

DIFFERENCES IN THE BRITISH AND AMERICAN VARIANTS OF MILITARY TERMS

¹SHAKHNOZA MUSURMANOVA

¹SENIOR TEACHER, CHIRCHIK HIGHER TANK COMMAND ENGINEERING SCHOOL,
shaxnoza90.90@mail.ru

Abstract

Military terminology includes words and phrases related to armed forces, hostilities, military discipline, and regulations. Military terms are formed in a morphological and lexical-semantic way that is characteristic of the English language. In addition, military concepts include terms related to various fields of science and technology, borrowed from other languages. Terms related to the military field are usually unambiguous, but it can be observed that plural terms are still used in this field. Students studying in this field should be aware of such changes. This plays an important role in the training of highly qualified military specialists in the military field.

Teaching a foreign language to students studying at a military academy, especially in their field vocabulary, is a topical issue these days, as it is effective to teach language phenomena within the field, focusing on its theoretical and practical aspects. Increasing students' vocabulary at the expense of terms is one of the requirements for in-depth study of a foreign language.

Keywords: Media education, military text, term, vocabulary, terminology, methods, language.

Introduction

Military terminology is a system of lexical means denoting the concepts of military science and used in the sphere of special communication. Military terminology, being a peripheral layer of vocabulary, at the same time has diverse connections with the general vocabulary of the language. Since military affairs, military science, are divided into separate areas, respectively, there is a separation of tactical, military-organizational, military-technical terminology, terminology by types of troops and types of armed forces.

Military science in the modern era is a very dynamic, rapidly developing branch of knowledge, and in connection with this, military terminology is constantly expanding and developing. The bulk of the military vocabulary is regulated by charters, instructions, combat documents, and because of this, to a greater or lesser extent, depending on the specifics of a particular language, it is unified. Both oral and written military speech is characterized by great

terminological saturation, therefore, the identification and knowledge of the features of the military terminology of a particular language is extremely important.

Military terminology differs from neutral vocabulary functionally (specialization in the field of military affairs) and semantically (clarity of semantic boundaries, stylistic neutrality, lack of emotional coloring, as well as the desire for unambiguity).

Unlike an ordinary word, a military term can be correlated with only one object of reality, represented either by one concept, or by one denotation, or by any number of identical objects. This unequivocal correlation is manifested only within the framework of one branch of military affairs. The ambiguity of a military term can only take place when it is used in various areas of military affairs or in various contexts: report, message, report, staff unit; subdivision, part, connection, number; subdivision, group, goal, object.

The unambiguity of a term in this sense should not be confused with the options for translating a term into another language, since the translation equivalent of a term is not its meaning, but only one of the possible options for equivalent correspondence.

Methods

Military terms, as a rule, do not have synonyms, or they differ in their usage. The systemic conditionality of military terms is a certain dependence of terms on each other (an expression of generic and specific concepts, a well-known hierarchy). This property of military terms can be traced in military ranks. Since large masses of people with very different levels of knowledge and training are employed in the military sphere, military terms must meet one more requirement - to be clear, simple, and understandable. It is precisely because of this that many military terms are created on the basis of common vocabulary and are motivated.

This property is primarily possessed by terms designed to ensure mass communication (commands, terminology of orders, reports, orders). These terms should be concise, to ensure conciseness of presentation. The facts of semantic contraction of compound terms is the answer to these requirements Dormidontov A.A. Military translation textbook. - M., Voenizdat, 1972, 386 pp. Military materials in the broad sense of the word usually include military art materials, military journalistic and military-political materials, military scientific and military-technical materials, acts of military administration. It is customary to include scientific and technical materials and management acts related to the life and activities of the troops and military institutions of the armed forces as military materials proper. Military fiction, military journalism, and military-political materials are military only in their purposefulness and subject matter, and basically possess those features that are generally inherent in all socio-political, journalistic, and artistic texts.

All military materials differ from any other materials in the richness of special military vocabulary, the widespread use of military and scientific and technical terminology, the presence of a certain number of variable-stable and stable phrases that are characteristic only for

the military sphere of communication, the abundance of military nomenclature and special abbreviations and symbols used only in military materials, but from the point of view of syntax - the wide use of elliptical (especially in military documentation) and clichéd constructions, the poverty of tense verb forms, a concise form of utterance, the use of numerous parallel constructions within one sentence expressed by infinitive and participial phrases.

All this is connected with a certain functional load that characterizes the military sphere of communication: conciseness, clarity and specificity of wording, accuracy and clarity of presentation, which ensures a logical sequence of presentation, harmony of construction, a clear delineation of one thought from another, ease of perception of the transmitted information.

When working with military terminology it is very important to know all the nuances of their use, since the material serves as the basis for making important decisions, conducting military operations, etc. Therefore, the adequacy of the translation of military materials implies not only the exact transfer of the content of the material, but also a more thorough transfer of its structural form, sequence parts and arrangement of the material, the sequence of presentation and a number of other factors that may seem unnecessary, formal, but important for a military specialist. For example, in combat documents, the order of paragraphs and subparagraphs, their designation (in Arabic numerals and Latin letters), the accuracy of the transmission of dates and times, coordinates, geographical names, numbering and names of units and subunits, and other data are of great importance.

The style of military terminology is not uniform. In American military materials, there are two trends in the presentation of the material: either in a dry official-clerical language using bulky, often archaic turns and constructions, or in a simple, colloquial, sometimes familiar language. The latter trend is noted mainly in military and military-technical materials designed for private and non-commissioned officers in military service. This trend is associated primarily with the low level of general and technical training of conscripts, and, consequently, with the desire to make dry official statutory materials and difficult technical instructions more popular and accessible to the bulk of military personnel.

Because of this, many American military materials are replete with explanatory illustrations, tables, diagrams and diagrams that help bring the reader to the essence of the issue being presented.

Results

Military vocabulary includes, first of all, all words and combinations denoting military concepts, i.e. concepts directly related to the armed forces, military affairs, war, etc. In addition, scientific and technical terms should be attributed to military vocabulary, used in connection with military concepts (for example, track "tank caterpillar or any combat vehicle, tracked").

Further, military vocabulary may include words and combinations that, although they do not denote military concepts proper, are used almost exclusively in the military environment, and are little known or completely unknown in general use (for example, boondocks "jungle"; behavior report "letter (soldier) home"; side arms "cutlery"), as well as some foreign borrowings, various jargon, etc.

Thus, military vocabulary includes both words and combinations that express specific military concepts, as well as words and combinations that are used primarily in the armed forces.

Military vocabulary can be divided into the following two groups:

1. Military terminology.

Military terminology, in turn, is divided into: a) official terminology, consisting of statutory terms; b) hazing terminology used in the oral speech of military personnel and in some types of military literature, but which is not officially accepted.

2. Emotionally colored elements of military vocabulary. Emotionally colored elements of military vocabulary are in most cases stylistic synonyms for the corresponding military terms (for example, doughboy (colloquial word) and infantryman (term) mean "infantryman").

The above groups of military vocabulary are closely interconnected in terms of their place in the vocabulary of the language, the scope of use and some functions.

Corresponding rows of words of various groups of military vocabulary, as a rule, synonymously designate the same objects, processes and phenomena. They may have properties common to both groups, such as the comparative narrowness of their use, incomprehensibility or incomprehensibility for persons who do not belong to the armed forces.

Many words belonging to one group of military vocabulary may lose some of their properties and, conversely, acquire properties characteristic of another group. For example, words such as mess, pillbox, silo, dud, which once belonged to military slang, that is, emotionally colored elements of military vocabulary, have become statutory terms.

Changes in the composition of the military vocabulary, especially its continuous replenishment, the loss of a number of words from it, the change in meanings, are closely related to the continuous development of the general conditions for the operation of the armed forces.

Modern American military terminology is developing most intensively in the development of new types of weapons - primarily nuclear and space combat systems (orbital weapon "orbital weapon"; global missile "global missile"; silo launcher "silo-type launcher"; stratospheric fallout "contamination of the stratosphere with radioactive products of a nuclear explosion"), electronic and other technical means (beam rider guidance "beam guidance"; laser range finder "laser rangefinder"; ambush detection device "a (technical) ambush detection tool"; air cushion vehicle "air cushion vehicle").

Aviation terminology is constantly updated, in particular the terminology of army aviation (continuous airborne alert "continuous combat duty in the air"; radar picket aircraft "radar patrol aircraft"; gunship "armed helicopter"; copter-borne "transported by helicopters"; aviation battalion "aviation battalion; army aviation battalion"; helilift "helicopter transfers").

Many new terms have appeared in connection with the reorganization of ground forces and higher command structures (strike command "strike command"; field army support command "army rear command"; division base "general organizational elements of divisions, divisional

base"; logistics operations center "center rear management").

New terms have also appeared related to the change in some fundamental provisions (doctrines) in tactics and operational art (area defense "area defense; positional defense"; forward edge of the battle area "forefront of the defense area"; nuclear safety line "nuclear safety line "; spoiling attack "preemptive strike; counterattack with going beyond the front line"; nuclear environment "conditions for the use of nuclear weapons, nuclear environment").

Especially many new words are noted in the terminology that reflects the concepts of the so-called "war by unusual means and methods" (unconventional warfare). A significant place is occupied by terms related to various issues of American military strategy (balance of terror "balance of terror"; massive retaliation "massive retaliatory strike, massive counterattack"; brush fire war "local war, local war; local fighting"; quick -response strategy "flexible response strategy").

Many new military terms arose in connection with the American aggression in Vietnam (enclave "bridgehead; strong point"; strategic hamlet "strategic village (fortified settlement)"; jungle canopy platform "landing area for helicopters on tree crowns in the jungle").

It is necessary to keep in mind the rather significant differences in the English military vocabulary used in the USA and England. This is explained, first of all, by some specific features of the organization, weapons, tactics of the armed forces of these countries, as well as certain differences between the English and American versions of modern English. Despite the ongoing work within NATO to unify English military terminology (especially in the field of tactics and operational art), discrepancies in the term of logic continue to occur.

For example, the concepts of "connection" or "association" in the USA are expressed using the term large unit, and in England - formation. The same term may have different meanings in the US and England. For example, general staff in the United States means "the general part of the headquarters", and in England - "the operational intelligence part of the headquarters." There are noticeable differences in military ranks and especially in the terminology of the organization: the "secretary of defense" in the

United States is called the Secretary of Defense, and in England - the Defense Minister. A number of terms are used only in the United States (for example, Chief of Staff "Chief of Staff (a branch of the armed forces)") or only in England (for example, commandos "commandos". Some differences in spelling and pronunciation of N.B. Aristov should also be taken into account.

The military vocabulary also includes a number of military terms specific to the armed forces of Canada, Australia and other countries that speak English.

Terminology occupies the most prominent place in military literature of all genres, therefore the translation of military terms becomes the most important in all the activities of a military translator. Modern American military terminology is developing most intensively in the development of new types of weapons. For example:

- in the field of nuclear missile and space combat systems - orbital weapon - orbital weapon; global missile - global missile; silo launcher - mine-type launcher; stratospheric fallout - contamination of the stratosphere with radioactive products of a nuclear explosion

- in the field of electronic and other technical means - beam rider guidance - guidance along the beam; laser range finder - laser rangefinder; ambush detection device - (technical) ambush detection device; air cushion vehicle

- in the field of army aviation - continuous airborne alert - continuous combat duty in the air; radar picket aircraft - radar patrol aircraft; gunship - armed helicopter; copter-borne - carried by helicopters; aviation battalion - aviation battalion; army aviation battalion; helilift - helicopter transfers

Many new terms appeared in connection with the reorganization of the formations of the ground forces and the higher authorities - strike command - strike command; field army support command - command of the rear of the army; division base - general organizational elements of divisions, divisional base; logistics operations center - rear management center.

New terms have also appeared related to the change in some fundamental provisions (doctrines) in tactics and operational art, for

example, area defense - area defense; positional defense; forward edge of the battle area - forward edge of the defense area; nuclear safety line - nuclear safety line; spoiling attack - preemptive strike; counterattack with going beyond the front line; nuclear environment - conditions for the use of nuclear weapons, nuclear environment.

Especially many new words are noted in the terminology that reflects the concepts of the so-called "war by unusual means and methods" (unconventional warfare). A significant place is occupied by terms related to various issues of American military strategy, such as balance of terror - the balance of forces of intimidation; massive retaliation - massive retaliatory strike, massive counterattack; brush fire war - local war, local war; hostilities of local importance; quick-response strategy - a flexible response strategy. Many new military terms arose in connection with the American aggression in Vietnam, for example, enclave - coastal foothold; stronghold; strategic hamlet - strategic village (fortified settlement); jungle canopy platform - a landing pad for helicopters on tops of trees in the jungle, for example, commandos - paratrooper units of "commandos".

All this, as well as an analysis of the structural features and other specific properties of American military terms, allows us to assert that the translation of many of them is far from simple, since in different languages there is no complete correspondence between military concepts and between ordinary communicative concepts.

Most military terms are recorded in military and technical bilingual dictionaries, which can be of great help to a military translator. But dictionaries cannot fully satisfy the needs of the translator, since military terminology is in constant development, more and more new military concepts appear, and, consequently, new terms. To overcome this difficulty, the translator needs to master a certain methodology for working with new terminology. First of all, when translating military terms, one should take into account the consistency of military vocabulary. It clearly indicates the area of use of the term, within which its equivalent should be sought, based on knowledge of military affairs and military terminology of the target language.

When translating complex terms, structural analysis also helps, according to which the last component of a complex term determines its generic affiliation, and the components preceding it limit the scope of the general concept, i.e., reduce it to the rank of species. Such an approach to 'translating a complex term makes it possible to determine its system affiliation and makes it easier to find the corresponding equivalent in Russian'. At the same time, it must always be remembered that in the American version of the English language, a complex term may denote not a military concept common to all languages, but a specifically American reality, the content of which is completely alien to Russian military reality. If this is true, then one should not look for terminological correspondence, the translation should be explanatory or descriptive.

This can be illustrated by the following examples. Suppose it is necessary to translate the following speech work related to the field of military supply:

Although in German -Russian military dictionary "(M., Bo-enizdat, 1978) there is the term *das Fertigstellungslos* with the translation "batch of production" (the term *das Zünderlos* is missing), in the specified context, this translation cannot be used, since here we are talking about supply, and not about making something. Since the word *das Los* can mean "party", "share", "part", then, limiting the scope of the search for an equivalent only to supply issues, we will eventually get the following version of the translation:

The fuse shipment has arrived.

When translating complex terms-realities, the search for an equivalent is carried out by the same method, but at the level of understanding only the original term. The equivalent in this case has no terminological correspondence and can only be obtained by explanatory translation based on the understood specific content. Let's explain this with an example. Suppose we need to translate the following sentence:

Für die Führung der Truppen im Kampf müssen die Führer immer befohlene Führungslinien-, in be-tracht ziehen (VRV, RRVusw).

In order to command troops in battle, commanders must always take into account the main lines of action of their troops indicated by

them (the forward edge of the defense, the rear border of the defense area, etc.).

The term *die Führungslinie* in the military dictionary is interpreted as a (conditional) line of command and represents a purely German military reality, the content of which becomes clear from the explanations in brackets: "the front line of defense; dividing line", which makes it possible to translate not according to dictionary correspondence, but according to functional identity based on the analysis of invariant content.

When translating operational-tactical terms, you need to be very careful, since it is in this group of terms that a hierarchical dependence of terms on the scale of hostilities and the rank of command (strategic, operational, tactical) is found, although when translated into Russian, this dependence appears to be much less degree. For example, a department or department of headquarters is distinguished at the headquarters, however, in the American version, one term staff is used for headquarters of all ranks. A few words should be said about the terms counter-offensive, counter-attack, counter-stroke, which are often perceived as synonyms, which leads to a distortion of meaning, since in American tactical terminology these terms are not synonymous, and each of them corresponds to a completely specific range of concepts:

counter-offensive - a systematically prepared counterattack, carried out against an enemy wedged into a defensive position from a predetermined line.

counter - attack - a counterattack that arose in the course of repelling an enemy offensive without prior preparation and organized by the troops leading the battle on their own, without an order from above. In no case should this term be translated as "counterattack", since a counterattack is not a tactical term, but an operational one, i.e., it belongs to a higher hierarchical category.

Its equivalent is the term counter-stroke.

The Russian meaning of the term "counter-preparation" corresponds in the translation language to artillery preparation, preparatory bombardment - terms used to designate artillery fire, which opens on the starting positions of the enemy, prepared for the offensive. As you can

see, element-by-element translation of operational-tactical complex terms can lead to gross errors. Operational-tactical terms can be translated into Russian only after a full understanding of the entire scope of the concept with which this term is correlated. Often military bilingual dictionaries do not help to solve this problem, as they give only some of the possible correspondences. Considerable assistance in such cases is provided by tactical handbooks and charters, which contain definitions of the relevant concepts.

Thus, the use of a systemic organization and structural analysis of various types of military terminology, the identification of the hierarchical dependence of terms, their specific and generic affiliation, and the penetration into the entire depth of the designated concept helps to correctly translate a particular term in a specific context. But this is not the only way to find terminological equivalents. The systemic and structural organization of terminology is only an auxiliary tool that helps to solve the problem of the term in translation.

The main and main way in solving the problem of translating terms is to establish a functional identity. So far, we have talked about functional identity only in relation to the translation of speech works, but this translation technique is also applicable to the translation of single terms. Since the term within a certain field of knowledge is always unambiguous, the functional purpose of the object of reality denoted by the term, regardless of whether this object is an object of reality or a concept, makes it possible to find an equivalent correspondence in the TL. Functional purpose in a certain form activity is determined by the acting object itself, and knowledge of the object allows you to find the necessary term in the TL. This is a general and often the only way to find terminological matches in the TL when they are not fixed in the dictionary or when the dictionary match is not suitable for a particular context.

The translation of the term according to the functional identity is carried out according to the following scheme. First, within the context, the scope of the term is determined, then its function in a given speech work, that is, its correlation with a certain concept, denotation or relation. It must be recalled that a denotation is a specific mental image of a specific object of reality, a concept is an abstracted generalized image of a

class of homogeneous objects of reality, and homogeneity is determined by one or more classification features that mainly determine the content of this concept (for example, a flat surface on a certain distance from the fulcrum for the concept of "table"). Relations, on the other hand, are interactions between denotations or concepts, or between both. After clarifying with which concept this term is correlated, the meaning of the speech product becomes completely clear, and its translation is carried out relatively simply. Two cases are possible here. The first one is when the object (denotation, concept or relation) correlated with the term also takes place in military reality in the TL. In this case, the presence of the object determines the corresponding term in the TL. For example, in the speech work *The building was destroyed by an artillery shell*, the correlation of the term *shell* with a specific object of reality, which is referred to in Russian military terminology as an artillery shell, is clearly traced, therefore the entire speech work is easily translated into Russian:

The building was destroyed by an artillery shell.

Having determined the functional correlation of terms, we can penetrate much deeper into the content of the entire statement, and, consequently, find suitable equivalent correspondences in the Russian language.

The identification of functional identity becomes the most universal method for establishing equivalent correspondences for those terms that correspond to concepts that differ in scope from similar concepts of the Russian language. Terminological correspondences are established in this case by clarifying and limiting the corresponding similar concepts in order to clearly define those specific boundaries within which a given term should function in a particular speech work. The latter is possible only if the military translator has a good command not only of the language, but also of the subject to which the translated text belongs. Without knowledge of the essence of the matter, it is almost impossible to determine the functional correlation of the term. Lack of awareness can lead to inaccuracies in understanding the meaning of the term, and hence to a distortion of the original meaning.

In addition, it can be rather difficult to determine the functional correlation of terms due to the

different volume of military concepts correlated with a particular term in different languages. The habit of seeing in a term only one, close to our perception, part of the scope of the concept sometimes hides from the military translator that part of the scope of the concept, which in our military reality is associated with a completely different term or is its connotative meaning, i.e., the meaning associated with the main by some association. In such cases, this part of the volume of the military concept passes by the translator's consciousness, which makes it difficult to understand the original message. To overcome such difficulties, it is necessary to look for the functional correlation of a term by its invariant meaning. The concept of an invariant can be extended not only to a complete speech work, but also to a single term.

The fact is that the full scope of the concept contained in this particular term is determined by many circumstances. This is not only the denotative, conceptual and relative correlation of a linguistic sign, but also all its connotations, as well as the meanings associated with its etymology and linguistic tradition. It is far from easy to take into account all these factors, but the method of finding the invariant value can provide significant assistance in such situations.

The invariant meaning of a term is such a mentally generalized meaning that can be traced in all possible variants of the term's correlation. The variety of all possible correlations of the term can be imagined by using the term in various speech works. However, this way is unacceptable for a translator due to its unproductiveness; it is much more useful to turn to a military bilingual dictionary.

Usually, in a dictionary entry of a bilingual dictionary, several variants of equivalent correspondences of the term with the terms of the Russian language are given. In the absence of equivalent terminological matches in the dictionary, a descriptive translation of the term is given with the necessary our explanations. Finding the invariant meaning of the term in any case means that the translator carefully reads and analyzes all the variants of correspondences given in the dictionary with all the explanations. Analyzing these correspondences on the TL, the translator seeks to understand what unites all these options, what is common in each of them. This general (invariant) may not be fixed in any particular word, but it is invisibly present in

every variant. It is due to the presence of an invariant that all variants of correspondences refer to this term. The general can be attributed in the TL to different concepts. The difficulty lies precisely in being able to identify this common, abstracting from the fact that meaning in the TL is assigned to different concepts.

This is the common, present in each equivalent correspondence for a given FL term, and is its invariant meaning. Most often, the invariant meaning is formulated in the form of a speech product, and not in the form of an equivalent terminological correspondence.

Minyar-Beloruchev proposes to consider the following expressions in connection with this provision: perform complex operations with an object; offensive; turning an action into an operation.

The first expression is perceived upon presentation as "manipulation with the object", "actions with the object, including its processing, assembly, disassembly, etc." In this expression, the word "operation" differs in the breadth of its meaning and can have several correspondences in the target language.

In the second expression, the word "operation" appears in a different capacity. It does not mean military operations in general and not an offensive in general, but offensive operations undertaken jointly by several formations. In this example, the word "operation" is chosen to designate a specific military concept included in the system of strictly defined concepts: combat - operation - battle. Obviously, here the word "operation" should not have one of the correspondences, but the only equivalent in the target language.

In the third expression, the word "operation" also denotes a systematized, strictly defined scientific concept from the field of activity theory: operation - action - activity.

The designation by the word "operation" in the second and third expressions included in the system of concepts of any field of science or technology suggests that, in contrast to the first example, we are dealing with terms that are united by the commonly used word "operation", which gave rise to these terms.

Finding the invariant meaning of some military terms helps to solve the problem of their

translation, especially in cases where the terminological correspondence is not in the dictionary and is not visible when reading a speech work.

A few words should also be said about the translation of terms-realities, i.e., non-equivalent terms that have the object of correlation only in the reality of foreign armed forces. As already mentioned, the existence of such terms is explained by the fact that military affairs develop in each country in its own original way, which is determined by the originality of the adopted military doctrine, the main direction of the international policy of this state, and the peculiarities of the dominant worldview. These reasons bring to life concepts specific to a given state or even objects of reality that are not observed in the reality of other states.

The translation of such terms causes difficulties mainly because the translator does not know with which concept the given term should be correlated in the target language, because the object of correlation is absent in the TL. Since there is no ready-made object, it should be created by an appropriate explanation, i.e., explain the concept existing in the FL and then decide on its designation.

Examples of reality terms are: Agent Orange, GI, green berets, flexible response, action statins, Blue and the Gray, four-star general, Catch 22. To translate them, you must first understand the content of each term, and then decide which of them to translate descriptively, for which term to introduce a new term into the TL by transliteration or transcription of the American term or by its literal translation.

Transliteration or its kind of transcription is used in cases where a foreign language concept can also be used in TL. An example is the term "Bundeswehr", which entered the Russian language as an independent concept. During transcription, a foreign language term is not translated, but is transmitted in the letters of the Russian alphabet, for example: agent orange, ji, wehrmacht, laser, etc.

The initial introduction of transliteration (or transcription) is always accompanied by a detailed explanation of the content of the term, then it becomes known in military literature and begins to be used without explanation. So it was,

for example, with the term infrastructure "infrastructure", which was originally translated descriptively: "the system of stationary structures of the armed forces", and having become famous, began to be transliterated. Another example is the military term AgentOrange, which means a chemical weapon used by US troops in Vietnam as a defoliant to destroy crops and, according to many experts, is the cause of pregnancy disorders, cancer and body deformity. The following terms are used as literal translations: Green berets - green berets, flexible response - flexible response, although these terms initially required a descriptive translation or commentary:

- green berets - US Army Special Forces;

- flexible response - the military-political doctrine of the United States, proclaimed by President Kennedy in 1961. Provided for armed intervention in the conflict anywhere in the world.

Terms that are relatively rare in translations are usually not transliterated, but are provided with explanatory translations. Obtaining an exhaustive explanatory translation is possible only if the entire scope of the concept correlated with the term is known, since otherwise inaccuracies in the translation are possible. So, in particular, the term Catch 22, when used, must necessarily be accompanied by an explanatory translation: a provision in army instructions stating that a soldier's request for exemption from military service can be granted if he is considered mentally unfit for combat.

These examples convincingly show that the translation of non-equivalent terms should be accompanied by a deep penetration into the content of the concept correlated with the term, i.e., in the end, the main way of finding an equivalent correspondence remains in force for this part of military terminology, namely, the establishment of the functional significance of the term.

Translation of military ranks from Russian into English and from English into Russian can be done in two ways. The most advantageous option is to replace the Russian military rank with the corresponding US military rank and vice versa:

Rear Admiral - Rear Admiral

Flight Lieutenant - Captain

Warrant Officer

However, sometimes such a replacement turns out to be impossible. Thus, the following ranks Brigadier General, Brigadier, Commandore, which are translated as brigadier general (both for Brigadier General and Brigadier), commander, have no analogues in the Russian armed forces. In some cases, it is almost impossible to offer an unambiguous replacement, since several Russian terms correspond to one American term and vice versa:

Second Lieutenant - Lieutenant, Second Lieutenant

Ensign - lieutenant, junior lieutenant

Sometimes, when it is necessary to emphasize the national flavor, it is possible to use a literal translation. So, although the Lieutenant Commander corresponds to the captain of the third rank, in some cases the translation is more appropriate Captain Third Rank, however, it is necessary to clarify which British or American rank this corresponds to.

When translating such terms, it is also necessary to keep in mind the rather significant differences in the English military vocabulary used in the United States and Great Britain. This is explained, first of all, by some specific features of the organization, weapons, tactics of the armed forces of these countries, as well as certain differences between the English and American versions of modern English. Despite the ongoing work within NATO to unify English military terminology (especially in the field of tactics and operational art), discrepancies in the term of logic continue to occur. For example, the concepts of "connection" or "association" in the US are expressed using the term large unit, and in the UK - formation. The same term may have different meanings in the US and UK. For example, general staff in the United States is the general part of the headquarters, and in the UK - operational intelligence. There are noticeable differences in military ranks and, especially, in organizational terminology: the Minister of Defense in the USA is called the Secretary of Defense, and in the UK - Defense Minister, in the Navy, a senior lieutenant in the USA is Lieutenant Junior Grade, and in the UK - Sub-Lieutenant, junior lieutenant in the US - Ensign,

in the UK - Midshipman. A number of terms are used only in the United States, for example, Chief of Staff - chief of staff (a branch of the armed forces), or only in the UK.

With regard to the difficulties of understanding and translation, terminological phrases can be divided into those in which the components (each separately) completely coincide in meaning with the corresponding Russian terms. For example, rear establishment "rear establishment". The literal translation, as a rule, in this case gives the correct Russian correspondence.

A particular example of this type of terms-phrases are those compound terms in which the general meaning of the entire combination fully corresponds to the Russian term, but individual elements may differ from the components of the Russian equivalent. For example, ammunition supply point (literally "ammunition supply point") "ammunition supply point"; organizational equipment (literally "organizational property") "inventory property".

There are also terminological combinations in which it is quite possible to derive a general meaning from the meaning of individual components. However, the literal translation will not be correct. For example, automotive equipment (literally "self-propelled property") "cars, tractors, armored combat vehicles", etc.; level of supply (literally "supply level") "supply rate".

Discussion

In addition, it is necessary to point out the terms-phrases similar to the above, but not clearly revealing their full meaning: unit of fire (literally "unit of fire") "ammunition"; troop basis (literally "military basis") "organizational staffing"; executive officer (literally "executive officer") "chief of staff (brigade, battalion)".

A special place is occupied by those terms-phrases that are incomprehensible only for the reason that they denote specific concepts characteristic of the armed forces of the United States and England. For a correct translation, it is necessary to know the essence of these concepts. For example, administrative center "administrative center"; general staff "general part of the headquarters"; special staff "special

part of the headquarters"; Adjutant General's Corps "adjutant general's service".

Finally, there is a relatively small group of terminological combinations that belong to a very special category of phraseological units ("fusions"). In these combinations, the overall meaning is usually not derivable from the values of the individual components. For example, Quartermaster General "Quartermaster General, Chief of the U.S. Quartermaster Service"; Provost Marshal "chief of the military police"; Sam Browne belt "officer's belt with a harness."

In the terminological combinations of the substantive group, the following subgroups can be distinguished:

1. Combinations like missile defense. In these combinations, the relationships between the components are unclear. For example, amphibious tank fire support "landing fire support for amphibious tanks" or "landing fire support for amphibious tanks"; tank target "tank (target)" or "tank fire target"; aircraft defense "air defense" or "defense (defense) of an aircraft (bomber)".

2. Combinations like platoon commander - commander of the platoon. These combinations denote the same concept. However, if in the first case we see a stable combination expressing one complex concept, then in the second case - a free combination denoting two separately distinguishable concepts - "commander + platoon". It should be noted that the use of nominative combinations with a definition preceding the noun is more typical for the English statutory style (as opposed to the combination of noun + definition with the preposition of).

The above does not apply to terminological combinations such as angle of sight, line of departure, in which, due to their frequent use, the result of the process of component desemantization is noticeable. The general meaning of combinations is determined not so much by the meanings of individual components as by a special interpretation. These combinations approach compound words.

Combinations like velocity of the target. In these combinations, the main component is specified by the definition. The combination takes on a specific meaning. However, as a rule, such free combinations of a new concept do not form.

The United Kingdom and the United States were once described by writer George Bernard Shaw as "two countries divided by a common language." Today, the British and Americans are still at odds.

Check grammar has created a handy infographic to compare words in a British and American dictionary. This can be useful to anyone in communication.

A lot has changed since British researchers introduced a funny language called "English into the New World" 400 years ago. The United States, on the other hand, has always been proud of its pronunciation and originality. The confusing part is the richness of the dictionary, and some English words have a special meaning in the United States.

The pictures below show the words we always confuse in British and American English.

специалиста: межвуз. сб. науч. тр. - Череповец. 1990. - С. 83-95.

- [8] От кнопки до ушанки: что дарили друг другу Россия и США. http://www.bbc.com/russian/international/2015/05/15Q512_tr_us_russia_gifts
- [9] Судзиловский Г.А. Не в ногу (военный юмор) Outofstep (Military humour) : книга для чтения на английском языке / выпуск 19. - М.: Воениздат, 1979. - 165 с.
- [10] Ўзбекистон Республикаси Фанлар Академияси Алишер Навоий номидаги тил ва адабиёт институти. А.Мадвалиев таҳрири остида. Ўзбек тилининг изоҳли лугати. – Т.: 240 б.

Reference

- [1] R.S.Samarov. Harbiy atamalarning yangi izohli lugʻati. Oʻzbekiston Respublikasi Mudofaa vazirligi Qurolli kuchlar Akademiyasi. – T.: Innovatsiya-Ziyo, 2020. – B. 122.
- [2] Бубнов И. А. Военная топография: Учеб. пособие / И.А. Бубнов, А.К. Калинин, С.А. Шленников, А.И. Кремпл. – М.: Воениздат, 1969; Шевчук В. Н. Военно-терминологическая система в статике и динамике: Дис. ... д-р. филол. наук. – М.: 1985.
- [3] Гальперин И.Р. О термине «сленг» // Вопросы языкознания. – 2001 - №1 – С. 17-21.
- [4] Гасанова А.С. Многозначность как одно из направлений развития значимой стороны слова. Вестник Атырауского государственного университета им.Х.Досмухамедова, №1(52) . 2019. - С.4-10.
- [5] Дониёров Р. Ўзбек тили техник терминологиясининг айрим масалалари. – Т.: Фан, 1977. – Б. 144. 34
- [6] Жирмунский В.М. Общее и германское языкознание. – Л.: Наука, 1976. – 698 с.
- [7] Коровушкин В. П. О типологии сокращений в английском и русском военных жаргонах // Языковые проблемы подготовки военного