

Pragmatic Peculiarities Of The Translation Of Military Vocabulary And Military Phraseological Units From English Into Uzbek

Khakimova Dildora Ikromovna

ALFRAGANUS UNIVERSITY

Tashkent,Uzbekistan, e-mail: lucky_dilya86@mail.ru

+998(91)5509960



Abstract – This article is devoted to the study of the translation of military vocabulary and military phraseological units of the English language into Uzbek. The pragmatic peculiarities of the translation of phraseological units and methods for selecting equivalents are given.

Keywords – Tracing, Phraseological Unit, Professionalisms, Terminology, Term, Military Sphere.

Translating of military terminology is one of the main issues in the practice of translation in the implementation of written translations, the transmission of important military-political information and interrogations, and all linguistic "innovations" get into written speech through oral speech. It happens that concepts exist only in the oral version. This and a number of other problems characteristic of oral communication arise when countries cooperate with foreign countries in the field of military training and education, exchanging of military experience and organizing trainings for military personnel. Just like other specialists, military personnel need knowledge of a foreign language to implement and improve their professional military activities and solve communication tasks of a professional nature, which is important for the development and strengthening of the military sphere of our country.

Words used mainly by representatives of a certain field of activity or branch of science are called special vocabulary. The special vocabulary includes terms, i.e., words or phrases naming scientific, technical, military, etc. concepts [Paluanova Kh.D., 2016].

In addition to terms, the layer of special vocabulary includes professionalism. The term is mainly used in a purely specific branch of science or the sphere of human activity. Professionalisms are more often used in the colloquial speech of representatives of a certain profession or specialty. From the point of view of the language style, the terms are used in the official style, and the professionalisms are more neutral and tend to the colloquial style of speech. They are also called semi-official words of people of the same profession. It can be the language of doctors, teachers, musicians, military personnel, etc. [B.Strang, 2009, p. 414]. Here is what J. writes about this. Austin: "... all kinds of particular concepts, such as jargon, argot, special language, slang, and the like, do not have the necessary terminological rigor of definitions. They are often used indiscriminately, substitute for each other or receive ambiguous, sometimes mutually exclusive interpretations" [J.Austin, 2008; 440].

Professionalism is often interpreted as a product of individual creativity of individual social and industrial-professional groups of native speakers [Shevchuk V.N., 2006; 191-192].

Professionalisms occupy a special layer of vocabulary, which is intermediate between terms and neutral common words. They arouse the interest of linguists in the field of sociolinguistics, lexicography, stylistics and cognitive science.

Having studied the English phraseological units of the sports sphere, N.Dittmar concludes that figurative terminology, rich in idiomatic expressions, refers "to the lexical sphere of professional jargon" [N.Dittmar, 2009; 321].

The lexical and semantic field of professionalism is much broader than the semantics of terms. This difference is explained by the fact that professionalisms have a wider sphere of realities compared to a relatively narrow circle of realities denoted by terms.

Considering the professional vocabulary from the position of stylistics, we can conclude that in most cases it is devoid of expression. Unregulated military terminology is used in diaries, letters and speeches of military staff [Bates, 2006; 211]. As well as terms, professional words do not express a subjective attitude and assessment to the object of utterance. Hence, like terms, professionalisms perform only a nominative function. Only in certain genres of fiction there are colloquial professionalism. They often have a negative connotation and belong to a conversational-familiar style.

Military phraseological units, as well as military terms, can initially be common expressions, and then acquire the status of a term [Akhmedov O.S., 2016; 133]. Phraseological units used in the military sphere are divided into two groups: 1) with elements of professionalism and 2) arising on the basis of everyday vocabulary. Military stable phrases are characterized by a narrow sphere of use, since military vocabulary belongs to a rather narrow circle of speakers, is used and understood only by military staff [Shevchenko, Mitchell, Ignatov, 2016; 68]. The scope of the use of professional vocabulary is quite limited, although it is included in the system of literary language [Bolinger, 2005; 114].

When translating, the translator is obliged to convey all the information as fully and accurately as possible, without errors and distortions. The study of the process of formation of military terms is necessary to determine the exact meaning of the term and the way it is transmitted during translation. Of course, this knowledge is most necessary for a military interpreter in an interpretation situation, when we are talking about significant time constraints. Knowledge of the following ways of word formation is necessary for a translator to quickly orient and understand the issues. The most common are syntactic terms that are formed by using signs that already exist in the language, while the most productive ways are affixation, calcification, word composition, reduction and conversion.

I. Rasulov believes that tracing paper is one of the most adequate ways to translate military vocabulary [Rasulov And, 1977; 66]. In addition to tracing paper, affixation, composition, morphological, phonological and lexico-semantic methods of translation are used to translate military vocabulary. The term "tracing paper" appeared in the late XIX-early XX century. Sh. Bally first introduced this term and interpreted it as follows: "Tracing paper is a borrowed word from another language" [Bally Sh, 1961; 67].

It should be noted that when using the tracing (calque) paper method in the translation of military vocabulary, a foreign (borrowed) word can be used, which undergoes phonetic processing of the translation language and is further used in it. Therefore, there is a distinction between full tracing paper method and partial tracing paper. For example, the gallicism chief of staff first entered the Russian language as "*chief of staff*", and then into the Uzbek language as "*shtab boshligi*".

So, English phraseological units of the military sphere of use, denoting various types of weapons and military equipment, usually do not have Uzbek equivalents and analogues. When translating such expressions from English into Uzbek, the name of this weapon in Uzbek should be selected. It follows from this that a military phraseology in translation can be transformed into a military term in the absence of such a phraseological expression in the target language.

Another difficulty in translating English phraseological units of military discourse into Uzbek is the national and cultural content, which is difficult to convey in the translation language even in the form of a simple phrase, not to mention the form of phraseological expression. Borrowed words entered the Uzbek military vocabulary mainly through the Russian language.

In the translation of phraseological units, tracing paper method is not able to convey the image embedded in the semantics of the phraseological unit. On the basis of calque, you can keep the form, but lose the meaning. For example, the

English phraseology field study will be incorrectly translated as "dala o'rganish" (study the field). The form and components of phraseology are preserved here, but the semantic meaning is lost – "studying the experience of troops in field classes". This means that this expression cannot be translated into Uzbek in the form of phraseology. To preserve the meaning of the expression in the Uzbek language, it is advisable to use the explication method – dala mashg'ulotlarida qo'shin tajribasini o'rganish. As you can see, it is this method of translation that retains the meaning of phraseology, but changes its form.

Explication is a method of unfolding (revealing) the essence of an object (phenomenon) through a variety of other objects and phenomena. In our case, this method gives us the opportunity to fully understand phraseological units and terms that have no equivalents in the Uzbek language.

Mukhamedova L.D. studied the translation of complex English military terms into Uzbek: general staff – not "*general shtab*", but "*bosh shtab*"; first lieutenant – not "*birinchi leytenant*", but "*kichik leytenant*"; tactical air command – not "*taktik havo qo'mondoni*", but "*havo qo'mondonligi taktikasi*" [Mukhamedova L.D., 2021;116].

It is impractical to translate English military expressions word by word into Uzbek, since the translation may be completely wrong. It often happens that a military phraseology in translation becomes a military term in the absence of such a phraseology in the Uzbek language. Adequate translation requires background knowledge of the military sphere. For example, a translator with linguistic knowledge of the military sphere will correctly translate the English expression "warrant officer" into Uzbek if there is background knowledge – a sergeant major (for the air force) and a conductor (for the navy).

Thus, in this article, a study of military terms and methods of their translation from English into Uzbek was conducted. Most military terminology refers to the terms themselves, i.e., the term correlates with one concept and does not carry ambiguity. Their exact correspondences in the Uzbek language provide a complete translation of the speech of prisoners of war. At the same time, do not forget that the meaning and use of words, even military ones, is directly related to the context. This is what should be given special attention in the context of oral communication. Errors in the translation of military terms can lead to significant distortion and change of meaning. Combat documents, regulations, instructions and technical descriptions, where the accuracy of the translation of military terms is a prerequisite, also often have to be translated during interrogation. In order to avoid such mistakes, the interpreter needs to constantly improve his knowledge of military terminology, modern realities of the development of military science and technology, as well as the military-political situation in the world. Summing up the above, it should be noted that translating military discourse is not an easy and extremely responsible task. The translator of this profile is obliged not only to demonstrate excellent knowledge of native and foreign languages, but also to understand the realities of domestic and foreign weapons, the principles of military service, to know the history and structure of the army of his native country and the army of the enemy.

REFERENCES

- [1]. Akhmedov O.S. Linguistic analysis and translation problems of tax-customs terms in English and Uzbek: Philol.doctor of science diss. - Tashkent, 2016. – 255 p.
- [2]. Bally Sh. French style. – Moscow, 1961. – 269 p.
- [3]. Mukhamedova L.J. Gallicisms in the military terminology of English and the problems of translating them into Uzbek: Philol. fan. PhD on diss.- Tashkent, 2021. – 172 p.
- [4]. Paluanova H.D. Ecologist terminolarning derivation hususiyatlari. – T.: Fan va technology, 2016. – 152 b.
- [5]. Rasulov I. Lexicon of the Uzbek language during the glorious war years. - Tashkent: Science, 1977. – 149 p.
- [6]. Shevchuk V.N. Concerning incorporation in English military terms // Semantic and syntactic problems of the theory of language and translation. - M., 2006. – pp. 191-204.
- [7]. Austin J.L. The Meaning of Words. – New York, 2008. – P.240.
- [8]. Bates E. Language in, on, and about time. – Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2006. – P. 201-229.
- [9]. Bolinger D. Language: The Loaded Weapon. – London: Longman, 2005. – 114 p.
- [10]. Dittmar N. Sociolinguistics: a Critical Survey of Theory and Applications. – London: Edward Arnold, 2009. – 336 p.
- [11]. Strang B. Modern English Structure. – London: Duckworth, 2009. – 414p.