

Ключевые слова: “онимный код”, коннотации, коннотема, библейский оним.

Анотація

Л. М. Бражнік. “Онімний код” поезії М. Гумільова

Статтю присвячено розкриттю “онімного коду” поезії М. Гумільова, репрезентованого складною образною системою власних імен, що мають прямі та переносні значення й відбивають духовні шукання поета.

Ключові слова: “онімний код”, конотації, конотема, біблейський онім.

Abstract

L. Brazhnik. “The Onyms code” in N. Humilyov’s Poetry

The article focuses on the linguistic analysis of “the onyms code” in “Judif” by N. Humilyov. Some additional connotations of the proper names of the poetic text have been identified; the types of implication observed in the poem have been singled out and characterized. The semantic group of the Bible anthroponyms: Judif, Salomea, Olofern, Jokanaan, introduced by the poet, has been described. The four mentioned onyms in the poem have the following connotations: “Russia”, “Germany”, “war”, “death”, “the Russian people”, “tragedy”. They emphasize two main aspects of the war: the war, as a call and a fatal necessity, and the war, as a threat, violence and death. The fatal necessity leads a person to danger or death, and at the same time a need for some outcome is hidden in it. It leads to a contradictory perception of the poem. It has been stated that the complex image system of the literary proper names reflects the inner world of the poet and reveals the peculiarities of the “Silver Age” poetry.

Key words: “the onyms code”, connotations, connoteme, biblical onyms.

**D. V. Vasylenko
(Horlivka)**

УДК 81’37.811.111

THE CIVILIAN APPROPRIATION OF MILITARY VOCABULARY

In accordance with M. Foucault’s discourse theory, language is not a static bank of words but a dynamic repertoire of vocabulary, phrases, concepts, and context that includes the traditions, institutions, social practices, and symbolic systems in which it’s used [1]. Any specific discourse is inseparable from these features of a society.

Military vocabulary has become part of the English language over many years. This has been a normal process, since people tend naturally to draw upon experiences in one area of life in order to give fresh insight and understanding to experiences in another.

A lot of military words have established themselves quite firmly in people’s modern-day consciousness. American linguists, W. Glowka, R. Goodword, A. Wilson, admit the incredible productivity and flexibility of military vocabulary which has a great impact on the English language [2; 3; 10]. W. Silkett writes that “few specialized vocabularies have been as similarly borrowed, copied, and altered as has the military vocabulary” [7].

One may say that the use of militaristic language is harmless, and serves to make people’s communication more colorful and precise. What has concerned some linguists (G. Lakoff and M. Johnson) is patterns of metaphorical thinking at the metacognitive level [4]. They assert that in English-speaking society people conceive of “argument as war” as shown by a set of conceptual metaphors which may become part of people’s belief system. Linguistic research has proved the influence of language on people’s thinking patterns.

D. Smith has explored these ideas further and proved that the dominant theme of war emerges repeatedly: “Politics is war”, “Electoral reform is war”, “Improvement of the economy is a battle”, “Marketing is war”, “Environmental protection is a battle”, “Medical progress is a battle”, etc. [8].

Ch. Schaffner and A. Wenden assert that these metaphors are related to one another at an ideological level [6]. They conclude that the language of journalists and diplomats frequently represents ideological stances that accept and promote war as a legitimate way of regulating international relations and settling inter-group conflict; that language promotes values, sustains attitudes and encourages actions that create conditions that can lead to war; and that language itself creates the kind of enemy image

essential to provoking and maintaining hostility that can help justify war. The linguists write about the need for critical language education in *Language and Peace*.

Though many researchers cannot make any definite claims about the effects of militaristic language in public speech, they caution its frequent use saying that it might further the militaristic mindset of the American society.

Some questions remain: why militaristic vocabulary is frequently borrowed, whether it always has negative effects and whether it has possible good effects or be more effective in some discourse. It's worth questioning whether militarized language has any significant effects on American citizens, whether the public's appropriations of such terminology imply recognition of and resistance to the ideological manipulation at work in military discourse. *The guiding question of this inquiry is:* to what extent militarized vocabulary influences the way the English language is used and the effects of the language use on society. It is important to understand current changes in these spheres better in order to overcome the socio-linguistic barrier between the native culture of learners and the culture of the target language.

The article aims at studying the appropriation of military discourse into the public sphere and the infiltration of military terminology into specialized vocabularies. *The following questions have been considered:*

1. What sociolinguistic factors led to the spread of military lexicon in American English at the end of the 20th and the beginning of the 21st century?
2. What were the main sociofunctional groups of military lexical units?
3. Which core lexemes within military terminology became the bases of lexical innovations?
4. What military words were adopted by the public?
5. What spheres of social life were affected by the military lexicon impact most of all? What specialized vocabularies borrowed military terms?
6. How does the spread of military vocabulary affect the public? Is there any evidence of the militarization of public speech and the social realm that is ongoing on different levels?

Any language is a reflection of different social processes that influence the mentality of people who speak this language. It is always contextualized and situated within a given socio-cultural setting. To study the language changes it is necessary to investigate social, cultural and political situation in the country.

This investigation is based on authentic language data: samples of public discourse data (media) in which military lexical units can be found; discourse realizations of military vocabulary which acquire new meanings or, on the contrary, do not actualize their meanings described in the lexicographic sources. A representative sample of extracts from different kinds of text shows how military words and set expressions are used in public speech. It provides some data for the use in research and makes it possible to get a better understanding of the extent to which military terminology infiltrates the language of civilians [5; 9].

To analyze the collected data *the methods of semantic (contextual) analysis and sociolinguistic analysis* have been applied.

This sociolinguistic survey of war words focuses on the regional wars at the end of the 20th – the beginning of the 21st century. Several factors influence the civilian appropriation of military vocabulary. They are based on the following correlations: 1. “A human being – war”, 2. “A human being – weaponry”, 3. “A human being – military science”.

The correlation between certain extralinguistic and lexico-semantic processes has been established. Two main sociofunctional groups of military lexical units have been distinguished. They reveal: 1. The character, the participants, the aims and goals of the war; war operations and activities (*The War with Iraq 1991; 2003-10 – George Bush's Vietnam*); 2. The Revolution in military affairs and technological changes which have influenced military science (*high-tech weapons, smart weapons, brilliant weapons, precision-guided weaponry, stealth*).

Military core lexemes have been singled out, and the interaction of general lexicon and military terms has been revealed: *weapon* (before 900; ME (Middle English) *wepen*, OE (Old English) *wæpen*), *ight* (before 900; ME *ig(h)hten*, OE *fe(o)htan*), *ire* (before 900; ME; OE *fyr*); *war* (before 1150; ME, late OE *werre*), *kill* (1175-1225; ME *cullen*, *killen* – *to strike, beat, kill*; OE *cyllan*), *battle* (1250-1300; ME *bataile* < OF (Old French)), *defense* (1250-1300; ME < OF), *mine* (1275-1325 ME < MF (Middle French)); *gun* (1300-1350; ME *gunne*, *gonne*); *grenade* (1525-1535; E (English) < F (French)), *bomb* (1580-1590; E < F), *missile* (1600-1610; E < L (Latin)).

Some military lexemes shift their meanings over time, as they are used in new circumstances. Despecialization of meaning is a common type of semantic shift: **bomb** – “an outstandingly good person or thing”; **barrage** – “information flow”; **frontiere** – “to achieve the expected result”; **kill** – “destroy”; **stealth bathing suit** – “bathing suit whose cut and pattern are designed to hide flaws in the figure of the wearer”. Another common type of semantic shift is transspecialization. Some specialized vocabularies have borrowed a number of military terms:

computing: **logic bomb** = **logic time-bomb** – “an instruction secretly programmed into a computer, as an act of sabotage or fraud, that will cause the system to break down in specific circumstances”, **dictionary attack** – “an attempted illegal entry to a computer system that uses a dictionary headword list to generate possible passwords” (“I’m wondering where I can find good collections of dictionaries which can be used for dictionary attacks?” [security.stackexchange.com]);

business: **cross-ring** – “commercial fraud”, **Weapons of Mass Consumption** – (pun) < weapons of mass destruction;

politics: **ceasefire** – “conflict prolongation”, **Weapons of Mass Distraction** – “something which distracts a person’s mind from important events”, **turf battle** – “a conflict or argument between rivals for control of something” (“Anna and Rohan were the perfect weapon of mass distraction always talking into the early hours of the morning” [urbandictionary.com]);

law: **freedom fighters** – “terrorists”, **artillery** – “criminals” (“The statement, “One man’s terrorist is another man’s freedom fighter,” has become a cliché” [ict.org.il/ResearchPublications]);

science and technology: **relativistic bomb** – “any of various objects or devices travelling in space that are held, because of their great speed, to be able to destroy anything in their path” (“Their most probable weapon would be a relativistic bomb, a projectile that strikes its target planet at close to the speed of light” [adrianberry.net/cataster]);

medicine: **smart bomb** – “drugs” (“Doctors have successfully dropped the first “smart bomb” on breast cancer, using a drug to deliver a toxic payload to tumor cells while leaving healthy ones alone” [nbcnews.com/id]).

Military lexemes with semantic shift express some negative connotation in specialized vocabularies, such as confrontation, aggression, conflict, disagreement, argument and others. Militaristic language has significant emotional appeal and it serves to highlight aspects of daily life as having a war-like character.

Further detailed research of the impact of warfare and military terminology on the English language is necessary for sociolinguistics which has become an increasingly important field of study, as language use symbolically represents fundamental dimensions of social behavior. Sociolinguistics brings together theory, description, and application in the study of language. The investigation of the linguistic resources will give the complete representation of the social background of the English language development, the non-linguistic factors that influence the language. It will help to identify different aspects connected with civilian adoption and manipulation of military lexicon.

Bibliography

1. Foucault M. The Archeology of Knowledge / Michel Foucault. – Routledge Classics edition, 2002. – 275 p.
2. Glowka W. Among the New Words // American Speech, 2001-2006. – [en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Nuclear_option].
3. Goodword R. How does War Affect the Way we Speak? – [alphadictionary.com/articles].
4. Lakoff G. and Johnson M. Metaphors We Live by / George Lakoff and Mark Johnson. – University of Chicago Press : Chicago, 2003. – 276 p.
5. New Words [Hargraves O.]. – Oxford University Press, 2004. – 320 p.
6. Schaffner Chr. and Wenden A. Language and Peace, Dartmouth Publishing Company, 1995. – [chass.utoronto.ca/~cpercyc/cours].
7. Silkett, Wayne A. Words of War. Military Affairs 49.1 (1985): 13-16. – [chass.utoronto.ca/~cpercyc/cours].
8. Smith D. Peace Magazine July-August, 1997. – P. 14.
9. The Oxford Dictionary of New Words [Knowles E., Elliott J.]. – Oxford, New York, Oxford University Press, 1997. – 357 p.
10. Wilson A. Military Terminology and the English Language, 2008. – [chass.utoronto.ca/~cpercyc/cours].

Аннотация

Д. В. Василенко. Переход англоязычной военной лексики в общеупотребительный лексикон и профессиональные подязыки

Статья посвящена исследованию военных лексических единиц современного английского языка, процессов их деспециализации (детерминологизации) и трансспециализации (транстерминологизации), их переходу в общеупотребительную лексику и профессиональные подязыки. В статье отмечается, что вследствие изменений их семантики образуются инновации, которые концентрируются вокруг лексем: *war, kill, bomb, gun* и передают пейоративные значения: агрессивные, неправомерные, наступательные, неожиданные действия, конфронтацию и конфликты. Выделяются сферы употребления военных лексем: бизнес, политика, медицина, закон и правопорядок. Определяются социолингвистические факторы, влияющие на процессы адаптации военной лексики.

Ключевые слова: военные термины, общеупотребительная лексика, специальная лексика, ядерные лексемы, социолингвистические факторы.

Анотація

Д. В. Василенко. Перехід англomовної військової лексики до загальноживаного лексикону та професійних підмов

Статтю присвячено дослідженню військових лексичних одиниць сучасної англійської мови, процесів їх деспеціалізації (детермінологізації) та трансспеціалізації (транстермінологізації) і переходу до загальноживаної лексики та професійних підмов. У статті зазначено, що внаслідок змін їх семантики утворюються лінгвальні інновації, які концентруються навколо ключових лексем: *war, kill, bomb, gun* і передають пейоративні значення: агресивні, неправомірні, наступальні, несподівані дії, конфронтацію і конфлікти. Виокремлено сфери вживання військових лексем: бізнес, політика, медицина, закон та правопорядок. Визначено соціолінгвістичні чинники, що впливають на процеси адаптації військової лексики.

Ключові слова: військові терміни, загальноживана лексика, спеціальна лексика, ядерні лексеми, соціолінгвістичні чинники.

Abstract

D. V. Vasylenko. The Civilian Appropriation of Military Vocabulary

The article is dedicated to the problem of English war terms transition to the general lexicon and some specialized vocabularies. It has been stated that military terminology serves to perform linguistic and social functions: it names new objects and reflects new notions, fosters the communication process, and gives a particular ideological spin to wartime news reports. The data examined have proved the interrelation between social and linguistic phenomena, the changes which take place in the society and the language and their interdependence. The survey discloses the peculiarities of English military lexicon as a dynamic system, the development of the English military vocabularies under the influence of certain sociolinguistic factors: the character and the aims of military conflicts; the Revolution in military affairs and technological changes which have influenced military science. Three main sociofunctional groups of military lexical units have been distinguished. The core lexemes within military terminology which have become the bases of lexical innovations have been singled out. Some spheres of social life and specialized vocabularies affected by the military lexicon have been identified.

Key words: military terms, general lexicon, specialized vocabularies, sociolinguistic factors, civilian adoption and manipulation of military lexicon.