THE LEVELS OF FORMATION OF THE MILITARY TERMINOLOGICAL SYSTEM AND THE MILITARY DISCOURSE
(based on the Persian and Ukrainian languages)

Abstract. In modern military terminology there are unique parameters of expression of social space, which are reproduced in the linguistic picture of the world of a certain people, tendencies of reflection and fixation in the language of a system of views on world transformations, wars and globalized philosophy of the whole society – the speakers of different languages. This leads to the expansion of knowledge and ideas about changes in the world which belong to the national linguocultural community, that is, to the expansion of the cognitive collective and, in particular, the military space.

The article deals with the analysis of the concept of «terminology» as forming factor of military terminology system and military discourse (micro, macro-, megalevels).

The study of the cognitive-pragmatic aspects as well as basic characteristics of the concept of terminology as the factor which forms military terminological systems and military discourses with the use of a complex approach within the paradigm of term – terminological system – discourse according to our own formulated three-level model (micro-, macro- and megalevels) contributes to the timeliness and novelty of this article.

The purpose of our research was to investigate the mechanisms of formation of modern military terminological system and military discourse. The tasks of the current research were to outline the main specific approaches to the problem, to determine the levels of military terminology functioning according to the pragmatic principle, specifically:

- microlevel – word-formation level of military term building, aiming to search and study the constituent parts of language code means as such, which are implicit in particular term-building elements;
- macrolevel – the level of formedness of military terminological system, aiming to investigate classificational and systematizing characteristics...
of the military terminological system, the subject matter of storage and communication of information which has been systematized in hierarchic order, and which is accumulated in specific term-concepts considering their interrelations;

- *megalevel* – the level of formation of the military/war discourse.
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**РІВНІ ФОРМУВАННЯ ВІЙСЬКОВОЇ ТЕРМІНОСИСТЕМИ ТА ВІЙСЬКОВОГО ДИСКУРСУ (на матеріалі перської та української мов)**

**Анотація.** У сучасній військовій термінології спостерігаються унікальні параметри вираження соціального простору, які відтворюються у мовній картині світу певного народу, тотожні тенденції вираження й фіксації в мові єдиної системи поглядів на світові перетворення, глобалізованої філософії всього соціуму – носіїв різних мов. Це призводить до розширення структурованої сукупності знань і уявлень про зміни у світі, яким володіє національна лінгвокультурна спільнота, тобто до розширення когнітивного колективного та, зокрема, військового простору.

Терміни, як знаки особливого типу, виявляють свою специфіку в тому, що позначають явища, відносини, предмети, комунікативно й когнітивно значущі лише в особливому семіотичному просторі, – просторі тієї чи іншої професійної діяльності.

Стаття присвячена загальній характеристиці термінології як фактора формування військової терміносистеми та військового дискурсу (мікро-, макро-, мегарівні).

Дослідженням когнітивно-прагматичних особливостей та основних характеристик поняття термінології як фактора формування військової терміносистеми та військового дискурсу в парадигмі термін – терміносистема – дискурс за трирівневою моделлю (мікро-, макро-, мегарівні) зумовлюється актуальність та новизна цієї статті.

У дослідженні визначено рівні функціонування військової термінології за прагматичним принципом, а саме:
мікрорівень – словотворчий рівень побудови військового терміна, спрямований на пошук та розгляд складників власне засобів мовної коду, прихованих у певних термінотворчих елементах;
- макрорівень – рівень формування військової терміносистеми, що передбачає з’ясування класифікаційно-систематизуючих характеристик військової терміносистеми, змісту зберігання й передавання систематизованої у певній ієрархічній залежності інформації, яка акумулюється у спеціальних термінопоняттях та відношень між ними;
- мегарівень – рівень формування військового/воєнного дискурсу.

Ключові слова: військовий термін, військова термінологія, військова терміносистема, військовий дискурс.

Introduction. The development of anthropocentric approach has triggered the shift of the linguistic academic paradigm to the multidisciplinary plane, and brought about the formation of the new methodology of scientific research in the sphere of modern linguistics. The study of linguistic phenomena becomes relevant from the perspective of cognitive and pragmatic aspects which are efficiently analyzed by means of the tools of cognitive linguistics and linguistic pragmatics. From the perspective of cognitive linguistics, consistency of the term moves beyond the boundary of the system of relations in a specific area of its functioning; it suggests that there is a direct connection between the conceptual structure of the term and the conceptual system of the area of knowledge in which it functions, and the scientific paradigm which is employed to study the term.

On the whole, world social changes and the ongoing russia's full-scale war against Ukraine affect modern military terminology and determine the relevance of its research, and in today's circumstances there is a need to study scantily investigated Persian military terminology in particular.

The study of the cognitive-pragmatic aspects as well as basic characteristics of the concept of terminology as the factor which forms military terminological systems and military discourses (based on the Persian and Ukrainian languages) with the use of a complex approach within the paradigm of term – terminological system – discourse according to our own formulated three-level model (micro-, macro- and megalevels) contributes to the timeliness and novelty of this article.

Terms are the signs of a particular type; they show their specificity by means of denoting phenomena, relations and things, which have communicative and pragmatic meaning only in a particular semiotic field – the field of certain professional activities.

Analysis of recent studies and publications. Terminological studies are among of the most important lines of research in the national and foreign
schools of language studies, which is seen in the variety of approaches used to study terminology. Military terminology is the actual subject of research in profession-oriented linguistics. It has been studied by O. Andriianova (the stages of forming and semantics of naval terminology in the Ukrainian language) [1], A. Kyrychenko (peculiarities of English aviation radiotelephony discourse) [2], L. Murashko (Ukrainian military vocabulary in its historical development: a case study of military ranks and posts) [3], Y. Rybalka (the structure of the lexical set "military vocabulary of Cossacks" in the Ukrainian language of XVI–XVII centuries) [4], L. Turovska (military ranks and posts in Ukraine, historical and genetic perspective of studying Ukrainian military terminology) [5], H. Khalymonenko (Turkic military vocabulary in the speech of Ukrainian Cossacks) [6], L. Khalinovska (formation, structure and development of Ukrainian aviation terminology) [7], Y. Yaremko (formation of Ukrainian military terminology) [8], N. Yatsenko (formation of the military clothes names in the Ukrainian language) [9], A. Romanchenko (characteristics, classification, creation, and means of enriching of aviation terminology in the Persian language) [10], A. Kalahroodi (English-Persian military terms and abbreviations) [11], M. Rostami (Persian-English military terms and expressions) [12], C. Herbert Gilliland (US naval slang) [13], Christine Ammer (military terms that apply to sports) [14], etc.

However, despite some modern linguistic insights in the field of military terminology, a number of problems still remain understudied, which especially applies to Persian military terminology. The study of objective laws and processes of conceptualization, verbalization, formation, development, functioning, and the discourse-forming role of military terminology may be possible in the multi-paradigm dimension which involves both general scientific and specific linguistic cognitive and pragmatic research methods [15] and takes into account global trends in the world security sphere. Recent research conducted with the dominance of functional-communicative approach has systematized and divided the scope of problems of modern linguistic pragmatics among micro-, macro- and megapragmatics [16]; these levels take into account the specific character of impact made by units and categories of the studied elements on formation of communicative senses, which are pragmatic in character. The study of discourse is strongly influenced by van Dijk's ideas [17] which present broader understanding of discourse analysis.

The purpose of our research was to investigate the mechanisms of formation of modern military terminological system and military discourse. The tasks of the current research were to outline the main specific approaches to the problem, to determine the levels of military terminology functioning according to the pragmatic principle [16], we propose our own formulated three-level model, specifically:
- **microlevel** – word-formation level of military term building, aiming to search and study the constituent parts of language code means as such, which are implicit in particular term-building elements;

- **macrolevel** – the level of formedness of military terminological system, aiming to investigate classificational and systematizing characteristics of the military terminological system, the subject matter of storage and communication of information which has been systematized in hierarchic order, and which is accumulated in specific term-concepts considering their interrelations;

- **megalevel** – the level of formation of the military/war discourse.

**Research results. Microlevel.** On the microlevel, communicative senses are considered as the constituent parts of language code means, and, first of all, particular term-building elements. Indeed the study of the essence, nature and organization of such category of human interaction as military/war discourse is impossible without taking into consideration cognitive-semantic and pragmatic characteristics of terms; these characteristics structure the terms, define their instability, their nature is communicatively oriented. Military terms are the categorical components of the military/war discourse. Terms have the ability to inform structurally and semantically about the aspects of objective reality fixed in them. In this aspect the role of the inner form of terms is important: the "transparent" inner form allows to decipher the term "technically". This explains the trend in term formation to create motivated terms with predictable semantics. Correlations of the derivational means (of the term-building elements) with a particular specific field of science are of the equal logical importance. In that case any relational term-building element may acquire the property of the information-carrying medium in a term.

For example, in Persian, the suffix - bān – «بان» derived from ancient Iranian - "to protect" [18], serves in the minds of the Persians as a cognitive marker for the formation of terms with the following meanings:

a) "the person who protects something" joins the base, denoting "the object that is protected":

  - پشت pošt – back + «بان» poštibān (from the Middle Persian guard) formed: support (security) poštibāni;
  - دریا daryā – sea + «بان» bān – daryābān, formed: Vice Admiral daryābān;
  - مرز marz – border + «بان» bān – marzbān, formed: border guard marzbān;

b) "the administrator who manages something". In this case, the suffix joins the base which has the meaning "the object which is controlled":
For example, in Ukrainian military terminology, the suffixal method of word formation is also one of the most productive. For example, verbs of an imperfect form with a derivative suffix -увати (-uva/iuva) are based on an infinitive, from which terms with the meaning 'process of action' are formed: десантувати – десантування /to land – landing; оточувати – оточення /to surround – surrounding; анексувати – анексування /to annex – annexation; пеленгувати – пеленгування /to find direction – direction finding; дислокувати – дислокування /to deploy – deployment; мінувати – мінування /to mine – mining; комплектувати – комплектування /to man – manning; вистежувати – вистежування /to track (down) – tracking (down); бомбувати – бомбування /to bombard – bombardment; маневрувати – маневрування /to maneuver – maneuvering; завойовувати – завойовання /to conquer – a conquest; висувати – висування (військ, сил) /to advance – advancement (of troops, forces); атакувати – атака /to attack – an attack (attacking). The derivational basis with -увати (-uva/iuva) is characterized by high activity in military terminology. The derivatives in such word-formation models can both be made from both own linguistic words (рятувати – рятування /to rescue – rescue; маневрувати – маневрування /to maneuver – maneuvering; пеленгувати – пеленгування /to find direction – direction finding; завоювати – завоювання /to conquer – a conquest), and from words borrowed from other languages (анексувати – анексування /to annex – annexation; патрулювати – патрулювання /to patrol – patrol (patrolling); десантувати – десантування /to land – landing).

On the microlevel, the military term is, as a rule, the medium of collective professional and scientific information and memory; its heuristic value lies in the fact that being the sign which registers specific generalizations and common factors in an object, it becomes the tool of cognition.

Military terms are the linguistic expressions of term-concepts in the military sphere, and they serve to formulate and relay specific information. Being the most important component of communication, they naturally engage in the process and the results of cognition.

As the medium of collective professional memory, the military term actively participates in specific communication, serves to the development of human cognitive and transformational activities in the military sphere. The information, which becomes condensed in a military term, is a peculiar kind of recording of scientific and technical knowledge; due to this, its objective
sense represents not only the object of cognition, but also the mental process which is associated with the cognition.

The information nature of the military term lies in the fact that being a unit of professional knowledge it accumulates common-language and specific information, and turns it into terminological military information. Terminological information has its own specific character, and is seen as a dynamic means which serves to develop human creative thought and transformational activities.

"Decoding" of the military term through its definition should correlate with the terminological information contained in certain term-building elements or in the inner form of a particular term, i.e. the terminological information is encoded by means of specific term-building elements which have subject-matter information value, and establish the affiliation of a particular word-term to an open terminological group. In the recent period of information revolution, the process of naming specific concepts is of great significance, as this is a unique nominative activity of coding and decoding, storage and processing of terminological information.

Military terminology plays the role of classification and systematization; it structures and regularizes scientific knowledge. Within this framework, the information imbedded in military terms and term-concepts regulates and coordinates professional activities of military experts.

**Macrolevel.** The role of classification and systematization played by military terminology is clearly seen on the next level – *macrolevel*. Consistency is one of the most important conditions of existence of any term, which must be a part of a particular *terminological system* – an organized set of terms, which properly formulate the system of concepts of the theory, and characterize a particular field of human knowledge or activities.

Terminology is a set of terms used in a particular field of scientific knowledge or professional activity to designate its professional concepts, and a terminological system is a systematically organized set of such terms. The terminological system as a systemic formation is formed on the basis of the terminology of the relevant field of knowledge or activity, actualized by the totality of its terminological units, which are subject to ordering, standardization and lexicographic processing.

Despite the fact that systemacy is considered a feature of both terminological systems and terminology, the grade of its manifestation in them is not equal. Thus, in the terminological system, its manifestation is explicit, while in terminology it is implicit. Within cognitive terminology studies, the concept of "terminological system" is considered as a consciously constructed system of units that reflects the processes of conceptualization and categorization of fragments of scientific knowledge or professional activity of specialists in a particular field. Terminology reflects the results of
ordering terms within the nominative activity of a person in a certain field of knowledge or professional activity. It is these criteria that are considered by cognitive science terminologists to be key to distinguishing between terminology and terminological system [19].

*Terminological system* is a higher degree of organization of lexical units in comparison with *terminology*; two types of consistency are commonly found in it. First, there is logical consistency defined by the system of concepts which the terminological system correlates with. Second, there is language consistency characteristic of terminological systems: derivative and compound terms are formed on the basis of lexical units used to express initial terms [5].

In the notional structure of the terminological systems there is the actualization of the contents of storage and communication of information which has been systematized in hierarchic order, and which is accumulated in specific term-concepts considering their correlations.

There are several typical characteristics of the *military terminological system*:
- coherence of the terminological system. For instance, military terms taken together constitute a coherent terminological system which provides an overview of the functioning of a particular branch of the armed forces (arms of service, uniformed services etc.), or the armed forces on the whole (e.g. names of military units in any language collectively form a coherent system, i.e. a terminological system):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arabic</th>
<th>Persian</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>يغان</td>
<td>vāhed-e</td>
<td>unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>واحد پیاده نظام</td>
<td>piyād-e</td>
<td>rifle unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>سبک</td>
<td>vāhed-e</td>
<td>light rifle unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>واحد پیاده نظام</td>
<td>piyād-e</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>واحد مکانیزه</td>
<td>vāhed-e</td>
<td>mechanized unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>واحد تانک</td>
<td>tānk</td>
<td>tank unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>واحد زرهی</td>
<td>zereh</td>
<td>armor unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>واحد شناسایی</td>
<td>šenāsāyi</td>
<td>reconnaissance unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>واحد هوابرد</td>
<td>havābord</td>
<td>airborne unit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- correspondence between the sum of the parts and the whole. If, for example, it concerns the terminological system which describes the structural design of some military equipment, then the terms – the names of parts and units – should collectively give a full description of any article of military equipment;

- particular stability of the terminological system. It reflects the system of views in a particular field of scientific knowledge (in this case – in the military science) at a definite stage with a definite duration;

- the structured character of the terminological system. The structure of the terminological system may be single-level, or linear (for example, the words of command written up in the armed forces drill statutes, according to which drills are conducted with and without weapons), and hierarchical – with subsystems which characterize relations of gender and aspect, between the whole and its parts, the objects and their characteristics, e.g. names of arms of service, branches of the armed forces, military units, and the cause-and-effect relationships:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>جوخد</th>
<th>juxe</th>
<th>відділення</th>
<th>element; section</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>دسته</td>
<td>daste</td>
<td>взвод</td>
<td>(armour) platoon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>گروهان</td>
<td>goruhān</td>
<td>рота</td>
<td>company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>گردان</td>
<td>gardān</td>
<td>батальйон</td>
<td>battalion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>هنگ</td>
<td>hang</td>
<td>полк</td>
<td>regiment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>تیپ</td>
<td>tip</td>
<td>бригада</td>
<td>brigade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>لشکر</td>
<td>laškar</td>
<td>дивізія</td>
<td>division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>سپاه</td>
<td>sepāh</td>
<td>корпус</td>
<td>corps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ارتش</td>
<td>arteš</td>
<td>армія</td>
<td>army</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>گروه ارتش</td>
<td>goruh-e arteš</td>
<td>група армій</td>
<td>army group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Terminology is characterized by a hierarchical systematic approach, that is, there are generic and specific concepts in it, the relationship between concepts belonging to a particular sphere. So, for example, based on various signs, it is possible to single out the systemacy in the existence of different types of mines:

1) based on the intended purpose:

- مین ضد نفر | min-e zedd-e nafar | противіхотна міна | antipersonnel mine
- مین ضد تانک | min-e zedd-e tānk | протитанкова міна | antitank mine
2) based on the method of activating:

\( \text{min-e dūr} \)  
\( \text{қерована міна} \)  
\( \text{controlled mine} \)

\( \text{min-e ta'xīrī} \)  
\( \text{міна уповільненої дії} \)  
\( \text{delayed-action mine} \)

Consequently, we can observe the pragmatic functional ability of the term to systematize knowledge about certain fragments of reality.

The analysis also revealed the fact that such a feature as the systemacity of military terms is characteristic of the languages studied.

The military terminological system is a part of the national terminological system; it has its own peculiarities of formation and functioning due to the special nature of military affairs.

The military terminological system is both a finite and open system of terms of different origin, created by employing the lexical manner of production (formed or borrowed), the semantic manner (common words which acquired a terminological meaning), and the syntactic manner (newly-created combinations of words of nominative type) [9]. According to T. Kyiak, one should study modern terminological systems, in the military field in particular, only within the framework of their functional value in the context, particularly in professional languages [20] or the discourse.

Development and functioning of any terminology is influenced by both lingual and extra-lingual factors, which serve as the agents for creating word-building patterns and syntactic constructions; they have effect on changes in semantics of words, generate a significant quantity of foreign loan words and autochthonous neologisms, which denominate new concepts in the military sphere.

Megalevel. This is the next level of formation of the military/war discourse; it makes up the basis of professional interaction of members of the armed forces.

The notion of discourse is in permanent motion, and it continuously changes in historical perspective. Strict adherence to subordination in communications between the participants of the military/war discourse is the only condition which remains unchangeable. In the military sphere the concept of subordination reflects status-and-role relations between the communicants. It should be noted that subordination and closed nature are the key concepts of the military/war discourse; it does not allow participation of outsiders in specific status-and-role relations and ritual behavior (assignment of tasks to the subordinates, accurate and laconic wording of commands and instructions, precise clichés – specified questions and answers when on routine duty and guard duty, etc.). Structuredness and preciseness
are seen not just in the course of communication, but also in the composition of some types of military texts, which is reflected in creation of different military papers: statutes, instructions, orders, commands, report, dispatches, etc.

Driven by the principle of formal/informal communication, it makes sense to divide the military/war discourse into the formal military/war discourse and the informal military discourse (military slang, etc.).

The formal military/war discourse includes military technical materials, military documents, statutes, instructions, orders, commands, reports, and dispatches which feature a number of properties, specifically: the terminological corpus changes only when some terms become obsolete; new terms appear due to reformation of the armed forces branches, appearance of new types of weaponry and combat equipment; development of new forms and methods of warfare; presence of acronyms, index notations, and conventional symbols for the majority of types of weaponry and combat equipment.

Text features of the formal military/war discourse focus on the armed forces statutes. The determinant language features of the formal military/war discourse are the following: the use of speech formulas prescribed by the statutes; the imperative mood of the verb as the prevailing grammatical construction; the so-called commanding tone, i.e. loud and accurate pronunciation.

The informal military discourse is close to military slang on the grounds of similar features – "non-normative, informal, stylistically degraded language of members of the armed forces used with the aim to perform some speech functions (expressive, evaluative, collaborative, pejorative, euphemistic, etc.), which is composed of the units – slang words – that have different lexicographic markedness "[21, 37]. Based on this statement, we put forward the definition of the informal military discourse as follows: the informal language of members of the armed forces which does not keep to the standards of the formal language, and is used with the aim to perform some speech functions through the use of military slang words.

All in all, the concepts military discourse and war discourse bear the features of both objective identity and permanent contrast, which depends on which state institution worked at a particular document, and whether expert from defence and law enforcement agencies were engaged in the work [22].

We put forward our own multilevel structure of the military institutional discourse:

- the first level of the military institutional discourse – the professional (informal) level where the communicants stand on the same stage of hierarchic professional interaction (between the commanding officers or the
subordinates), which is secretive in nature and falls within the category of informal military discourse;

- the second level of the institutional discourse in the armed forces and militarized structures – the *professional subordination* level of interaction between the commanding officers and the subordinates. Such interaction is formal in nature; it develops within the framework of specific genres connected with the line of duty, etc. This type of communication is realized in determined boundaries of status-and-role relations, in oral communication or in standard and structured texts (orders, commands, reports, dispatches, letters of comment, information memos, etc.);

- the third level – the *tactical and organizational*, which is organizational in character; it maintains the status hierarchy of the military social institution as such. Written texts are the documents of a higher level of significance than those of the second level: regulatory documents, statutes, rules, etc. It is distinguished from the previous level by the fact that within the third level the interaction is realized with the view to organize and regulate the activities of a particular structure tasked with successful fulfillment of assigned missions;

- the fourth level – the *national-strategic* level. This is the level at which one can observe the distinction between the military discourse and the war discourse; it represents the contact of a military institution in a definite country with the world and the society, in particular, it defines the strategy of the military organization in the sphere of security and defense at the country level. Written texts of this level are military doctrines, treaties, charters, concepts, strategies, laws, presidential decrees, etc.

The fundamental basis of the national military/war discourse is the state documents that define the strategy of the state policy of a particular country in the field of security and defense, and which recorded verbalized experience of thinking with a certain way of coding/decoding and conceptualizing knowledge in this area.

Since there is a causal relationship between external threats, national security and defense issues of a particular country, terminology is formed in military/war discourses of different languages, the so-called terms-codes of the thematic field "National Security and Defense", containing the key meanings of certain documents.

Certainly, under the influence of external threats and hostilities, in the process of linguistic communication the society forms new terminology concepts, terminological layers of modern military terminology; certain terms-codes of national and global military/war discourse, which are fixed in the main documents of the state/community of states are also formed. In the
Ukrainian military/war discourse the examples are as follows: military policy of Ukraine, temporary occupation, defense reform, security forces, defense forces, strategic communications, the threat of military force, military-political situation, military-political relations, military conflict, armed conflict, actual hostilities, military and political challenge, temporarily occupied territories, multidimensional struggle, defense budget, containment, stability, interaction, Joint Forces Operation, partial and full mobilization, interservice groups of troops, etc. The above mentioned examples of terms are the codified basis of certain documents (for example: The Military Doctrine [23], The White Paper [24], various legislative documents (the Law of Ukraine "On National Security" [25], "The Decree on the National Security Strategy of Ukraine" [26], the Law of Ukraine "About Defense of Ukraine" [27], the Law of Ukraine "About the Fight Against Terrorism" [28]), etc.) are part of the terminological system that forms the basis of the national military/war discourse of the Ukrainian language.

For example, the terms-codes of military/war discourse that determine the strategy of the national security, the concept of various statutes of Armed Forces of the Islamic Republic of Iran (hereinafter - IRI), the basic principles of The Constitution of Islamic Republic of Iran [29], on which the activities of Supreme National Security Council of IRI are based, are as follows: devotion to Islam (اصلاحي budan), national security (امنیت ملی amniyat-e melli), national interests (منافع ملی manâfe melli), national character of the army (مردمی budan), Islamic values (ارزش‌های اسلامی arzeshâ-ye eslami), political and legal doctrine of the Velâyat-e Faqih (ولايت فقیه xodkafâyî), discipline (انضباط enzebâh), simplicity (سادگی sâdegi), defence capability (دفاع بودن defâ' budan), power (اقطادار enqedâr), etc.

For example, "concepts such as self-reliance, "holy defense" and export of the revolution first entered the military lexicon during the Iran-Iraq War and were codified as doctrine in the early 1990s" [30].

The IRI is a state whose value system is predetermined by the ideology and norms of Islam: in the organization and equipping of the countries defense forces, there must be regard for faith and religion as their basis and rules. And so the Islamic Republic's army, and the corps of Revolutionary Guards must be organized in accordance with this aim. They have responsibility not only for the safeguarding of the frontiers, but also for a religious mission, which is Holy War (JIHAD) along the way of God, and the struggle to extend the supremacy of God's Law in the world [31].

The influence of Islam, the preservation and protection of Islamic spiritual values determine the strategy of the national security and defense of
the IRI, forming the basis of the military doctrine of the state, as an alternative to Western and other models of social development [30]; it directly influences and forms the national linguistic view of the world, the national conceptual view of the world and the military/war discourse of the IRI in particular: the Army of the Islamic Republic of Iran must be an Islamic Army, i.e., committed to Islamic ideology and the people, and must recruit into its service individuals who have faith in the objectives of the Islamic Revolution and are devoted to the cause of realizing its goals [31].

In the modern world, the role of Islam as a global political-forming factor is growing. Based on ideological and political principles and moral and ethical criteria of Islam, the main tendencies of the military/war discourse of the IRI are also formed, which affects modern international relations quite significantly.

Thus, the military/war discourse is an institutional discourse which develops within the hierarchic framework of the military institution and the national military establishment; it is realized by communicants in line with their professional roles. The level of the discourse determines the structure of texts and the communicative result of the discourse. The specific character of interaction within the military field (preciseness, accuracy, laconic brevity) is reflected in the structure of documents, precise formulation of aims, and logical sequence of the assigned tasks.

Conclusions. In modern military terminology there are unique parameters of expression of social space, which are reproduced in the linguistic picture of the world of a certain people, tendencies of expression and fixation in the language of a system of views on world transformations, wars and globalized philosophy of the whole society – the speakers of different languages. This leads to the expansion of the structured body of knowledge and ideas about changes in the world which belong to the national linguocultural community, that is, to the expansion of the cognitive collective and, in particular, the military space.

In summary, modern military terminology (microlevel) is a complex of sector-specific and multisectoral words and word combinations (specific names) which denominate corresponding fragments of the military subcultural view of the world; they correlate with specific concepts and facts of the military field, denominate the concepts of the military sector, and form a corresponding terminological system, i.e. the stratum of modern military vocabulary of the language, which is a sublanguage of special purpose.

Military terminological system (macrolevel) is a complex of terms united by the common subject matter, and which reflect the conceptual, objective and functional similarity of military phenomena. It is composed of
formal military specific vocabulary (terminology), slang words, emotionally
coloured units of military vocabulary, and is a basis-forming component of
the military discourse.

The next level is the level of formation of the military/war discourse
(megalevel) as the basis of professional interaction of members of the armed
forces.

At the microlevel, the cognitive-pragmatic features of military terms
are predetermined and formed by their functions – to be means of formation
and functioning, at the macrolevel – the military terminology system, at the
megalevel – military/war discourse.
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