

PHILOLOGICAL SCIENCES

CORPORATE JARGON IN THE INFORMAL DISCOURSE OF MILITARY SERVICES

Olga Andriyanova¹

DOI: https://doi.org/10.30525/978-9934-588-11-2_39

Today, as the Russo-Ukrainian war is continuing in eastern Ukraine, the attention of society is drawn to the military. The linguistic situation in the military is of interest to linguists. However, the informal vocabulary of the military, which appears in the sociolect, remains out of the linguists' attention.

The purpose of our research is to investigate one type of sociolect – the jargon of soldiers, peculiar to groups of people with a special character of activity and subculture, complex and multidimensional, with a clear internal structure and ritual expression, corporate values and norms.

Military jargon is formed under special conditions.

First, there are socio-occupational groups in the military environment with some differences and characteristics that belong only to them, however, they do not exist in isolation but affect one another. Structurally, the Armed Forces of Ukraine consist of conscript and contract service (soldiers, sergeants, ensigns, officers) and civilian personnel. Organizationally, the Armed Forces are divided into separate species and genera. Therefore, within the military sublanguage, for example, the sublanguage of the Land Forces can be distinguished, as well as the sublanguage of mechanized troops, etc. In addition, we distinguish the professional language of teachers and cadets of higher education, as well as even of a separate military unit. Accordingly, we can talk about the existence of both common military jargon (understood by most members of this society), and the jargon of certain socio-professional groups (say, jargon of tankers, gunners, etc.).

Secondly, the speech culture of soldiers is formed in a fairly regulated environment. People engaged in military affairs, especially cadets and conscripts, live quite an isolated life and communicate mostly within the unit, staying in one company of people around the clock (training, housing, food). Therefore, corporate jargon in informal discourse, as a consequence of close communication, penetrates into all spheres of life and promotes the rapprochement of military members who used to be in different social groups.

Thirdly, the number of native speakers of military specialty is quite numerous, and is only increasing due to hostilities in Eastern Ukraine. That is, we can talk about the mass use of military jargon and its spread in spoken language.

¹ Hetman Petro Sahaidachnyi National Army Academy, Ukraine

Obtained material (selected from fiction, magazine and newspaper periodicals, radio and television programs, documentaries and feature films, Internet discourse, conversations with the military) allowed us to establish that the jargon is heterogeneous. At one time L. Stavitskaya expressed the right opinion that «any society cannot inherently be socially homogeneous; it is divided into social, corporate groups with its sublanguage, which, on one hand, defies the literary standard, and, on the other, produces its own self-sufficient linguistic micro-world, indifferent to the standard and to other socio-linguistic groups» [1, p. 54]. The jargon reproduces the specificity of the professional language in which it is used as a means of internal group language communication.

The use of military jargon is due to:

- economy of speech means (need for reduction of words) («Makar» – Makarov pistol; «Saushka» – self-propelled artillery unit);
- traditions that have developed in the military sphere («payka» – the amount of food given out in the canteen; «triohsoty» – wounded in battles);
- the possibility of secreting information: («mulyk» that is translated as «cartoon» – universal camouflage color);
- the desire of the military to belong to a particular subculture with a special sublanguage.

The jargon of the military is constantly growing and diversifying. The majority of jargon is related to topics concerning the basics of professional activity, although the military life of soldiers and officers is also widely reproduced in the jargon.

For example, lexemes are often used to denote:

- military equipment («karandash» which means «pencil» – a rocket projectile from hail; «Pokemon» – a modernized Kalashnikov machine gun; «mukha» which means «a fly» – a hand anti-tank grenade launcher, «beha» – infantry fighting machine);
- military ranks, positions and professions («Polkan» – Colonel; «Starliey» – Senior Lieutenant; «Kap», «Kapitoshka», «Two Lieutenants» – Captain; «Batko» which is translated as «Father» – Unit Commander; «Contrabas» – contract officer; «Bobry» which means «beavers» – engineers involved in the construction of wells, trenches and other structures);
- service life (for soldiers: «Dembel» – demobilized; «zapah» meaning «smell» – before taking the oath; «karas» that is translated as «crucian» – served six months in the Navy; «godok», «cherpak» meaning «ladle», «phazan» which means «pheasant» – served a year; «did» that is «grandfather» – served from 1.5 to 2 years; «duh», «zelenyi» which means «green», «pidguznyk» translates as «diaper», «salabon», «salaga», «synok» meaning «son», «udav» – served the first 6 months of conscription);
- military and domestic activities: («kashlo» – any kind of porridge; «drib 16» – barley porridge; «drib 8» – «fine barley porridge; «balabasy» – volunteer treats; «biluha» – soldiers' underwear; «boyovka» – combat clothing; «organize a PGD» – remove all beds from the sleeping area and make general cleaning).

Testing for the viability of military jargon occurs in a live speech. As a result of the armed confrontation, some of them were actualized, such as «zelenka», «sushka», «dvohsotyi», others became a part of the spoken language, or even are included into general dictionaries. However, there are new developments in the jargon that will soon disappear from the active vocabulary of Ukrainians, along with the phenomena they denote.

The jargon is essential for the full life of each language. The only necessary thing for it is to be formed within its own language. As Yuriy Shevelyov noted: «Jargon and slang are and have long been the soil from which the living juices come to this language, the soil where its life flows smoothly. It is well-known that modern Romance languages came from «vulgar» rather than normative Latin».

In our work we use the term «military jargon», under which, following Korovushkin V. P., we consider «a lexical microsystem that covers all the set of military jargon» [2, p. 57]. According to Kharchenko E. V., military jargon is a corporate language «the language of professionals in one narrow field» [3, p. 59]. Zakharchuk O. A. defines military jargon «as an open, moving layer of vocabulary» [4, p. 224].

In our view, military jargon is a sociolect that functions within the corporate culture of servicemen and serves as their informal professional communication.

Military-professional jargon is a secondary name for an object or phenomenon and has a counterpart in the literary language. Also the definition of Boyko B. L. is of great importance for us: «military jargon acts as a secondary name for what has its name in the normative literary language of statutes and regulations, in the texts of factory specifications for military equipment» [5, p. 97].

Thus, military jargon, formed in special conditions and having certain features, is one of the active ways of fixing military-professional activity and is necessary for the proper functioning of the professional language.

We see a further perspective on the study of sociolects in the language of the military. The illustrated material collected during the study can be used in sociolinguistics classes, stylistics of the modern Ukrainian language, as well as to serve as a compilation of the vocabulary of the military jargon.

References:

1. Stavitska, L. (2000). Korotkyy slovnyk zharhonnoyi leksyky (na materialy suchasnoyi ukrayins'koyi literatury) [A short dictionary of jargon (on the material of contemporary Ukrainian literature)]. *Slovo i chas*, no 4, pp. 54–58.
2. Korovushkin, V. P. (2003). Nestandartnaya leksika v angliyskom i ruskom voyennykh podyazykakh (ponyatiynyy apparat sotsioleksikologicheskogo opisaniya) [Special vocabulary in English and Russian military sublanguages (conceptual apparatus of socio-lexicological description)]. *Vestnik Orenburgskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta*, no 4, pp. 53–59.
3. Kharchenko, Y. V. (2002). Korporativnyy yazyk i mezhkul'turnaya kommunikatsia [Corporate language and intercultural communication]. *Russkiy yazyk: istoriya i sovremennost'*: materialy mezhdunar. nauch. Prakt. konf. pamyati prof. G. A. Turbina [Russian language: history and modernity: international materials. Scientific-practical conf. memory prof. G.A. Turbina]. (23–24 Oct. 2002). Chelyabinsk, vol. II, pp. 201–202.

4. Zakharchuk, O. A. (2011). Tematicheskaya klassifikatsiya voyennogo zhargona kak otrazheniye professional'nogo vospriyatiya voyennosluzhashchikh. [Thematic classification of military jargon as a reflection of the professional perception of military personnel]. *Vestnik Chelyabinskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta. Filologiya. Iskusstvovedeniye*. Chelyabinsk, vol. 57, no 24 (239), pp. 224–226.

5. Boyko, B. L. (2008). Yazykovaya kartina mira armeyskoy subkul'tury [Linguistic picture of the world of army subculture]. *Vestnik Voyennogo universiteta*, no 4, pp. 96–102.

6. Shevel'ov, Yu. (1996). Dvomovnist' i vul'haryzmy [Bilingualism and Vulgarisms]. *Vydatnyy filoloh suchasnosti* (Naukovi vyklady na chest' 85-littyi Yuriya Shevel'ova). [An outstanding philologist of the present (Scientific Presentations in Honor of the 85th Anniversary of Yuri Shevelyov)]. Kharkiv.

DECLENSION OF MASCULINE NAMES AND DECLENSION OF HARD GROUP IN MODERN UKRAINIAN LITERARY LANGUAGE

Julia Akhmedova¹

DOI: https://doi.org/10.30525/978-9934-588-11-2_40

Formulation of the issue. The morphological paradigms of anthroponyms – names of individuals – are included in the inflection system of lexical and grammatical categories of the noun. Compared with appellatives, in the declension process they reveal many specific features. The inflectional paradigm issues of the number of classes and subclasses of nouns were studied by I. I. Kovalyk, Yu. K. Redko, P. P. Chuchka, L. P. Kalakutska, A. A. Zalizniak, L. T. Masenko, V. O. Horpynych, I. M. Zheliezniak, N. P. Dziatkivska, L. G. Skrypnyk, S. I. Holovashchuk, S. L. Kovtiukh, O. M. Kashtalian and others. Despite the long-standing tradition of studies of word-changing paradigms of anthroponyms, in modern domestic linguistics there is no comprehensive description of the distinctive forms of Ukrainian proper masculine and feminine names, taking into account extra- and intralingual factors.

The relevance of the study is due to the need for the systematic analysis of the morphological paradigms of Ukrainian names of individuals and the identification of the number of EPCs (elementary paradigmatic classes) of anthroponyms of the first declension of the hard group to indicate males.

The purpose of the article is to analyze inflectional paradigms in the singular and plural of Ukrainian proper male names and their variants, taking into account the necessary factors. Realization of the goal involves the following tasks: 1) consider the influence of morphological name categories on the selection of case endings of the studied subclass of anthroponyms; 2) establish other criteria for determining inflectional paradigms of proper masculine names; 3) characterize highlighted EPCs of the I declension of the hard group.

¹ Volodymyr Vynnychenko Central Ukrainian State Pedagogical University, Ukraine