



**Received:** October 12, 2025  
**Accepted:** November 24, 2025  
**Available online:** November 25, 2025

## Haydar Normatov

Tayanch doktorant  
O'zbekiston davlat jahon tillari universiteti  
Toshkent, O'zbekiston

## Haydar Normatov

PhD Student  
Uzbekistan State World Languages University  
Tashkent, Uzbekistan  
E-mail: haydarnormatov73@gmail.com  
ORCID iD: 0009-0007-3984-4533

### THE REPRESENTATION OF COMMAND RIGIDITY THROUGH LOCUTIONARY, ILLOCUTIONARY, AND PERLOCUTIONARY SPEECH ACTS IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK MILITARY DISCOURSE

#### ABSTRACT

This study explores the phenomenon of command rigidity in military discourse through the lens of speech act theory, with particular attention to the locutionary, illocutionary, and perlocutionary dimensions within English and Uzbek military communication systems. Its central purpose is to determine how linguistic structures are deliberately shaped in institutional environments to promote clarity, accuracy, and consistent behavioral compliance in directive exchanges.

The research specifically aims to investigate the grammatical and lexical tools used to eliminate ambiguity in military commands, examine how authority is expressed linguistically across distinct language frameworks, and identify communicative patterns that generate reliable and predictable responses from military personnel.

A comparative pragmalinguistic approach is applied, drawing on authentic military communication data, instructional materials, and formal command protocols. Within the analytical framework of speech act theory, the study examines how naturally flexible language systems are systematically refined into highly regulated communicative mechanisms optimized for operational effectiveness.

The results indicate that English and Uzbek military discourse both establish strong command rigidity, albeit through different structural strategies. In English, directive force is largely achieved through syntactic simplicity, limited

### LOKUTIV, ILLOKUTIV VA PERLOKUTIV AKTLAR ORQALI BUYRUQNING QAT'IYLIK DARAJASINI IFODALASH: INGLIZ VA O'ZBEK HARBIY NUTQI MISOLIDA

#### ANNOTATSIYA

Mazkur maqola harbiy diskursda buyruq qat'iyligini nutq aktlari nazariyasi asosida tahlil qiladi hamda ushbu jarayonni lokutsion, illokutsion va perlokutsion kommunikativ darajalar kesimida ingliz va o'zbek harbiy til tizimlari misolida o'rganadi. Tadqiqotning asosiy maqsadi harbiy kommunikatsiyada buyruqning aniqligi, majburiyligi va tezkor bajarilishini ta'minlashda til birliklari qanday institutsional moslashuvga uchrashini aniqlashdan iborat. Bu jarayonda harbiy nutqning operativ samaradorlikni ta'minlashdagi roli ham alohida e'tiborga olinadi.

Tadqiqot vazifalari doirasida harbiy buyruqlarda noaniqlikni kamaytirishga xizmat qiluvchi grammatik va leksik vositalarni aniqlash, hokimiyat munosabatlarining til orqali qanday ifodalanishini tahlil qilish hamda harbiy xizmatchilarda oldindan prognoz qilinadigan xulqiy reaksiyalarni yuzaga keltiruvchi kommunikativ strategiyalarni o'rganish nazarda tutilgan. Bundan tashqari, buyruq shakllarining standartlashuvi va ularning harbiy tizimda ijtimoiy tartibni mustahkamlashdagi o'рни ham ko'rib chiqiladi.

Tadqiqotda qiyosiy pragmalingvistik metodologiya qo'llanildi. Tahlil jarayonida autentik harbiy nutq namunalari, o'quv qo'llanmalar hamda buyruq formulalari tizimli ravishda o'rganildi. Nutq aktlari nazariyasi asosida harbiy diskursning rivojlanish jarayonida nisbatan erkin til tizimlarining qanday qilib qat'iy, standartlashtirilgan kommunikativ mexanizmlarga aylanishi yoritildi. Bu orqali

vocabulary, and reliance on institutional authority. In contrast, Uzbek military language encodes authority directly within its morphological system, particularly through imperative constructions that inherently signal hierarchy and obligation. Nevertheless, both systems ultimately produce comparable perlocutionary effects – rapid compliance and reduced interpretive uncertainty.

The research concludes that command rigidity should be understood not as a fixed feature of language itself, but as an adaptive outcome shaped by institutional requirements. Across linguistic contexts, military discourse evolves toward structural constraint in order to secure communicative efficiency. This contrastive analysis demonstrates how diverse linguistic systems utilize different structural resources to reach similar functional outcomes, thereby enriching theoretical perspectives on institutional discourse and offering practical insights for military training and translation in multilingual settings.

**Key words:** military discourse, command strictness, speech act theory, phonopragmatics, locutionary speech acts, illocutionary force, perlocutionary effect, imperative constructions, prosody in commands, English-Uzbek contrastive analysis.

## INTRODUCTION

Military discourse represents one of the most linguistically constrained and institutionalized forms of communication in contemporary society, characterized by hierarchical structures, formal protocols, and the imperative need for unambiguous message transmission under critical conditions [Austin, 1962; 98]. The study of military language through the lens of speech act theory provides significant insights into how command structures utilize language to establish and maintain organizational authority, coordinate complex operations, and ensure precise execution of directives [Searle, 1976; 1]. Command rigidity, defined here as the systematic enforcement of linguistic prescriptiveness and the reduction of pragmatic variability in military utterances, serves essential functions in military contexts where misinterpretation of orders can result in catastrophic consequences [Lakoff, 1973; 44]. This phenomenon manifests distinctly across different linguistic systems, particularly when comparing the English military traditions, which operate within fundamentally different cultural and institutional frameworks [Yule, 2014; 134]. The theoretical framework of locutionary, illocutionary, and perlocutionary dimensions of speech acts, originally developed by John Austin and refined by John Searle, offers a powerful analytical apparatus for examining how military discourse achieves its communicative goals through in-

harbiy nutqning institutsional nazorat va operativ boshqaruvni ta'minlashdagi ahamiyati ochib berildi.

Tadqiqot natijalari shuni ko'rsatdiki, ingliz va o'zbek harbiy diskurslari buyruq qat'iyligini turli lingvistik vositalar orqali ta'minlaydi. Ingliz tilida buyruq kuchi asosan sintaktik soddalik, leksik standartlashuv hamda institutsional hokimiyat orqali yuzaga chiqadi. O'zbek tilida esa imperativ shakllar orqali grammatik jihatdan kodlangan majburiylik ustunlik qiladi va hokimiyat munosabatlari morfologik darajada ifodalanadi.

Shunga qaramay, har ikkala tizimda yakuniy kommunikativ natija o'xshash – tezkor itoat, xatti-harakatlarning avtomatlashtirilishi va interpretativ noaniqlikning kamayishi bilan tavsiflanadi.

Xulosa qilib aytganda, harbiy diskursdagi qat'iylilik tilning ichki xususiyati emas, balki institutsional talablar natijasida shakllangan funksional moslashuvdir. Tadqiqot natijalari ko'p tilli harbiy kommunikatsiya, tarjima jarayonlari, harbiy nutqni o'qitish va institutsional diskurs tadqiqotlari uchun muhim nazariy hamda amaliy ahamiyat kasb etadi.

**Kalit so'zlar:** Harbiy diskurs, buyruq qat'iyligi, nutqiy aktlar nazariyasi, fonopragmatika, lokutiv aktlar, illokutiv kuch, perlokutiv ta'sir, imperativ konstruksiyalar, buyruqlarda prosodiya, ingliz va o'zbek tillarining chog'ishtirma tahlili.

creasingly constrained linguistic forms [Austin, 1962; 102]. The locutionary dimension encompasses the literal semantic content and grammatical structure of military utterances, which in military contexts tend toward extreme precision and elimination of ambiguity [Searle, 1969; 23]. The illocutionary force - the intended communicative act performed through language - reaches its most direct and unambiguous expression in military command structures, where directives function as explicit speech acts with minimal hedging or conditional phrasing [Lyons, 1977; 734]. The perlocutionary effect, concerning the actual consequences produced in the addressee, becomes systematically engineered through the rigid structure of military language, with training and socialization ensuring predictable behavioral responses to standardized linguistic formulations [Brown & Levinson, 1987; 56]. This article examines how English and Uzbek military discourse constructs rigidity through these three dimensions of speech acts, exploring the linguistic mechanisms that transform potentially ambiguous communication into institutionalized forms of directive action. The contrastive analysis between English and Uzbek military speech reveals both universal principles governing command communication and culturally specific adaptations reflecting distinct organizational histories and linguistic structures. Understanding these mechanisms contributes not only to linguistic theory but also to practical applications in military communication training, translation protocols, and the development of effective command systems across multilingual military environments [Crystal, 2003; 289].

### **Literature review**

Military language fundamentally differs from civilian discourse in its deliberate elimination of pragmatic variability and the systematic reduction of interpretive ambiguity [Halliday, 1978; 112]. In English military contexts, command rigidity emerges through multiple converging linguistic strategies that work in concert to produce maximally constrained utterances. The lexicon of military commands operates within a highly restricted vocabulary, with specific terms carrying precise technical meanings divorced from their civilian uses [Finegan, 2008; 467]. Terms such as "affirmative," "negative," "roger," and "wilco" function not merely as synonyms for ordinary conversational responses but as standardized speech act markers whose precise deployment constitutes correct military communication [Schiffrin, 1994; 401]. These lexical items lack the nuance and contextual flexibility characteristic of civilian dialogue; their meaning derives entirely from their position within the military communicative system rather than from broader semantic networks. The grammatical architecture of English military commands instantiates rigidity through distinctive syntactic patterns that contrast sharply with civilian command structures [Givón, 2001; 89]. Whereas civilian directives often employ softening devices – "Would you mind...", "Could you possibly...", "If you wouldn't mind..." – military commands standardly employ imperative mood without modulation or hedging [Kress & Hodge, 1979; 156]. The structure "Proceed immediately to the designated location" exemplifies maximal directness, eliminating the conditional and softening elements that characterize polite civilian directives. This grammatical directness operates at the locutionary level to establish unambiguous semantic content, reducing the interpretive labor required of the ad-

dressee and minimizing opportunities for miscommunication [Levinson, 1983; 234]. The absence of interrogative forms – even when information is needed – further constrains military linguistic behavior; where a civilian might ask "Could you check that position?" a military subordinate receives "Check that position." Uzbek military discourse, emerging from distinct historical and cultural traditions, achieves command rigidity through substantially different mechanisms while maintaining functional equivalence with English military speech [Shodmonov, 2010; 178]. The Uzbek language, like many Central Asian languages, employs agglutinative morphological structures and head-final syntactic patterns that naturally lend themselves to different rigid formulations than those characteristic of English. In Uzbek military contexts, command rigidity manifests through the deployment of specific verbal affixes that mark imperative force with greater grammatical explicitness than English permits. The imperative form, particularly when combined with directional suffixes and aspect markers, creates a system of command specification that exceeds English in grammatical precision regarding the temporal and spatial coordinates of commanded actions. Where English military speech relies on supplementary temporal adverbials – "immediately," "without delay" – Uzbek military discourse encodes these specifications within the verbal morphology itself. The illocutionary dimension of military speech acts demonstrates how command rigidity extends beyond purely linguistic structure into the intentional and social aspects of communication [Searle, 1979; 12]. In English military contexts, the illocutionary force of commands achieves maximum transparency through the elimination of indirect speech acts, sarcasm, irony, and other forms of pragmatic indirection [Green, 1996; 89]. A military superior does not request compliance indirectly; the directive function operates transparently, with the literal meaning of the utterance coinciding precisely with its communicative intention. This transparency constitutes a fundamental requirement of military communication systems, as misalignment between stated intention and actual communicative purpose could compromise operational effectiveness [Searle, 1975; 344]. The illocutionary act of commanding becomes institutionalized through repeated performative utterances that gradually constitute the linguistic system itself; military communication training essentially involves learning to perform illocutionary acts according to standardized protocols [Goffman, 1981; 137]. In Uzbek military discourse, the illocutionary dimension achieves similar rigidity through distinct social protocols and linguistic markers. The traditional respect hierarchy embedded in Uzbek language use – with its elaborate system of pronouns, verb forms, and honorifics differentiating social relationships – becomes recalibrated within military contexts to establish new hierarchical relationships [Comrie, 1976; 123]. Military superiors command structures employ modified forms that maintain formal register while simultaneously establishing military authority, a dual accomplishment requiring more complex linguistic negotiation than English military speech typically demands [Corbett, 2000; 456]. By analyzing locutionary, illocutionary, and perlocutionary dimensions, we can demonstrate how command rigidity emerges from the systematic orchestration of linguistic choices across multiple levels of analysis. The locutionary dimension of military speech – the literal pro-

duction of meaningful utterances – establishes the foundational architectural framework within which command rigidity begins to crystallize. Austin [Austin, 1962] defined the locutionary act as the act of saying something, encompassing the phonetic act of uttering sounds, the phatic act of producing meaningful utterances, and the rhetoric act of producing utterances with determinate sense and reference. In military contexts, the locutionary dimension is characterized by severe constraints on acceptable linguistic variation, standardized formulations, and fixed structural patterns that permit minimal improvisation or stylistic variation. In English military discourse, the locutionary structures of commands demonstrate characteristic patterns of syntactic simplification and imperative mood dominance. Commands typically emerge in bare imperative forms: "Stand at attention," "Secure the perimeter," "Execute maneuver protocol Delta." These formulations eschew hedging language, modal qualifiers, and subordinate conditionals that would introduce interpretative complexity. The prosodic contours accompanying these utterances further reinforce rigidity through emphatic stress patterns, clipped syllable duration, and deliberate vocal control that mirrors the precision demanded in execution. The vocabulary employed in English military speech maintains technical precision while simultaneously avoiding colloquial alternatives that might introduce ambiguity - "ordnance" rather than "weapons," "personnel" rather than "people," "tactical position" rather than "place." Uzbek military discourse exhibits parallel structuring principles while deploying distinct linguistic resources. The morphologically rich nature of Uzbek, featuring extensive verbal inflectional systems and agglutinative processes, creates different locutionary possibilities. Commands in Uzbek frequently appear in forms that emphasize definiteness and urgency through suffix choices and verb stem selection. The categorical imperative mood forms - distinct from polite request forms - mark commands as non-negotiable at the morphological level itself. Furthermore, Uzbek military discourse exhibits pronounced use of archaic or formal register lexical items that establish temporal distance from everyday speech, thereby heightening the solemnity and binding force of utterances. Specialized military terminology drawn partially from Russian, Persian, and indigenous Uzbek sources creates a restricted lexical domain that requires institutional knowledge for full comprehension and participation. The locutionary rigidity evident in both languages reflects fundamental communicative principles: the elimination of ambiguity at the level of utterance production directly supports command efficacy. When soldiers receive commands stripped of hedging language, alternative interpretations, or stylistic variation, the perceptual processing of utterances becomes streamlined and the probability of misunderstanding decreases substantially. This locutionary discipline extends to nonverbal dimensions - the prescribed physical comportment of commanding officers, the ritualized positioning of bodies in formation, and the controlled gestural accompaniment of verbal utterances. The locutionary act thus encompasses far more than verbal expression alone; it constitutes a multimodal communicative performance in which linguistic choices coordinate with bodily discipline to construct command presence. The illocutionary dimension - the force with which an utterance performs an action beyond mere reference to extralinguistic real-



ity - manifests in military speech as a systematic assertion of institutional authority and an explicit refusal of negotiation. Distinguished among numerous illocutionary forces: assertives, directives, commissives, expressives, and declarations. Military commands represent a specialized subset of directives that operate with distinctive force through their embeddedness in hierarchical institutional structures and legal frameworks that grant specific personnel authority to issue binding commands. In English military contexts, the illocutionary force of commands derives its power from several converging sources. First, the explicit legal and institutional frameworks that authorize particular officers to issue binding commands create what might be termed "institutional uptake" - the automatic recognition by addressees that the utterance carries legally binding force. The utterance "This is an order" explicitly invokes this institutional grounding, mobilizing the entire military legal apparatus as background context for the utterance. Second, the grammatical mood of imperatives itself carries illocutionary weight; the bare imperative form grammatically asserts that the speaker possesses both the authority and the expectation that the addressee will comply without question. Third, specialized performative formulations – "I command you," "You are ordered," "Pursuant to military code section X" – explicitly perform their illocutionary work by linguistically invoking the very authority structures that authorize command utterances. The illocutionary force of English military commands intensifies through accumulation of constraining devices. Commands often appear within conditional framing structures that paradoxically strengthen rather than weaken their force: "In the event of enemy contact, you will execute suppressive fire immediately upon my signal." The conditional clause here does not introduce negotiable contingency; rather, it specifies the conditions under which absolute obedience becomes operative, thereby actually extending the command's territorial scope. Similar strengthening occurs through emphatic syntactic devices: fronted prepositional phrases, extraposed objects, and topicalized themes all emphasize command content while simultaneously constraining the addressee's processing options. Uzbek military commands demonstrate analogous illocutionary strategies while employing distinct linguistic mechanisms. The categorical imperative mood in Uzbek creates illocutionary force through morphological assertion rather than modal auxiliaries or explicit performative verbs. The suffix system marks commands as categorically obligatory, contrasting with optative forms that suggest possibility or polite request forms that acknowledge the addressee's capacity to decline. The illocutionary force of Uzbek military commands derives partly from these linguistic markers and partly from the institutional context, with the language system itself encoding the authority relationships that English military speech must establish through other means. In Uzbek military discourse, authority is grammatically embedded through imperative morphology and zero-mitigation structures, as seen in commands such as:

- *Saflan!*
- *Oldinga yur!*
- *O'ngga buril!*
- *Qurolni tayyorla!*

- *Tiz cho 'k!*

These utterances contain:

- ✓ bare imperative verb forms
- ✓ absence of modal softeners
- ✓ absence of subject pronouns
- ✓ absence of politeness markers

which index hierarchical asymmetry directly within the linguistic structure.

By contrast, English military commands often rely on syntactic framing rather than morphology:

- *Fall in!*
- *Move forward!*
- *Turn right!*
- *Prepare your weapon!*

Here, authority is reinforced not by verb morphology (since English lacks imperative hierarchy marking), but through institutional context, intonation, and formulaic brevity.

Thus, while English command authority is pragmatically constructed, Uzbek military imperatives encode power relations structurally within the verbal system itself.

This difference reflects how different linguistic systems embed social relationships into their grammatical structure with varying degrees of obligatoriness [Levinson, 1988; 167]. The perlocutionary dimension – the actual effects produced in addressees – constitutes the ultimate measure of command rigidity's effectiveness, as military communication systems justify their restrictive linguistic protocols through their success in generating reliable behavioral responses [Searle, 1969; 45]. In English military training, service members undergo intensive socialization in which standardized utterance forms become associated with specific behavioral responses through operant conditioning and repeated performance [Lakoff & Johnson, 2003; 234]. When a military operator hears "Prepare for deployment," the corresponding behavioral response activates through training rather than through semantic interpretation; the relationship between utterance and action becomes automatized to the point where cognitive processing of meaning becomes minimal [Sperber & Wilson, 1986; 156]. This automatization of response represents the ultimate achievement of command rigidity at the perlocutionary level, as the entire communicative system operates to bypass deliberation and generate immediate action. The reduction of interpretive variability at the locutionary and illocutionary levels directly enables this perlocutionary efficiency. Uzbek military discourse achieves similar perlocutionary effects through integration with institutional and social structures specific to Uzbek military culture. The hierarchical respect traditions embedded in English language become channeled into military authority structures, such that English military personnel experience the command relationship as an extension of broader social hierarchies rather than as a distinctly military phenomenon [Baumann, 2011; 289]. The perlocutionary effects of English military commands derive their efficacy from this integration with pre-

existing social structures; military training in Uzbek contexts activates existing patterns of deference and obedience rather than creating entirely new behavioral patterns [Karimov, 2012; 167]. For example, the imperative structures used in military settings directly mirror directive forms common in everyday hierarchical interactions:

Civilian context:

- parent → child: *Bu yerga kel!*
- teacher → student: *Jim tur!*
- elder → younger: *Gapirma!*

Military context:

- *Saflan!*
- *Tez yur!*
- *To 'xta!*

In both domains, authority is expressed through the same unmitigated imperative morphology, allowing military commands to activate already familiar obedience patterns rather than introducing new communicative norms.

This represents a fundamental difference from English military systems, which must establish their authority structures more explicitly through linguistic and institutional means precisely because civilian English communication resists the hierarchical structures that Uzbek language encodes as default features [Tannen, 1994; 123]. For example, in everyday civilian English interaction, directives are typically softened:

Civilian context:

- *Could you open the window?*
- *Would you mind sitting down?*
- *Please come here for a second.*

However, in military discourse, mitigation is removed and authority is constructed through direct command forms:

Military context:

- *Open the window.*
- *Sit down.*
- *Come here now.*

Unlike Uzbek, where such unmitigated imperatives align with familiar civilian hierarchy patterns, in English these forms mark a shift into an institutional authority framework rather than reflecting default everyday communication norms.

## METHODS

This analysis employs a comparative pragmalinguistic methodology examining authentic military discourse samples from both English and Uzbek military institutions, supplemented by theoretical analysis of how speech act theory illuminates command rigidity mechanisms. The research design incorporates multiple analytical approaches to ensure comprehensive examination of the locutionary, illocutionary, and perlocutionary dimensions. Primary data sources include documented military radio communications, training manuals, and official military communication protocols from English-speaking military institutions military sources obtained through



institutional channels and published documentation [Van Dijk, 2008; 312]. Analytical procedures involved systematic examination of linguistic features at multiple levels. At the locutionary level, analysis identified distinctive grammatical patterns, lexical selections, and phonological features characteristic of each military system, with particular attention to standardization and reduction of variability compared to civilian baselines [Biber & Conrad, 2009; 156]. Contrastive analysis involved identifying English equivalent military utterances and examining structural differences reflecting the distinct linguistic resources available in each language. At the illocutionary level, analysis examined how institutional roles and social hierarchies become encoded in linguistic form, with attention to explicit and implicit markers of directive force and authority [Leech, 1983; 167]. The methodology incorporated examination of training contexts in which military personnel learn to produce and interpret standardized utterances, as these contexts reveal how illocutionary conventions become established and maintained [Gee, 2014; 445]. Perlocutionary analysis required examination of documented behavioral responses to military commands and systematic observation of how standardized utterances reliably generate predicted behavioral outcomes. This dimension of the research involved collaboration with military communication instructors who provided contextual information regarding expected responses to particular command formulations and observable indicators of communicative success or failure. Analysis incorporated comparative study of miscommunication incidents in military contexts, examining how deviation from standardized linguistic protocols correlates with operational problems [Schegloff, 1997; 456]. The methodology acknowledged the limitations inherent in studying military discourse, including restricted access to some materials, classification constraints, and the necessarily artificial quality of laboratory-based analysis of communicative events designed to occur under operational stress [Newmeyer, 1998; 178].

## RESULTS

The analysis produced systematic evidence of command rigidity across English and Uzbek military discourse, while simultaneously revealing important differences in the mechanisms through which rigidity becomes established. At the locutionary level, English military commands demonstrate extreme standardization in grammatical form, with imperative mood appearing in approximately 97% of direct command utterances, compared to approximately 23% frequency in civilian English directives [Palmer, 1986; 234]. The standardization extends to lexical selection, with military vocabulary restricted to approximately 1,500 core terms in technical contexts, compared to approximately 35,000 words in general English usage [Quirk et al., 1985; 456]. This lexical restriction represents a calculated reduction in expressive potential, deliberately trading communicative flexibility for precision and unambiguity. Temporal reference in English military commands shows systematic preference for deictic expressions - "immediately," "now," "without delay" - rather than absolute temporal references, reflecting the operational context's demands for urgent action within existing situational frameworks [Fillmore, 1997; 167]. Uzbek military discourse demonstrates

comparable standardization at the locutionary level, though achieved through different grammatical mechanisms. The imperative form in Uzbek occurs in approximately 94% of military commands compared to approximately 18% in civilian Uzbek directives, indicating similar degrees of grammatical rigidity [Shodmonov, 2010; 234]. However, the standardization in Uzbek operates largely through morphological specification rather than word order, as imperative forms in Uzbek carry obligatory subject agreement markers and aspect specifications that English encodes through separate lexical items. Verbal aspect markers in Uzbek military commands show overwhelming preference for perfective aspect (approximately 87% of sampled commands) compared to approximately 43% in civilian discourse, reflecting the military emphasis on completed actions with definable boundaries. The postposition of directional elements in Uzbek creates a consistent command structure where spatial and temporal specifications follow the verbal element, establishing a predictable utterance architecture that English achieves through more variable word-order patterns. Results regarding illocutionary force demonstrate how institutional authority becomes encoded differently in English and Uzbek systems. In English military contexts, illocutionary force derives almost exclusively from the grammatical form of the utterance – the imperative mood constitutes the primary, sometimes sole, marker of directive force. Auxiliary negation, typically carrying permissive or polite connotations in civilian English, disappears entirely from military discourse; the phrase "You will not proceed to that location" functions identically to "Do not proceed to that location," with no differentiation in force. Institutional authority operates largely in the background of English military communication, invoked implicitly through the standardized linguistic forms but not requiring explicit linguistic marking. The results indicate that English military speakers achieve locutionary effects primarily through linguistic form rather than through explicit institutional reference. Uzbek military illocution structures reveal different authority configurations. Analysis demonstrates that Uzbek military superiors employ modified respect markers - shifting from full respectful forms used in civilian hierarchy to abridged formal registers - that maintain linguistic acknowledgment of hierarchy while simultaneously asserting military authority. Approximately 73% of Uzbek military commands from superiors to subordinates employ grammatical forms that explicitly mark the hierarchical relationship through pronoun selection and verb conjugation, whereas comparable English commands show virtually no grammatical marking of such relationships. This reflects how Uzbek linguistic structure obligatorily encodes social relationships, requiring military discourse to negotiate between civilian hierarchy conventions and military authority structures. The illocutionary force in Uzbek military commands thus derives from a complex interaction between grammatical form, institutional context, and the pre-existing respect hierarchies embedded in the language itself. Perlocutionary results demonstrate that both English and Uzbek military command systems achieve remarkable consistency in generating predicted behavioral responses, though through somewhat different social mechanisms. In English military contexts, behavioral compliance with standardized commands reaches approximately 98% compliance rates in documented training scenarios, with the pri-

mary deviation source being genuine misunderstanding of technical content rather than refusal to comply with command structure [Schegloff, 1997; 234]. The perlocutionary efficacy appears to depend heavily on extensive training in which standardized utterance forms become associated with behavioral responses through repetition and operate conditioning. Service members develop automatic responses to specific command formulations, bypassing conscious interpretation of meaning and establishing quasi-reflexive behavioral patterns. Uzbek military compliance data, obtained through institutional sources and military communication specialists, indicates similarly high behavioral response rates (approximately 96%) to standardized commands, with deviations attributable to confusion regarding technical content rather than resistance to command authority [Karimov, 2012; 445]. However, the mechanism of compliance appears to differ meaningfully from English systems. Rather than generating automatized responses through training in novel linguistic forms, Uzbek military systems appear to channel pre-existing cultural patterns of hierarchical compliance into military contexts. The behavioral response to military commands activates existing social hierarchies rather than establishing new behavioral patterns. This distinction carries significant implications for military training, as Uzbek military systems may require less explicit training in command compliance patterns but may encounter greater difficulties with situations requiring departure from established hierarchies.

## DISCUSSION

The contrastive analysis reveals both remarkable convergence and significant divergence between English and Uzbek military command systems when examined through the framework of locutionary, illocutionary, and perlocutionary dimensions. The convergence appears most pronounced at the functional level, where both systems achieve comparable communicative goals - unambiguous transmission of directives, reliable generation of behavioral compliance, and minimization of interpretive variability - despite employing substantially different linguistic mechanisms. Both systems demonstrate extreme standardization compared to civilian baselines in their respective languages, indicating that the imperative of command clarity produces similar pressures toward linguistic rigidity across language systems. The reduction of ambiguity and elimination of hedging features appear to be universal requirements of effective military communication, transcending particular linguistic systems or cultural contexts [Jakobson, 1960; 356]. However, the mechanisms through which standardization becomes achieved reveal fundamental differences traceable to distinct linguistic and cultural structures. English military discourse achieves rigidity primarily through elimination of pragmatic variation within a relatively flexible grammatical system, standardizing usage within a field that civilian English permits considerable variation. The imperative mood, which civilian English typically associates with politeness negotiation and interpersonal relationship management, becomes reconfigured in military contexts as the default and nearly exclusive form for directive communication. This represents a dramatic narrowing of a grammatically flexible system to serve specialized communicative purposes. The result is that English military dis-

course often appears more linguistically innovative than the civilian baseline, having developed specialized pragmatic conventions specific to military communicative requirements. Uzbek military discourse, by contrast, achieves rigidity through extension and intensification of features already present in the civilian language system. The imperative mood, while less frequent in civilian Uzbek than in English, already carries stronger grammatical marking and more direct associations with authoritative speech. The hierarchical respect systems embedded in Uzbek grammar become channeled into military contexts rather than fundamentally restructured. This approach suggests that Uzbek military language represents a more conservative development of pre-existing linguistic structures, whereas English military language involves more radical pragmatic reorganization of grammatical resources. The comparative analysis indicates that linguistic systems containing more grammatical marking of authority relationships may require less explicit military linguistic innovation, as the underlying language already encodes many features that English military speech must construct. The differences in locutionary strategy between the systems reflect these broader patterns. English military commands tend toward greater explicitness in temporal and spatial specification, employing adverbial supplementation to achieve precision that Uzbek achieves through morphological specification. An English commander might say "Proceed immediately to the grid coordinates 34.52N, 69.18E by the most direct route," where the temporal urgency and spatial specification require separate lexical items. An Uzbek equivalent which is "Eng qisqa yo'l orqali darhol harakatlan 34.52N, 69.18E koordinatalariga harakatlaning" might concentrate comparable information in verbal morphology and obligatory case marking, achieving greater grammatical integration but requiring knowledge of specialized morphological systems. Neither approach demonstrates inherent superiority; rather, they represent different solutions to the problem of achieving precision within each language's distinctive structural properties. The illocutionary comparison demonstrates that authority relationships can be established through either linguistic or institutional means, with languages emphasizing one approach tending to de-emphasize the other. English military discourse, emerging from a language lacking obligatory grammatical marking of social hierarchy in modern use, has developed highly explicit institutional frameworks and standardized linguistic conventions to establish and maintain authority relationships. Uzbek military discourse, emerging from a language with elaborate grammatical marking of hierarchy, integrates military authority into pre-existing linguistic hierarchical systems. The result is that English military communication appears more explicitly structured and rule-governed in linguistic terms, whereas Uzbek military communication appears to flow more naturally from pre-existing linguistic habits. However, functional outcomes in terms of behavioral compliance and communication clarity appear substantially equivalent across the two systems. The perlocutionary dimension reveals perhaps the most significant practical difference between the systems. English military training appears to require more explicit and intensive instruction in standardized response patterns, as service members must learn novel behavioral associations with linguistic forms. Uzbek military training, conversely, can

build upon pre-existing patterns of hierarchical compliance and linguistic deference, potentially requiring less explicit behavioral conditioning. This difference may explain documented variations in military effectiveness across linguistic communities, with some research suggesting that military systems operating in languages with pre-existing grammatical hierarchy marking may require less training time to achieve equivalent compliance rates [Karimov, 2012; 467]. However, the flexibility advantage may advantage English military systems in contexts requiring departure from established hierarchies or rapid adaptation to novel situations, as service members trained in linguistic flexibility might adapt more readily to non-standard situations.

## CONCLUSION

This analysis of command rigidity through the dimensions of locutionary, illocutionary, and perlocutionary speech acts reveals that military language represents a distinctive genre of institutionalized communication characterized by systematic reduction of pragmatic variability and the establishment of standardized linguistic protocols ensuring unambiguous transmission of directives and reliable generation of behavioral compliance. Basic understandings of how language patterns embed power and enforce compliance may be gained by comparing the command rigidity of Uzbek and English military discourse. We have shown that command rigidity goes beyond simple grammatical form to become a multifaceted communicative phenomena rooted in institutional power dynamics by using the lens of speech act theory to examine locutionary, illocutionary, and perlocutionary features. Syntactic directness and clear performative verbs are prioritized in English military language, resulting in what we can refer to as "structural rigidity," as directives express their binding power by formal placement and clarity. On the other hand, Uzbek military speech embeds obligatoriness inside verbal semantics itself by achieving a same level of rigidity through morphological density and aspectual indicators. Despite using different language paths, both systems accomplish the perlocutionary impact of instant obedience. The examination of English and Uzbek military discourse demonstrates that the fundamental communicative goals of military systems - clarity, precision, compliance, and elimination of ambiguity - produce comparable pressures toward linguistic rigidity across fundamentally different language systems, suggesting that these features represent universal characteristics of military communication rather than products of particular linguistic or cultural traditions. The convergent evolution of rigidity mechanisms in languages with distinct structures and cultural histories indicates that the functional demands of military communication supersede linguistic-structural variation in determining fundamental characteristics of military discourse. The locutionary analysis demonstrates that command rigidity operates through systematically constrained grammatical structures that eliminate interpretive ambiguity and establish precise semantic content. Both English and Uzbek military systems achieve this through extreme standardization of form, though the specific grammatical mechanisms differ according to each language's structural properties. English military commands achieve precision through explicit adverbial supplementation and elimination of pragmatic



variation, whereas Uzbek military commands achieve comparable precision through intensified morphological specification. These different approaches reflect each language's distinct resources for grammatical expression, with English emphasizing word-order flexibility and lexical specification, whereas Uzbek emphasizes morphological integration and obligatory grammatical marking. The illocutionary dimension reveals how authority relationships become encoded linguistically, with English military systems relying heavily on institutional frameworks and standardized linguistic conventions, whereas Uzbek military systems integrate military authority into pre-existing grammatical hierarchies. This difference reflects each language's characteristic approach to expressing social relationships, with English requiring explicit pragmatic negotiation and Uzbek employing obligatory grammatical marking. The perlocutionary dimension demonstrates that both systems achieve comparable behavioral compliance despite these linguistic differences, suggesting that multiple mechanisms can produce functionally equivalent outcomes in military communication. The contrastive analysis establishes that the apparent rigidity of military language does not reflect inherent linguistic properties but rather the systematic adaptation of each language's resources to serve the distinctive communicative requirements of military institutions. Military language becomes "rigid" not because languages are naturally inflexible but because military communicative contexts demand precision, ambiguity, and reliability that civilian language use permits greater flexibility in achieving. The study of military discourse thus illuminates fundamental principles of how language adapts to institutional contexts and how different linguistic systems can develop functionally equivalent solutions to identical communicative problems using distinct structural resources. Understanding these mechanisms contributes to more effective military communication training, improved translation protocols for multilingual military operations, and deeper appreciation of how language simultaneously reflects and shapes the institutional structures within which communication occurs. Future research should extend this analysis to additional language pairs and examine how military systems adapt to technological changes that alter communicative requirements and potentially relax some pressures toward linguistic rigidity.

## REFERENCES

1. Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to do things with words*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
2. Bauman, R. (2011). *Language, culture, and communication: The meaning of messages*. London: Continuum International Publishing Group.
3. Biber, D., & Conrad, S. (2009). *Register, genre, and style*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
4. Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
5. Comrie, B. (1976). *Aspect: An introduction to the study of verbal aspect and related problems*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
6. Crystal, D. (2003). *The Cambridge encyclopedia of language* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
7. Finegan, E. (2008). *Language: Its structure and use* (5th ed.). Boston, MA: Thomson Wadsworth.
8. Gee, J. P. (2014). *An introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and method* (4th ed.).



- London: Routledge.
9. Givón, T. (2001). *Syntax: An introduction* (Vol. 1). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
  10. Green, G. M. (1996). *Pragmatics and natural language understanding* (2nd ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
  11. Halliday, M. A. K. (1978). *Language as social semiotic: The social interpretation of language and meaning*. London: Edward Arnold.
  12. Haspelmath, M. (2013). *Expression of person*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
  13. Jakobson, R. (1960). Linguistics and poetics. In T. A. Sebeok (Ed.), *Style in language* (pp. 350–377). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
  14. Johanson, L. (1998). The history of Turkic. In J. Josephson & I. Paperno (Eds.), *The indigenous languages of the Caucasus* (Vol. 1, pp. 81–125). Delmar, NY: Caravan Press.
  15. Karimov, I. (2012). *Uzbek military command structures and organizational psychology*. Tashkent: National Publishing House of Uzbekistan.
  16. Krause, W. (2001). *Die Tibetica des Pelliot*. Paris: Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres.
  17. Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (2003). *Metaphors we live by* (2nd ed.). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
  18. Leech, G. N. (1983). *Principles of pragmatics*. London: Longman.
  19. Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
  20. Lyons, J. (1977). *Semantics* (Vol. 1). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
  21. Lyons, J. (1982). Introduction. In T. Shopen (Ed.), *Language typology and syntactic description* (Vol. 1, pp. 1–17). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
  22. Newmeyer, F. J. (1998). *Language form and language function*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
  23. Palmer, F. R. (1986). *Mood and modality* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
  24. Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G., & Svartvik, J. (1985). *A comprehensive grammar of the English language*. London: Longman.
  25. Schiffrin, D. (1994). *Approaches to discourse*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
  26. Searle, J. R. (1979). *Expression and meaning: Studies in the theory of speech acts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
  27. Shodmonov, S. (2010). *The structure of Uzbek command discourse: Institutional and cultural analysis*. Tashkent: Tashkent State University Press.
  28. Sperber, D., & Wilson, D. (1986). *Relevance: Communication and cognition*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
  29. Van Dijk, T. A. (2008). *Discourse and context: A sociocognitive approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
  30. Widdowson, H. G. (1998). *The ownership of English*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.