

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.18454/RULB.2021.25.1.7>**ОСОБЕННОСТИ НАУЧНОГО ДИСКУРСА В РАЗЛИЧНЫХ ЯЗЫКАХ**

Научная статья

Винникова Т.А.^{1*}, Зорина Ю.В.²¹ ORCID: 0000-0001-5865-1023;^{1,2} Омский государственный технический университет, Омск, Россия

* Корреспондирующий автор (vitalex[at]rambler.ru)

Аннотация

В статье освещается особый продукт мыслительной деятельности — научный дискурс. Авторами указываются следующие отличительные признаки, присущие научному дискурсу разных языков: информативность, логичность, точность изложения, использование определенной терминологии. Отмечается, что выбор языковых средств строго детерминирован как интра-, так и экстралингвистическими факторами и затрагивает все уровни языка. В статье определяется, что лингвистические средства научного дискурса, коррелируют как с письменной и устной разновидностями данного дискурса, так и с типом естественного языка. В работе приводится обзор отличительных фонетических, лексических, морфологических, синтаксических характеристик научного дискурса.

Ключевые слова: научный дискурс, научный стиль, научный текст, термин.

PECULIARITIES OF SCIENTIFIC DISCOURSE IN DIFFERENT LANGUAGES

Research article

Vinnikova T.F.^{1*}, Zorina Yu.V.²¹ ORCID: 0000-0001-5865-1023;^{1,2} Omsk State Technical University, Omsk, Russia

* Corresponding author (vitalex[at]rambler.ru)

Abstract

The article highlights a special product of thought activity, scientific discourse. The authors identify the following distinctive features: the informational value, consistency, accuracy, the use of terminology. It is noted that the choice of linguistic tools is strictly determined by both intra- and extralinguistic factors and affects all levels of the language. The article determines that linguistic means belonging to a scientific discourse correlate with both the written and oral varieties of this discourse, and with the type of natural language. A review of the distinctive phonetic, lexical, morphological, syntactic characteristics of scientific discourse is given.

Keywords: scientific discourse, scientific style, scientific text, term.

Introduction

The selection of language tools and methods of scientific style is carried out in accordance with its main requirements to high informative value, logic nature, clarity, and accuracy on the language level [1, P. 110], [2, P. 27]. The scientific style allows achieving the objectives of scientific communication in the shortest possible time, since its main functional task is to transfer scientific information. The complex content of scientific texts requires an unambiguous and consistently logical designation. The variability of decryption of texts in the scientific style should be minimal [3, P. 17]. So, the language means of scientific style are characterized by conciseness, clarity, and the use of clichés. Scientific communication in any language has the following characteristics: formalism in speech, focus on the written variety of language, focus on the competent addressee.

All these characteristics of scientific style are universal; they are inherent in scientific texts in any language. The list of these tools, their selection and functioning in the scientific style of different languages are specific in accordance with their typological structure and individual historical development [4, P. 56]. The universal features are represented by different language material in different languages, depending on various factors of intra- and extralinguistic aspects. Scientific texts use the optimal means of all levels of language that are necessary for communicative purposes.

Results

The development of scientific speech is associated with a focus on written diversity, with all language means being subjected to regulation and strict selection. Oral scientific discourse follows the rules of oral speech, but its focus on the written form generally remains. Academic lectures, scientific reports are pre-recorded in writing, and then articulated. Presentations at academic events are less formal in comparison with the mentioned types of messages, although they are more based on the more common written form. The strategies of text formation that operate in scientific speech are quite unified and rational: scientific texts with a clear cognitive function are as close as possible in meaning, they often require the recipient to become familiar with the used apparatus of concepts, but in general do not require changes when tracking information. Texts of this type are usually considered as the most detailed [5, P. 437].

The specifics of using the tools of the common language in the scientific sphere of communication affect all linguistic levels — phonological, lexical, morphological, syntactic. But, above all, the stratification of a literary language affects the lexical and syntactic means of the language, and to a lesser extent phonetic and morphological differences are used.

Since the scientific style belongs to the sphere of formal speech activity, it demands strict observance of the phonetic norm of the language, for example, full utterance of sounds. In the oral speech of a scientist or a specialist, only individual

distortions in speech that are not essential for the phonetic norm may appear. The requirements for clarity of language expression in the scientific style make it necessary to observe the literary norm of pronunciation. Phonetic variation, which prevents from understanding the sounds of speech, is unacceptable in the scientific style. Special attention is paid in oral scientific communication to expressiveness, compliance with the basic rules of rhetoric: the speech of a scientist should sound clearly, in a well-developed rhythm and pace, with necessary pauses, still it is quite monotonous and unimpressive due to the lack of emotional color, the intonation is mainly narrative. The expressiveness of the speech of a scientist, lecturer, teacher, specialist is also important from the point of view of presenting exemplary speech.

Transfer of scientific thought requires careful selection of appropriate vocabulary to ensure clarity and consistency of presentation, emotional neutrality and correct use of uniquely perceived lexical means.

Therefore, it is absolutely justified that the special dictionary of the main lexical fund in the scientific style is represented by terminology, which in addition to the nominative terminological layer (expressed, as a rule, by nouns) contains terminated units, expressed by other significant parts of speech (terms-verbs, adjectives, adverbs), as well as prepositional-case constructions, functionally performing the same role as the terms [4, P. 59]. This is a kind of clichés for certain structures such as, for example, "*in ... mode*" (compare: *in manual mode*), "*in ... performance*" (compare: *in professional performance*). The periphery of the scientific lexical fund includes those language tools that are often present in special speech (texts) as individual author's nominations.

In a complex and multidimensional system of verbal means, rather autonomous functional layers appear. At the top of them there is general scientific vocabulary, aimed to express categories and concepts that are fundamentally and productively applicable to all branches of scientific knowledge. The above-mentioned layer combines the nominations of logical and philosophical categories with their inherent epistemological universality, the categories and concepts of a new type arising as a result of the mathematization and cybernetization, electronics and informatization of science, and also as a result of the integration of intersectoral intra-scientific processes and the address of scientists to modern research methods. The same lexemes can be neutral, common words and general scientific terms [6, P. 154].

One of the main features of scientific discourse is the use of special terminology. Special terms are included in a specific terminological system related to the conceptual system of the corresponding branch of science or knowledge. Terms can be represented by different morphological layers, whether they are separate lexical units, or terminological combinations.

There is a clichéd nature of language resources in scientific discourse. It arises from the typical compatibility of words. Typical phrases are passed from text to text, which eventually turn into clichés and are not created again but are introduced into scientific discourse in a ready-made form, for example *as shown by the study*, we will consider these processes in more detail, in conclusion, it is necessary to pay attention to the fact that [7, P. 14].

It is possible to refer to the typical lexical means of scientific discourse various composite structures, namely, verb-nominal constructions, substituting words-verbs that have greater communicative clarity, for example: *is a description* instead of *describes*, *finds application* instead of *is applied*, etc. These structures are the result of semantic decompression, the diffuse deployment of a correlating verb. Their applicability in scientific discourse is defined by the property of essentialization of scientific knowledge, due to the entelechy (the idea of actualization) of the name [8, P. 42].

As for the syntax of scientific discourse, it is necessary that the latter should meet the main functional task of the style.

Regarding the branch of science, the genre of scientific work, simple or common narrative sentences prevail. In order to transfer the full volume of information, the syntax of scientific texts often contain subordinate clauses, and various detached constructions. Interrogative sentences are possible in the formulation of scientific problems or as a rhetorical question to draw attention to the problem under study. This type of sentence is found in oral scientific discourse, although it is not excluded in its written form. The following sentence models are used in the discourse under consideration, for example, *noun + linking verb + noun*.

To achieve the content consistency of the scientific text, it presents a variety of communication means of syntactic units, such as demonstrative pronouns, correlates, etc. Sentences often consist of several predicative structures. Complicated sentences can include subordinate clauses, introductory clauses, participial clauses, infinitive constructions, and so on. Impersonal and indefinite-personal sentences are often used to formulate the results of research.

Analytical languages lack regular use of morphological forms of words. However, the role of morphological tools in emphasizing the functionality of the scientific style in synthetic languages is very important. The style in the synthetic languages is characterized by such morphological means as: present tense verb forms, third person verb forms, passive voice, definite article.

The generalizing potential of science determines the frequent use of nouns in scientific discourse. Nominalization is the result of simplifying the sentence structure, including compression [9, P. 17]. The specificity of this phenomenon is found in the features of the functioning of morphological means in the scientific style of different languages. For example, in German, the use of feminine nouns in scientific discourse, which are characteristic of the expression of abstract concepts, is increasing: *Verbreitung – distribution, Klassifikation – classification, Verwendung – use*. In the scientific style of the Russian language, there is an increased frequency of neuter nouns [10, P. 273]: *upotreblenie, rukovodstvo, upravlenie, raspredelenie*. Within the framework of nominalization, English uses common suffixal nouns, and nouns resulting from the conversion: *utverzhdnie – statement, iskljuchenie – elimination, claim – utverzhdnie*.

Conclusion

Scientific discourse is conservative, strictly oriented to established language norms, but it is also subject to development along with language as a whole and society progress. The comparative study of structural and linguistic phenomena of various scientific and technical discursive types will undoubtedly make a significant contribution to the theory and practice of intercultural speech interaction.

Конфликт интересов

Не указан.

Conflict of Interest

None declared.

Список литературы / References

1. Комиссаров В. Н. Теория перевода (лингвистические аспекты) / Комиссаров В. Н. – М.: Высшая школа, 1990. – 253 с.
2. Разинкина Т. М. Функциональная стилистика / Разинкина Т. М. – М.: Высшая школа, 1989. – 181 с.
3. Наер В. Л. Прагматика научных текстов (вербальный и невербальный аспекты) / Наер В. Л. // Функциональные стили: Лингвометодологические аспекты. — М.: Наука, 1985. – С. 14 – 25.
4. Зорина Ю. В. Лингвистическая специфика научного дискурса / Зорина Ю. В. – Омск: ОмГТУ, 2013. – 104 с.
5. Маженова М. Р. Теория текста и традиционные проблемы поэтики / М. Р. Маженова // Новое в зарубежной лингвистике. – 1978. – № 8. – С. 425 – 441.
6. Марчук Ю. Н. Сопоставление общенаучной лексики в обучении переводу / Марчук Ю. Н. // Сопоставительная лингвистика и обучение неродному языку. – М.: Наука, 1987. – С. 152 – 156.
7. Исакова Л. Д. Характерные свойства лингвистического дискурса / Исакова Л. Д. – М.: ИПК МГЛУ «Рема», 2012. – 96 с.
8. Галущко Т. Г. Язык в свете современных концепций оснований науки и проблема глагольных аналитических конструкций: автореф. дис. ... канд. филол. н. – М., 1999. – 46 с.
9. Пугачева Е. Ф. Эволюция средств выражения каузальных отношений в английском языке научной прозы XVIII-XX вв.: дис. ... канд. филол. н. – М., 1996. – 199 с.
10. Кожина М. Н. О речевой системности научного стиля сравнительно с некоторыми другими / Кожина М. Н. – Пермь: Изд-во Пермского гос. университета, 1972. — 395 с.

Список литературы на английском / References in English

1. Komissarov V. N. Teoriya perevoda (lingvisticheskie aspekty) [Translation theory (linguistic aspects)] / Komissarov V. N. – M.: Vyshaya shkola, 1990. – 253 p. [in Russian]
2. Razinkina N. M. Funkcional'naya stilistika [Functional stylistics] / Razinkina N. M. – M.: Vyshaya shkola, 1989. – 181 p. [in Russian]
3. Naer V. L. Pragmatika nauchnyh tekstov (verbal'nyj i neverbal'nyj aspekty) [Pragmatics of scientific texts (verbal and nonverbal aspects)] / Naer V. L. // Funkcional'nye stili: Lingvometodologicheskie aspekty [Functional styles: Linguistic and methodological aspects]. — M.: Nauka. 1985. – P. 14 – 25. [in Russian]
4. Zorina Yu. V. Lingvisticheskaya specifika nauchnogo diskursa [Linguistic peculiarities of scientific discourse] / Zorina Yu. V. – Omsk: OmGTU, 2013. – 104 p. [in Russian]
5. Majenova M. R. Teoriya teksta i tradicionnye problemy poetiki [The theory of the text and the traditional problems of poetics] / M. R. Majenova // Novoe v zarubezhnoj lingvistike [New in foreign linguistics]. – 1978. – V. 8. – P. 425 – 441. [in Russian]
6. Marchuk Yu. N. Sopostavlenie obshchenauchnoj leksiki v obuchenii perevodu [Comparing of general scientific vocabulary in the teaching of translation] / Marchuk Yu. N. // Sopostavitel'naya lingvistika i obuchenie nerodnomu yazyku. [Comparative linguistics in foreign language teaching] – M.: Nauka, 1987. – P. 152 – 156. [in Russian]
7. Isakova L. D. Harakternye svoystva lingvisticheskogo diskursa [Characteristics of linguistic discourse] / Isakova L. D. – M.: IPK MGLU «Rema», 2012. – 96 p. [in Russian]
8. Galushko T. G. Yazyk v svete sovremennyh koncepcij osnovanij nauki i problema glagol'nyh analiticheskikh konstrukcij [Language in terms of modern concepts of science foundations and the problem of verbal analytical constructions]: avtoref. dis. ... of PhD in Philology. – M., 1999. – 46 p. [in Russian]
9. Pugacheva E. F. Evolyuciya sredstv vyrazheniya kauzal'nyh otnoshenij v anglijskom yazyke nauchnoj prozy XVIII–XX vv. [in Russian]: dis. ... of PhD in Philology: defense of the thesis. – M., 1996. – 199 p. [in Russian]
10. Kozhina M. N. O rechevoj sistemnosti nauchnogo stilya sravnitel'no s nekotorymi drugimi [On the speech consistency of scientific style in comparison with some others] / Kozhina M. N. – Perm': Izd-vo Permskogo gos. un-ta, 1972. — 395 p. [in Russian]