Rashidov Otabek Ziyadulayevich

Termez State University

Teacher of the Interfaculty Department of Foreign Languages

SOURCES OF FORMATION AND THEORETICAL DIRECTIONS OF MILITARY TERMINOLOGY IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK LANGUAGE

Abstract. This article examines the sources of formation and key theoretical directions in the development and study of military terminology in English and Uzbek. Military terms arise under the influence of historical conflicts, institutional structures, technology, and intercultural contact, and they evolve through borrowing, word-formation, semantic change, and terminologization. The paper outlines major theoretical approaches to military terminology—structural, semantic, cognitive, socioterminological, translation-oriented, and corpus-based—and applies them comparatively to English and Uzbek.

Keywords: military terminology, term formation, English, Uzbek, borrowing, terminologization, socioterminology, translation, standardization.

Аннотация. В данной статье рассматриваются источники формирования и ключевые теоретические направления развития и изучения военной терминологии на английском и узбекском языках. Военные термины возникают под влиянием исторических конфликтов, институциональных структур, технологий и межкультурных контактов и эволюционируют посредством заимствований, словообразования, семантических изменений и терминологизации. В статье изложены основные теоретические подходы к военной терминологии — структурный, семантический, когнитивный, социотерминологический, переводоориентированный и корпусный — и проведено их сравнительное применение к английскому и узбекскому языкам.

Ключевые слова: военная терминология, терминообразование, английский, узбекский, заимствования, терминологизация, социотерминология, перевод, стандартизация.

Introduction. Military terminology is a highly specialized lexical subsystem that serves operational communication, training, doctrine writing, procurement, and strategic messaging. Unlike everyday vocabulary, military terms are expected to be precise, standardized, and stable; however, modern warfare and security environments accelerate lexical change. In English, military terminology develops under strong institutional standardization (e.g., alliance doctrine, defense publishing systems) and constant technological innovation. In Uzbek, military terminology reflects Turkic lexical foundations, historical layers of Persian-Arabic influence, long-term Russian mediation during the Soviet period, and contemporary modernization where international terms increasingly enter through English.

Main part. In specialized linguistic studies, a **term** is defined as a lexical unit that designates a clearly delimited concept within a specific field of knowledge and functions in professional communication with a stable and conventionalized meaning. Unlike general vocabulary, terms are characterized by their close association with a structured system of concepts and by their functional orientation toward accuracy and efficiency.

Military terminology represents a particularly distinct category of specialized lexis. Its specificity is determined by several interrelated factors. First, military terms are tightly **concept-bound**, as they are directly connected to doctrinal principles, tactical procedures, and organizational structures. Second, they operate under strict **operational constraints**, which require immediacy of understanding, semantic precision, and the elimination of ambiguity in high-stakes communicative situations. Third, military terminology is subject to strong **standardization pressures**, enforced through official manuals, glossaries, and hierarchical command systems to ensure uniform interpretation and interoperability. Finally,

the system of military terms is highly dynamic due to **rapid technological and strategic innovation**, driven by the emergence of new weapons platforms, cyber capabilities, and hybrid forms of warfare.

A terminological system is not merely a list of words; it is a concept network where hierarchical relations (e.g., weapon → missile → cruise missile) and functional relations (e.g., detection → tracking → engagement) structure meanings.

A significant portion of English military terminology originates from earlier historical strata. The influence of **French and Norman** is particularly evident in the vocabulary of command, rank, and military administration (e.g., *army, lieutenant, sergeant*). In addition, **Latin and Greek** sources have played a crucial role in shaping strategic, scientific, and technical terminology, producing terms such as *strategy, logistics,* and *ballistic*. Furthermore, the experience of colonial expansion and global military engagements has contributed to the development of extensive operational vocabulary, including a large number of abbreviations and acronyms that reflect modern military practice.

The Uzbek military lexicon is grounded primarily in a **Turkic linguistic base**, which provides core terms related to traditional concepts of defense, protection, and weaponry. Alongside this foundation, **Persian and Arabic** layers have historically exerted strong influence, particularly in administrative terminology, rank titles, and abstract concepts associated with honor, duty, and governance. A decisive stage in the formation of Uzbek military terminology occurred during the **Russian and Soviet period**, which introduced a wide range of institutional, organizational, and technical terms, especially in the areas of command structure, military ranks, and equipment. In the contemporary period, **international influence mediated by English** has become increasingly prominent, particularly in high-technology fields such as cyber operations, unmanned systems, and surveillance technologies.

Comparative perspective: While English functions largely as a source language that disseminates military terms globally—especially in high-technology and alliance-based contexts—Uzbek has historically absorbed military terminology through Russian and is now increasingly adopting terms directly from English in response to modernization and international cooperation.

Translation-oriented theory occupies a central position in the study of military terminology, as military communication frequently operates in multilingual and multinational contexts. One of the primary challenges involves **conceptual non-equivalence**, where a specific term or concept is present in one military doctrine but lacks a direct counterpart in another. Another critical issue concerns the **transfer of abbreviations and acronyms**, requiring translators to decide whether such forms should be retained in their original shape, translated into the target language, or expanded for clarity. In addition, translators must constantly negotiate between **calquing and direct borrowing**, balancing the need for semantic transparency and readability against the demands of international standardization and interoperability. A further complication arises from **false friends**, particularly those mediated through Russian or English, which may appear formally similar but differ in meaning or usage.

The practical value of translation-oriented theory lies in its applicability to the preparation of bilingual and multilingual military manuals, professional training materials, and documents intended for international military cooperation.

Conclusion. Military terminology in English and Uzbek emerges from intertwined sources: historical layers, institutional standardization, borrowing, internal word-formation, and semantic specialization. English shows strong productivity in compounding and acronymization, amplified by alliance interoperability and global defense discourse. Uzbek military terminology reflects a Turkic core enriched by Persian–Arabic heritage, shaped substantially by Russian-mediated institutional vocabulary, and increasingly influenced by English-driven technological innovation. Theoretical directions—structural, semantic,

cognitive, socioterminological, translation-oriented, and corpus-based—provide complementary tools for analyzing these terminologies as dynamic systems rather than static word lists. Future research should prioritize corpus-driven bilingual termbases, concept mapping across doctrines, and translation guidelines for emerging domains such as cyber and unmanned warfare.

References:

1.   Saidazimkhon, S. (2022, August). LEXICOGRAPHICAL FORMATION AND THE USAGE OF MILITARY TERMINOLOGY IN ENGLISH. In INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCES (Vol. 1, No. 11, pp. 57-62).

2.   Karshieva, B. F. (2023). A component of professional communicative competence in English is professional engineering knowledge. Journal of Universal Science Research, 1(12), 257-261.

3.   Karshieva, B. F. (2024). TEACHING ENGLISH TO TECHNICAL STUDENTS THROUGH THE PRINCIPLES OF INTEGRATION BASED ON INTERDISCIPLINARY RELATIONS. Экономика и социум, (7 (122)), 108-111.

4.   Рашидов, О. З. (2018). СОВРЕМЕННЫЕ МЕТОДИКИ ПРЕПОДАВАНИЯ АНГЛИЙСКОГО ЯЗЫКА. Вопросы педагогики, (6-2), 54 56.

5.   Rashidov, O. (2022). TRANSLATION PROBLEMS OF LITERATURE. Общественные науки в современном мире: теоретические и практические исследования, 1(24), 39-43.