

The Usage of SEMES Analysis for Differentiating Compound Military Terms from Phraseological Units of Military Discourse

Hakimova D. I.

Samarkand State University,
Uzbekistan



Abstract – The present article is devoted to differentiating analysis of compound military terms and phraseological units of military discourse. The author points at main features of their difference. Moreover, the article investigates derivative regulations of formation of military phraseological units on the basis of compound military terms. The author implements seme analysis and studies the peculiarities of contextual surrounding in the formation of general phraseological meaning. Theoretical part of the article is proved by corresponding examples.

Keywords – SEME, Military Discourse, Compound Military Term, Phraseological Unit, Semantics, Inner Shape, Expressive-Emotional Meaning, Stylistic.

I. INTRODUCTION

The problem of the phraseological unit and its prototype is an interesting and relevant study of phraseological units with an obvious internal shape. Similar phraseological units remain insufficiently studied in modern linguistics. In phraseological units with an obvious internal shape, the structure is not completely defined. This attracts the attention of phraseological researchers.

In order to determine the semantic fields between the phraseological units of military discourse and their prototypes, it is necessary, first of all, to study the internal shape of such phraseological units. The basis of the theory of prototype, as rightly pointed out by Sh.S. Safarov, the problem of interpreting categorical education, i.e. concepts [6;219]. The functioning of the corresponding phraseological units in modern English and Uzbek languages allowed us to trace the main differences in their meaning.

The starting point in the work is the similarity of the terminological meaning of phraseological units of military discourse with the general phraseological meaning. Based on semantic cohesion and reproducibility, composite terms have

been consistently included in phraseology by scholars: N.N. Amosova, V.V. Vinogradov, A.V. Kunin, N.M. Shanskyet others.

However, an analysis of the meaning of super word military terms, on the one hand, and the meaning of phraseological units, on the other, shows the vulnerability of this approach. As V.L. Arkhangelskiy, between the compound term and the figurative winged expression formed from the same term, there is a profound structural difference. For example, there is a big semantic difference between the physical term “Torricellian emptiness” in the meaning of “airless space” and the expression “Torricellian emptiness” in the meaning of “absence of anything”, where expressiveness and ironic appreciation are clearly felt [1;64].

Compound terms of an etymologically figurative structure require not a philological interpretation of meanings, but logical definitions [9; 64]. The nature of the stability of terminated phrases (compound terms), the nature of the connectedness of their elements is different compared to the nature of the stability and connectedness of commonly

used phraseological units. In phraseological units this nature is semantic, in compound terms – conceptual [2; 55].

The inclusion of composite military terms in phraseology is a consequence of the reassessment of the nominative function of phraseological units of the unilateral application of such a research method as the analysis of the semantic dependence of the components of phraseological units.

Indeed, if we consider phraseological units as a functional unit of two or more mutually determined lexemes, then identifying the difference in the meaning of phraseological units and a composite military term will cause particular difficulties. The same thing happens when the phraseological unit and the composite military term are combined into one class based on their nominative function.

It should be noted that for phraseological units with an internal shape, the relations of the semantic structure of phraseological units to the semantic structure of the prototype are important. It is in this comparison that one sees the possibility of identifying similarities and differences between the values of both units. An attempt to formalize the essence of this relationship at the semantic level will allow us to identify the starting points of the studied semantic fields. It is best to conduct a similar study using the approximate modeling method [7;31].

An approximate linguistic model is an experimental similarity to a specific language object in which the basic processes and phenomena similar to the main processes and phenomena occurring in a real object are conditionally formalized. It is necessary to clarify what will later be called seme. It is known that many scientists understand by seme the smallest unit of meaning in the composition of the information that this or that unit of language carries [8; 43]. Since the method for isolating this cannot itself be absolutely objective, one needs to use dictionary definitions. Moreover, it is necessary to establish a semantic inventory of compound military terms and phraseological units from examples of speech use. So, the main processes and phenomena to be distinguished and displayed in the semantic structure of composite military terms were:

- a) Specialisms relating compound military terms to military discourse: arms, guard, soldier, lieutenant, etc.;
- b) Secondary or potential semes, which form the basis of the internal form of the new phraseological meaning: run the guard - go unnoticed by sentries, relieve the guard - change the guard;
- c) The obligatory reflection of syntagmatic connections in the semantic structure of a composite

military term at the family level: to put somebody on his guard - warn someone.

- d) In the semantic structure of phraseological units, which are genotypes of composite military terms, the following were identified:
- e) The relationship between the seme and the corresponding seme in the structure of the phraseological unit as the relationship of the internal form to its genotype: Jack Johnson - (military jarg.) heavy gun, large-caliber shell (named after the famous Negro boxer;
- f) Indicators of the expressive-emotional function of PE: gravel crusher - (Amer. military. jarg.) infantry man;
- g) The obligatory reflection of syntagmatic connections in the semantic structure of phraseological units at the family level: chain of command - hierarchical ladder [4; 154].

Based on the proposal from V.V. Kaplunenko model analysis of composite military terms, consider the features of the semantic structure of the verb expression of the military discourse lay siege to smth - to besiege, block. Its value is defined as follows: surround a place with armed forces, attack from all sides.

Dividing the definition as a syntagma into components, the following components (semes) can be distinguished: S1 - surround, S2 - place, S3 - with armed forces, S4 - persistence, S5 - attack, S6 - from all sides. First of all, it is striking, firstly, the tautology of the vocabulary definition, and secondly, the differences in relations between Sams. It seems that such semes as S1, S5 and S6 can be combined into one - S1, because they are connected by many common features (S1 and S6 - on the basis of the inclusion of the latter in the first, S1 and S5 - on the basis of the indivisibility of action within the semantic structure of the composite military term - "siege"). Of course, the selection of such seeds is conditional, syntagmatic division could be continued to the smallest units, but, as it will be seen, continued to the smallest units, but, as will be seen later, the proposed division stage more fully satisfies the requirements of the research problem.

Of the four received, S3 - with armed forces is called style-building, i.e. defining the terminological essence of meaning, its belonging to a specific functional style of the language. Apparently, you can make a finite list of style-forming seme of any terminological system, which is narrow and closed. Seme S1 is a differentiating seme in the structure under consideration. It defines the difference between the meaning of the composite military term lay siege to smth and

the meanings of other military terms. So, based on the presence of Seme S3, this compound military term can be identified with words and phrases such as maneuver - to maneuver, attack, mariners - marine corps, etc.

Seme S1 differentiates the considered value, indicates the nature and mode of action, expressed in a composite military term. It is not at all determined by the military terminological system and cannot serve as an indicator of belonging to the functional style of the language. In other words, the presence of this seme is in no way connected with the "military." Mark, while the seme S5 most directly determines the relevance of the composite military term lay siege to smth military terminology. Seme S2 (a place) can also be called differentiating on the grounds that, together with S1, it finally establishes the nature and orientation of the action, expressed in a composite military term.

The fourth of the distinguished semes - S4 (persistence) carries an optional characteristic of an action expressed by a composite military term and not always explicitly highlighted in speech. Such semes are called potential [3; 101].

Compound military terms included in phraseology can mean completely different concepts: positions, actions, events, etc. Let's analyze some of them.

In the English-Russian phraseological dictionary A.V. Kunin recorded an expression marked "military." Absence without leave - unauthorized absence [4; 22] relating to the designation of an event. If we divide this phraseological unit into separate semes, we get S1 - absence, S2 - without, S3 - leave. Seme S1 is dominant in terms of semantics because it means "absence", i.e. absence from the position of the structural approach, as expressed by the key noun of this expression. Semes S2 and S3 are clarifying elements and convey the meaning "without farewell", i.e. "unauthorized". In this composite military term, Seme S3 is a prime example when the action verb "to leave" becomes the noun "leave".

Among the phraseological units of military discourse, there are paired and synonymous units denoting actions: come out of action - exit the battle, drop out of action and put out of action - disable, knock out, spoil [4; 26]. As can be seen, in both expressions the semes S2 (out of) and S3 (action) coincide semantically and structurally. However, the S1 tenses are different: the verbs "come" and "put". These semes play a decisive role in determining the meaning of expressions: in the first compound military term, the action is transferred that is committed by an object - a person in relation to himself - to exit the battle or to fail. In the second case, the object also performs the action itself, but not in

relation to itself, but in relation to another object: incapacitate, spoil something. Despite the fact that the key semes S1 "come" and "put" are so similar in external structure, they are completely different in updating the semantic meaning.

There are military-themed idioms built around one key token:

Appeal to arms - resort to weapons;
Bear arms - carry weapons;
Bear arms (against or for) - take up arms;
Beat to arms - call to arms;
Carry arms - carry weapons (with you);
Fly to arms - hastily prepare for war, unexpectedly take up arms; ground arms - lay down arms, give up;
Lie on one's arms - sleep with arms at hand, sleep in full combat gear;
Present arms - take on guard;
Rise in arms - take up arms, rebel with arms in hands, etc. [4; 47].

It is easy to see that the key lexeme that forms all of the above examples of composite military terms is the lexeme "arms" - a weapon.

Thus, in distinguishing composite military terms from phraseological units of military discourse, there is a difference that manifests itself mainly in the reflection of stylistic meaning and expressive-emotional properties. Moreover, phraseological units of military discourse are characterized by motivated imagery, while composite military terms only refer to certain objects or phenomena.

It is known that the establishment of the semantic potential of phraseological meanings based on a dictionary definition alone does not exhaust the content of phraseological units. The lack of definition in the description of the phraseological unit (hereinafter phrase) is noted by all the compilers of phraseological dictionaries. So, A.V. Kunin speaks of "interpretation of the phraseological meaning" - a complex method, which, in addition to the definition, also includes the disclosure of the meaning of the etymone phraseological unit, comparison of the value of the phraseological unit with the value of the etymone, as well as an illustration of the phraseological value in the speech environment or context [5; 43]. Compilers of various dictionaries undoubtedly use the same method. So, E.A. Fedorchenko conducted the distribution of linguistic units and analyzed them with the help of complementary and gradual classifications [10].

The opinions of prominent phraseology scholars make one doubt that the phraseological meaning is of the nature of a semantic syntagma, the model of which was established by us with respect to the substantial structure of the composite military term (hereinafter referred to as SVT). The necessity of comparing the semantic structure of phraseological units with the meaning of the image underlying the phraseological unit, the need to disclose phraseological meanings in the context indicate the ambiguous nature of the meaning of phraseological units, and the fact that the structure of this meaning is complicated by various types of relationships. However, it is extremely important to establish (on the basis of formal data) the nature of the two-plan nature, which, undoubtedly, is the basis of the expressive-emotional function of phraseological units; in other words, to determine the basic relationship, especially the relationship between the phraseological unit and the prototype. These relations are defined as relations in the conformal mapping system.

Between two systems (structures) there is a conformal mapping if one of them is formed on the basis of the other, in such a way that the main signs of the first structure (system) are connected with the main signs of the other structure (system) by the relations of motion, similarity, or inversion. As applied to linguistics, it can be said that the nature of the movement is inherent in the privative opposition, in which a weak (unmarked member) includes signs of a strong (marked) member of the opposition. Similarity is a development of a sign that does not entail its qualitative changes, but affects the place and function of the sign in the system (structure). Let us denote the relations: motion - p, similarity - s, inversion - i. We return now to the main problem of the study and try to determine the value of the phraseological unit *lay siege to smb.* based on relationships with the meaning of its prototype compound military term. The semantic inventory of this phraseological unit, established by the dictionary definition, consists of this: S1 - to seek to win, S2 - a person's, S3 - love, S4 - persistently.

Let us consider how, through which relations, these two structures are connected. S1 in the phraseological meaning is related to S1 in the structure of the composite military term by the relation of movement. This can be argued on the basis that seek to win has broader semantics than S1 surround and attack, the action expressed by the first seme is not so narrowly defined and limited. So, S1 and seme S4 of a composite military term are related by the similarity relation, if for a composite military term the sign of intensity is optional and not always explicitly expressed, then in the structure of the phraseological unit it determines such a connotative characteristic as evaluation. Finally, S2

(phraseological unit), which at first glance has no seemingly expressed logical connections with any seme of the prototype, enters into inverse relations with seme S2 of the composite military term in contrasting the inverse values of "animation" / "inanimate". It should be noted that the last of the established relationships is obvious in the surface structure of the composite term *lay siege to smb* and idioms *lay siege to smb*.

Before proceeding to the determination of the dependencies of the installed components of the phraseological meaning, *lay siege to smb*. It is desirable to point out differences in the content of phraseological units and compound military terms. Obviously, the main elements of the phraseological meaning are connected by various relations with the elements of the semantic structure of the prototype, provided that the prototype is a living internal form of phraseological units, perceived by all speakers of this language. This is one feature of the phraseological meaning. The second feature, which is associated with the disappearance of the milieu stylistic mark inherent in its prototype, is as follows. Entering into relations with Seme as of actual phraseological meaning, the style-forming Seme of the composite term cannot determine the phraseological unit belonging to the functional style of the language. The analyzed phenomenon is an example of the expansion of meaning or a way out of the framework of narrow professional consumption, which is inevitably associated with the emergence of new functions and features of the language unit. As will be shown below, it is the two-pronged aspect of the existence of phraseological units with a living internal form that determines its rich expressive and emotional capabilities.

The model of the semantic structure of phraseological units *lay siege to smb*. It is based on a comparison with the composite term model. The syntactic functions of phraseological units and compound terms are the same - both units are verbal phrases. Seme S1 (surround and attack) in the composite term and S1 in the phraseological unit are related by the motion relation p-S1 p S1, and S1 symbolizes the function of the semantic structure of the composite term.

It is necessary to make one more amendment to the proposed model. It was mentioned above that the role of S3 seme (with armed forces) in a composite military term loses its importance in the structure of the phraseological units, in other words, this seme is obscured. However, she can become more active in speech, as, for example, in the following statement: General Maccouton laid siege to her

like he did to the fortress of saint-Bernard seven years ago ... (G. Wylle).

The use of phraseological unit lay siege to smb. is mediated by the direct assignment of its value to the value of the prototype. This forces the recipient of information to resort to associations, from which it is concluded that General McCoughton "besieged the girl's heart", as the army did for 7 years and called St. Bernard fortress, i.e. with military perseverance and straightforwardness, not bothering with excessive tricks, with one goal in mind: to take control of the girl, as he took possession of the fortress. Here, all the relations between the elements of the phraseological meaning and the meaning of the composite term (internal form) are defined as similarity, in addition, the seme S3 of the composite term (operations of armed forces) is updated [3; 105].

In this change of relationship, the active role of etymone in the synchronous aspect of semantics, which has already been talked about and is being discussed, is manifested. Changes in the relations in the semantic structure of phraseological units, as well as the existence of the relations themselves, determine the expressive and emotional function of phraseological units, create all kinds of connotations (designations) of phraseological units. In the following example, the semantic relationship between phraseological units and the internal form is already of a different nature.

One day Raggles came and laid siege to the heart of the great city of Manhattan. She was the greatest of all and he wanted to learn her note in the scale; to taste and appraise and classify and solve and label her and arrange her with individuality (Best stories of O'Henry, "The Making of a New-Yorker").

The above statement is permeated with one thought - its subject (Raggles) identifies the city of Manhattan with a living creature. Seme "animation" can be traced in a whole chain of words connecting the context of she - city - heart - individuality. Under the influence of this semantic information, the inversion relations of the corresponding seme of phraseological unit S2 and the seme S2 pr of the internal form cease in relation to negation.

Establishing relationships in the structure of phraseological units with the simultaneous recognition of their mobility and variability as a result of the influence of purely verbal and contextual factors can be of great help in translating phraseological units from one language to another [3; 107]. So, in the first of the above examples, the active perception of similarity relations in the structure of

phraseological units makes us use the word "besiege" when translating phraseological units into Russian, because any other will not be able to adequately convey the action of a general who, in love, acts like in war. The translation of phraseological units in the second example will be completely different. The complete repayment of the terminological attribute and the negation of another indicate an active connection with the internal form only through the S4 persistence attribute and the relationship of movement. Therefore, in this case, it is generally advisable to avoid military associations, retaining only the sign of "intensity of action", S4 and translating phraseological units into Russian: "persistently looking for keys to the heart of Manhattan", or "decided to win the heart of Manhattan." We traced only two cases of the functioning of the phraseological meaning lay siege to smb. in speech. Of course, they far from exhaust the connotative possibilities of phraseological units generated by its two-plan structure.

The following pair of examples is chosen to confirm the idea that the meaning of phraseological units has the main features:

1. "Big guns to Join Talks on Ulster" (Morning Star)
2. "The stage", he went on, "is all right if you can be one of the big guns but there's nothing to the rest of it. It takes a long while to get up" (Th. Dreiser, "Sister Carry").

Compound military term - big gun S1 - big caliber heavy, S2 - gun

Phraseological Unit - big gun, S1 - important, S2 - a person

Between S1 pr and S1 of phraseological unit there are relations of movement. This conclusion can be made on the basis that the path from the concepts of "big caliber heavy" to "important" is the path from more specific to more abstract - S1 p S1 pr.

The ratio of S2 pr to S2 should be defined as the ratio of inversion, because in this case, the opposition "inanimate" / "animated" is explicitly distinguished.

In the first of these examples, the established relationship is not changed. In the second example, under the influence of semantic information of a military nature, there is a change in the relations of movement and inversion on relations of similarity.

II. CONCLUSION

So, the above study of the meanings of some phraseological units of the modern English language, formed from superword military terms, allows us to draw the following conclusions.

The phraseological meaning of such phraseological units with a living internal form is the interaction of the semantic structure of the phraseological unit and the semantic structure of its prototype in the conformal mapping system. This interaction is based on certain relationships, the main of which are movement, likeness, and inversion. The nature of these relationships changes in speech according to the communicative tasks of the speaker (author of a work of art). The existence and mobility of relations determines the expressive and emotional function of phraseological units, its connotative content.

In the structure of both phraseological units and the composite military term, there are mandatory syntagmatic connections. The establishment of relations in the phraseological meaning (using the phraseological example with a living internal form) will greatly help in translating phraseological units, as well as in improving the definitions in phraseological manuals.

REFERENCES

- [1] Arkhangelsk V.L. Persistent phrases in modern Russian. – Rostov University, 1964.
- [2] Golovin B.N. On some evidence for the termination of a phrase. // Vocabulary, terminology, styles. – Gorky: Gorky University, 1973.
- [3] Kaplunenko V.V. Some features of the meaning of phraseological units with a living internal form. // Questions of phraseology of the Roman and German languages. – Samarkand: SamSU, 1981. - P. 97-109.
- [4] Kunin A. V. English-Russian phraseological dictionary. - Ed. 3rd, rev., In two books. – Moscow: SE, 1967. - T.1. - 738 p.; T.2. - 739-1264 p.
- [5] Kunin A.V. The main problems of English phraseology and the creation of the English-Russian phraseological dictionary. Doctoral diss. – Moscow, 1965.
- [6] Safarov Sh.S. Semantics. – Tashkent: Uzbekistan National Encyclopedia, 2013. – 344 p.
- [7] Soldatenkov V.A. Electronic models. – Moscow, 1968.
- [8] Stepanova M.D. Word formation and stylistics issues. // Linguistics and methodology. – Moscow: Moscow State Pedagogical Institute named after M. Toreza. – Issue VI, 1974.
- [9] Tolikina E.N. About the common distinguishing feature of phraseological units, delimiting them from non-phraseologisms. // Problems of stability and variation of phraseological units. – Tula. 1972.
- [10] Fedorchenko E.A. Formation and development of the terminological vocabulary of customs in Russian. – Moscow, 2004. – P. 91.