



## THE SPECIFICITY OF THE FUNCTIONING AND TRANSLATION OF ABBREVIATIONS IN THE ENGLISH MILITARY DISCOURSE

**Avyasova Irina**

Senior teacher of Jizzakh state pedagogical university

### Article history:

### Abstract:

**Received:** 1<sup>st</sup> January 2023  
**Accepted:** 1<sup>st</sup> February 2023  
**Published:** 6<sup>th</sup> March 2023

The purpose of this article is to develop an effective method (algorithm) for translators to decipher abbreviations in order to understand source texts, based on the nature of certain procedures and cognitive operations used in the process. The authors of this paper typifies existing military abbreviations based on their structural characteristics, establishes the cognitive operations used in the process of decoding abbreviations, analyzes abbreviations and their decoding procedures element by element to determine the order of their use, create a cognitive model of perception, understanding, and decoding by translators of unfamiliar abbreviations, and identify methods and approaches used in this process and approaches used in this process.

**Keywords:** military terminology, graphic abbreviations, transformation-based, deciphering, lexico-semantic substitutions, descriptive translation.

### INTRODUCTION

Currently, the armed forces are one of the most important social institutions in most countries of the world. In view of the military-political contacts between the Russian Federation and NATO member states, as well as the continuous development of the armed forces, the renewal and modification of the technical component and weapons, changes in military directives, orders, charters or other documents, it becomes necessary to study military discourse and translate military texts. Military translation is a separate linguistic discipline due to the high requirements for the quality and accuracy of translation, errors in which, at best, will lead to arbitrary and subjective interpretation of the text and misunderstandings during negotiations, and at worst, they can cost someone their life or entail serious material costs. It requires an impeccable command of not only foreign military terminology, but also adequate Russian and Uzbek military terminology, which is regularly updated. In addition, the translator needs to have deep knowledge of a linguistic and cultural nature, since the approach to military affairs in different countries has significant differences, which is manifested both in the structure of military regulations and in the style of presenting the material. The relevance of the work is also due to the practical assistance in the activities of military translators and general translators, who often come across unfamiliar abbreviations, military abbreviations and, in general, military vocabulary. The purpose of this study is to study the ways of translating abbreviations of the English-language military discourse. The novelty of the study lies in the identification of the percentage of ways to translate military vocabulary, namely

abbreviations, on the basis of the US Army field manual for the training of snipers.[15]

### MATERIALS AND METHODS

The concept of "military discourse" was proposed by G.M. Strelkovskiy. He believes that "military discourse is a specific speech organization of the worldview, inherent exclusively to military personnel, characterized by comparability with the situation of speech communication, the situation that has developed in any military area, various military facts, reliable military-theoretical principles, as well as military- historical events and sources" [12, p. 164].

Military discourse is an institutional discourse because it has the properties of this type of discourse. So, the domestic scientist V.I. Karasik believes that in institutional discourse, participants in communication act as representatives of certain groups of people (boss-subordinate) [6, p. 291]. This type of communication, status-oriented discourse, refers to institutional communication, that is, to the verbal interaction of different representatives of social groups or institutions with each other, as well as with people who realize their role opportunities.

Military vocabulary can be divided into military terminology, which includes concepts related to the military sphere, and military-technical terminology, including scientific and technical terms, as well as slang words and phrases that are synonymous with established military terms and are used exclusively in the oral speech of military personnel [11, p. 25].

Modern English military vocabulary has a number of abbreviated lexical units that are used both in the oral speech of military personnel and in written form of directives, orders, and statutory documents.



In the scientific literature, the terms "abbreviation" and "abbreviation" are often used as synonyms. According to the well-known linguist O.D. Meshkov, the term "abbreviation" must be used in the broad sense of the word, and it is any abbreviated version of the spelling and pronunciation of a word (term) or phrase, regardless of its structure and the nature of the resulting unit [10, p. 40]. According to A.P. Shapovalova, A.P. Averyanova uses the terms "abbreviation" and "abbreviation" as synonyms [13, p. 55]. It must be emphasized that some linguists criticize this approach. For example, A.P. Shapovalova is of the opinion that the cited A.P. Averyanova, as examples, the words *Vtuz*, *MFA* cannot be classified as complex abbreviations, since they refer to alphabetic initial abbreviations, since they are formed from the initial letters of the original phrases ("Ministry of Foreign Affairs", "higher technical educational institution") [13, p. 56].

Supporters of the separation of these two terms are D.I. Alekseev and V.N. Shokurov. Alekseev believes that there are graphic abbreviations and letter abbreviations with a common method of formation, but with a different type of connection between the abbreviated word and its full form, as well as between the abbreviation and the name [1, p. 145]. V.N. Shokurov separates these two concepts, for example, he recommends that *VVS* be referred to as abbreviations, and *private* (from "private soldier") to abbreviations [14, p. 184].

Thus, the definition of O.D. Meshkov and V.V. Borisov. O.D. Meshkov interprets the concept of "abbreviation" as various processes, as a result of which a word is somehow reduced in comparison with its prototype [10, p. 32]. V.V. Borisov understands an abbreviation as "a letter or a short combination of letters that have an alphabetic resemblance to the original word or expression and are used instead of this word or expression for brevity" [2, p. 98].

Having studied the works of linguists at the end of the 20th century, it can be concluded that by "abbreviation" they understood the process of formation of abbreviations, and by the term "abbreviation" scientists understood the word itself, obtained as a result of abbreviation [5, p. 13].

Abbreviations are divided into lexical and graphic. Lexical abbreviations are used both in oral and written speech. Graphic abbreviations are not used in oral speech, but they are used in writing. Graphic abbreviations are not words and are used only in writing, but when read, they are deciphered and read in full (for example, *Svc Plt* - "service platoon" - "взвод обслуживания") [4, p. 25].

V.V. Borisov divides lexical abbreviations into two categories:

- Transformation-based abbreviations, among which truncations (for example, *co* - "company" - "потра") and abbreviations can be distinguished;

- abbreviations based on omission (for example, *private* - from "солдат", "военнослужащий низшего звания") [2, p. 54].

Abbreviations (letter abbreviations) are divided into abbreviations that are spelled (for example, *FDA* - forward defense area - "передовой район обороны"), and acronyms - words derived from the initial letters of the original combination of words that can be pronounced not by individual letters, but entirely (for example, *FEBA* - "Forward Edge of Battle Area" - "передний край района обороны") [2, p. 55].

It should be noted that in some cases, abbreviations change morphologically and phonetically, that is, they move from one type of abbreviation to another.

Abbreviations can be in the proposal the main and secondary members. Based on the rules of English grammar, they can take on the appropriate morphological design. But sometimes there are some inconsistencies with these rules. For example, you may encounter an unstable plural form or an unstable spelling. So, in the first case, the plural forms can be specified in different ways, for example, these *MOS* (military occupational specialties) and these *MOSSs*. And in the second case, the -s suffix can be attached with or without an apostrophe: *ten ICBM's* (intercontinental ballistic missiles) and *ten ICBMs*.

In fact, the formation of the plural of abbreviations occurs by adding the suffix -s at the end of the abbreviation, regardless of the way the full form of this abbreviation is pluralized. For example, *POW* prisoner of war - *POWs* prisoners of war; *EM* enlisted man - *EMs* enlisted men.

The appearance of a large number of abbreviations currently leads to difficulties in translating them, since one abbreviation can have many meanings. For example, in some combat documents, the official order of writing abbreviations is not observed, moreover, in a sentence, abbreviations may have different syntactic functions, and therefore, different morphological design (past tense, plural, possessive, article). This creates certain difficulties in translating military abbreviations.

## **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

When translating abbreviations, it is necessary to refer to a dictionary, but even dictionaries cannot provide all the meanings of abbreviations found in the



material. It is for this reason that it is necessary to know the methods of translating abbreviations. First of all, it is necessary to study the context and try to determine the meaning of a certain abbreviation. Then you need to carefully analyze the structure of the abbreviation and decipher its components.

Consider the methods of transferring English military abbreviations into Russian.

- Full borrowing: the abbreviation WS - "weapon system" - "система вооружения" in the Russian text will be denoted by the same Latin letters.

- Transliteration: NATO, which in Russian will be transmitted as "НАТО".

- Transcription together with tracing: ATL - "Alpha team leader" - "командир группы Альфа".

- Deciphering the abbreviation and its translation: FEBA - "Forward Edge of Battle Area" - "передний край района обороны."

- Deciphering the abbreviation and its translation, followed by the formation of a new abbreviation in the target language: CIA - "Central Intelligence Agency" - "ЦРУ" [3, p. 2].

The above features of abbreviations are confirmation of the fact that they differ in many ways from ordinary lexical units. When translating abbreviations, it is necessary to take into account their features, as well as to know the basic methods of translating abbreviations.

Among the most common difficulties in translating abbreviations are:

- 1) the difficulty of translating abbreviations lies in the fact that the abbreviation applies to all parts of speech: verbs (atk - attack), nouns (svc - service), adjectives (subor - subordinate), adverbs (NW - North-West), prepositions (w / o - without);

- 2) non-compliance with the rules for writing abbreviations (lowercase and uppercase letters, with and without punctuation marks);

- 3) in a certain context, abbreviations have a certain syntactic meaning, in connection with which they are transformed morphologically (they take the form of the plural, are used with the article, take the form of the possessive case, etc.) [11, p. 10].

Another feature of the military vocabulary is the presence of index designations and conventional signs that are used to designate different types of weapons and military equipment. These symbols should be well known to both the interpreter and the translator [8, p. 120]. Example: index CH-57A stands for C - cargo, H - helicopter, 57 - design number, A - modification.

To decipher this type of conventional signs, special tables are used, described in the charters. Abbreviations are inherent in other languages, but only

in English they are the most numerous and are a characteristic feature of the English language.

The material of our study was the US Army field manual for the training of snipers (DOA Sniper Training 1994). 786 military terms were found in it, and the number of abbreviations is 146 (this is 19% of the total).

In order to trace the frequency of using one or another method of translating abbreviations, it is necessary to be guided by the classification of methods for translating English military abbreviations into Russian, for example, proposed by a domestic specialist in the field of translation theory V.N. Komissarov. He proposes to divide transformations into two groups:

1. Lexical and grammatical, where lexical ones include:

- transcription;

- transliteration;

- tracing;

- lexico-semantic substitution (concretization, generalization, modulation); And grammatical ones include:

- literal translation;

- segmentation of proposals;

- consolidation of proposals;

- grammatical substitutions (forms of a word, part of speech, member of a sentence) 2. Lexico-grammatical, which include:

- antonymic translation;

- descriptive translation;

- compensation [7, p. 11].

When translating abbreviations in the US Army Field Manual for Sniper Training (DOA Sniper Training 1994), the following methods are used:

1. Translation of the full form is a frequently used method. In our case, 60 terms out of 146 (41%) were translated using it.

Example 1: SEO (Sniper employment officer) - "офицер по использованию снайперов";

Example 2: EVENT (end of evening nautical twilight) - "конец вечерних навигационных сумерек".

2. Often lexico-semantic substitutions also find their application. In our case, this type of translation occurred 33 times out of 146 (which is 23%).

Example 1: LBE (Loading-bearing equipment) - "разгрузочная система";

Example 2: MRE (Meal, ready-to-eat) - "сухой паек".

3. Transcription and transliteration are used in 26 cases out of 146 (which is 18%).

Example 1: SAGE (semi-automatic ground environment) - "СЕЙДЖ";



Example 2: MIJI - complex electronic interference "Миджи".

4. Descriptive translation occurred 14 times out of 146 (10%).

Example 1: CLP (Cleaner, lubricant, preservative)

Example 2: SHELREP (Shelling report) - "a report about the shelling of enemy artillery."

5. Translation of the full term and the formation of a new abbreviation already in the target language. There were 13 such examples out of 146 (8%).

Example 1: CIA (Central Intelligence Agency) - CIA (Центральное Разведывательное Управление);

Example 2: NOD (night observation device)

## CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the translation of military texts has a number of features, since military terminology is a specific language material. The characteristic linguo-stylistic features of military discourse are structured and clear formulations, logical and concise presentation, an abundance of military terminology, the presence of abbreviations and abbreviations. In the course of the analysis, we considered a variety of approaches to the definition of the terms "abbreviation" and "abbreviation" and identified several features in the understanding of these terms by various researchers. The term "abbreviation" can mean both the process of word formation and its result, and also has a broader meaning than "abbreviation". When translating abbreviations and abbreviations, the most popular methods can be distinguished, which include translation of the full form, lexical-semantic substitutions, transcription and transliteration. The most frequent method of translation is the translation of the full form (41%), followed by lexico-semantic substitutions, the third place is taken by the method of transcription and transliteration of the abbreviation (23%), then follows the descriptive translation (10%), and the least frequent was the translation of the full term and the formation of a new abbreviation (8%).

The study has a universal character and will be of interest not only to linguists and translators, but also to international specialists due to its multidisciplinary. The information obtained in the course of the study will be able to appropriately expand the linguo-cultural training of both military translators and translators in general, who, due to the specifics of the profession, are forced to deal with translation in various fields of activity. Practical courses on military translation, as well as special courses and special seminars on the problems of linguoculturology

and intercultural communication, can also become a sphere of practical application of the research results.

## REFERENCES:

1. Alekseev D.I. About the dictionary of abbreviations of the Russian language // Lexicographic collection. M., 1963. Issue. VI. pp. 145–146.
2. Borisov V.V. Abbreviations and acronyms. Military and scientific and technical abbreviations in foreign languages / ed. HELL. Schweitzer. M.: Military Publishing House, 1972. 318 p.
3. Butskov I.G., Potalui V.V. Abbreviations in English military vocabulary // International Journal of Experimental Education. 2011. No. 8. p. 94–95.
4. Dubenets E.M. Lexicology of modern English. Moscow: Glossa-Press. 2002. 192 p.
5. Ilchenko L.M. Compressive word formation as one of the ways to implement the principle of language economy: author. diss. cand. philol. Sciences. Pyatigorsk. 1994. 35 p.
6. Karasik V.I. Language circle: personality, concepts, discourse. Volgograd: Change. 2002. 477 p.
7. Komissarov V.N. Theory of translation (linguistic aspects): textbook. for in-t and fact. foreign lang. M.: Higher school, 1990. 253 p.
8. Kopreva L.G. The specificity of the translation of abbreviations in the English military vocabulary // Society: sociology, psychology, pedagogy. 2012. No. 2. p. 125–129.
9. LES: Linguistic Encyclopedic Dictionary / ch. ed. V.N. Yartseva. M.: Sov. encycle. 1990. 682 p.
10. Meshkov O.D. Word formation of modern English. M.: Nauka, 1976. 312 p.
11. Nelyubin L.L., Dormidontov A.A., Vasilchenko A.A. Military translation textbook. English language. General course. M.: Military Publishing House, 1981. 380 p.
12. Explanatory translation dictionary / comp. L.L. Nelyubin. Moscow: Flinta: Science. 2003. 320 p. Strelkovskiy G.M. Theory and practice of military translation: German language. M.: Military Publishing House, 1979. 272 p.
13. Shapovalova A.P. Experience in building a general theory of abbreviation: dis. ... Dr.



- Philol. Sciences. Rostov-on-Don, 2004. 421 p.
14. Shokurov V.N. Abbreviations as a special group of lexical formations in English // Uchen. app. MOPI them. N.K. Krupskaya. 1952. T. 73. Issue. 5. p. 184–185.
  15. Sniper Training FM 23-10 Headquarters: Field Manual / Field Manual Headquarters. Department of the US Army. Washington, 1994. 327 p.
  16. Avyasova, Irina Rafailovna " Specific Features of Using Abbreviation in English Military Discourse" Texas Journal of Philology, Culture and History, ISSN NO: 2770-8608, <https://zienjournals.com> Date of Publication: 18-12-2022, p. 22-26.
  17. Avyasova Irina Rafailovna, "WAYS OF TRANSLATION OF MILITARY ABBREVIATIONS AND CONTRACTIONS IN THE ENGLISH MILITARY DISCOURSE", ELECTRONIC JOURNAL OF ACTUAL PROBLEMS OF MODERN SCIENCE, EDUCATION AND TRAINING. DECEMBER, 2022-12 ISSN 2181-9750, p. 80-86.