhancing comprehension and retention.

*(vii) Precise rendering of implicit or vague data:* Some information in the original text may be implicit or vaguely expressed, requiring translators to render it more explicitly in the target language. This involves making implicit details explicit, clarifying ambiguous references, and ensuring that the intended meaning is conveyed accurately to the reader.

*(viii) More accurate descriptions:* Translators strive to provide accurate descriptions in the target language, including precise naming of geographical locations and disambiguation of pronouns. By ensuring that descriptions are clear and unambiguous, translators help readers visualize the setting and characters more vividly, contributing to a richer reading experience.

*2.2.2.5 Klaudy’s Typology of Explicitation*

Klaudy (2009) introduced a widely recognized typology of explicitation, which comprises four categories: "obligatory," "optional," "pragmatic," and "translation-inherent" explicitation (pp. 106-107). According to Klaudy, obligatory explicitation arises from differences in the syntactic and semantic structures of languages, while optional explicitation is influenced by variations in text-building strategies and stylistic preferences across languages (p. 106). Furthermore, pragmatic explicitation often parallels cultural explicitation, stemming from the absence of common knowledge in the source language culture within the target-language cultural community. Lastly, translation-inherent explicitation is attributed to a fundamental characteristic of translation activity: the need to convey concepts originally formulated in the source language into the target language (Klaudy, 1993).

Klaudy (2009) presents a comprehensive typology of explicitation, categorizing it into four distinct types:

*(i) Obligatory explicitation:* This type of explicitation arises from inherent differences in the syntactic and semantic structures of languages. It is necessary to ensure that the translated text conforms to the grammatical rules and linguistic conventions of the target language. Obligatory explicitation addresses structural disparities between languages to maintain clarity and coherence in the translation process.

*(ii) Optional explicitation:* Unlike obligatory explicitation, which is dictated by linguistic differences, optional explicitation is influenced by variations in text-building strategies and stylistic preferences across languages. Translators may choose to introduce additional explicit elements to enhance the readability or stylistic coherence of the translation, even if such explicitation is not strictly required by linguistic constraints.

*(iii) Pragmatic explicitation:* Pragmatic explicitation often coincides with cultural explicitation and arises from the absence of common knowledge in the source language culture within the target-language cultural community. Translators may need to provide explanatory or contextual information to bridge cultural gaps and ensure that the translated text is intelligible and culturally relevant to the target audience.

*(iv) Translation-inherent explicitation:* This type of explicitation is fundamental to the nature of translation itself. It stems from the inherent challenge of conveying concepts originally formulated in the source language into the target language. Translation-inherent explicitation involves clarifying ambiguities, resolving linguistic ambiguities, and ensuring semantic fidelity while transferring meaning from one language to another.

Each type of explicitation identified by Klaudy serves a specific purpose in the translation process, addressing different challenges and considerations that translators encounter when navigating between languages and cultures. These categories provide valuable insights into the diverse strategies employed by translators to achieve accuracy, clarity, and cultural relevance in their translations.

For my categorization and analysis of explicitation in the translation of military terminology from English into Vietnamese, I have chosen to adopt a combined framework that incorporates Klaudy's typology—specifically focusing on obligatory and pragmatic explicitation (Klaudy, 2009)—alongside Nida's concepts of amplification and register markedness (Nida, 1964). This integrated approach allows for a nuanced examination of how explicitation operates in this specialized context, addressing both the linguistic structures that necessitate clarity and the cultural considerations that inform the translator's decisions.

Transitioning to the functionality of explicitation in the translation of military texts, it is essential to recognize that this process plays a pivotal role in ensuring that specialized terminology and nuanced meanings are effectively conveyed. Military texts often contain jargon and concepts that may not translate directly or might be ambiguous in Vietnamese. Explicitation thus becomes a necessary strategy to clarify these terms, ensuring that the intended meanings are accessible and comprehensible to the target audience. By applying insights from both Klaudy (2009) and Nida (1964), we can explore how explicitation not only enhances comprehension but also preserves the integrity of the original military discourse, facilitating effective communication in this critical field. This exploration will shed light on best practices for translating military terminology, contributing to clearer and more precise military communications between English and Vietnamese.

2.3. Deployment and functions of explicitation in translation of military terminology from English into Vietnamese

Translation of military terminology requires a systematic approach to ensure accuracy, clarity, and cultural relevance. This analytical framework integrates the explicitation categories proposed by prominent scholars in translation studies, namely Klaudy, Nida, and the concept of register markedness. Each category addresses specific linguistic and contextual challenges encountered in military translation, making them essential components of the analytical framework.

In the realm of translating military terminology, Klaudy's concept of obligatory explicitation underscores the importance of adhering to specific linguistic requirements within the target language. While this approach undoubtedly ensures precision and consistency by following grammatical rules and conventions, it may inadvertently overlook the dynamic nature of military jargon, which often evolves rapidly. Consequently, striking a balance between linguistic accuracy and contextual relevance becomes paramount. Thus, military terminology, with its intricate nuances, may necessitate a degree of flexibility that goes beyond strict linguistic guidelines to effectively capture its essence.

Similarly, Nida's notion of amplification offers valuable insights into providing additional context and background information to elucidate complex military terms. However, the challenge in military translation lies in maintaining a delicate balance between furnishing sufficient information for comprehension and avoiding unnecessary verbosity, particularly in operational documents where brevity is pivotal for clarity and efficiency. As a result, translators must navigate this fine line skillfully to ensure that the translated text remains clear and accessible to its intended audience.

Moreover, addressing gaps in direct equivalents of terms in the target language, as advocated by Nida, is crucial for the accurate conveyance of military terminology. Nonetheless, this endeavor may encounter obstacles, especially in languages with limited lexical resources or disparate cultural contexts. Therefore, translators must exercise discernment in navigating these gaps to preserve the intended meaning and context of the source text without introducing ambiguity or misinterpretation.

Furthermore, pragmatic explicitation involves making implicit aspects of meaning more explicit to aid understanding, particularly when cultural or contextual knowledge is assumed in the source text but not necessarily shared by the target audience. This type of explicitation is especially valuable in military translation, as it helps bridge the gap between the source and target cultures, ensuring that critical information is conveyed effectively. By clarifying assumptions, providing background information, or explaining cultural references, pragmatic explicitation enhances comprehension and prevents potential misinterpretations.

Additionally, the proposal of register markedness, which focuses on aligning the style of the target text with that of the source text, plays a pivotal role in upholding the integrity and authenticity of military communications. However, in the multifaceted landscape of military discourse, accurately capturing the nuances of register and tone while ensuring clarity and accessibility poses a significant challenge. Hence, translators must skillfully balance linguistic fidelity with communicative effectiveness to meet the diverse demands of military translation successfully.

Ultimately, the incorporation of these explicitation categories—obligatory explicitation, amplification, pragmatic explicitation, and register markedness—provides a robust analytical framework for translating military terminology. By systematically addressing linguistic and contextual challenges, translators can achieve accuracy, clarity, and cultural relevance in military translation, thereby facilitating effective communication within military contexts.

2.3.1. Obligatory Explicitation in Military Translation

Klaudy's (2009) concept of Obligatory Explicitation involves providing additional information in the translation to address differences in syntactic and semantic structures between languages. This type of explicitation is essential for ensuring that a translated text aligns with the grammatical and linguistic conventions of the target language, preserving both clarity and coherence.

Take, for example, the English term Defense of the River Line. While it is understood in English that the river serves as a natural barrier in a defensive strategy, simply using the word "river" in Vietnamese might not fully capture this strategic context. To make the meaning clear to Vietnamese readers, the phrase is translated as phòng ngự theo tuyến vật cản nước (defense along a water barrier). By explicitly adding “water barrier” (vật cản nước), the translation makes it clear that the river is not just a geographical feature, but a defensive obstacle, ensuring that the full tactical significance of the original phrase is conveyed. This additional clarity is crucial for a proper understanding of military terminology in Vietnamese, demonstrating how obligatory explicitation enhances precision in translation. Vietnamese often requires more specific context to fit its grammatical and syntactic norms. The English structure assumes that the defensive nature of the river line is implied. However, Vietnamese demands an explicit mention of "tuyến vật cản nước" to indicate the specific role of the river in military defense. This explicit detail helps maintain sentence flow, preventing any ambiguity. The translation introduces the necessary context that fits the logic of the military strategy being described. Without the addition of "vật cản nước" (water barrier), the translation could be too vague, leading to potential confusion about where or how the defense is structured. This explicit mention aligns with Vietnamese military communication norms, ensuring that the translation remains coherent within its cultural and linguistic context.

The explicitation of "the river" as a defensive barrier helps readers fully grasp the nature of the military strategy. In this context, it transforms the concept from just a geographic feature (the river) to an integral part of a defensive plan. By providing the necessary contextual details, the translation ensures that the audience understands the strategic importance of the river as a military barrier.

In this example, obligatory explicitation is key to ensuring that Vietnamese readers can comprehend the strategic importance of the "Defense of the River Line". Without the added context of "vật cản nước," the translation might lack the precision needed to convey the full meaning. This strategy ensures that translations not only match the grammatical and syntactic requirements of the target language but also provide clarity, coherence, and a deeper understanding of military operations.

Languages often have specific conventions and norms that must be adhered to in translation. Obligatory explicitation addresses these conventions by providing additional information that aligns with the linguistic norms of the target language.

English term: Bolster Defense

Vietnamese Translation: Củng cố công sự phòng ngự

In translating "Bolster Defense" into Vietnamese as "Củng cố công sự phòng ngự", additional information is provided to align with the linguistic norms and conventions of Vietnamese. The term "Bolster Defense" in English is somewhat abstract, typically referring to the act of strengthening or improving defensive capabilities. However, Vietnamese often requires more specific and explicit descriptions to ensure clarity and coherence.Conclusion

Clarification of "Defense" as "Công sự phòng ngự" (Defensive Fortifications): In English, the word "Defense" is a broad term that could refer to various aspects, including military strategy, troops, or fortifications. In Vietnamese, however, the term "phòng ngự" (defense) often requires a clearer and more concrete context. By translating it as "công sự phòng ngự" (defensive fortifications), the phrase becomes more specific, referring to physical defensive structures. This explicitness aligns with Vietnamese linguistic norms, where military terms tend to be more detailed and concrete.

In Vietnamese, abstract actions such as "bolster" typically need more concrete explanations to fit into grammatical structure. The translation "Củng cố" (to strengthen) directly relates to the action of reinforcing, while "công sự phòng ngự" provides a clear object for this action. This level of detail ensures that the sentence is grammatically coherent, as Vietnamese syntax often favors explicit subjects and objects to avoid ambiguity.

The additional information—"công sự" (fortifications)—helps clarify the nature of the defense being bolstered. In Vietnamese military terminology, it is common to specify what kind of defense is being referred to, especially in tactical or operational contexts. Without this specificity, the translation could be too vague, leaving readers uncertain about whether "defense" refers to troops, strategies, or physical structures. By including "công sự", the translation explicitly focuses on the strengthening of physical defensive works, which aligns with the Vietnamese norm of providing precise and unambiguous information.

Vietnamese military language often requires explicit references to both the action being performed and the specific military assets involved. In this case, "Củng cố công sự phòng ngự" provides a clear understanding that the action (bolstering) refers specifically to fortifications. This ensures that the translation is not only linguistically correct but also contextually appropriate for military communication, where such precision is vital.

The translation of "Bolster Defense" into "Củng cố công sự phòng ngự" demonstrates the use of obligatory explicitation to align with Vietnamese linguistic and military conventions. The term "Defense" is clarified to refer specifically to "công sự" (fortifications), ensuring that the target language accurately conveys the intended meaning. This added specificity is essential because, in Vietnamese, abstract terms often need further explanation to avoid ambiguity. Moreover, the grammatical structure of Vietnamese requires clear and explicit subject-object relationships, making the inclusion of "công sự" critical for maintaining clarity and coherence.

 Different languages have unique syntactic and semantic structures that can impact the translation of military terminology. Obligatory explicitation helps bridge these differences by adding necessary information to align with the grammatical rules and linguistic conventions of the target language.

English Term: Defense Receipts

Vietnamese Translation: Tổng số tiền đưa vào quỹ bộ quốc phòng từ nước ngoài
In translating "Defense Receipts" into Vietnamese as "Tổng số tiền đưa vào quỹ bộ quốc phòng từ nước ngoài," necessary information is added to align with the grammatical rules and linguistic conventions of Vietnamese. This process involves obligatory explicitation, ensuring that the term is fully understood in the target language by providing additional contextual information that may be implicit in the English source text.

In English, the term "Defense Receipts" is often understood in a financial or budgetary context, implying funds or revenues received by the defense department. However, in Vietnamese, the word "Receipts" does not directly translate in the same financial context. By explicitly stating "Tổng số tiền đưa vào quỹ bộ quốc phòng" (the total amount of money deposited into the defense fund), the translation aligns with Vietnamese linguistic conventions, where financial terminology often requires explicit mention of the action (depositing) and the entity involved (defense fund).

Vietnamese grammar generally requires more specific explanations when referring to financial or institutional concepts. In English, "Defense Receipts" might imply funds from various sources, but Vietnamese tends to demand a clearer structure. The added phrase "từ nước ngoài" (from abroad) ensures that the context of the funds being received internationally is made explicit. This addition fits Vietnamese grammatical rules, where clarity in subject, object, and source is essential for coherence.

The phrase "từ nước ngoài" (from abroad) provides critical context that would otherwise be assumed in the English term. Without this, the Vietnamese translation might seem incomplete or too vague, leading to potential misunderstandings. By specifying that the funds come from sources abroad, such as weapon sales, the translation adheres to Vietnamese conventions of clearly stating both the source and the purpose of financial receipts, ensuring that the term fits smoothly into military or financial discourse.

The translation of "Defense Receipts" into "Tổng số tiền đưa vào quỹ bộ quốc phòng từ nước ngoài" demonstrates the importance of obligatory explicitation in ensuring the grammatical and linguistic accuracy of the translation. In Vietnamese, terms related to finance and defense often require explicit details to make the meaning clear. The additional information about the source of the funds (from abroad) and the nature of the receipts (for the defense fund) ensures that the translation adheres to both the grammatical rules and linguistic conventions of Vietnamese, ultimately enhancing the clarity, precision, and cultural appropriateness of the term.

2.3.2. Amplification in Military Translation

Nida (1964) discusses the need for amplification to achieve dynamic equivalence, emphasizing that translations should not only convey the meaning of the original text but also make it understandable and relevant to the target audience. Amplification involves adding extra information to ensure that military terms and concepts are clearly understood in the target language. This is particularly crucial for military texts, where specific terminology may have unique implications that are not directly translatable.

For example, the term "The commander must consider that the loss of a platoon position may compromise the entire company's defense" might be translated as "Người chỉ huy cũng phải cân nhắc tới tình huống khi mất một trung đội có thể gây nguy hiểm cho toàn bộ khả năng phòng ngự của đại đội." While the English phrase "company's defense" may seem straightforward, its tactical and operational nuances could be lost in translation without additional context.

In the Vietnamese translation, *"khả năng phòng ngự của đại đội,"* additional information is provided for clarity. The word *"khả năng"* (i.e., *capability*) is added to emphasize the capacity or ability of the company to defend itself, a nuance that isn't explicitly mentioned in the English term "*defense*." By adding this, the translator clarifies that the defense is not just a static position but an active ability to perform defensive actions. Moreover, the term *"phòng ngự"* (i.e., *defense*) ensures that the translation is understood in the specific context of military operations, avoiding potential misinterpretation as a general defensive stance.

Military texts often involve specialized terms that carry strategic and tactical importance. Simply translating terms literally may not fully communicate the meaning. Amplification provides crucial elements such as:

* Clarification of Intent: Adding "khả năng" clarifies that "defense" refers to the company’s capability or readiness to defend, rather than just a passive stance. This is critical in military discourse, where a unit’s ability to defend has significant implications for operational planning.
* Contextual Information: By specifying "phòng ngự," the translation highlights active defense against attacks, which may not be fully captured in the English word "defense." This ensures that the reader understands the operational context and the specific defensive measures being discussed.

Additionally, amplification is essential in expanding abbreviations and acronyms commonly found in military documents, which may not be immediately clear to the target audience. For instance, when translating "Defense Readiness Condition (DEFCON)," the original term in English may be widely recognized, but its full meaning might be unclear in Vietnamese if translated literally or left unexplained.

In an amplified translation, "Trạng thái sẵn sàng phòng ngự (DEFCON)" not only expands the acronym but also provides necessary background. Retaining the acronym DEFCON in parentheses ensures that military personnel can recognize the term in both languages, thereby maintaining clarity and consistency. This strategy is crucial in international military contexts, where acronyms like DEFCON are universally understood.

2.3.3. Pragmatic explicitation

Klaudy's (2009) concept of pragmatic explicitation refers to the process by which translators provide additional explanatory information to make a text more comprehensible to readers from different cultural backgrounds. In the context of military translation, this form of explicitation is crucial because military terminology, strategies, and procedures often carry cultural significance or context-specific knowledge that may not be shared across languages or cultures.

Pragmatic explicitation is essential as it provides additional explanatory details to bridge cultural differences, ensuring that military terms are comprehensible to readers from different cultural backgrounds. For instance, when translating "Collective Defense" as "Phòng thủ tập thể", adding an explanation like "khái niệm mà một cuộc tấn công vào một quốc gia trong liên minh sẽ được coi là tấn công vào tất cả các quốc gia" (the concept that an attack on one nation in the alliance is considered an attack on all) further clarifies what collective defense means, particularly in the context of military alliances such as NATO. This additional explanation is crucial because it helps clarify the term for an audience that may not be familiar with military terms or structures in Western alliances.

Furthermore, different cultures may have different understandings of military terms based on their own defense strategies, alliances, and historical contexts. For instance, Western military alliances often emphasize mutual defense principles like NATO's Article 5, whereas other nations may have different or no equivalent defense pacts. By explicitly stating how collective defense works in a Western context, the translator bridges the cultural gap, ensuring that the target audience—who may be unfamiliar with this concept can fully grasp its implications.

Thus, bridging cultural gaps is essential to ensure that key military concepts are fully understood by the target audience. This is especially important when the target culture lacks familiarity with specific military organizations or strategies, thereby helping to maintain clarity and accuracy in translation. In this particular case, the term “collective defense” may be well understood in Western contexts, where military alliances like NATO play a significant role. However, for Vietnamese readers, where NATO or similar military doctrines may not be as familiar, this concept needs to be clarified. Therefore, the explicit addition of the NATO doctrine principle, explained in the Vietnamese context, ensures that the target audience can understand how the term functions within an international military strategy.

Moreover, without pragmatic explicitation, readers from a different cultural background might misinterpret the term. For example, the literal translation "phòng thủ tập thể" (collective defense) might be understood as a generic or symbolic reference to defense by a group of countries, without conveying the legally binding nature of mutual defense pacts. Thus, explicitation adds necessary context to avoid misunderstanding and ensure precise communication. In addition, countries that are not part of alliances like NATO may not immediately understand the specific legal and operational responsibilities involved in collective defense. For instance, Vietnam follows a policy of non-alignment, meaning that the idea of defending other nations as part of a mutual defense pact may not be as widely known or practiced.

Therefore, pragmatic explicitation ensures that the cultural gap between Western military alliances and the Vietnamese audience is effectively bridged by explaining the deeper meaning behind such military terms. Another significant aspect of pragmatic explicitation is its role in transforming implicit concepts into explicit knowledge by providing necessary background information. This approach is particularly relevant in military contexts, where terminology can be highly specialized and not universally understood. A pertinent example of this is the translation of the term “grazing fire

Grazing Fire determs a specific type of artillery or small arms fire that is directed so that the projectiles travel close to the ground, typically aimed at hitting targets at short range. The Vietnamese term “hỏa lực sát mặt đất” translates to “firepower directed close to the ground.” This explicates that this type of fire is intended to impact targets situated near the ground, often including enemy troops or equipment positioned at low elevations.

Pragmatic explicitation is crucial because many military terms assume a level of specialized knowledge. The translation “hỏa lực sát mặt đất” explicitly communicates that “grazing fire” targets low-lying threats, offering context that may not be immediately apparent to all readers. Providing background information aids readers, particularly those unfamiliar with military jargon, in grasping the term fully. By explaining that “grazing fire” is utilized to target near-ground threats, the audience can better visualize its tactical application. Without the necessary context, specialized terms can lead to misunderstandings. Specifying that the fire is aimed close to the ground helps prevent confusion regarding the term’s tactical implications, thereby ensuring accurate communication.

Pragmatic explicitation ensures that all readers, including those less familiar with military terminology, can effectively engage with the material. Clear explanations promote understanding and ensure that military strategies are communicated effectively across diverse audiences.

2.3.4. Register markedness

Clarifying formality levels by making implicit tones or styles explicit is an essential strategy in translation, as emphasized by Nida (1964). In many cases, the level of formality in the source text may be implicit, especially in languages where register is less pronounced or where cultural expectations around formality differ. By carefully adjusting the register in the target language, the translator ensures that the intended formality becomes more explicit, thereby guiding the target audience toward the correct interpretation. For example, the English term "Defense troops" is relatively neutral and can be used in various contexts, both formal and informal. However, when translating this into Vietnamese as "Quân phòng ngự," the translator selects a term that clearly maintains a formal military register. In doing so, the translation makes the formality level explicit and appropriate for military contexts, ensuring that the tone aligns with the seriousness and professional nature of military discourse.

This adjustment is particularly important because, in English, "Defense troops" does not necessarily convey a strict level of formality. Yet, in Vietnamese, "Quân phòng ngự" is distinctly formal, highlighting the importance of precision and respect for military terminology. By making this formality more explicit in the Vietnamese translation, the translator ensures that the target audience recognizes the appropriate context and tone of the term. Thus, adjusting formality levels through pragmatic explicitation not only bridges linguistic differences but also helps prevent potential misinterpretations of tone or style in the target language. This approach ensures that the translation is not only accurate in meaning but also faithful to the intended register and tone of the original text.

Neutralizing or formalizing terms is a crucial strategy in translation to make specialized terminology more accessible, particularly when dealing with complex or ambiguous military language. This approach ensures that the intended meaning is both clear and comprehensible, even for audiences who may not have deep familiarity with the subject matter. To illustrate this more cohesively, below is an example of how this process works, drawing from House's (2015) principles of making specialized terms more accessible.

Example: "Defense transport" → "Vận tải phục vụ phòng ngự"

Explanation: The term "Defense transport" in English can be somewhat ambiguous because it may not be immediately clear whether it refers to logistical support, military vehicles, or transportation for defensive purposes. Therefore, the translation into Vietnamese, "Vận tải phục vụ phòng ngự," not only formalizes the expression but also removes ambiguity. By specifying that the transport is in service of defense purposes, the translator clarifies the technical concept and uses formal language to make it more precise and understandable.

The word "defense" can carry multiple interpretations in English, ranging from personal defense to military defense. In this case, by specifying "phục vụ phòng ngự" (serving defense purposes), the translator neutralizes the broader meaning of the word, making it more targeted toward military transport. This adjustment ensures that the term is clearer and more focused on its intended context.

Furthermore, the use of "phục vụ" (serving) in Vietnamese formalizes the expression. This choice of vocabulary aligns with cultural expectations of clarity and respectfulness, particularly in military contexts where formal language is valued. Thus, the translation is not only more accessible but also adheres to the formal tone typically expected in such discourse.

Explicitly indicating social hierarchies and clarifying relationships through appropriate terminology is essential in military contexts. Here’s a deeper exploration of the translation of “Special Operations Forces” into “Lực lượng đặc nhiệm”.

The term “Special Operations Forces” refers to elite military units trained to perform high-risk missions that require specialized skills, such as counter-terrorism, reconnaissance, and direct action. This designation implies a level of prestige, capability, and authority within the military structure. The Vietnamese translation, “Lực lượng đặc nhiệm,” serves multiple purposes:

The phrase maintains a formal register, which is appropriate for military discourse. The use of the term “lực lượng” (forces) conveys strength and organization, while “đặc nhiệm” (specialized/elite) highlights the unit's unique capabilities and specialized training. By using this specific terminology, the translation emphasizes the critical role that Special Operations Forces play within the military hierarchy. It signifies that these units are not just regular troops but are instead distinguished by their specialized missions.

The translation clearly delineates the hierarchy within the military. Understanding that “Lực lượng đặc nhiệm” represents elite units helps the audience grasp the broader military structure and the specialized roles these units fulfill. This clarity is essential for effective communication, particularly in contexts involving military strategy and operations.

In Vietnamese culture, formal titles and designations carry significant weight. By maintaining a formal tone in the translation, the audience is guided to recognize the respect and authority associated with these forces, aligning with cultural expectations regarding military hierarchy.

The precise translation helps avoid ambiguity. If a more general term were used, it could diminish the perceived importance of these forces or lead to misunderstandings about their capabilities and missions. The explicit reference to specialization ensures that readers understand the unit's elite status and operational focus.

By explicitly indicating social hierarchies, the translation serves as a cultural bridge, helping audiences from different backgrounds understand the nuances of military structure and operations. This is particularly important in discussions involving international military cooperation or strategies, where clarity about the roles and ranks of different units is critical.

In summary, the translation of “Special Operations Forces” to “Lực lượng đặc nhiệm” not only reflects an accurate linguistic equivalent but also plays a vital role in conveying the hierarchical significance, specialized nature, and operational importance of these military units. This attention to detail in translation ensures effective communication and understanding across cultural and linguistic boundaries.

2.4. Corpus-based approach

The *corpus-based approach* has emerged as a pivotal methodology in linguistic and translation studies, allowing for empirical, data-driven analysis of language use in various contexts. Within the domain of translation, the corpus-based approach facilitates a systematic exploration of linguistic patterns, trends, and translation strategies. This section delves into *Corpus-Based Translation Studies*, a subfield that has gained prominence by utilizing large corpora to examine translation norms and tendencies. By leveraging corpora—structured, machine-readable collections of text—researchers can uncover recurring patterns, test hypotheses, and provide quantitative evidence in their analyses.

The section also examines different *corpus types*—ranging from monolingual and bilingual corpora to specialized corpora, such as parallel and comparable corpora—that serve distinct purposes in translation research. Lastly, the application of corpora across various research fields highlights the versatility and potential of corpus-based studies to enhance understanding in domains as diverse as translation, lexicography, and sociolinguistics.

2.4.1. Corpus-based translation studies

Corpus-based translation studies (CTS) is a relatively new approach to translation studies that emerged in the 1990s as a response to the limitations of traditional approaches to translation analysis. CTS is based on the use of large electronic corpora of bilingual texts to identify and analyze translation patterns, translation strategies, and other features of translated language. By employing corpus-based methods, researchers can analyze large amounts of data quickly and accurately, thus providing insights into the nature of translation that were previously impossible to obtain.

Baker (1993) laid the foundation for CTS with her seminal article, *Corpus Linguistics and Translation Studies: Implications and Applications*. In this article, Baker discusses the potential of corpus-based methods for translation studies, highlighting that such methods can provide systematic and comprehensive analyses of translation phenomena. These include patterns of language use, translation strategies, and variation across genres, time periods, and languages. Moreover, Baker emphasizes the importance of building high-quality corpora that are representative of the languages and genres being studied. While she acknowledges the limitations of corpus-based methods—such as the inability to capture the translator's intentions or the context in which the translation was produced—Baker argues that corpus-based studies can complement other methods of analysis in translation studies and offer valuable insights into translation as a linguistic and cultural practice.

Similarly, Bernardini (2000), in her article *A Corpus-Based Approach to Discourse Markers*, argues that corpus-based methods can provide a more comprehensive understanding of discourse markers than traditional approaches. She points out that these methods reveal patterns of use across different genres, languages, and contexts, thereby shedding light on the semantic and pragmatic functions of these markers. Despite acknowledging challenges in applying corpus-based methods, Bernardini concludes that they offer a valuable tool for analyzing discourse markers and, consequently, for enhancing our understanding of language use in communication. While Bernardini does not focus specifically on translation studies, her findings are nonetheless relevant to the field as they demonstrate how corpus-based methods can be applied to uncover deeper insights.

In contrast, Chesterman (1998) focuses on the broader role of translators in his article *Causes, Translations, Effects*, where he discusses how translators mediate cultural differences and shape translations. He emphasizes the importance of understanding the cultural, social, and historical contexts in which translations are produced. Although Chesterman does not specifically address corpus-based translation studies, his work can be seen as complementary to such studies. Corpus-based methods provide a systematic way of analyzing translations, identifying patterns of language use, and revealing translation strategies. Together, these perspectives offer a more comprehensive understanding of the complex factors that shape the translation process and its effects.

Hunston (2002), in her work *Corpora in Applied Linguistics*, discusses the use of corpus linguistics across various areas of applied linguistics, including language teaching, lexicography, and discourse analysis. While she does not focus on CTS specifically, Hunston's observations are relevant to the field, as corpus-based methods allow for a systematic analysis of translations, helping to identify patterns of language use and translation strategies. She highlights that corpus-based methods can address a wide range of research questions, including those related to language acquisition, language use in specific genres or domains, and language variation across contexts. In translation studies, this methodology facilitates analysis of translations across genres, time periods, and languages, providing valuable insights into translation strategies.

Finally, Mahlberg (2013), in his article *Corpus Stylistics and Shakespeare's Plays*, demonstrates the potential of corpus-based methods beyond the realm of translation studies by applying these techniques to literary analysis. He uses corpus linguistic methods to analyze the language and style of Shakespeare’s plays, showing that corpus-based methods provide a more systematic and quantitative approach to analyzing language use and style in specific domains. While his focus is on literature rather than translation, Mahlberg's approach illustrates how corpus-based methods can be similarly applied to translated texts. This offers the possibility of identifying patterns of language use and areas for improvement in translation practice that might not be immediately apparent through traditional analysis.

Building on this foundation, the advantages of Corpus-Based Translation Studies (CTS) are particularly relevant in the field of military translation. The empirical and data-driven nature of CTS stands in contrast to traditional approaches that often rely on theoretical assumptions or subjective judgments. By utilizing large-scale empirical data, CTS enables researchers to identify and analyze translation patterns and strategies objectively. In the context of translating military terminology from English into Vietnamese, this systematic examination becomes invaluable, illuminating the explicitation strategies employed by translators. As we transition into exploring these strategies, it becomes clear that a corpus-based approach not only enhances our understanding of translation practices but also informs best practices for ensuring clarity and accuracy in military communication across languages**.** Another advantage of CTS is its ability to provide a detailed and nuanced analysis of translation phenomena. By analyzing large corpora of military texts, CTS can identify subtle patterns and variations in the translation of military terminology that may not be evident through other methods of analysis. This is especially relevant for military translation, where terminology is highly specialized, and even minor variations in translation can have significant consequences. Such an approach can reveal the ways in which explicitation operates within the translation of military terms such as *defense*, *combat*, and *forces*, providing valuable insights into how translators deal with the complexities of military language across different contexts.

Corpus-Based Translation Studies has been applied to a wide range of topics, including translation universals, norms, strategies, and translator expertise. In the context of military translation, CTS has been particularly useful for identifying translation strategies applied to military terminology across different language pairs. Furthermore, it allows researchers to evaluate the effectiveness of these strategies in accurately conveying the meaning of the source text while taking into account the nuances of the target language.

For this research project, which compares translations of military texts from English into Vietnamese, CTS offers several key benefits. First, the use of corpora enables the analysis of large volumes of translated military texts, a necessity for conducting a comprehensive comparative study of explicitation strategies. By analyzing these translations, it becomes possible to identify specific patterns in the translation of military terminology and assess how effectively various translation strategies are employed (Baker, 1995).

Second, CTS can uncover translation difficulties that are unique to military language. Military texts often contain specialized terminology and complex syntax that present challenges for translators. By analyzing a corpus of military translations, this study can identify terms or phrases that are particularly prone to misinterpretation or require explicitation to clarify meaning in the target language (Laviosa, 2002). This insight can help develop strategies to enhance the accuracy and consistency of future translations, particularly in addressing the frequent ambiguities in military terminology.

Third, CTS has the potential to improve translation quality overall. By examining a large corpus of military texts translated from English into Vietnamese, it is possible to identify common errors, inconsistencies, or areas where explicitation has been applied either too liberally or inadequately. This analysis can inform the development of best practices for translating military texts, ultimately leading to more accurate and coherent translations (Bowker & Pearson, 2002).

In conclusion, CTS offers a powerful and systematic tool for analyzing language and translation patterns in military texts. By adopting a comparative study perspective, this research aims to identify best practices for explicitation in the translation of military terminology from English into Vietnamese. Through the empirical analysis of large datasets, it is possible to develop a more refined understanding of the strategies used by translators, thereby improving the overall quality of military translations in this language pair.

While CTS offers numerous advantages, it is important to acknowledge its limitations. One key limitation is the inability to fully capture the translator's intentions or the broader context in which the translation was produced. This means that while CTS can identify patterns and strategies, it cannot always explain the underlying motivations behind certain translation choices. Additionally, building high-quality corpora that are truly representative of the languages and genres being studied, such as military texts, can be challenging. Ensuring the corpora contain relevant and balanced data is essential for deriving accurate and meaningful insights from the analysis.

Nonetheless, despite these challenges, CTS remains a valuable approach for analyzing translated texts, particularly in specialized fields such as military translation. By focusing on empirical data and offering detailed analyses of translation strategies like explicitation, CTS enhances our understanding of translation as both a linguistic and cultural practice.

2.4.2. Corpus types

Having explored the advantages and applications of Corpus-Based Translation Studies (CTS) in the context of military translation, it is essential to delve deeper into the specific tools that underpin this methodology. A key component of CTS is the selection and utilization of various corpus types, each serving distinct purposes in the analysis of translation strategies and patterns. Understanding these corpus types—ranging from monolingual and bilingual corpora to parallel and comparable corpora—provides the foundation for conducting systematic and data-driven research in translation studies. The following section examines these different corpus types and their relevance to analyzing explicitation strategies in military texts.

After several decades of advancement, a multitude of corpus types have been established. In terms of academic inquiry, corpus research encompasses two primary methodologies: corpus-based and corpus-driven approaches (Tognini-Bonelli, 2001, pp. 10-11). Corpus-based studies focus on topics substantiated by evidence from corpora, whereas corpus-driven research applies corpus linguistics methodology to extract meaningful insights from the corpus data (Teubert & Cermakova, 2004, p. 57). Apart from this classification, corpora can be categorized based on their objectives, resulting in nine distinct types (see Tables 2-1). These corpora are utilized to observe changes and variations within a language, identify translation characteristics between translated and original texts, analyze translation patterns, and support training activities. Overall, corpus research is extensively subcategorized to fulfill various academic objectives.

Table 2.1

 Corpus Type

| **Corpus Type** | **Content** | **Aim** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Monolingual Corpora  | Texts produced in one language | To analyse the naturalness or to measure deviation from norms between a language |
| Comparable Corpora | Translated texts and non-translated texts which are all in the same language | To identify the nature of translated text in general and the nature of the process of translation itself |
| Parallel Corpora (translation corpora) | Source texts and their translation(s) (alignment needed) | To examine translation strategies |
| Learner Corpora | Texts written by learners of a foreign language, such as student essays | By comparing with corpora of texts written by native speakers, researchers can examine what learners know and do not know in an attempt to facilitate training |
| Monitor Corpora (historical corpora) | Texts of a language in different times | To examine language changes and diversity |
| Internet as Virtual Corpus  | Internet Texts | To find out if a word or a phrase we have heard really exists and in which kinds of texts it occurs |
| Specialised Corpora | Texts of a specific type, such as such as newspaper editorials, scientific articles, or casual conversations | To make observations about that particular language in that specific field |
| General Corpora | Texts of many types, possibly in both spoken and written forms | To make general observations about that particular language |
| Spoken Corpora | Spoken texts of many types compiled into various kinds of corpora, including monolingual, comparable or parallel | To make observations from spoken texts |

Table 2-1 Corpus Types (Baker 1995: 230-235; Bowker & Pearson 2002: 11-13; Cobb 2003; Granger 2003: 19; Hatim 2001: 152; Hunston 2002: 14-16; Laviosa 2002: 34-38; Munday 2008: 181; McEnery 2003: 450-451; Olohan 2004: 23-44; Sinclair 1991: 23-26; Teubert & Cermakova 2004: 76, 139-144)

While Table 2-1 provides distinct definitions for each corpus type, it's essential to term that parallel corpora can exist in either unidirectional or bidirectional forms, as Olohan emphasizes.:

Parallel corpora can be unidirectional, i.e. source texts in language A and target texts in language B, or bidirectional, i.e. source texts in language A and translations in language B, and source texts in language B and their translations in language A. the latter configuration means that the corpus may also encompass a “comparable corpus” element, i.e. source texts in language A can be compared with source texts in language B, if the corpora are compiled according to criteria that facilitate direct comparison of data.

(2004: 24)

Additionally, Olohan highlights that the accessibility of source texts and their translations significantly impacts the complexity involved in compiling and utilizing parallel corpora (2004, p. 25).

In addition to the previously mentioned nine types, corpora can also be categorized into dichotomous classifications: synchronic versus diachronic (Bowker & Pearson, 2002; Laviosa, 2002) and static versus dynamic (Bowker & Pearson, 2002; Olohan, 2004). Synchronic corpora, as their name suggests, consist of texts created within a specific timeframe and are utilized to study language usage during that period. Conversely, diachronic corpora encompass texts spanning a prolonged duration, aiming to analyze the evolution of language over time. Regarding static or dynamic attributes, static corpora cease to expand once established, while dynamic corpora continuously incorporate new texts, making them well-suited for diachronic investigations.

After discussing various types of corpora and their roles in translation studies, it’s vital to examine their applications in specific fields, particularly military translation. The flexibility of corpora allows researchers to explore translation patterns, language diversity, and discourse structures, providing valuable insights into language practices and techniques.

The origins of corpus linguistics trace back to the 1960s, marked by significant projects like Randolph Quirk’s Survey of English Usage in 1960 (Teubert & Cermakova, 2004) and the Brown Corpus in 1967 by Henry Kucera and W. Nelson Francis. These early developments laid the groundwork for major corpora such as the British National Corpus (1995) and the Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA) (Davies, 1990). Although initially focused on linguistic research, these corpora have become essential tools for translation scholars, facilitating comparative analyses between translated and non-translated texts.

The use of corpora in translation studies gained momentum in the 1990s, particularly after Mona Baker’s landmark 1993 article, Corpus Linguistics and Translation Studies: Implications and Applications, which introduced corpus methods and identified translation universals, including explicitation (Baker, 1993). This shift encouraged researchers to apply corpus techniques to various translation phenomena, enriching the field.

My research specifically focuses on explicitation in the translation of military terminology from English to Vietnamese using a parallel corpus. This approach allows for the identification of instances where implicit information is made explicit, thereby enhancing clarity and fidelity in translation. By systematically categorizing these patterns, the study aims to reveal common strategies employed by translators, contributing to a deeper understanding of translation processes.

Utilizing a corpus-based approach not only streamlines research efforts but also aligns with the growing emphasis on data-driven methodologies in translation studies. This investigation represents a novel contribution to the field, offering insights that can inform both academic research and practical translation strategies in specialized contexts. Through this study, I aim to shed light on how explicitation functions in military translation, ultimately enhancing our comprehension of translation practices in this critical area.
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2.5. Previous Studies on Explicitation

Having highlighted the importance of a corpus-based approach in examining translation strategies, especially explicitation, it is crucial to review prior research that has utilized parallel corpora in this area. Previous studies have leveraged parallel corpora to analyze how translators render implicit information explicit in their texts, shedding light on the patterns and trends that arise across various languages and genres. This section will examine key parallel corpus studies focused on explicitation, outlining their methodologies and findings to provide context for the current research on military translation from English into Vietnamese.

Table 2.2

Previous Studies on Explicitation

| **Study** | **Research Object** | **Field/Register** | **Explicitations as Main Feature** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Øverås (1998) | Cohesion | Fiction | Yes |
| Perego (2003) | Cultural, channel-based, and reduction-based | Film subtitling | Yes (when translators dealt with objects or events unknown in the target culture and pertaining to history and politics; when elicited by a shift from the visual non-verbal channel or from the auditive non-verbal channel to the visual verbal channel, namely, the written language; and when some information is made more important and focal by reduction) |
| Pápai (2004) | Shifts in cohesion, instances of disambiguation, | Various | Yes |
|  | additions of linguistic and extra-linguistic |  |  |
|  | information, etc. |  |  |
| Konšalová | Finite verbs in main and subordinate clauses, | Popular texts on history | Yes |
| (2007) | participial phrases and infinitive constructions, |  |  |
|  | deverbative nouns and adjectives |  |  |
| Denturck | Expression of causal relations | Novels | Yes |
| (2012) |  |  |  |
| Tong (2013a) | Pronouns | Political texts | Yes |
| Tong (2013b) | Connectives of reason and result | Political texts | Yes |
| Južnič (2013) | Nominalized infinitive | Literary and non-literary texts | Yes, and obligatory due to differences between Italian and Slovene |
| Li (2014) | Pronouns | Political texts | Yes |
| Krogsgaard | Nominalizations, passives, system-bound terms, | Legal texts | Yes |
| (2017) | elliptical phrases |  |  |
| Molés-Cases (2019) | Manner-of-motion expressions | Narrative texts | Yes |
| Molés-Cases | Manner-of-motion expressions | Narrative texts | Yes |
| Study | Research Object | Field/Register | Explicitations as Main Feature |
| Jiménez-Crespo (2015) | Navigation menus | - | Yes |
| Jiménez-Crespo (2017) | Medical terminology | - | Yes |
| Jiménez-Crespo and Tercedor Sánchez (2017) | Medical terminology | - | Yes |
| Van Beveren, De Sutter, and Colleman (2018) | Optional "om" | Complementiser for | No |
| (the explicit | infinitive complements |  |  |
| prepositional |  |  |  |
| complementiser for |  |  |  |
| infinitive complements |  |  |  |
| Marco (2018) | Connectives | Result/consequence and | Yes |
| indicating | contrast/concession |  |  |
| Feng, Crezee, & Grant (2018) | Collocation | - | Yes |
| Alasmri & Kruger (2018) | Conjunctive markers | - | Yes |
| Molés-Cases (2019) | Manner-of-motion | Expressions | Yes |

# The exploration of explicitation in translation studies has produced a wealth of findings across various fields and registers, providing valuable insights into how explicit information enhances clarity and coherence in texts. Notable contributions include Øverås's (1998) examination of cohesion in fiction, which demonstrates that explicitation plays a crucial role in creating text coherence. Perego (2003) extends this discussion to the realm of film subtitling, highlighting the necessity of explicitation when dealing with cultural references that may not be readily understood in the target language. This is particularly relevant in contexts involving historical or political elements, where the translator must navigate complex cultural landscapes.

# Pápai (2004) further enriches the conversation by analyzing shifts in cohesion and instances of disambiguation across various genres, emphasizing the importance of explicit information in supporting clarity. Linguistic structures are also a focus in studies by Tong (2013a, 2013b) and Li (2014), which investigate the roles of pronouns and connectives in political texts. Their findings reveal how specific linguistic elements are employed to clarify meaning, underscoring the nuanced strategies translators adopt to achieve fidelity to the source text while ensuring comprehensibility for the target audience.

# Additionally, Jiménez-Crespo (2015, 2017) showcases the effectiveness of corpus analysis in specialized fields, such as medical terminology. This approach provides a systematic framework for understanding how explicitation functions in contexts that require precise language and clarity.

# Despite these valuable insights, several limitations persist within the existing body of research. A significant gap is evident in the lack of studies addressing the unique demands of military translation. Military texts possess distinct characteristics that may necessitate different explicitation strategies compared to those employed in fiction, political, or medical texts. The specific nature of military language, with its technical jargon and acronyms, requires a tailored approach to explicitation that is not sufficiently represented in the current literature.

# Furthermore, while Perego (2003) acknowledges cultural references, there is an overall inadequacy in addressing the cultural implications of explicitation in military contexts. Translators must navigate complex cultural and contextual factors specific to military discourse, which may not be captured by studies focused on other genres. The linguistic complexity of military texts presents another challenge; as existing research often prioritizes syntactic elements without fully accounting for the specialized language that characterizes military communication.

# Methodologically, the absence of comprehensive corpus-based studies specifically targeting military texts signifies a notable gap. Although some researchers have employed corpus methods, the application of these techniques to military terminology and translation remains largely unexplored. Most studies tend to concentrate on explicitation within a single language pair or genre, lacking comparative analyses that could provide a richer understanding of how explicitation varies across different contexts.

# In conclusion, while the existing research on explicitation has laid a foundational understanding of its role in translation, significant limitations remain, particularly concerning military translation. These gaps underscore the need for further investigation into how explicitation operates within this specialized field, with a focus on the unique linguistic, cultural, and contextual challenges it presents. This thesis aims to address these limitations by exploring explicitation in the translation of military terminology from English to Vietnamese, thereby contributing new insights to the broader field of translation studies.

CHAPTER SUMMARY

# This chapter has synthesized key concepts related to military texts, terminology, equivalence in translation and translation strategies, and explicitation in translation studies. It highlighted the importance of a corpus-based approach to explore how explicitation functions in the translation of military terminology from English to Vietnamese. This study employs a framework informed by the theories of Klaudy (2009) and Nida (1964) to analyze explicitation in the translation of military terminology from English to Vietnamese. The framework categorizes explicitation into four key types: obligatory explicitation, amplification, pragmatic explicitation, and register markedness. Each of these categories plays a critical role in understanding how military terminology is translated and adapted for the target audience.

CHAPTER 3: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This chapter presents the methodology utilized in the study of explicitation in the translation of military texts from English into Vietnamese. It begins with a justification of the philosophical perspectives that form the foundation of the research paradigm, along with the rationale for the selected research design and methods. Subsequently, the chapter will detail the criteria employed for selecting relevant military texts and the analytical framework guiding the investigation of explicitation strategies. Additionally, the procedures for data collection are outlined, along with the techniques used for data analysis.

3.1. Research paradigm

Research can be conducted through different lenses, such as positivism, interpretivism, critical theory, and pragmatic paradigm. Each grounds in specific assumptions regarding four key elements: ontology, epistemology, methodology, and methods. The choice of research paradigm should align with the nature of the study, including its purpose, questions, and the suitability of selected methods. It's important to term that the selection of a research paradigm is based on practical considerations rather than rigid adherence to a particular ideology. Research paradigms are not inherently superior to one another, nor are they mutually exclusive. (Rehman et al., 2016)

The current research aligns with the Pragmatic paradigm which arose from the perspective of philosophers who argued against the notion that accessing the 'truth' about the real world could be achieved solely through a single scientific method advocated by the Positivist paradigm or by determining social reality as constructed under the Interpretivist paradigm. Instead, proponents such as Alise and Teddlie (2010), Biesta (2010), Tashakkori and Teddlie (2003a, 2003b), and Patton (1990) advocated for a worldview that encompasses methods of research deemed most suitable for studying a particular phenomenon. This approach embraces practicality and pluralism, allowing for the combination of methods to illuminate participants' behaviors, the underlying beliefs shaping those behaviors, and the potential consequences. Thus, the Pragmatic paradigm advocates for a relational epistemology, recognizing that the researcher determines the appropriate relationships in the study, an ontology that acknowledges multiple interpretations of reality, a mixed methods methodology integrating quantitative and qualitative research, and an axiology that values research conducted for the benefit of people.

3.1.1. Epistemology: Relational

Relational epistemology indeed underscores the significance of understanding the intricate dynamics between various elements in the translation process. In the context of investigating explicitation in translation, particularly concerning military terms from English to Vietnamese, it is crucial to acknowledge the multifaceted relationships at play. Rather than rigidly adhering to one methodological framework, researchers should embrace a flexible approach, incorporating diverse methods to delve into the complexities of explicitation. Given the intricacies of translation, especially when dealing with technical terminology, a singular methodological approach may not suffice to capture the nuances accurately. Adopting a variety of methods allows researchers to gain a comprehensive understanding of how explicitation manifests in translations within this specific domain. For instance, researchers might employ comparative analysis to scrutinize how certain military terms are translated across different texts or contexts. Additionally, qualitative interviews with translators could provide invaluable insights into their decision-making processes and the factors influencing explicitation. Furthermore, quantitative analysis might be employed to identify patterns and trends in the explicitation of military terminology. By embracing a relational epistemology and employing a diverse range of methodological approaches, researchers can navigate the intricate web of relationships inherent in the translation process, shedding light on the phenomenon of explicitation in translations of military terms from English into Vietnamese.

3.1.2. Ontology: Non-Singular Reality

Non-Singular Reality Ontology challenges the traditional notion that there is a single, objective reality in language and translation. Instead, it acknowledges that language is inherently subjective, and that translation is a complex process influenced by a multitude of factors. This perspective opens up avenues for understanding translation phenomena, such as explicitation, through a lens that embraces diversity and multiplicity. Explicitation, as a translation phenomenon, involves making implicit information explicit in the target language. It is a common strategy employed by translators to ensure clarity and convey the intended meaning accurately. However, the way explicitation is approached can vary significantly among translators and translation scholars due to their diverse interpretations shaped by cultural, linguistic, and contextual factors.

Cultural nuances play a significant role in shaping translation practices. Every language and culture has its own set of norms, values, and conventions that influence the way meaning is conveyed. Translators must navigate these cultural differences carefully to ensure that the translated text resonates with the target audience while remaining faithful to the source text.

Linguistic differences further complicate the translation process. Each language has its own unique grammar, syntax, and vocabulary, which may not have direct equivalents in other languages. Translators must be adept at finding creative solutions to bridge these linguistic gaps while maintaining coherence and accuracy in the translation.

The specific context of translation also cannot be overlooked. Military terminology, for example, presents its own set of challenges due to its technical nature and specialized vocabulary. Translators working in this field must possess not only linguistic proficiency but also a deep understanding of military culture, operations, and terminology. The context in which military texts are used, whether in training manuals, operational documents, or strategic communications, further shapes the translation process and determines the appropriate level of explicitation required.

By embracing the Non-Singular Reality Ontology, translators and translation scholars are encouraged to consider these various factors when approaching translation tasks. This perspective allows for a more nuanced understanding of translation phenomena and facilitates the development of effective translation strategies that take into account the complexities of language, culture, and context. Ultimately, it enables translators to produce translations that are not only linguistically accurate but also culturally sensitive and contextually relevant.

3.1.3. Axiology: Value-Laden

Value-Laden Axiology in the context of translation studies, particularly within the Pragmatic paradigm, places emphasis on conducting research that holds practical value for translation practice. Axiology, as a branch of philosophy concerned with values, guides researchers to prioritize studies that contribute to the improvement of translation quality and effectiveness. Explicitation, a phenomenon commonly encountered in translation, holds particular relevance within the domain of military term translation. Military communication demands precision, clarity, and accuracy to ensure effective transmission of information. Therefore, exploring explicitation in this context has significant practical implications for translators and the quality of their translations. By delving into the strategies and techniques used in explicitating military terminology during translation, researchers can uncover insights that directly benefit translators working in this field. Understanding when and how explicitation should be applied can help translators navigate the complexities of military terminology more effectively, leading to translations that are not only linguistically accurate but also contextually appropriate. Moreover, the exploration of explicitation in military term translation contributes to the ongoing improvement of translation quality within the broader domain of military communication. As translators gain a deeper understanding of the nuances and challenges associated with translating military terminology, they can refine their skills and approaches, ultimately enhancing the overall quality and accuracy of translations in this specialized area. In essence, research into explicitation in military term translation aligns with the principles of Value-Laden Axiology by directly benefiting translation practice and contributing to the continual improvement of translation quality. By shedding light on practical strategies that enhance translation effectiveness, such research serves the needs of both translators and the stakeholders who rely on accurate and precise translations in the field of military communication.

3.2. Research Design

Research designs serve as critical frameworks that guide the collection, analysis, interpretation, and reporting of data in research endeavors. This study embraces a Pragmatic paradigm, which emphasizes practical applications of research methods and favors a mixed methods approach. Specifically, the research employs an Explanatory Sequential Design, particularly effective for exploring complex phenomena like explicitation in military translation.

The Explanatory Sequential Design, as articulated by Creswell, Plano Clark, et al. (2003), aims to leverage qualitative data to provide explanations for and enhance initial quantitative findings. This design comprises three distinct phases which are described in the following charts:

Table 3.1.

Research design



**Phase 1: Qualitative Method**

In this initial phase, the focus is on identifying instances of explicitation in military translations. The primary objective is to analyze the translations for changes made to military terms and their surrounding context. This phase addresses the research question: What explicitation strategies are employed in the translation of military terminology within the corpus?

To achieve this, a comprehensive analysis of selected texts is conducted, examining translators’ decisions to make implicit information explicit. This involves categorizing different explicitation strategies, such as amplification, obligatory explicitation, and register markedness. By analyzing specific examples, this phase illuminates how translators navigate the complexities of military terminology and the challenges they face in ensuring accuracy and clarity.

**Phase 2: Quantitative Method**

Following the qualitative phase, the second phase of the study shifts towards quantifying the findings to provide measurable data regarding the use of explicitation strategies in the translation of military terminology. This phase aims to identify which types of explicitation—such as obligatory explicitation, amplification, pragmatic explicitation, and register markedness—are most and least commonly used.

Data is collected from the corpus of translations, focusing on frequency counts of each explicitation strategy identified in the qualitative phase. This involves comparing translated texts with their source texts to highlight specific changes made to military terminology. By employing statistical analysis, this phase enhances the understanding of patterns in explicitation use, allowing for clearer identification of trends and variations across different translations.

**Phase 3: Qualitative Method**

The final phase aims to gain deeper insights into the reasons behind the use of explicitation strategies in military translation. This phase directly addresses the question: How and why are these explicitation strategies used?

Through qualitative data analysis methods, such as thematic analysis or content analysis, this phase explores the motivations, contextual factors, and cultural considerations that influence translators' choices. Interviews with professional translators or focus group discussions are conducted to gather personal insights and experiences regarding their translation practices. The goal is to contextualize the quantitative findings and provide a richer understanding of how and why certain strategies are favored, considering aspects such as audience, purpose, and the nature of military texts.

Integrating the findings from both the quantitative and qualitative phases is crucial for developing a comprehensive understanding of explicitation in the translation of military terms. Specifically, the qualitative phase informs and builds upon the results of the quantitative phase. Furthermore, the insights gained from the qualitative analysis help explain the patterns observed in the quantitative findings, thereby providing a richer context for understanding explicitation strategies.

By employing triangulation, the study validates and enriches the analysis; this approach involves corroborating evidence across different data sources and methods, enhancing the reliability and depth of the findings. Consequently, the integration of both qualitative and quantitative findings contributes to a more nuanced understanding of how explicitation strategies are utilized in military translation.

Ultimately, this holistic perspective informs best practices and theoretical considerations in translation studies. In summary, this detailed research design sets the stage for a systematic investigation into explicitation in military texts, aiming to make significant contributions to the field of translation studies, particularly concerning the translation of military terminology from English to Vietnamese.

3.3. Research Method

The study introduces a method designed to create a parallel corpus consisting of military English-Vietnamese texts, which forms the cornerstone for examining translation practices within the military domain. Utilizing machine-aided bilingual corpora can improve the efficiency and quality of translation by facilitating more natural interpretations and strategies in both source and target texts (Zanettin, 2013).

Additionally, the study delves into the contemporary landscape of qualitative and quantitative methods within the realm of military translation, offering insights into why both approaches are utilized to analyze the amassed data.Top of Form

3.3.1. Corpus-based quantitative method

The corpus-based quantitative method is adopted for the thesis because it provides a systematic and data-driven approach to studying explicitation strategies in translation, particularly within the highly specialized field of military texts. Several reasons justify the use of this method.

Firstly, the corpus-based approach enables the research to be grounded in real-world data by drawing directly from a bilingual parallel corpus of English and Vietnamese military texts. This allows for empirical validation of explicitation strategies, rather than relying solely on anecdotal evidence or subjective interpretations (Baker, 1995). Quantitative analysis ensures that findings are backed by measurable data, which enhances the accuracy and objectivity of the study (Munday, 2004).

Secondly, the quantitative method facilitates the systematic examination of explicitation strategies across a large body of texts. By comparing source and target texts, the frequency and patterns of explicitation strategies—such as amplification, obligatory explicitation, and register markedness—can be quantified (Pym, 2005). Consequently, this helps answer key research questions, such as which strategies are most or least frequently employed. Moreover, it provides insights into how military terminology is consistently or variably translated across different texts (Gambier, 2004).

In addition, military texts are highly specialized, requiring precise translation of terms with critical meanings. Therefore, the corpus-based approach, especially with its use of parallel corpora, allows for the targeted study of military terminology. This is essential for ensuring that the analysis is domain-specific and that the results are relevant to the unique linguistic and cultural challenges posed by military translation (Stubbs, 1996). Furthermore, the focus on military texts adds considerable value to the study, as there is limited research on the translation of military terminology, particularly between English and Vietnamese.

Moreover, by leveraging corpus tools such as Sketch Engine and GraphColl, the method allows for a detailed examination of collocations, word frequencies, and the contexts in which explicitation occurs. This leads to a deeper understanding of how translators handle ambiguities, cultural differences, and technical jargon, ultimately improving translation accuracy and performance (Krings, 2001). Additionally, quantitative methods help identify common explicitation practices that can enhance the overall quality of military translations.

While corpus-based research has been extensively discussed in international translation studies, its application in the Vietnamese context, particularly in military translation, remains limited. Thus, this thesis fills a significant research gap by applying corpus-based methodologies to Vietnamese-English translation. The quantitative aspect of the method ensures that the study is rigorous, providing replicable results that can inform future translation studies both in Vietnam and beyond (Baker, 1995; Munday, 2004).

Finally, the use of corpus-based tools not only improves the efficiency of data collection and analysis but also aligns with advances in translation technologies, such as machine translation. By analyzing large amounts of data, the method also aids in training machine learning models for military translation, offering practical benefits for translators working in this specialized field (Koehn, 2009).

In conclusion, the corpus-based quantitative method is ideally suited for this thesis because it allows for a precise, data-driven investigation of explicitation strategies in military translation. Ultimately, it ensures rigor, relevance, and replicability, making significant contributions both to the field of translation studies and to the practical challenges of translating military texts between English and Vietnamese.

3.3.2. Qualitative method

To ensure a comprehensive analysis of explicitation strategies in military translation, it is essential to complement the corpus-based quantitative method with a qualitative approach. While the quantitative analysis offers measurable insights into patterns and frequencies, the qualitative method provides a deeper understanding of the underlying reasons and contextual factors behind these patterns. The qualitative method is employed in the thesis as it offers a detailed and comprehensive insight into the contextual and cultural elements that shape explicitation strategies in military translation. There are several important reasons that support the adoption of this approach:

Firstly, the qualitative approach allows for a deeper exploration of the motivations and decision-making processes behind explicitation strategies used by translators. While quantitative analysis focuses on frequency and measurable data, qualitative research addresses the "why" and "how" behind translation choices (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011). By conducting thematic or content analysis, the study can uncover insights into the contextual and linguistic challenges translators face when dealing with specialized military terminology. This is crucial, as military texts often contain highly specialized, sensitive, and culturally embedded information that requires careful handling in translation.

Secondly, qualitative methods help to capture the complex and varied nature of explicitation in translation. Explicitation strategies, such as amplification or register markedness, are not always uniform or predictable. These strategies may vary depending on factors such as the text’s intended audience, the purpose of the translation, and the translator’s interpretation of the source text. By using qualitative analysis, the study can identify patterns and variations in the use of explicitation that quantitative methods alone may not reveal (Denzin & Lincoln, 2018).

Furthermore, military texts present unique linguistic and cultural challenges that often require translators to make implicit information explicit to ensure clarity and accuracy. Qualitative methods, such as interviews with professional military translators or focus group discussions, can provide direct insights into the reasoning behind these translation decisions. This adds a valuable human dimension to the research, allowing for a more comprehensive understanding of how explicitation strategies are applied in real-world military translation scenarios (Bryman, 2012).

In addition, the qualitative approach allows the study to address the specific cultural and linguistic considerations relevant to translating military texts between English and Vietnamese. The analysis of translator choices and cultural adjustments made during the translation process requires a method that can account for these subtleties. Qualitative research is well-suited to examine how cultural differences between English and Vietnamese, particularly in military contexts, affect explicitation strategies. For example, translators may need to explicate certain terms to bridge the gap between differing military systems and terminologies in the two cultures (Flick, 2014).

Moreover, the integration of qualitative data complements the quantitative findings from the corpus-based analysis. By combining both methods, the study can triangulate its results, ensuring a more robust and comprehensive investigation of explicitation in military translation. Qualitative insights help contextualize and explain the patterns and trends observed in the quantitative phase, offering a richer interpretation of the data (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011). This mixed-methods approach enhances the validity and depth of the study, as it draws from multiple sources of evidence.

In conclusion, the qualitative method is ideally suited for this thesis because it provides a more detailed and contextualized exploration of explicitation strategies in military translation. It complements the corpus-based quantitative analysis by adding depth, context, and a human perspective to the study. Ultimately, this combination of methods ensures that the research is comprehensive, addressing both the empirical and interpretative aspects of explicitation in military translation from English to Vietnamese**.**

3.4. Analytical framework of the study

The analytical framework for this thesis, grounded in the explicitation strategies identified by Nida (1964) and Klaudy (2009), has been thoughtfully chosen to facilitate a systematic analysis of translating military texts from English to Vietnamese. The selected explicitation strategies—(i) Amplification, (ii) Obligatory Explicitation, (iii) Register Markedness, and (iv) Pragmatic Explicitation—are particularly appropriate for this study as they align closely with both the translation process and the specific characteristics of military discourse. By employing these strategies, the framework aims to explore how military terminology and concepts are adapted in translation and the reasons behind these translation decisions, considering the linguistic, cultural, and functional needs of the Vietnamese target audience.

Chart 3.1

Analytical Framework of the study



Table 3.2

How Analytical framework work

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Strategy** | **How to Identify the Strategy** | **How the Strategy is Used** | **Why the Strategy is Used** |
| **Nida (1964)****Ampli**f**ication** | - Additional information or elaboration is added in the target text. - Expanding on terms or concepts that may be unclear in the target language. - Providing extra details to clarify or explain the meaning. | - Used to clarify ambiguous terms, technical jargon, or acronyms. - The translator may provide descriptions or expand terms for better comprehension. - Often adds contextual or procedural details. | - To ensure clarity, especially in specialized military contexts. - To fill gaps where direct equivalents do not exist. - To enhance understanding and avoid misinterpretations. |
| **Klaudy (2009)****Obl**i**gatory Explicitation** | - A term or concept in the source language has no direct equivalent or may be unclear in the target language. - The translation involves adding necessary explanatory information. | - Expanding or clarifying a concept that is implicit in the source language but is required explicitly in the target language. - Common when translating legal, technical, or military terms. | - To make implicit information explicit, ensuring the target audience fully understands. - Necessary to bridge linguistic or cultural gaps. - To prevent misinterpretations and ensure the accuracy of specialized terminology. |
| **Nida (1964)****Register Markedness** | - The translation uses specific language choices that highlight formality, informality, or technicality. - Shifts in tone, politeness, or technical jargon signal a change in register. | - The translator adapts the language to fit the appropriate level of formality, such as using formal military terms or polite forms when addressing high-ranking officers. - Can also involve adjusting the tone based on the intended audience (e.g., military personnel vs. civilians). | - To align with the target culture's norms and expectations for communication. - To ensure the translation reflects the correct level of respect, authority, or professionalism. - To avoid miscommunication, especially in hierarchical structures like the military. |
| **Klaudy (2009)****Pragmatic Explicitation** | - The source text assumes shared knowledge or cultural norms that may not apply in the target language or culture. - The translator adds background or context to ensure the intended message is understood. | - Adding or clarifying implicit cultural, social, or situational context that the target audience might not understand. - Common in idiomatic expressions, culturally bound references, or implicit references in the source language. | - To make the text culturally and contextually relevant for the target audience. - To ensure the intended meaning is conveyed without confusion, especially in cross-cultural military collaborations. - To bridge gaps in shared knowledge between the source and target audiences. |

3.5. Data collection procedures

As mentioned, the corpus-based approach serves as the primary research tool in this study, enabling a systematic and empirical investigation into explicitation in the translation of military terminology from English into Vietnamese. Therefore, the data collection procedures encompass two main components: corpus construction and key term identification.

Chart 3.2

The process of corpus construction



3.5.1. Corpus construction

To ensure comprehensive data for my study, English-Vietnamese Military Parallel Corpus (EVMPC) was constructed, a resource dedicated to data analysis. Constructing a corpus is vital as it transforms raw materials into aligned sentences, facilitating the analysis. This section outlines the steps of corpus construction, including methodologies and software employed in the process.

*3.5.1.1. Text selection*

The initial phase of corpus construction involves text collection, which is influenced by three key factors: the intended purpose of the corpus, the quality of the raw texts, and their accessibility (Bai, 1998, p.17). EVMPC, designed primarily for computer-assisted translation resource development, also serves military English and translation studies purposes. Following Chen and Ge's (2011) guidelines, EVMPC aims for large capacity to support machine learning and representativeness across various military domains.

Corpus is composed of the following English texts and their translated Vietnamese version:

This research centers on a comprehensive collection of military manuals, comprising 115 texts that are essential to the US Army. The selected manuals include "Corps Operations FM 3-92 (FM 100-15)," which outlines operational procedures and strategies for corps-level engagements; "Division Operations ATP 3-91," detailing the tactical frameworks and principles for division-level operations; and "Brigade Combat Team FM 3-90.6," which provides guidance on brigade-level tactics and techniques.These manuals are not only foundational documents for military operations but also rich sources of specialized terminology that reflect the complexities of military discourse. field. The above texts that constitute the English-Vietnamese Parallel Corpus can be regarded as authentic texts because they have not been created specifically for the purposes of this research. According to Bowker and Pearson (2002), an authentic text is a natural text that consists of genuine communication between people under normal circumstances and is an example of real ‘live’ language usage.

Translators of the texts and the size of the texts:

The 115 military texts from "Corps Operations FM 3-92 (FM 100-15)," "Division Operations ATP 3-91," and "Brigade Combat Team FM 3-90.6" were translated by translators and lecturers at the General Department of National Intelligence and Defense, Ministry of National Defense of Vietnam.The English-Vietnamese Parallel Corpus comprises 250,163 English words and 254,538 Vietnamese words.

Text quality encompasses the excellence of source and translated texts, as well as the normalcy of text storage (Wang, 2004, p.8). In the case of an English-to-Vietnamese specialized translation corpus, source text quality refers to the excellence of military English materials, while translated text quality pertains to the standard of Vietnamese translations. Unlike general-purpose or news texts, English- Vietnamese military works are challenging to obtain online. Therefore, a selection of military authentic documents was made to reflect military English characteristics. The chosen English texts were in high-standard American-ENglish, and their Vietnamese translations were of similar quality, ensuring consistency. All selected texts were available either in print or electronic formats.

To construct the corpus, the paper documents underwent digitization using an OCR scanner, resulting in electronic versions. Subsequently, the recognized texts were stored as Microsoft Word 2003 documents. Pre-processing steps involved removing page headers, footers, and corrupted characters, resulting in a final corpus comprising over a thousand pages containing more than 1 million English words and Vietnamese characters.

*3.5.1.2. Raw text scanning error recognition and proofreading*

The initial step in constructing a parallel corpus involves selecting and gathering bilingual linguistic resources. Linguistic resources play a pivotal role in various natural language processing applications and information retrieval tasks. Recent studies highlight the significance of cross-lingual information retrieval (Xu, Weischedel & Nguyen, 2001: 105-110). "Linguistic resources" encompass extensive sets of linguistic data and descriptions available in machine-readable formats, utilized for corpus construction, enhancement, or evaluation of natural language and speech algorithms or systems (Godfrey and Zampolli, 1995:90). These resources comprise written and spoken corpora, lexical databases, grammars, and terminologies, with this study focusing solely on issues related to written corpora.

The raw texts for corpus construction were obtained through scanning recognition technology, and the resulting paper documents were stored as Microsoft Word 2013 documents. Despite some garbled characters being removed during the scanning process, numerous recognition errors remained, necessitating thorough proofreading. The texts were proofread meticulously over three rounds. Initially, the embedded spelling and grammar checker in Microsoft Word 2013 was used for preliminary proofreading, addressing obvious scanning errors, and removing non-linguistic illustrations. In the second round, a careful reading was conducted to identify and rectify subtle errors, with reference to the original printed texts when necessary. Finally, a comprehensive review of all electronic texts was undertaken to ensure error-free content.

*3.5.1.3. Automatic sentence alignment*

In the development of my parallel corpus, alignment units encompass various layers, including texts, paragraphs, sentences, phrases, and words. The granularity of these units directly correlates with the linguistic information and practical utility offered by the corpus, albeit with increased difficulty in text processing. While aligning texts and paragraphs is relatively straightforward, aligning phrases or words presents greater challenges due to translators' flexibility in expression during the translation process. Hence, sentence-level alignment is the most common practice, given its relatively manageable complexity and significant application value in fields like machine translation and bilingual dictionary compilation.

Sentence alignment, a core procedure in parallel corpus construction, can be achieved through three main methods: length-based, word-based, or a hybrid approach (Wang, 2005, p. 3). Sentence alignment is chosen in my corpus-building process due to its comprehensibility and typically high correlation between the lengths of translated and source sentences (Losoya, 2009). Length-based alignment calculates sentence length using either word count or letter count, with both methods demonstrating high alignment accuracy, ranging from 96% to 99.4% (Gale & Church, 1991). However, the accuracy of length-based alignment diminishes for complex sentences, and correcting errors in this method is challenging once they occur.

The word-based method relies on identifying corresponding words across source and translation texts, maximizing the number of related words in aligned sentences. However, defining corresponding words can be problematic due to polysemy, and the solution often involves identifying cognitive words in both texts to achieve better alignment performance (Wang, 2005). Automatic sentence alignment facilitates easy application of the data in various corpus concordance programs, enhancing its utility for linguistic analysis and research.

*3.5.1.4. Manual alignment checking*

To ensure the accuracy of sentence alignment, manually assisted computerized alignment outputs undergo manual proofreading. Any detected errors are corrected, and corresponding tags are adjusted accordingly. Copyright considerations play a crucial role in data selection, with ethical implications regarding the intellectual property rights of authors or owners of the sourced texts. Corpus creators also hold rights over the collection due to their intellectual contributions in sampling selection, markup, and annotation.

Access to resources can pose challenges, particularly for copyrighted materials not available online. Procuring and converting published paper books into the corpus can be costly and labor-intensive. While some online resources are available, not all are freely accessible, often requiring authorization from translators. Leveraging my experience with computer-assisted translation tools, I utilized translation memory (TM) in Trados to aid in data processing.

3.5.2. Key Term Identification

The process of selecting key military terms for this thesis is grounded on three core factors: linguistic relevance, functional significance, and frequency within military discourse. The terms *defense, forces, operations, battle, combat, and firing* have been specifically chosen because they represent essential elements of military communication. Each term plays an integral role in understanding military strategy, tactics, and actions, which makes them crucial for analysis, especially in the context of explicitation in translation from English to Vietnamese.

Firstly, these terms were selected based on their high frequency within military discourse. Through the use of word frequency lists and collocation patterns, the most common military terms in English texts were identified. This ensures that the chosen terms are central to military communication and that they appear frequently in operational reports, manuals, and other related texts, solidifying their importance in this study. Furthermore, the selected terms reflect fundamental military concepts and functions. For instance, they range from overarching strategies such as defense and operations to tactical elements like battle and firing. Their relevance to the overall understanding of military discourse is paramount, as their accurate translation is essential for maintaining clarity and precision in Vietnamese. Moreover, these terms cover a broad spectrum of military contexts, spanning from high-level strategies to specific tactical actions. By selecting terms that represent both abstract concepts, like operations, and concrete actions, such as firing, the analysis aims to provide a comprehensive examination of how explicitation strategies are applied across different levels of military communication. Finally, each of these terms presents unique challenges for translation due to their varying degrees of specificity and abstractness. For example, translating operations may require the addition of contextual information to the Vietnamese text, while translating firing could necessitate technical elaboration. Consequently, these terms were chosen because of their potential to demonstrate various explicitation strategies that can enhance clarity and precision in the target language.

In conclusion, the selection of these key military terms ensures a thorough investigation into how explicitation strategies are applied in translating military texts from English to Vietnamese. These terms provide a strong foundation for analyzing both the linguistic and cultural dimensions of military translation, ultimately contributing to a clearer understanding of how meaning is conveyed in the target language.

3.6. Data Analysis Procedures

After the key terms are identified, data analysis procedures are conducted.

Chart 3.3

The Data Analysis Procedures



**Pilot Analysis of the Key Term: "Defense"**

**Step 1: Frequency Analysis**

The initial step involves examining the frequency of the term "defense" in the English source texts and its corresponding Vietnamese translations. For example, if "defense" appears 30 times in the English texts, we would analyze how it is rendered in Vietnamese, identifying any shifts, omissions, or additions. This quantification helps us understand the term's significance within military discourse.

**Step 2: Collocation Analysis**

Following frequency analysis, we conduct a collocation analysis to investigate the contexts in which "defense" is employed. In English military texts, "defense" often co-occurs with terms like "strategy," "forces," "capabilities," or "systems." We then examine the Vietnamese translations to see if similar collocations are present. For instance, if "defense" translates to "phòng thủ," we look for related phrases such as "chiến lược phòng thủ" (defense strategy) or "lực lượng phòng thủ" (defense forces). Notable shifts in these collocation patterns may indicate explicitations where the Vietnamese text provides additional context.

**Step 3: Identification of Explicitations**

Next, we identify explicitations in the Vietnamese translations where clarifying information is added. For example, if the English text refers to "national defense," the translation might specify "quốc phòng," inherently enriching the cultural context. We categorize these explicitations according to the strategies outlined by Nida (1964) and Klaudy (2009), noting instances where context or detailed descriptions are introduced.

**Step 4: Categorization of Explicitations**

***Define the Unit of Analysis***

The first task is to identify the "unit of analysis." For this example, the term "defense" will be treated as the unit of analysis. Military-related terms such as "defense," "defense strategy," "defense minister," or "national defense" may require explicitation to ensure that the translation is clear and culturally relevant to the target audience. In military contexts, "defense" could refer to multiple concepts, ranging from military defense (as in defense forces) to defense strategies (tactics or political decision-making related to national security).

***Develop the Coding System***

The next step is to develop a coding system that will be used to categorize instances where explicitation occurs. For each identified instance of **"defense,"** the coding system will log:

1. **Source Term/Phrase**: The term **"defense"** in the original text.
2. **Translated Term/Phrase**: The corresponding translation of **"defense"** in the target language.
3. **Type of Explicitation**: The type of explicitation used (e.g., *Obligatory Explicitation*, *Amplification*, *Pragmatic Explicitation*, *Register Markedness*).
4. **Contextual Notes**: Any additional context that explains why explicitation was necessary (e.g., cultural relevance, linguistic differences, etc.).

 Table 3.3

Coding Sheet with "Defense"

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Unit of Analysis** | **Source Term/Phrase** | **Translated Term/Phrase** | **Explicitation Type** | **Contextual Notes** |
| Term | "Defense" | "Phòng thủ" | Obligatory Explicitation | Standard translation for military defense (no direct equivalent). |
| Term | "National Defense" | "Quốc phòng" | Obligatory Explicitation | Literal translation with cultural context for Vietnamese national security. |
| Term | "Defense Strategy" | "Chiến lược phòng thủ" | Amplification | Explanation added: "Chiến lược phòng thủ" is clarified as a specific military strategy. |
| Phrase | "National Defense Policy" | "Chính sách quốc phòng (chính sách bảo vệ an ninh quốc gia)" | Amplification | Added context about the broader scope of national defense and security policies. |
| Term | "Defense Minister" | "Bộ trưởng Quốc phòng" | Register Markedness | Formal title, adjusted to fit the Vietnamese political hierarchy. |

 ***Analyze Translations and Apply the Coding System***

With the coding sheet ready, we now analyze instances where "defense" appears in the translation. The term will be tracked and categorized according to the following explicitation types:

*Example 1*: Obligatory Explicitation

In the case of "defense" being translated as *"Phòng thủ*" in Vietnamese, this is categorized as Obligatory Explicitation because the English term "defense" does not have a direct equivalent in Vietnamese. "Phòng thủ" refers to military defense, but the concept of "defense" can also be broader, including political or economic defense strategies, so the translator has to clarify its military meaning in the context.

*Example 2:* Amplification

When "Defense Strategy" is translated as "*Chiến lược phòng thủ*" in Vietnamese, the translator adds an explanation by amplifying the term. The phrase "Chiến lược phòng thủ" is clarified with further meaning: it's a military strategy specifically designed for defense, not just any type of strategy. This is an example of Amplification; as additional information is added to ensure full comprehension.

*Example 3*: Register Markedness

The term "Defense Minister" might be translated as "*Bộ trưởng Quốc phòng*" in Vietnamese. This is an example of Register Markedness, where the tone or formality is adjusted to fit the Vietnamese political hierarchy. In this case, the translation ensures that the military rank and the position of "Defense Minister" are properly conveyed in a formal, culturally appropriate manner.

*Example 4*: Pragmatic Explicitation

If the term "Strategic Defense" is translated as "*Phòng thủ chiến lược*," this is an example of Pragmatic Explicitation. The translator adapts the term for better cultural understanding in the target language. The concept of "strategic defense" might not have an immediately obvious counterpart in Vietnamese, so the translator uses a culturally specific term that makes sense within the Vietnamese military context.

**Step 5: Quantitative Analysis of Explicitation Types**

After analyzing the translations and categorizing the instances of explicitation, the next step is to quantify the results. For example, out of 10 instances of the term **"defense"** that were analyzed in a military text, the distribution of explicitation types might look like this:

Table 3.4

Percentage of Total Instances

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Explicitation Type** | **Number of Instances** | **Percentage of Total Explicitation** |
| Obligatory Explicitation | 3 | 30% |
| Amplification | 4 | 40% |
| Register Markedness | 2 | 20% |
| Pragmatic Explicitation | 1 | 10% |
|  |  |  |

In this example:

* **30%** of the explicitation instances were categorized as **Obligatory Explicitation**, suggesting that a third of the translations of "defense" required additional information for clarity due to a lack of direct equivalents in Vietnamese.
* **40%** were categorized as **Amplification**, indicating that most of the instances needed extra details or explanations for full comprehension.
* **20%** were categorized as **Register Markedness**, indicating that the tone and formality of the translation had to be adjusted to fit the Vietnamese military or political system.
* **10%** were categorized as **Pragmatic Explicitation**, showing that a smaller proportion of translations involved cultural or contextual adaptations.

**Step 6: Qualitative Analysis**

In this phase, we explore the rationale behind the selected explicitation strategies. For example, we may consider why "quốc phòng" was chosen over a simpler term like "phòng thủ." This choice could reflect cultural nuances, the necessity for clarity, or alignment with military communication standards in Vietnam.

This pilot analysis of the term "defense" illustrates the effective adoption of explicitation in military terminology translation. By examining frequency, collocation, and explicitations, we demonstrate strategies that enhance clarity and communicative effectiveness, ensuring that translated meanings resonate accurately with the intended Vietnamese audience. This structured approach not only validates the findings but also contributes to a deeper understanding of translation practices within military discourse.

**3.7. Trustworthiness**

Member checking is a vital step in the research process, particularly in qualitative studies, as it enhances the credibility and validity of findings. In the context of my study on explicitation strategies in the translation of military terminology, engaging with experts Truong Hai Thanh and Tran Anh Vu is essential for refining interpretations and ensuring the accuracy of conclusions.

The first step in member checking involves thorough preparation. I summarized the key findings regarding explicitation strategies identified in my research. Four primary strategies were examined: amplification, obligatory explicitation, register markedness, and pragmatic explicitation. For instance, I found that translators often employ amplification by expanding terms like "combat operations" to "các hoạt động chiến đấu," thus clarifying the operational context for Vietnamese readers. Additionally, terms such as "combat zone" were translated to "khu vực chiến đấu" to eliminate ambiguity, while the formal tone of military texts was preserved in translations like "combat unit" to "đơn vị chiến đấu." Cultural nuances were also addressed, as seen in translating "combat readiness" to "sự sẵn sàng cho chiến đấu," which reflects the importance of context in military communication.

Once the findings were summarized, I reached out to engage them in a member checking process. An email was sent to both, inviting them to share their insights and feedback on the research. I expressed my hope that their expertise could enhance the validity of my study and inquired about their availability for a discussion, whether in person or via video call. This initial engagement set the stage for a collaborative dialogue focused on refining the research.

During our meeting, I presented my findings in a structured manner, specifically addressing the explicitation strategies identified in the study. For example, I explained how amplification was utilized to clarify military terms and enhance understanding for the target audience. I invited their thoughts on the effectiveness of this approach, fostering an open conversation about their experiences in military translation.

Encouraging their feedback was a critical component of the member checking process. I posed specific questions to both experts, such as whether they felt my interpretation of amplification accurately reflected their experiences and if there were additional examples of obligatory explicitation that should be considered. Their insights were invaluable, providing practical perspectives that enhanced the depth of the analysis.

As the discussion unfolded, I meticulously documented their insights. Tran Anh Vu affirmed the significance of amplification in making military terms accessible, noting that he often had to explain concepts like "combat readiness" in greater detail to ensure clarity. Truong Hai Thanh emphasized the necessity of maintaining formality in translations, particularly for official military documents, underscoring the importance of register markedness.

Following the meeting, I took the time to reflect on their feedback and consider how it could be integrated into my research. Thanh's emphasis on contextual clarity in amplification prompted me to revise that section to better align with his experiences. Similarly, Vu’s suggestions regarding register markedness encouraged me to incorporate specific examples from his practice, enriching that aspect of my analysis.

To conclude the member checking process, I expressed my gratitude to both experts for their valuable contributions. A follow-up email was sent, thanking them for their insights and informing them of how I had incorporated their suggestions into my analysis. This acknowledgment not only reinforced the collaborative nature of the research but also fostered an ongoing dialogue about the complexities of military translation.

In summary, member checking with Truong Hai Thanh and Tran Anh Vu significantly enhanced the credibility and depth of my findings on explicitation strategies in military translation. This process not only ensured that the research accurately reflects the nuances of translation practices but also enriched my understanding of the subject matter. By engaging with experts in the field, I was able to refine my analysis and contribute to a more robust exploration of translation strategies, ultimately benefiting both the academic community and professional practice in military translation.

**Expert Profiles**

Truong Hai Thanh is a seasoned military linguist and translator specializing in the translation of military documents between English and Vietnamese. With over 15 years of experience, Thanh has worked extensively on official military publications and strategic communications for the Vietnamese Ministry of Defense. His expertise covers the nuances of military terminology, register maintenance, and cultural adaptation, making him a respected authority on the linguistic challenges in military translation. Thanh’s practical knowledge of maintaining formality and precision in official documents provided invaluable insights during the member checking process.

Tran Anh Vu is a professional military translator and language instructor with a strong background in applied linguistics and translation studies. Vu has contributed to numerous military translation projects, including operational directives, training manuals, and joint multinational exercises. His work often focuses on explicitation strategies to ensure clarity and operational effectiveness in translated texts. Vu’s experience with both field-level and strategic military communications allows him to offer practical perspectives on terminology adaptation and audience comprehension. His feedback was crucial in refining the analysis of amplification and pragmatic explicitation strategies in this study.

CHAPTER SUMMARY

In this chapter, we examined the research methodology employed in the study of explicitation strategies in the translation of military terminology from English into Vietnamese. We began by outlining the overall research design, which combines qualitative and quantitative approaches to provide a comprehensive analysis of translation practices. We detailed the selection of the corpus, consisting of a range of military texts, and explained the criteria for text inclusion to ensure relevance and representativeness. The chapter highlighted the methods used for data collection, including both qualitative analyses—focused on identifying explicitation strategies through thematic and content analysis—and quantitative analyses, which involved frequency counts of the identified strategies. The chapter also described the specific explicitation strategies explored in the study: amplification, obligatory explicitation, register markedness, and pragmatic explicitation. Each strategy was defined and illustrated with examples from the translated texts, showcasing how translators enhance clarity and comprehension in military contexts. Furthermore, we discussed the significance of member checking as a means to validate findings, emphasizing the importance of gathering insights from experienced practitioners in the field. The integration of their feedback into the research process was presented as a vital step in ensuring the reliability and applicability of the study's conclusions. In summary, this chapter provided a thorough overview of the research methodology, outlining the structured approach taken to investigate translation strategies in military texts. The combination of qualitative and quantitative methods, along with the engagement of expert feedback, aimed to create a robust framework for understanding the complexities of military translation and to inform best practices in the field. This methodological foundation sets the stage for the subsequent chapters, where we will analyze findings and discuss their implications.

**CHAPTER 4: FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION**

In the previous chapter, the methodology of this study was justified, laying the foundation for analyzing explicitation strategies in the translation of military termilology from English into Vietnamese. This chapter presents the findings that directly address the research questions of this study:

1. *What explicitation strategies are employed in the translation of military terminology in military texts from English into Vietnamese?*
2. *How and why are these explicitation strategies used?*

By examining the translation of key military terms in the selected corpus, this chapter uncovers patterns of explicitation and provides insights into how military terminology—such as *defense*, *forces*, *operations*, *battle*, *combat*, and *firing*—is handled in Vietnamese translations. These findings are discussed in relation to the theoretical framework of explicitation strategies proposed by Nida (1964), Klaudy (2009).

To facilitate a clear understanding of the explicitation strategies in use, the findings are presented according to the two research questions. First, Section 4.1 provides the explicitation strategies identified in the corpus and quantifies the frequency of each strategy and determining which strategy is the most and least utilized. These findings are discussed in comparison with similar studies, providing insights into the prominence of certain strategies in military translation.

Second, Section 4.2 explores how and why these explicitation strategies are applied. This qualitative assessment delves into specific examples, illustrating the reasoning behind the translators' choices. The analysis also reflects on linguistic and cultural factors influencing the use of explicitations and their impact on the clarity and effectiveness of the Vietnamese translations.

4.1. Explicitation strategies used in the corpus and their frequency

 The focus of the study is on identifying explicitation strategies in the translation of military terminology from English to Vietnamese, using the frameworks proposed by Nida, Vanderauwera, and Klaudy. A total of 304 examples from a corpus constructed on the basis of these texts have been recorded representing different categories of explicitation strategies. After analyzing these examples, various explicitation strategies have been identified and categorized based on the theories of the scholars mentioned.

*Amplification* involves expanding upon or adding information to a term or concept to enhance understanding. In the context of military translation, amplification provides additional details that clarify complex or ambiguous terms. For instance, the term "Defense Template" is amplified to "thước chỉ huy (có số liệu tính toán sẵn trong điều kiện phòng ngự)" to specify that it involves pre-calculated data used in defensive conditions. This approach improves clarity, accuracy, accessibility, and consistency in translations, making complex military concepts comprehensible and contextually precise for the target audience.

*Obligatory Explicitation* refers to the translation strategy where additional information is provided because the target language requires more detail to convey the intended meaning accurately. In military texts, this often involves specifying details that are implicit in the source language. For example, when translating terms related to military operations or equipment, the target language may necessitate additional descriptive elements to ensure that the reader fully understands the term's meaning and application. This strategy helps bridge gaps in understanding between languages by fulfilling the specific requirements of the target language.

*Register Markedness* deals with how the language used in translation reflects the specific register or level of formality required in the target text. In military translations, this involves maintaining the appropriate level of technicality and formality to align with the original text's register. For instance, a highly technical military term in English might need to be translated into a term with a corresponding level of technicality in Vietnamese. Register Markedness ensures that the translation remains consistent with the original document's tone and style, preserving the intended impact and formality of the text.

*Pragmatic Explicitation* involves making implicit or context-dependent information explicit in the translation to aid understanding. This strategy is particularly important in military texts, where certain information may be assumed or understood within the source culture but needs to be clearly stated for the target audience. For example, if an English military document references a specific tactical procedure without elaboration, the Vietnamese translation may need to include additional explanations or context to ensure that the target audience fully grasps the procedure's significance and application.

Based on the analysis of military terminology within the corpus, a total of 304 instances of explicitation strategies were identified. The distribution of these strategies is as follows:

Table 4.1

Distribution of Explicitation Strategies Applied to Key Military Terms in Translation

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *Military Terms* | *Amplification* | *Obligatory Explicitation* | *Register Markedness* | *Pragmatic Explicitation* | *Total Instances* |
| Defense | 23 | 42 | 13 | 8 | 86 |
| Force(s) | 22 | 36 | 11 | 7 | 76 |
| Operation | 21 | 21 | 9 | 6 | 57 |
| Battle | 10 | 13 | 6 | 3 | 32 |
| Combat | 6 | 11 | 9 | 2 | 28 |
| Firing | 5 | 13 | 5 | 2 | 25 |
| **Total per Strategy** | **87** | **136** | **53** | **28** | **304** |

Chart 4.1

 Percentage Distribution of Explicitation Strategies Applied to Key Military Terms in Translation

**Obligatory Explicitation (44.74%):** As the most prevalent strategy, with 136 instances, obligatory explicitation underscores the necessity for precision in translation. Specifically, this strategy is vital for accurately conveying the specific meanings of military terms, thereby ensuring they align with the grammatical and semantic structures of the target language. Notably, this high percentage reflects the complexity and specificity often required in military communication.

**Amplification (28.57%):** With 87 instances, amplification emerges as a significant strategy, indicating a clear focus on enhancing understanding by adding explanatory details. This is crucial in military contexts, where terms can be complex and multifaceted. Ultimately, the goal is to ensure that the target audience fully grasps the implications of the terminology used.

**Register Markedness (17.39%):** Applied in 53 instances, register markedness focuses on adjusting the translation to fit the appropriate level of formality or technical specificity. While this is important, its relatively lower incidence suggests that, in military translations, clarity and precision often take precedence over formality.

**Pragmatic Explicitation (9.21%):** With 28 instances, pragmatic explicitation is the least employed strategy. This indicates that, although tailoring the translation to the context and audience is important, it may be less critical in military settings, where the terminology is often already clear to the intended audience.

Overall, the data reveals a strong emphasis on clarity—through amplification—and precision—through obligatory explicitation—in military translations. This focus is essential for effective communication, especially given the high stakes involved in military operations. Although register markedness and pragmatic explicitation are relevant, they appear to play a secondary role compared to the overarching goals of ensuring clarity and precision. Thus, while it is important to consider the audience and context, the primary objective remains to accurately convey the intended message.

4.1.1. Explicitation in translation of Term “Defense”

Table 4.2

 Explicitation Strategies Applied to the Translation of "Defense"

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Amplification | Obligatory Explicitation | Register Markedness | Pragmatic Explicitation | Total Explicitation |
| 23 | 42 | 13 | 8 | 86 |

Chart 4.2

Explicitation Strategies Applied to the Translation of "Defense"

**Total Explicitation Instances (32)**

The term appears 32 times in the dataset, indicating its relevance in the specific military context being analyzed. This frequency highlights the term's importance in discussions related to military operations or concepts.

**Amplification (10 instances, 31.25%)**

The presence of amplification, with 10 instances, suggests that this strategy is utilized to provide additional context or explanatory details. This is crucial for enhancing clarity and ensuring that the audience fully understands the complexities associated with the term. The emphasis on amplification indicates that military terminology often involves nuances that require elaboration, particularly in contexts where precise comprehension is vital for effective communication.

**Obligatory Explicitation (13 instances, 40.63%)**

Obligatory explicitation is the most frequently employed strategy in this context, with 13 instances. This strategy ensures that essential details are included, aligning with the grammatical and semantic standards of the target language. The high frequency of obligatory explicitation underscores the need for accuracy in military communication, where specific meanings must be conveyed clearly. This focus indicates that translators prioritize clarity and precision, ensuring that the term's specific context or categories are well defined and unambiguous.

**Register Markedness (6 instances, 18.75%)**

Register markedness appears 6 times, reflecting an adjustment in the translation to fit the appropriate level of formality or technical specificity. While this strategy is important, its incidence suggests that clarity and precision take precedence in the translation process. The consideration of register markedness indicates an awareness of the audience's familiarity with military terminology, allowing for a balance between maintaining an appropriate level of formality and ensuring clear understanding.

**Pragmatic Explicitation (3 instances, 9.38%)**

Pragmatic explicitation is the least utilized strategy in this context, with 3 instances. This suggests that while context is relevant, the term is likely well understood by the intended audience. Consequently, translations can retain straightforward language without needing extensive contextual adaptation. The relatively low frequency of pragmatic explicitation indicates that the term’s meaning is generally clear, allowing for a more direct approach in translation.

In summary, the analysis of explicitation strategies reveals that obligatory explicitation is the predominant strategy, comprising 40.63% of total instances, highlighting a strong emphasis on clarity and precision. Amplification follows with 31.25%, indicating its role in enhancing understanding, while register markedness accounts for 18.75%, emphasizing appropriate formality. Pragmatic explicitation, at 9.38%, suggests that the audience’s familiarity with the term allows for a more straightforward translation approach.

Overall, this analysis underscores the necessity of employing varied explicitation strategies in military translation to ensure effective communication. By recognizing the distinct roles these strategies play, translators can enhance the clarity and accuracy of military texts, thereby facilitating better understanding among diverse audiences.

4.1.2. Explicitation in translation of Term “Forces”

Table 4.3

Explicitation Strategies Applied to the Translation of “Forces”

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Amplification | Obligatory Explicitation | Register Markedness | Pragmatic Explicitation | Total Explicitation |
| 22 | 36 | 11 | 7 | 76 |

**Chart 4.3**

Explicitation Strategies Applied to the Translation of “Forces”

**Explicitation Strategies Applied to the Translation of "Forces"**

**Total Explicitation Instances (76)**

The term appears **76 times** in the dataset, underscoring its significance within the military context being examined. This frequency highlights the term's importance in discussions about military concepts and operations.

**Amplification (22 instances, 28.95%)**

Amplification, with 22 instances, suggests that this strategy is often employed to provide additional context or explanatory details. This focus on amplification is crucial for enhancing clarity, ensuring that the audience fully understands the complexities associated with the term. In military contexts, where terminology can be intricate, the use of amplification helps to clarify meanings and implications, facilitating better communication.

**Obligatory Explicitation (36 instances, 47.37%)**

Obligatory explicitation is the most prevalent strategy in this context, with **36 instances**. This indicates a strong emphasis on precision and accuracy in translation, ensuring that essential details are included to align with the grammatical and semantic requirements of the target language. The high frequency of this strategy reflects the critical need for clear communication in military settings, where misunderstandings can have significant consequences. It underscores the importance of providing clear definitions and contextual information to avoid ambiguity.

**Register Markedness (11 instances, 14.47%)**

Register markedness appears 11 times, suggesting a focus on adapting the translation to the appropriate level of formality or technical specificity. While this strategy is relevant, its lower frequency compared to amplification and obligatory explicitation indicates that clarity and precision take precedence in the translation process. This suggests that translators prioritize ensuring that the terminology is accessible and understandable to the audience, even if it means sacrificing some formality.

**Pragmatic Explicitation (7 instances, 9.21%)**

Pragmatic explicitation is the least utilized strategy in this context, with 7 instances. This indicates that while contextual adaptation is important, the term is likely well understood by the intended audience. As a result, translations can remain straightforward without needing extensive contextual elaboration. The lower frequency of pragmatic explicitation suggests that the audience’s familiarity with the terminology allows for a more direct approach in translation.

In summary, the analysis of explicitation strategies reveals that obligatory explicitation is the dominant strategy, comprising **47.37%** of total instances, highlighting a significant focus on clarity and precision in military translations. Amplification follows with **28.95%**, indicating its important role in enhancing understanding. Register markedness accounts for **14.47%**, suggesting that while formality is a consideration, it does not overshadow the necessity for clear communication. Pragmatic explicitation, at **9.21%**, indicates that the audience’s familiarity with the term permits a more straightforward translation approach.

Overall, this analysis emphasizes the importance of utilizing varied explicitation strategies in military translation to ensure effective communication. By understanding the distinct roles these strategies play, translators can improve the clarity and accuracy of military texts, facilitating better comprehension among diverse audiences.

4.1.3. Explicitation in translation of Term “Operations”

Table 4.4

Explicitation Strategies Applied to the Translation of "Operation"

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Amplification | Obligatory Explicitation | Register Markedness | Pragmatic Explicitation | Total Explicitation |
| 21 | 21 | 9 | 6 | 57 |

Chart 4.4

Explicitation Strategies Applied to the Translation of "Operation"

 **Total Explicitation Instances (57)**

The term "Operations" appears 57 times in the dataset, highlighting its importance in military contexts. This frequency not only signifies the term's role in discussions about military strategies, planning, and execution but also underscores its relevance in operational contexts.

**Amplification (21 instances, 36.84%)**

The substantial presence of amplification indicates that the term "Operations" often necessitates additional context for effective comprehension. Specifically, this strategy serves to clarify complex military concepts and ensure that the audience fully understands the implications of the term. Moreover, the emphasis on amplification reflects the intricate nature of military operations, where clarity is essential for accurate interpretation and decision-making. By enhancing the description of the term, translators facilitate better understanding among diverse audiences, particularly in high-stakes environments where miscommunication can lead to critical errors.

**Obligatory Explicitation (21 instances, 36.84%)**

In addition to amplification, the equal frequency of obligatory explicitation suggests that conveying precise meanings is crucial when translating "Operations." This strategy focuses on ensuring that all necessary details are included to meet grammatical and semantic standards in the target language. Consequently, the use of obligatory explicitation underscores the importance of maintaining accuracy in military communication. Furthermore, this strategy helps delineate the specific contexts or categories associated with the term, thereby ensuring that translators convey the intended message without ambiguity. This precision is vital in military contexts, where clear and accurate information is essential for operational effectiveness.

**Register Markedness (9 instances, 15.79%)**

Conversely, the lower incidence of register markedness indicates that while formal and technical appropriateness is considered, the primary focus remains on clarity and precision. This observation suggests that military personnel are likely familiar with the terminology, which minimizes the need for extensive adjustments in formality. Therefore, the approach taken in translating "Operations" demonstrates an understanding that while formality may enhance communication in some contexts, it should not compromise the clarity necessary for effective military discourse.

**Pragmatic Explicitation (6 instances, 10.53%)**

Moreover, the least frequently employed strategy, pragmatic explicitation, suggests that context plays a role in understanding the term "Operations," but it is often already clear to the target audience. This realization indicates that the audience's familiarity with military terminology allows for a more straightforward translation approach. Consequently, the use of pragmatic explicitation reflects an understanding of the audience's needs and the context in which the term is used, ensuring that translations remain accessible while still conveying the necessary information.

In summary, the analysis of explicitation strategies for the term "Operations" reveals a significant emphasis on both amplification and obligatory explicitation, each comprising 36.84% of the total instances. This dual focus highlights the essential need for clarity and precision in military translations. Although register markedness and pragmatic explicitation are also relevant, they occupy a lesser role, indicating that the primary objective is to accurately convey military concepts without sacrificing clarity.

Overall, this analysis illustrates the necessity of employing varied explicitation strategies in military translation to ensure effective communication. By understanding the distinct roles these strategies play, translators can enhance the clarity and accuracy of military texts, which is crucial for maintaining operational effectiveness.

4.1.4. Explicitation in traslation of Term “ Fire”

Table 4.5

 Explicitation Strategies Applied to the Translation of "Firing

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Amplification | Obligatory Explicitation | Register Markedness | Pragmatic Explicitation | Total Explicitation |
| 5 | 13 | 5 | 2 | 25 |

The term in question appears 25 times in the dataset, reflecting its relevance in the specific military context being analyzed. This frequency indicates that the term is significant enough to warrant attention in discussions surrounding military terminology and translation practices.

**Amplification (5 instances, 20%)**

The presence of amplification, with 5 instances, suggests that this strategy is employed to add explanatory details. This use of amplification is crucial for enhancing clarity and ensuring that the audience comprehensively understands the term. The role of amplification here is to provide necessary context, which is particularly important in military settings where terminology can be intricate and multifaceted. Thus, the focus on amplification highlights the complexity of the term and the importance of clear communication.

**Obligatory Explicitation (13 instances, 52%)**

The substantial use of obligatory explicitation, comprising **13 instances**, indicates that precision is a top priority when translating this term. This strategy ensures that essential details are included, aligning with the grammatical and semantic standards of the target language. The emphasis on obligatory explicitation underscores the critical nature of accuracy in military communication, where specific meanings must be conveyed clearly. This high percentage illustrates that translators are keenly aware of the necessity to clarify the specific context or categories related to the term, reducing the likelihood of misinterpretation.

**Register Markedness (5 instances, 20%)**

The equal occurrence of register markedness, with 5 instances, suggests that while the formality of the translation is a consideration, the primary focus remains on clarity and precision. This indicates that the audience is likely familiar with the terminology, minimizing the need for extensive formal adjustments. The approach to register markedness here indicates that maintaining an appropriate level of formality is important, but it should not overshadow the necessity for clear and accurate communication.

**Pragmatic Explicitation (2 instances, 8%)**

Lastly, pragmatic explicitation appears in 2 instances, indicating that it is the least utilized strategy in this context. This suggests that while context is important, the term is generally well understood by the intended audience. As a result, the translations can remain straightforward without requiring extensive contextual adaptation. The low frequency of pragmatic explicitation highlights that the term’s meaning is likely clear to the audience, allowing for a more direct approach in translation.

In summary, the analysis of explicitation strategies reveals that obligatory explicitation is the most prominent strategy, comprising 52% of total instances. This indicates a strong emphasis on accuracy and clarity in translating the term. Amplification and register markedness follow, each at 20%, demonstrating their roles in enhancing understanding and maintaining appropriate formality, respectively. Pragmatic explicitation, while still relevant, takes a back seat at 8%, suggesting that the audience's familiarity with the term allows for a more straightforward translation approach.

Overall, this analysis underscores the importance of employing varied explicitation strategies in military translation to ensure effective communication, particularly in contexts where clarity and precision are paramount. By recognizing the distinct roles of these strategies, translators can better convey military concepts and ensure that the intended messages are accurately communicated.

4.1.5. Explicitation in translation of Term “ Combat’

Table 4.6

Explicitation Strategies Applied to the Translation of "Combat"

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Amplification | Obligatory Explicitation | Register Markedness | Pragmatic Explicitation | Total Explicitation |
| 6 | 11 | 9 | 2 | 28 |

Chart 4.5

Explicitation Strategies Applied to the Translation of "Combat"

**Total Explicitation Instances (28)**

The term appears **28 times** in the dataset, indicating its significance in the military context under examination. This frequency reflects the term's relevance in discussions surrounding military operations or concepts.

**Amplification (6 instances, 21.43%)**

The presence of amplification, with 6 instances, suggests that this strategy is utilized to provide additional explanatory details. This is important for enhancing clarity and ensuring that the audience fully understands the nuances of the term. The focus on amplification indicates that the term may carry complexities that require further elaboration, particularly in military settings where precise comprehension is critical for effective communication.

**Obligatory Explicitation (11 instances, 39.29%)**

Obligatory explicitation is employed 11 times, making it the most frequently used strategy in this context. This strategy is crucial for ensuring that essential details are included, thereby aligning with the grammatical and semantic standards of the target language. The emphasis on obligatory explicitation highlights the need for accuracy in military communication, where specific meanings must be conveyed clearly. This high frequency indicates that translators prioritize clarity and precision, ensuring that the term's specific context or categories are well defined.

**Register Markedness (9 instances, 32.14%)**

Register markedness appears 9 times, reflecting a focus on adjusting the translation to fit the appropriate level of formality or technicality. While this strategy is important, its relatively high incidence suggests that clarity and precision still take precedence in the translation process. This indicates an awareness of the audience's familiarity with military terminology, allowing for the maintenance of an appropriate level of formality without compromising understanding.

**Pragmatic Explicitation (2 instances, 7.14%)**

Pragmatic explicitation is the least employed strategy in this context, with 2 instances. This suggests that while context matters, the term is likely well understood by the intended audience. Consequently, translations can maintain straightforward language without needing extensive contextual adaptation. The low frequency of pragmatic explicitation indicates that the term’s meaning is generally clear, enabling a more direct translation approach.

In summary, the analysis of explicitation strategies reveals that obligatory explicitation is the predominant strategy, comprising 39.29% of total instances, highlighting a strong emphasis on clarity and precision. Amplification follows with 21.43%, indicating its role in enhancing understanding, while register markedness accounts for 32.14%, emphasizing appropriate formality. Pragmatic explicitation, at 7.14%, suggests that the audience’s familiarity with the term allows for a more straightforward translation approach.

Overall, this analysis underscores the necessity of employing varied explicitation strategies in military translation to ensure effective communication. By understanding the distinct roles these strategies play, translators can enhance clarity and accuracy in conveying military concepts, thereby facilitating better understanding among their audiences.

4.1.6. Explicitation in translation of Term “ battle”

Table 4.7

Explicitation Strategies Applied to the Translation of "Battle"

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Amplification | Obligatory Explicitation | Register Markedness | Pragmatic Explicitation | Total Explicitation |
| 10 | 13 | 6 | 3 | 32 |

Chart 4.6

Explicitation Strategies Applied to the Translation of "Battle"

**Total Explicitation Instances (32)**

The term appears 32 times in the dataset, indicating its relevance in the specific military context being analyzed. This frequency highlights the term's importance in discussions related to military operations or concepts.

**Amplification (10 instances, 31.25%)**

The presence of amplification, with 10 instances, suggests that this strategy is utilized to provide additional context or explanatory details. This is crucial for enhancing clarity and ensuring that the audience fully understands the complexities associated with the term. The emphasis on amplification indicates that military terminology often involves nuances that require elaboration, particularly in contexts where precise comprehension is vital for effective communication.

**Obligatory Explicitation (13 instances, 40.63%)**

Obligatory explicitation is the most frequently employed strategy in this context, with 13 instances. This strategy ensures that essential details are included, aligning with the grammatical and semantic standards of the target language. The high frequency of obligatory explicitation underscores the need for accuracy in military communication, where specific meanings must be conveyed clearly. This focus indicates that translators prioritize clarity and precision, ensuring that the term's specific context or categories are well defined and unambiguous.

**Register Markedness (6 instances, 18.75%)**

Register markedness appears 6 times, reflecting an adjustment in the translation to fit the appropriate level of formality or technical specificity. While this strategy is important, its incidence suggests that clarity and precision take precedence in the translation process. The consideration of register markedness indicates an awareness of the audience's familiarity with military terminology, allowing for a balance between maintaining an appropriate level of formality and ensuring clear understanding.

**Pragmatic Explicitation (3 instances, 9.38%)**

Pragmatic explicitation is the least utilized strategy in this context, with 3 instances. This suggests that while context is relevant, the term is likely well understood by the intended audience. Consequently, translations can retain straightforward language without needing extensive contextual adaptation. The relatively low frequency of pragmatic explicitation indicates that the term’s meaning is generally clear, allowing for a more direct approach in translation.

In summary, the analysis of explicitation strategies reveals that obligatory explicitation is the predominant strategy, comprising 40.63% of total instances, highlighting a strong emphasis on clarity and precision. Amplification follows with 31.25%, indicating its role in enhancing understanding, while register markedness accounts for 18.75%, emphasizing appropriate formality. Pragmatic explicitation, at 9.38%, suggests that the audience’s familiarity with the term allows for a more straightforward translation approach.

Overall, this analysis underscores the necessity of employing varied explicitation strategies in military translation to ensure effective communication. By recognizing the distinct roles these strategies play, translators can enhance the clarity and accuracy of military texts, thereby facilitating better understanding among diverse audiences.

4.2. Deployment and fuctions of explicitation strategies in translation of military terminology

This section investigates the deployment and functions of explicitation strategies in the translation of military terminology, focusing on how these strategies are utilized to ensure effective communication**.**

4.2.1. Obligatory Explicitation

Obligatory explicitation involves adding information that is necessary due to structural or semantic differences between languages to ensure grammatical correctness and clarity.

The primary application of obligatory explicitation is Structural Adjustments, which involves incorporating grammatical elements or additional details to ensure that the translation aligns with the grammatical rules and conventions of the target language**.**

**Example 1:**

*ST: The fire support plan will be executed more efficiently with fire support plan annex, which outlines detailed information such as objectives, tasks, and the forces involved. It is crucial to clearly outline the operational plan, timelines, and contingency strategies. Ultimately, the assessment and learning process will enable units to enhance their performance in upcoming missions.*

*TT: Kế hoạch chi viện hỏa lực sẽ được thực hiện một cách hiệu quả hơn với phụ lục kèm theo kế hoạch chi viện hỏa lực, trong đó bao gồm các thông tin chi tiết như mục tiêu, nhiệm vụ, và lực lượng tham gia. Việc trình bày rõ ràng kế hoạch tác chiến cùng thời gian thực hiện cũng như các phương án dự phòng là rất quan trọng. Cuối cùng, quy trình đánh giá và rút kinh nghiệm sẽ giúp các đơn vị cải thiện hiệu suất trong các chiến dịch sau*.

Clarification of the "Annex": The English term "Annex" refers to a supplementary document attached to the main plan. In Vietnamese, this concept is made explicit with the phrase "phụ lục kèm theo," which translates directly to "attached annex." This ensures that the reader understands that this is an additional document, something that might be implied in English but needs to be stated clearly in Vietnamese due to linguistic norms.

Additional Explicitation for "Fire Support Plan": The term "Fire Support" in English is left somewhat open, but in the translation, "kế hoạch chi viện hỏa lực" (literally, "fire support plan") provides the complete context of what kind of support is being provided. In Vietnamese, it is common to explicitly state the nature of the military operations to avoid ambiguity, especially when dealing with complex plans or documents.

The translation "phụ lục kèm theo kế hoạch chi viện hỏa lực" follows the standard Vietnamese word order, which places modifiers after the noun they modify, ensuring the term adheres to Vietnamese grammatical rules. The phrase "kèm theo" (accompanied by) also adds the necessary clarification that the annex is part of a larger document, a detail that is understood in English but needs to be fully expressed in Vietnamese for grammatical and structural coherence.

In Vietnamese military communication, explicit terms like "phụ lục" and "kèm theo" are crucial to maintaining clarity, especially in official documentation. Without this explicitation, the concept of an annex could be misunderstood or left unclear in Vietnamese, as the word "phụ lục" alone may not imply attachment to a main document. Vietnamese tends to require explicit connections between components of a text to ensure smooth comprehension. The addition of "kèm theo" (attached to) helps to make the sentence flow naturally and meet the grammatical expectations of the language, where specifying relationships between different elements (such as an annex and its main document) is more common.

Military documents in Vietnamese typically require more detailed explanations of supporting elements like annexes. By specifying that the annex is "kèm theo" the "fire support plan," the translation aligns with professional conventions in Vietnamese military communication, ensuring that the document is fully understood by its intended audience.

In this case, obligatory explicitation is used to ensure that the concept of an annex is fully conveyed in Vietnamese, addressing both structural differences and linguistic norms. This added information prevents potential ambiguity and ensures that the translation is accurate, clear, and contextually appropriate.

**Example 2.**

*ST: Fire support sectors are generally structured into small, adaptable teams that can be maneuvered and coordinated with other forces to ensure operational effectiveness. Strong collaboration among these units is essential for reaching the campaign's objectives.*

*TT: Các tiểu khu yểm trợ hỏa lực thường được tổ chức thành các nhóm nhỏ, linh hoạt trong việc điều động và phối hợp với các lực lượng khác để đảm bảo tính hiệu quả trong các hoạt động tác chiến. Sự phối hợp chặt chẽ giữa các đơn vị này là rất quan trọng để đạt được mục tiêu chiến dịch.*

In the translation of *Fire Support Sector* into Vietnamese as *Tiểu khu yểm trợ hỏa lực*, obligatory explicitation plays a key role in maintaining both coherence and clarity. The term *Fire Support Sector* in the source language carries a more abstract military concept, implying a defined geographical area or section where fire support operations occur. However, this abstraction could be ambiguous for a Vietnamese audience unless further contextual details are provided to explain the specific nature of the "sector."

Introduction of "Tiểu khu" (Subdivision): In the source text, the term *sector* implies a division or geographical area. The translation makes this concept explicit by using the term *"tiểu khu,"* which directly means "small subdivision" or "sector." In Vietnamese military communication, the explicit addition of *"tiểu khu"* helps clarify that the focus is on a distinct, smaller geographical unit within a larger operational area. Without this explicit mention, the audience might not fully understand the scope or nature of the sector being referred to.

Clarification of "Yểm trợ hỏa lực" (Fire Support): The source text phrase *"fire support"* is translated as *"yểm trợ hỏa lực,"* which explicitly defines fire support as providing direct or indirect fire to assist other military units. In Vietnamese, the phrase *"yểm trợ"* (support) paired with *"hỏa lực"* (firepower) makes the military function of this sector clear. This explicitation is necessary because in English, "fire support" is often used more flexibly, but in Vietnamese, the function and purpose need to be more explicitly defined to prevent misunderstanding.

Alignment with Grammatical Norms: Vietnamese often requires more detailed and explicit terms to ensure clarity. While the English term *sector* might imply a certain division or area, Vietnamese tends to use explicit descriptors like *"tiểu khu"* to define the geographical or operational boundaries clearly. This ensures that the grammatical structure adheres to Vietnamese norms, maintaining sentence flow and preventing ambiguity.

 The phrase *yểm trợ hỏa lực* (fire support) in Vietnamese makes the military role of this sector much clearer than the English equivalent. By providing additional details that align with Vietnamese military terminology, the translation clarifies the purpose and scope of operations in this sector. This ensures that the translation resonates with the cultural and linguistic expectations of a Vietnamese military audience. Without the addition of *"tiểu khu"* (small sector) and *"yểm trợ hỏa lực"* (fire support), the Vietnamese translation could be too vague and fail to convey the specific military role of the sector. This added context helps maintain coherence by providing all necessary details to ensure full comprehension of the term’s operational function.

In this example, obligatory explicitation is essential to ensuring that Vietnamese readers clearly understand the meaning of *Fire Support Sector*. The explicit mention of *"tiểu khu"* and *"yểm trợ hỏa lực"* provides necessary contextual details that might be implicit in the English source but are crucial in Vietnamese for clarity. This approach not only adheres to the grammatical rules and linguistic conventions of the target language but also aligns with the military norms, ensuring that the translation is precise and easily understood within its operational context.

**Example 3**

*ST: A prominent example of a fire support ship is the USS Arleigh Burke destroyer from the United States Navy. This ship features advanced weapon systems, such as a 127mm gun and Tomahawk cruise missiles. During different conflicts, the USS Arleigh Burke has conducted fire support operations for ground troops, targeting critical objectives and offering assistance for military missions.*

*TT: Một ví dụ về chiến hạm chi viện hỏa lực là tàu khu trục USS Arleigh Burke của Hải quân Hoa Kỳ. Tàu này được trang bị các hệ thống vũ khí hiện đại, bao gồm pháo 127mm và tên lửa hành trình Tomahawk. Trong các cuộc xung đột, USS Arleigh Burke đã thực hiện các nhiệm vụ hỗ trợ hỏa lực cho lực lượng bộ binh trên đất liền, bắn phá các mục tiêu quan trọng và cung cấp sự yểm trợ cho các hoạt động tác chiến của quân đội.*

The translation of *Fire Support Ships* into Vietnamese as *Chiến hạm chi viện hỏa lực* utilizes obligatory explicitation to ensure that the term is clear, culturally appropriate, and grammatically correct in the target language. In this case, the original English term *Fire Support Ships* is relatively straightforward, but in the Vietnamese context, it requires additional clarification and explicitation to fully convey its meaning.

Introduction of "Chiến hạm" (Warship): The word *"ships"* in English is a broad term and could refer to any type of vessel. However, in a military context, it is important to specify the type of ship involved. The translation uses the term *"chiến hạm"*, which explicitly refers to a "warship" or "battleship." This ensures that the Vietnamese reader understands that these are military ships involved in combat or defense, not just any ships providing support. This explicitation aligns with the syntactic and cultural norms of the Vietnamese language, where military terminology often requires more specific labels.

Clarification of "Chi viện hỏa lực" (Fire Support): In the source text, *"fire support"* implies a range of activities where ships provide artillery or other firepower to assist land or naval forces. The translation makes this clearer by using *"chi viện hỏa lực"* (support with firepower). This explicitly defines the role of the ships as providing firepower support, which could be less clear in the English version. In Vietnamese military terminology, *"chi viện"* (support) combined with *"hỏa lực"* (firepower) offers a more complete and precise description of the ships' function. Alignment with Grammatical Norms: In Vietnamese, military terms often require more specificity to avoid ambiguity. Simply translating *"ships"* as *"tàu"* (a general term for ship) would be insufficient. By using *"chiến hạm"*, the translator aligns with Vietnamese grammatical conventions and provides a clear understanding of the type of ships involved, ensuring that the translation maintains both coherence and accuracy.

The explicitation of *"chi viện hỏa lực"* ensures that the audience comprehends the exact role of the ships. While *"fire support"* in English can be implicit and general, Vietnamese requires more direct and explicit phrasing to make the military role immediately clear. The addition of *"hỏa lực"* (firepower) explicitly ties the ship's actions to combat support, ensuring clarity for Vietnamese readers. Without the addition of *"chiến hạm"* and *"chi viện hỏa lực,"* the translation might be too vague, as the concept of "fire support" and "ships" can vary widely. The explicit clarification avoids any confusion about the nature of the ships and their purpose, ensuring that the translation is accurate and unambiguous.

In this translation, obligatory explicitation ensures that Vietnamese readers fully understand the term *Fire Support Ships* by specifying both the type of ship (*chiến hạm*) and the nature of the support provided (*chi viện hỏa lực*). This strategy is crucial in maintaining clarity, aligning with Vietnamese military terminology, and providing the necessary details that might be implicit in English but required in Vietnamese for proper comprehension. The translation, therefore, ensures that the term is fully understood in the target language and cultural context.

**Example 4**

*ST: The combat ratio to service reflects the allocation of resources within the military and can vary depending on the operational strategy and the size of the unit.*

*TT: Tỷ lệ quân số chiến đấu và quân số đơn vị hậu cần phản ánh sự phân bổ nguồn lực trong quân đội, và nó có thể thay đổi tùy theo chiến lược tác chiến và quy mô của đơn vị.*

The translation of *Combat Ratio to Service* into Vietnamese as *Tỷ lệ quân số chiến đấu và quân số đơn vị hậu cần* employs obligatory explicitation to ensure that the term is clear, culturally appropriate, and grammatically correct in the target language. This translation adds necessary context to fully convey the meaning of the original term, which may be implicit in English but needs to be explicit in Vietnamese. The English term *"Combat Ratio"* refers to the ratio of combat personnel to other types of personnel. However, this term is somewhat vague and lacks specific details in English. The translation specifies *"quân số chiến đấu"* (combat personnel), making it clear that the ratio pertains to the number of personnel directly involved in combat operations. This explicitness ensures that the Vietnamese reader understands exactly what is being measured in the ratio.

The term *"to Service"* in the English phrase implies the comparison of combat personnel to support or service personnel. The Vietnamese translation clarifies this by adding *"quân số đơn vị hậu cần"* (service personnel), which explicitly refers to the support units within the military. This additional detail aligns with Vietnamese military terminology, where distinguishing between combat and support roles is essential for understanding military ratios.

In Vietnamese, military terms often require more detailed descriptions to ensure grammatical and syntactic clarity. The English phrase *"Combat Ratio to Service"* is concise and assumes familiarity with the context, but in Vietnamese, it is essential to explicitly state both categories being compared. By translating it as *"Tỷ lệ quân số chiến đấu và quân số đơn vị hậu cần,"* the translation aligns with Vietnamese grammatical norms, where explicitness is crucial for clarity.

The addition of *"quân số chiến đấu"* (combat personnel) and *"quân số đơn vị hậu cần"* (service personnel) ensures that the translation precisely conveys the concept of comparing combat personnel to support personnel. This explicitation avoids ambiguity by clearly defining the two groups being measured, which is vital for understanding military ratios and their implications. Without the additional details provided in the Vietnamese translation, the term *"Combat Ratio"* might be too vague, potentially leading to misunderstandings about what is being measured. The explicit mention of both combat and service personnel clarifies the scope of the ratio and provides a complete picture of the comparison, enhancing the reader's understanding of military resource allocation. The translation adheres to local conventions for military terminology, where detailed descriptions are often necessary to ensure the accurate conveyance of complex concepts. By providing explicit information about both combat and service personnel, the translation meets the expectations of Vietnamese military documentation and discourse.

In this translation, **obligatory explicitation** plays a crucial role in ensuring that the Vietnamese term *Tỷ lệ quân số chiến đấu và quân số đơn vị hậu cần* accurately reflects the meaning of the English phrase *Combat Ratio to Service*. By specifying the categories of personnel involved and aligning with Vietnamese grammatical and linguistic conventions, the translation provides the necessary context and clarity. This approach ensures that the term is fully understood in the target language and fits seamlessly into the context of Vietnamese military communication.

**Example 5**

*ST: The objective of military training is to improve the combat effectiveness of units, and this is often accomplished through combat-type training maneuvers, allowing soldiers to acclimate to pressure and unexpected scenarios. These drills usually incorporate the use of weapons, equipment, and combat tactics in settings that closely resemble the actual battlefield.*

*TT: Mục tiêu của việc huấn luyện quân sự là nâng cao khả năng tác chiến của các đơn vị, điều này có thể đạt được thông qua diễn tập trong điều kiện sát thực tế chiến đấu, giúp quân nhân làm quen với áp lực và các tình huống không lường trước. Những cuộc diễn tập này thường bao gồm việc sử dụng vũ khí, trang thiết bị và kỹ thuật chiến đấu trong môi trường tương tự như thực địa.*

 The translation of *Combat Type Training Maneuvers* into Vietnamese as *Diễn tập trong điều kiện sát thực tế chiến đấu* involves the strategy of obligatory explicitation. This approach ensures that the translated term conveys a clear and precise meaning in the target language, accounting for the differences in grammatical structure and context between English and Vietnamese. The English term *"Combat Type Training"* implies training exercises that are specifically designed to simulate combat scenarios. However, the term alone may not fully convey the extent of realism required in the exercises. The Vietnamese translation *"Diễn tập trong điều kiện sát thực tế chiến đấu"* explicitly describes the nature of the training, translating to "exercises under conditions closely resembling actual combat." This additional detail makes it clear that the training is intended to replicate real combat conditions. The phrase *"trong điều kiện sát thực tế chiến đấu"* (under conditions closely resembling actual combat) elaborates on the type of training being referred to. This added detail provides necessary context that the English term does not fully encompass. It specifies that the training maneuvers are conducted in settings that closely mimic real combat scenarios, thereby enhancing understanding.

Alignment with Grammatical Norms: In Vietnamese, military and training terms often require more detailed descriptions to fit grammatical and syntactic norms. The English term *"Combat Type Training Maneuvers"* is relatively concise and may assume familiarity with the concept. In contrast, Vietnamese requires explicit details to clearly convey the training's nature. The translation *"Diễn tập trong điều kiện sát thực tế chiến đấu"* ensures that the description aligns with Vietnamese grammatical standards by specifying the training conditions. The explicit description *"trong điều kiện sát thực tế chiến đấu"* clarifies that the training maneuvers are conducted under conditions that closely resemble real combat situations. This additional information is crucial for understanding the scope and realism of the training, which might otherwise be ambiguous in the English term. Without the added context, the English term *"Combat Type Training Maneuvers"* might be too vague, potentially leading to misunderstandings about the nature of the training. The Vietnamese translation avoids this ambiguity by providing a clear explanation of the training conditions, ensuring that the term accurately reflects the intended meaning. The translation adheres to local norms for military terminology, where detailed explanations are often necessary to ensure precision. By explicitly describing the training conditions, the translation meets the expectations of Vietnamese military documentation, providing a more complete and culturally appropriate understanding of the term.

In this translation, obligatory explicitation is crucial for accurately conveying the meaning of the English term *Combat Type Training Maneuvers*. The Vietnamese translation *Diễn tập trong điều kiện sát thực tế chiến đấu* provides necessary context by specifying that the training is conducted under conditions closely resembling actual combat. This approach aligns with Vietnamese grammatical norms, enhances understanding, and prevents ambiguity, ensuring that the term is clearly and appropriately conveyed in the target language.

**Example 6:**

*ST: Units can improve their combat skills and coordinate effectively in defensive situations by carrying out shooting exercises in environments that closely resemble real scenarios, particularly at a defense training range*

*TT: Các đơn vị có thể nâng cao kỹ năng chiến đấu và phối hợp hiệu quả trong các tình huống phòng ngự thông qua việc thực hiện các bài tập bắn trong điều kiện sát với thực tế, đặc biệt là tại bãi tập bắn trong phòng ngự.*

The English term *"Defense Training Range"* typically refers to a designated area where military personnel practice defensive tactics. However, the term alone might not fully convey the specific context or purpose of the range in Vietnamese. The Vietnamese translation *"Bãi tập bắn trong phòng ngự"* specifies that the range is used for firing practice within a defensive context. The term *"bãi tập bắn"* (shooting range) provides explicit information about the nature of the range, while *"trong phòng ngự"* (within defense) clarifies the type of training conducted there.

The phrase *"trong phòng ngự”* adds necessary context that aligns with the intended use of the training range. By explicitly stating that the range is used for defensive training, the translation ensures that the term is fully understood in its military context. This detail is crucial for accurately conveying the purpose of the training range, which might be implied but not explicitly stated in the English term.

Vietnamese often requires more explicit descriptions to fit grammatical and syntactic norms. The English term *"Defense Training Range"* may be succinct, but Vietnamese requires detailed context to clearly define the term. The translation *"Bãi tập bắn trong phòng ngự"* provides a more comprehensive description that adheres to Vietnamese grammatical standards, specifying both the function of the range and the context in which it is used. The addition of *"trong phòng ngự"* (within defense) clarifies that the range is used for practicing defensive tactics. This explanation helps the Vietnamese audience understand the specific focus of the training, which is crucial for ensuring that the term is accurately interpreted in the military context. Without the added context, the English term *"Defense Training Range"* might be too vague, potentially leading to confusion about the range's purpose. The Vietnamese translation provides explicit details to avoid ambiguity, ensuring that the audience comprehends the exact nature of the training range and its intended use.

In this translation, obligatory explicitation is essential for conveying the precise meaning of the English term *Defense Training Range*. The Vietnamese translation *Bãi tập bắn trong phòng ngự* provides necessary context by specifying that the range is used for firing practice within a defensive framework. This approach aligns with Vietnamese grammatical norms, enhances understanding, and prevents ambiguity, ensuring that the term is accurately and appropriately conveyed in the target language.

**Example 7**

*ST: The strategy of defense in depth goes beyond just the initial defensive line; it incorporates additional layers behind it, enabling the defending forces to sustain their combat effectiveness even if the front line is penetrated. Effective coordination among infantry units, fire support, and the rapid response capability of reserve forces is essential for maintaining defensive strength and adaptability in combat.*

*TT: Chiến thuật phòng ngự thành thê đội có chiều sâu không chỉ dựa vào lớp phòng ngự đầu tiên mà còn bao gồm các lớp bổ sung phía sau, cho phép lực lượng phòng ngự duy trì sức chiến đấu ngay cả khi lớp trước bị xâm nhập. Sự liên kết chặt chẽ giữa các đơn vị bộ binh, hỏa lực và khả năng phản ứng nhanh của các lực lượng dự trữ là rất quan trọng để đảm bảo hiệu quả phòng ngự và tính linh hoạt trong chiến đấu.*

The English term *"Defense in Depth"* refers to a military strategy where multiple layers of defense are established to create a robust defense system. However, this term might be too abstract or insufficiently descriptive in Vietnamese. The Vietnamese translation *"Phòng ngự thành thê đội có chiều sâu"* specifies that the defense is organized into multiple layers with depth. The phrase *"thành thê đội có chiều sâu"* (layered defense with depth) provides a more explicit description of this strategic concept.

The term *"thành thê đội có chiều sâu"* (layered defense with depth) adds necessary context that aligns with the strategic nature of the original term. It explicitly describes the concept of layered defense, helping to convey the idea of multiple, successive lines of defense, which might be implicit in the English term but needs explicit articulation in Vietnamese.

Vietnamese often requires more explicit descriptions to fit its grammatical and syntactic norms. The English term *"Defense in Depth"* is concise and abstract, but Vietnamese typically demands a more detailed description to ensure clarity. The translation *"Phòng ngự thành thê đội có chiều sâu"* provides a comprehensive explanation that fits Vietnamese grammatical structures and conveys the concept of multiple defensive layers. The addition of *"thành thê đội có chiều sâu"* (layered defense with depth) clarifies that the defense strategy involves various levels of fortification. This explanation helps the Vietnamese audience understand the strategic importance and implementation of the defense plan, which is crucial for accurate interpretation in a military context. Without the added context, the term *"Defense in Depth"* might be too vague or abstract for the Vietnamese audience. The translation provides explicit details to prevent ambiguity, ensuring that the concept of a multi-layered defensive strategy is clear and well-understood.

In this translation, obligatory explicitation is crucial for conveying the precise meaning of the English term *Defense in Depth*. The Vietnamese translation *"Phòng ngự thành thê đội có chiều sâu"* provides explicit details about the layered nature of the defense strategy, aligning with Vietnamese grammatical norms and enhancing understanding. This approach prevents ambiguity and ensures that the term is accurately interpreted in the target language, reflecting both the strategic concept and local military documentation standards.

In conclusion, obligatory explicitation plays a critical role in ensuring clarity, accuracy, and alignment with grammatical norms when translating military terms from English to Vietnamese. This strategy addresses both structural and semantic differences between the two languages, helping to prevent ambiguity and ensure that key military concepts are fully conveyed. By providing explicit contextual details that might be implicit in the source language, the translator can meet the expectations of Vietnamese military communication, ensuring that the intended meaning is preserved and understood within the target culture.

4.2.2. Amplification

Amplification is a translation strategy that involves providing extra information to improve understanding, make the translation clearer, and ensure that the target audience comprehends the term as intended. This often includes providing additional context, elaborating on specific concepts, or expanding abbreviations. The initial application of amplification is **contextual clarification**. This approach seeks to guarantee that military terms are thoroughly and precisely understood by including extra information about their application, purpose, and setting. This is particularly vital in military settings, where accuracy and clarity are essential due to the specialized and detailed nature of the terminology**.**

**Example 8:**

*ST: Bolstering defense involves enhancing and fortifying military defense sites to improve their resilience against enemy assaults. This includes reinforcing structures such as trenches, bunkers, and strongpoints, as well as upgrading defensive weapon systems and equipment.*

*TT: Củng cố trận địa (công sự) phòng ngự là quá trình gia tăng sức mạnh và độ kiên cố của các vị trí phòng thủ nhằm bảo vệ lực lượng trước các cuộc tấn công của đối phương. Quá trình này bao gồm việc xây dựng và gia cố các công trình như hào, chiến hào, và lô cốt, cũng như cải thiện hệ thống vũ khí và trang bị.*

The original phrase "bolster defense" can be applied to various aspects of defense, such as reinforcing military infrastructure, improving defensive readiness, or increasing operational preparedness. However, without additional context, this term can be vague, particularly in military communication where precision is crucial.

The Vietnamese translation amplifies the term by specifying two key areas of focus:

Công sự phòng ngự (fortifications): This term refers to physical structures like bunkers, trenches, or defensive walls that are either built or strengthened to protect troops during combat. By incorporating this term, the translation clarifies that "bolstering defense" involves the physical construction or enhancement of defensive structures. This explicitation helps in understanding that the focus is on tangible improvements in fortifications.

Trận địa phòng ngự (positions): This term determs the strategic locations where military units are stationed to defend against attacks. It encompasses both the physical location and the arrangement of forces, emphasizing tactical positioning. The use of "trận địa" in the translation indicates that bolstering defense also involves enhancing the positioning and readiness of troops. Thus, the translation highlights that the term pertains to strategic adjustments in defense setup.

Without amplification, "bolster defense" could be interpreted as a broad concept, leading to potential ambiguity. The addition of "công sự" (fortifications) and "trận địa" (positions) removes this vagueness, making it clear that the action pertains to strengthening physical structures or strategic positions. For instance, a military leader interpreting "bolster defense" might initially assume it refers to improving overall readiness or resource allocation. However, with the amplified translation, it becomes evident that the focus is specifically on reinforcing physical infrastructure or adjusting troop positions. In military contexts, precision is of utmost importance. Simply translating "bolster defense" without specifying the type of defense being enhanced might lead to misinterpretation. The added terms "công sự" and "trận địa" ensure that the defense enhancement involves either physical infrastructure or strategic positioning, both of which are critical for effective military operations. For example, "Củng cố công sự phòng ngự" clearly directs efforts towards building or strengthening fortifications, whereas "Củng cố trận địa phòng ngự" emphasizes improving the strategic arrangement of forces.

Moreover, in military operations, bolstering defense can encompass a range of activities, from reinforcing troops' morale to enhancing supply lines. However, in tactical scenarios, it specifically refers to fortifying positions or defensive lines. Amplification thus provides a clearer understanding of the specific actions being taken. For instance, if a base is under threat, "Củng cố công sự phòng ngự" would be interpreted as constructing or enhancing fortifications, while "Củng cố trận địa phòng ngự" would imply repositioning or adjusting the deployment of forces for better defense.

Finally, military strategies often rely on both fortifications and troop positioning. The amplified translation reflects these two critical aspects of defense: strengthening physical defenses ("công sự") and improving tactical deployment ("trận địa"). In a battle preparation context, "bolstering defense" with fortifications might involve constructing stronger barriers or bunkers, while reinforcing positions would focus on better placement of troops or artillery—both essential for successful defense.

In conclusion, the amplified Vietnamese translation of "bolster defense" as "Củng cố công sự phòng ngự / Củng cố trận địa phòng ngự" provides essential clarity by specifying that the term refers to enhancing both the physical and tactical elements of defense. This detailed explanation ensures that military personnel understand exactly which aspect of defense needs to be strengthened, thereby improving the accuracy and effectiveness of communication in operational settings

**Example 9: Fire Support Sector**

Context 1

*ST: Fire Support Sector (Amphibious Landing) is a designated area established to provide fire support for landing forces during military operations. This area is typically located near the coastline, allowing warships and other attacking vehicles to deploy firepower quickly and effectively.*

*TT: Khu chi viện hỏa lực (đổ bộ đường biển) là khu vực được thiết lập để cung cấp hỗ trợ hỏa lực cho các lực lượng đổ bộ trong các chiến dịch quân sự. Khu này thường được bố trí gần bờ biển, cho phép các tàu chiến và phương tiện tấn công khác có thể triển khai hỏa lực một cách nhanh chóng và hiệu quả.*

Context 2:

 *ST: Fire Support Sector is a military unit organized to provide fire support for combat forces in a specific area. This detachment typically includes weapon systems such as artillery, missiles, and air support, arranged to ensure rapid and effective fire support.*

 *TT: Tiểu khu yểm trợ hỏa lực là một đơn vị quân sự được tổ chức để cung cấp hỗ trợ hỏa lực cho các lực lượng chiến đấu trong một khu vực nhất định. Tiểu khu này thường bao gồm các hệ thống vũ khí như pháo, tên lửa và hỏa lực không quân, được bố trí để đảm bảo khả năng chi viện hỏa lực nhanh chóng và hiệu quả.*

The term "fire support sector" refers to a designated area where fire support—such as artillery or air support—is concentrated to assist military operations. However, this term can be somewhat general without additional context.

In the Vietnamese translation, amplification enhances clarity and precision by incorporating specific details:

* + - 1. Khu chi viện hỏa lực (đổ bộ đường biển): This translation specifies "khu chi viện hỏa lực" (fire support area) and further clarifies with "đổ bộ đường biển" (amphibious landings). By including "đổ bộ đường biển," the translation provides crucial context, indicating that the fire support sector is specifically relevant to amphibious operations. This added detail is essential because it helps to understand the type of operation being supported. For instance, in an amphibious landing scenario, fire support must be tailored to both sea and land elements to ensure effective assistance during the landing phase.
			2. Tiểu khu yểm trợ hỏa lực: This term translates to "subsector of fire support" and narrows the focus by detailing smaller, more specific areas within the broader fire support sector. By using "tiểu khu" (subsector), the translation emphasizes that the support is organized into localized segments. This additional detail helps clarify that the fire support is not merely a broad area but involves precise, tactical positioning.

The inclusion of "đổ bộ đường biển" ensures that the role of the fire support sector is clearly understood in the context of amphibious operations. This precision is crucial for effective military planning as it specifies the operational environment and the type of support required. Without this detail, the term "fire support sector" might be interpreted broadly, which could lead to misunderstandings about its application.

Moreover, by incorporating "amphibious landings" and "subsector," the translation provides detailed context that enhances the reader's comprehension of the operational setting. This additional information helps to clarify how fire support is utilized, ensuring that the term's application is correctly understood in specific scenarios.

The addition of these specific details ensures that the term "fire support sector" is accurately represented in Vietnamese. The added context maintains the original term's meaning and relevance, which is crucial for precise communication in military texts. Furthermore, consistent use of detailed terminology throughout the text helps maintain clarity and uniformity. By specifying "khu chi viện hỏa lực (đổ bộ đường biển)" and "tiểu khu yểm trợ hỏa lực," the translation aligns with military language standards and ensures that readers can interpret and apply these concepts consistently.

In summary, the Vietnamese translation of "fire support sector" as "Khu chi viện hỏa lực (đổ bộ đường biển); tiểu khu yểm trợ hỏa lực" effectively amplifies the term by specifying the operational context and scope. This detailed explanation ensures that military personnel fully understand the nature and application of the fire support, thereby improving the accuracy and effectiveness of communication in military contexts.

Example 10: Combat Readiness Marksmanship Proficiency Course

The term "combat readiness marksmanship proficiency course" refers to a specialized training program aimed at assessing and enhancing a soldier’s marksmanship skills in preparation for combat. While this term suggests a focus on shooting skills, it could be interpreted in various ways, such as theoretical training or simulation exercises. Therefore, to ensure clarity and precision, the translation "Khóa sát hạch bắn đạn thật" provides essential amplification.

Firstly, "Khóa sát hạch" translates to "assessment course" or "proficiency test," indicating that the course is designed to evaluate and measure skills. Secondly, "bắn đạn thật" means "live ammunition training," which specifies that the course involves practical, real-world shooting with live rounds rather than simulated or theoretical exercises.

By amplifying the term with "bắn đạn thật," the translation clarifies that the course includes actual live-fire exercises. Without this detail, the term "marksmanship proficiency" might be misunderstood as referring to a theoretical or simulation-based training program. Thus, by specifying "bắn đạn thật," the translation ensures that readers understand the practical nature of the course, emphasizing that participants will engage in real shooting exercises.

In military training, practical experience with live ammunition is crucial for assessing a soldier's readiness for combat. Hence, the amplification highlights that the course evaluates not just theoretical knowledge but actual shooting skills under realistic conditions. This understanding is essential for comprehending the level of preparedness being assessed.

Moreover, "bắn đạn thật" underscores that the course is directly relevant to combat situations. This distinction is important because it conveys that the training is designed to ensure proficiency in real combat scenarios, not just in a controlled or simulated environment. Effective marksmanship in actual combat conditions is critical for operational success.

Consequently, the amplified translation removes any ambiguity about the nature of the training. By specifying "live ammunition," it becomes clear that the course involves practical exercises, providing a more accurate representation of what participants will experience.

Additionally, the use of detailed terms like "bắn đạn thật" ensures consistency in conveying the practical aspects of military training. It aligns with military standards and ensures that the term is understood uniformly across different contexts.

Ultimately, the detailed translation helps readers grasp the full scope of the course, including its purpose and practical application. Therefore, it ensures that military personnel and stakeholders understand that the course is aimed at achieving a high level of combat readiness through live-fire practice. In summary, the Vietnamese translation "Khóa sát hạch bắn đạn thật" effectively amplifies "combat readiness marksmanship proficiency course" by specifying "bắn đạn thật" (live ammunition training). This added detailensures clarity about the practical nature of the training, emphasizing that it involves real shooting exercises and is crucial for evaluating combat readiness. **Such** detail improves the accuracy and effectiveness of communication in military contexts, ensuring that the nature and objectives of the course are

clearly understood.

**Example 10: Operation Evaluation Group**

*ST: The purpose of the group is to offer insights that enhance the planning and execution of future military operations, which is conducted by the Operation Evaluation Group*

*TT: Mục tiêu của nhóm là cung cấp những hiểu biết giúp cải thiện quy trình lập kế hoạch và thực hiện các nhiệm vụ quân sự trong tương lai, điều này được thực hiện bởi nhóm phân tích kinh nghiệm hoạt động chiến đấu.*

The term "Operation Evaluation Group" determs a team tasked with evaluating various aspects of military operations. However, this term can be broad and encompass different focuses such as logistical support, operational effectiveness, or strategic planning. To provide a clearer and more precise understanding, the Vietnamese translation "Nhóm phân tích kinh nghiệm hoạt động chiến đấu" offers essential amplification.

Firstly, "Nhóm phân tích" translates to "analysis group" or "team of analysts," specifying that the group's primary function is to conduct thorough evaluations. Secondly, the phrase "kinh nghiệm hoạt động chiến đấu" translates to "combat operational experiences." This addition clarifies that the group's evaluations are specifically concerned with analyzing experiences from combat situations, not just general operations.

By incorporating "phân tích kinh nghiệm," the translation explicitly highlights that the group’s role involves the examination and evaluation of past combat experiences. This is crucial because it differentiates this group from those that might focus on logistical or administrative aspects. Therefore, the translation ensures that readers understand that the group's evaluations are centered on assessing the effectiveness and outcomes of military actions in real combat scenarios.

Additionally, specifying "hoạt động chiến đấu" (combat operations) further refines the scope of the group's work. This term underscores that the evaluations pertain to military actions involving direct engagement with the enemy, providing a clear context for the type of operational experiences being analyzed. In contrast, a more generic term like "operation" could imply a broader range of activities, potentially including non-combat operations.

Furthermore, this level of detail ensures that the role of the Operation Evaluation Group is precisely understood. It implies that the group is engaged in a detailed analysis of combat effectiveness, tactics, and the lessons learned from past engagements. This understanding is essential for comprehending how such evaluations contribute to improving future military strategies and operations.

In summary, the Vietnamese translation "Nhóm phân tích kinh nghiệm hoạt động chiến đấu" amplifies the term "Operation Evaluation Group" by specifying the focus on analyzing combat operational experiences. This amplification provides a clear and precise understanding of the group's role, emphasizing its function in evaluating the effectiveness of military actions in combat scenarios. Consequently, this level of detail improves the accuracy and relevance of the translation, ensuring that the specific nature of the group's evaluations is effectively communicated in military contexts.

Example 10: The fire support channel

ST: The fire support channel allows ground troops, artillery units, and air support to share information in real time, ensuring that firepower is aimed accurately at the designated targets.

TT: Tuyến thông tin liên lạc chi viện hỏa lực cho phép các lực lượng trên mặt đất, đơn vị pháo binh và không quân trao đổi thông tin theo thời gian thực, nhằm đảm bảo rằng hỏa lực được hướng đúng mục tiêu.

The term "fire support channel" generally refers to a system or method used to coordinate and manage fire support during military operations. However, without additional context, it could be interpreted in several ways, including logistical channels, operational routes, or general communication channels.

In the translation, “Tuyến thông tin liên lạc chi viện hỏa lực” offers crucial amplification to ensure clarity:

"Tuyến thông tin liên lạc" translates to "communication channel" or "communication line." This addition specifies that the term refers to a network or system used for communication purposes. By including this phrase, the translation makes it clear that the channel is not merely a physical or tactical route but a dedicated communication network used to facilitate the coordination of fire support. "Chi viện hỏa lực" translates to "fire support." This term ensures that the purpose of the communication channel is specifically for coordinating and managing fire support, such as artillery or air support. By specifying "chi viện hỏa lực," the translation emphasizes that the channel is integral to coordinating fire support operations, rather than other types of military support or logistics.

Firstly, the term "tuyến thông tin liên lạc" highlights that the channel is focused on communication. This clarification is essential because it differentiates this channel from other potential types of channels, such as logistical or operational routes, which may not involve direct communication. By specifying this, the translation provides a precise understanding of the channel’s role in coordinating military operations.

Secondly, the addition of "chi viện hỏa lực" ensures that the channel’s purpose is clearly defined. In military operations, fire support is a critical component that requires precise coordination. The amplified translation underscores that the communication channel is dedicated to managing and directing fire support efforts, which is crucial for effective combat operations. Without this detail, the term "fire support channel" might be misunderstood as a general channel without a specific focus.

Furthermore, specifying "fire support" clarifies the type of support being managed. This is vital for operational clarity, as different types of support (e.g., medical, logistical) have different requirements and processes. In this context, the term ensures that readers understand that the channel is used to manage and coordinate artillery or air support, which requires detailed and accurate communication.

In summary, the Vietnamese translation “Tuyến thông tin liên lạc chi viện hỏa lực” effectively amplifies the term “Fire Support Channel” by specifying that it is a "communication channel" used for "fire support." This amplification provides a precise understanding of the channel’s purpose and role in military operations. It ensures that the term is clearly interpreted as a communication network crucial for coordinating fire support, improving accuracy and operational effectiveness in military contexts.

Amplification in these examples ensures that military terms are not simply translated literally but are enriched with additional details to make the meaning clear and contextually appropriate in the target language. Each amplified term provides necessary context, whether by specifying the type of operation (e.g., "amphibious landings" in Example 2), or by clarifying the nature of the action (e.g., "live ammunition training" in Example 3). This approach is essential for maintaining the tactical and operational nuances of military texts.

**Example 11: Defense Template**

*ST: Defense template is a military tool intended to aid commanders in planning and executing defensive operations. This device usually comes with essential parameters and data, allowing commanders to easily determine distances, angles, and other relevant factors in a defensive setting.*

*TT: Thước chỉ huy (có số liệu tính toán sẵn trong điều kiện phòng ngự) là một công cụ quân sự được thiết kế để hỗ trợ chỉ huy trong việc lập kế hoạch và thực hiện các hoạt động phòng ngự. Thiết bị này thường được trang bị sẵn các thông số và dữ liệu cần thiết, giúp các chỉ huy dễ dàng tính toán khoảng cách, góc độ và các yếu tố khác trong bối cảnh phòng ngự.*

The term *defense template* in military contexts refers to a predetermined guide or tool that commanders use to plan and execute defensive operations. These templates are crucial for ensuring that military units can follow structured plans when responding to various tactical situations. Typically, they include detailed tactical data such as terrain analysis, troop positioning, timing, and coordination elements, all of which are essential for constructing effective defensive strategies. Thus, a *defense template* is not just a conceptual tool but a functional framework designed to help military leaders anticipate and respond to threats.

In the Vietnamese translation, the phrase *"có số liệu tính toán sẵn trong điều kiện phòng ngự"* (*with pre-calculated data under defensive conditions*) expands on the basic term *thước chỉ huy* (*command ruler*). While *thước chỉ huy* by itself could suggest a generic tool for command purposes, the additional information specifies that this tool is designed for use in defense operations, with the included data already tailored for defensive scenarios. This amplification is essential because it transforms a general tool into one that conveys the strategic depth required in defensive planning, ensuring that the Vietnamese version reflects the technical nuances of its English counterpart.

Furthermore, the addition of "có số liệu tính toán sẵn" reinforces the idea that the *defense template* is a sophisticated planning tool, incorporating precise calculations and predetermined data points. These calculations might include estimates of enemy force strength, movement patterns, and optimal defensive positions based on terrain and available resources. Without this amplification, a reader might mistake the template for a simple diagram or chart, failing to grasp its complexity and its role as a critical decision-making tool in high-pressure situations. Thus, this additional information is crucial in conveying the full scope and purpose of the template.

The phrase *thước chỉ huy* alone could be interpreted broadly as a general command tool, applicable to various scenarios beyond defense. However, the amplified translation specifies that the tool is intended for defense purposes, complete with pre-calculated data to aid in precise decision-making. This clarification ensures that the translation remains faithful to the original term's specificity and technical application, reducing the risk of ambiguity and misinterpretation.

Moreover, this amplified translation makes the term more accessible to non-experts by offering additional context about its function. In technical or military texts, specialized terminology can often be confusing to those without a background in the field. By adding this explanatory detail, the translation bridges the knowledge gap, making the term more comprehensible. This is particularly significant in military documents where precision and clarity are paramount, and even small misunderstandings can lead to critical miscommunications.

In conclusion, amplification in this translation does more than just add extra words; it deepens the reader's understanding of the *defense template*, ensuring that its purpose, functionality, and complexity are communicated effectively across languages.

**Example 12: Defense Suppression Weapon**

*ST: One example of a defense suppression weapon to neutralize air defense systems is the AGM-88 HARM (High-speed Anti-Radiation Missile), which is intended to target enemy radar systems and air defense units. This missile can detect radar signals, enabling it to accurately hit its targets, thus diminishing the enemy's defensive strength and facilitating future air operations.*

*TT: Một ví dụ về vũ khí tiêu diệt phương tiện phòng không là tên lửa AGM-88 HARM (High-speed Anti-Radiation Missile), được thiết kế để nhắm vào các hệ thống radar và phương tiện phòng không của đối phương. Tên lửa này có khả năng phát hiện tín hiệu radar, cho phép tấn công chính xác các mục tiêu, từ đó làm suy yếu khả năng phòng thủ và mở đường cho các hoạt động không quân tiếp theo.*

The term defense suppression weapon refers to weapons specifically designed to neutralize or suppress enemy air defense systems. These systems play a vital role in protecting forces from aerial attacks by detecting, targeting, and engaging aircraft or missiles. As a result, defense suppression weapons are deployed with the aim of incapacitating these systems, thereby ensuring greaterfreedom of movement for offensive air operations. By eliminating or neutralizing these air defense systems, military forces can conduct aerial missions with reduced risk, enabling them to achieve air superiority more effectively.

In the Vietnamese translation, the addition of the phrase "phương tiện phòng không" (air defense assets) clarifies that the weapon is specifically targeting air defense systems, rather than general defensive structures. This expansion is important because it provides critical specificity, indicating that the suppression weapon is aimed at a particular type of military equipment involved in air defense, such as radar systems, surface-to-air missiles, and anti- aircraft artillery.

Moreover, the amplified translation clearly conveys that the weapon is intended to destroy or neutralize air defense systems, not just general defensive capabilities. Without this clarification, a reader might misinterpret the weapon as targeting any kind of defensive mechanism, whereas its specific purpose is to counter systems designed to defend against air attacks. This distinction is essential, as it ensures that the term is understood in its proper military context.

By specifying "phương tiện phòng không," the translation ensures that the reader understands the exact target of the suppression weapon. This precision is crucial, particularly in military operations where multiple layers of defense—air, ground, and naval—are often involved. Knowing that this weapon is aimed specifically at air defense systems enhances the technical accuracy of the translation, as it reflects the weapon's role in disabling enemy air defenses.

Additionally, the amplification makes the term more comprehensible to non-expert readers by providing enough context to clarify the weapon's function and role within military operations. By emphasizing that it focuses on air defense systems, the translation helps readers better understand how the weapon fits into broader military strategies, such as air superiority campaigns. In these campaigns, the suppression of enemy air defenses is a critical step in ensuring that friendly forces can operate effectively in the airspace, allowing for greater operational flexibility and strategic advantage.

In conclusion, amplification in this translation is not just about adding extra words but about ensuring that the full scope and purpose of the defense suppression weapon are conveyed clearly. By providing the necessary context and specificity, the translation enhances both the accuracy and accessibility of the term, making it easier for readers to grasp its importance in military operations.

**Example 13: Fireball**

*ST: The formation of a fireball happens quickly and can last anywhere from a few seconds to several minutes, depending on the explosion's intensity. This fireball can produce catastrophic effects, caused not only by its intense heat but also by the pressure and shockwaves generated by the blast, leading to significant destruction of buildings and loss of life in nearby areas.*

*TT: Quả cầu lửa (của vụ nổ hạt nhân) Quá trình hình thành quả cầu lửa (của vụ nổ hạt nhân) thường diễn ra nhanh chóng và có thể kéo dài từ vài giây đến vài phút, tùy thuộc vào sức mạnh của vụ nổ. Quả cầu lửa có thể gây ra những tác động tàn phá lớn, không chỉ do nhiệt độ cao mà còn do áp lực và sóng xung kích từ vụ nổ, dẫn đến thiệt hại rộng lớn cho các công trình và sinh mạng trong khu vực lân cận.*

In military contexts, the term fireball typically refers to the massive, intensely hot explosion that occurs during a nuclear detonation. This fireball is a key characteristic of nuclear explosions, forming in the initial moments of the detonation, and can reach extremely high temperatures and expand rapidly. As it forms, it emits intense heat and light, often causing widespread destruction and contributing to the catastrophic effects of a nuclear explosion.

The Vietnamese translation adds "của vụ nổ hạt nhân" (from a nuclear explosion), which provides the crucial context that this fireball is not just from any explosion, but one specifically resulting from a nuclear detonation. This amplification is necessary because the term quả cầu lửa (fireball) could otherwise refer to any large-scale fire or explosion, whether caused by conventional weapons, natural events, or industrial accidents. By adding this detail, the translation ensures that the fireball is clearly understood as a nuclear phenomenon, not a general explosion.

The additional information "của vụ nổ hạt nhân" removes any ambiguity about the origin of the fireball. Without this detail, the reader might assume that the fireball refers to any large explosion or fire. In military communication, it is critical to specify that this fireball is from a nuclear detonation, as it determs the extreme scale, intensity, and destructive potential unique to nuclear warfare.

By specifying that the fireball originates from a nuclear explosion, the translation aligns more accurately with its use in military contexts, particularly in nuclear warfare discussions. This precision is crucial, as the effects of a nuclear fireball—its size, temperature, and impact—are vastly different from those of other types of explosions. Thus, the expanded explanation ensures that the reader understands the fireball’s specific characteristics, reinforcing the distinction between nuclear and conventional weapons.

The amplification makes the term more accessible to readers who may not be familiar with specific military jargon. For those outside of military circles, the term fireball might evoke images of large fires or explosions in general. By explicitly stating the connection to nuclear detonations, the translation provides essential context that helps the reader understand the sheer scale, intensity, and destructive capacity of the fireball in a nuclear context. This added detail is vital for non-experts, ensuring they grasp the magnitude and significance of the event described.

**Example 14: Operation Map Overlay**

*ST: Using the* ***operation map overlay*** *allows operational commanders to easily update and monitor battlefield conditions, including the positions of forces, key objectives, and environmental factors. The application of this technology enhances analytical capabilities and decision-making processes, while also improving command effectiveness in military operations.*

*TT: Sử dụng Sơ đồ tình hình chiến dịch trên bản đồ chế tạo bằng vật liệu trong suốt giúp chỉ huy tác chiến dễ dàng cập nhật và theo dõi tình hình chiến trường, bao gồm vị trí của lực lượng, các mục tiêu quan trọng, và các yếu tố môi trường. Việc áp dụng công nghệ này nâng cao khả năng phân tích và ra quyết định, đồng thời cải thiện hiệu quả chỉ huy trong các chiến dịch quân sự.*

In military contexts, the term fireball typically refers to the massive, intensely hot explosion that occurs during a nuclear detonation. This specific fireball is a key characteristic of nuclear explosions, forming in the initial moments of the detonation, and it can reach extremely high temperatures while expanding rapidly. As it forms, it emits intense heat and light, often causing widespread destruction and contributing to the catastrophic effects of a nuclear explosion.

In the Vietnamese translation, the addition of "của vụ nổ hạt nhân" (from a nuclear explosion) provides crucial context, specifying that this fireball is not just from any explosion but is specifically the result of a nuclear detonation. This amplification is necessary because the term quả cầu lửa (fireball) could otherwise refer to any large-scale fire or explosion, whether caused by conventional weapons, natural events, or industrial accidents. By including this detail, the translation ensures that the fireball is understood as a nuclear phenomenon rather than a general explosion.

Furthermore, the additional information "của vụ nổ hạt nhân" removes any ambiguity about the origin of the fireball. Without this detail, a reader might assume that the fireball refers to any large explosion or fire. In military communication, however, it is critical to specify that this fireball is the result of a nuclear detonation, as it determs the extreme scale, intensity, and destructive potential unique to nuclear warfare.

By specifying that the fireball originates from a nuclear explosion, the translation aligns more accurately with its use in military contexts, particularly in discussions surrounding nuclear warfare. This precision is crucial because the effects of a nuclear fireball—its size, temperature, and impact—are vastly different from those of other types of explosions. Thus, the expanded explanation ensures that the reader fully understands the fireball’s specific characteristics, reinforcing the distinction between nuclear and conventional weapons.

Moreover, the amplification makes the term more accessible to readers who may not be familiar with specific military jargon. For those outside of military circles, the term fireball might evoke images of large fires or explosions in general. However, by explicitly stating the connection to nuclear detonations, the translation provides essential context that helps the reader grasp the sheer scale, intensity, and destructive capacity of the fireball in a nuclear context. This added detail is vital for non-experts, as it ensures they understand the magnitude and significance of the event described.

**Example 15: Combat Signal**

*ST: Combat signals can include the use of flags to communicate orders during offensive or defensive operations. For example, a blue flag might signify "advance," whereas a red flag could indicate "retreat."*

*TT: Ví dụ về tín hiệu (quy ước) chỉ huy chiến đấu trong thực tế có thể là việc sử dụng cờ hiệu để truyền đạt các mệnh lệnh trong các cuộc tấn công hoặc phòng thủ. Chẳng hạn, một cờ hiệu màu xanh có thể được sử dụng để chỉ thị "tiến lên," trong khi cờ hiệu màu đỏ có thể báo hiệu "rút lui."*

The term combat signal refers to pre-determined or pre-arranged signals used during combat for communication between military units. These signals are vital for coordinating actions on the battlefield, particularly in high-stress situations where verbal communication may be impossible due to distance, noise, or operational constraints. In this context, the Vietnamese translation adds the term "(quy ước)" (pre-arranged/conventional), which clarifies that these signals are not spontaneous or improvised but part of a standardized communication system used in combat situations. This amplification is crucial because the term tín hiệu (signal) alone could be interpreted more generally, possibly leading to confusion about the specific context in which these signals are employed. By specifying quy ước, the translation makes it clear that these signals are part of a structured, agreed-upon system that plays a critical role in command and control during battle.

Furthermore, the inclusion of the term quy ước (pre-arranged) ensures that the reader understands these are not just any signals, but part of a planned and structured communication protocol. This clarification is important for military texts, as understanding the difference between ad-hoc and conventional signals can significantly impact how one interprets the overall communication system in combat situations. Without this amplification, a reader might assume these signals are spontaneous, leading to potential misunderstanding of their role in command and control.

Additionally, the amplified term tín hiệu (quy ước) accurately reflects the function of these signals, emphasizing their standardized nature within military operations. This precision is critical for understanding how units communicate effectively during combat. Specifically, combat signals are part of an organized system used to relay commands, movements, or warnings. Therefore, the amplified translation ensures that this aspect is clearly conveyed to the reader.

Moreover, by adding quy ước to the translation, the concept becomes more accessible to readers who may not be familiar with military terminology or operations. For non-expert readers, the amplification clearly indicates that these signals are part of an organized protocol rather than random or improvised signals. As a result, this added layer of explanation helps demystify military communication practices, making the text easier to understand for a broader audience.

4.2.3. Pragmatic explicitation

Pragmatic explicitation involves adding necessary contextual information to ensure that specialized military terms are clearly understood by readers from different cultural or linguistic backgrounds. This approach helps bridge gaps in knowledge and improves the accuracy and accessibility of the translation.

**Example 16:**

ST: During the defensive operation in Fallujah, the brigade set up a defense on wide front with fortified positions, employing infantry units along with artillery and air support to manage large areas. They implemented a range of defensive strategies, including fortifications and outposts, to thwart enemy attacks from various directions while also keeping the ability to launch quick counterattacks when the chance arose.

TT: Trong chiến dịch phòng ngự ở Fallujah, lữ đoàn đã thiết lập phòng ngự trên chính diện rộng với các vị trí phòng thủ kiên cố, sử dụng các đơn vị bộ binh kết hợp với pháo binh và hỗ trợ không quân để kiểm soát các khu vực rộng lớn. Các biện pháp phòng ngự đa dạng đã được triển khai từ các công sự đến các điểm chốt, nhằm ngăn chặn sự tiến công của lực lượng đối phương từ nhiều hướng khác nhau, đồng thời duy trì khả năng phản công nhanh chóng khi có cơ hội.

The term "Defense on wide front" refers to a military strategy where defensive measures are spread out over a large geographical area rather than being concentrated in a narrow zone. The Vietnamese translation "Phòng ngự trên chính diện rộng" explicitly translates to "defense on a wide front," which conveys that the defensive efforts are not limited to a small area but cover a broad, extensive zone. This clear delineation ensures that readers understand the strategic intention of distributing defensive resources across a large area.

In practical terms, if a military force is defending a city, "Phòng ngự trên chính diện rộng" would indicate that the defense is set up around the entire perimeter of the city rather than just at a few key points. This provides a comprehensive understanding of the defensive approach and its implications for military strategy and resource allocation.

The translation accurately captures the essence of the original English term by maintaining the strategic concept of a wide-front defense. It reflects the same tactical decision to extend defensive capabilities over a broad area. This accuracy is crucial for conveying the correct strategic intent and ensuring that the term’s meaning is preserved in translation.

If the term were misinterpreted as "phòng ngự trên một mặt trận hẹp" (defense on a narrow front), it would misrepresent the strategy and potentially alter the understanding of the defensive setup, leading to incorrect tactical decisions or miscommunications.

By using "trên chính diện rộng," the translation helps readers grasp the scale and scope of the defensive strategy. It provides a visual and conceptual picture of a defense that covers an expansive area, which is crucial for understanding the logistical and operational aspects of implementing such a strategy.

For military analysts or strategists, this translation clarifies that resources, manpower, and fortifications are distributed over a large front, which affects planning, deployment, and tactical considerations. It assists in comprehending the broader context of the defense strategy and its implications for operational success.

The translation "trên chính diện rộng" eliminates any potential ambiguity about the extent of the defense. It specifies that the defense is not limited to a small, focused area but spans a wide geographical region. This clear explicitation helps prevent any confusion about the defensive strategy's scope and ensures that the term is understood in its correct context.

Without this explicit translation, there might be confusion if the term were translated more generally as "phòng ngự rộng" (broad defense), which could be interpreted in various ways and may not clearly convey the idea of a defense specifically spread across a wide front.

The Vietnamese translation "Phòng ngự trên chính diện rộng" effectively clarifies, maintains accuracy, enhances understanding, and prevents misinterpretation of the English term "Defense on wide front." It provides a precise and detailed description of the defensive strategy, ensuring that the term is understood correctly and in the proper context

 **Example 17: Demoralize the Defense**

*ST: Demoralizing the defense is a military tactic aimed at weakening the fighting spirit of the opponent, causing them to lose confidence in their defensive capabilities. This strategy can be implemented through various methods, such as continuous and powerful attacks, the use of propaganda, or inflicting significant casualties and damage to their equipment.*

*TT: Làm mất tinh thần quân địch phòng ngự là một chiến thuật trong tác chiến quân sự nhằm làm suy yếu ý chí chiến đấu của đối phương, khiến họ mất niềm tin vào khả năng phòng thủ của mình. Chiến thuật này có thể được thực hiện thông qua nhiều phương pháp khác nhau, như tấn công mạnh mẽ và liên tục, sử dụng thông tin tuyên truyền, hoặc gây ra các thiệt hại nặng nề về nhân lực và trang bị.*

The term "Demoralize the defense" refers to a tactical action aimed at undermining the morale of enemy forces who are in a defensive position. The Vietnamese translation "Làm mất tinh thần quân địch phòng ngự" explicitly describes this psychological impact. It translates to "make the enemy's defensive forces lose their morale," providing a clear explanation of the intended effect.

In practice, if an army is trying to demoralize its opponents, the translation makes it clear that the goal is to weaken the enemy's will to fight by affecting their mental state, rather than simply attacking their physical positions. This context helps in understanding the broader strategic intent behind such an action.

The translation accurately reflects the specific intent of demoralizing the defense. It conveys the idea that the action is not about physical destruction but about creating psychological stress to diminish the effectiveness of the enemy’s defense. This precise description ensures that the term's tactical objective is clearly communicated.

If the term were inaccurately translated as "Làm suy yếu phòng ngự" (weaken the defense), it could imply a broader range of actions, including physical attacks or strategic maneuvers, rather than focusing solely on the psychological aspect of demoralization.

The translation "Làm mất tinh thần quân địch phòng ngự" helps readers grasp the significance of demoralization in a defensive context. It clarifies that the objective is to impact the enemy’s morale, which is crucial for understanding how psychological tactics are used in warfare.

For military strategists or analysts, understanding that "làm mất tinh thần" means to undermine morale rather than just physical strength helps in evaluating the effectiveness of various tactics and their potential impact on enemy forces. By specifying "làm mất tinh thần" (demoralize) and "quân địch phòng ngự" (enemy’s defensive forces), the translation avoids ambiguity regarding the nature of the action. It ensures that the tactical goal is understood as targeting the psychological state of the enemy, rather than being misinterpreted as a physical or logistical action.

Without this explicit translation, there could be confusion if the term were simply translated as "Gây rối cho phòng ngự" (cause trouble for the defense), which does not clearly convey the psychological aspect of demoralization and could be misunderstood as a broader or less specific action. The Vietnamese translation "Làm mất tinh thần quân địch phòng ngự" effectively clarifies, maintains accuracy, enhances understanding, and prevents misinterpretation of the English term "Demoralize the defense." It provides a precise description of the psychological impact intended by the action, ensuring that the term is understood accurately within its tactical context.

**Example 18: Cut Behind Defenses**

Context 1

*ST: Another instance of cutting behind defenses is Operation Overlord during World War II, especially the D-Day invasion in 1944. In this operation, Allied forces not only assaulted the beaches but also deployed paratroopers deep into French territory, right behind German defenses. These airborne troops captured critical bridges and strategic locations, disrupting German operations and severing supply lines. This enabled Allied forces to advance from the beaches and move further inland, playing a crucial role in the defeat of the German army in the war.*

*TT: Một ví dụ khác về chọc sâu vào phía sau lưng địch là chiến dịch Overlord trong Thế chiến II, đặc biệt là cuộc tấn công vào Normandy (D-Day) vào năm 1944. Trong chiến dịch này, lực lượng Đồng minh đã không chỉ tấn công từ bờ biển mà còn triển khai các đơn vị nhảy dù vào sâu trong lãnh thổ Pháp, ngay phía sau các vị trí phòng thủ của Đức. Các đơn vị nhảy dù này đã chiếm giữ các cầu và các điểm chiến lược, gây rối loạn cho quân Đức và cắt đứt các tuyến tiếp tế. Điều này đã tạo điều kiện cho lực lượng Đồng minh tiến vào từ bờ biển và tiến sâu vào nội địa, góp phần quyết định vào sự thất bại của quân đội Đức trong cuộc chiến.*

*Context 2:*

*ST: The Maginot Line is a classic example of cutting behind defenses during World War II. Instead of directly attacking the fortified defense system of France along the border, the Germans chose to launch their assault through Belgium, an area that was less heavily defended. This tactic allowed the Germans to avoid strong defensive positions and rapidly advance into French territory from the north, causing significant surprise and heavy losses for the French army.*

*TT: Maginot Line là một ví dụ điển hình về đi vòng qua trận địa phòng ngự của địch trong Thế chiến II. Thay vì tấn công trực tiếp vào hệ thống phòng thủ kiên cố của Pháp dọc theo biên giới, quân Đức đã chọn cách tấn công qua Bỉ, một khu vực không được bảo vệ mạnh mẽ. Chiến thuật này cho phép quân Đức né tránh các vị trí phòng thủ mạnh mẽ và nhanh chóng tiến vào lãnh thổ Pháp từ phía Bắc, gây ra sự bất ngờ lớn và thiệt hại nặng nề cho quân đội Pháp*

English Term: Cut behind defenses

Vietnamese Translations: Chọc sâu vào phía sau lưng địch, Đi vòng qua trận địa phòng ngự của địch

Both translations clearly describe the tactical maneuver of penetrating or bypassing enemy defenses to reach the rear. The first translation, "Chọc sâu vào phía sau lưng địch," suggests a deep penetration behind enemy lines, while the second, "Đi vòng qua trận địa phòng ngự của địch," implies a maneuver to go around enemy defensive positions. The first translation is useful for situations where the goal is to penetrate deeply into the enemy’s territory, potentially disrupting their rear areas. The second translation is applicable when the maneuver involves bypassing the defenses to achieve a flanking position or avoid direct confrontation. Both translations reflect the tactical nature of the maneuver effectively. "Chọc sâu vào phía sau lưng địch" accurately conveys the action of penetrating deep into enemy territory, while "Đi vòng qua trận địa phòng ngự của địch" accurately describes the action of going around the enemy's defensive positions.

If the context involves a strategy that emphasizes infiltration and disruption behind enemy lines, "Chọc sâu vào phía sau lưng địch" would be more precise. Conversely, for a strategy focusing on maneuvering around defenses to achieve a strategic advantage, "Đi vòng qua trận địa phòng ngự của địch" would be more appropriate.

Providing both translations offers a comprehensive view of the maneuver, aiding in its conceptualization. The translations together cover both aspects of the maneuver—deep penetration and bypassing defenses—helping readers understand the full range of possible tactical approaches.

Readers can better grasp the strategic flexibility of the maneuver by understanding that it can involve both deep infiltration and lateral movement around defenses, which are key concepts in military tactics. Both translations

specify the intent and method of the maneuver clearly, reducing ambiguity. By providing different ways to describe the action, they ensure that the tactical intent is conveyed accurately and that there is no confusion about the nature of the maneuver. Without these precise translations, a term like "cut behind defenses" could be misunderstood as merely a general attack on enemy defenses without clarifying whether it involves deep penetration or maneuvering around them.

 **Example 19 Fire for Effect**

*ST: Fire for Effect can be executed with a range of weapons, including individual rifles, artillery, and missiles. The goal is to gain a tactical advantage in battle by diminishing the enemy's capabilities and creating openings for attacking forces to move forward.*

*TT: Bắn tiêu diệt có thể được thực hiện bằng nhiều loại vũ khí khác nhau, từ súng trường cá nhân đến pháo binh và tên lửa. Mục tiêu là để tạo ra ưu thế trong chiến đấu bằng cách làm giảm khả năng của đối phương và mở ra cơ hội cho lực lượng tấn công tiến lên.*

English Term: Fire for Effect Vietnamese Translation: Bắn tiêu diệt

In military terminology, "Fire for Effect" refers to a tactical command directing artillery or weaponry to focus on maximum impact, aiming to achieve the intended result, typically after an initial adjustment fire. It is a phase of combat where the aim is to eliminate the target, often after ensuring accuracy with preliminary rounds. This phrase is relatively concise and assumes that the receiver of the message understands the context and procedure behind it.

The Vietnamese translation "Bắn tiêu diệt" (literally, "shoot to destroy" or "fire to eliminate") introduces a level of specificity by explicitly indicating the purpose of the action—destruction or elimination of the target. This is an example of pragmatic explicitation because the Vietnamese translator has chosen to make the intended outcome—elimination—clearer in the target language, rather than leaving it to be inferred.

The term "tiêu diệt" (eliminate) makes the intended effect of the fire unambiguous. While "Fire for Effect" implies the purpose of achieving maximum damage, the Vietnamese term leaves no room for ambiguity, ensuring that the action's objective is fully transparent to the reader or listener. The translation adds cultural and practical understanding for a Vietnamese audience, who may benefit from a more explicit reference to the goal of "firing." In a military setting, making the command clearer in terms of the target's elimination helps avoid misinterpretation or confusion about the purpose of the command.

Military English, particularly American military terminology, often uses compact terms that rely on shared knowledge or implicit understanding of procedures. In contrast, Vietnamese military terms might require more explicit descriptions to convey the same level of understanding, particularly in translated texts.

The Vietnamese language may prioritize clarity, especially in technical or specialized domains like military contexts, where precision in command and communication is vital. Thus, "Bắn tiêu diệt" provides a more direct description of the action's outcome than the somewhat vague and procedural "Fire for Effect."

In conclusion, the explicitation seen in the translation of "Fire for Effect" into "Bắn tiêu diệt" stems from the need to ensure clarity and precision in communication, especially in military settings where the goal of destruction is central to the command. This explicitation aligns with the pragmatic strategy of ensuring that the target audience can immediately grasp the intended meaning without ambiguity.

**Example 20: Fire from Defilade**

English Term: Fire from Defilade

Vietnamese Translation: Bắn từ trận địa hỏa lực che khuất

*ST: The attacking units will select hidden positions, such as those found in mountainous areas, thick forests, or natural defenses, to execute fire from defilade. These sites enable them to remain out of sight of the enemy, allowing for effective use of firepower to eliminate targets while minimizing risk.*

*TT: Lực lượng tấn công sẽ chọn các vị trí ẩn nấp, như những khu vực có địa hình đồi núi, rừng rậm hoặc các công sự tự nhiên, để thực hiện bắn từ trận địa hỏa lực che khuất. Những vị trí này giúp họ che giấu bản thân khỏi tầm nhìn của đối phương, từ đó có thể sử dụng hỏa lực để tiêu diệt mục tiêu một cách hiệu quả mà không phải chịu rủi ro cao.*

The translation of the English term "Fire from Defilade" into Vietnamese as "Bắn từ trận địa hỏa lực che khuất" provides an interesting example of pragmatic explicitation, where additional details are introduced to ensure clarity and comprehensibility in the target language.

In military terminology, "Fire from Defilade" refers to the act of firing weapons from a position that is protected or concealed from enemy observation, such as behind a hill or a fortification. The term is compact and assumes a shared understanding of what "defilade" means in military tactics—firing from a hidden or shielded position.

The Vietnamese translation "Bắn từ trận địa hỏa lực che khuất" (literally, "fire from a hidden or shielded firing position") explicates the term by adding several elements that clarify the concept.

Trận địa hỏa lực: This phrase can be understood explicitly as "firing position" or "firing site," which provides more information about the location of the firing activity. While "defilade" in English refers implicitly to a concealed or protected position, the Vietnamese translation indicates that the firing is happening from a structured firing position ("trận địa hỏa lực").

Che khuất: This part of the phrase means "hidden" or "shielded," which directly translates the tactical concept of defilade. In the English term, the idea of being hidden or shielded is embedded in the word "defilade," but it is not explicitly stated. The Vietnamese translation makes this aspect clear, emphasizing that the firing is not just from any position but from one that is deliberately concealed from the enemy.

The term "defilade" is a highly specific military term that assumes familiarity with the concept among military personnel. In the translation, this term is broken down and explained in simpler and more descriptive terms to ensure that the target audience fully understands what "defilade" entails. By adding "trận địa hỏa lực" (firing position) and "che khuất" (concealed), the translator ensures that the full tactical meaning is conveyed clearly in Vietnamese, leaving no room for ambiguity.

In English, military terms are often compact and rely on specialized jargon. However, in Vietnamese, where such military jargon may not be as commonly understood or immediately recognizable, explicitation helps bridge the gap by providing a fuller explanation of the concept. The phrase "trận địa hỏa lực che khuất" not only translates "fire from defilade" but also elaborates on what this means in practical terms for the Vietnamese reader.

In military contexts, precision is paramount, and the risk of misunderstanding could have serious consequences. The explicitation of "defilade" as "che khuất" ensures that the tactical advantage of being hidden is not lost in translation. By explicitly stating the nature of the firing position (concealed), the Vietnamese translation enhances the clarity of the command or description, reducing the chance of misinterpretation.

The explicitation of "Fire from Defilade" as "Bắn từ trận địa hỏa lực che khuất" reflects a pragmatic approach to ensuring that the military concept is fully understood in the target language. By breaking down the technical term "defilade" into its essential components—"trận địa hỏa lực" (firing position) and "che khuất" (concealed)—the translator adds clarity and detail, which are crucial in a military context where clear and unambiguous communication is critical. This process of explicitation is driven by the need to adapt the compact, jargon-heavy English term into a more descriptive and accessible form in Vietnamese.

**Example 21: Fire in Short Bursts**

*ST: The fire in short bursts technique is often applied in situations requiring speed and precision, such as close combat or when attacking critical targets where minimizing collateral damage to friendly forces is essential. By firing a series of rounds in quick succession, the attacking force can exert significant pressure on the enemy, reducing their ability to respond and increasing the chances of success in the assault.*

*TT: Kỹ thuật bắn loạt ngắn thường được áp dụng trong các tình huống cần sự nhanh chóng và chính xác, như trong giao tranh gần hoặc khi tấn công các mục tiêu quan trọng mà yêu cầu giảm thiểu thiệt hại cho lực lượng đồng minh. Bằng cách bắn một loạt đạn liên tiếp, lực lượng có thể gây áp lực lớn lên đối phương, làm giảm khả năng phản ứng và tăng cường cơ hội thành công trong cuộc tấn công.*

Firstly, the translation explicitly describes the firing technique, indicating that it involves short, controlled bursts. By doing so, it clearly conveys that the firing is conducted in brief intervals rather than through continuous or sporadic shots. For example, the term "loạt ngắn" translates to "short bursts," which helps readers understand the specific method used to control fire. This clarity is essential, especially in military contexts where precise terminology is critical.

Moreover, the translation accurately reflects the firing method being described, ensuring that the original term's precision is preserved. This accuracy is crucial for conveying the intended tactical approach. For instance, by using "loạt ngắn" (short bursts), the translation not only aligns with the original meaning but also captures the essence of firing in controlled bursts. Consequently, this ensures that the tactical nuance is maintained, which is vital for effective communication in military operations. In addition, the translation enhances understanding of the tactical efficiency of firing in short bursts. It provides important context regarding how this technique affects ammunition use and accuracy. For example, the term "Bắn loạt ngắn" helps readers grasp that this method is employed to conserve ammunition while improving accuracy. This insight is particularly important for understanding effective combat strategies, as it highlights the practical benefits of using short bursts in a military setting.

Furthermore, the translation effectively prevents misinterpretation by clearly communicating the nature of the firing technique. It avoids any potential confusion regarding whether the firing is continuous or sporadic. By specifying "Bắn loạt ngắn," the translation clarifies that the technique involves short bursts, thereby preventing any ambiguity about the firing method. This precision is essential in ensuring that all personnel have a shared understanding of the tactical approach.

**Example 22: Flush by Fire**

*ST: By employing a range of weaponry, including infantry rifles, artillery, and air support, the attacking forces can damage the enemy's infrastructure, equipment, and personnel. The aim of the flush by fire is not just to eliminate specific targets but also to weaken the enemy's ability to organize and deploy, thus facilitating the advancing forces in achieving their strategic goals.*

*TT: Bằng cách sử dụng các loại vũ khí khác nhau, từ súng bộ binh đến pháo binh và không quân, lực lượng tấn công có thể gây ra hư hại cho cơ sở hạ tầng, trang thiết bị, và lực lượng quân địch. Mục tiêu của chế áp bằng hỏa lực không chỉ là tiêu diệt mục tiêu cụ thể mà còn là làm giảm khả năng tổ chức và triển khai của quân địch, từ đó mở ra cơ hội cho lực lượng tấn công tiến lên và thực hiện các mục tiêu chiến lược.*

The Vietnamese translation "Chế áp bằng hỏa lực" successfully captures the idea of "Flush by Fire" by clearly outlining the use of firepower to compel the enemy to abandon their position.

To begin with, the translation explicitly defines the tactical goal of employing concentrated firepower for suppression. The phrase "Chế áp" (suppress) together with "bằng hỏa lực" (by firepower) communicates the intention to drive the enemy out through intense and focused firing. This precise language ensures that the action's objective is readily understood, which is essential in military contexts.

Additionally, the translation accurately reflects the purpose of the action, specifically the need to suppress or push the enemy from their defensive positions using firepower. By preserving the original term's tactical nuance, it effectively communicates the strategic intent. For instance, "bằng hỏa lực" (by firepower) accurately portrays the aim of using fire to achieve suppression, highlighting the systematic approach employed in military operations.

Furthermore, the translation improves comprehension of the tactical context surrounding the use of firepower. It offers important insights into how firepower can be utilized to displace or disrupt enemy positions. The term "Chế áp bằng hỏa lực" helps readers understand the application of firepower to force an enemy's retreat or movement. This clarity is vital for grasping its use in tactical situations, where understanding engagement dynamics can significantly impact decision-making. Moreover, the translation effectively avoids misinterpretation by making the specific purpose of using firepower for suppression clear. By using "chế áp" (suppress) and "bằng hỏa lực" (by firepower), it specifies that the aim is to use firepower to force the enemy out, thereby eliminating any ambiguity regarding the nature of the suppression. This level of precision is critical in military communication, where misunderstandings can lead to serious consequences.

 **Example 23: English Term: Force Point (Site)**

*ST: Force Points are structures or locations designed to allow vehicles and infantry to traverse areas of shallow water, such as rivers, streams, or marshes. These crossings are often built using durable materials like wood or concrete and may include temporary bridges or ramps to facilitate movement.*

*TT: Bến vượt qua chỗ nước nông là một cấu trúc hoặc địa điểm được thiết kế để cho phép phương tiện và lính bộ có thể vượt qua các khu vực nước nông, như sông, suối hoặc đầm lầy. Những bến này thường được xây dựng bằng các vật liệu bền chắc như gỗ hoặc bê tông và có thể bao gồm cầu tạm hoặc đường dẫn để hỗ trợ việc di chuyển.*

The translation "Bến vượt qua chỗ nước nông" explicitly indicates that the site is a designated area for crossing shallow water, clearly defining its function.

The phrase "vượt qua chỗ nước nông" (crossing shallow water) provides specific details about the site's role in facilitating the movement of troops or vehicles across shallow water, ensuring that its purpose is easily understood.

This translation accurately conveys the site's function in military operations, focusing on its strategic use as a crossing point for shallow water. The term "Bến vượt qua" (crossing point) communicates the site's importance in amphibious operations, clearly reflecting its role in water crossings and ensuring that the tactical purpose is correctly conveyed.

By specifying that the site is intended for shallow water crossings, the translation helps readers, particularly those unfamiliar with amphibious operations, comprehend the site's strategic importance. The inclusion of "chỗ nước nông" (shallow water) provides necessary context, making the operational significance of the site more apparent, particularly in military logistics and movement planning.

The translation avoids ambiguity by defining the site clearly as a crossing point for shallow water, preventing confusion with other types of crossing points or sites. The phrase "Bến vượt qua chỗ nước nông" eliminates potential misinterpretation, ensuring that the term is understood specifically as a location for crossing shallow water, rather than a general crossing point.

**Example 25: Stay-Behind Force**

*ST: By collecting information about the enemy's activities, locations, and equipment, these small teams or special units can offer crucial data for tactical planning, thereby improving the combat effectiveness of the stay-behind force.*

*TT: Bằng cách thu thập thông tin về các hoạt động, vị trí và trang thiết bị của quân địch, những nhóm nhỏ hoặc đơn vị đặc nhiệm này có khả năng cung cấp dữ liệu quý giá cho các kế hoạch tác chiến, từ đó giúp tăng cường hiệu quả chiến đấu của lực lượng ở lại hoạt động trong lòng địch.*

The translation "Lực lượng ở lại hoạt động trong lòng địch" explicitly describes the role of the force as staying behind enemy lines for various operational tasks. This choice of words clearly communicates that these forces are positioned within enemy territory, engaging in covert activities. Example: The phrase "ở lại hoạt động trong lòng địch" (stay behind and operate within enemy territory) effectively outlines the covert nature and operational environment of the force, ensuring the role is understood clearly.

Furthermore, the translation accurately reflects the strategic purpose ofthe stay-behind force. It captures the essence of the force’s role, which is to remain behind enemy lines for tasks such as intelligence gathering, sabotage, or other operations.

The term "lực lượng ở lại" (stay-behind force) conveys the precise strategic intent and operational function of these forces, ensuring clarity in military contexts. Moreover, the translation enhances understanding by helping readers, especially those unfamiliar with such military strategies, to comprehend the concept of a stay-behind force. It provides context regarding how these forces operate covertly within enemy territory, offering insight into their tactical significance.

By specifying "hoạt động trong lòng địch" (operate within enemy territory), the translation assists readers in grasping the role of these forces and their importance in strategic military operations. Additionally, the translation prevents any ambiguity about the role and operational environment of the stay- behind force. It clearly distinguishes these forces from others, specifically highlighting their covert operational context. The phrase "ở lại hoạt động trong lòng địch" ensures there is no confusion about the force’s mission, clarifying their role as distinct from other military units.

4.2.4 Register Markedness

**Example 26: English Term: Hasty defense**

*ST: Defensive structures are typically not intended to be permanent and can be easily dismantled or modified based on the situation in combat. They are quickly established in urgent scenarios when there is a threat from the enemy and can be adapted according to changes on the battlefield. Furthermore, because they are constructed using readily available materials in a short period, their costs are generally lower than those of permanent fortifications. For these reasons, they are considered an effective solution for various situations, known as hasty defenses.*

*TT: Các công trình phòng ngự thường không được thiết kế kiên cố và có thể dễ dàng tháo dỡ hoặc điều chỉnh tùy thuộc vào tình hình chiến đấu. Chúng được thiết lập nhanh chóng trong các tình huống khẩn cấp, khi có sự đe dọa từ đối phương, và có thể thay đổi linh hoạt theo diễn biến trận chiến. Ngoài ra, vì được xây dựng từ các vật liệu có sẵn trong thời gian ngắn, nên chi phí cũng thường thấp hơn so với các công trình kiên cố, chính vì vậy, chúng là giải pháp hiệu quả cho nhiều tình huống, gọi là phòng ngự lâm thời.*

The term "hasty defense" is used in military contexts to describe a defense that is established quickly in response to an immediate threat. The word "hasty" conveys urgency and lack of preparation, suggesting that the defense is reactive rather than planned. The Vietnamese translation "phòng ngự lâm thời" directly translates to "temporary defense." This term is structured to maintain a formal tone suitable for military documentation and discussions, emphasizing the provisional nature of the defense. The English term "hasty defense" may be perceived as somewhat informal or conversational, primarily indicating a quick response without delving into the specifics of the military situation. In contrast, the Vietnamese term "phòng ngự lâm thời" uses formal language that is characteristic of military discourse. The term "lâm thời" (temporary) adds a level of specificity that aligns with the formality of military operations, indicating that this is not just a casual or improvised action but a strategic decision in response to a particular context.

In military language, precision is crucial. The addition of "lâm thời" enhances the understanding of the term by specifying that the defensive position is temporary. This distinction is important because it clarifies that the forces are not merely hastily organized but are doing so under conditions that necessitate adaptability and quick thinking. The translation reflects an understanding of military operations where terms like "phòng ngự lâm thời" not only convey urgency but also underscore the strategic implications of such actions. It suggests a need for flexibility and preparedness in dynamic combat situations.

The translation of "hasty defense" to "phòng ngự lâm thời" demonstrates how explicitation occurs through the interplay of formality levels and register markedness. The Vietnamese term provides a more formal and contextually rich understanding of the concept, clarifying the urgency and provisional nature of the defense. By emphasizing "lâm thời," the translation aligns with the expectations of military discourse, ensuring that the intended meaning is communicated effectively while maintaining a formal register.

**Example 28: Force-Sensing**

*ST: Ensuring safety in military and rescue operations is crucial, and the force-sensing involves analyzing and identifying the location where a shell or explosive device might explode. Key factors to take into account include the geographical area, type of explosive, environmental conditions, and population density in the vicinity. Precise evaluations contribute to optimizing military strategies and safeguarding community safety.*

*TT: Việc đảm bảo an toàn trong các hoạt động quân sự và cứu hộ rất quan trọng, và sự đánh giá điểm nổ là quá trình phân tích và xác định vị trí nơi một quả đạn hoặc thiết bị nổ có khả năng phát nổ. Các yếu tố cần xem xét bao gồm vị trí địa lý, loại thiết bị nổ, điều kiện môi trường và mức độ dân số xung quanh. Đánh giá chính xác giúp tối ưu hóa chiến thuật quân sự và bảo vệ an toàn cho cộng đồng.*

The term "Force-Sensing" is a technical term used in military contexts, referring to the ability to detect and evaluate the impact or presence of forces. This requirement for precise language reflects a high level of formality. In this regard, the translation "Sự đánh giá điểm nổ" effectively maintains this level of formality by utilizing terms that are specific to military operations.

Moreover, the use of "đánh giá" (assessment) indicates a formal and analytical approach, aligning seamlessly with the technical nature of the original term. In military communications, clarity and formality are essential, especially when discussing operations that involve potential combat situations. Thus, the translation preserves this essential quality by employing formal language that accurately conveys the intended meaning.

Furthermore, the phrase "điểm nổ" (explosion point) is specific and determs a technical aspect of military operations. This specificity signifies register markedness, as it is not a common phrase in everyday language; rather, it is tailored for a particular audience—military personnel. In addition, the addition of "Sự" (the act of) before "đánh giá" emphasizes that the translation is focused on the evaluative process, thereby reinforcing the specialized nature of the term. This formality is crucial in military contexts, where precision in language can significantly impact operational decisions.

Consequently, the choice of terms reflects a deep understanding of military operations and suggests a level of expertise. The translator’s use of formal language indicates that the term is intended for an audience familiar with military concepts, thereby marking it as specialized. In summary, the translation of "Force-Sensing" to "Sự đánh giá điểm nổ" demonstrates a strong alignment with the formal register required in military communication. Notably, the explicitation occurs through the choice of specialized vocabulary that conveys not only the act of sensing but also the analytical aspect of evaluating forces. This ensures clarity and precision—qualities that are vital in military contexts—highlighting the importance of maintaining a formal and technically accurate register in the translation process.

**Example 29 : Defense Highway**

*ST: Defense highway must also ensure easy maintenance and repair, and are often constructed in strategic locations to support the rapid and efficient movement of military forces*

*TT: Đường ô tô quân sự còn phải đảm bảo dễ dàng bảo trì và sửa chữa, thường được xây dựng ở những vị trí chiến lược để hỗ trợ việc di chuyển nhanh chóng và hiệu quả của quân đội.*

The term "Defense Highway" is somewhat neutral and could be used in various contexts, including military or general transportation contexts. It doesn't explicitly signal a high level of formality or specificity.

The Vietnamese translation "Đường ô tô quân sự" explicitly marks the formality level and specificity. It translates directly to "Military Highway" or "Military Motor Road," which clarifies that the highway is specifically designated for military use. This explicitness ensures that the formality and specialized nature of the term are communicated effectively.

In Vietnamese, adding "quân sự" (military) aligns with cultural norms that require precise and formal terms for military-related concepts. In Vietnamese, military and defense terms are typically formal and well-defined, reflecting the importance of hierarchy and specificity in military contexts.

By using "quân sự," the translation adapts to these cultural expectations, ensuring that the term is appropriately formal and clearly indicates its military function. This adaptation respects Vietnamese norms where formal titles and terms are used to convey specific roles and functions. This term might be too broad or unclear without additional context, as "Defense" could imply various aspects of military defense, not just transportation.

The translation clarifies and formalizes the term by specifying "ô tô" (motor vehicles) and "quân sự" (military). This formalization makes the term more accessible by explicitly indicating that it pertains to military vehicles and infrastructure. It removes ambiguity and ensures that the term is understood within the military context.

The translation "Đường ô tô quân sự" enhances clarity by providing specific information about the nature of the highway. The term "ô tô" specifies that it is meant for motor vehicles, while "quân sự" clarifies that it is for military use. This explicitness ensures that the translation is precise and contextually appropriate, aligning with the need for clear communication in both military and civilian contexts.

In summary, the use of register markedness in the translation from "Defense Highway" to "Đường ô tô quân sự" involves clarifying the term's military context, adapting to cultural norms, formalizing the jargon, and enhancing precision. The Vietnamese translation ensures that the term is explicitly understood within its military context, reflecting both the formal nature of military terminology and the specific use of the highway.

**Example 30 Defense in Depth**

*ST: Defense in depth not only relies on the first line of defense but also includes additional layers behind, allowing forces to maintain combat effectiveness even when breached. The close coordination between units and the ability to respond swiftly are key factors in ensuring effectiveness in combat situations."*

*TT: Phòng ngự thành thế đội có chiều sâu không chỉ dựa vào lớp phòng thủ đầu tiên mà còn bao gồm các lớp bổ sung ở phía sau, cho phép lực lượng duy trì sức chiến đấu ngay cả khi bị xâm nhập. Sự liên kết chặt chẽ giữa các đơn vị và khả năng phản ứng nhanh chóng là yếu tố then chốt để đảm bảo hiệu quả trong các tình huống chiến đấu.*

The term "Defense in Depth" is a specialized military concept referring to a layered defense strategy designed to delay an adversary's advance through multiple defensive positions. While the term itself is technical, it doesn’t explicitly mark a high level of formality outside of military contexts.

The translation "Phòng ngự thành thế đội có chiều sâu" provides a detailed and formal explanation of the concept. "Phòng ngự" (defense), "thành thế" (position/formation), and "có chiều sâu" (with depth) collectively capture the strategic essence of the term. The translation maintains a high level of formality and specificity, making the technical nature of the term explicit.

In Vietnamese, military terminology often requires precise and formal expressions to reflect its significance accurately. The translation adapts to these cultural norms by providing a detailed description rather than a direct translation. This ensures that the concept is understood in the Vietnamese military context, where such strategies are described with specific terminology. By using a descriptive translation, the term aligns with the Vietnamese practice of clearly articulating complex military concepts to ensure that they are comprehensible within the cultural and military framework.

The term is technical and might not be immediately clear without additional context. It is a specific military jargon that requires explanation for those unfamiliar with the concept. The translation formalizes and clarifies the jargon by expanding on the concept. "Thành thế đội có chiều sâu" (position/formation with depth) provides a more detailed explanation, making the specialized term accessible to those who might not be familiar with the English jargon. This formalization helps ensure that the term is understood in the Vietnamese military context.

Although "Defense in Depth" doesn’t directly involve social hierarchies, the translation reflects the strategic complexity of military operations, which is inherently hierarchical. The detailed explanation aligns with the structured nature of military planning and strategy. The translation "Phòng ngự thành thế đội có chiều sâu" enhances clarity by explicitly describing the strategy. The term "có chiều sâu" (with depth) helps to clarify that the defense is not just a single layer but involves multiple defensive layers. This explicit description ensures that the concept is precise and accurately conveyed, which is crucial for understanding military strategies.

In summary, the translation of "Defense in Depth" into "Phòng ngự thành thế đội có chiều sâu" effectively uses register markedness by providing a formal and detailed explanation of the military concept. This approach ensures that the technical nature of the term is communicated clearly and appropriately within the Vietnamese military context, adapting to cultural expectations and enhancing the precision of the concept.

**Example 31: Defense in Place**

*ST: In rugged terrain, the brigade might opt to set up the defense in place on elevated positions, using the height to monitor and deter enemy assaults.*

*TT: Trong những khu vực có địa hình gồ ghề, lữ đoàn có thể chọn phòng ngự cố định tại các điểm cao, lợi dụng độ cao để quan sát và ngăn chặn các cuộc tấn công của đối phương.*

The term "Defense in Place" refers to a military strategy where forces are positioned to defend a specific location rather than moving or maneuvering. It is a specialized term but generally has a neutral formality level, suited to tactical or strategic discussions. The translation "Phòng ngự cố định" is formal and specific. "Phòng ngự" (defense) is a standard military term, and "cố định" (fixed) explicitly indicates that the defense is stationary. This translation maintains the technical and formal register of the term, aligning with military discourse in Vietnamese.

In Vietnamese, military terms often need to be both precise and formal to convey their strategic implications accurately. "Phòng ngự cố định" adapts well to these cultural expectations by using clear and formal language to describe the concept of stationary defense. The term "cố định" (fixed) is commonly used in Vietnamese military terminology to indicate something that does not move, aligning with the need for clear and formal expressions in military contexts.

The term could be somewhat technical or ambiguous to those unfamiliar with military jargon. The translation clarifies and formalizes the term. "Cố định" directly translates to "fixed," which explicitly conveys that the defense is meant to be stationary. This formalization helps make the term more accessible and understandable in a military context.

Although "Defense in Place" itself doesn’t involve social hierarchies, the translation’s formal nature reflects the structured and strategic aspects of military operations. The clarity provided by "Phòng ngự cố định" supports understanding the specific nature of the defensive strategy. The translation "Phòng ngự cố định" enhances clarity by explicitly defining that the defense is fixed or stationary. This precise translation ensures that the military strategy is clearly understood, avoiding any potential ambiguity associated with the original English term.

In summary, the translation of "Defense in Place" into "Phòng ngự cố định" effectively uses register markedness by providing a clear and formal explanation of the concept. This approach ensures that the term's strategic and technical nature is accurately conveyed in

**Example 33: Operation Officer**

*ST: Operation officers create battle plans that take into account the existing circumstances, the strengths of their forces, and the strategic goals set forth. They need to evaluate elements like terrain, the enemy, and available resources to ensure that the plans are feasible and effective in practice.*

*TT: Sĩ quan tác chiến xây dựng các kế hoạch chiến đấu dựa trên tình hình hiện tại, năng lực của lực lượng và các mục tiêu chiến lược đã đề ra. Họ cần phải phân tích các yếu tố như địa hình, đối phương, và nguồn lực sẵn có để đảm bảo rằng kế hoạch là khả thi và hiệu quả trong thực tế.*

Context and Usage: In English, "Operation Officer" is a role commonly found in military and organizational settings. It determs a person responsible for overseeing, coordinating, and executing operations. The formality level is generally neutral but can vary depending on the context—whether in a military, corporate, or emergency management setting. In Vietnamese, "Sĩ quan tác chiến" translates to "Operation Officer" but with added formal and technical nuances. "Sĩ quan" (officer) is a military rank that inherently conveys formality and authority. "Tác chiến" (operations) specifies the type of operations the officer is involved in, which is a formal and technical term within military contexts. The translation employs a formal register, reflecting both the authority and specialized nature of the role. "Sĩ quan" indicates a position of rank and responsibility, while "tác chiến" adds specificity regarding the nature of the officer's duties.

In Vietnamese military culture, titles and roles are often conveyed with precise and formal language to reflect the structure and hierarchy of the armed forces. This precision helps in maintaining clarity regarding roles and responsibilities.

"Sĩ quan": The term "Sĩ quan" is commonly used in Vietnamese to determ a military officer, encompassing various ranks. This term reflects the hierarchical nature of the military, where officers hold positions of authority.

"Tác chiến": This term is specific to military operations, emphasizing the tactical and strategic aspects of the role. It aligns with the cultural expectation of using formal and accurate terminology for military functions.

While the term is specific, it might not immediately convey the full scope of responsibilities or the hierarchical status of the role, especially to those unfamiliar with military or organizational jargon. The translation formalizes and clarifies the term by explicitly indicating that the officer’s role is related to military operations. "Tác chiến" (operations) provides a precise description of the role, making it clear that it pertains to strategic and tactical responsibilities within the military.

The term suggests a role with certain responsibilities and authority but does not explicitly indicate rank or hierarchical status within the military structure.

"Sĩ quan" explicitly determs a military officer, which implies a rank and formal position within the military hierarchy. The translation clearly reflects the officer’s role and status, aligning with the structured nature of military organizations where rank and roles are distinctly defined.

The translation of "Operation Officer" into "Sĩ quan tác chiến" effectively utilizes register markedness and translation strategies to convey the role with formality, precision, and cultural relevance. By providing a detailed and formal description, the Vietnamese translation accurately reflects the role’s hierarchical status and specialized nature, aligning with military terminology and cultural expectations.

**Example 34: Combat Vehicle Weapon System**

*ST: The Combat Vehicle Weapon System encompasses the collection of armaments fitted on military vehicles, including tanks, armored personnel carriers, and infantry fighting vehicles. This system usually features a range of weapons, such as cannons, machine guns, and missiles, aimed at maximizing the vehicle's offensive and defensive functions. By doing so, the weapon system not only boosts firepower but also enhances survivability and adaptability in combat scenarios.*

*TT: Tổ hợp vũ khí của xe chiến là hệ thống vũ khí được trang bị trên các phương tiện chiến đấu, như xe tăng, xe bọc thép hoặc xe chiến đấu bộ binh. Hệ thống này thường bao gồm nhiều loại vũ khí khác nhau, chẳng hạn như pháo, súng máy, và tên lửa, được thiết kế để tối ưu hóa khả năng tấn công và phòng thủ của xe. Tổ hợp vũ khí không chỉ tăng cường sức mạnh hỏa lực mà còn cải thiện khả năng sống sót và linh hoạt trong các tình huống chiến đấu.*

The English term "Combat Vehicle Weapon System" is rendered in Vietnamese as “Tổ hợp vũ khí của xe chiến.” This analysis will examine the translation through the perspectives of formality levels and register markedness, demonstrating how and why explicitation occurs in this context.

To begin with, the formality levels in the translation are conveyed through the use of precise and technical language. The phrase "Tổ hợp vũ khí" (weapon system) signifies a sophisticated arrangement of weaponry specifically designed for combat vehicles. This choice of wording reflects the serious nature of military terminology, indicating that it is not merely about any weapon but a specialized system that integrates various elements for effective operation. The term "xe chiến" (combat vehicle) further enhances the formal and technical aspect of the subject matter, underlining the importance of precise language in military settings.

Furthermore, the translation showcases register markedness by employing language tailored for a specialized audience. The terms "vũ khí" (weapons) and "xe chiến" (combat vehicle) are specific to military operations and may not be commonly understood by the general population. This deliberate choice of language underscores the specialized nature of the discourse, indicating that the content is meant for individuals with military expertise. By utilizing such terminology, the translator ensures that the translation aligns with its target audience, thereby enhancing comprehension and reducing the risk of misunderstandings.

Additionally, the explicitation within this translation clarifies the relationship between the components of the phrase. The inclusion of "của" (of) in “Tổ hợp vũ khí của xe chiến” clearly links the weapon system to the combat vehicle, indicating ownership and functional integration. This explicit connection is crucial, as it informs the reader that the weapon system is specifically designed for use in combat vehicles. The clarity of this relationship ensures that the intended meaning is effectively communicated, leaving little room for misinterpretation.

Moreover, the specificity of the translation plays a vital role in conveying the technical aspects associated with military operations. By accurately translating "Combat Vehicle Weapon System" to “Tổ hợp vũ khí của xe chiến,” the translator preserves the intended meaning while ensuring its suitability for a military context. This careful consideration of terminology reflects an understanding of military language and its significance in operational discussions.

Furthermore, the explicit nature of the translation emphasizes the seriousness of military communications. The phrase “Tổ hợp vũ khí” (weapon system) implies a level of sophistication and complexity that is expected in military contexts. By effectively conveying this complexity, the translator not only enhances clarity but also reinforces the formal register associated with military terminology. This is crucial in situations where decisions regarding weapon systems can have substantial implications for operational effectiveness and strategy.

In conclusion, the translation of "Combat Vehicle Weapon System" to “Tổ hợp vũ khí của xe chiến” illustrates a deliberate approach to maintaining formality levels and register markedness within military discourse. The explicitation achieved through the use of specialized vocabulary and clear relationships between terms enhances understanding and ensures precision in communication. By employing formal language tailored for a specific audience, the translation accurately reflects the seriousness and specificity of military operations, highlighting the significance of careful attention to terminology in the translation process. This analysis reveals that a rigorous approach to translating military terminology is vital for accurate and effective communication in this critical field.

**` Example 35: Combat Service Mask**

*ST: The combat service mask is a personal protective tool created to protect soldiers from chemical, biological, and radiological threats in combat settings. This gear not only offers safety but also ensures that personnel can remain operational in hazardous situations, enabling them to perform their duties effectively, even in challenging environments.*

*TT: Mặt nạ phòng độc binh chủng hợp thành là thiết bị bảo vệ cá nhân được thiết kế để bảo vệ người lính khỏi các tác nhân hóa học, sinh học và phóng xạ trong môi trường chiến đấu. Thiết bị này không chỉ cung cấp khả năng bảo vệ mà còn giúp duy trì khả năng hoạt động của quân nhân trong các tình huống nguy hiểm, cho phép họ thực hiện nhiệm vụ hiệu quả ngay cả trong điều kiện khắc nghiệt.*

Vietnamese Translation: “Mặt nạ phòng độc binh chủng hợp thành” The English term "Combat Service Mask" is translated into Vietnamese as “Mặt nạ phòng độc binh chủng hợp thành.” This analysis examines the translation from the perspectives of formality levels and register markedness, demonstrating how and why explicitation occurs in this instance.

First and foremost, the translation exhibits a high degree of formality through the use of specialized language. The term "Mặt nạ phòng độc" (combat mask) refers to a protective device designed to shield the wearer from chemical, biological, or radiological threats. This choice reflects a commitment to precise terminology, which is crucial in military contexts where clarity is essential. The addition of "binh chủng hợp thành" (combined arms) further specifies that the mask is intended for use by multiple branches of the military, highlighting the serious nature of the equipment.

Moreover, the translation illustrates register markedness by using language that caters to a specific audience. The term “Mặt nạ phòng độc” is not commonly found in everyday language, suggesting it is aimed at individuals familiar with military concepts. By selecting such specialized terms, the translator ensures the translation resonates with its target audience, enhancing understanding and minimizing the risk of misinterpretation.

The explicitation within this translation clarifies the relationship between its components. The inclusion of "binh chủng hợp thành" specifies the contexts in which the mask is applicable, indicating its suitability for various military branches. This added clarity is crucial, as it communicates that the mask is designed for a multifaceted military environment rather than being a generic protective item. This focus on clarity ensures that the intended meaning is conveyed effectively, reducing potential confusion.

Furthermore, the specificity of the translation is vital in capturing the technical aspects of military equipment. By accurately translating "Combat Service Mask" to “Mặt nạ phòng độc binh chủng hợp thành,” the translator maintains the intended meaning while ensuring its relevance to military operations. This careful choice of terminology demonstrates an awareness of the complexity and significance of the equipment being discussed.

Additionally, the explicit nature of this translation highlights the serious implications of military communications. The term “Mặt nạ phòng độc” implies a level of sophistication and complexity expected in military contexts. By effectively conveying this complexity, the translator enhances clarity and reinforces the formal register associated with military terminology, which is particularly important in scenarios where the functionality of protective equipment can impact personnel safety and operational success.

In summary, the translation of "Combat Service Mask" to “Mặt nạ phòng độc binh chủng hợp thành” reflects a deliberate approach to maintaining formality levels and register markedness within military discourse. The explicitation achieved through the use of specialized vocabulary and clear term relationships improves understanding and ensures precision in communication. By employing formal language suited for a specific audience, the translation accurately conveys the seriousness and specificity of military operations, underscoring the need for careful attention to terminology in the translation process. This analysis emphasizes that a meticulous approach to translating military terms is essential for effective communication in this vital field.

CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION

This chapter delves into the broader implications of the study on explicitation in the translation of military texts from English into Vietnamese. It examines the impact of the research findings on military translation practices, translation theory, and methodology. Additionally, it identifies the study's limitations and proposes directions for future research.

5.1. Recapitulation of the study

This study examines the role of explicitation in the translation of military texts from English into Vietnamese, utilizing a corpus-based approach to analyze the strategies employed in translating military terminology. Notably, the research highlights the necessity of clarity and precision in military communication, particularly in contexts where accurate information is crucial for operational effectiveness.

To address the first research question—what explicitation strategies are employed in the translation of military terminology within the corpus, and which strategy is the most and least utilized? —this inquiry seeks to identify and categorize the explicitation strategies used in military translations. The findings indicate that amplification and obligatory explicitation are the most frequently employed strategies, reflecting a strong emphasis on enhancing clarity and precision in the translated texts. In contrast, register markedness and pragmatic explicitation appear to be used less often, thereby suggesting that they play a secondary role in the overall translation process.

Building on this, the second research question—how and why are these explicitation strategies used?—explores the rationale behind the use of specific strategies in military translation. The study reveals that translators prioritize clarity—achieved through amplification—and precision—achieved through obligatory explicitation. This focus is vital for effective communication, especially given the high stakes involved in military operations. Furthermore, while context and audience considerations remain important, the overarching goal is to ensure that the intended message is accurately conveyed.

In summary, the study underscores the critical importance of clarity and precision in military translations, demonstrating that the choice of explicitation strategies significantly impacts the effectiveness of communication in high-stakes environments. Thus, the interrelationship between these strategies and their application highlights the essential role of explicitation in achieving successful military translations.

5.2. Contributions of the study

As far as theoretical Contribution is concerned This study enhances the theoretical framework surrounding explicitation in translation studies, particularly within the context of military terminology. By providing a detailed analysis of explicitation strategies—such as amplification and obligatory explicitation—the research contributes to the understanding of how these strategies function to improve clarity and precision in translated texts. Furthermore, it explores the interplay between linguistic and cultural factors in military translation, thereby enriching the existing literature on translation theory and expanding the discussion of context-specific translation practices.

Methodologically, the study employs a robust corpus-based approach, which serves as a methodological contribution to the field of translation studies. By utilizing a specialized corpus of military texts, the research systematically analyzes translation strategies in a quantitative manner, allowing for objective comparisons and insights into the frequency and application of explicitation strategies. This methodological rigor provides a model for future research, encouraging the use of corpus analysis in the investigation of translation practices across various domains and languages.

From a practical standpoint, the findings of this study have significant implications for military translators and language professionals. By highlighting effective explicitation strategies, the research equips practitioners with the tools necessary to enhance the clarity and accuracy of military translations. This is particularly important in high-stakes contexts, where precise communication can impact operational outcomes. Additionally, the study fosters a deeper understanding of the strategic use of language in military communication, guiding translators in their efforts to convey complex military concepts accurately to Vietnamese audiences.

In summary, this study makes meaningful contributions across theoretical, methodological, and practical dimensions, advancing the field of translation studies and providing valuable insights for both academic research and professional practice in military translation.

5.3. Implications

**Implications for Translation Theory**

The framework for analyzing explicitation in the translation of military terminology is deeply intertwined with cross-language discourse analysis, enriching our understanding of how meaning is conveyed in military contexts. By employing translation as a heuristic tool, researchers can delve into the nuanced layers of military language across different cultures and languages, facilitating a comprehensive examination of military communication.

**Contextualizing Military Discourse**

Understanding the cultural context is vital in this analysis, as military terminology often reflects cultural values, historical experiences, and institutional practices unique to each nation. For instance, when translating terms from English to Vietnamese, it becomes evident how cultural context shapes the interpretation of military concepts. A term like "national security" may evoke distinct connotations based on a country's historical background and geopolitical concerns. This highlights the necessity of considering cultural implications in military translations, where meanings can significantly vary.

Moreover, the situational dynamics of military communication—including audience, purpose, and setting—play a crucial role in how terms are understood and utilized. By analyzing these dynamics through translation, we can identify how explicitation strategies adjust meanings to fit specific military contexts. This approach ensures that translations are not only accurate but also relevant, adapting to the nuances of each scenario in which military terminology is employed.

**Analyzing Semantic Variability**

Translation also serves as a critical tool for analyzing semantic shifts that occur when military terms transition between languages. For example, the term "combat readiness" may be translated with varying levels of detail and emphasis, reflecting local military doctrines. Such analyses reveal how specific terms are adapted to align with the target language’s military practices and cultural expectations, demonstrating the complexity of meaning that emerges during translation.

Additionally, cross-language discourse analysis allows for the examination of ideological influences on translation choices. Translators may select terms that resonate with national security narratives or political ideologies, revealing biases through the explicitations used. For instance, translating "defense strategies" in a way that emphasizes aggressive tactics may reflect underlying ideological perspectives, offering critical insights into the motivations behind translation decisions.

**Enhancing Cross-Cultural Communication**

Clear communication is paramount in military contexts, and utilizing translation as a heuristic tool helps identify potential misunderstandings arising from different interpretations of military terminology. By analyzing specific translations, researchers can uncover areas where additional context is necessary to ensure clarity. For instance, the term "joint operations" may require further elaboration in Vietnamese to fully convey its meaning and implications, thereby promoting clearer communication among military personnel.

Furthermore, explicitation strategies serve as tools for adapting military language to align with cultural norms. For instance, formal military language in English may need adjustments in Vietnamese to reflect local communication styles. This adaptation is essential for effective cross-cultural military collaboration, where understanding and respecting cultural differences can significantly enhance operational success.

The integration of the framework with cross-language discourse analysis provides a robust lens for examining the translation of military terminology. By employing translation as a heuristic tool, researchers can navigate the complexities of meaning that arise when military concepts cross linguistic and cultural boundaries. This comprehensive approach not only enhances our understanding of military discourse but also contributes to developing effective communication strategies, fostering greater collaboration and understanding among diverse military forces. Ultimately, this interdisciplinary framework improves both translation practices and military operational effectiveness in a global context, facilitating better communication and cooperation in international military engagements. Through this interconnected analysis, we can appreciate the critical role of translation in bridging cultural gaps and enhancing the clarity and effectiveness of military communication worldwide.

 **Implications for Methodology**

The methodological approach employed in this study has several important implications. Firstly, the successful application of a three-phase mixed-methods approach underscores its effectiveness in providing a comprehensive analysis of translation strategies. By combining both quantitative and qualitative analyses, this approach offers a nuanced understanding of complex phenomena. The demonstrated effectiveness in this study suggests that similar methodologies can be applied to other translation studies, enabling a deeper and more holistic understanding of various translation challenges.

Furthermore, the use of a corpus-based approach in this study highlights the value of leveraging large datasets for empirical research. Analyzing extensive corpora provides robust insights into translation practices and strategies. This methodology not only supports detailed empirical analysis but also underscores its potential for exploring various aspects of translation and language use. Researchers can adopt corpus-based methods to gain a more data-driven perspective on translation phenomena. In addition, the study identifies several promising areas for future research:

Comparative Studies: Future research could benefit from comparing explicitation strategies in military translation across different languages and cultures. Such comparative studies would help identify both universal patterns and context-specific practices, thereby enriching our understanding of how explicitation functions in diverse linguistic and cultural settings.

Longitudinal Studies: Examining how explicitation strategies evolve over time could provide valuable insights. Longitudinal studies would explore how changes in military communication and translation practices influence the use of explicitation strategies, thus shedding light on their dynamic nature.

Technological Integration: Investigating the impact of translation technologies—such as machine translation and translation memory systems—on explicitation strategies could offer forward-looking perspectives on the future of military translation. Understanding how these technologies influence the application of explicitation would provide valuable insights into evolving translation practices and their implications.

Overall, the methodological approach of this study not only advances current research but also opens up new avenues for exploring and enhancing translation practices across various contexts.

**Implications for Military Translation Practices**

The study identifies the most and least frequently used explicitation strategies, thereby offering a detailed understanding of which strategies are most effective in various contexts. By highlighting these strategies, translators are better equipped to determine which methods to employ to ensure that military texts are both clear and accurate in Vietnamese. This understanding is crucial, as it helps prevent misinterpretations and ensures that the intended meaning of military concepts is preserved.

Moreover, the research underscores how explicitation can bridge linguistic and cultural gaps. For instance, certain military terms may carry specific cultural connotations or operational meanings that differ between English and Vietnamese. Consequently, effective explicitation is essential to convey these nuances accurately, thereby preventing potential misinterpretations and maintaining the intended meaning.

Furthermore, the study provides practical guidelines on how to apply explicitation effectively. This includes specific examples and actionable strategies to clarify ambiguous terms or concepts, which enhances the clarity of translations. These guidelines are intended to assist translators in navigating the complexities of military texts and improving their translation practices.

In addition to these guidelines, the research highlights the need for targeted training programs that focus on explicitation strategies. Such programs are crucial for educating translators about the importance of explicitation in military translation and for equipping them with the practical skills necessary to apply these strategies effectively.

Moreover, the study suggests the development of detailed translation guidelines that outline best practices for applying explicitation. These guidelines would serve as a valuable reference for translators, aiding them in making informed decisions about when and how to use explicitation in different contexts. By including examples of common challenges and solutions related to explicitation, the utility of these guidelines can be further enhanced.

Additionally, the study advocates for ongoing professional development opportunities for translators. This could involve workshops, seminars, or online resources designed to keep translators updated on the latest practices and research in military translation. Continuous learning and professional growth are essential for maintaining high standards in translation practices.

The study also emphasizes the importance of establishing standardized practices for the application of explicitation strategies. Consistency in these practices ensures that translations maintain a high level of quality and coherence, which is crucial for effective communication in military contexts. By standardizing explicitation practices, discrepancies that may arise from inconsistent application can be avoided, thereby enhancing the overall quality of translations and ensuring that all military documents are clear, accurate, and uniform in presentation.

Furthermore, consistent application of explicitation strategies is vital for maintaining operational effectiveness. In military contexts, clarity and precision are critical for ensuring that instructions and information are accurately understood and acted upon. Thus, by adhering to standardized practices, translators can contribute significantly to the successful execution of military operations.

Finally, ensuring consistency in translation practices is essential for maintaining coherence across various military documents. This coherence is crucial for creating a unified understanding of military concepts and strategies, which facilitates better coordination and collaboration within military teams.

Overall, the insights from this study provide a robust foundation for improving military translation practices by emphasizing clarity, training, and consistency. By implementing these recommendations, translators can enhance the quality and effectiveness of military translations, ultimately supporting better communication and operational success in military contexts.

5.3. Limitations of the study

Despite the valuable contributions of this study, several limitations must be acknowledged. Firstly, the research focuses solely on military manuals, excluding other types of military texts that may provide additional insights into the translation process. This narrow focus means that the findings might not fully capture the broader spectrum of military discourse. Additionally, the study concentrates on the translation of selected key terms based on their frequency, rather than analyzing all military terminology present in the texts. This limitation could result in a skewed understanding of how explicitation strategies are employed across the entirety of military language.

Furthermore, the qualitative analysis conducted in this study relies heavily on subjective interpretations of translation strategies. While this approach yields valuable insights, it also introduces potential biases and variability in interpretation. To improve the robustness and reliability of the analysis, future studies could benefit from incorporating perspectives from multiple reviewers or utilizing automated tools for qualitative analysis. These methods would help mitigate individual biases and provide a more objective assessment of how explicitation strategies are applied.

Additionally, the study does not include interviews with military translators or personnel, which limits insights into their experiences and approaches to translating military terminology. Engaging with practitioners in the field could enrich the analysis by providing real-world context and understanding of the challenges faced during translation.

The focus of this research on English and Vietnamese may also limit the applicability of the findings to other language pairs. The unique linguistic and cultural characteristics of these two languages could influence explicitation strategies in ways that are not generalizable to other language combinations. To broaden the understanding of explicitation in military translation, future research could include additional language pairs, allowing for comparative studies across different languages that reveal both universal patterns and language-specific practices in the use of explicitation.

In summary, while this study significantly contributes to the field of translation studies, addressing these limitations by expanding the corpus size, enhancing objectivity in qualitative analysis, and incorporating additional language pairs could further enrich the understanding of explicitation in military translation. Such expansions would not only deepen insights into translation practices but also foster better communication across diverse military contexts.

5.4. Suggestions for further research

 To build upon the findings and address the limitations identified in this study, several avenues for further research are suggested:

Broaden the Scope of Texts: Future studies should consider a wider range of military texts beyond manuals, such as operational reports, training materials, and strategic documents. This broader scope can provide a more comprehensive understanding of how military terminology is translated and the various contexts in which explicitation strategies are applied.

Include Qualitative Insights from Practitioners: Conducting interviews or surveys with military translators and personnel could provide valuable insights into their experiences, challenges, and approaches to translating military terminology. Understanding the practical implications of translation choices could enrich the analysis and offer a more grounded perspective on the effectiveness of explicitation strategies.

Expand the Corpus Size and Diversity: Increasing the corpus size and incorporating a diverse range of military documents can enhance the representativeness of the findings. By examining different military contexts and documents, researchers can identify variations in translation practices and explicitation strategies across various situations and types of discourse.

Investigate the Impact of Cultural Context: Future research could focus on how cultural context influences the translation of military terminology. Analyzing specific cases where cultural nuances affect translation choices can shed light on the role of cultural factors in shaping meaning and understanding in military discourse.

Examine Translation in Crisis Situations: Investigating how military terminology is translated in real-time during crises or conflicts could provide insights into the urgency and adaptability of translation strategies. This research could highlight how explicitations are employed under pressure and the implications for effective communication in high-stakes situations.

Assess the Role of Technology: Exploring the impact of technology, such as machine translation tools and translation memory systems, on the translation of military terminology could provide insights into contemporary practices and challenges. Analyzing how technology interacts with explicitation strategies could inform future practices in military translation.

By pursuing these suggestions, future research can significantly enhance the understanding of explicitation in military translation and contribute to more effective communication strategies within diverse military contexts. This expanded knowledge will not only benefit translation studies but also improve operational effectiveness and collaboration in military environments globally.

5.5. Concluding remarks

As a military instructor with extensive experience in translating materials for joint military operations and conferences, I’ve encountered numerous challenges in dealing with the complex and often highly specialized language of the military. Military terminology can be dense, technical, and laden with cultural and contextual nuances that do not always have direct equivalents in Vietnamese. In such cases, the application of explicitation strategies has proven to be both a practical and necessary tool for bridging these linguistic gaps.

Through my experience, I’ve come to appreciate how strategies like amplification and obligatory explicitation can transform difficult or obscure terms into more understandable and relatable concepts for the target audience. While it’s true that explicitation can sometimes lead to a departure from the literal meaning of the original text, this flexibility is essential when communicating within a cross-cultural military context

The flexibility and adaptability of explicitation are key when translating for diverse military audiences, particularly in international forums where clarity and mutual understanding are paramount. By adding necessary context, the translator enables communication that goes beyond mere word-for-word translation. As I have experienced firsthand in military cooperation, the clarity of a message can make the difference between successful collaboration and misunderstandings. In this regard, explicitation is not just a technique but a fundamental approach to ensuring that all parties—regardless of language and cultural background—are on the same page.

While explicitation does carry the risk of straying from the original text, it offers significant value in making military communication accessible and effective. This is especially true when one considers the critical nature of the content being communicated—where precision and clarity are essential for success. Through this study, I have come to recognize the indispensable role of explicitation in military translation, as it facilitates a deeper level of comprehension and fosters smoother interactions between international military partners.
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**APENDIX A**

**Obligatory Explicitation**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **English Term** | **Vietnamese Translation** |
| a forward defense | phòng ngự phía trước |
| a mobile defense | phòng ngự cơ động |
| a perimeter defense | phòng ngự chu vi |
| agency operation | phương tiện chiến đấu; cơ quan chiến dịch |
| air doctrine | thuyết quân sự sử dụng lực lượng không quân |
| an area defense | phòng ngự khu vực |
| characteristic operation | tính năng khai thác; tính năng vận hành |
| code operation | mã chiến dịch |
| combat aviation | không quân chiến đấu; không quân lục quân |
| combat aviation battalion | tiểu đoàn không quân lục quân |
| combat aviation company | đại đội không quân lục quân |
| combat award | huân chương chiến đấu |
| combat base | nhóm chi viện; căn cứ chiến dịch |
| combat body | đơn vị chiến đấu; binh đoàn chiến đấu |
| combat boots | giày cao cổ, ủng dã chiến |
| combat box | đội hình chiến đấu “hình hộp” |
| combat canister | hộp mặt nạ phòng độc |
| combat capable crew | phi đội có khả năng chiến đấu |
| combat capacity | khả năng chiến đấu |
| combat car | xe chiến đấu hạng nhẹ, chiến xa |
| combat cargo air unit | đơn vị không quân vận chuyển quân đổ bộ |
| combat cargo command | bộ chỉ huy không quân vận tải |
| combat cargo mission | nhiệm vụ chuyển hàng đến khu vực tác chiến |
| combat cargo officer | sĩ quan tiếp vận chiến dịch |
| combat cargo plane | máy bay vận chuyển quân đổ bộ |
| combat cargo supply unit | đơn vị vận chuyển hàng hóa quân sự |
| combat carrier | xe vận chuyển chiến đấu |
| combat celling | trần bay chiến đấu |
| combat centurion award | huân chương vì 100 lần cất cánh chiến đấu |
| combat chart | sơ đồ tác chiến hải quân |
| combat chemical intelligence | tình báo hóa học trong quá trình chiến đấu |
| combat chronicle | biên niên sử quân sự, biên niên sử |
| combat forces | lực lượng chiến đấu |
| combat heart | tinh thần chiến đấu |
| combat officer | sĩ quan tại ngũ; sĩ quan chiến đấu |
| combat radius (capability) | bán kính tác chiến |
| combat range | trường bắn để huấn luyện bắn chiến đấu |
| combat ratio to service | tỷ lệ quân số chiến đấu và quân số đơn vị hậu cần |
| combat ration | khẩu phần chiến đấu |
| combat readiness | sự sẵn sàng chiến đấu |
| marksmanship proficiency course | khóa sát hạch bắn đạn thật |
| combat readiness trainer | máy bay huấn luyện chiến đấu |
| combat readiness training | sự huấn luyện phi công |
| combat ready posture | tính sẵn sàng chiến đấu |
| combat realism | điều kiện sát thực tế chiến đấu |
| combat reconnaissance | sự trinh sát chiến thuật, sự trinh sát chiến đấu |
| combat record | lịch sử chiến đấu |
| combat regiment | trung đoàn công binh |
| combat replacement | bổ sung quân chiến đấu |
| combat replacement factor | hệ số bổ sung chiến đấu |
| combat report | bản báo cáo tác chiến (khẩn cấp); báo cáo chiến đấu |
| combat reserve | lực lượng dự bị chiến đấu |
| combat reserve ration | lượng dự trữ lương thực chiến đấu |
| combat resupply | sự bổ sung tiêu hao phương tiện vật chất trong chiến đấu |
| combat scarred | được tôi luyện trong chiến đấu; có kinh nghiệm chiến đấu |
| combat search and rescue | tìm kiếm và giải cứu trong chiến đấu |
| combat sector | đoạn địa hình tác chiến; phân khu chiến đấu |
| combat security | sự bảo đảm chiến đấu; cảnh giới chiến đấu |
| combat service | phục vụ chiến đấu; bảo đảm hậu cần |
| combat service element | phân đội phục vụ chiến đấu |
| combat service group | nhóm phục vụ chiến đấu |
| combat service mask | mặt nạ phòng độc binh chủng hợp thành |
| combat service support | sự bảo đảm hậu cần cho bộ đội trong trận đánh |
| combat serviceable | có thể sử dụng trong điều kiện chiến đấu |
| combat serviceable clothing | quần áo sử dụng trong điều kiện chiến đấu |
| combat shakedown | sự vận dụng kiến thức đã học vào điều kiện chiến đấu |
| combat signal | tín hiệu (quy ước) chỉ huy chiến đấu |
| combat situation | tình hình chiến sự, tình hình chiến đấu |
| combat skill | kỹ năng chiến đấu; chuyên môn quân sự |
| combat speed | tốc độ chiến đấu |
| combat station | trạm chiến đấu |
| combat strength | biên chế chiến đấu; thành phần chiến đấu |
| combat stress | sự căng thẳng của trận đánh |
| combat strong | lực lượng chiến đấu mạnh |
| combat suit | quân phục chiến đấu |
| combat support | chi viện chiến đấu; yểm trợ tác chiến |
| combat support company | đại đội chi viện hỏa lực |
| combat support computation | sự tính toán để bảo đảm chiến đấu |
| combat support element | phân đội trợ chiến, phân đội chi viện |
| combat support intelligence | tình báo quân sự |
| combat support plan | kế hoạch bảo đảm vật chất |
| combat support training center | trung tâm huấn luyện lực lượng hậu cần |
| combat support troops | lực lượng chi viện trực tiếp; đơn vị và cơ quan hậu cần |
| combat survival | hoạt động giải thoát trong điều kiện chiến đấu |
| combat task | nhiệm vụ chiến đấu |
| combat team | tổ chiến đấu; cụm chiến đấu; toán chiến đấu |
| combat television | sử dụng vô tuyến truyền hình trong chiến đấu |
| combat theater | chiến trường; khu vực hoạt động quân sự |
| combat thrust booster | bộ tăng tốc cơ động |
| combat tire | bộ săm lốp chống đạn (dùng cho xe chiến đấu) |
| combat trained | đã được huấn luyện chiến đấu |
| combat training | sự huấn luyện chiến đấu |
| combat training center | trung tâm huấn luyện chiến đấu |
| combat training command | ban chỉ huy huấn luyện chiến đấu |
| combat training unit | đơn vị huấn luyện chiến đấu |
| combat type aircraft | máy bay chiến đấu |
| combat type training maneuvers | diễn tập trong điều kiện sát thực tế chiến đấu |
| combat umpire loss | tổn thất quy ước trong diễn tập (theo quyết định của trọng tài) |
| combat unfit | không phù hợp phục vụ trong quân đội |
| Command | bộ chỉ huy chiến dịch; bộ tư lệnh chiến dịch |
| command the battle  | chỉ huy trận đánh |
| Commander | lệnh (trưởng) chiến dịch; tư lệnh (trưởng) binh chủng hợp thành |
| Defense against enemy propaganda | chống tuyên truyền của địch |
| Defense against infiltration | phòng ngự chống địch thâm nhập |
| Defense agreement | Thỏa thuận / Hiệp định phòng ngự |
| Defense classification | Phân loại thông tin quốc phòng |
| Defense Communications Agency | Cục thông tin Bộ Quốc phòng |
| Defense Communications System | Hệ thống thông tin quốc phòng |
| Defense Data Network | Mạng dữ liệu quốc phòng |
| Defense emergency | Tình trạng quốc phòng khẩn cấp |
| Defense estimate | Đánh giá khả năng phòng ngự |
| Defense in woods | phòng ngự trong rừng |
| Defense Information School | Trường thông tin Bộ Quốc phòng |
| Defense Intelligence Agency / School | Cục / Trường tình báo quốc phòng |
| Defense Minister / Secretary | Bộ trưởng Bộ Quốc phòng |
| Defense obstacle | vật cản phòng ngự |
| Defense plan | Kế hoạch phòng ngự |
| Defense policy | Chính sách quốc phòng |
| Defense position | vị trí phòng ngự |
| Defense Production Committee | Ủy ban sản xuất quân sự |
| Defense readiness condition | Trạng thái sẵn sàng phòng ngự |
| Defense scheme | Kế hoạch phòng ngự |
| Defense Supply Agency / Service | Cơ quan cung ứng quốc phòng |
| Defense works | công trình phòng ngự |
| Defense zone | giải phòng ngự |
| engage in battle  | – tham gia trận đánh |
| fight a battle  | chiến đấu trong trận đánh |
| fire support plan annex | phụ lục kèm theo kế hoạch chi viện hỏa lực |
| fire support sector | khu chi viện hỏa lực (đổ bộ đường biển); tiểu khu yểm trợ hỏa lực |
| fire support ships | chiến hạm chi viện hỏa lực |
| fire support table | bảng bắn; bảng chi viện hỏa lực |
| fire support team | nhóm chi viện hỏa lực; cụm hỏa lực |
| fireball | quả cầu lửa (của vụ nổ hạt nhân) |
| fireproof | chịu lửa; không cháy; chống cháy |
| firer | xạ thủ; người bắn súng; người châm ngòi nổ; máy điểm hỏa; máy gây nổ; pháo thủ; khởi động động cơ tên lửa |
| force in arms  | lực lượng vũ trang |
| force integrity  | giữ nguyên tổ chức của đơn vị |
| force majeur  | lực lượng (chiếm) ưu thế |
| force structure and financial resources program  | chương trình nâng cao tổ chức và tài trợ kinh phí cho lực lượng vũ trang |
| force-marching  | di chuyển bằng hành quân cấp tốc |
| join the battle  | tham gia vào trận đánh |
| launch a battle –  | phát động trận đánh |
| lose a battle  | thất bại trong trận đánh |
| observe the battle  | quan sát trận đánh |
| operation plan | kế hoạch chiến dịch; kế hoạch tác chiến |
| operation research | sự nghiên cứu chiến dịch |
| operation's platoon | trung đội chỉ huy; trung đội khai thác tin |
| prepare for battle  | chuẩn bị cho trận đánh |
| retreat from battle  | rút lui khỏi trận đánh |
| win a battle  | giành chiến thắng trong trận đánh |

**APENDIX B**

**Register Markedness**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| English Term | **Vietnamese Translation** |
| Altitude | độ bay cao trung bình |
| battle casualty (technical)  | thương vong trận đánh |
| battle casualty (technical)  | thương vong trận đánh |
| battle casualty (technical)  | thương vong trận đánh |
| battle casualty report (official)  | báo cáo thương vong trận đánh |
| battle casualty report (official)  | báo cáo thương vong trận đánh |
| battle casualty report (official)  | báo cáo thương vong trận đánh |
| battle cry (figurative)  | tiếng hô vang trận đánh |
| battle cry (figurative)  | tiếng hô vang trận đánh |
| battle cry (figurative)  | tiếng hô vang trận đánh |
| battle ensign (naval term)  | cờ trận đánh |
| battle ensign (naval term)  | cờ trận đánh |
| battle ensign (naval term)  | cờ trận đánh |
| battle fatigue (psychological)  | mệt mỏi trận đánh |
| battle fatigue (psychological)  | mệt mỏi trận đánh |
| battle fatigue (psychological)  | mệt mỏi trận đánh |
| battle honor (ceremonial)  | danh dự trận đánh |
| battle honor (ceremonial)  | danh dự trận đánh |
| battle honor (ceremonial)  | danh dự trận đánh |
| battle plan (formal)  | hoạch trận đánh |
| battle plan (formal)  | hoạch trận đánh |
| battle plan (formal)  | hoạch trận đánh |
| battle readiness (military)  | sẵn sàng trận đánh |
| battle readiness (military)  | sẵn sàng trận đánh |
| battle readiness (military)  | sẵn sàng trận đánh |
| battle strategy (formal)  | chiến lược trận đánh |
| battle strategy (formal)  | chiến lược trận đánh |
| battle strategy (formal)  | chiến lược trận đánh |
| battle zone (technical)  | khu vực trận đánh |
| battle zone (technical)  | khu vực trận đánh |
| battle zone (technical)  | khu vực trận đánh |
| battlefield tactics (technical)  | – chiến thuật trận đánh |
| battlefield tactics (technical)  | – chiến thuật trận đánh |
| battlefield tactics (technical)  | – chiến thuật trận đánh |
| battlefront (technical)  | mặt trận trận đánh |
| battlefront (technical)  | mặt trận trận đánh |
| battlefront (technical)  | mặt trận trận đánh |
| bolster defense | củng cố công sự / trận địa phòng ngự |
| breach defense | phá vỡ / chọc thủng phòng ngự |
| build up the defenses | xây dựng công sự / trận địa |
| Capability | khả năng chiến đấu |
| Career | phục vụ tại ngũ |
| carry enemy defenses | đè bẹp hệ thống phòng ngự địch |
| clash of battle (literary)  | cuộc đụng độ trận đánh |
| clash of battle (literary)  | cuộc đụng độ trận đánh |
| clash of battle (literary)  | cuộc đụng độ trận đánh |
| clear defenses | chọc thủng tuyến phòng ngự |
| combat forces | lực lượng chiến đấu |
| combat officer | sĩ quan tại ngũ; sĩ quan chiến đấu |
| combat ratio to service | tỷ lệ quân số chiến đấu và quân số đơn vị hậu cần |
| combat reconnaissance | sự trinh sát chiến thuật, sự trinh sát chiến đấu |
| combat regiment | trung đoàn công binh |
| combat replacement | bổ sung quân chiến đấu |
| combat reserve | lực lượng dự bị chiến đấu |
| combat resupply | sự bổ sung tiêu hao phương tiện vật chất trong chiến đấu |
| combat sector | đoạn địa hình tác chiến; phân khu chiến đấu |
| combat service | phục vụ chiến đấu; bảo đảm hậu cần |
| combat service element | phân đội phục vụ chiến đấu |
| combat service group | nhóm phục vụ chiến đấu |
| combat service mask | mặt nạ phòng độc binh chủng hợp thành |
| combat service support | sự bảo đảm hậu cần cho bộ đội trong trận đánh |
| combat serviceable | có thể sử dụng trong điều kiện chiến đấu |
| combat serviceable clothing | quần áo sử dụng trong điều kiện chiến đấu |
| combat strong | lực lượng chiến đấu mạnh |
| combat task | nhiệm vụ chiến đấu |
| combat team | tổ chiến đấu; cụm chiến đấu; toán chiến đấu |
| combat theater | chiến trường; khu vực hoạt động quân sự |
| combat training center | trung tâm huấn luyện chiến đấu |
| combat training command | ban chỉ huy huấn luyện chiến đấu |
| combat training unit | đơn vị huấn luyện chiến đấu |
| combat type aircraft | máy bay chiến đấu |
| combat type training maneuvers | diễn tập trong điều kiện sát thực tế chiến đấu |
| combat umpire loss | tổn thất quy ước trong diễn tập (theo quyết định của trọng tài) |
| combat unfit | không phù hợp phục vụ trong quân đội |
| combat vehicle ammunition | đạn dược cho xe chiến đấu |
| combat vehicle main armament system | hệ thống vũ khí chủ yếu của xe chiến đấu |
| combat vehicle weapon system | tổ hợp vũ khí của xe chiến đấu |
| combat visual information support center | trung tâm quan sát bảo đảm tin tức chiến đấu |
| combat wing | liên đoàn không quân chiến đấu; không đoàn chiến đấu |
| combat zone | khu vực tác chiến; vùng hoạt động chiến đấu |
| Commande | tư lệnh (trưởng) chiến dịch |
| conducts an area defense | tiến hành phòng ngự khu vực |
| Coordination system | hệ thống phối hợp hỏa lực |
| crack defenses | chỉ huy / đánh thủng phòng ngự |
| cut behind defenses | chọc sâu phía sau tuyến phòng ngự địch |
| Defense in depth | phòng ngự chiều sâu |
| Defense suppression weapon | vũ khí chế áp lực lượng phòng không |
| demoralize the defense | làm mất tinh thần lực lượng phòng ngự |
| dent defense | đánh thọc sâu hệ thống phòng ngự |
| employ the perimeter defense | sử dụng chiến thuật phòng ngự chu vi |
| engagement in battle (formal) | – sự tham chiến |
| English Term | Vietnamese Translation |
| establishes a perimeter defense | thiết lập phòng ngự chu vi |
| Fire (noun/verb) | hỏa lực; phóng (tên lửa); ngọn lửa; bắn (súng); gây nổ; đốt cháy |
| Fire support | sự chi viện hỏa lực |
| Fire support channel | tuyến thông tin liên lạc chi viện hỏa lực |
| Fire support commander | người chỉ huy lực lượng chi viện hỏa lực |
| Fire support control center | đài chỉ huy chi viện hỏa lực |
| Fire support coordination center | trung tâm hiệp đồng chi viện hỏa lực |
| Fire support coordination element | nhóm hiệp đồng chi viện hỏa lực |
| Fire support coordination line | tuyến hiệp đồng chi viện hỏa lực |
| Fire support coordinator | sĩ quan hiệp đồng chi viện hỏa lực |
| Fire support element | phân đội chi viện (hỏa lực) |
| Fire support group | đội (tàu) chi viện hỏa lực |
| Fire support helicopter | máy bay trực thăng chi viện hỏa lực |
| Fire support means | phương tiện chi viện hỏa lực |
| Fire support missile | tên lửa chi viện hỏa lực |
| Fire support plan | kế hoạch chi viện hỏa lực |
| Fire support plan annex | phụ lục kèm theo kế hoạch chi viện hỏa lực |
| Fire support sector | khu chi viện hỏa lực (đổ bộ đường biển) |
| Fire support ships | chiến hạm chi viện hỏa lực |
| Fire support table | bảng bắn; bảng chi viện hỏa lực |
| Fire support team | nhóm chi viện hỏa lực; cụm hỏa lực |
| Fireball | quả cầu lửa (của vụ nổ hạt nhân) |
| Fired | đã bắn |
| Fireproof | chịu lửa; không cháy; chống cháy |
| Fireproof | chịu lửa; không cháy; chống cháy |
| Firing | sự bắn; phát bắn; sự nổ (mìn); sự phóng (tên lửa); sự khởi động (động cơ); sự giật mìn; sự bắt lửa của ngòi nổ |
| focus the defense | tập trung phòng ngự |
| force center  | trung tâm dự báo khí tượng |
| force cone  | đuôi nòng |
| force split forces  | phân chia lực lượng |
| force total  | lực tổng hợp, hợp lực |
| force-sensing  | sự đánh giá điểm nổ |
| Operation office | phòng tác chiến (ở căn cứ không quân) |
| Operation officer | sĩ quan tác chiến |
| Operation officer | sĩ quan tác chiến |
| Operation specialist | chuyên gia về các vấn đề chiến dịch |
| Operation tower | trạm kiểm tra - điều phối |
| Operational | (thuộc) tác chiến, (thuộc) hành quân |
| Operation's planner | sĩ quan lập kế hoạch tác chiến |
| Operation's support officer | sĩ quan bảo đảm chiến dịch |
| organizes an area defense | tổ chức phòng ngự khu vực |
| penetrating the defense | xuyên thủng phòng ngự |
| planning an area defense | lập kế hoạch phòng ngự khu vực |
| prepare the defense | chuẩn bị phòng ngự |
| skirmish battle (military jargon)  | trận giao tranh nhỏ |
| skirmish battle (military jargon)  | trận giao tranh nhỏ |
| skirmish battle (military jargon)  | trận giao tranh nhỏ |

**APENDIX C**

**Pragmatic Explicitation**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **English Term** | **Vietnamese Translation** |
| air doctrine | học thuyết quân sự sử dụng lực lượng không quân |
| aircraft operation | máy bay chiến đấu; máy bay sẵn sàng thực hiện nhiệm vụ |
| avoid the battle  | tránh trận đánh |
| call off the battle  | hủy bỏ trận đánh |
| Change operation | sự thay đổi kế hoạch chiến dịch; sự thay đổi kế hoạch trận đánh |
| combat arms | binh chủng tham chiến |
| combat aviation | không quân chiến đấu; không quân lục quân |
| combat aviation battalion | tiểu đoàn không quân lục quân |
| combat aviation company | đại đội không quân lục quân |
| combat award | huân chương chiến đấu |
| combat base | nhóm chi viện; căn cứ chiến dịch |
| combat body | đơn vị chiến đấu; binh đoàn chiến đấu |
| combat boots | giày cao cổ, ủng dã chiến |
| combat box | đội hình chiến đấu “hình hộp” |
| combat canister | hộp mặt nạ phòng độc |
| combat capable crew | phi đội có khả năng chiến đấu |
| combat capacity | khả năng chiến đấu |
| combat car | xe chiến đấu hạng nhẹ, chiến xa |
| combat cargo air unit | đơn vị không quân vận chuyển quân đổ bộ |
| combat cargo command | bộ chỉ huy không quân vận tải |
| combat cargo mission | nhiệm vụ chuyển hàng đến khu vực tác chiến |
| combat cargo officer | sĩ quan tiếp vận chiến dịch |
| combat cargo plane | máy bay vận chuyển quân đổ bộ |
| combat cargo supply unit | đơn vị vận chuyển hàng hóa quân sự |
| combat carrier | xe vận chuyển chiến đấu |
| combat celling | trần bay chiến đấu |
| combat centurion award | huân chương vì 100 lần cất cánh chiến đấu |
| combat chart | sơ đồ tác chiến hải quân |
| combat chemical intelligence | tình báo hóa học trong quá trình chiến đấu |
| combat chronicle | biên niên sử quân sự, biên niên sử |
| combat command | bộ chỉ huy chiến đấu |
| combat commander | tư lệnh, trưởng bộ chỉ huy chiến đấu |
| combat commission | sự phong quân hàm sĩ quan cho lực lượng đang chiến đấu |
| combat comrades | bạn chiến đấu |
| combat facility | công trình chiến đấu |
| combat forces | lực lượng chiến đấu |
| combat heart | tinh thần chiến đấu |
| combat officer | sĩ quan tại ngũ; sĩ quan chiến đấu |
| combat radius (capability) | bán kính tác chiến |
| combat range | trường bắn để huấn luyện bắn chiến đấu |
| combat ration | khẩu phần chiến đấu |
| combat readiness | sự sẵn sàng chiến đấu |
| combat readiness marksmanship proficiency course | khóa sát hạch bắn đạn thật |
| combat readiness trainer | máy bay huấn luyện chiến đấu |
| combat readiness training | sự huấn luyện phi công |
| combat ready posture | tính sẵn sàng chiến đấu |
| combat realism | điều kiện sát thực tế chiến đấu |
| combat reconnaissance | sự trinh sát chiến thuật, sự trinh sát chiến đấu |
| combat record | lịch sử chiến đấu |
| combat regiment | trung đoàn công binh |
| combat replacement | bổ sung quân chiến đấu |
| combat replacement factor | hệ số bổ sung chiến đấu |
| combat report | bản báo cáo tác chiến (khẩn cấp); báo cáo chiến đấu |
| combat reserve | lực lượng dự bị chiến đấu |
| combat reserve ration | lượng dự trữ lương thực chiến đấu |
| combat resupply | sự bổ sung tiêu hao phương tiện vật chất trong chiến đấu |
| combat scarred | được tôi luyện trong chiến đấu; có kinh nghiệm chiến đấu |
| combat search and rescue | tìm kiếm và giải cứu trong chiến đấu |
| combat sector | đoạn địa hình tác chiến; phân khu chiến đấu |
| combat security | sự bảo đảm chiến đấu; cảnh giới chiến đấu |
| combat service | phục vụ chiến đấu; bảo đảm hậu cần |
| combat service element | phân đội phục vụ chiến đấu |
| combat service group | nhóm phục vụ chiến đấu |
| combat service mask | mặt nạ phòng độc binh chủng hợp thành |
| combat service support | sự bảo đảm hậu cần cho bộ đội trong trận đánh |
| combat serviceable | có thể sử dụng trong điều kiện chiến đấu |
| combat serviceable clothing | quần áo sử dụng trong điều kiện chiến đấu |
| combat shakedown | sự vận dụng kiến thức đã học vào điều kiện chiến đấu |
| combat signal | tín hiệu (quy ước) chỉ huy chiến đấu |
| combat situation | tình hình chiến sự, tình hình chiến đấu |
| combat skill | kỹ năng chiến đấu; chuyên môn quân sự |
| combat speed | tốc độ chiến đấu |
| combat station | trạm chiến đấu |
| combat strength | biên chế chiến đấu; thành phần chiến đấu |
| combat stress | sự căng thẳng của trận đánh |
| combat strong | lực lượng chiến đấu mạnh |
| combat suit | quân phục chiến đấu |
| combat support | chi viện chiến đấu; yểm trợ tác chiến |
| combat support company | đại đội chi viện hỏa lực |
| combat support computation | sự tính toán để bảo đảm chiến đấu |
| combat support element | phân đội trợ chiến, phân đội chi viện |
| combat support intelligence | tình báo quân sự |
| combat support plan | kế hoạch bảo đảm vật chất |
| combat support training center | trung tâm huấn luyện lực lượng hậu cần |
| combat support troops | lực lượng chi viện trực tiếp; đơn vị và cơ quan hậu cần |
| combat survival | hoạt động giải thoát trong điều kiện chiến đấu |
| combat task | nhiệm vụ chiến đấu |
| combat team | tổ chiến đấu; cụm chiến đấu; toán chiến đấu |
| combat television | sử dụng vô tuyến truyền hình trong chiến đấu |
| combat theater | chiến trường; khu vực hoạt động quân sự |
| combat thrust booster | bộ tăng tốc cơ động |
| combat tire | bộ săm lốp chống đạn (dùng cho xe chiến đấu) |
| combat trained | đã được huấn luyện chiến đấu |
| combat training | sự huấn luyện chiến đấu |
| combat training center | trung tâm huấn luyện chiến đấu |
| combat training command | ban chỉ huy huấn luyện chiến đấu |
| combat training unit | đơn vị huấn luyện chiến đấu |
| combat vehicle | xe chiến đấu |
| combat vehicle ammunition | đạn dược cho xe chiến đấu |
| combat vehicle main armament system | hệ thống vũ khí chủ yếu của xe chiến đấu |
| combat vehicle weapon system | tổ hợp vũ khí của xe chiến đấu |
| combat veteran | cựu chiến binh |
| combat visual information support center | trung tâm quan sát bảo đảm tin tức chiến đấu |
| combat weary | bị mệt mỏi trong trận đánh; bị hư hỏng trong trận đánh |
| combat weight | trọng lượng chiến đấu |
| combat wing | liên đoàn không quân chiến đấu; không đoàn chiến đấu |
| combat wise | tinh thông về chiến thuật, có kinh nghiệm chiến đấu |
| combat workout | huấn luyện chiến đấu; luyện tập chiến đấu |
| combat worthiness | sự thích dụng cho chiến đấu, tính thích hợp cho chiến đấu |
| combat worthy | thích dụng cho chiến đấu, thích hợp cho chiến đấu |
| combat zone | khu vực tác chiến; vùng hoạt động chiến đấu |
| concept operation | ý định chiến dịch |
| control operation | chỉ huy tác chiến; chỉ huy chiến đấu |
| declare battle  | tuyên bố trận đánh |
| Defense Advisory Committee | Ủy ban tư vấn Bộ Quốc phòng (Mỹ) |
| delay the battle  | trì hoãn trận đánh |
| end the battle  | kết thúc trận đánh |
| escalate the battle  | leo thang trận đánh |
| Fire away | nổ súng |
| Fire blank | bắn đạn giả |
| Fire broadside | bắn tất cả các súng một bên mạn tàu |
| Fire by order | bắn theo lệnh |
| Fire by single shots | bắn phát một |
| Fire concentrations | bắn tập trung |
| Fire for effect | bắn tiêu diệt |
| Fire from defilade | bắn từ trận địa hỏa lực che khuất |
| Fire in bursts | bắn loạt |
| Fire in long bursts | bắn loạt dài |
| Fire in short bursts | bắn loạt ngắn |
| Fire in support (of) | chi viện hỏa lực (cho) |
| Fire on call | bắn theo yêu cầu |
| Fire over the sights | bắn ngắm trực tiếp |
| Fire overhead | bắn qua đầu đơn vị bạn |
| Fire short of the no fire line | bắn gần |
| Fire shot for shot | bắn phát một |
| Fire smoke | bắn đạn khói |
| Fire tapers off | hỏa lực yếu |
| Fire through gaps in the friendly lines | bắn qua khoảng cách giữa các đội hình chiến đấu quân bạn |
| Fire within the battle area (friendly lines) | bắn quân địch xuất hiện ở vị trí quân bạn |
| Flush by fire | chế áp bằng hỏa lực |
| force a battle  | buộc phải giao chiế |
| force door  | cửa ngăn nước (ở xe tăng) |
| force feed gun  | bơm nhớt |
| force issue  | phân phát cưỡng bách (thực phẩm bị hỏng) |
| force point (site)  | bến vượt qua chỗ nước nông |
| force rendezvous  | khu vực tập trung (máy bay đổ bộ) |
| Full automatic fire | bắn liên tục |
| Get fully operational | đưa vào sẵn sàng chiến đấu toàn bộ |
| Grazing fire | hỏa lực sát mặt đất |
| halt the battle  | ngừng trận đánh |
| Hammer fire | búa phát lửa |
| Hammer with fire | bắn mãnh liệt |
| Hang fire | bắn chậm |
| Hold fire | tạm ngừng bắn |
| Hold under fire | chế áp bằng hỏa lực |
| Hug the fire | áp sát theo tiếng nổ của đạn đại bác quân bạn |
| Immobilize by fire | kìm hãm bằng hỏa lực |
| Invite fire | thu hút hỏa lực địch |
| Keep under fire | khống chế bằng hỏa lực |
| Launch fire | phát hỏa |
| Lay down fire | phát hỏa |
| Lift fire | chuyển di hỏa lực (vào chiều sâu) |
| Maneuver fires | cơ động hỏa lực |
| Mask fires | tạo ra khối chắn để bắn |
| Mass fire | tập trung hỏa lực |
| Obliterate by fire | tiêu diệt bằng hỏa lực |
| Observe fire | quan sát kết quả bắn |
| Obtain fires | yêu cầu hỏa lực |
| Open fire | bắt đầu bắn |
| Operation map | bản đồ tác chiến; bản đồ tình hình |
| Operation schedule | kế hoạch chiến dịch (theo các giai đoạn) |
| Operation's group | nhóm chiến dịch (của bộ tham mưu) |
| Operation's instructions | mệnh lệnh chiến đấu |
| Operation's section | bộ phận tác chiến; ban tác chiến |
| Operation's subsection | ban tác chiến |
| Overfire | bắn quá cao |
| Overhead fire | bắn qua đầu |
| Place under fire | đặt dưới hỏa lực |
| Ramp up fire | tăng cường hỏa lực |
| Ranged fire | bắn ở khoảng cách |
| Reduce fire | giảm cường độ hỏa lực |
| Restore fire | khôi phục hỏa lực |
| resume the battle  | tiếp tục trận đánh |
| Return fire | bắn phản kích |
| Run into fire | gặp phải hỏa lực |
| Saturate with fire | bắn mạnh |
| Secure supporting fires | bảo đảm chi viện hỏa lực |
| Shift fire | chuyển di hỏa lực (theo chính diện) |
| Smother up fire | bắn chế áp |
| Spill fire | bắn ra ngoài giới hạn xác định |
| Sporadic fire | bắn rời rạc |
| Suppressing fire | hỏa lực chế áp |
| Sweep fire | quét hỏa lực |
| Tight fire | hỏa lực dồn dập |
| turn the tide of battle  | làm thay đổi cục diện trận đánh |
| Uncover fire | bắn bộc lộ |
| Vary fire | thay đổi cách bắn |
| Vertical fire | hỏa lực từ trên cao |
| Volley fire | bắn loạt |
| Withering fire | hỏa lực mãnh liệt |

**APENDIX D**

**Amplification**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **English Term** | **Vietnamese Translation** |
| a reverse slope defense | phòng ngự ở sườn dốc phía sau |
| a reverse-slope defense | phòng ngự ở sườn núi khuất |
| a Y-shaped perimeter defense | phòng ngự chu vi hình chữ Y |
| base operation | căn cứ chiến dịch; căn cứ hải quân (50% các phương tiện phục vụ tại chỗ) |
| battalion area defense | phòng ngự khu vực cấp tiểu đoàn |
| bitter battle –  | trận đánh dữ dộ |
| bloody battle –  | trận đánh đẫm máu |
| chain of command | hệ thống chỉ huy hành quân |
| combat aviation | không quân chiến đấu; không quân lục quân |
| combat aviation battalion | tiểu đoàn không quân lục quân |
| combat aviation company | đại đội không quân lục quân |
| combat award | huân chương chiến đấu |
| combat base | nhóm chi viện; căn cứ chiến dịch |
| combat body | đơn vị chiến đấu; binh đoàn chiến đấu |
| combat boots | giày cao cổ, ủng dã chiến |
| combat box | đội hình chiến đấu “hình hộp” |
| combat canister | hộp mặt nạ phòng độc |
| combat capable crew | phi đội có khả năng chiến đấu |
| combat capacity | khả năng chiến đấu |
| combat cargo air unit | đơn vị không quân vận chuyển quân đổ bộ |
| combat cargo command | bộ chỉ huy không quân vận tải |
| combat cargo mission | nhiệm vụ chuyển hàng đến khu vực tác chiến |
| combat cargo officer | sĩ quan tiếp vận chiến dịch |
| combat cargo plane | máy bay vận chuyển quân đổ bộ |
| combat cargo supply unit | đơn vị vận chuyển hàng hóa quân sự |
| combat carrier | xe vận chuyển chiến đấu |
| combat celling | trần bay chiến đấu |
| combat centurion award | huân chương vì 100 lần cất cánh chiến đấu |
| combat chart | sơ đồ tác chiến hải quân |
| combat chemical intelligence | tình báo hóa học trong quá trình chiến đấu |
| combat chronicle | biên niên sử quân sự, biên niên sử |
| combat heart | tinh thần chiến đấu |
| combat radius (capability) | bán kính tác chiến |
| combat range | trường bắn để huấn luyện bắn chiến đấu |
| combat ration | khẩu phần chiến đấu |
| combat readiness | sự sẵn sàng chiến đấu |
| combat readiness marksmanship proficiency course | khóa sát hạch bắn đạn thật |
| combat readiness trainer | máy bay huấn luyện chiến đấu |
| combat readiness training | sự huấn luyện phi công |
| combat ready posture | tính sẵn sàng chiến đấu |
| combat realism | điều kiện sát thực tế chiến đấu |
| combat reconnaissance | sự trinh sát chiến thuật, sự trinh sát chiến đấu |
| combat scarred | được tôi luyện trong chiến đấu; có kinh nghiệm chiến đấu |
| combat search and rescue | tìm kiếm và giải cứu trong chiến đấu |
| combat security | sự bảo đảm chiến đấu; cảnh giới chiến đấu |
| combat service | phục vụ chiến đấu; bảo đảm hậu cần |
| combat service support | sự bảo đảm hậu cần cho bộ đội trong trận đánh |
| combat serviceable | có thể sử dụng trong điều kiện chiến đấu |
| combat serviceable clothing | quần áo sử dụng trong điều kiện chiến đấu |
| combat shakedown | sự vận dụng kiến thức đã học vào điều kiện chiến đấu |
| combat signal | tín hiệu (quy ước) chỉ huy chiến đấu |
| combat situation | tình hình chiến sự, tình hình chiến đấu |
| combat skill | kỹ năng chiến đấu; chuyên môn quân sự |
| combat speed | tốc độ chiến đấu |
| combat station | trạm chiến đấu |
| combat stress | sự căng thẳng của trận đánh |
| combat superiority | ưu thế chiến đấu; ưu thế quân sự |
| combat support | chi viện chiến đấu; yểm trợ tác chiến |
| combat support computation | sự tính toán để bảo đảm chiến đấu |
| combat support element | phân đội trợ chiến, phân đội chi viện |
| combat support intelligence | tình báo quân sự |
| combat support plan | kế hoạch bảo đảm vật chất |
| combat support training center | trung tâm huấn luyện lực lượng hậu cần |
| combat support troops | lực lượng chi viện trực tiếp; đơn vị và cơ quan hậu cần |
| combat survival | hoạt động giải thoát trong điều kiện chiến đấu |
| combat task | nhiệm vụ chiến đấu |
| combat team | tổ chiến đấu; cụm chiến đấu; toán chiến đấu |
| combat television | sử dụng vô tuyến truyền hình trong chiến đấu |
| combat theater | chiến trường; khu vực hoạt động quân sự |
| combat thrust booster | bộ tăng tốc cơ động |
| combat tool | phương tiện chiến đấu |
| combat train | đoàn vận tải hậu cần (thuộc) thê đội một |
| combat uniform | quân phục chiến đấu |
| combat vehicle | xe chiến đấu |
| combat vehicle ammunition | đạn dược cho xe chiến đấu |
| combat vehicle main armament system | hệ thống vũ khí chủ yếu của xe chiến đấu |
| combat vehicle weapon system | tổ hợp vũ khí của xe chiến đấu |
| combat visual information support center | trung tâm quan sát bảo đảm tin tức chiến đấu |
| operation communications | thông tin liên lạc trong tác chiến; thông tin liên lạc trong chiến đấu |
| Company defense | phòng ngự cấp đại đội |
| Control authority | quyền điều hành chiến dịch; (snh) người chỉ huy chiến dịch |
| deadly battle | trận đánh chết người |
| decisive battle  | trận đánh quyết định |
| Defense again methods of entry | phòng ngự chống thâm nhập |
| Defense arsenal | thiết bị kỹ thuật phòng ngự |
| Defense coordination center | Trung tâm phối hợp phòng ngự |
| Defense development and production sharing program | Chương trình chia sẻ sản xuất quốc phòng |
| Defense Establishment | Lực lượng / Thể chế quốc phòng |
| Defense in place | phòng ngự cố định / tại chỗ |
| Defense island | ổ chống cự / ổ đề kháng |
| Defense line | tuyến/dải phòng ngự |
| Defense of the river line | phòng ngự theo tuyến vật cản nước |
| Defense on wide front | phòng ngự trên chính diện rộng |
| Defense template | thước chỉ huy phòng ngự |
| Defense training range | trường bắn huấn luyện phòng ngự |
| desperate battle  | trận đánh tuyệt vọng |
| Fire support | sự chi viện hỏa lực |
| Fire support channel | tuyến thông tin liên lạc chi viện hỏa lực |
| Fire support commander | người chỉ huy lực lượng chi viện hỏa lực; tư lệnh (trưởng) lực lượng chi viện hỏa lực |
| Fire support committee | ủy ban chi viện hỏa lực (trong chiến dịch đổ bộ) |
| Fire support control center | đài chỉ huy chi viện hỏa lực |
| Fire support coordination | (sự) hiệp đồng chi viện hỏa lực |
| Fire support coordination center | trung tâm hiệp đồng chi viện hỏa lực |
| Fire support coordination element | nhóm hiệp đồng chi viện hỏa lực |
| Fire support coordination line | tuyến hiệp đồng chi viện hỏa lực |
| Fire support coordinator | sĩ quan hiệp đồng chi viện hỏa lực |
| Fire support element | phân đội chi viện (hỏa lực) |
| Fire support group | đội (tàu) chi viện hỏa lực; cụm tàu chi viện hỏa lực |
| Fire support helicopter | máy bay trực thăng chi viện hỏa lực |
| Fire support means | phương tiện chi viện hỏa lực |
| Fire support missile | tên lửa chi viện hỏa lực |
| Fire support plan | kế hoạch chi viện hỏa lực |
| Fire support plan annex | phụ lục kèm theo kế hoạch chi viện hỏa lực |
| Fire support sector | khu chi viện hỏa lực (đổ bộ đường biển); tiểu khu yểm trợ hỏa lực |
| Fire support ships | chiến hạm chi viện hỏa lực |
| Fire support table | bảng bắn; bảng chi viện hỏa lực |
| Fire support team | nhóm chi viện hỏa lực; cụm hỏa lực |
| Fireball | quả cầu lửa (của vụ nổ hạt nhân) |
| Firepower | sức mạnh hỏa lực; phương tiện hỏa lực; lực lượng hỏa lực |
| Fireproof | chịu lửa; không cháy; chống cháy |
| force elimination  | sự ra quân, sự giải ngũ |
| force landing  | buộc phải hạ cánh, hạ cánh khẩn cấp |
| force march  | hành quân cấp tốc |
| force reduction in strength  | sự giảm quân số đã được ấn định trước |
| force relief  | ra quân, giải ngũ |
| force retrograde movement  |  buộc phải rút lui |
| forces allocated to NATO  | lực lượng được tách ra để nhập vào lực lượng liên quân NATO |
| forces build-up  | sự tập trung lực lượng |
| historic battle  | trận đánh mang tính lịch sử |
| ierce battle  | trận đánh ác liệt |
| intense battle | trận đánh căng thẳng |
| long battle  | trận đánh kéo dài |
| Operation evaluation | sự phân tích tác chiến; sự phân tích hoạt động chiến đấu |
| Operation evaluation group | nhóm phân tích kinh nghiệm hoạt động chiến đấu; nhóm phân tích kinh nghiệm chiến dịch |
| Operation map overlay | bản đồ chiến dịch (trên bàn can); sơ đồ tình hình chiến dịch trên bản đồ chế tạo bằng vật liệu trong suốt |
| Operation mission | phái đoàn chiến dịch quân sự; nhiệm vụ chiến dịch |
| Operation office | phòng tác chiến (ở căn cứ không quân); sở chỉ huy |
| Operation record book | sổ tay tác chiến; sổ tay chiến dịch |
| Operation room | phòng tác chiến; sở chỉ huy; đài chỉ huy |
| Operation squadron | phi đội bảo đảm chiến dịch |
| strategic battle  | trận đánh mang tính chiến lược |