

Speech Acts and Communicative Strategies in Military Literary Discourse: A Comparative Pragmatic Analysis of English and Uzbek

Soatova Malika Sayfitdinovna

Head of the Department of Romano-Germanic Languages, "TYH" Center of the Armed Forces of the Republic of Uzbekistan

Independent Researcher at Uzbekistan State World Languages University

Email: malikasoatova111@gmail.com

Abstract

This article examines speech acts and communicative strategies in English and Uzbek military literary discourse from a comparative pragmatic perspective. Military literary discourse represents a complex form of communication in which institutional hierarchy, operational necessity, personal emotion, moral responsibility and national identity interact. The study is based on the theoretical principles of speech act theory, politeness theory, discourse analysis and cross-cultural pragmatics. Selected dialogue situations from English and Uzbek war prose are analyzed according to their illocutionary force, linguistic realization, contextual function and anticipated perlocutionary effect. The findings indicate that directives occupy a central position in both English and Uzbek military literary discourse because commands, warnings, instructions and prohibitions organize military action and reflect power relations. However, assertives, commissives, expressives and declaratives also contribute to the representation of military experience. English military dialogue frequently relies on concise imperatives, modal constructions, institutional vocabulary and strategically controlled emotional expression. Uzbek military dialogue demonstrates comparable functional directness but more visibly employs verbal suffixes, respectful imperative forms, forms of address, collective pronouns and culturally marked expressions of solidarity. The analysis identifies authority, mitigation, persuasion, solidarity, emotional restraint, strategic ambiguity and identity construction as major communicative strategies. The article concludes that the two traditions share common institutional functions while differing in the linguistic and cultural resources used to realize them.

Keywords: speech act, military literary discourse, communicative strategy, directive, pragmatics, politeness, English, Uzbek, comparative analysis.

Introduction

Language in military literature does not merely describe military events. It organizes actions, establishes relationships, communicates danger, expresses loyalty and reveals the psychological condition of characters. An officer's command may cause a unit to advance, retreat or remain in position. A soldier's promise may represent personal loyalty, professional duty or willingness to sacrifice. A warning may save lives, while silence may indicate fear, resistance, discipline or emotional shock.

Military literary discourse should therefore be studied as both a linguistic and a social phenomenon. It reflects institutional rules and rank relations, but it also presents individual experiences of war. Military characters communicate under pressure, with limited time and incomplete information. Their utterances are shaped by urgency, danger, discipline, responsibility and the expectation of immediate action.

From a pragmatic perspective, an utterance is not simply a grammatical structure. It is an action performed through language. Austin distinguished between locutionary, illocutionary and perlocutionary dimensions of an utterance. The locutionary act concerns what is said, the illocutionary act concerns what the speaker intends to perform, and the perlocutionary act concerns the effect produced on the listener (Austin, 1962). Searle later systematized speech acts into assertives, directives, commissives, expressives and declaratives (Searle, 1969; 1979).

This classification is especially productive for military discourse because military communication is highly action-oriented. A command requires compliance, a warning demands caution, a promise creates responsibility and an official declaration may change the institutional status of a person. Nevertheless, military literary discourse differs from actual military regulations. Literary dialogue is constructed not only to represent communication among characters but also to influence the reader.

Consequently, military literary discourse operates on two pragmatic levels. On the internal level, one fictional character performs a speech act toward another character. On the external level, the author uses the dialogue to shape the reader's interpretation of authority, courage, fear, loyalty or violence. A direct command may simultaneously organize fictional action and reveal the commander's personality.

The purpose of this study is to identify and compare the principal speech acts and communicative strategies represented in English and Uzbek military literary discourse. The research addresses the following questions:

1. Which types of speech acts are particularly significant in English and Uzbek military literary dialogue?
2. How are authority, hierarchy and solidarity linguistically expressed?
3. Which communicative strategies are used to increase or reduce the force of military utterances?
4. What similarities and differences can be observed between English and Uzbek military literary traditions?
5. What difficulties may arise when military speech acts are translated between English and Uzbek?

Literature Review and Theoretical Framework

Speech act theory developed from the understanding that speaking is a form of social action. Austin argued that speakers perform actions such as promising, warning, ordering, apologizing and

declaring through utterances (Austin, 1962). Searle developed a systematic classification of illocutionary acts and emphasized the relationship between linguistic form, speaker intention and social convention (Searle, 1969).

Searle's five-part classification provides the principal analytical model for this study (see picture 1):

Speech Act Category	Definition	Typical Functions	Common Examples	Example Utterances
1. ASSERTIVES 	Commit the speaker to the truth of a proposition.	- Report information - Describe states of affairs - Make claims - Provide evaluations - Make predictions	- Reports - Descriptions - Claims - Evaluations - Predictions	<i>"The enemy is advancing."</i> <i>"The supply line is secure."</i> <i>"I believe we can win."</i> <i>"This plan is effective."</i> <i>"We will succeed."</i>
2. DIRECTIVES 	Attempt to make the listener perform an action.	- Direct or request action - Give instructions - Issue warnings - Prohibit actions	- Commands - Requests - Instructions - Warnings - Prohibitions	<i>"Move forward."</i> <i>"Please send the report."</i> <i>"Follow my instructions."</i> <i>"Watch out!"</i> <i>"Do not open fire."</i>
3. COMMISSIVES 	Commit the speaker to a future action.	- Promise future action - Make vows - Provide guarantees - Make offers	- Promises - Vows - Guarantees - Offers	<i>"I will return for you."</i> <i>"I promise to do it."</i> <i>"I guarantee your safety."</i> <i>"I offer my assistance."</i>
4. EXPRESSIVES 	Communicate the speaker's psychological or emotional state.	- Express feelings - Show gratitude or regret - Offer praise or apology - Express sympathy - Convey emotions	- Gratitude - Regret - Praise - Condolence - Apology	<i>"Thank you for your help."</i> <i>"I regret what happened."</i> <i>"Great job!"</i> <i>"I am sorry for your loss."</i> <i>"Please forgive me."</i>
5. DECLARATIVES 	Create an institutional change through their successful performance.	- Bring about changes in status or position - Make official decisions - Alter institutional realities	- Dismissal - Appointment - Surrender - Sentencing - Promotion	<i>"You are dismissed."</i> <i>"I appoint you as officer."</i> <i>"We surrender."</i> <i>"You are sentenced."</i> <i>"You are promoted."</i>

Military communication is institutionally regulated. The communicative rights of speakers depend on their rank, role and operational responsibility. A command issued by an authorized officer has a different pragmatic status from the same grammatical sentence spoken by an ordinary civilian. Institutional context therefore contributes directly to illocutionary force.

Politeness theory is also relevant to military discourse. Brown and Levinson define politeness strategies as methods of managing the social "face" of participants during interaction (Brown & Levinson, 1987). Commands, criticism and prohibitions can threaten the listener's autonomy or social dignity. Military hierarchy permits direct forms that might be considered impolite in ordinary conversation. However, this does not mean that politeness disappears from military interaction.

Halbe's study of communication in a military workplace demonstrates that institutional hierarchy and politeness coexist. Military personnel may use direct commands in operational contexts but employ mitigation, explanation and informal solidarity in office communication or interpersonal situations (Halbe, 2011). Thus, clarity itself may function as a form of professional respect when misunderstanding could produce serious consequences.

In English and Uzbek military discourse, directives are realized through different grammatical resources. English commonly uses short imperative clauses such as "Move forward," "Hold your position" and "Report immediately." Uzbek commands can similarly be short, but the language also provides a wider range of morphologically marked imperative forms, including *bor*, *boring*, *borsin*,

bormang and *kutib turing*. These forms encode number, respect, prohibition and the relationship between speaker and listener.

The analysis of military discourse must therefore combine grammatical, pragmatic, sociolinguistic and cultural perspectives. It is insufficient to identify only the imperative mood. A formally declarative sentence such as “You will remain here” may function as a strict command. Likewise, a question such as “Could you check the eastern road?” may perform an indirect directive rather than request information.

Materials and Methods

The study employs qualitative comparative pragmatic analysis. Its analytical material consists of selected and representative dialogue situations found in English and Uzbek military and war literature. English-language patterns are considered with reference to works such as Ernest Hemingway’s *A Farewell to Arms* and Tim O’Brien’s *The Things They Carried*. Uzbek-language patterns are considered with reference to war prose such as Shuhrat’s *Shinelli yillar* and O‘tkir Hoshimov’s *Ikki eshik orasi*.

The study does not attempt to establish statistical frequency for the entire literary traditions. Instead, it identifies recurrent pragmatic patterns in scenes involving:

- commands and military instructions;
- communication between officers and soldiers;
- reports about combat situations;
- promises and expressions of loyalty;
- warnings and prohibitions;
- emotional reactions to danger or loss;
- collective appeals and motivational speech;
- institutional decisions.

The following analytical criteria are applied:

1. grammatical form of the utterance;
2. type of speech act;
3. direct or indirect realization;
4. rank and social role of the participants;
5. communicative purpose;
6. politeness or impoliteness strategy;
7. emotional and ideological meaning;
8. anticipated effect on the listener.

The examples used in the comparative tables are normalized and analytically reconstructed. They illustrate typical pragmatic structures rather than reproduce extended passages from literary texts.

Results and Discussion

Directives constitute the most characteristic speech-act category in military literary discourse. Military organization depends on coordinated action, and commands are linguistic instruments through which authority is transformed into behavior.

A typical English military directive may consist of a verb and a complement:

- “Hold the bridge.”
- “Secure the area.”
- “Wait for my signal.”

- “Do not open fire.”

The subject is normally omitted because the listener is understood. The short structure reduces ambiguity and communicates urgency. Adverbs such as *now*, *immediately* and *at once* can further intensify the directive.

Uzbek military directives display similar brevity:

- *Ko ‘prikni saqlang.*
- *Hududni nazoratga oling.*
- *Mening ishoramni kuting.*
- *O‘t ochmang.*

The Uzbek examples also show explicit morphological marking. The suffix *-ing* may indicate plural reference, formal respect or institutional distance. The negative command is commonly formed with *-ma* followed by the appropriate personal marker, as in *bormang*, *chekinmang* and *o‘t ochmang*.

Directives may be classified according to their pragmatic force:

Directive subtype	English realization	Uzbek realization	Main function
Direct command	Hold the line.	Safni ushlab turing.	Immediate action
Prohibition	Do not move.	Qimirlamang.	Prevention of action
Warning	Keep your head down.	Boshingizni egib turing.	Protection from danger
Instruction	Check the northern road.	Shimoliy yo‘lni tekshiring.	Task assignment
Permission	You may proceed.	Davom etishingiz mumkin.	Authorization
Indirect command	I need that report tonight.	Hisobot bugun kechqurun kerak.	Action through implication

Both languages permit direct and indirect directives. However, the choice between them depends on urgency and rank. During combat, a superior character usually employs a direct imperative. In planning scenes, medical situations or communication among equals, the directive may be mitigated.

For example, the English question “Could you take a look at the map, Sergeant?” is grammatically interrogative but pragmatically directive. Its force is softer than “Look at the map.” An Uzbek speaker may similarly say *Serjant, xaritani ko‘rib chiqsangiz*, literally presenting the action in a conditional or polite form. The intended action remains clear, but the command is socially moderated.

Assertives and the Construction of Military Reality

Assertives report information and construct the characters’ understanding of the military situation. They are essential because decisions depend on observations, intelligence, evaluation and prediction.

Common military assertives include:

- “The road is blocked.”
- “They crossed the river before dawn.”
- “We have enough supplies for two days.”
- *Dushman sharq tomondan yaqinlashmoqda.*
- *Aloqa uzildi.*

- *Bizning bo‘linma hali yetib kelgani yo‘q.*

These utterances may appear to be neutral descriptions, but their pragmatic effect can be directive. The statement “The eastern road is open” may indirectly recommend a route. Similarly, *O‘q-dori kamayib qoldi* may function as an indirect request to conserve ammunition or obtain additional supplies.

Assertives in military literature are rarely completely objective. They may reflect uncertainty, fear, loyalty or manipulation. A commander may minimize losses to maintain morale. A frightened soldier may exaggerate danger. An unreliable report may cause disastrous decisions.

English military literary discourse frequently marks uncertainty through epistemic expressions such as *I think, probably, it seems, may have* and *must be*. Uzbek discourse uses forms such as *menimcha, ehtimol, shekilli, ko‘rinadi, bo‘lsa kerak* and *ekan*. These markers indicate the speaker’s degree of confidence and distribute responsibility for the information.

The difference between “The enemy is retreating” and “The enemy seems to be retreating” is pragmatically important. The second utterance limits the speaker’s commitment to the truth of the proposition. In military situations, such differences may influence the level of operational risk.

Commissives, Loyalty and Moral Obligation

Commissive speech acts commit the speaker to future conduct. Military literary discourse frequently represents promises, vows and guarantees because war narratives are concerned with responsibility, loyalty and sacrifice.

Typical English commissives include:

- “I will return for them.”
- “I give you my word.”
- “We will hold this position.”
- “I will not leave anyone behind.”

Uzbek commissives may be expressed as:

- *Ular uchun qaytib boraman.*
- *So‘z beraman.*
- *Bu pozitsiyani saqlab qolamiz.*
- *Hech kimni tashlab ketmayman.*

The English auxiliary *will* and the Uzbek future form *-adi* or intentional forms such as *-moqchiman* can indicate commitment. However, grammatical future meaning alone does not automatically create a promise. Context, sincerity and social expectations determine whether an utterance functions as a commissive.

In military literature, commissives frequently operate at three levels:

1. **Personal commitment**, such as a promise to protect a friend.
2. **Professional commitment**, such as a promise to complete a mission.
3. **Collective commitment**, such as an oath of loyalty to the unit or homeland.

Uzbek military literary discourse often reinforces collective commitment through words such as *Vatan, xalq, burch, qasam* and *sadoqat*. English texts similarly employ *country, duty, unit, honor* and *the men*. The difference is not in the existence of patriotic concepts but in their preferred linguistic framing and historical associations.

A commissive may also become a strategy of self-persuasion. When a frightened soldier says “I will go back,” the utterance may not only inform another person but also help the speaker overcome fear. The illocutionary act is directed outward, while its psychological effect is partly directed inward.

Expressives and the Representation of Emotion

Expressives communicate gratitude, sorrow, anger, admiration, regret and other psychological states. Military institutions often value emotional control, but military literature exposes the tension between professional discipline and human vulnerability.

English expressive acts may include:

- “Good work, Sergeant.”
- “I am sorry about your men.”
- “Thank you for coming back.”
- “Damn this war.”

Uzbek equivalents may be represented as:

- *Barakalla, serjant.*
- *Yigitlaringiz uchun afsusdaman.*
- *Qaytib kelganingiz uchun rahmat.*
- *Bu urush qurib ketsin.*

English military characters are often represented through restrained or understated emotional language. Grief may be expressed through a short sentence, hesitation or silence. Uzbek war prose may also employ restraint, but emotional evaluation is frequently supported by culturally marked interjections, blessings, kinship expressions and references to family or homeland.

Forms such as *barakalla*, *rahmat*, *attang*, *afsus*, *omon bo‘ling* and *Xudo asrasin* may convey emotion, encouragement or concern. Their meaning cannot always be translated through a single English equivalent. For example, *barakalla* may combine praise, approval and encouragement, while *omon bo‘ling* may express farewell, concern and a wish for safety.

Expressives in military literature have an important humanizing function. They temporarily weaken institutional distance and reveal the personal relationship behind military roles. A commander who thanks a subordinate recognizes the subordinate as an individual rather than merely as a performer of orders.

Declaratives and Institutional Authority

Declaratives change social or institutional reality when uttered by an authorized speaker under appropriate conditions. Their effectiveness depends on rank, legal authority and institutional procedure.

Examples include:

- “You are relieved of duty.”
- “You are promoted to captain.”
- “This unit is dismissed.”
- “We surrender.”
- *Siz vazifangizdan ozod etildingiz.*
- *Sizga kapitan unvoni berildi.*
- *Bo‘linma tarqatilsin.*
- *Biz taslim bo‘lamiz.*

The same sentence spoken by a person without authority may fail as a declaration. A soldier cannot officially promote another soldier merely by saying, “You are now a captain.” The institutional position of the speaker is part of the felicity conditions of the speech act.

In military literature, declaratives frequently become turning points in the narrative. A dismissal can produce humiliation, a promotion can create responsibility, and a declaration of surrender can represent either defeat or the protection of human life.

Uzbek declaratives often employ passive constructions and institutional vocabulary, including *tayinlandi, ozod etildi, unvon berildi* and *buyruq e'lon qilindi*. English uses passive patterns such as *is appointed, is dismissed* and *is hereby ordered*. Both languages thus separate the institutional decision from the private personality of the speaker.

Communicative Strategies in Military Literary Discourse

Strategy of Authority and Control

Authority is the central communicative strategy of military discourse. It is realized through:

- direct imperatives;
- rank titles;
- institutional vocabulary;
- short sentence structure;
- repetition;
- explicit time limits;
- prohibition;
- authoritative intonation.

English military dialogue frequently uses rank terms before or after the directive:

- “Lieutenant, take your men east.”
- “Report to headquarters, Sergeant.”

Uzbek military dialogue similarly employs:

- *Leytenant, odamlarni sharqqa olib boring.*
- *Serjant, shtabga axborot bering.*

Forms of address identify the listener and activate the institutional relationship. Historical Uzbek military literature may also contain forms influenced by a particular period, such as *o'rtoq komandir* or *o'rtoq mayor*. Such expressions carry both military and ideological meaning.

The authority strategy is not limited to superiors. A medical officer may issue commands to a higher-ranking wounded officer because professional responsibility temporarily changes the communicative relationship. Thus, institutional power is situational and connected to competence as well as rank.

Strategy of Mitigation and Politeness

Mitigation reduces the interpersonal pressure of a directive, criticism or refusal. It may be realized through modal verbs, conditionals, explanations, respectful forms and inclusive pronouns.

English mitigation includes:

- “Could you wait outside?”
- “You might want to check the radio.”
- “Let us consider another route.”
- “I am afraid that plan will not work.”

Uzbek mitigation includes:

- *Tashqarida kutib tursangiz.*
- *Radioni tekshirib ko'rsangiz yaxshi bo'lardi.*
- *Boshqa yo'lni ham ko'rib chiqaylik.*
- *Menimcha, bu reja ish bermaydi.*

The Uzbek suffix *-ing* is especially significant. It may express respect even when the utterance is clearly directive. Consequently, directness and politeness are not always opposites. *Darhol boring* is grammatically direct but may remain socially appropriate because its verbal form marks respect or formal distance.

Mitigation is reduced in immediate danger because excessive politeness may delay comprehension. During combat, “Get down!” is more appropriate than “Would you mind lowering your head?” The pragmatic principle is not maximum politeness but contextual appropriateness.

Strategy of Solidarity and Collective Identity

Military literary discourse frequently constructs an opposition between “we” and “they.” Collective pronouns and shared forms of address produce group identity.

English examples include:

- “We stay together.”
- “Our men are waiting.”
- “No one gets left behind.”

Uzbek examples include:

- *Biz birga qolamiz.*
- *Yigitlarimiz kutmoqda.*
- *Hech kimni tashlab ketmaymiz.*

The Uzbek possessive forms in *yigitlarimiz*, *bo‘linmamiz* and *Vatanimiz* explicitly mark collective belonging. English uses the possessive determiner *our* for the same general function.

Solidarity may also be constructed through informal address. Soldiers may use surnames, nicknames, kinship terms or shortened ranks. Such forms reduce institutional distance and create emotional cohesion. However, an informal form used by an outsider may be interpreted as disrespectful. The pragmatic meaning depends on group membership.

Strategy of Persuasion and Morale Building

Military leaders do not rely exclusively on commands. They may use persuasive discourse to motivate exhausted or frightened soldiers. Persuasion often combines assertives, commissives and directives.

A typical motivational sequence may include:

1. an assertion about the situation;
2. an appeal to shared values;
3. a promise of support;
4. a directive to act.

For example:

“The road behind us is closed. We are the only unit holding this position. I will remain here with you. Prepare to defend the bridge.”

An Uzbek version may follow a similar pragmatic pattern:

Orqadagi yo‘l yopilgan. Bu pozitsiyani faqat biz saqlab turibmiz. Men ham sizlar bilan qolaman. Ko‘prik mudofaasiga tayyorlaning.

The leader first defines reality, then creates solidarity, demonstrates personal commitment and finally issues a command. The directive becomes more persuasive because it is supported by explanation and shared responsibility.

Strategy of Concealment and Strategic Ambiguity

Military characters may hide information for operational, political or psychological reasons. Concealment can protect confidential information, prevent panic or manipulate subordinates.

Strategic ambiguity is realized through:

- vague references;
- passive constructions;
- euphemisms;
- incomplete answers;
- code words;
- omission of responsible agents.

An officer may say, “There have been losses” instead of identifying the number or names of the dead. An Uzbek speaker may use *yo‘qotishlar bor* instead of giving direct details. Such utterances reduce emotional impact and conceal responsibility.

Euphemistic expressions such as *casualties*, *collateral damage*, *neutralize*, *yo‘qotish*, *zararsizlantirish* and *safdan chiqarmoq* may transform violent events into technical or administrative concepts. Military literature often exposes the contrast between such institutional vocabulary and the human reality it conceals.

Strategy of Silence and Non-Verbal Response

Silence is pragmatically meaningful in military literary discourse. A character’s failure to answer may indicate:

- disagreement;
- fear;
- grief;
- discipline;
- resistance;
- inability to speak;
- acceptance of an order.

In a strict military context, silence after a command may be interpreted as compliance. In another situation, the same silence may signal moral protest. Literary narration supplies the contextual details that enable the reader to interpret it.

Non-verbal acts such as saluting, turning away, lowering the head or avoiding eye contact may function as responses to speech acts. A salute can acknowledge an order, express respect or replace a verbal farewell. Pragmatic analysis must therefore consider the relationship between spoken language, silence and physical behavior.

Comparative Characteristics of English and Uzbek Military Literary Discourse

Pragmatic feature	English military literary discourse	Uzbek military literary discourse
Dominant speech act	Directives	Directives
Common command form	Short imperative clause	Imperative verb with personal or respectful suffix
Expression of hierarchy	Rank, institutional role, word order and context	Rank, forms of address, pronouns and verbal morphology
Respect marking	Titles, modal verbs and indirectness	Titles, plural-respect forms, verbal endings and indirect constructions

Collective identity	We, our unit, our men	Biz, bo‘linmamiz, yigitlarimiz, Vatanimiz
Emotional expression	Frequently restrained or understated	Restrained forms alongside culturally marked interjections and wishes
Indirect directives	Questions, modals and declarative statements	Conditional forms, polite imperatives and necessitative constructions
Institutional declarations	Passive and formulaic constructions	Passive forms and official administrative vocabulary
Main pragmatic value	Clarity and operational control	Clarity combined with morphologically expressed social relations
Translation difficulty	Implicit hierarchy may require explanation	Respect and social distance may lack direct English equivalents

The comparison demonstrates that both languages prioritize clarity, brevity and authority in urgent military situations. The principal differences concern how social relationships are encoded. English often relies on institutional context and lexical forms of address. Uzbek more visibly encodes respect, number and social distance through grammatical morphology.

This does not mean that every English command is direct or every Uzbek command is polite. Literary discourse allows considerable variation according to character, period, genre and situation. A brutal commander may deliberately violate politeness norms. A respected leader may combine directness with solidarity. A frightened soldier may use fragmented or incomplete speech regardless of the normal conventions of military communication.

Translation Implications

The translation of military literary dialogue requires pragmatic equivalence rather than simple word-for-word replacement. A grammatically accurate translation may still fail if it changes the relationship between speakers.

For example, the English command “Sit down, Lieutenant” can be translated as:

- *O‘tiring, leytenant.*
- *O‘tir, leytenant.*

The first form indicates formal respect or institutional distance. The second is more familiar, rough or explicitly superior, depending on context. Selecting the wrong form may change the commander’s personality and the relationship between the characters.

Similarly, the Uzbek command *Kutib turing* may be translated as “Wait,” “Please wait,” “Stay here” or “Hold your position.” The correct English equivalent depends on the military situation and intended force.

Several pragmatic factors should therefore be considered during translation:

1. rank relationship between the speakers;
2. operational urgency;
3. historical period;
4. degree of familiarity;
5. emotional condition;

6. direct or indirect illocutionary force;
7. intended effect on the listener;
8. broader narrative function.

Military terminology must also be distinguished from ordinary vocabulary. The English verb *engage* may mean entering combat rather than participating in a general activity. The Uzbek verb *egallamoq* may mean capturing, occupying or taking a position, depending on context. Translators must preserve both professional meaning and pragmatic force.

Conclusion

The comparative analysis shows that speech acts are fundamental elements of English and Uzbek military literary discourse. Directives occupy the central position because military action depends on commands, instructions, warnings and prohibitions. Assertives construct operational reality, commissives express loyalty and responsibility, expressives reveal the human consequences of war, and declaratives produce institutional changes.

Both English and Uzbek military literary discourse use language to represent authority, discipline, urgency and collective identity. Their shared pragmatic functions result from the institutional nature of military communication. However, the two languages employ different linguistic resources.

English military discourse frequently realizes authority through concise imperatives, rank terms, modal constructions and standardized institutional vocabulary. Uzbek military discourse also values brevity and precision but more explicitly marks the relationship between speakers through verbal suffixes, respectful forms, pronouns and culturally specific expressions.

The communicative strategies identified in the study include authority, mitigation, solidarity, persuasion, concealment, emotional restraint and strategic silence. These strategies demonstrate that military discourse cannot be reduced to simple commands. Institutional power interacts with personality, emotion, cultural norms and literary intention in a dynamic system.

The findings are relevant to comparative pragmatics, discourse studies, literary analysis and translation. Further research may create a larger bilingual corpus of military literary dialogue and examine the frequency, distribution and translation of specific speech-act categories across different historical periods and literary genres.

References

1. Abdusalomov, F. A. (2025). *Sociolinguistic features of the imperative mood in English and Uzbek military discourse*. PhD dissertation abstract. Tashkent: Uzbekistan State World Languages University.
2. Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to Do Things with Words*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
3. Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
4. Culpeper, J. (2011). *Impoliteness: Using Language to Cause Offence*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
5. Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and Social Change*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
6. Halbe, D. (2011). Language in the military workplace: Between hierarchy and politeness. *Text & Talk*, 31(3), 315–334.
7. Hemingway, E. (1929). *A Farewell to Arms*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.
8. Hoshimov, O'. (1986). *Ikki eshik orasi*. Tashkent.
9. Leech, G. N. (2014). *The Pragmatics of Politeness*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
10. Mey, J. L. (2001). *Pragmatics: An Introduction*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Blackwell.

11. O'Brien, T. (1990). *The Things They Carried*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
12. Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
13. Searle, J. R. (1979). *Expression and Meaning: Studies in the Theory of Speech Acts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
14. Shuhrat. (1958). *Shinelli yillar*. Tashkent.
15. Trosborg, A. (1995). *Interlanguage Pragmatics: Requests, Complaints and Apologies*. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
16. Van Dijk, T. A. (Ed.). (1997). *Discourse as Social Interaction*. London: Sage Publications.