

## РОЗДІЛ 5 ЗАГАЛЬНЕ МОВОЗНАВСТВО

УДК 81'373.612.2; 14

DOI <https://doi.org/10.32782/tps2663-4880/2022.23.1.34>

### THE IDENTIFICATION AND DETERMINOLOGISATION OF THE METAPHOR IN THE OFFICIAL BUSINESS DOCUMENT

### ІДЕНТИФІКАЦІЯ ТА ДЕТЕРМІНОЛОГІЗАЦІЯ МЕТАФОРИ В ОФІЦІЙНОМУ-ДІЛОВОМУ ДОКУМЕНТІ

**Demianchuk Yu.I.,**

*orcid.org/0000-0001-8722-5568*

*PhD in Economics,*

*Lecturer of the German Language at the Department of Foreign Languages and Translation Studies  
Lviv State University of Life Safety*

The study makes an attempt to identify a military metaphor in an official business document (hereinafter referred to as the OBD) and to depict the process of determinologization of the military vocabulary in neutral one (in the form of a metaphor) in order to present the specifics of the military term formation. The study focuses on the coexistence of the military language constructs and the military metaphor in the OBD, which thereby rethinks the priorities of semantic dominance of the military language constructs (lexemes, term phrases) to the military metaphors, foregrounding the content and scope of the military-political discourse. The similarity between the special lexemes and the term phrases and the metaphor can be found in the lineup of semantic dependence between the concepts in fragments of the OBD. The difference between the term phrase and the metaphor consists only in the frequency of use of term locations (terminological units that are two, three and four component phrases) and the frequency of use of the metaphor in the OBD; in regulation of the terminological phrases and the metaphors according to the degree of term logicity; calculation and preservation of the global value that determines the importance of the components (term phrases, metaphors) for solving content analysis problems. To some extent, the method of analysis allows to outline the stylistic pertain of the military terminology, which is a key unit for consideration of special translation with the pronounced military-communicative function and the military metaphor, which is confidently becoming a universal mean of understanding the military realities. The main purpose of the study is to analyze the military metaphor in the OBD in order to demonstrate the in-depth knowledge of the military-political discourse texts.

**Key words:** military terminology, metaphor, official business document, determinologization.

У дослідженні робиться спроба ідентифікувати військову метафору в офіційно-діловому документі (далі ОДД) та зобразити процес детермінологізації військової лексики в нейтральну (у формі метафори) з метою представлення специфіки військового термінотворення. Виходячи з початкової гіпотези про те, що науково-популярні тексти використовують форми аналогії, які піддаються прямій інтерпретації та високій доступності, ми намагаємося показати, що фактичний спеціалізований військово-політичний дискурс міг би отримати користь від більш простих і різноманітних аналогій. Дослідження зосереджується на співіснуванні військових мовних конструктів та військової метафори в ОДД, що тим самим зміщує акценти семантичного домінування військових мовних конструктів (лексем, терміносполучень) на військові метафори висуваючи на передній план зміст і обсяг військово-політичного дискурсу. Подібність між спеціальними лексемами та терміносполученнями і метафорою можна знайти в ланцюжку семантичної залежності між поняттями у фрагментах ОДД. Різниця між терміносполучкою і метафорою полягає лише у частоті вживання термінолокацій (термінологічних одиниць – двох, трьох та чотирьох компонентних словосполучень) й частоті вживанні метафори в ОДД; впорядкуванні термінологічного словосполучення та метафори за ступенем термінологічності; підрахунку і збереженні глобальної ваги, що визначає значимість компонентів (терміносполучки, метафори) для розв'язання задач контент аналізу. Певною мірою, методика аналізу, дозволяє окреслити стильову приналежність військової термінології, що становить ключову одиницю розгляду спеціального перекладу з яскраво вираженою військово-комунікативною функцією та військової метафори, яка впевнено стає універсальним засобом осмислення військових реалій. Основна мета дослідження полягає в аналізі військової метафори в ОДД, щоб продемонструвати глибинне пізнання текстів військово-політичного дискурсу.

**Ключові слова:** військова термінологія, метафора, офіційно-діловий документ, детермінологізація.

**Introduction.** Analyzing the military terminology, which is a key component of the military-political speech and holds its place in its structure, as well as “is realized in the language through the language” [2], we aim not only to determine the military

metaphor and its positioning in OBD, but also to distinguish between the factors of formation of metaphors that determine the further acquisition of features of the military identity by metaphor. We agree that “the translation of official business texts is a process

of interpretation” [3] and is “relevant for the study of the special military terminology” [8]. According to R. Temmerman, separation of the context of realization of the military terminology content from OBD is followed by interpreting its content in one of linguistic analysis types [10]. Having developed the ideas of M. Harvey [4] on the combination of methods of the linguistic analysis, what gives the key to understanding the official business text and plays an important role in constructing a correct interpretation of the document, he laid the foundation for the theory of potential problems of interpretation of the military terminology in the sphere of term formation by introducing the concept of communication macro-environment into the scholarly discourse. Actually, D. Jurafsky wrote about a possibility of combining the military terminology as a means of communication in the military-political discourse, asserting that the penetration of the military terminology into various conceptual structures of OBD predetermines the formation of the military communication macroenvironment [5]. This opinion is popular in the modern theories of military term formation, in particular in the work of T. Vrabel “Lexical Aspects of Translation of the Business Correspondence”, where the scholar construes the military communication macroenvironment as a sphere of legal relations covering the government activities, international relations, jurisprudence, and military sphere [11]. Within the framework of such communication, the objectification of the official business terminology fits into the block of the language of diplomacy and law.

Researchers extensively investigated the military terminology and the metaphor separately, either in a context or in a document. Kugler [6] investigated the military metaphor in official business texts, but not in conjunction with a military terminology in one NATO’s official business document. The multi-use of terminological units within the OBD and the rare use of the metaphor in a same document are emphasized in Scott and Brydon’s *Dimensions of Communication* [9], a classic work that substantiates the need to use communication in understanding the military organization, in particular in the general and in the public discourse.

**Results and Discussion.** The specifics of military’s term formation can vary and this complicates the process of analyzing the respective context, because along with the main function of the military term, i.e. the nominative and definitive function (naming and definition of a special concept regulated by a definition within certain limitations), both significant and expressive functions can be traced [13]. However, the complexity consists only in the system of concepts [7, c. 256]. According to S. Flusberg, T. Matlock and

P. Tibodeau the terminologization that is often based on a metaphor is defined by cultural and social factors [2, c. 1–18]. In our research, lexical units of the metaphor served as a vivid example: “bone” – bomber B-1; “chicken plates” – protective tabs for small arms used in bulletproof vests; “close” – get closer (attack of forces); “yaw” – fumble; “commo” – means of communication; “thrust” – traction; “flight suit insert” – pilot; “pod” – transporter-launcher container; “dust-off” – helicopter evacuation; “rack” – bomb carrier; “bay” – bomb bay (NT, USDDT, RC, CEA) used to define the military equipment and military maneuvers.

The mismatch of worldviews and ideological positions produces new forms of the military terminology, which not only expands the military worldview and is projected onto the text, but also creates a new textual space for other spheres.

As a rule, the determinologization of the military vocabulary into the neutral one (in the form of a metaphor) and into the terminology of other spheres, is associated by some researchers (R. Hartmann, E. Coelho, M. Harvey) with the political discourse. Further, S. Yermolenko and S. Bybyk see the political discourse as a phenomenon that we face every day. Researchers assert that the struggle for the power is the main theme and driving motivator of this sphere of communication [12]. Decoding of a military language unit in the political sphere provides a key to understanding a text or its fragment.

In our research, the determinologization means a reverse process that allows us to take into account the military context of OBD, the perception of which incorporates the special military terminology in a form of a metaphor, as well as tools and conditions of its interpretation into the political discourse (text). To illustrate the process of determinologization, we use the nominations of military maneuvers: ‘defense’ and ‘launch an offensive’, by classifying the components of their semantic structure on such criteria as: 1) to prepare to repel the enemy attacks; 2) to create favorable conditions for assumption of the offensive; 3) type of hostilities; 4) rapid advancement of military units; 5) establishing control over a certain territory (USDDT, OALD).

Regrouping of military language constructs as a result of the actualization of a token and expression in the context of the political sphere shifts the emphasis of the semantic dominance, bringing the content and the scope of the political OBD to the fore. The mechanism of use of the procedure of determinologization in specific fragments of OBD is described below.

(1) Democrats launch offensive on climate. Democrats in both the House and Senate are boosting their messaging on climate this week ahead of the August recess (Sobczyk 2019).

(2) US climate deniers often rest their case on the defense of the American way of life... [1].

As stated above, the public perceptions of democrats in the House of Representatives and the Senate and their opponents (reflected in the relevant tokens) connect the nominations of defense and offensive with the climate change. However, conducting a defense operation, choosing the military tactics, and conduct of combat are, first of all, the prerogatives of language constructs in the military sphere.

Each individual fragment of the text carries certain political information obtained from various magazines (E&E News Reporter; European Journal of American Studies) and embodies the expressed military vocabulary (to launch an offensive; defense) in the political context, but with a different conceptual meaning (Democrats launch offensive on climate; on the defense of the American way of life).

As a result, this method of forming the military terminology involves a certain technology of use, since it is a set of procedures aimed at the linguistic study of the text of an official business document, as well as at the structuring of its meanings.

**Conclusion.** The conclusions of this study demonstrated that the military metaphor can exist in the official business terminology and reveals a highly specialized content in the OBD.

The analysis of the examples has pointed out the similarities between the parenthetical constructions (lexical tokens, commonly used phrases, term combinations) and the metaphor, as suggested by Flusberg [2], such as the author's idiosyncrasies that reveal the cognitive processes of the military identity; language tools designed to retransmit, first of all, the objective message regulated by the content and form and the pragmatic potential of language units. The differences between the term combination and the metaphor are noticeable at the level of lexical-semantic and stylistic expression of the military identity and consist in the frequency of use of both the term combination and the metaphor in OBD. Therefore, we confirmed the findings of Scott and Brydon [9], who identified a repeated use of terminological units within OBD and a rare use of metaphors in the same document.

#### REFERENCES:

1. Collomb J.-D. The ideology of climate change denial in the United States. *European journal of american studies*. 2014. 9–1. P. 1–20. DOI: 10.4000/ejas.10305.
2. Flusberg S., Matlock T., Tibodeau P. War metaphors in public discourse. *Metaphor and Symbol*. 2018. Vol. 33, № 1. P. 1–18.
3. Ganesh J., Gupta M., Varma V. Interpretation of semantic tweet representations. *Proceedings of the 2017 IEEE/ACM International Conference on Advances in Social Networks Analysis and Mining*. URL: <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1704.00898.pdf>. (дата звернення: 19.06.2022).
4. Harvey M. A beginner's course in legal translation: the case of culture bound terms. URL: <http://www.tradulex.com/Actes2000/harvey.pdf> (дата звернення: 10.06.2022).
5. Jurafsky D., Martin J. H. *Speech and Language Processing: An Introduction to Natural Language Processing, Computational Linguistics, and Speech Recognition*. Second Edition. Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 2008. URL: [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/200111340\\_Speech\\_and\\_Language\\_Processing\\_An\\_Introduction\\_to\\_Natural\\_Language\\_Processing\\_Computational\\_Linguistics\\_and\\_Speech\\_Recognition](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/200111340_Speech_and_Language_Processing_An_Introduction_to_Natural_Language_Processing_Computational_Linguistics_and_Speech_Recognition). (дата звернення: 15.06.2022).
6. Kugler R. *The NATO response force 2002–2006: Innovation by the Atlantic Alliance. Case studies in defense transformation*. Washington D.C: National Defense University, Center for Technology and National Security Policy, 2007.
7. Lakoff G., Johnson M. *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1980.
8. Loenning K. L., Sonneveld H. B. Introducing terminology. *Terminology. International Journal of Theoretical and Applied Issues in Specialized Communication*. 1994. 11 (1). P. 1–6. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1075/term.1.1.01loe>.
9. Scott M., Brydon S. *Dimensions of communication: An introduction*. 1-st Edition. McGraw-Hill Humanities/Social Sciences/Languages, 1996. 576 p.
10. Temmerman R. *Towards new ways of terminology description. The sociocognitive approach*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2000. 276 p. DOI: 10.7202/002265ar.
11. Вrabель Т. Лексичні особливості перекладу ділової кореспонденції. *Наукове мислення: зб. статей учасників шостої міжнародної практично-пізнавальної інтернет-конференції «Наукова думка сучасності і майбутнього»*, (23 по 30 листопада 2016 р.). Дніпро: Видавництво НМ, 2016. С. 37-41.
12. Ермоленко С. Я., Бибик С. П., Коць Т. А., Сютя Г. М., Чемеркін С. Г. *Літературна норма і мовна практика: монографія*. / за ред. С. Я. Ермоленко. Ніжин: ТОВ Видавництво «Аспект-Поліграф», 2013. 320 с.
13. Шевчук В. Н. *Военно-терминологическая система в статике и динамике* : автореф. дис. ... д-ра филол. наук : 10.02.19. Москва, 1985. 43 с.