№10(14)

ISSN 1829-4820



Филиал МГУ имени М.В.Ломоносова
в г. Ереване

Журнал входит в список
периодических изданий ВАК РА

ՌՈՒՍԱԳԻՏՈՒԹՅԱՆ ԱՐԴԻ ՀԻՄՆԱԽՆԴԻՐՆԵՐԸ

Գիտամեթոդական հանդես

ПРОБЛЕМЫ СОВРЕМЕННОЙ РУСИСТИКИ

Научно-методический журнал

MAIN ISSUES IN MODERN RUSSIAN STUDIES

Scientific Methodological Journal

2022

Երևան քաղաքում Մոսկվայի Մ.Վ. Լոմոնոսովի անվան պետական համալսարանի մասնաճյուղ

Филиал Московского государственного университета им. М.В. Ломоносова в г. Ереване

M. Lomonosov Moscow State University, Yerevan branch

ՌՈՒՍԱԳԻՏՈՒԹՅԱՆ ԱՐԴԻ ՀԻՄՆԱԽՆԴԻՐՆԵՐԸ

Գիտամեթոդական հանդես

ПРОБЛЕМЫ СОВРЕМЕННОЙ РУСИСТИКИ

Научно-методический журнал

MAIN ISSUES IN MODERN RUSSIAN STUDIES

Scientific Methodological Journal

10 (14)

ԵՐԵՎԱՆ 2022
ЕРЕВАН 2022
YEREVAN 2022

Երաշխավորվել է տպագրության Երևան քաղաքում Մոսկվայի Մ.Վ.Լոմոնոսովի անվան պետական համալսարանի մասնաճյուղի գիտական խորհրդի կողմից

Печатается по решению Ученого совета филиала Московского государственного университета им. М.В. Ломоносова в г. Ереване

Reprinted by decision of the Academic Council of the branch of the Moscow State University M.V. Lomonosov in Yerevan

«ՌՈՒՍԱԳԻՏՈՒԹՅԱՆ ԱՐԴԻ ՀԻՄՆԱԽՆԴԻՐՆԵՐԸ» գիտամեթոդական հանդեսի առաքելությունը ՀՀ-ում ռուսագիտության՝ որպես լեզվաբանության ճյուղի մասսայականացումն է, ռուսաց լեզվի ուսումնասիրման նկատմամբ հետաքրքրություն առաջացնելը, օտարերկրյա հետազոտողների ուշադրությունը հայ գիտնականների մշակումներին հրավիրելը, դրանով իսկ հայ ռուսագիտության մասսայականացումն է, համատեղ ծրագրերի, դրամաշնորհների մշակման հնարավորության ընձեռումը, մագիստրոսների ներգրավումը հետազոտական աշխատանքներին:

Назначение научно-методического журнала «**ПРОБЛЕМЫ СОВРЕМЕННОЙ РУСИСТИКИ**» рассматривается нами в ракурсе популяризации в РА русистики как отрасли языкознания, привлечения интереса к изучению русского языка, привлечения внимания зарубежных исследователей к разработкам армянских ученых и тем самым популяризации армянской русистики, возможности разработки совместных проектов, грантов и пр., привлечения магистрантов к научно-исследовательской работе.

ПРОБЛЕМЫ СОВРЕМЕННОЙ РУСИСТИКИ // Научно-методический журнал, №10 (14). / Глав. ред. Саркисян И.Р.; сост.: Акопян А.С. – Ереван: Изд-во МГУ, 2022. – 204 с.

ISSN 1829-4820

*Журнал входит в список периодических изданий **ВАК РА***

ORCID: 0000-0001-9263-6791

© Филиал МГУ им. М.В. Ломоносова в г. Ереване

ИСПОЛЬЗОВАНИЯ АНТРОПОНИМОВ В АНГЛО-АМЕРИКАНСКОМ, РУССКОМ И АРМЯНСКОМ ЖАРГОННОМ ВОЕННОМ ДИСКУРСАХ

Кристина Грачьяевна Мурадян
christinamuradyan24@gmail.com

Преподаватель кафедры общественных и гуманитарных наук,
Армянский государственный институт физической культуры;
Аспирант кафедры английского языка,
Государственный университет им. В.Я. Брюсова,
Ереван, Республика Армения

АННОТАЦИЯ

Статья посвящена исследованию официального антропонимикона военных дискурсов русского, армянского и англо-американского языков, который представлен антропонимическими моделями официального именования личности в военном этносоциуме. Изучен вопрос жаргонного использования антропонимов в военном дискурсе указанных языков с учетом как места, так и роли антропонимов в номинативной системе военного дискурса. На основе проведенного исследования сделан вывод: современный англо-американский, равно как и русский военный дискурс пополняется неологичным использованием антропонимов, в то время как в армянском военном дискурсе чаще используются прилагательные, характеризующие военнослужащих.
Ключевые слова: военный дискурс, антропонимы, русский язык, английский язык, армянский язык, неологизмы.

From the perspective of the total instability in the world caused by military actions in different parts of the globe, the increased interest of specialists in various fields, including linguists, who, first of all, are interested in military voca-

bulary, began to emerge in the armed forces of certain countries. It should be noted here that in addition to the words and phrases generally accepted in military discourse, special expressions, the so-called statutory official terminology, there is also a specific unique and distinctive jargon of military personnel, which is their informal lexicon and performs the function, figuratively speaking, of «conspiratorial communication» [4: 68].

It is quite apparent that an obligatory characteristic of a civilized state of our time is the presence of an army. At the same time, the composition of the armed forces of a particular state, as well as to some extent the degree of their combat capability, as well as the attitude of society to the army, the principle of its recruitment, and army traditions – all this in general seems to us to be one of the reasons directly affecting the emergence and active functioning of the so-called jargon of modern military personnel, which, in turn, is a specific way of representing the professional activities of military personnel.

Thus, the jargon of military personnel, on the one hand, really reflects the professional side of the military service, at the same time it (jargon) also reveals the "reverse", that is, the everyday side of the life of army employees. Following the researcher A.D. Schweitzer, we believe that the only difference between military jargon and the national vernacular vocabulary related to slang is its peculiar purpose to make the speech of military personnel, firstly, incomprehensible to the civilian population and, secondly, to narrow the scope of its application [8: 53].

Many factors are reflected in the military discourse, namely: the unusual nature of the environment, military service, and often participation in combat operations (real and training) – all this contributes to the enrichment of the speech of the military, including emotionally colored elements. With a high degree of probability, it can be assumed that military jargon to some extent may be a factor in the rapprochement of military personnel who previously belonged to different social groups. At the same time, from a psychological point of view, it can be stated that the commonality of the spoken vocabulary of military personnel serves as a direct means of adaptation in the military team of recruits [4: 28].

At the same time, it is noted that it is during the period of military operations that there is a real replenishment of military jargon with new elements. The features of the development and functioning of military jargon are universal. Ho-

wever, at the same time, they reflect in a certain way both the values and the national and cultural specifics of a particular linguistic and cultural community. And in order to directly characterize one's opponent (or ally), as well as express one or another attitude towards him, so-called onomastic realities, and in particular anthroponyms, are often used in military discourse. It seems obvious that one of the means of forming the so-called image of a serviceman is various means of naming him, which can actualize the direct content of military communication.

In this paper, we do not aim to consider the official anthroponymicon of military discourses of the Russian, Armenian, and English languages, which is represented by anthroponymic models of the official naming of a person in a military ethnosocium: these are the so-called anthroponymic models that are used in the generally accepted formulas of the official naming of an individual in the military discourse of a certain ethnic society. We are interested in the question of the slang use of anthroponyms in the military discourse of these languages. At the same time, we take into account both the place and the role of anthroponyms in the nominative system of military discourse.

It should be noted that anthroponyms have long been the object of research by scientists interested in topical issues of the essence of onyms, as well as the problem of the emergence of proper names, their obvious connection with reality, as well as with the traditions of the ethnosocium and its history. The end of the 20th – the beginning of the 21st century in Russian linguistics was marked by the emergence of a large number of studies devoted to the issues of secondary nomination based on proper names (Bolotov V.I., 1978; Shutkina G.M., 1978; Murnaeva E.N., 1993; Tkachuk E.A., 2001 and many others). Many scientists have been considering problems related to the role of discourse in revealing the semantics of proper names (Nikitina A.A., 1997; Aleynikova N.V., 1991; Ponomarenko A.V., 2003, Gaiduk I.V., 2001, etc.), as well as the structure and significance of anthroponyms, their linguistic, as well as the extralinguistic character (Kamovnikova N.E., 2000; Garagulya SI., 2000; Sheremet L.G., 1984; Gaiduk I.V., 2001; Kalashnikov A.V., 2004; Comarova R.A., 1991; Chernobrov A.A., 1994; Ermolovich D.I., 1981, 2005; Katermina V.V., 1998, etc.).

It seems quite obvious that onymy, like any part of the lexical system of a language, very actively reflects all the changes taking place directly in society and

the environment. Thus, anthroponyms to some extent turn out to be involuntary registrars of natural phenomena and events that took place in public life. Denisova V.V. speaks in detail about the extralinguistic aspect of onomastic universals [1]. The above, of course, applies to the army of any other state.

Proper names – names of a person as a class of onomastic nominations have a fairly high degree of informativeness since they reflect the diversity of social, cultural, economic, religious, political and, ultimately, military factors. In military discourse, anthroponyms perform various important functions. As for official onyms, it can be noted here that due to their specific denotative correlation, they primarily perform a specific nominative function. And unofficial anthroponyms – anthroponyms of military jargon – along with the nominative function also perform the so-called characterizing function. For example, A.V. Superanskaya identifies the following functions of proper names: «communicative, appellative, expressive and deictic» [2]. Researcher V.A. Nikonov notes such functions of anthroponyms as nominative, descriptive and ideological. In the first case, we are talking about the nature of the name of the object, in the second – about its description, and in the third – about the expression of the idea associated with the name [5].

It is an obvious fact that anthroponyms are an integral part of the military jargon of almost any language. Proper names can be considered as a possible way to convey directly the national and cultural specifics of the military personnel of a particular country. Let us stipulate that the lexical units in question in military jargon are not just ordinary slang labels that practically do not report any information, nor do they attribute certain properties to the referent. Conversely, it is well known that linguists consider identification, differentiating, and nominative functions to be the main purpose of anthroponyms in speech. And in the military jargon, we can see an interesting pattern. Following P.J. Mitchell, we state that there is a noticeable activation of the secondary functions of anthroponyms, namely, social, targeted, emotional, stylistic, aesthetic, and expressive [4].

Realizing the specific purpose of an individual nomination, anthroponyms in military discourse, more precisely, in military jargon, can in fact relate to specific or stereotypical national images, while performing a certain function of generalization. Russian unofficial military discourse, for example, actively used the anthroponyms «Katyusha» (the name of an artillery installation), Molotov (a mixture

of Molotov) during the Great Patriotic War; Soviet soldiers called the fascists Fritz, and German soldiers called the Russian military Ivan, etc. At the same time, the official anthroponymicon was no less widespread (IS tank – Joseph Stalin, KV tank – Kliment Voroshilov, PO plane – N.N. Polikarpov, etc.). In the German army, the famous Ferdinand tank was in service. There are many other similar examples.

Currently, the military discourse continues to be replenished with neological anthroponyms. For example, the well-known expression of the American military discourse «crazy Ivan» refers to the so-called sharp turns of an underwater submarine when it conducts a reconnaissance operation to detect an enemy submarine during combat operations or military training. It should be noted that for the American discourse, the proper name Ivan is a kind of synonym for everything Russian. And the adjective crazy in the above-mentioned phrase is used to figuratively define the surprise, the suddenness of the action of a military submarine because in American linguoculture Russians are always associated with suddenness, surprise, and shock. It should be noted that in the American military discourse of a jargon character, male names are very actively used – George, John, Jack, Charlie, and many others. At the same time, they figuratively give names to both people and inanimate objects with the help of onyms. Most often these anthroponyms are used in phrases. Here are examples: Dear John – the phrase means a letter from a bride or wife with bad news to a soldier; Tommy – an English/American soldier; Jack Jonson – a heavy gun, a heavy projectile; Hot Charlie – an energetic down-to-earth officer; Jack-of-the-Dust – storekeeper; George – autopilot; Dead and Charlie – tail gunner [4: 40].

Women's names have not been ignored by the American military discourse. So, in American military slang expressions, women names are often given to weapons, sometimes also as part of a phrase, which, in essence, is an oxymoron – a female name is a weapon: Black Maria – a large explosive cartridge; Magu – a rifle; Big Bertha – a large cannon, etc.

For comparison, we note that in the Russian military jargon discourse, the names of people most often determine the usual everyday work of the military. Anthroponyms are most actively used to nominate the attitude of soldiers to military service, their commanders, officers, etc.: Mukhtar, to me! (Мухтар, ко мне!)

– orderly; Vanka (Ванька) – platoon commander; Ivan the Terrible – battalion commander; Ali Baba and forty robbers – soldiers on duty in the canteen; D'Artagnan and three Musketeers – soldiers on duty in the military unit, etc.

Anthroponyms in Russian military discourse are also used to refer to military personnel of certain branches of the armed forces. For example, Vovan, Vovchik (Вован, Вовчик) is a serviceman of the internal troops.

In Russian military discourse, women names are also used. For example, in the military discourse of the period of the Great Patriotic War (1941–1945), as noted above, the female name Ekaterina was widely used in the colloquial diminutive version of Katyusha (Катюша) to denote a type of military equipment – small arms. And, for example, currently, in the Russian military discourse, the neological use of the female name Masha/Mashka (Маша/Машка) has 3 meanings: 1) a block for rubbing parquet floors in the barracks; 2) a piece of overcoat soaked with a special paste for rubbing the belt plate; 3) a mop. And in the Russian military neologistic slang discourse of pilots, any female or male name can often be the name of an aircraft of a certain brand. It should be noted that these names are used, as a rule, in their diminutive variants: Antosha, Antoshka, Annushka (Антоша, Антошка, Аннушка) – the designation of the famous An–2 aircraft [4: 53].

It should certainly be noted that particular jargonisms with an anthroponym in military discourse are ambiguous. In this case, the ambiguity of these jargons is predetermined by the environment, as well as the status of military personnel, depending on which, these jargon phraseological units with an anthroponym acquire a new meaning in military discourse. Here is an example: the well-known modern neologistic jargon of the American military discourse – the anthroponym John is usually used by the military in the meaning of «toilet», or «public men's toilet». And during the Second World War, the same anthroponym in slang usage denoted the recruits of the American army. We stipulate that it was the capital letter J that appeared in the written texts. This can be explained by the fact that usually the first and last name – John Doe – was given as a sample in all the questionnaires of recruits as an example for correct filling. In the jargon discourse, only the name – the anthroponym John – has been fixed. Thus, we can say that the old slang anthroponym has now received neological use.

It is curious that after the end of World War II, already in the middle of the last century, the well-known jargon John gradually began to be used with a new meaning to characterize the officers-lieutenants of the American army. Moreover, such variants of this anthroponym as «First John», denoting a lieutenant of the first degree, and «second John», denoting a lieutenant of the second degree, have become very popular in military discourse. Thus, it can be stated that proper names – anthroponyms in military discourse often acquire a new meaning [4: 40]. Moreover, jargonism-anthroponym can acquire a new meaning not only in the same linguistic picture of the world. It can acquire a new meaning in the system of another language in another language picture of the world. So, for example, it happened with the well-known slang anthroponym of the military discourse Ali Baba, which is used in the American army to denote a bad, dishonest person or a soldier or officer of the enemy army. This anthroponym appeared in the function of a slang word in American military discourse during the Iraq War. At the same time, in the Russian military discourse, a complex phrase with the same anthroponym has a rather positive connotation, because it serves to designate the division commander. However, in the Russian language picture of the world, this slang idiom of military discourse is ambiguous: in addition to the division commander, it also means a soldier on duty in the canteen.

The study of the Armenian military jargon discourse allowed us to come to the conclusion that proper names are not characteristic of the Armenian military jargon. In this case, lexical units are more often used to characterize an individual, which, in general, is characteristic of the colloquial discourse of the modern Armenian language. Here we can talk about creating an image discourse, namely: positioning a given object, that is, attributing to it some properties – the so-called image traits, while using various methods of nomination. As the researcher D.V. Olshansky notes, «... the image is subjective – it thickens the colors of the picture, either by embellishing the phenomenon or denigrating it» [6: 292]. At the same time, an anti-image creation technique can be used as an «attack on the created positive image» [3: 222; 7: 128–131]. The techniques of hyperbolization of image traits are also neologistic in the Armenian military discourse. This is most often achieved as a result of a certain concentration of different ways of positive or negative evaluation of the object. Following Ruzhentsova N.B., this phenomenon

can be called stylistic-pragmatic convergence [7: 128]. It should certainly be noted here that the unofficial version of the name of a serviceman in place of the official one is a certain means of modal transformation of a conditionally «neutral» description of the situation.

Thus, the conducted research allowed us to conclude that the modern American, as well as the Russian military discourse, is replenished with the neological use of anthroponyms, while in the Armenian military discourse adjectives characterizing military personnel are more often used.

ЛИТЕРАТУРА

1. *Denisova V.V.* Onomastic universals: extralinguistic aspect. Dis. ... Candidate of Philology: Ulan-Ude, 2003. – 180 p.
2. *Khushvakhtov B.S.* The official anthroponymicon of military discourse (on the example of the English language). Bulletin of Chelyabinsk State University, 2021. № 1 (447). – PP. 162–168.
3. *Lyashchuk O.N.* Image-making as a cultural technology of mankind // Scientific problems of humanitarian research, 2011. № 1. – PP. 218–223.
4. *Mitchell P.D.* American military slang. The influence of the Korean War // Language and culture, 2015. – № 2 (30). – PP. 51–57.
5. *Nikonov V.A.* Name and society. – Moscow: Gl. editorial office of the East. Literature publishing house «Nauka», 1974. – 278 p.
6. *Olshansky D.V.* Political PR. – Moscow: Peter, 2003. – 544 p.
7. *Ruzhentseva N.B.* Discrediting strategies and tactics of Russian speech. – Yekaterinburg: Ural. gos. ped. un-t, 2004. – 294 p.
8. *Schweitzer A.D.* Social differentiation of the English language in the USA. – Moscow: Nauka, 1983. – 215 p.
9. *Superanskaya A.V.* General theory of proper name. – Moscow, Nauka, 1973. – 366 p.

ԱՆԳԼՈ-ԱՄԵՐԻԿՅԱՆ, ՌՈՒՍԵՐԵՆ ԵՎ ՀԱՅԵՐԵՆ ԺԱՐԳՈՆԱՅԻՆ ՌԱԶՄԱԿԱՆ ԴԻՍԿՈՒՐՍՈՒՄ ՄԱՐԴԱԲԱՆՈՒԹՅՈՒՆՆԵՐԻ ՕԳՏԱԳՈՐԾՄԱՆ ՎԵՐԼՈՒԾՈՒԹՅՈՒՆ

Ք.Հ. Մուրադյան
christinamuradyan24@gmail.com

Հասարակական և հումանիտար գիտությունների ամբիոնի դասախոս,
Ֆիզիկական կուլտուրայի հայկական պետական ինստիտուտ,
Անգլերեն լեզվի ամբիոնի ասպիրանտ,
Վ. Բրյուսովի անվ. պետական համալսարան,
Երևան, Հայաստանի Հանրապետություն

ԱՄՓՈՓՈՒՄ

Հոդվածը նվիրված է ռուսական, հայկական և անգլո-ամերիկյան լեզուների ռազմական դիսկուրսների պաշտոնական մարդաբանության ուսումնասիրությանը, որը ներկայացված է ռազմական էթնոսոցիումում անհատի պաշտոնական անվանման մարդաբանական մոդելներով: Ուսումնասիրվել է վերոնշված լեզուների ռազմական դիսկուրսում մարդաբանությունների ժարգոնային օգտագործման հարցը՝ հաշվի առնելով ինչպես մարդաբանական անունների տեղը, այնպես էլ դերը ռազմական դիսկուրսի անվանական համակարգում: Հետազոտության հիման վրա եզրակացություն է արվել. ժամանակակից անգլո-ամերիկյան, ինչպես նաև ռուսական ռազմական դիսկուրսը համալրվում է մարդանունների նեոլոգիական օգտագործմամբ, մինչդեռ հայկական ռազմական դիսկուրսում ավելի հաճախ օգտագործվում են զինծառայողներին բնութագրող ածականներ:

Բանալի բառեր՝ ռազմական դիսկուրս, մարդաբանություն, ռուսաց լեզու, անգլերեն լեզու, հայոց լեզու, նորաբանություններ:

ANALYSIS OF THE USE OF ANTHROPONYMS IN ANGLO-AMERICAN, RUSSIAN AND ARMENIAN SLANG MILITARY DISCOURSES

Ch. Muradyan
christinamuradyan24@gmail.com

Lecturer at the Department of Social Sciences and Humanities,
Armenian State Institute of Physical Culture,
Postgraduate student at the Department of English,
Brusov State University,
Yerevan, Republic of Armenia

ABSTRACT

The article is devoted to the study of the official anthroponymicon of military discourses of the Russian, Armenian and American languages, which is represented by anthroponymic models of the official naming of a person in the military ethnosocium. The question of the slang use of anthroponyms in the military discourse of these languages is studied, taking into account both the place and the role of anthroponyms in the nominative system of military discourse. Based on the conducted research, the conclusion is made: modern American, as well as Russian military discourse, is replenished with the neological use of anthroponyms, while in Armenian military discourse adjectives characterizing military personnel are more often used.

Keywords: military discourse, anthroponyms, Russian, English, Armenian, neologisms.

Информация о статье:
статья поступила в редакцию 09 июля 2022 г.,
подписана к печати в номер 10 (14) / 2022 – 01.12.2022 г.