

## **МОВОЗНАВСТВО. ЛІТЕРАТУРОЗНАВСТВО**

UDC 8.81.81-13

DOI <https://doi.org/10.24919/2308-4863/41-1-13>

**Iryna BASARABA,**

*orcid.org/0000-0002-3209-9119*

*Instructor at the Department of Foreign Languages  
National Academy of State Border Guard Service of Ukraine  
(Khmelnyskyi, Ukraine) irynaborovyk2017@ukr.net*

### **METHODOLOGICAL RESEARCH APPROACHES AND METHODS OF PHRASEOLOGICAL SPACE OF ENGLISH MILITARY DISCOURSE**

*The article explores the basic concepts in the field of phraseology, relating to the basic methods of phraseological units research, as well as methodological approaches (variational, complicative, structural-typological). The author highlights the methods that can be used to study the main features of the formation and translation of phraseological units in English-language texts on military topics. The article covers the descriptions of methods and techniques used in philological research. The author analyzes the latest research conducted in phraseology in general and to study phraseological units in particular.*

*The article analyzes the existing definitions of "methodology", "method", as well as highlights the author's own approach to understanding these concepts. The general features, common and distinctive features of the methods used during the scientific research are determined and analyzed. In addition, the article raises questions of the main problems of modern methodology of linguistic research. The author describes his own approaches to the study of phraseological units of English-language military discourse, namely complicative, partial-linguistic, structural-semantic, onomasiological and cognitive. The article presents the classification of research methods, which are divided into paradigmatic (constructive, structural, functional, comparative-historical), interparadigmatic (comparative, typological) marginal (ethnolinguistic, psycholinguistic, sociolinguistic), complex (questionnaire, survey, survey, survey) contextual).*

*The author describes the methods used during his own research (structural, functional, typological, comparative), as well as a number of specific methods (the method of dictionary definitions, the method of phraseological description, the method of phraseological identifications). The application of these approaches and methods allowed to identify a set of phraseological units of English-language military discourse, to analyze them, to classify and highlight their structure.*

**Key words:** methodology, methods, research, approach, linguistics.

**Ірина БАСАРАБА,**

*orcid.org/0000-0002-3209-9119*

*викладач кафедри іноземних мов  
Національної академії Державної прикордонної служби України  
(Хмельницький, Україна) irynaborovyk2017@ukr.net*

### **МЕТОДОЛОГІЧНІ ПІДХОДИ ТА МЕТОДИ ДОСЛІДЖЕННЯ ФРАЗЕОЛОГІЧНОГО ПРОСТОРУ АНГЛОМОВНОГО ВОЄННОГО ДИСКУРСУ**

*У статті досліджуються основні поняття в області фразеології, що стосуються основних методів дослідження фразеологічних одиниць, а також методологічних підходів (варіаційний, комплікативний, структурно-типологічний). Автор висвітлює методи, що можуть використовуватись для дослідження основних особливостей утворення та перекладу фразеологічних одиниць у англomовних текстах саме на військову тематику. У статті висвітлюються описи методів та методик, що застосовуються під час філологічного дослідження. Автор проводить аналіз останніх досліджень, що проведені у фразеології загалом та для вивчення фразеологічних одиниць зокрема.*

*В статті проаналізовано вже існуючі визначення понять «методологія», «метод», а також висвітлено власний підхід автора до розуміння зазначених понять. Визначено та проаналізовано загальні ознаки, спільні та відмінні риси методів, що використовуються під час наукового дослідження. Окрім цього, в статті піднімаються питання основних проблем сучасної методології лінгвістичних досліджень. Автор проводить опис власних підходів для вивчення фразеологічних одиниць англomовного військового дискурсу, а саме комплікативно-го, частинно-мовного, структурно-семантичного, ономасіологічного т когнітивного. В статті представлено класифікацію методів досліджень, що поділяються на парадигмальні (конструктивний, структурний, функціональний, порівняльно-історичний), міжпарадигмальні (зіставний, типологічний) маргінальні (етнолінгвістичні, психолінгвістичні, соціолінгвістичні), комплексні (анкетування, опитування, спостереження, дистрибутивний, компонентний, контекстологічний).*

*Автор описує методи, що використовувались під час проведення власного дослідження (структурний, функціональний, типологічний, зіставний), а також ряд специфічних методів (метод словникових дефініцій, метод фразеологічного опису, метод фразеологічних ідентифікацій). Застосування даних підходів та методів дозволило виділити сукупність фразеологічних одиниць англomовного військового дискурсу, здійснити їх аналіз, провести класифікацію та виділити їх структуру.*

**Ключові слова:** методологія, методика, дослідження, підхід, лінгвістика.

**Statement of problems and substantiation of urgency of its revision.** At this stage of development of modern linguistics, language develops in accordance with the development of society, the characteristics of the media, culture, various types of communication. Language is a system installation in which each of the elements exists in close connection with other relevant elements. It belongs to a number of these objects, which are considered inaccessible for observation. Researchers remain accessible only to external manifestations of mobile functioning, namely human activity itself, as well as texts that demonstrate the results of this type of activity. Therefore, an extremely important issue is the development and adaptation of methods and techniques that allow to record the existing changes and predict the direction of further development of the language adequately. Such a science as "linguomethodology" is aimed at the formation of tools, various ways of cognition, vision and understanding of reality, as well as guidance and formation of reflective experience (Selivanova, 2006: 67).

One of the most common and constant problems in linguistics is the constant improvement and generalization of existing methods of linguistic research. Although most textbooks in linguistics identify this issue as the main object of research, in fact, due attention has not been paid to this issue until recently. Only since the 1990s for the first time the first manuals on the methods of linguistic research began to appear (I. Arnold, L. Ivanova, I. Tokareva) (Arnold, 1991: 208), (Ivanova, 1995: 45), (Tokareva, 2004: 83).

One of the important problems of linguistic methodology is the disorder of basic concepts. As noted in many dictionaries, linguistic methods are not a single set of ways to study and describe linguistic phenomena and entities, rather, they are a set of contradictory or complementary methods used in a variety of linguistic studies. It should be noted that such a "complex" is not permanent, it is systematically enriched. In addition, over time, the attitude to different methods changes, and allows us to state that the same method can be discredited in one linguistic practice, and in another, on the contrary, become the main and dominant. From this point of view, it is interesting to analyze and generalize the methods and techniques

of studying the phraseological space of military discourse, because it is the military sphere in the modern development of society is actively developing and reforming, and this, in turn, changes in everyday and professional speech.

**Analysis of recent research and publications.** Methods of linguistic research have been the subject of scientific research by a number of well-known researchers, in particular Yu. Apresian, E. Benvenist, L. Vasylieva, B. Holovin, R. Kobrin (features and content of certain methods of linguistic research); N. Ivanytska, V. Kocherhan, L. Turovska, F. Shlehel (stages of formation and features of methodological approaches in linguistics) (Ivanytska, 204: 221), (Ivashchenko, 2014: 32), (Kocherchan, 2006: 324).

A number of linguists have devoted their own research to the study of methods used in phraseology in general and methods of studying phraseological units in particular. For example, V. Arkhanhelskyi used a variational approach to the study of phraseological units, S. Gavrin applied a complicative approach, and D. Dobrovolskyi became the founder of the structural-typological method of studying phraseological units.

However, the analysis of scientific sources of domestic and foreign scholars showed the lack of a generalized and systematic approach to the use of research methods in military linguistics in general and the English-language phraseological space of military discourse in particular.

**Formulation of the aim and tasks of the article.** Given the above, the aim of the article is to identify and summarize the main methods and techniques that can be used to study the peculiarities of the formation and translation of phraseology in English texts on military topics, as well as a description of methods and techniques used in our study.

**Presentation of main material.** Methodology is considered the main way and method of cognition of reality. It participates in the formation of reflective human experience and streamlining previously acquired skills. The concept of methodology, according to some researchers, can be narrowed down to a set of techniques for the analysis of certain sciences. This approach significantly impoverishes the understanding of research methods, which, first of all, are formed on the general principles of research of

the object and awareness of its nature (Selivanova, 2006: 13). The issue of methodology and methodological approaches to research in various fields of science and technology is a very complex and controversial issue. The philosophical dictionary interprets methodology as "a system of principles and methods of organization and construction of theoretical and practical activities, as well as the doctrine of this system" (Rusanivkyi, 2004: 359).

On the contrary to this definition, O. Selivanova believes that the methodology is a way of knowing and understanding the reality and general processes involved in the formation and direct ordering of reflective human experience (Rusanivskyi, 2004: 12). In this context, the researcher O. Yefriemov emphasizes that there is a close connection of methodology with other basic sciences, including philosophy, while the methodology participates in the processes of forming the principles of worldview and cognition (Efremov, 2014: 8).

But the most successful and generalizing is the interpretation of "methodology" concept given by S. Goncharenko, in which he distinguishes several levels. In his opinion, "methodology means a system of theoretical knowledge that serves as the leading principles of scientific knowledge, ways and means of implementing scientific research" (Honcharenko, 2008: 70).

Each level of methodology has its own meaning and performs certain tasks. In particular, the first level is philosophical knowledge, which constitutes the philosophical basis and general scientific principles of research; the second – general scientific methodological approaches to conducting different types of scientific research, characteristics of these studies, their stages and elements; the third level covers research methods, principles and procedures in a specific scientific field, i.e. specific scientific methodology; fourth (according to a number of researchers) – includes methods and techniques of research (Honcharenko, 2008: 84).

If we talk about a specific scientific methodology in the relevant field, it includes both general scientific methodological approaches and specific issues (methods, techniques, etc.) typical for specific scientific knowledge, in particular in the field of linguistics.

The key problems of modern linguistics include the question of research methodology in this particular scientific field in general, as well as the main methods of studying the idiomatic space of military discourse in particular. In the course of its development, each method identifies exactly the aspect of language that is determined by its object of study. It is difficult to disagree with the opinion of some scien-

tists (A.Ierina, V.Zakhozhai, D.Ierin), who note that in conducting a particular scientific study should use only those methods that can provide a comprehensive and adequate assessment of the process or phenomenon of scientific interest, and the task of each researcher is to make the right selection of methods that will provide reliable results, based on awareness of the purpose, objectives and specifics of the study subject and its features, (Ierina, 2004: 45).

Studying the use of adequate research methods in a specific field of research, in particular linguistics, scientist V Zvehintsev interprets the method as "a set of techniques combined by some common principle and used in linguistic research to perform partial research tasks" (Zvehintsev, 1962: 90). According to the famous linguist M. Alefirenko, the method is "a set of research techniques, methods and operations used to achieve research objectives in accordance with a certain linguistic theory and principles (methodology) of cognition" (Alefirenko, 2005: 395).

In the context of our study, the most successful is the definition of "method" given by M. Alefirenko, which clearly describes the components of the method that are used to solve specific problems.

Thus, the term "method" means a set of techniques, rules, actions, principles, the main purpose of which is the focus of research on solving problems, as well as achieving goals in the linguistic field.

Researcher O. Selivanova, studying linguistic research methods, classifies them. The main methods of modern linguistics include paradigmatic, interparadigmatic, marginal and combined methods (Selivanova, 2006: 221). The scientist differentiates all existing methods of linguistics and divides them into 4 types:

- paradigmatic: functional, structural, constructive, comparative-historical;
- interparadigmatic: comparative, typological;
- marginal: ethnolinguistic, psycholinguistic, sociolinguistic;
- complex: questionnaires, surveys, observations, distributive, component, contextual, etc. (Selivanova, 2006: 214).

Researcher N.Amosova based the methods of research of phraseological units on the specifics of a concrete language and the interaction of phraseological units within a certain context, as well as the study of phraseological phenomena within the framework of use in speech. The disadvantage of the proposed approach is the lack of a clear distribution of phraseological units, taking into account their stability and system, as well as historical dynamics (Amosova, 1989: 67).

The methodology of studying phraseological units proposed by V.Arkhanel'skyi has a number of fea-

tures, including the division of a phraseological unit into constant and variable components, the study of their characteristics, taking into account the existence of a phraseological unit in a certain chronological period. This methodological approach is called variational. However, the disadvantage of this method is the lack of developed methodological procedures (Arkhanhelskyi, 1961: 211).

Taking into account the internal structure and organization of the phraseological system is realized in the structural-typological method of research, the founder of which is D. Dobrovolskyi. A characteristic feature of this approach is the analysis of this system in several languages, which allows to form a so-called typological series.

All these methods and approaches to the implementation of research methods are quite interesting and effective, but in the context of our scientific research, the closest to the realization of the research goal is a complicated approach developed by S. Havryk (Havryn, 1962: 20). It is some characteristic features of this method that have been adapted to the study and research of phraseological units of English-language military discourse. Such features are a clear identification of stable complicative phrases (phraseological units), which have the properties of stability, reproducibility and use, and the need to study the functional and semantic qualities of phraseology in close connection.

Thus, a thorough analysis of existing approaches to understanding the essence of methodology and research methods in science in general and linguistics in particular, as well as the study of methodological approaches to the study of phraseological space allowed to identify their own approaches and methods of studying phraseological units of English military discourse.

Based on the opinions and views of well-known scholars and linguists, by optimizing and reducing the necessary components and constituents to a reasonable minimum, we propose to study the phraseological units of English-language military discourse based on the following approaches:

- a complicated approach, which aims to identify the characteristics of phraseological units of English-language military discourse, patterns of their reproducibility and use in military texts, establishing dependencies and relationships between functional and semantic qualities of phraseological units;

- partial-linguistic approach, the main task of which is to identify patterns of use of phraseological units in English texts of military discourse and the peculiarities of their role in the context of the content of the sentence, role of a particular part of speech,

taking into account the structure of phraseology and grammatical structure;

- structural-semantic approach aimed at establishing the patterns of structural formation and use of phraseology of English-language military discourse, identifying their semantic load;

- onomasiological approach, which is based on the analysis of lexical forms from content to form, the study of the fixation of phraseological units by meaning, i.e. their motivation, taking into account the type of professional activity, which allows to translate certain extra-verbal content into language form;

- cognitive approach, which will identify the features of selection, perception and adequacy of translation of phraseological units of English-language military discourse.

During the study, according to the classification of O.Selivanova used paradigmatic methods, namely constructive and structural (establishing the structure-model of the phraseological unit), functional (identifying as part of the language is phraseology and what grammatical function plays in the sentence, the study of functional features as well as ways of language functions realization), and inter-paradigmatic methods, in particular comparative or typological (definition and research of phraseology by highlighting their common and distinctive features, combination of phraseological units according to their proximity by groups and types – semantic fields).

In addition, a number of specific research methods were used, such as:

- the method of dictionary definitions, which allowed us to learn the meaning of phraseological units and to form our own dictionary of phraseology of English-language military discourse;

- method of phraseological description – one of the most common methods used to identify phraseological units; its techniques (observation, classification, opposition techniques) were used to collect material from sources of English-language military discourse, their classification, interpretation of semantic features of the studied phraseological units;

- method of phraseological identification (O. Kunin) – the method serves and was used to determine the phraseological set of words and the possibility of classifying such a set as phraseological units; this method is based on the analysis of different types of phraseological meanings, the ratio of elements of phraseology and its entire structure, and also helps to distinguish phraseology among complex words and phrases.

#### **Conclusions and prospects for further research.**

Thus, the analysis allows us to draw the following conclusions:

- there are many approaches and views of foreign and domestic scientists to understand the concepts of "methodology" and "methods". Based on the analysis and taking into account the peculiarities of the study of the phraseological space of English-language military discourse, it can be stated that the most successful definition of "method" given by M. Alefirenko, according to which the method is a set of techniques, rules, methods, actions, principles. scientific research to solve the tasks, as well as achieving the goal in the linguistic field;

- based on the opinions and views of well-known scholars and linguists, by optimizing and reducing the necessary components and components to a reasonable minimum, the study of phraseological units of English-language military discourse was carried out using complicative, partial-linguistic, structural-se-

semantic, cognitive and onomasiological approaches. Each of them contributed to the achievement of certain objectives and goals of the study;

- in addition, to achieve the goal of their own research the most convenient and effective are structural, functional, typological, comparative research methods, as well as such specific methods as the method of dictionary definitions, the method of phraseological description, the method of phraseological identifications. The application of these approaches and methods allowed to identify a set of phraseological units of English-language military discourse, to analyze them, to classify and highlight their structure.

In the future, it is planned to analyze the cognitive features and patterns of discovery and adequacy of phraseological units translation, which are found in English texts on military topics.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Алефиренко Н. Ф. Современные проблемы науки о языке: Учеб. пособие. М., 2005. С. 395.
2. Амосова Н.Н. Основы английской фразеологии. Л.: Изд-во Ленинградского университета, 1989. 208 с.
3. Арнольд И.В. Основы научных исследований в лингвистике. – М: Высшая школа, 1991. 346 с.
4. Архангельский В.Л. О постоянных и переменных в структуре устойчивой фразы. Филологические науки, 1961. № 1. С. 210–213.
5. Гаврин С.Г. Вопросы лексико-семантического и грамматического анализа фразеологических единиц современного русского языка (на материале устойчивых метафорических сочетаний): автореф. дис. ... канд. филол. наук. М, 1962. 20 с.
6. Гончаренко С.У. Педагогічні дослідження: Методологічні поради молодим науковцям. Київ-Вінниця: ДОВ «Вінниця», 2008. 278с. С.70.
7. Ефремов О. Ю. Философия : учебник для военных вузов. Санкт-Петербург : Издательский дом "Питер". 2014. С. 8.
8. Єріна А.М., Захожай В.Б., Єрін Д.Л. Методологія наукових досліджень: навчальний посібник. Київ: Центр навчальної літератури, 2004. 212с.
9. Звегинцев В. А. Очерки по общему языкознанию.– М., 1962. – С. 90.
10. Иванова Л.П. Методы лингвистических исследований. – Киев: ИСНО, 1995.
11. Іваницька Н.Б. Зіставне мовознавство в системі лінгвістичних дисциплін. Нова філологія. 2014. № 64. С. 220–225.
12. Іващенко В.Л., Туровська Л.В. Слов'янське зіставне, порівняльне і типологічне термінознавство кінця ХХ – початку ХХІ століть. Мовознавство. 2014. № 2. С. 24–42
13. Кочерган М.П. Основы зіставного мовознавства. Київ : Академія, 2006. 424 с.
14. Кочерган М. Загальне мовознавство: підр. 3-тє видання. Київ: Видавничий центр «Академія», 2010. 234 с.
15. Селіванова О. С. Сучасна лінгвістика : термінологічна енциклопедія. Полтава : Довкілля-К. 2006. 716 с.
16. Стернин И.А., Стернина М.А. Виды и методы сопоставительных исследований лексики. Вестник ВГУ. Серия: филология. Журналистика. 2017. № 1. С. 66–68.
17. Токарева И.И. Принципы и методы исследования языка: Курс лекций / Под ред. А.П. Клименко. – Мн.: МГЛУ, 2004. – 121 с.
18. Українська мова : енциклопедія / редкол.: В. М. Русанівський (співголова), О. О. Тараненко (співголова), М. П. Зяблюк та ін. 2-е вид., виправл. і доп. Київ : Укр. Енциклопедія. 2004. 824 с. С. 359

#### REFERENCES

1. Alefirenko N. F. Sovremennyye problemy nauki o yazyike: Ucheb. posobie. [Modern problems of the science of language]. М., 2005, P.395 [in Russian].
2. Amosova N.N. Osnovy angliyskoy frazeologii. [Fundamentals of English phraseology]. L.: Izd-vo Leningradskogo universiteta, 1989, 208 p. [in Russian].
3. Arnold I.V. Osnovy nauchnyh issledovaniy v lingvistike. [Fundamentals of Scientific Research in Linguistics]. M: Vysshaya shkola, 1991, 346 p. [in Russian.]
4. Arhangel'skiy V.L. O postoyannykh i peremennykh v strukture ustoychivoy frazyi. [About constants and variables in the structure of a stable phrase]. Filologicheskie nauki, 1961. № 1. P.210–213. [in Russian].
5. Gavrin S.G. Voprosy leksiko-semanticheskogo i grammaticheskogo analiza frazeologicheskikh edinit sovremennogo russkogo yazyika (na materiale ustoychivyyih metaforicheskikh sochetaniy): avtoref. dis. ... kand. filol. nauk. [Questions of

lexical-semantic and grammatical analysis of phraseological units of the modern Russian language (based on stable metaphorical combinations)]. M, 1962. P.20. [in Russian].

6. Honcharenko S.U. Pedagogichni doslidzhennia: Metodolohichni porady molodym naukovtsiam.[ Pedagogical Pre-school: Methodological Pleasure for Young Science] Kyiv-Vinnytsia: DOV «Vinnytsia», 2008. P.70.

7. Efremov O. Yu. Filosofiia : uchebnik dlya voennykh vuzov. Sankt-Peterburg : Izdatelskiy dom "Piter". [Philosophy: a textbook for military universities], 2014. P.8 [in Russian].

8. Ierina A.M., Zakhozha V.B., Yerin D.L. Metodolohiia naukovykh doslidzen: navchalnyi posibnyk. Kyiv: Tsentri navchalnoi literatury. Research methodology: a textbook]. 2004. P.212.

9. Zvegintsev V. A. Ocherki po obschemu yazykoznaniiu. [Essays on General Linguistics] M., 1962. P.90 [in Russian].

10. Ivanova L.P. Metody lingvisticheskikh issledovaniy. [Linguistic research methods]. Kiev: ISIO. [in Russian]

11. Ivanytska N.B. Zistavne movoznavstvo v systemi lingvistychnykh dystsyplin. [Legal knowledge in the systems of linguistic disciplines] Nova filolohiia. 2014. № 64. P. 220–225.

12. Ivashchenko V.L., Turovska L.V. Slovianske zistavne, porivnialne i typolohichne terminoznavstvo kintsia XX – pochatku XXI stolit.[ Slavic comparative, comparative and typological terminology of the late XX – early XXI centuries] Movoznavstvo. 2014. № 2. P. 24–42

13. Kocherhan M.P. Osnovy zistavnoho movoznavstva.[ Fundamentals of comparative linguistics]. Kyiv : Akademiia, 2006. 424 p.

14. Kocherhan M. Zahalne movoznavstvo: pidr. 3-tie vydannia. [General linguistics]. Kyiv: Vydavnychi tseutri «Akademiia», 2010. P. 234.

15. Selivanova O. S. Suchasna lingvistyka : terminolohichna entsyklopediia. [Modern linguistics]. Poltava: Dovkillia, 2006. 716 p.

16. Sternin I.A., Sternina M.A. Vidy i metodyi sopostavitelnykh issledovaniy leksiki. [Types and methods of comparative research of vocabulary]. Vestnik VGU. Seriya: filologiya. Zhurnalistika, 2017. № 1. P.66–68. [in Russian].

17. Tokareva I.I. Printsipy i metodyi issledovaniya yazyka: Kurs lektsiy / Pod red. A.P. Klimenko. [Principles and methods of language research]. Mn.: MHLU, 2004. P.121. [in Russian].

18. Ukrainska mova : entsyklopediia / redkol.: V. M. Rusanivskiyi (spivholova), O. O. Taranenko (spivholova), M. P. Ziabliuk ta in. 2-e vyd., vypravl. i dop. Kyiv : Ukr. Entsyklopediia. [Ukrainian language: encyclopedia], 2004. P.359