“BABEŞ-BOLYAI” UNIVERSITY

FACULTY OF LETTERS

CLUJ-NAPOCA

ENGLISH MILITARY TERMINOLOGY AS AN ESSENTIAL DIMENSION OF THE SPECIALIZED LANGUAGE

SUMMARY OF THE DOCTORAL THESIS

SCIENTIFIC COORDINATOR

Ph.D. PROFESSOR MIHAI MIRCEA ZDRENGHEA

Ph.D. STUDENT

DOCHINOIU (FUIOREA) ELENA

CLUJ-NAPOCA

2011

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

A paper dedicated to the study of military language is to be found in the privileged position of initiating a dialogue at both linguistic and military levels. Consequently, we can notice the following advantages that derive through the study of this theme: the linguistic importance and the military importance. As far as the linguistic level is concerned, apparently, specialized languages would arouse little interest, due to their usage, which is circumscribed to various restricted socio-professional areas. Nevertheless, the style characteristics of the specialized languages, including (the specific terminology, the preference for certain morpho-syntactical structures, the particular meanings attributed to certain phrases), should not be left unnoticed. As to the military level, since the end of the Cold War, foreign language training - especially the learning of English, the *de facto* operational language - has become increasingly important within the armed forces. This is especially the case at NATO, due to an ever-increasing number of peace-support operations, on the one hand, and the Alliance's enlargement and partnership activities, on the other.

General considerations that will conduct the study will be focused on the approach to the English military terminology from the perspective of the Prototype Theory, pragmatics, stylistics and of the discourse analysis. Our analysis is based on a *corpus* made up of terms selected from several types of texts, (university textbooks, military magazines, specialized and general dictionaries).

The motivation for writing this paper

While writing a thesis, a question that exasperatingly and repeatedly occurs in the writer's mind is: 'Why have we chosen this topic and this methodological approach to it and not some other one?' In our case the question is why we have chosen to deal with **English Military Terminology as an Essential Dimension of the Specialized Language?**

The initial impetus for conducting this research was justified by the wish to explore the English military language from other, less studied perspectives. For example, there are no studies based on the analysis of military English from the point of view of the Prototype Theory. The second impetus stemmed from the wish to give emphasis to the linguistic and cultural knowledge acquired as an English teacher in the military system.

A third impetus was motivated by the fact that military English is becoming more and more widespread across the world. The need for effective communication is particularly acute

in peace-support operations, where linguistic misunderstandings risk leading to mistakes, which might in the worst case-scenario, result in casualties. Effective communication within the military context is vital and here English plays a cardinal part. In short, the deeper the collaboration between NATO countries, the more important the knowledge of military English. In this turbulent times, there is increased demand for effective military communications in English, particularly between members of international forces involved in peacekeeping operations in the world's trouble spots, but also between peacekeepers and local community leaders.

The novelty and originality of the paper

Our approach takes as a starting point an observation made after studying several bibliographical works, namely that a thorough analysis of the English mlitary terminology from the perspective of the Prototype Theory should not be left unnoticed. The originality of the theme chosen lies precisely in the prototypical approach to this type of terminology. Our contribution also consists in the description of English military terminology from two branches: Land Forces and Air Forces. Our permanent concern was to put into practice the theoretical notions, inspiring ourselves from the present studies, while offering a personal opinion with regard to the elements approached in the paper. Thus, although there are studies based on the analysis of English military terminology at the pragmatic, stylistic and discourse analysis levels, we have tried, while also offering a personal judgement with respect to some of those studies, to illustrate various features specific to the three levels, by selecting and approaching examples from several types of military texts (war novels, newspapers, speeches).

Aim and research objectives

The most dynamic segment of a contemporary natural language is that of the specialized languages. The dynamism of these segments is due to neology, that is highly present within terminologies, much more visible than in the other subsystems of the general language, (we refer here specifically to the general lexicon). The neological potential of most terminologies is extralinguistic. The source of this potential lies in the fact that the professional activities related to scientific and technical fields have as a result the production of goods bought by the consumer, and that he must be able to use. To do this, each consumer must know how to call

the products and their functions. Military terminology reflects the specialization of the military processes, more than any other linguistic domain.

Our aim in the present paper is to study the place of English military terminology within the specialized language, from a linguistic perspective. Consequently, we have structured our approach according to the specific characteristics that render military terminology as an essential dimension of the specialized language: a specific terminology and way of designating notions, the preponderance of the nominal class, the tendency towards hyponymy and abbreviation, towards the syntagmatic usage of terms, the use of speech acts and speech act verbs, of figures of style disguised in the military language, despite its denotative character, as well as the components that distinguish this terminology from the civilian life.

As to the research objectives, the first part of the work is based on an approach to the English military terms and syntagms, as well as to various grammatical structures from the perspective of the Prototype Theory. Further on, the paper relies on the discussion of different grammatical structures, introduced by means of military texts, and on the classification of the English military terms from the structural point of view and according to the degree of the semantic independence of elements, with a special emphasis on the lexical slang compounds. The second part focuses on the study of the English military terminology at the pragmatic and stylistic levels. The paper also encompasses an analysis of several military interviews from the point of view of the discourse analysis. The intention here is to discover to what extent and if there are indeed any actual differences in register, with respect to rank, age, and education, or any cultural or individual differences in using grammar or lexical units by the NCOs (non-commissioned officers) and officers. The study has at its basis a diversified corpus, various specialized dictionaries and glossaries, military handbooks, all being unclassified documents.

The methodological support of the paper

The methodological support of the paper is represented by the structural analysis, the semantic analysis, (used in investigating the meaning of vocabulary items), the discourse analysis, (used in the study of the military interviews), working with the dictionary, a method extensively used in our paper. In our investigation of English military terminology, we also made use of several pragmatic principles (the Cooperative Principle, the Politeness Principle), theories, (the Prototype Theory), employed in the prototypical approach to the English military semantic fields and grammatical structures. The theories and principles mentioned above are clearly explained in separate sections within the paper.

The methodological criteria that lie at the basis of our paper are the rigor and precision in rendering the definitions of the military terms, the notification of their multiple meanings, as well as their explanation in relation to their importance and practical needs. Terminological definitions belonging to the specialized lexicon, (in our case military terminology) have a conventional, rigorous, non-ambiguous, or prescriptive character. They manifest preference for the definitions applied to nouns, that list the properties of the classes of objects and distinguish the concepts. For the elaboration of the English-Romanian glossary we used various specialized works, published both abroad and in our country, making calls to the services of military specialists in order to specify the terminology.

The theoretical-scientific support of the paper

The theoretical-scientific support of the paper is represented by **linguistic military works:** Gregory, Clark, (1990), *Words of the Vietnam war: The Slang, Jargon, Abbreviations, Acronyms, Nomenclature, Nicknames, Pseudonyms, Slogans, Specs, Euphemisms, Double-talk, Chants and Names and Places of the Era of United States Involvement in Vietnam*, Linda, Reinberg, (1991), *In the Field. The language of the Vietnam War*, G., L., Pierce, (2002), *Barriers to Adaptability In a Multinational Team*, Paul, A., Chilton, Sue, Wright, Dan, Smith, (1998), *Language and Conflict*, J., D., Salt, (2004), *Speech Acts of War*, Pierre, Lerat, (1990), *L'hyperonimie dans la structuration des terminologies*, Luiza, Kraft, (2007), *Special operations and counterterrorist actions*, James, Arnold and Robert, Sacco, (1988), *Command English*, Cowley, R., & Parker, G, (1996), *The Reader's Companion to Military History*, Dana, Sorana, Urs, (2002), *The Technical Term in English and Romanian*, Maria, Teresa, Cabre, (1999), *Terminology. Theory, Methods and Applications*, Tom, McArthur, (1992), *The Oxford Companion to the English Language*, Michael, Billing, (2003), *Preface: Language as Forms of Death. At War with Words*; **military dictionaries**: Richard, Bowyer, (2004), *Dictionary of Military Terms*, *A Dictionary of United States Military Terms,* (1963), J, Quick, (1973), *Dictionary of Weapons and Military Terms*, *The Oxford Essential Dictionary of the U.S. Military*, (2001), Marc Leepson, Helen Hannaford, eds., (1999), *Webster's New World Dictionary of the Vietnam War*; **general dictionaries**: *Macmillan English Dictionary for Advanced Learners*, (2002), *Cambridge Advanced Learner's Dictionary*, (2008), *Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English* (The Complete Guide to Written and Spoken English), (1995), C, Nedelcu, I, Murar, A, Bratu, & A, Bantas, (2001), *Dictionar roman-englez*; **glossaries**: *G447. Glossary of Special Forces Terms*, (1998), Luiza, Kraft, (1999), *Glosar englez-roman de terminologie NATO*; **textbooks**: Luiza, Kraft, (2006), *Land Forces*

Operations. Curs de limba engleza, Luiza, Kraft, (2005), *NATO Staff Planning Course*, Luiza, Kraft, (2005), *Operational Design and Planning. Curs de limba engleza*, Mircea, Popa, (2002), *Manual de terminologie militara in limba engleza specifica structurilor NATO*, *Manualul NATO*, (1999), *Organisme si proceduri NATO de standardizare terminologica*, (2004); **military magazines**: *US Military*.

The structure of the paper

CHAPTER 1 PROTOTYPE THEORY AND THE ENGLISH MILITARY TERMS AND SYNTAGMS

The chapter begins with a short discussion on the basic notions related to terminology in general and military terminology in particular. There are defined the wide notion of term and the narrow meaning of military term. A special attention is given to the differences between the words used in the general lexicon and military terms. The chapter is based on a prototypical approach to the English military terms and syntagms. Starting from hyponymy, the sense relation that holds between classes and their members, (also called inclusion), which lies at the basis of the Prototype Theory, we will try to approach the English military terms and syntagms organized into semantic fields. Our analysis will be focused on two types of expressions: the simple expression, (both the hypernym and the hyponym are lexicalized by a single unit) and the compound expression (when the hypernym or the hyponyms are syntagmatic lexicalizations).

CHAPTER 2 A PROTOTYPICAL AND TRADITIONAL APPROACH TO THE ENGLISH MILITARY GRAMMATICAL STRUCTURES

The first section of the chapter is largely based on a prototypical approach to the grammatical categories. The syntactic property of English verbs, that of undergoing a transformation, as well as the relational nature of predicativity, defined through the contrasting effects of verbalization or nominalization will be dealt upon. We will also shortly mention several English verbal alternations restricted to nonprototypical and psychological predicates. Further on, we will use Prototype Theory as a framework within which to systematize the phenomena of aspect in military English. More precisely, we will try to explain the prototypical meaning of the progressive and of the perfect and show that, both for the progressive and for the perfect, there exists a family of senses that can be regarded as variations on a prototypical meaning as applied to prototypical situations. The section also expands upon various transformations undergone by the complement types, illustrated by means of nouniness,

according to which various complement types can be hierarchically grouped. Next, six features which apply to "and" and "or" considered by Leech as central coordinators, or clause linkers, will be closely analyzed in terms of their syntactic features.

The second section begins with a short investigation of the origin of the official militaristic terms. Next, various grammatical structures belonging to military texts are dealt upon. The structures are introduced and explained with multiple examples in the grammatical forms. The third section of the chapter focuses on the classification of English military compounds from the structural point of view and according to the degree of the semantic independence of elements, with a special emphasis on the lexical slang compounds. It is shown that compounds are highly productive in the area of word formation. The analysis of abbreviations within the NATO terminological system in the fourth section is motivated through the general tendency of economically employing speaking means, and especially employing specialized language. We will have in view here various structural types of abbreviations, more precisely: initialisms, acronyms, abbreviations and short forms, which are all examples of the truncation processes.

CHAPTER 3 PRAGMATIC ASPECTS IN THE ENGLISH MILITARY TERMINOLOGY

Although the Theory of Speech Acts proposed by Searle is intended to be completely general, speech acts are used considerably in the military context. We can find details about the types of speech acts, their form, the effective effects they can provide and how they are expressed by the interactants, which we will illustrate by means of various examples belonging to two distinct war novels: *All Quiet on the Western Front* and *Platoon*. People perform speech acts in both spoken and written interaction. Sometimes people announce their illocutionary intentions using phrases which contain performative verbs. Grice's Cooperative Principle is vital in understanding the theories evincing the motivation and intention beneath many terms used in military discourse.

Other pragmatic dimensions, such as the the Politeness Principle and their maxims, deixis, implicatures, indirect speech acts, speech act verbs are also encountered in the military language. The chapter basically relies on the analysis of several instances of such dimensions, by approaching examples from different types of military texts (newspapers, speeches, aviation manuals). Although the commonly-held view states that negative statements are pragmatically less favoured and convey less information than positive ones, negation as a pragmatic element is highly present in Joseph Heller's novel, *Catch-22*. Following Tottie's

model of the discourse functions of negative propositions, we will also try in this chapter to illustrate the pragmatic power of negation by means of several extracts from the novel mentioned above.

CHAPTER 4 STYLISTIC ASPECTS IN THE ENGLISH MILITARY TERMINOLOGY

The chapter focuses on the analysis of the stylistic features of English military speech. As all scientific languages, military language has a powerful denotative character. Nevertheless, there are military terms and expressions with a certain connotative power. At the level of the metaphorical expression, their usage renders the discourse with rich shades of expressiveness. The figures of speech associated with war are frequent in the military language. From among these, we will basically deal with the metaphor (the chromatic metaphor, the metaphor that includes names of metals, the syntagms with mythological reference) and the euphemism, but also with the oxymoron, the metonymy and the synecdoche.

Language plays a vital role in a person's ability to garner public support for forthcoming military engagements. We will also try to explore the rhetorical tactics used in national addresses by President John F. Kennedy during the Cuban Missile Crisis and President George W. Bush following the attacks of 9/11, more precisely how the presidents used metaphor to frame the enemy and justify retaliatory action. We also have in view the role that metaphorical thought played in bringing the American nation in the Gulf war, by investigating the system of metaphor that is used automatically and unreflectively to understand complexities and abstractions. Part of this system is devoted to understanding war.

CHAPTER 5 AN APPROACH TO THE ENGLISH MILITARY LANGUAGE FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF THE DISCOURSE ANALYSIS

The chapter concentrates on the analysis of several military interviews, with a view to finding whether or not there are any differences in the register used by NCOs and officers, any cultural or individual differences in using grammatical or lexical units, or any unusual characteristic features of military speech. We will approach our analysis with the help of the discourse analysis. We decided to analyze spoken language, instead of original documents or field manuals, because we realized that there would be no colloquial expressions or grammatical irregularities in those documents. Moreover, spoken language is fundamental to any linguistic study and *discourse*, as the dominant means of communication in society is the center of our daily lives. We will look at how the choice of verb tenses or other grammatical

features affect the structure of discourse. Aspects of cohesion and the discourse markers that are employed are also dealt upon. Some unusual lexical units and grammatical irregularities with respect to context and culture will be commented on.

Specific military issues, such as (the participants, the setting, the topic) and questions related to them, will be taken into account, prior to the analysis of the transcript. In addition to these components, we will have in view four different dimensions for analysis, which relate to the factors above. These are: the *social distance* scale, closely connected with the status of superiority, the *status* scale, concerned with participant relationships, a *formality* scale, relating to the setting or type of interaction, two *functional* scales relating to the purposes or topic of interaction. All speakers have to answer the primary question: *Why did you join the military*?

CONCLUSIONS

Hierarchy within classes is very important, especially in the case of terminologies, in our case military terminology. In the military language, the superordinate element, the hypernym, has more subordinate lexicalizations called co-hyponyms, that, in their turn, can have the role of hypernyms. Hyponyms have a more precise meaning, a larger number of semes, while hypernyms have a more vague meaning and can designate a larger number of objects. The semantic relation of inclusion is frequently encountered at the nominal level and less found at the level of verbs. The notion of inclusion (a fundamental relation in the military domain), manifests at the level of both simple expression (both the hypernym and the hyponym are lexicalized by a single unit) and the compound expression (when the hypernym or the hyponyms are syntagmatic lexicalizations).

Grammatical categories have a prototype structure, with central and marginal members, as concerns the range of syntactic and semantic attributes. In many cases members of a category can be graded with respect to their ability to undergo a range of transformations. The prototypical category of noun phrases showed that the noun phrases referring to humans undergo transformations (the rule of double raising, question tag formation). "There" as a subject NP allows some transformation (raising, accusative-gerund complementation), but fails to establish the number of the verb. The prototypical category of verb showed that many transitive verbs share a significant number of specific features, also undergoing transformations, (agentive nominalization, able-substitution, passivization), while some others do not. Such verbs which do not allow regular transformations are normally associated with the syntagm 'partial decategorization of verbs.'

In the notional approach to the parts of speech, the two word classes – that of noun and verb – are considered distributional classes with distinct membership, whose members include items that denote event, respectively, entity. We can find central members, whose status as belonging to one class or the other is definite and clear. Thus, central nouns will denote entities of the first order: persons, animals and other physical entities. verbs are regarded as denoting actions or states. Stative verbs do not normally occur in the progressive form. To be stative is acceptable for the class of adjective, but hardly acceptable for verbs.

The extension of the prototype concept started from word meaning and reached lingusitic categories like nouns and verbs. We have shown that, both for the progressive and for the perfect in the English military terminology, there exists a family of senses that can be

regarded as variations on a prototypical meaning as applied to prototypical situations. They are derived from the prototype, by dropping or in someway altering one or more of its salient attributes, as regards either the primary or secondary aspect. There is a correlation betwen categorial prototypicality and the ability to form the progressive aspect. Categorial prototypicality implies on the one hand that grammatical categories have best case members and members which systematically depart from the best case and on the other hand that grammatical description of morphosyntactic processes necessarily involves reference to the degree of categorial deviation from the best case. The concept of prototypicality, which implies the centrality vs. peripherality of cases assigned to the same category, is important for the study of grammar.

Military writing style stresses the use of the active voice. There are three important reasons for that: 1. active voice is direct, forceful and easy to understand; by contrast, passive voice can be vague, evasive, and hard to understand; 2. active voice is more conversational than passive voice (we normally speak in active voice); 3. sentences in active voice are shorter than sentences in passive voice. The difference between the active voice and the passive is a matter of emphasis. Nevertheless, we will often find the passive voice used in military publications. As concerns the modals, there is some variation, as we could observe, between different central modals and in certain contexts some of them fail the active-passive test, regarding the semantic independence of the subject.. Many of the semi-modals are showing signs of modal behaviour (grammaticalization). As we could also notice, some sentences involve specific grammatical areas that might cause uncertainty about word order, despite the simplicity of the basic rules. The grammatical system of any language is the most stable and the most slowly liable to changes. Since this system is the general foundation for the related languages, therefore, on the level of the semantic value and their formal expression, they are adequately correlative.

On investigating the origin of official militaristic terms, it was found that the majority of them originated during wars and conflicts, especially those of the 20th Century. It was also found that many of them are connected to the names of new weapons, instruments, or other innovations of war. It is a kind of paradox, but wars, in spite of their destruction, have a generative effect on language. The English language is typical of all languages, in that it has been subject to an on-going evolutionary process of change for centuries. The reasons for this evolution are multiple, but the influence of other societies and cultures on English has been the primary impetus for this change.

Compounds, though certainly fewer in quantity than derived or root words, still represent one of the most typical and specific features of English word structure. While compounds are mainly compact, implicit naming devices, noun phrases are descriptive, explicit naming devices. With respect to the total meaning of a compound, at least two types of representation are to be distinguished, namely the semantic representation or the sense given by the logical form of the compound and the conceptual representation or the meaning proper. Since military terminology is predominantly concentrated on denoting objects that are designed to accomplish certain states and less on naming agents, mainly because of its highly impersonal manner of reflecting reality, the –*ed* adjectival compounds outnumber the –*ing* formations.

Many of the military lexical slang compounds are formed with the word – 'head.' The head represents the person. As we could easily observe, the abbreviations within the speaking means are a direct result of the possibilities and needs of rendering the information contained in the multi-componential lexical units through one compact lexical unit. Such a unit mainly decreases the amount of information sent and, at the same time, it keeps the semantic integrity. Succinctness and precision are highly valued in the military language, and abbreviations can contribute greatly to a concise style.

Pragmatics can help to provide an unambiguous language used to command and control forces and equipment conducting military operations. Military communication counts on good and clear communication. The precise and timely transmission of information and its accurate recording are of paramount importance. Pragmatic dimensions such as speech acts and conversational types are essential parameters to successful understanding of the true nature of communication threads, especially the question concerning the evaluation of communication effectiveness. Military speech acts are different from those in general use. They are likely to be more formalized and more terse than those of everyday discourse.

As far as the aviation communication is concerned, Grice's maxim of manner (avoid ambiguity), seems to be strongly observed. The intended audience for the aviation texts varies widely in terms of cultural background (speech communities). In the aviation manuals, the gap between what is literally said and what is conveyed is narrow or nonexistent. Therefore, what is written is to be as explicit as possible. Apparently, there is no implicature or gap to be bridged, since implicatures tend to be culturally marked and different speech communities could interpret the meaning and the force of the utterances in different ways. Thus, in this context, indirect language, or indirect speech acts could give rise to pragmatic failure, e.g., failure to understand the pragmatic force of the speaker's utterance. These rules show an explicit observance of Grice's Cooperative Principle (and all the maxims of conversation).

Instructions and procedures are expressed either via modal verbs, (must and should) or via imperatives. They are not face-threatening acts, as they are performed for the hearer's own good. Instructions which include the modal "must" are performed bald-on-record, without explicit mitigating devices, (for example, 'please').

In analyzing speech act verbs, we have determined how the set of illocutionary forces is lexicalized in the English military vocabulary. There are semantic relations of entailment between English performative sentences, in virtue of the meaning of their main performative verbs. Some of the theoretical distinctions in the analysis of English speech act verbs derive from the fact that there is no one-to-one correspondence between actual illocutionary forces and speech act verbs. Grice's Cooperative Principle and Face Theory are vital in understanding the theories evincing the motivation and intention beneath so many dishonest terms used in military discourse. As it is shown in the texts analysed, euphemisms violate all maxims, (quantity, quality, relation and manner). The analysis of several texts proved the feature of politeness of the military euphemism.

Both the approbation and the sympathy maxims can be fit to be used in the military language. In his speech of Nobel Peace Prize, President Obama mostly applies to politeness strategies and euphemism transitions in order to soften the concepts. The analysis of negation as a pragmatic feature of the novel *Catch-22* revealed that it is closely connected to its use in the descriptive sections of the novel and to the creation of a humorous effect based on the presence of contradictory structures. The negative proposition cannot be taken into consideration without the affirmative proposition with which it forms a complex structure. For this reason, the negative proposition may precede or follow the affirmative proposition. Negation constitutes a discourse phenomenon, that is, it cannot be adequately explained without taking into account preceding and following propositions. Although denial is the most frequent function of negative clauses, reversals represent the category the most extensively used in the novel.

The function of any statement becomes clear during verbal exchanges in a dynamic context. People accomplish their aims through language, by means of pragmatic competence. Linguistic skills combined with pragmatic knowledge help to avoid miscommunication with the local target audience. Without bridging the gap between sentence meaning and speaker's meaning, misunderstandings can easily occur, people referring to other things than were initially intended, being unable to express beliefs and intentions in well-formed speech acts or communicate spontaneously and effectively in real-life military situations.

Military lexicon distinguishes itself by its force of expressiveness. The figures of speech that originate in the war vocabulary paraphrase to a certain extent the authority of the military language, with the intention of stimulating style and conveying meaning in a more vivid manner. On the one hand, the metaphors and nicknames catch the specific element of an operation through key words. Their power of making the discourse much more captivating and their function of carrying the sense of the expression from a level easy to understand to another one, more difficult are evident. They are disguised in a rhetorical language, conceived to support the action and the war. On the other hand, euphemisms enable a psychological distance from the gruesome details of warfare. They keep the public from thinking too much about the horrible things happening in places where wars are being fought, effacing the memory of actual cruelties.

The analysis concerning the metaphorical presidential rhetoric revealed the rhetorical strategies employed by Presidents Kennedy and Bush in the post-World War II era, as they attempted to seek legitimization in the American public eye for the military actions that they sought to pursue. The element of *pathos* is critical: in the foregoing rhetorical activity, the speakers seek to strike a balance between making the audience feel unsafe, by emphasizing the threat of the enemy and at the same time inspiring nationalism in the people, by portraying their own nation as powerful and morally entitled.

As concerns the role that metaphorical thought played in bringing the American nation in the Gulf war, as the analysis revealed, there is no way to avoid metaphorical thought, especially in complex matters. Because of the pervasiveness of metaphor in thought, we cannot always stick to discussions of reality in purely literal terms. It is in the service of reality that we must pay more attention to the mechanisms of metaphorical thought, especially because as we are witnessing, metaphors backed up by bombs can kill. The use of a metaphor with a set of definitions becomes pernicious when it hides realities in a harmful way. It is important to distinguish what is metaphorical from what is not.

The military interviews share a similar social context. As the analysis proved, they have their own generic structures, lexical and grammatical features and patterns of usage that reflect the relationship (social distance – power and status) between the interviewer and the interviewee. The interviewees have their own technical vocabulary and jargon and they also have their own slang and ways of expression. The slang and vulgar expressions reflect the situation of soldiers, their suffering in trenches and in combat areas. They also reflect the situation of soldiers in which they see their friends or enemies being injured or killed. Everyday casual social life contributed to the creation of slang expressions as well. The

relationship between the interviewees and the interviewer is impersonal and formal. The main reason for this is due to the fact that many of the interviewees are of a significantly low rank and have difficulty in comprehending the apparent informality of a Lieutenant Colonel. Age in the U.S. military is connected with the years of service, education and rank and this has an enormous impact on the register of single personnel.

The environment and culture have a deep impact on the way of communication. In our case, the military environment and military culture, including military customs and traditions are inseparable components of the military and a part of what distinguishes it from civilian life. The interviews proved that those with a longer service and higher rank speak more freely and openly. Their speech is rather semiformal than formal, although they try to speak 'proper English,' even when they invoke slang and colloquial expressions. On the contrary, those with a lower rank use rather substandard English, which is generally connected to a lesser education. However, as those from lower social classes progress through the ranks, the distinction between the two classes starts to merge. The same holds true for non-native speakers in the U.S. military.

SELECTIVE BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aarts, B., Denison, D., Keizer, E., & Popova, G. (2004). *Fuzzy Grammar. A Reader*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Anderson, John, M. (1999). "Syntactic categories and notional features." In B., Aarts, D., Denison, E., Keizer, & G., Popova. (2004). *Fuzzy Grammar. A Reader*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Anderson, A, R., & Belnap, N, D Jr. (1975). *Entailment*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton.

Angheli, N. (1996). *Verbal Compounds in English, Russian and Romanian*. Unpublished PhD Dissertation, University of Bucharest.

Arkin, W., Handler, J., Morrissey, J., & Walsh, J. (1990) *Encyclopedia of the U.S. Military*. USA: Harper & Row, Publishers.

Arnold, J., & Sacco, R. (1988). *Command English*. London: Longman.

Austin, J, L. (1962). *How To Do Things With Words*, 2nd Edition, ed. J.O. Urmson and M. Sbisá, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Ayto, J. (1999). *Twentieth Century Words*. GB: Oxford University Press.

Ayto, J. (1993). *Euphemisms*. London: Bloomsbury.

Bolinger, D. (1980). *Language - The Loaded Weapon: The Use and Abuse of Language Today*. London: Longman. (A)

Bolinger, D. "Wanna and the gradience of auxiliaries." In Gunter Brettscheinder Christian Lehmann (eds.), (1980), 288-305. (B)

Bolinger, D. (1961). *Generality, Gradience, and the All-or-None*. The Hague: Mouton.

Brown, P & Levinson, S, C. (1987). *Politeness. Some universals in language use.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Brown, G., & Yule, G. (1983). *Discourse Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bunt, H. "Dialog Pragmatics and Context Specification." In *Computational Pragmatics: Abduction, Belief and Context*," ed. by Harry Bunt and William Black. (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1999), 91-103.

Chilton, A., Paul, Wright, S., & Smith, D. (1998). *Language and Conflict.* Birmingham: Multilingual Matters Limited.

Ciobanu, G. (1997). *Introduction to Terminology*. Timişoara: Editura Universităţii din Timişoara.

Clark, H, H. (1996). *Using Language.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Clark, Gregory R. (1990). *Words of the Vietnam War: The Slang, Jargon, Abbreviations, Acronyms, Nomenclature, Nicknames, Pseudonyms, Slogans, Specs, Euphemisms, Double-talk, Chants, and Names and Places of the Era of United States Involvement in Vietnam*. Jefferson: N.C.: McFarland.

Clausewitz, Karl Von. (1976, rev. 1984). *On War*. Edited and translated by Michael Howard and Peter Paret. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Collins Cobuild English Usage. (1993). GB: HarperCollins Publishers.

Comrie, B. (1976). *Aspect*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cowley, R., & Parker, G. (1996) *The Reader's Companion to Military History*. USA: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Croft, W. (1991). *Syntactic Categories and Grammatical Relations: The Cognitive Organization of Information*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Croft, W. "Possible verbs and the structure of events," in *Meanings and Prototypes*, (London and New York: Routledge, 1990), 213-229.

Crystal, D. (1995). *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the English Language*. GB: Cambridge University Press.

Dahl, ¨O. (1985). *Tense and Aspect Systems*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Demurenko, A., & Nikitin, A. "Basic Terminology and Concepts in International Peacekeeping Operations: An Analytical Review," (translated by Robert, R, Love), in *Low Intensity Conflict & Law Enforcement*, Volume 6, (1997), 64-179.

Dennett, Daniel C. (1987). *The Intentional Stance*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press.

Downing, A., & Locke, P. (2006). *English Grammar: A University Course*. 2nd ed. Abingdon and New York: Routledge.

Dye, A, D. (1987). *Platoon*, (based on a screenplay by Oliver Stone). London: Harper Collins.

Fair, J. "Euphemisms for Israeli settlements confuse coverage," *Fair*. (26 June, 2002). <http://www.fair.org/press-releases/settlement-euphemisms.html>

Fowler, H. (1996). *Fowler's Modern English Usage*. GB: Oxford University Press.

Fraser, B. "The Domain of Pragmatics." In J.C., Richard and R, W, Schmidt. (Eds.). *Language and Communication*. (London: Longman, 1983), 64-115.

Funk, W. (1978). *Word Origin*. USA: Bell Publishing Company.

Galperin, I, R. (1977). *Stylistics*. Moscow Higher School.

Galton, A. (1984). *The Logic of Aspect*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Grice, H, P. "Logic and Conversation." In P, Cole and J., L, Morgan (eds.), *Syntax and Semantics*, Volume 3: Speech Acts, (Academic Press, 1975), 30-49.

Hampton, J, A. "Prototype models of concept representations." In I. Van Mechelen, J. A, (1993), 63-104.

Heller, J. (1961). *Catch-22*. London: Jonathan Cape.

Hidalgo-Downing, L. (2000). *Negation*, *Text Worlds and Discourse*: *The Pragmatics of Catch-22*. Stamford, CT: Ablex.

Hopper, P, J., & Thompson, A, S. "The discourse basis for lexical categories in universal grammar." In *Language* 60, (1984), 703-752.

Kimball, W, F. "Churchill and Roosevelt: The Complete Correspondence," Vol 1, *Alliance Emerging,* October 1993-November 1942. (Princeton, NJ.: Princeton Univ. Press, 1984), 277-293.

Klima, E, S. "Negation in English. The Structure of Language." In *Readings in the Philosophy of Language*, Ed. J. A. Fodor and J. J. Katz. (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1964), 246-323.

Kramsch, C. (2000). *Language and Culture*. GB: Oxford University Press.

Lakoff, G. "Metaphor and War: The Metaphor System Used to Justify War in the Gulf." In *Peace Research* 23, (HarperCollins, 1991), 25-32.

Lederer, R. "Oxymoronology." In *Word Ways: The Journal of Recreational Linguistics*. (US: Spring Valley, 1990), 52-64.

Leech, G. (1987). *Meaning and the English Verb*. London and New York: Longman.

Leech, G. (1983). *Principles of Pragmatics.* London: Longman.

Lerat, P. "L'hyperonimie dans la structuration des terminologies." In *Langage*, nr. 98, (1990), 79-88.

Levin, B. (1993). *English Verb Classes and Alternations. A Preliminary Investigation*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.

Levinson, Stephen, C. "Deixis." In Laurence R. Horn, Gregory L. Ward (eds.), *The Handbook of Pragmatics*, (Blackwell Publishing, 2006), 978–1020.

Levinson, Stephen, C. (1983). *Pragmatics.* Cambridge. UK: Cambridge University Press.

Lyons, J. (1968). *Introduction to Theoretical Linguistics*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Mey, J, L. (1993). *Pragmatics - An Introduction*. Oxford U.K and Cambridge U.S.A: Blackwell Publishers.

Mihăilescu, C, Al. (2010). *Fuzzy Grammar. A Theoretical Approach*. Sibiu: Psihomedia.

Newmeyer, F, J, (1999). "The discrete nature of syntactic categories: against a prototype-based account." In B., Aarts, D., Denison, E., Keizer, & G., Popova. (2004). *Fuzzy Grammar. A Reader*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Palmer, F, R. (1987). *The English verb.* London and New York: Longman.

Pigeau, R., & McCann, C. "Redefining Command and Control." In C. McCann & R. Pigeau (Eds.), in *The human in command: Exploring the modern military experience*, (New York: Kluwer/Plenum, 2000), 163-184.

Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G., & Svartvik, J. (1985). *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London: Longman.

Reinberg, L. (1991). *In the Field: The Language of the Vietnam War*. New York: Facts on File.

Remarque, E, M. (1982). *All Quiet on the Western Front*. Transl. by A, W, Wheen, New York: Ballantine Publishing Group.

Rosch, E. (1978). "Principles of Categorization." In B., Aarts, D., Denison, E., Keizer, & G., Popova. (2004). *Fuzzy Grammar. A Reader*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ross, J, R. (1973). "Nouniness." In B., Aarts, D., Denison, E., Keizer, & G., Popova. (2004). *Fuzzy Grammar. A Reader*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sager, J, C., Dungworth, P., & McDonald, F. (1980). *English Special Languages: Principles and Practice in Science and Technology*. Wiesbaden: Oscar Brandstetter.

Salt, J, D. "Speech Acts of War." In R.G. Ingalls, M.D. Rossetti, J, S, Smith and B.A. Peters (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 2004 Winter Simulation Conference*, (2004), 1040-1049.

Saussure, de Ferdinand. (1916). *Cours de Linguistique Generale*, Paris: Payot.

Scheutz, M., & Logan, B. "Affective versus Deliberative Agent Control." In: *Proceedings of the AISB '01 Symposium on Emotion, Cognition and Affective Computing*, (University of York, 21st – 24th March, 2001), 1-10.

Searle, J, R. (1975). "Indirect speech acts." In P., Cole and J., Morgan, (eds.): *Syntax and Semantics* 3: *Speech Acts*, (1975), 62-79. (A)

Searle, J, R. (1969). *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Searle, J, R., & Vanderveken, D. (1985). *Foundations of Illocutionary Logic.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. `

Shattuck, L, G. "Communicating Intent and Imparting Presence." In *Military Review*, (March-April, 2000), 87-99.

Shawcross, P. (1993). *English for Aircraft Maintenance*. Paris: Belin.

Stavropoulos, P. "US Hypocrisy on Human Rights. The case of Turkey." *World Socialist Website*. (14 September, 1999).

<http://www3.wsws.org/articles/1999/sep1999/hum1-s14.shtml>

Sungil, J. (2008). "Energy Security and Military Intervention: Explaining the Persian Gulf War 1990-91," *All Academic Research*. (17-19 December, 2008), 1-22.

<http://www.allacademic.com//meta/p_mla_apa_research_citation/3/6/0/3/6/pages360367/p360367-1.php>

Sweetser, E. (1990). *From etymology to pragmatics: metaphorical and cultural aspects of semantic structure*. New York : Cambridge University Press.

Taylor, J, R. (1995). "Grammatical Categories." In B., Aarts, D., Denison, E., Keizer, & G., Popova. (2004). *Fuzzy Grammar. A Reader*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Taylor, J R. (1991). *Linguistic Categorization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Thomas, J. (1995). *Meaning in Interaction* : *An Introduction to Pragmatics*. Essex: Longman.

Tottie, G. (1991). *Negation in English Speech and Writing: A Study in Variation*. San Diego: Academic Press.

Urs, S, D. (2002). *The Technical Term in English and Romanian*. Bucureşti: Editura Oscar Print.

Verkuyl, H, J. "Aspectual classes and aspectual composition." In *Linguistics and Philosophy*, 12, (1989), 39-94.

Warner, M. "Secretary of state Rice places conditions on Iran, Syria for talks." (21 December, 2006).

<http://www.pbs.org/newshour/bb/middle_east/july-dec06/rice_12-21.html>

Wierzbicka, A. (1990). "Prototypes Save." In B., Aarts, D., Denison, E., Keizer, & G., Popova. (2004). *Fuzzy Grammar. A Reader*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wierzbicka, A. (1987). *English Speech Act Verbs. A Semantic Dictionary*. Sydney: Academic Press.

Zdrenghea, M., M., & Greere, A., L. (1997). *A Practical English Grammar with Exercises*. Cluj-Napoca: Clusium.

DICTIONARIES:

A Dictionary of United States Military Terms. (1963) USA: Washington, D.C.: Public Affairs Press.

Bantaş, A., & Leviţchi, L. (2004). *Dicţionar englez-român.* Bucureşti: Teora.

Bowyer, R. (2004). *Dictionary of Military Terms*. Third edition. Macmillan, Bloomsbury.

Bullock, A., & Trombley, S. (1998). *The Fontana Dictionary of Modern Thought*. London: Harper Collins.

Cambridge Advanced Learner's Dictionary. (2008). (Third Edition), Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dictionary of Military Terms. (2004). Third edition. Macmillan, Bloomsbury.

G447. Glossary of Special Forces Terms. (1998). FOTMAT. DLI, Lackland AFB, Texas.

Holder, R, W. (1989). *The Faber Dictionary of Euphemisms.* London: Faber.

Kraft, L. (1999). *Glosar englez-român de terminologie NATO*. Bucureşti: Editura Academiei de Înalte Studii Militare.

Macmillan English Dictionary for Advanced Learners. (2002). International Student Edition. Macmillan Publishers Ltd.

Oxford Essential Dictionary of the U.S. Military. (2001). GB: Oxford University Press.

Predatu, E. (2003). *Dicţionar militar englez-român, român-englez.* Bucureşti: Editura Niculescu.

Quick, J. (1973). *Dictionary of Weapons and Military Terms*. USA: McGraw/Hill Book Company.

Rawson, H. (1981). *Dictionary of Euphemisms and Other Doubletalk.* New York: Crown Publishers.

Staicu, Stelian. (1980). *Lexicon militar*. Bucureşti: Editura Militară.

The Oxford Essential Dictionary of the U.S. Military. (2001). GB: The Berkley Publishing Group.

Wales, K. (1989). *A Dictionary of Stylistics*. London: Longman.

TEXTBOOKS:
English Skills for Staff Officers in Multinational Operations. (1998). DLI, Lackland AFB, Texas.

ICAO (2004). Manual on the Implementation of ICAO Language Proficiency Requirements. International Civil Aviation Organization.

Kraft, L. (2007). *Special operations and counterterrorist actions.* Bucureşti: Editura Universităţii Naţionale de Apărare "Carol I."

Kraft, L. (2006). *Land Forces Operations. Curs de limba engleză*. Bucureşti: Editura Universităţii Naţionale de Apărare "Carol I."

Kraft, L. (2005). *NATO Staff Planning Course*. Bucuresti: Editura Universitatii Nationale de Aparare "Carol I." (A)

NATO Handbook. (2001). NATO Office of Information and Press. Brussels – Belgium.

Popa, M. (2003). *Manual de terminologie militară în limba engleză specifică structurilor NATO*. Braşov: Editura Centrului Regional pentru Managementul Resurselor de Apărare.

INTERNET TEXT SOURCES

Joint Chiefs of Staff. (2001). *Department of Defense Dictionary of Military and Associated Terms*. Department of Defense, 30 June, 2010.

<http://www.dtic.mil/doctrine/dod_dictionary/index.html>

Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia. (2010). *Glossary of military abbreviations.*

<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Glossary_of_military_abbreviations>

Associated Press. "Iraqi Prime Minister Makes Pointed Warning as Iran Agrees To Attend Security Conference," (Fox News), 29 April, 2007).

<http://www.foxnews.com/story/0,2933,269095,00.html>

Crescent International. "The West's War of Euphemisms." (1-15 May, 2000).

<http://www.aldeilis.nSAet/english/index2.php?option=com_content&do_pdf=1&id=1185>

CNN. "The US airstrikes in Pakistan called "very effective." (18 May, 2009).

<http://articles.cnn.com/2009-05-18/politics/cia.pakistan.airstrikes_1_qaeda-pakistani-airstrikes?_s=PM:POLITICS>

Kennedy, John, F. "Cuban Missile Crisis Address to the Nation." *American Rhetoric. Top 100 Speeches.* (October 22, 1962).

<http://www.americanrhetoric.com/speeches/jfkcubanmissilecrisis.html>

Bush, George, W. "Address to a Joint Session of Congress Following 9/11 Attacks." *AmericanRhetoric. Top 100 Speeches*. (September 20, 2001)

<http://www.americanrhetoric.com/speeches/gwbush911jointsessionspeech.htm>

INTERNET RESSOURCES

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Military_terminology

http://www.dtic.mil/doctrine/jel/doddict/natoterm_index.html

http://dexonline.ro/

http://dictionary.babylon.com/

http://machaut.uchicago.edu/websters

http://jade.theostrohafamily.com/rank.htm