

Политическая лингвистика. 2024. № 4 (106).
Political Linguistics. 2024. No 4 (106).

УДК 811.161.1'42+355.732
ББК ШП41.12-51+У305.04

ГРНТИ 16.21.33

Код ВАК 5.9.8

Dilya A. Khaliullina

Udmurt State University, Izhevsk, Russia, madeleine777@mail.ru, SPIN code: 6306-6572, <https://orcid.org/0009-0002-1816-3468>

Armaments Discourse as a Separate Type of Discourse

ABSTRACT. *The article presents the conclusions of studies of armaments discourse, which allow distinguishing it as a special type of professional discourse. The military-industrial complex is a social institution, the importance of which for society is determined by its main goal — ensuring national security. The professional group of armorers has been functioning in the Udmurt Republic for more than two hundred years, since the very foundation of Izhevsk armaments factory, which makes it relevant to study the professional speech of armorers in this region. The present article is aimed at distinguishing armaments discourse as a separate type of professional discourse of armorers. The article defines the constitutive features of armaments discourse (aims, prototypical places, participants, values, genres, strategies, topics, precedent texts, discourse formulae) on the basis of the sociolinguistic approach developed by V. I. Karasik. The research has been carried out within the framework of the cognitive-discursive approach, taking into account extralinguistic factors, which determined the peculiarities of this type of discourse. The study has conducted a comparative analysis of the constitutive features of armaments discourse with those of the related types of discourse (military, scientific, and engineering). The research has revealed that armaments discourse is a hybrid form of discourse and overlaps military, engineering, and scientific types of discourse.*

KEYWORDS: *armaments discourse, institutional discourse, armorers, military-industrial complex, social institutes, constitutive features of discourse, hybrid discourse.*

AUTHOR'S INFORMATION: *Khaliullina Dilya Al'fredovna, Post-Graduate Student of Department of the Russian Language, Theoretical and Applied Linguistics, Udmurt State University, Izhevsk, Russia.*

FOR CITATION: *Khaliullina D. A. (2024). Armaments Discourse as a Separate Type of Discourse. In *Political Linguistics*. No 4 (106), pp. 284-288.*

Диля Альфредовна Халиуллина

Удмуртский государственный университет, Ижевск, Россия, madeleine777@mail.ru, SPIN-код: 6306-6572, <https://orcid.org/0009-0002-1816-3468>

Оружейный дискурс как отдельный вид дискурса

АННОТАЦИЯ. *В настоящей статье представлены выводы исследований оружейного дискурса, позволяющие выделить его в особый вид профессионального дискурса — оружейный. Оборонно-промышленный комплекс является общественным институтом, значимость которого для социума определяется его основной задачей — обеспечением национальной безопасности государства. Со времен основания Ижевского оружейного завода в Удмуртской Республике уже более двух столетий функционирует профессиональная группа оружейников, что обуславливает актуальность изучения профессиональной речи данной субкультуры в регионе. Целью настоящей статьи является выделение дискурса оружейников в отдельный вид профессионального дискурса. На основе социолингвистического подхода В. И. Карасика нами были определены конститутивные признаки оружейного дискурса (цели, прототипные места, участники, ценности, жанры, стратегии, тематика, прецедентные тексты, дискурсивные формулы). Исследование проводилось в рамках когнитивно-дискурсивной парадигмы, учитывались экстралингвистические факторы, обусловившие специфику данного вида дискурса. Также был проведен сравнительный анализ конститутивных признаков оружейного вида дискурса со смежными ему видами дискурса (военным, научным, инженерным). Исследование показало, что оружейный дискурс находится на пересечении военного, инженерного, научного типов дискурса, т. е. относится к гибриднему формату дискурса.*

КЛЮЧЕВЫЕ СЛОВА: *оружейный дискурс, институциональный дискурс, оружейники, оборонно-промышленный комплекс, социальные институты, конститутивные признаки дискурса, гибридный дискурс.*

ИНФОРМАЦИЯ ОБ АВТОРЕ: *Халиуллина Диля Альфредовна, аспирант кафедры русского языка, теоретической и прикладной лингвистики, Удмуртский государственный университет; 426034, Россия, г. Ижевск, ул. Университетская, 1; email: madeleine777@mail.ru.*

ДЛЯ ЦИТИРОВАНИЯ: *Халиуллина, Д. А. Оружейный дискурс как отдельный вид дискурса / Д. А. Халиуллина. — Текст : непосредственный // Политическая лингвистика. — 2024. — № 4 (106). — С. 284-288.*

In the present article communicative activities in the sphere of communication related to weapons production are identified as a separate category — gunsmiths' discourse. To distinguish a new type of institutional discourse it's necessary to identify its constitutive features, as

well as peculiarities and social significance of the studied sphere of communication.

The study of society in institutional aspect is connected with the main category of sociology — social institution. In linguistics within the framework of the cognitive-discursive paradigm the

© Khaliullina D. A., 2024

social institution is considered as a frame, whose structure includes people with their characteristics and behaviour patterns, typical facilities, mythologemes and texts [Карасик 2002: 294].

Despite the existence of the term *military-industrial complex*, scholars (A. S. Sorokin, Ye. M. Astakhov, R. V. Borisov, Ye. M. Gunkin, M. Yu. Mazur et al.) consider it preferable to use the term *defence industrial complex*, which emphasizes the defensive nature of the military policy.

Defence industry complex is a social institution, whose importance for society is determined by its main goal — ensuring national security. The studied sphere of communication is considered important for society, which determines the need to research it from a linguistic point of view.

Functioning of social institutions is not possible without language, therefore discourse plays a major role “in shaping reality, creating patterns of understanding, which people then apply in social practices” [Mayr 2008: 5]. There exist a number of approaches to understanding institutional discourse. In his institutional theory of discourse M. Foucault applies the term *discursive formation*, whose elements (objects of discourse, utterances, topics, notions) are subject to certain rules of shaping [Foucault 1969: 53]. Thus, according to Foucault, social institutions firmly control the process of discourse production by developing certain norms and rules of its production and realization. In the sociology of P. Bourdieu the limiting function is performed by *habitus*, i.e. a certain system of dispositions, producing individual and collective practices, allowing to generate thoughts, actions, perceptions within the limits determined by socio-historical conditions of creating this habitus [Bourdieu 1980: 88–92].

According to the sociolinguistic approach discourse is communication between people considered from the standpoint of the social group they belong to or with regard to speech-behavioural situation, e.g. institutional discourse [Карасик 2002: 194].

In the present article we justify distinguishing of gunsmiths’ discourse as a separate type of discourse on the basis of a model by V. I. Karasik. This model allows to distinguish a new type of discourse taking into consideration the following constitutive features: status-role characteristics of participants of communication, chronotope, aim of communication, values, strategies, topic, genres, precedent texts, discourse formulae [Карасик 2002: 195, 209].

Space and time are regarded as closely interconnected social constructs possessing specific features depending on the society they are

constructed in; there are different co-existing space-times in any social institution and, consequently, in social practices and texts [Fairclough 2003: 151]. The traditions of metal processing had been formed by the Udmurts long before Izhevsk plants were founded [Шумилов 1987: 25]. According to Ye. F. Shumilov, the ancient Udmurts mastered the technique of metal processing, artistic embellishment of assault and hunting weapons, made striking and cutting objects of high quality [Шумилов 1987: 25–27].

The prototype places of the proper gunsmiths’ discourse are manufacturing facilities, research institutes, testing grounds. Within the framework of subgenres the prototype places are different: museums of military equipment and weapons, media chronotopes, etc.

The participants of gunsmiths’ discourse are gun designers, workers of weapons factories and other specialists of defence industrial complex, members of law enforcement agencies and military departments. In the Russian language there exist different words denoting representatives of the studied professional group: *оружейник, оружейный мастер, конструктор оружия, конструктор-оружейник*, etc. Depending on the contextual conditions of functioning of lexemes the following groups of words can be identified:

1. lexemes reflecting narrow specialization of a gunsmith (*ложник, ствольщик, ружейник*, etc.);
2. lexemes determining the place of the profession in the hierarchy of positions and military ranks (*чертежник, конструктор, главный конструктор, начальник отдела, инженер-майор, инженер-капитан, инженер-полковник*, etc.).

Gunsmiths’ discourse proper is realized within the framework of the status-role relations “gunsmith-professional — gunsmith-professional”, “gunsmith-professional — gunsmith-semiprofessional”, “gunsmith-semiprofessional — gunsmith-semiprofessional”. Gunsmiths’ discourse functioning in media space is addressed to a broad audience. In this case participants of the discourse are a gunsmith-professional and a nonprofessional. The role of a nonprofessional can be performed by an addressee (an interviewer) or an addressee-viewer (a broad audience).

The topic of gunsmiths’ discourse is primarily connected with the construction of weapons and ammunition, as well as the history of guns and military equipment.

Gunsmiths’ discourse is aimed at solving problems connected with development, testing, production of weapons.

According to the Decree of the Ministry of Education and Science of the Russian Federation of September 12, 2016 No. 1180, gradu-

ates of the major specialization “Small arms and cannon weapons, artillery and missiles” are able to successfully perform scientific-research, engineering, production and technological, organizational, management and testing activities. In this respect strategies of gunsmiths’ discourse coincide with the ones of the engineering discourse and include project, explanatory, analytical, assessment, supervisory strategies, etc.

The study revealed the field structure of the discourse of gunsmiths. In genres of the official-business and scientific subdiscourses a gunsmith acts as a representative of a social group, which allows to categorize them as main genres of the studied discourse. The speech genres of the official-business subdiscourse include business letters, orders, memoranda, production meetings, etc., whereas the scientific subdiscourse comprises such substyles, as proper scientific substyle (theses, scientific articles, scientific reports, dissertations), industrial engineering substyle (patent specifications, technical specifications, operating manuals, technical requirements, factory test reports), scientific-educational substyle (manuals on fire-arms, handbooks, guides, lectures), popular science substyle (popular science articles). Linguistic analysis of mass media texts suggests that it’s in media genres that individual peculiarities of a gunsmith’s personality are mostly manifested. Hence, mass media genres, including a newspaper article, a radio program and a documentary, are suggested to be classified as peripheral ones [Халиуллина 2022а: 173—177].

The precedent texts of institutional gunsmiths’ discourse are tactical and technical requirements. The precedent texts of personal gunsmiths’ discourse are phraseologisms, proverbial phrases, quotations, etc. [Халиуллина 2022б: 173—177; Халиуллина 2023: 822]

Due to the processes of globalization and mediatization affecting different spheres of human life, the boundaries between social practices are blurring, which results in hybridization of institutional discourse [Мырашова 2022: 60]. A hybrid discourse format combines features and properties of discourse of different social institutions, and yet is a qualitatively new formation differing from the types of discourse it has originated from [Там же].

We consider gunsmiths’ discourse as a hybrid format discourse, since it overlaps with military, engineering and scientific types of discourse.

A. V. Ulanov defines institutional military discourse as a special type of speech organization of the worldview of military people, which represents the reflection of the structural features of the army as a social institution and is distinguished by the specific targeted military communication, socially oriented character of communication, specific chronotope [Уланов 2014: 19].

The terms *engineering discourse* and *technical discourse* are not synonymous, since engineers use scientific knowledge to create technical systems [Ульянова 2018: 18]. Engineering discourse is characterized by its polycode, predictable, metaphorical nature, engineering quasi-reality, rigid architectonics of all engineering texts, semantic unambiguity, the hermeneutic circle principle, etc. [Ульянова 2018: 19—20].

Scientific discourse is distinguished by the following main features: 1) scientific issues, the study of the surrounding world; 2) equal status of the participants; 3) creative dialogue as a method of discourse realization (both in oral and written variants) [Тернак 2017: 66].

Comparative characteristics of constitutive features of gunsmiths’ discourse with military, engineering and scientific types of discourse is presented in Table 1.

Table 1

Component	Military discourse	Engineering discourse	Scientific discourse	Gunsmiths’ discourse
Participants	Members of law enforcement agencies and military departments.	Engineers-professionals, semi-professionals and nonprofessionals with different educational qualification.	Research scientists/scholars, academic experts, scientists-teachers, scientists-popularizers.	Gun designers, workers of weapons factories, members of law enforcement agencies and military departments et al.
Prototype places	Open and closed meetings of military departments, military units, military bases, army groups, etc.	Manufacturing facilities, research laboratories, universities, institutes, etc.	Conference rooms, laboratories, scientist’s/scholar’s studies, libraries, etc.	Manufacturing facilities, research institutes, testing grounds, museums of military equipment and weapons, media chronotopes, etc.
Aims	Implementation of the assigned task (military actions, defeating the enemy army).	Solving problems requiring experience with engineering systems.	Translation of new knowledge of a new object or phenomenon in a verbal form.	Solving problems connected with development, testing, production of weapons.

Component	Military discourse	Engineering discourse	Scientific discourse	Gunsmiths' discourse
Values	Values appeal to qualities necessary for warfare: discipline, subordination, courage, honour, observance of military traditions, etc.	Values depend on the key concepts of the particular engineering field.	Values are centered in the key concepts: <i>verity, knowledge, research</i> .	Values are centered in the key concepts: <i>defence, labour, Motherland</i> .
Strategies	Strategy of presentation.	Project, explanatory, analytical, assessment, supervisory strategies, etc.	Performance, examination, implementation in practice.	Project, explanatory, analytical, assessment, supervisory strategies, etc.
Topic	Military conflict, principles and tactics of warfare, subordination.	Topic depends on the particular engineering field.	A wide range of issues (e.g. distinguishing natural science and humanities).	The construction of weapons and ammunition, the history of guns and military equipment, etc.
Genres	Orders, instructions, directives, recommendations, etc.	Instructions, technical specifications, applications, business letters, etc.	Dissertations, monographs, theses, scientific articles, abstracts, etc.	Theses, business letters, scientific articles, scientific reports, technical specifications, operating manuals, technical requirements, factory test reports, manuals on fire-arms, guides, lectures, etc.
Precedent texts	Statutory documents and documents regulating military service.	Representation, computation, instruction.	Works of the classics of science, titles of monographs and articles, quotations, etc.	Tactical and technical requirements.
Discourse formulae	Clichés, statutory formulae, conventional commands, etc.	Discourse formulae are specified in clichés.	Discourse formulae are specified in clichés.	Discourse formulae are specified in clichés.

The study has revealed a significant overlap in such criteria as participants, prototype places and genres. Thus, gunsmiths' discourse overlaps, but does not coincide with military, engineering and scientific types of discourse, which allows to attribute it to a hybrid format.

Gunsmiths' discourse is a separate type of institutional and personal discourse, comprising speech and written practices of a gunsmith. The peculiarities of this type of discourse are conditioned by the sphere of usage and the specifics of the historic development of Izhevsk as a city of gunsmiths.

БИБЛИОГРАФИЧЕСКИЙ СПИСОК

1. Карасик, В. И. Языковой круг: личность, концепты, дискурс / В. И. Карасик. — Волгоград : Перемена, 2002. — 477 с. — Текст : непосредственный.
2. Мурашова, Е. П. Мнемонический потенциал гибридного дискурса (на материале англоязычных политических медиатекстов) / Е. П. Мурашова. — Текст : непосредственный // Политическая лингвистика. — 2022. — № 4 (94). — С. 59–69.
3. Терпак, М. А. Компаративный подход к изучению научно-технического дискурса (на основе организации научно-технической статьи на русском и английском языках) / М. А. Терпак. — Текст : электронный // Вестник Самарского университета. История, педагогика, филология. — 2017. — Т. 23. — № 3. — С. 66–70. — URL: <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/komparativnyy-podhod-k-izucheniyu-nauchno-tehnicheskogo-diskursa-n>

a-osnove-organizatsii-nauchno-tehnicheskoy-stati-na-russkom-i (дата обращения: 22.04.2024).

4. Уланов, А. В. Русский военный дискурс XIX — начала XX века: структура, специфика, эволюция : автореф. дис. ... д-ра филол. наук / А. В. Уланов. — Омск, 2014. — 40 с. — Текст : непосредственный.

5. Ульянова, У. А. Реализация категории связности в инженерном дискурсе (на материале текстов Missing Manual) : дис. ... канд. филол. наук / Ульянова У. А. — Томск, 2018. — 197 с. — Текст : непосредственный.

6. Халиуллина, Д. А. Жанровая организация оружейного дискурса / Д. А. Халиуллина. — Текст : электронный // Стратегии межкультурного взаимодействия в контексте мирового образовательного пространства: опыт и перспективы : материалы IX Междунар. науч.-практ. конф. (Ижевск, 28 ноября 2022 г.). — Ижевск : Удмуртский государственный университет, 2022a. — С. 173–177. — URL: <https://elibrary.ru/item.asp?id=49960663> (дата обращения: 27.04.2024).

7. Халиуллина, Д. А. Коммуникативные стратегии и тактики оружейного дискурса Удмуртской Республики / Д. А. Халиуллина. — Текст : электронный // Вестник Удмуртского университета. История и филология. — 2023. — Т. 33. — № 4. — С. 819–825. — URL: <https://elibrary.ru/item.asp?id=54366842> (дата обращения: 04.05.2024).

8. Халиуллина, Д. А. Фразеологические единицы как средство формирования медиаобраза оружейника Удмуртской Республики / Д. А. Халиуллина. — Текст : электронный // Медиаобраз региона в современной массовой коммуникации. — Вологда : Вологодский государственный университет, 2022b. — С. 120–124. — URL: <https://elibrary.ru/item.asp?id=50419295> (дата обращения: 03.05.2024).

9. Хомутова, Т. Н. Военно-политический дискурс как особый тип дискурса / Т. Н. Хомутова, К. А. Наумова. — Текст :

электронный // Вестник ЮУрГУ. Серия: Лингвистика. — 2017. — Т. 14. — № 3. — С. 49–53. — URL: <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/voenno-politicheskiy-diskurs-kak-osobyy-tip-diskursa> (дата обращения: 24.05.2024).

10. Шашок, Л. А. Характерные особенности военного дискурса (на материале работ отечественных лингвистов) / Л. А. Шашок. — Текст : электронный // Политическая лингвистика. — 2018. — № 6. — С. 116–119. — URL: <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/harakternye-osobennosti-voennogo-diskursa-na-materiale-rabot-otechestvennyh-lingvistov> (дата обращения: 05.05.2024).

11. Шумилов, Е. Ф. Искусство ижевских оружейников / Е. Ф. Шумилов. — Ижевск : Удмуртия, 1987. — 172 с. — Текст : непосредственный.

12. Bourdieu, P. *Le sens pratique* / P. Bourdieu. — Paris, 1980. — 475 p. — Text : unmediated.

13. Fairclough, N. *Analysing discourse: textual analysis for social research* / N. Fairclough. — London ; New York : [s.n.], 2003. — 270 p. — Text : unmediated.

14. Foucault, M. *L'archéologie du savoir* / M. Foucault. — Paris : [s.n.], 1969. — 275 p. — Text : unmediated.

15. Mayr, A. *Language and power. An introduction to institutional discourse* / A. Mayr. — London ; New York : [s.n.], 2008. — 204 p. — Text : unmediated.

REFERENCES

1. Karasik, V.I. (2002). *Yazykovej krug: lichnost', koncepty, diskurs* [Language circle: personality, concepts, discourse]. Volgograd: Peremena, 477 p. (In Russ.)

2. Murashova, E.P. (2022). Mnemonicheskij potencial gibridnogo diskursa (na materiale angloyazychnyh politicheskikh media-tekstov) [The mnemonic potential of hybrid discourse: analysis of English-language political media texts]. *Politicheskaya lingvistika*, 4(94), 59–69 (In Russ.)

3. Terpak, M.A. (2017). Komparativnyj podhod k izucheniyu nauchno-tehnicheskogo diskursa (na osnove organizacii nauchno-tehnicheskoy stat'i na russkom i anglijskom yazykah) [Comparative approach to the study of scientific and technological discourse (on the basis Russian and English scientific-technical articles composition)]. *Vestnik Samarskogo universiteta. Istorija, pedagogika, phologiya*, 23(Iss. 3), 66–70 (In Russ.)

4. Ulanov, A.V. (2014). *Russkij voennyj diskurs XIX — nachala XX veka: struktura, specifika, evolyuciya* [Russian military discourse of the XIX — early XX centuries: structure, specifics, evolution] [Abstract of Dis. of Doct. of Philology]. Omsk, 40 p. (In Russ.)

5. Ul'yanova, U.A. (2018). *Realizaciya kategorii svyaznosti v inzhenernom diskurse (na materiale tekstov Missing Manual)*

[Coherence realization in engineering discourse (on the material of Missing Manual texts)] [Dis. of Cand. of Philology]. Tomsk, 197 p. (In Russ.)

6. Haliullina, D. A. (2022a). Zhanrovaya organizaciya oruzhejnogo diskursa [Genre organization of gunsmiths' discourse]. In *Strategii mezhkul'turnogo vzaimodejstviya v kontekste mirovogo obrazovatel'nogo prostranstva: opyt i perspektivy* (Materials of IXth Intern. scient. and pract. conf., pp. 173–177). Retrieved April 27, 2024, from <https://elibrary.ru/item.asp?id=49960663> (In Russ.)

7. Haliullina, D. A. (2023). Kommunikativnye strategii i takтики oruzhejnogo diskursa Udmurtskoj Respubliki [Communicative strategies and tactics of gunsmiths' discourse of the Udmurt Republic]. *Vestnik Udmurtskogo universiteta. Istorija i filologija*, 33(4), 819–825. (In Russ.)

8. Haliullina, D. A. (2022b). Frazеологические единицы как средство формирования медиаобраза оружейника Udmurtskoj Respubliki [Phraseological units as a means of shaping the media image of the gunsmith of the Udmurt Republic]. In *Mediobraz regiona v sovremennoj massovoj kommunikacii* (pp. 120–124). Retrieved May 3, 2024, from <https://elibrary.ru/item.asp?id=50419295> (In Russ.)

9. Homutova, T.N., & Naumova, K.A. (2017). Voенно-politicheskij diskurs kak osobyy tip diskursa [Military-political discourse as a special type of discourse]. *Vestnik YuUrgU. Seriya: Lingvistika*, 14(3), 49–53. Retrieved May 24, 2024, from <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/voenno-politicheskiy-diskurs-kak-osobyy-tip-diskursa> (In Russ.)

10. Shashok, L.A. (2018). Harakternye osobennosti voennogo diskursa (na materiale rabot otechestvennyh lingvistov) [Characteristic features of military discourse (on the material of works of Russian linguists)]. *Politicheskaya lingvistika*, 6, 116–119. Retrieved May 5, 2024, from <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/harakternye-osobennosti-voennogo-diskursa-na-materiale-rabot-otechestvennyh-lingvistov> (In Russ.)

11. Shumilov, E.F. *Iskusstvo izhevskih oruzhejnikov* [Art of Izhevsk gunsmiths]. Izhevsk: Udmurtiya, 172 p. (In Russ.)

12. Bourdieu, P. (1980). *Le sens pratique*. Paris: Les Éditions de Minuit, 475 p. (In Fr.)

13. Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analysing discourse: textual analysis for social research*. London, New York: Routledge, 270 p. (In Eng.)

14. Foucault, M. (1969). *L'archéologie du savoir*. Paris: Éditions Gallimard, 275 p. (In Fr.)

15. Mayr, A. (2008). *Language and power. An introduction to institutional discourse*. London, New York: Continuum International Publishing Group, 204 p. (In Eng.)