Use of Military Terms in English

Rashidov Otabek Ziyodullaevich
Teacher, Termez State University

Abstract
This article deals with use of military terms in English. The saturation of the special terminology is a characteristic feature of military materials (in this study, it was found that there are an average of 13-15 terms on each page of the text of the combat manual). Military materials typically include military art materials, military journalistic and military-political materials, military scientific and military-technical materials, and military command documents (various military documents).

Keywords: military, work, average, feature, command

It is common to refer to military materials as scientific and technical materials and as control acts relating to the life and activities of military establishments of the troops and armed forces. Military fiction, military journalism, and military-political materials are military only in terms of relevance and subject matter, and have features that are essential to all socio-political, journalistic, and literary texts [Nelubin 1981]. Defining the boundaries of the concept is difficult in military terms, because the scope of military terminology is very wide and the most commonly used terms have a specific, narrow meaning in it. V.N. Shevchuk proposes the following definition of the concept of "military term": "a stable unit of synthetic or analytical nomination, in the sense regulated by its definition, is given to the relevant concept in the conceptual-functional system of a particular field of military profession." [Shevchuk 1989 , 8]. G.M. Strelkowski writes in his textbook "Theory and Practice of Military Translation. The German Language": exists. or activity. Therefore, it is not possible to speak about the general concept of "military term", but it is necessary to distinguish between tactical, organizational, military-technical terms, terms related to different branches and types of armed forces. All these are different directions of military knowledge and activity, and each of them has its own terminological character. In each of these directions the meaning of the term is very clear "[Strelkovsky 1979, 83]. In a general sense, military terminology includes all words and phrases that express military concepts, i.e., concepts directly related to the armed forces, military affairs, war, and so on. In addition, scientific and technical terms should be associated with a military dictionary with military concepts (for example, a track - a tank or trail of any combat vehicle, tracked). Terminology problems, in particular the blurring of the boundaries of the use of certain terms, as in the example above, A.I. Moiseev: "Typically, terms and all other signs related to terminology in general: semantic accuracy, precision, consistency, lack of synonymy, etc., are nothing more than their inclination or necessary qualities or, finally, the requirements for 'goodness.'" structured terminology. Consistency, weak meanings of real terms, examples of their polysemy, homonymy and synonymy are well known "[Moiseev 1970-1, 138]. In defining military terms in the future, we will rely on the works of B.N. Golovin, who studied the peculiarities of word terms [Golovin 1980, 4-11]. We list the most important of them: the interrelationship with the concept, not with a particular topic; the need for definition; formation of individual concepts specific to individual scientists; the interrelation of the meaning of the term with the meanings of other terms within the relevant terminological system; interrelationships with a particular professional activity, etc. "Thus, in the term a word, its objective meaning comes to the fore, being

subjective, evaluative, or completely removed or hidden" [Golovin 1980, 7]. Z.I. Komarova places the following requirements on the term: originality, clarity, brevity, consistency, emotional expressive neutrality, lack of modal and stylistic functions, indifference to context, habituality, lack of synonyms and homonyms in the same term system, and so on. [Komarova 1979]. Consistency can be called one of the most important features of terminological unity. The concept of a terminological system in linguistics is one of the basic concepts of terminology, which means that there is always a certain structure of its components, i.e. its components. From the point of view of A.V. Superanskaya, the terminological system should be viewed as a complex object in the direction from its components to the whole; and speaking of structure, in the direction from the integrity of the object to its parts and the nature of their interrelationships [Superanskaya 2004, 115]. The terminological system is "a linguistic model of a particular particular field that exists along with a logical model represented by a system of concepts and a system of definitions that reflects the logical model in the system of verbal signs". Military terminology can include words and phrases, although they do not correctly mean military concepts, they are used almost exclusively in the military environment, and are generally unknown or completely unknown (e.g., bondocks - forest; behavior report - house (soldier's house; side hands - tableware), as well as some foreign debts, various jargons, etc., as well as in many respects emotionally diverse elements of military vocabulary that are stylistic synonyms of relevant military terms (e.g., dough (colloquial word) and infantry (term) means "infantry") [Sudzilovsky 1979 , 37]. Changes in the composition of the military dictionary, especially the constant replenishment of it, the loss of a few words from it, the change in meaning are closely related to the constant development of the general conditions of the armed forces. After reading the document "FM 23-10 Sniper Training" ("DOA Sniper Training (FM 23-10)"), which was first issued in 1994 for the needs of the U.S. Army and covered not only the training of snipers, but to some extent. In all other areas of military affairs, we can define the main areas of activity of military terminology. Modern British military terminology defines new types of weapons - primarily nuclear missile defense systems (wire-protected missiles - guided missiles; rocket-propelled grenades - active missile projectiles; radioactive fallout - radioactive products of nuclear explosions), radio-electronic and other technical means. (instruction to the light rider - light control; laser range - laser distance detector; ambush detection device - (technical) ambush detection tools); terms related to the reorganization of ground forces and senior command structures (logistics operations center - rear control center); terms related to the change of some basic rules (doctrines) of tactics and operational art (electronic countermeasures - electronic countermeasures). It is important to keep in mind the significant differences in the English military vocabulary used in the United States and the United Kingdom. This is explained both by the specific features of the organization, the weapons, the tactics of the armed forces of these countries, and the differences between the English and American versions of modern English. For example, the concepts of 'connection' or 'unification' in the United States are expressed using this term, and in the United Kingdom - formation; general staff is the "common part of headquarters" in the United States, and the "operational intelligence part of headquarters" in the United Kingdom. There are differences in military titles, and especially in the organization's terminology: in the United States it is called "Secretary of Defense" and in the United Kingdom - Minister of Defense ... A number of terms are used only in the United States (e.g. Chief of Staff - "Chief of Staff" Armed Forces Service) ") or only in the UK (e.g. teams - the English military dictionary also includes a number of military terms specific to the armed forces of Canada, Australia and other English-speaking countries [Korovushkin 1980].

Thus, military terms, among other terminological features, are distinguished by specific areas of activity, and these areas themselves, along with a clear function and consistency, are a sign that

allows a word or phrase to be classified as a military term. Military terms and definitions are part of an open dynamic language system that undergoes certain changes and lives according to specific laws of development.

From ancient times, when military affairs emerged, a separate system was formed, and the thesaurus of special nomenclature terms used by military experts in wartime and in the daily life of the army expanded: ideology and propaganda, weapons, combat training. With the increasing sophistication of military equipment and the development of tactical and strategic capabilities, new names began to emerge and take root in the language: landing forces, military aviation, nuclear forces. Tactically obsolete items are gradually falling into the category of historicity: ballista, gaziri, line table, cavalry, red army. There is also an inseparable, indivisible "core" of universal terms that has survived for centuries: soldier, captain, navy, medal, victory. Military terminology serves its main purpose in the interests of society and the state, as it is related to the processes in political life (external and internal). Combining a meaningful "military" arsenal of language by compiling a dictionary of military terms is no easy task. On the one hand, the scope of the language opens up here, on the other hand, there is a specific urgent need for coding and systematization related to the legal side of the military life of society, among other things. In 2011, under the general editorship of D.O. Rogozin, the team of authors prepared a large scientific work - a unique dictionary-reference "On the terms and definitions of war and peace." This glossary of military terms is devoted to all the special terminology groups we have previously mentioned. It contains articles on various naming conventions on various topical issues - war and peace, military affairs, military history, contemporary issues of national and international security. For example, the dictionary interprets the military situation - the term is also heard in peaceful areas: martial law - the strategic deployment of the armed forces in accordance with the requirements of war.

The terminological system of the dictionary reveals the problems of military science and war theory, the history and classification of the Armed Forces and weapons, as well as economics, geography, pedagogy, history and law in this field.

Used literature

1. Бархударов Л.С. Общелингвистическое значение теории перевода. //В.сб.: «Теория и практика перевода». -Л., 1962.- с. 44-47.

2. Бархударов Л.С. Очерки по морфологии современного английского языка. М.: Высш. школа, 1975. -156 с.

3. Бархударов Л.С. Процесс перевода с лингвистической точки зрения. //В.сб.: «Конференция по вопросам теории и методики преподавания перевода. Тезисы докладов». -М., 1964.-с.61-63.

4. Бархударов Л.С., Штелинг Д.А. Грамматика английского языка. – М.: Высш. школа, 1965. – 482 с.

5. Бархударов Л.С., Я. И. Рецкер. Курс лекций по теории перевода. М., 1968.

6. Бенвенист Э. Общая лингвистика. – М.: Прогресс, 1974. –447 с.

7. Болдырова М.М. Сочетания to + Participle II со значением результативного состояния в современном английском языке. – В кн. : Учен. Зап. МГПИ т. 59. –Москва, 1971. –С. 35-44.

8. Большой англо-русский словарь. /Под руков. Гальперина И.Р. –Москва: Советская энциклопедия, 1972. I-II т. 1688 с.

9. Буронов Ж. Сравнительная типология английского и тюркских языков. – М.: Высшая школа, 1983. – 268 с.

10. Валгина Н.С. Синтаксис современного русского языка. – Москва: Высшая школа, 1978. - 439 с.

11. Делиева Л.М., Непесова Р.Г., Слонимская Н.Н. К методике сопостовительного исследования неродственных языков // Известия. Турк. сер., серия общественных наук. - №2. М., 1973.–С 47-55.

12. Каушанская В.Л., Ковнер Р.Л., Кожевникова О.Н., Прокофьева Е.Ф., Райнес З.М., Сквирская С.Е., Цырлина Ф.Я. Грамматика английского языка. – Л.: Просвещение. Ленингр. отд-ние, 1973. - 319 с.

13. Кацнельсон С.Д. Типология языка и речевое мышления. –Л.: Наука, 1972. -216 с.

14. Catford J. A linguistics theory of translation. Oxford, 1965.-556p.

15. Сепир Э. Положения лингвистики индоевропейских языков. //В кн.: Звегенцев В.А. История языкознания XIX – XX веков в очерках и извлечениях, ч. II . –М. 1960. -С. 134-141.

16. Julmatov T. "Юный Бек". -Ташкент, из-во Г.Гуляма 1997, с.288