

A Cross-Cultural Analysis of The Typology of War and Battle Lexemes in English

Tuxtazarova Sarvinoz Umidjon qizi

Phd student of Fergana State University, Uzbekistan

Received: 11 April 2025; **Accepted:** 07 May 2025; **Published:** 09 June 2025

Abstract: This paper explores the typological variety of war- and battle-related lexemes in English, focusing on both literal and metaphorical formations. Using a linguocultural and lexicographic approach, it examines their semantic categories, diachronic development, and conceptual framing, with comparative analysis from Uzbek. The study finds that English possesses a highly diversified lexical field shaped by historical, ideological, and media-driven influences. In contrast, Uzbek equivalents reflect both structural gaps and growing lexical borrowing due to globalization. This research contributes to the understanding of cross-cultural lexical typology and the cognitive framing of conflict.

Keywords: War lexemes, battle compounds, metaphor, Uzbek comparison, cognitive linguistics, linguocultural analysis.

Introduction: The conceptualization of conflict in English is deeply embedded in a wide array of lexemes derived from the roots war and battle. These terms occur both in literal military contexts and in metaphorical extensions applied to social, political, economic, and even cultural domains. This paper aims to classify the diverse types of compound lexemes formed with war and battle, compare them with Uzbek equivalents, and interpret their sociolinguistic implications using a linguocultural framework. The study also explores the diachronic development and obsolescence of certain war-related compounds in English. The research is guided by the following questions: (1) What are the main typological categories of war and battle compounds in English? (2) How do these categories differ or correspond to lexical constructions in Uzbek? (3) What role do metaphor and cognitive framing play in their semantic evolution?

METHODS

The primary methodology involves qualitative lexicographic analysis using the Oxford English Dictionary (OED) as the core data source for English lexemes. Obsolete and current uses of battle and war compounds were documented, and their contextual usages were analyzed. Comparative equivalents in

Uzbek were identified through native Uzbek dictionaries, academic Uzbek corpora, and translations. Additionally, metaphorical and conceptual framing was interpreted using theories from cognitive linguistics and discourse analysis. No Wikipedia sources were used; only scholarly publications and peer-reviewed works were consulted.

This study also applied a cross-cultural semantic analysis framework based on Wierzbicka's NSM (Natural Semantic Metalanguage) approach and utilized corpus tools to examine frequency and distribution patterns in the Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA) and the British National Corpus (BNC). For Uzbek, the National Corpus of the Uzbek Language and select Uzbek news portals were used as reference points.

RESULTS

1. Literal and Tactical Formations of 'Battle' Lexemes such as field battle, horn battle, saw battle, and windmill battle originate from historical military tactics, where formations often reflected the physical appearance or structure of troops (e.g., horn-shaped, square-shaped) [1]. These terms are now largely obsolete, reflecting specific early modern English military discourse.

Additionally, formations like pitched battle and running battle continue to appear in journalistic and literary contexts, denoting planned versus sporadic engagements. Such compounds illustrate the resilience of older forms alongside newer metaphorical innovations.

2. Modern and Metaphorical Types of 'War' Lexemes derived from war span:

- Participants: civil war, proxy war, people's war, gang war [2]
- Scope: limited war, total war, private war, party war [3]
- Medium or Method: cyberwar, psychological war, biowar, information war, hybrid war [4]
- Cause or Domain: drug war, culture war, trade war, water war, gender war, succession war, turf war, bidding war, pamphlet war [5]

These lexemes serve various rhetorical and strategic functions. For instance, culture war and gender war are prevalent in ideological discourses, while cyberwar and infowar reflect technological and digital threats.

3. Lexical Equivalence and Gaps in Uzbek Some English lexemes have direct Uzbek equivalents: economic war (iqtisodiy urush), civil war (fuqarolar urushi), cold war (sovuq urush). Others have entered as loanwords: hybrid war (gibrid urush), infowar (axborot urushi), psychological war (psixologik urush). However, culturally embedded terms like turf war, bidding war, and pamphlet war often lack concise lexical counterparts and require explanatory phrases.

Uzbek equivalents tend to reflect more formalized or militaristic usages. Metaphorical extensions, while increasingly present in Uzbek media, are not as deeply entrenched in everyday language. This points to differing cultural practices in metaphorical framing and genre conventions.

4. Religious and Ideological Constructs The term holy war in English, often associated with the Crusades, finds partial correspondence in the Arabic-derived jihad, present in Uzbek as jihod or g'azovot. The concept differs semantically and ideologically: holy war emphasizes religious militarism, while jihod also encompasses personal spiritual struggle [6]. Despite

their overlap, usage frequency in English corpora suggests jihad has become more prominent than holy war in recent decades.

In modern Uzbek, jihod may appear in theological or historical contexts, but its public and political usage remains sensitive due to national security and censorship concerns. This contrasts with English media, where jihad frequently appears in security and ideological narratives.

5. Conceptual Metaphors and Cognitive Framing Many compound forms illustrate the WAR IS CONFLICT metaphor, allowing abstract domains to be framed as zero-sum battles. For example, battle of the sexes, war on drugs, and word wars personify ideological and social disputes as violent clashes [7]. While evocative, such metaphorization may contribute to polarization in discourse.

Metaphors like trade war or information war influence policy framing and public sentiment, often invoking urgency and high stakes. In Uzbek, such metaphors are either borrowed directly or translated descriptively, indicating emerging yet cautious adaptation of cognitive strategies.

6. Diachronic Trends and Lexical Obsolescence Corpus analysis shows a gradual decline of literal battle-compounds and a sharp rise in metaphorical war-compounds since the mid-20th century. This shift parallels the changing nature of conflict—from physical confrontations to cyber, ideological, and media battles. For instance, pamphlet war was prevalent during the Reformation and Enlightenment but is now largely replaced by Twitter war or media war. Uzbek equivalents often struggle to keep pace with these rapid semantic innovations, leading to hybrid usage or explanatory paraphrasing.

In the table given below illustrates the attributes of battle and war that show the types of war and battle in the American and English culture and their explanations in Uzbek and English languages. The terms that exist in Uzbek language are given while if the term lacks in Uzbek, the definition is given to explain it.

English Term	Uzbek Explanation	English explanation
Field battle	Dala janggi	A pitched battle fought in open terrain
Shear battle	Xanjar shaklli harbiy kuchlar	A wedge-shaped tactical formation
Saw battle	Arrasimon shaklli batalyon	A battalion arranged in a saw-like formation

Horn battle	Shoxlari va qanotlari mavjud jangovar qo‘shin	Troops arranged with flanks/horns
Square battle	Kvadrat shaklli saf tuzilmasi	A square-shaped battle formation
Windmill battle	Markaziy kvadratdan to‘rt tomonga yoyilgan ustunlar bilan saf	Complex formation with arms like windmill blades
Sea battle	Dengiz janggi	A naval engagement at sea
Scone battle	Safga tizishning muayyan usuli	A specific battlefield deployment method
Game battle	Qaroqchi yoki ovchilar bilan olishuv	A skirmish with poachers or raiders
Mountain battle	Tog‘ jangi	Battle conducted in mountainous terrain
Gun battle	Otishma	A prolonged firefight involving guns
Battle of sexes	Jinslar o‘rtasidagi qarama-qarshilik	Gender-based ideological or social conflict
Pitched battle	Katta jang	A large, organized, direct clash
Tank battle	Tanklar janggi	Battle involving armored vehicles (tanks)
Ship war	Kemalar janggi	War between naval vessels
Civil war	Fuqarolar urushi	Armed conflict within a single country
Private war	Shaxsiy sabablarga asoslangan cheklangan urush	A limited war driven by personal motives
Holy war	Diniy sabablarga asoslangan urush	A religiously motivated or ideological war
Hot war	Qurolli to‘qnashuvlar bilan kechadigan urush	An active military conflict with combat
Cold war	Sovuq urush – to‘qnashuvsiz mojaro	Political/economic conflict without direct combat
Book war	Kitoblar orqali bahs	Scholarly conflict via published works
Paper war	Yozma shakldagi nizo, bosma tahdid	Dispute fought through writing or print
Brain war	Intellektual musobaqa	A contest of intellect or ideas
Party war	Kichik guruhlar o‘rtasidagi jang	A small-scale group conflict

Naval war	Dengizdagi urush	War conducted at sea
Land war	Quruqlikdagi urush	Ground-based warfare
Word war / Word wars	So‘z o‘yinlariga asoslangan musobaqa	Vocabulary-based digital competition
Preventive war	Gumon qilingan xavfga qarshi oldindan urush boshlash	A preemptive strike to neutralize threats
Pamphlet war	Broshuralar orqali olib borilgan mafkuraviy kurash	Ideological debate via pamphlets
Trade war	Savdo urushi	Conflict via economic and trade restrictions
Succession war	Taxt uchun jang	Conflict over succession to power
Ocean war	Okean ustida olib borilgan urush	Warfare on the ocean
Limited war	Cheklangan qurolli kuchlar bilan urush	War fought with limitations on resources
Total war	Barcha resurslarni safarbar qilgan urush	Full-scale mobilized war
Water war	Suv resurslari ustidan kurash	Conflict over water rights or access
Propaganda war	Jamoatchilik fikriga ta‘sir o‘tkazish uchun kurash	Battle to influence public opinion
Culture war	Madaniy qadriyatlar ustidan nazorat uchun kurash	Conflict between ideological/cultural values
Drug war	Giyohvandlikka qarshi kurash	State campaign against narcotics trade
People’s war	Aholining hukmron tabaqalarga qarshi kurashi	Mass-based revolutionary warfare
Economic war	Iqtisodiy bosim va sanksiyalar orqali olib borilgan kurash	War using economic tools and sanctions
Range war	Yaylovlar ustidan kurash	Cattlemen’s conflict over grazing lands
Turf war	Hududlar ustidan jinoyat guruhlari o‘rtasidagi urush	Street/gang conflict over territory
Proxy war	Vakillar orqali olib boriladigan urush	War fought indirectly via allied forces
Gang war	Ko‘cha janggi	Violent conflict between gangs

Psychological war	Psixologik jang	War using mental pressure and propaganda
Bidding war	Narxni oshirish orqali auksiondagi kurash	Competitive auction involving price raises
Biowar	Biologik qurollar orqali olib boriladigan urush	Warfare using biological agents
Stamp war	Markalar bilan bog‘liq nizo yoki kurash	Conflict possibly related to postage or collectibles
Forever war	Abadiy jang	A prolonged, seemingly endless war
Gender war	Gender urushi	Socio-political conflict over gender roles
Hybrid war	Gibrid urush	War combining conventional and unconventional means
Information war	Axborot urushi	Conflict fought through information control or disinformation

DISCUSSION

This typological review highlights how the English lexicon of war extends far beyond battlefield terminology, entering everyday sociopolitical language through metaphor. Compared to Uzbek, English presents a more diversified and culturally layered lexical field. The presence of numerous compound types in English reflects the language's historical engagement with warfare, ideological struggle, and its global media influence.

The gaps in Uzbek suggest not only differing conceptual metaphors but also the influence of globalization on lexical borrowing. Uzbek media increasingly adopts English-derived compounds, particularly in military, political, and digital spheres, indicating a shift toward internationalized discourse.

Moreover, the cognitive framing of conflict terms reflects sociopolitical ideologies. In English, war metaphors are used both for critique and mobilization, whereas in Uzbek, such usage is more constrained. The incorporation of war-related compounds often signals attempts to modernize public discourse or to align with global narratives.

The compiled glossary provides a systematic overview of terminological variations associated with the lexemes battle and war, encompassing both their literal military usage and metaphorical extensions across diverse conceptual domains. The data illustrates the semantic richness and functional adaptability of these terms in English, as they are employed to denote not

only conventional armed conflicts—such as field battle, tank battle, or naval war—but also a range of non-combatant confrontations, including propaganda war, gender war, and trade war.

A notable dimension of this lexical field is the integration of spatial and tactical descriptors, particularly evident in historically attested formations such as square battle, horn battle, or windmill battle, which reflect early modern military practices and their corresponding terminologies. Equally important is the emergence of ideologically or technologically mediated conflicts, such as information war, psychological warfare, and hybrid war, which signal a shift from physical to symbolic and strategic domains of antagonism. This terminology reveals a semantic continuum wherein the core notion of “war” as organized, oppositional struggle is preserved, while its applications expand in response to socio-political, technological, and cultural transformations. The lexical productivity of the terms also demonstrates the metaphoric potential of “war” as a framing device in public discourse, legitimizing diverse forms of struggle, competition, or resistance.

CONCLUSION

The analysis shows that English war-related lexemes encapsulate not just martial phenomena but also broader social, ideological, and technological dynamics. Their spread into metaphorical domains reflects both linguistic creativity and sociocultural values. In sum, the analyzed expressions reflect both

the historical evolution and discursive flexibility of the war/battle semantic field in English, making it a fertile area for further linguocultural and conceptual analysis. For Uzbek, increasing incorporation of such terms signals linguistic adaptation in response to global information flows. Further research could involve corpus-based frequency analysis and experimental metaphor elicitation studies to deepen the comparative understanding. Expanding the study to include spoken corpora or media discourse analysis would offer additional insights into pragmatic usage and reception.

REFERENCES

Oxford English Dictionary. (n.d.). Entries: Horn battle, Field battle, Windmill battle.

Musolff, A. (2022). Metaphor and political communication. *Metaphor and Symbol*, 37(2), 89–103.

Chilton, P. (2004). *Analysing political discourse: Theory and practice*. Routledge.

Flusberg, S. J., Matlock, T., & Thibodeau, P. H. (2018). War metaphors in public discourse. *Metaphor and Symbol*, 33(1), 1–18.

Charteris-Black, J. (2004). *Corpus approaches to critical metaphor analysis*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Cook, D. (2005). *Understanding jihad*. University of California Press.

Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors we live by*. University of Chicago

Ibragimjonovna, A. M. (2023). The Issues Related to Studying of Language and thought in Cognitive Linguistics. *Miasto Przyszłości*, 31, 271-273.

Tuxtazarova, S. (2024). ЛИНГВИСТИЧЕСКАЯ КАРТИНА МИРА: ИЗУЧЕНИЕ ЕЕ ПОНЯТИЯ И ЗНАЧЕНИЯ В ЛИНГВАКУЛЬТУРОЛОГИИ. *Наука и технология в современном мире*, 3(12), 150-152.