

STRUCTURAL AND SEMANTIC FEATURES OF THE ENGLISH AND UZBEK PHRASEOLOGICAL UNITS OF MILITARY DISCOURSE

Khakimova Dildora Ikromovna*

*Doctoral Student,
Samarkand State University,
UZBEKISTAN
Email id: lucky_dilya86@mail.ru

DOI: 10.5958/2278-4853.2022.00051.9

ABSTRACT

The present article is devoted to investigating the structural components of phraseological units of military discourse as well as to their semantic meaning as to the component which nominates a definite military object, phenomenon, action or military rank. Moreover, the models for forming phraseological units of military topics are defined based on their structure.

KEYWORDS: *Semantics, Structural Peculiarities, Model Of Formation, Phraseological Unit, Military Object, Act, Process.*

INTRODUCTION

In world linguistics, more and more increasingly, the object of scientific research covers a range of problems associated with the functioning of professional linguistic units, as well as their semantic nature and features of use in a particular area. Knowledge of a foreign language can give the military the possibility of easy access to information about military professionals.

In the world's leading research schools, special attention is given to the study of the semantic and functional features of phraseological units of certain areas of language use. Of particular importance are the problems associated with the formation and functioning of phraseological units of language and speech forms, the peculiarities of their translation into other languages, and the correspondence between their semantic and connotative meanings.

Classification, without a doubt, is a universal property of language, to which great attention is given in modern linguistic theory. For example, classification is considered to be as a model of the "linguistic picture of the world", and the classification moment is present in the linguistic nomination itself, which is often inaccessible via direct observation, and so on [M.I. Rasulova, 2021, p. 158].

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The military sphere has been the object of investigation in various dissertations on the material of one or many languages. Mostly researchers examined the lexical and grammatical system of military terms in linguistics. For example, Colby Elbridge compiled "Army Talk: a familiar dictionary of soldier speech" [Colby Elbridge, 2008, 310 p.]. V.V. Chebotareva investigated military terms in the English language and speech [V.V. Chebotareva, 2008, p. 90-96]. F.I.

Ergasheva considered the ways of forming English military terms are formed [F.I. Ergasheva, 2010, p. 36-44].

S.E. Erkinov wrote his PhD thesis on the topic “System-functional aspects of military-professional language units (on the material of the English language)” [S.E. Erkinov, 2020, 156 p.]. Yu. N. Sdobnova investigated terms from the military service in France [Yu. N. Sdobnova, 2014, p. 195-209]. M.A. Shevchenko, P.J. Mitchell compiled a manual titled “Military-naval resources of Great Britain” [M.A. Shevchenko, P.J. Mitchell, 2016, 242 p.]. V.N. Shevchuk studied derived military terms in the English language [V.N. Shevchuk, 2003, 231 p.]. Russian military speech, words and expressions were investigated by V.I. Shlyakhov [V.I. Shlyakhov, 2011, 328 p.]. In the present article these works are used as foundational material.

The following methods were used in the present article: methods of linguistic description, componential analysis, method of classification and comparative analysis.

The object of the research in the present article contains phraseological units (further PhUs) of military discourse that are classified according to the names of military objects, acts or processes.

Results and Discussion

Most of importantly, the cultural content of the language is manifested in phraseology, which is the study of stable combinations of words, clichés, proverbs, sayings and catchphrases [M.I. Rasulova, 2005, p. 207]. The object of study in phraseology is phraseological turns, i.e., stable combinations of words that are similar to words, but distinguished by their reproducibility as ready-made and integral units [N.M. Shanskiy, 1985, p. 4].

Phraseologisms transform important information about the norms of behaviour, material and spiritual values and social principles of the given linguistic society [E.M. Lyulcheva, 2015, p. 216]. Phraseologisms as linguistic phenomena are sources of information about a certain sociohistorical period [A.E. Mamatov, 1999, p. 53].

Semantically, nature of phraseological units is a fairly large store of knowledge is embedded in phraseological units and this knowledge is actualized in the process of communication through the form of various associations that provide the listener/reader with an opportunity to understand the meaning of a particular phraseological unit [N.Z. Nasrullaeva, 2018, p. 113].

Phraseological units are semantically related words and sentences that are not formed according to the general laws of ordinary phrases, but are reproduced in speech in a finished state, and have a fixed structure and a certain lexical composition [V.N. Teliya, 1998, p. 559].

English and Uzbek phraseological units for naming military objects

After World War I, an expression to describe a large gun was formed: *Big Bertha*. At first this phrase was jargon spoken by military people, but then the use of the expression eventually expanded the boundaries and it acquired widespread use not only in speech discourse, but also in fictional texts:

The Germans constructed enormous siege guns, known as “Big Bertha”, and set them up in a forest behind Laon, and were firing shells into Paris from a distance of seventy-five miles (U. Sinclair, “World’s End”, chapter 22).

In the Uzbek military discourse, there are phrases denoting the leader of the army: *қўшиннинг боши, қўшиннинг юраги*.

Commander's role in military affairs is great, which is proven by the example of the PhU *general's battle* – a battle, the outcome of which is decided by a skillful command [Dictionary of military terms, p. 68]. No less important is the *pitched battle*, a carefully prepared, fierce battle [A.V. Kunin, 1967, p. 68]. The expression *soldier's battle* has acquired a positive connotation – a battle, the outcome of which is decided by the soldier's valour. This example demonstrates the heroism of soldiers who are ready to give their lives for their homeland. Such soldiers are praised in heroic songs and poems. In English phraseology the expression *the bed of honour* indicates that the grave of a soldier who has fallen in battle [A.V. Kunin, 1967, p. 75]. The meaning of this phraseological unit is actualized on the basis of a metaphorical rethinking of the components of “bed” and “honour”. The bed is an object for sleeping, but in this phraseological unit it means a tomb or a grave. The word “honour” indicates the person who has been honoured with it, i.e. a soldier who fell in battle to defending his homeland.

Among military objects, a special place is occupied by the names of weapons and their components occupy a special place. Many of these names became part of military expressions, whose etymology lies in foreign languages: *blue beans* - bullets (German etymology, from *blaue Bohnen* - bluish lead) [A.V. Kunin, 1967, p. 70].

English And Uzbek Phraseological Units For Naming Military Actions

In the Uzbek military discourse such phraseological units function as *қатордан чиқармоқ, сафдан чиқармоқ*, used with unusable items of military equipment that is no longer functional. Therefore, the expression *танкни сафдан чиқармоқ* means “to render the tank unusable”. There are English analogues for this example: *come (or go) out of action* 1) get out of the battle, 2) get out, get out of action; *put out of action* – disable, knock out, spoil [A.V. Kunin, 1967, p. 26]. The last of the above phraseological units actualizes its meaning in the passive voice:

Someone should have put him out of action long ago,’ he said bitterly. (J. Aldridge, ‘I Wish He Would Not Die’, book II, ch.19).

Fred Winter resumes riding at Newbury today on Double Cross 11, the horse that put him out of action for five days when falling at Sandown last Saturday. (‘Daily Herald’, Jan.19, 1962).

In the history of the English language, the expression *beat to arms* – to call to arms [A.V. Kunin, 1967, p. 46], which pragmatically speaking, encourages a person to participate in the struggle for their homeland. It is this meaning that neutralizes the negativity of this expression and, on the contrary, is “saturated” with the sacred duty of any person to the homeland.

It should be emphasized that the wide popularity of the “military” component of the word “arms” is as part of English phraseological units: *present arms* – to take on guard [A.V. Kunin, 1967, p. 47].

Another frequently used word in phraseological units of military subjects is the word “battle”:

Do battle – to fight;

Drawn battle – an ineffectual battle;

Give (or offer) battle – to battle, to fight;

Fight a losing battle – to wage a useless fight, to wage a fight doomed to failure;

Fight somebody's battle for him – get into a fight on someone's behalf [A.V. Kunin, 1967, p. 68]:

“You knew that he was quixotic enough to fight your battles for you. Now he will be in trouble”.

“Asquith was not fighting my battles”, MacGregor said. “He was decent enough to give me a chance to escape the newspapers and to see a little sense on this affair” (J. Aldridge, “The Diplomat”, chapter 44).

English phraseology is replete with antonymic expressions, the opposite meaning of which is formed through semantically opposing components: *lose the battle* [A.V. Kunin, 1967, p. 571] and *win the battle*.

Language is a unique means for describing a wide variety of human activities, including military actions: *have (hold or keep) somebody at bay* 3) (military) do not give a respite to the enemy, constantly harass [A.V. Kunin, 1967, p. 69].

The semantic meaning of the English phraseological unit *stand at bay* - 3) (military) is based on persistent defence [A.V. Kunin, 1967, p. 69] and contains such qualities as endurance and stamina, which are conveyed by the component composition of the expression.

Military actions are directly related to the use of weapons: *draw a bead on* – to aim, take aim [A.V. Kunin, 1967, p. 69].

English And Uzbek Phraseological Units For Naming Military Processes

In military discourse, a special place is occupied by stable phrases denoting various processes that are directly or indirectly related to military topics [V.V. Modin, 2008, p. 83].

Such expressions are, in turn, are capable of expressing different assessments: positive, negative or neutral. For example, the following phraseological unit with a military theme expresses a negative assessment: *absence without leave* (military) unauthorized absence [A.V. Kunin, 1967, p. 22]. If we divide this phraseological unit into separate components, we see that they, in principle, do not convey any negativity. However, in military discourse, the content of which, first of all, is primarily related to the manifestation of courage and patriotism, the meaning of "unauthorized absence" leaves an unfavourable impression about the person who committed this act.

Structural Peculiarities Of The English And Uzbek Phraseologisms Of Military Terms

The most numerous subclass is PhU with the structure v + n. Because the leading method of expressing object communication in Uzbek is control, and in English it is contiguity, thus, the object-postpositive type with control in the Uzbek language corresponds to the object-postpositive type with contiguity in English: *carry off a sentry* – to capture, “remove” the guard; *keep sentry* – to stand on the clock, to guard [A.V. Kunin, 1967, p. 806].

In the Uzbek language, such expressions are built according to the noun + verb model: *қўнғилини ўстурмоқ* – to inspire; cheer up; encourage; to amuse; to reassure; to praise (smb.) [M. Sadikova, 1989, p. 163]; *мижжа қоқмай чиқмоқ* – do not close; spend the night without sleep [M. Sadikova, 1989, p. 172]:

Ўзлининг қамалишини қутмаган Саидакбар-Ҳожи гангиб қолди. Ўша куни кечаси билан мижджа қоқмай чиқди (Shuhrat).

It should be noted that the subclass "verb + noun (or noun + verb)" is quite numerous in both languages: *to hold smb. (as a) hostage* – to keep someone hostage; *to seize (take) smb. hostage* – to keep someone hostage; *бошини эгмоқ (букмоқ) = бои эгмоқ* [M. Sadikova, 1989, p. 58]; *бошини тикмоқ* – risk your life; be ready to give your life (for smb., smth.) [M. Sadikova, 1989, p. 58]:

Эртадан бери ёлғиз ўтирибман. Сен ўлгур бу уйда бир марта ҳам бошингни тикмадинг(Oybek).

The same subordinate-object types are characteristic of English phraseological units with the structure v + adj + n, the constant component of which is the adjective, the same subordinate-object types are characteristic: *rule with a heavy (or high) hand* arbitrarily control, control with an iron hand; *keep in tight-knit gloves* (etym. bibl.) [A.V. Kunin, 1967, p. 780]:

Determined to ride the fore-horse herself, Meg would admit no helpmate... and so, in single blessedness and with the despotism of Queen Bess herself she ruled all matters with a high hand ... [W. Scott, "St. Ronan's Well", ch. I].

One of the most numerous subclasses is formed by English phraseological units with the structure v + prep + n: *tobe in the running* to have a chance of winning [A.V. Kunin, 1967, p. 784]; *tobe out of the running* to leave the game, have no chance of winning, to be out of work [A.V. Kunin, 1967, p. 784]. We now give examples of phraseological units-antonyms built according to this model: *fall into ranks* to line up (about soldiers, etc.) [A.V. Kunin, 1967, p.741]; *rise from the ranks* 1) advance from rank and file to officer; 2) to go out to the people [A.V. Kunin, 1967, p. 741]:

In his time, the old gentleman was a working mason, and had risen from the ranks more, I think, by shrewdness than by merit [R. Stevenson, "The Wrecker", ch. 11].

It is customary to consider these terms as substantive phraseological units, that are functionally correlated with a noun, that is, phraseological units, the core component of which is a noun: *nominal (probationary or suspended) sentence* – a conditional sentence [A.V. Kunin, 1967, S. 806]; *active service* 1) participation in hostilities; 2) active military service [A.V. Kunin, 1967, S. 808]. Uzbek phraseological units: *ёли бор йузум* – a fearless fighter, a real man [M. Sadikova, 1989, p.99]; *дўст бор, душман бор* – there are friends, there are enemies; there are your own there are strangers (i.e., try not to fall on your face in the mud in front of them) [M. Sadikova, 1989, p. 91].

Adjective phraseological units should be considered, to be functionally correlated with adjectives, i.e., PU, the core component of which is the adjective. The share of adjective phraseological units in the total volume of the studied phraseological units is very insignificant. Here are some examples of English and Uzbek expressions: *a tight rein* – strict discipline; iron gauntlets [A.V. Kunin, 1967, p. 751]; *strained relations* – bad relations [A.V. Kunin, 1967, p. 751]; *кучга тўлган* – in the prime of life [M. Sadikova, 1989, p. 143].

Comparing both languages, one can see that there are phraseological units that are structurally related to the sentence. Phraseological units are typical for both English and Uzbek languages are

phraseological units, are built according to the structure of a simple sentence, and have components that correlate as subjects and predicates (and minor members of the sentence) and express a complete thought: *put somebody on his best behaviour* – grant a trial period so that a person can express himself [A.V. Kunin, 1967, p. 78]; *pay one's respects to somebody* – to honour someone, or give them respect [A.V. Kunin, 1967, p. 755]; *keep the memory (or the remembrance) of somebody alive (or something)* [A.V. Kunin, 1967, p. 757]; *замона чирсилаб тугибди* – the situation in the world is difficult, the world is facing a threat [M. Sadikova, 1989, p. 114]; *жаҳоннинг кетига ўт қўяди = дунёга ўт қўяди* – he will crush the whole world [M. Sadikova, 1989, p. 104].

As a rule, phraseological units based on the model of complex sentences (complex and complexly composed) are proverbs, among which it is possible to distinguish between figurative and non-figurative proverbs. If in non-descriptive proverbs the word-components are used in the literal sense, in their literal meanings, then in figurative proverbs the literal meanings of the word-components are rethought. In accordance with the definition of a phraseological unit that we have adopted, a few of figurative proverbs are included in the research material, since they are few in number and do not represent subclasses characteristic of both or for one or both languages. The following units can be cited as examples: *Wars bring scars* – war takes many lives = *Уруш зарар келтирар* [K.M. Karamatova, Kh.S. Karamatov, 2000, p. 369]; *When war begins, hell opens* – war brings many problems = *Урушли жой – мазор* [K.M. Karamatova, Kh.S. Karamatov, 2000, p. 369].

CONCLUSION

Phraseologisms related to military subjects are used to designate military service, hostilities and violent phenomena, military equipment, ranks and the everyday lives of military personnel. Thus, according to their semantic features, phraseological units of military discourse are subdivided into three main groups: 1) military objects, 2) military actions and 3) military processes. Several common models of the formation of phraseological units within the framework of the subject under study were identified according to their structural features.

REFERENCES

1. Colby Elbridge. Army Talk: a familiar dictionary of soldier speech. – Edition. 4th ed. Published. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2008. – 310 p.
 2. Chebotareva V.V. Angliyskiy voenniy termin v yazike i rechi // Sbornik nauchnih i nauchno-metodicheskikh trudov kafedri teorii prepodavaniya inostrannih yazikov MGU. – M.: MAKSS Press, 2008. – P. 90-96.
 3. Dictionary of military terms [Electronic resource]. – http://www.dtic.mil/doctrine/dod_dictionary/
 4. Ergasheva F.I. Sposobi obrazovaniya angliyskih voennih terminov // Prepodavanie yazika i literaturi. – Tashkent, 2010. – № 8. – P. 36-44.
 5. Erkinov S.E. Sistemno-funksionalnie aspekti voenno-professionalnih yazikovih edinits (na materiale angliyskogo yazika): PhD thesis. – Samarkand: SamSIFL, 2020. – 156 p.
 6. Karamatova K.M., Karamatov X.S. Proverbs. Maqollar. Poslovitsi. – Tashkent: Mehnat, 2000. – 398 p.
-

7. Kunin A. V. Anglo-russkiy frazeologicheskiy slovar. – Izd. 3-e, ispr., v dvuh knigah. – Moscow: SE, 1967. – T.1. – 738 p.; T.2. – 739-1264 p.
8. Lyulcheva E.M. Natsionalno-kulturnoe svoeobrazie frazeologicheskikh edinit angliyskogo yazika // Obrazovanie i pedagogicheskie nauki, 2015. - № 7. – P. 214-217.
9. Mamatov A.E. O‘zbek tili frazemalarining shakllanish masalalari: Avtoref. diss. ... d-ra filol. nauk. – Tashkent, 1999. – 56 p.
10. Modin V.V. Voennye teksty kak ob’ekt funktsionalnoy stilistiki // Yazik dlya spetsialnykh tseley kak ob’ekt funktsionalnoy stilistiki. – Siktivkar, 2008. – P. 83-87.
11. Nasrullaeva N.Z. Formirovaniye gendernykh konseptov v angliyskoy i uzbekskoy frazeologicheskikh kartinah mira: Diss. ... dok. filol. nauk. – Tashkent, 2018. – 250 p.
12. Rasulova M.I. Osnovy leksicheskoy kategorizatsii v lingvistike.– Tashkent: Fan, 2005. – 268 p.
13. Rasulova M.I. Problemy kategorizatsii na urovne teksta: ponyatie i interpretatsiya // Aktualnye problemy sovremennoy lingvistiki. Sbornik nauchnykh statey: k yubileyu professora D.U. Ashurovov. – Tashkent: VNESHINVESTPROM, 2021. – P. 158-170.
14. Sadikova M. Kratkiy uzbeksko-russkiy frazeologicheskiy slovar. – Tashkent: Uzbek Encyclopedia, 1989. – 336 p.
15. Sdobnova Yu.N. Nekotorye diskursivnye osobennosti sovremennoy voennoy terminosistemy vooruzhennykh sil Frantsii // Vestnik Moskovskogo gosudarstvennogo lingvisticheskogo universiteta. – 2014. - № 10 (696). P. 195-209.
16. Shanskiy N.M. Frazeologiya sovremennogo russkogo yazika. – Moscow: Visshaya shkola, 1985. – 160 p.
17. Shevchenko M.A., Mitchell P.Dj., Ignatov A.A. Voennno-morskie sili Velikobritanii. Angliyskiy yazik: uchebnoe posobie. – Tomsk, 2016. – 242 p.
18. Shevchuk V.N. Proizvodnye voennye terminy v angliyskom yazike: Affiksialnoe slovoproizvodstvo. – M.: Voenizdat, 2003. – 231 p.
19. Shevchuk V.N. Otnositelno inkorporatsii v angliyskikh voennykh terminakh // Semantiko-sintaksicheskiye problemy teorii yazika i perevoda. – M., 2006. – P. 191-204.
20. Shlyakhov V.I. Rossiyskaya i amerikanskaya voennaya razgovornaya sreda v slovak i virazheniyakh. – M.: URSS, 2011. – 328 p.
21. Teliya V.N. Frazeologizm // Yazikoznanie. Bolshoy ensiklopedicheskiy slovar. – 2-e izd. – Moscow: Russian encyclopedia, 1998. – 685 p.