



МИНИСТЕРСТВО НАУКИ И ВЫСШЕГО ОБРАЗОВАНИЯ РОССИЙСКОЙ
ФЕДЕРАЦИИ

федеральное государственное бюджетное образовательное учреждение
высшего образования

«РОССИЙСКИЙ ГОСУДАРСТВЕННЫЙ
ГИДРОМЕТЕОРОЛОГИЧЕСКИЙ УНИВЕРСИТЕТ»

Кафедра английского языка и литературы

ВЫПУСКНАЯ КВАЛИФИКАЦИОННАЯ РАБОТА

На тему Лингвостилистические особенности маркированных языковых единиц в
научном функциональном стиле речи

Исполнитель _____ Малышкин Дмитрий Владимирович _____

(фамилия, имя, отчество)

Руководитель _____ к.ф.н., доцент _____

(ученая степень, ученое звание)

_____ Ильинская Яна Анатольевна _____

(фамилия, имя, отчество)

«К защите допускаю»

Заведующий кафедрой _____  _____

_____ к.ф.н., доцент _____

(ученая степень, ученое звание)

_____ Родичева Анна Анатольевна _____

(фамилия, имя, отчество)

«29» июня 2020г.

Санкт-Петербург

	1
	2
1.		12
1.1	12
1.2	16
1.3	« - - »	21
II.	-	25
2.1	25
2.2	27
III.	36
3.1		36
3.2		... 38
III	40
4.	 42
4.1		.
	42
4.2		.
	“restricted scientific English”	49
4.3		.
	55
4.4		-
.	61
IV	69
	70
	73

1954 1956 .

[3].

» [11].

« » , ,
[12]. « »

,
[13].

« » ,
-
[17]. ,
« », ,

-
[53].

, , , , ,
[24].
« »

, , , , ,
[24].
« » , « »
-
:

, , » [9]. ,
« »

, [35].

« » « »,

1963

« . ».

,
, « » « »,

[10].

. «

»,

, . . .

, . «

»

[14].

. . . «

»

« », « », « - »

« » [52].

, « »

« »,

, . . .

«

»,

« » . . .

« . » . . .

, ,

[19]. . .

, . . .

,

[13]. . . .

,

[1]. . . .

. . . .

,

.

,

[18].

,

,

. . . .

.

:

,

,

[6].

.

.

«Investigating English style».

,

,

[28].

«

»

.

,

,

—

.

.

,

.

,

.

XX

,

,

,

-

.

. . . : «

» [16] «

» [17].

,

,

.

[17].

,

«

», «

,

,

,

,

,

».

. . . ,

,

.

,

,

,

,

[11].

,

. . . «

» «

»,

,

.

,

« » [22, 23].

« »
»,

[4].

· · · · ·

[18]. · · ·

: , · · [21].

· · · · ·
· · · · ·
· · · · ·
· · · · ·

[3].

· · · · ·
· · · · ·
· · · · ·

[24].

« History of Scientific English»

Language of Science» . [27]. «The

[30].

[11].

[11].

[11].

« »

[11].

. . .
-
.

[29].

, ,
.
.
.
.

[18].

to seem,

. ,
.
. . ,
, ,
- . ,
,

[14].

, , , . .
. 1)
« »
, - ,
, ,

1.

1.1

« » .
 .
 .
 « », .
 .
 ,
 .
 ;
 ;
 . « »
 , . .
 [29].

« » . ,
 . « » .
 106 [71].

«Hence, anything resembling the ancient style in shape or use» -
 Webster [74]. McMillan ,
 «the individual way that someone behaves and does things» [66]. Oxford
 dictionary «An official or legal title» [68].

, « » -
 . , , . ,
 , , .
 .
 , , .

« », «
».
« »
«
— —
— , » [10, 7 .].
« »
«
» . . « -
,
,
,
-
; ,
, , (. .
) ,
» [2, 455 .].
,
.
« » 1967
, « — ,
,
,
».
[14, 437 .].
, — ,

· ,
· ,
· — , , ,
· « »
· « » [42, 36].

« » . .
« ,
— ,
— : —
— , — ,
— — , —
— , —
— —
» [2, . 455-456].

· , · . .
« » . « —
· ,
· ,

« » ,
· » [46, 221].

· , · . . ,
· , · M.

· ,
· . . ,
· ,
· .

. - ,
« » « ». - ,
« ».
« » « »
. . , ,
. ,
.
«
» [10, 8 .]. . .
« ».
. ,
;
« - », « - » . .
,
, [36, 214 c.]
,
. . . « »
[7, 200 .]. , ,
:
-
, - ,
- . ,
.
. . « » [33 ,
34 .]. ,
« » « ».
« » .

[37, 150 c.].

[37, 148 .].

» [11, 252 .].

1.3

« — — »

[49, 10 .].

[52, . 84-85].

[52, .84-85].

,
[27, 7 .].

. . ,
, ,

[24, 12 .].

,
-
.
,
,
,
- ,

I

« »,
« ».

, ,
, ,
.
, ,
, ,
, « -
, ,
, ,

« » ,
, ».

II.

-

2.1

1)

[57, 63 .].

2)

3) — , ,
.

· , ,
, ,
· ,
·

[62, 5 c.].

4) · , ,
, ,
· ,
· ,

[54,

502 .].

, ,
, ,
, , ,
, ,
· ,
·

2.2

[40, 25 .].

□.

" "

[17, с.

324].

-
 .
 - , .
 -
 .
 .
 -
 .
 .
 : , ,
 , , , , .
 , .
 : , , , , ,
 .
 .
 . . ,
 «
 ».
 « » ,
 - -

[24, 12 .].

,
 , . . .
 -
 ,
 .

[24, 80 .]. .

1)

2)

«

»,

3)

«

»,

1-

2.3

72 .].

[5,

[16, 25

.].

” [30, 11 .].

[45, 3 .].

[45, 4 .].

» [38, 9 .].

» [47, 7 .].

» [23, 101 .].

14 .].

[32,

[4, 12 .].

» [5, 70 .].

II

.
, ,
.
, ,
.
—
.

III.

3.1

[18, 26 c.] .

[2, 447 .].

. [2, 341 .].

[23, 114 c.].

[25,

150 c.].

[15, 321

c.].

3.2

[15, .424] .

«««

» [31, 87 .].

» [23, 120 c.].

1. - ;

2. - [23, 140c.]

[23, 143 c.].

[24, 148 c.]

III

•
•
,
,
,
-
• • •
, • •
,
•
• •
,
•
,
•
,
•
•
,
•
•
•

4.

4.1

» . . . [69].

«**Classifier:** (1) A word or prefix used in various languages to indicate the grammatical or semantic classification of words. (Cf. classificatory language, numerative classifier.)—(2) In the ideographic writings, especially Chinese, an additional symbol added to the phonetic (q.v.) to form a compound ideographic character.

Clause: In general a subdivision of a sentence containing a subject and a predicate.

Click: A speech-sound, produced by an inspiration of air, characteristic of the Bushman and Hottentot languages, and also of the Kafir-Sotho group of the Bantu languages.

Clipped word: A word that has lost its initial or final part or both.

Closed stress: Sweet's term for the stress when the consonant is heard while the vowel still has its maximum intensity.

Closed syllable: A syllable ending in a consonant. Also called blocked or checked syllable.

Closed vowel: A vowel pronounced with the mouth opened less than in the production of another vowel sound.

Closure: The phonetic process by which some part or parts of the speech mechanism momentarily cut off the stream of air, producing an occlusive or stop sound.

Cluster: In phonetics, a group of phonemes, not necessarily constituting a syllable.

Cocoliche: An "immigrant language" in Argentina, consisting of a mixture of Italian and Spanish.

Cognate words: Two or more words in different languages which have the same root.

Cohortative mood: In some languages, a distinct mood, used in utterances expressing an exhortation, encouragement, suggestion, etc. The designation is applied by grammarians in general to the imperative or subjunctive moods when used in such sentences.

Coinage: The creation of a new, artificial word; also, the process of creating such word.

Coined word: An artificial word, deliberately created for a certain purpose.

Collateral clause: A subordinate clause (q.v.)» [69, p. 43-44].

,
.
,
,
,
,
: «subject», «predicate», «clause»,
«vowel», «consonant», «phonemes», «phonetics».
, «process», «inspiration», «air», «creation»,
«word», «sound», «mechanism»

,
,
,
«a group of phonemes», «a mixture of Italian and
Spanish», «a subdivision of a sentence»,

grammatical or semantic classification of words», «The phonetic process».

: « maximum», «additional», «opened», «different», «new».

«A word that has lost its initial or final part», «A vowel pronounced with the mouth opened», «some part or parts of the speech mechanism momentarily cut off the stream of air», «called blocked or checked syllable» -

«speech mechanism»

«speech»

«produced», «pronounced», «producing».

: «indicate», «form», «called»,
«express», «create»

«to indicate»
«A word or prefix used in various
languages to indicate the grammatical or semantic classification of words».

«placed over a vowel to indicate the correct sound in
pronunciation»; «affixation (qq.v.) which may be used to indicate the concepts of
time»; «prefixed to words in philological texts to indicate that the word or word -
form».

«to indicate»

[1, 80 .].

«cut off».

« » [59].

«**Lexeme**: the smallest contrastive unit in a semantic system(run, cat, switch on); also called lexical item;

Lexical diffusion: the gradual spread of a linguistic change through a language;

Lexical verb: A verb expressing an action, event, or state; also called a full or main verb;

Lexicography: The art and science of dictionary-making(carried on by lexicographers);

Lexicology: The study of the history and present state of a language's vocabulary (carried on by lexicologists);

Lexicon: The vocabulary of a language, especially in dictionary form; also called lexis;

Liaison: The pronunciation of a consonant at the end of a word when the next word begins with a vowel (linking)

Ligature: A character in which two or more letters have been joined together;

Lingua Franca: A medium of communication for people who speak different first languages;

Lingual/linguo-: Said of any sound made with the tongue;

Linguist: Someone who is proficient in several languages; A student or practitioner of the subject of linguistics; also called a linguistcian;

Linguistic atlas: A set of maps showing the geographical distribution of linguistic terms; also called dialect atlas;

Linguistics: The science of language; also called linguistic science or linguistic sciences;

Linking: A sound introduced between two syllables or words, for ease of pronunciation, as in the English linking in (car and bus);

Lipogram: A text from which a specific letter has been omitted throughout » [59, 454 p.].

: «language», «verb», «vocabulary», «pronunciation», «consonant», «vowel», «syllables», «words».

«form», «end», «unit», «system», «spread», «set», «science»

: « semantic», «linguistic», «dictionary».

: «maximum», «additional», «opened», «different», «new».

‘full/main verb’,

«expressing», «have been joined», «has been omitted»,
«speak».

4.2

“restricted scientific English”

: theory, phenomenon, to analyze, to observe, to show

[56].

«The previous discussion already touched on the question about the morphosyntactic status of proper noun modifiers. For German and Swedish, this is not a question as proper noun modifiers are straightforwardly recognisable as part of compounds. In English, by contrast, how to distinguish phrasal modification and compounding is a longstanding and vexed question. Breban (2018) suggests a dual functionally motivated analysis with some proper noun modifiers being phrasal and other parts of compounds.

For most of the articles in this issue, the question is not a salient one that affects their argumentation. Alexiadou, for example, focuses solely on synthetic patterns, which she refers to as compounds. In other articles, the topic is touched on in passing, e.g. Rosenbach. Breban & De Smet show that the issue is not restricted to current English, but that the precursors of present-day proper noun modifiers are both clearly phrasal modifiers and likely compounds.

Their relation to determiner genitives has been at the heart of the discussion surrounding proper noun modifiers. Rosenbach and Koptjevskaja-Tamm's seminal ideas were conceived against the background of their previous individual work on genitive and possessive constructions, and Rosenbach (2006, 2007, 2010) investigates proper noun modifiers as part of a wider research project on the grammatical variation and gradience between genitives and noun modifiers. Central to her argument is that determiner genitives and proper noun modifiers are semantically/functionally equivalent. This idea has been challenged: Breban (2018) argues that they both help identify the noun phrase referent but do this in different ways and are therefore functionally different. Schlücker (2018) argues that the two constructions are semantically different in that, even when they alternate, determiner genitives express relations within the 'genitive repertoire' and proper noun modifiers express relations from the 'noun modifier repertoire' [56, p. 751-752].

«discussion», «question», «status», «part», «analysis», «argument»,
«argumentation», «articles», «topic», «issue», «patterns», «precursors», «relation»,
«ideas», «background», «work», «constructions», «project», «variation»,
«gradience», «referent», «ways» .

» [41].

«morphosyntactic status», «part of compounds»,

«previous discussion», «vexed question».

terms of», «for the first time», «under these conditions»,

«heart».

«at the heart of discussion».

o «heart»

: «morphosyntactic», «phrasal», «genitive», «possessive»,
«grammatical», «noun».

[3, 95 .],

: «previous»,
«recognizable», «longstanding», «vexed», «salient», «synthetic», «other»,
«restricted», «current», «wider», «research», «central», «equivalent», «different».

: «proper
noun modifiers are straightforwardly **recognisable** as part of compounds»,
«phrasal modification and compounding is **a longstanding** and **vexed** question»,
«focuses solely on **synthetic** patterns, which she refers to as compounds»,
«investigates proper noun modifiers as part of a **wider** research», «Central to her
argument is that determiner genitives and proper noun modifiers are

semantically/functionally equivalent», «constructions are semantically different in that, even when they alternate, determiner genitives express relations».

« + »: «touched on the question», «to distinguish phrasal modification», «affects their argumentation».

«we argue that...»,
«introduced in more details».

[63].

« This study’s results show that in a perception task, listeners appear to be sensitive not only to the phonological category of pitch accents, but also their phonetic realization, as listeners appear to be sensitive to increasingly extreme manipulations of F0 within a single pitch accent type. In the traditional AM model of intonational phonology, pitch accent and edge tones have largely been binned into discrete categories, with meaning presumed to be attached to those categories and their combinations (Pierrehumbert & Hirschberg, 1990). The results presented here provide further motivation for considering intonational variation on a phonetic as well as a phonological level. This study also provides further motivation for the development of ethnolinguistic variety-specific ToBI models as well as phonetic methods for studying intonational variation cross-dialectally. While we have employed the MAE-ToBI conventions (Beckman & AyersElam, 1997) in this study, the nature of the intonational system of AAL has not yet been fully described (McLarty, 2018; Thomas, 2015). As the current study’s results provide evidence that listeners are sensitive to differences in the realization of F0 and timing of the L+H* pitch accent, future studies should examine whether the tonal inventory of AAL differs from MAE, as this could be one element that triggers the observed differences in listener judgements.

Relatedly, as much of the work on prosody has focused on the meaning of intonational contours in an imagined Standard American English as opposed to in specific varieties, it is clear that much more work is needed on both variation in speaker production and listener perception on contour meaning. Though the current study did not reveal differences in perception of ‘sounding black’ conditioned by listener demographics, future work should explore how such

perceptions could potentially be affected by listeners with different background and sociolinguistic experiences » [63, p. 71-78].

«pitch accent»,
«phonology», «tone», «prosody» .
«study»,
«result», «tasks», «category», «combinations», «realizations», «type», «model»,
«variation», «level», «development», «methods», «conventions», «studying»,
«nature», «system», «evidence», «differences», «inventory», «element»,
«judgments», «work», «production», «perception», «backgrounds», «experiences».

« + »/
« + ».
:
«sensitive», «extreme», «single», «traditional», «further», «current», «observed»,
«imagined», «specific», «future», «different».

4.3

«A sentence may consist of just one clause (it is then called a simple sentence) or it can be a complex sentence, involving several clauses. There may be

a main clause and a subordinate clause, joined to it by a conjunction, which can indicate reason (The old lion was sleeping because he was exhausted) or temporal sequence (The old lion was sleeping after eating the hunter) and so on.

Underlying both words and grammar there is semantics, the organisation of meaning. A word can have two sorts of meaning. First, it may have 'reference' to the world: red describes the colour of blood; chair refers to a piece of furniture, with legs and a back, on which a human being may comfortably sit. Secondly, a word has 'sense', which determines its semantic relation to other words, e.g. narrow is the opposite (more specifically: the antonym) of wide, and crimson refers to a colour that is a special sort of red (we say that crimson is a hyponym of red).

Every morpheme has a meaning. The ending -er, added to a verb, may derive a noun which refers either to the agent (e.g. baker) or else to an instrument intended for the activity (e.g. mower). Some morphemes have different meanings with different kinds of word: un- indicates an opposite quality with an adjective (e.g. kind, unkind), but a reverse action with a verb (tie, untie).

Meaning is also associated with the way in which words are combined to make phrases, clauses and sentences. Compare The dog bit the postman and The postman bit the dog, which involve the same word meanings but quite different sentence meanings because of the different syntactic arrangements.

As language is used, meaning is both the beginning and the end point. A speaker has some message in mind, and then chooses words with suitable meanings and puts them together in appropriate grammatical constructions; all these have established phonetic forms, which motivate how one speaks. A listener will receive the sound waves, decode them, and—if the act of communication is successful—understand the speaker's message.

The study of language must surely pay close attention to meaning. We consider the meanings of words, and their grammatical properties, and see how these interrelate. When a speaker of a language encounters a new word they may first of all learn its meaning, and will then have a fair idea of the morphological

and syntactic possibilities. Or they may first of all learn something of how to use the word grammatically, and this will help them to work out its meaning» [61, 6 p.].

: «red», «colour», «crimson», «blood», «chair», «legs», «back».

«idea», «possibilities», «speaker», «study», «point», «kind», «activity»,

[3, c. 114-117].

«sentence» «clause»
«meaning»

[22, c. 169].

«new», «fair», «close»,
«appropriate», «reverse», «opposite».

«suitable» «appropriate».

«invaluable source», «greater possibilities».

« » ,

«good» «bad» [39,

106 .].

: «can», «may», «will».

«encounters»

« »,

Oxford Learner's Dictionary []

'Underline'

«

».

'indicate'

«refers either to the agent (e.g. baker) or else to an instrument»,

«intended for».

« : , » [67].

«Before exploring the impact of corpora on linguistics in general, however, let us return to the observation that corpus linguistics focuses upon a group of methods for studying language. This is an important observation, but needs to be qualified. Corpus linguistics is not a monolithic, consensually agreed set of methods and procedures for the exploration of language. While some generalisations can be made that characterise much of what is called 'corpus linguistics', it is very important to realise that corpus linguistics is a heterogeneous field. Differences exist within corpus linguistics which separate out and subcategorise varying approaches to the use of corpus data. But let us first deal with the generalisations. We could reasonably define corpus linguistics as dealing with some set of machine-readable texts which is deemed an appropriate basis on

which to study a specific set of research questions. The set of texts or corpus dealt with is usually of a size which defies analysis by hand and eye alone within any reasonable timeframe. It is the large scale of the data used that explains the use of machine-readable text. Unless we use a computer to read, search and manipulate the data, working with extremely large datasets is not feasible because of the time it would take a human analyst, or team of analysts, to search through the text. It is certainly extremely difficult to search such a large corpus by hand in a way which guarantees no error. The next generalisation follows from this observation: corpora are invariably exploited using tools which allow users to search through them rapidly and reliably. Some of these tools, namely concordancers, allow users to look at words in context. 1 Most such tools also allow the production of frequency data of some description, for example a word frequency list, which lists all words appearing in a corpus and specifies for each word how many times it occurs in that corpus. Concordances and frequency data exemplify respectively the two forms of analysis, namely qualitative and quantitative, that are equally important to corpus linguistics» [67, 34 p.].

«group of methods» «set of methods».

«heterogeneous», «monolithic», «alone», «machine-readable».

4.4

«restricted scientific English»

«Housed in the modern, gabled, jarringly chrome, brick, and mustard yellow Stata Center at MIT is the Department of Linguistics and Philosophy. Noam Chomsky has had an office in the department for forty-five years. His room is full of shelves with books, five rubbery office plants, and a small table in the center facing a poster of Bertrand Russell. Under Russell's looming face is the quotation: "Three passions, simple but overwhelmingly strong, have governed my life: the longing for love, the search for knowledge, and unbearable pity for the suffering of mankind." Across Chomsky's desk stretch piles and piles of books and unbound manuscripts. They look like a small mountain range.

Prior to an office interview, Chomsky spoke at the 2005 Morris Symposium on the Evolution of Language at Stony Brook, New York. There, his speech seemed flat, almost without affect. He stood at a lectern and read directly from a paper, speaking in such low tones that it was sometimes hard to make out what he was saying. Today, in person he accompanies his greeting with a puckish grin but is otherwise grave. He takes a seat at the table and sits very still, talking in such a forceful stream that it is virtually impossible to get a word in edgewise. The sense that he cares deeply about what he is saying is unmistakable and compelling.

Chomsky's style of exposition in person is almost exactly the same as in his writings—he takes no prisoners. Depending on whether you disagree or agree with him, you will probably experience his manner as one of airless conviction or the just impatience of a man who knows the truth and is weary of waiting for others to get it. Debating him is a high-stakes venture—he shows little respect for the intelligence of those who don't accept his views.

Chomsky has served as a geographical constant in the minds of generations of scientists and linguists since the early 1960s. It was as if, on the publication of his first book, he thumped down a flag and said, "This is the North Pole," and the rest of the scientific world mapped itself accordingly» [70, 28 p.].

«Interview», «Symposium», «lectern»,
«paper», «tones», «greeting», «the table», «writings», «manner», «the truth»,
«venture», «respect», «intelligence», «views».

: «They
look like a small mountain range», «his speech seemed flat», «he takes no
prisoners», «in the minds of generations», «he thumped down a flag».

«He stood at a lectern and read directly from a paper, speaking in
such low tones that it was sometimes hard to make out what he was saying’ –
‘Even in the normally dry tones of science journals, you can perceive the
researchers’ surprise»
«airless conviction», «It was as if Chomsky had delivered unto Skinner and
behaviorism a knockout punch».

concerned», «as far as possible», «it can be argued that»

«to make out», «thumped down»,

«To get a word in edgewise», «to engage at some level with Chomsky's definition of language».

«To come to the idea», «To make observation»,

«an office – a room», «magazine – journal».

: «weary»,
«legendary», «hotly», «splash», «combative».

«flat speech», «the deepest mysteries», «the ridiculous way», «the compelling sense».

«Syntactic Structures, for example, contrasted two methods for writing a grammar. The best method, said Chomsky, collapsed all of language into a set of rules. And in much the same way that software generates output in a computer, those rules can generate an entire language. For example, an English sentence can be described as “S goes to NP VP,” meaning that a sentence (S) consists of a noun phrase (NP) and a verb phrase (VP). “NP goes to Det N” means that a noun phrase consists of an “a,” the determiner (Det), and a noun (N).⁷

Chomsky also pointed out that the set of language rules could be made smaller and simpler if you included ways to relate certain sentences to each other. “The man read the book” and “The book was read by the man,” for example, have a striking similarity. Instead of having separate rules for each of them, Chomsky suggested that the more complicated second sentence was derived from the first. He called this a transformation.

If the phrase structure analysis of “The man read the book” is “S goes to NP1 VP NP2,” then “The book was read by the man” can be represented as “S goes to NP2 VP by NP1.” In this way, the relationship between all the simple active sentences of English and their passive versions can be described by just these two simple structures and the transformational rule that links them.

Language, in this view, is basically a set of sentences. And the job of a grammar, or theory of language, is to generate all of the language’s allowable

sentences (“The cat sat on the mat”; “The plane was rocked by turbulence”) but none of the bad ones (“Cat mat the on sat”; “Turbulence plane by the rocked was”). A grammar generates all possible utterances of a language, Chomsky said, “in the same way that chemical theory generates all possible compounds» [70, 27 p.].

« grammar», «language»,
«sentence».

« method», «structure», «utterances»,
«theory», «relationship», «way», «analysis».

,
, -
« theory of language»,
«syntactic structures».

« syntactic», «transformational».
« certain»,
«entire», «simple», «allowable».

.
,
« The best method».

,
. .
, ,
,
-
« . » .

:
«As you are reading these words, you are taking part in one of the wonders of the natural world. For you and I belong to a species with a remarkable ability:

we can shape events in each other's brains with exquisite precision. I am not referring to telepathy or mind control or the other obsessions of fringe science; even in the depictions of believers these are blunt instruments compared to an ability that is uncontroversially present in every one of us. That ability is language. Simply by making noises with our mouths, we can reliably cause precise new combinations of ideas to arise in each other's minds. The ability comes so naturally that we are apt to forget what a miracle it is. So let me remind you with some simple demonstrations. Asking you only to surrender your imagination to my words for a few moments, I can cause you to think some very specific thoughts» [64, 9 p.]

«obsessions of fringe science», «surrender your imagination to my words».

«wonders», «remarkable ability», «exquisite precision», «blunt instruments», «miracle».

:
«The smallest part of a word, the part that cannot be cut up into any smaller parts, is called its root. Roots can combine with special suffixes to form stems. For example, the root Darwin can be found inside the stem Darwinian. The stem Darwinian in turn can be fed into the suffixing rule to yield the new stem Darwinianism. From there, the inflectional rule could even give us the word Darwinianisms, embodying all three levels of word structure. Interestingly, the pieces fit together in only certain ways. Thus Darwinism, a stem formed by the stem suffix -ism, cannot be a host for -ian, because -ian attaches only to roots; hence Darwinismian (which would mean “pertaining to Darwinism”) . Similarly, Darwinsian (“pertaining to the two famous Darwins, Charles and Erasmus”),

Darwinsianism, and Darwinsism are quite impossible, because whole inflected words cannot have any root or stem suffixes joined to them» [64, 27 p.]

«root», «stem», «suffix», «word».

«levels of word structure».

«piece», «part», «rule», «levels».

«part of a word», «levels of word structure».

«suffixing», «inflectional», «inflected».

«certain», «new», «special».

IV

«Restricted scientific English»,

, -
.

1. :
/ - : : ,2002. - 384 .
2. /
. -2- : ,2004. - 569 .
3. / ;
; - : URSS, 2009. - 392 .
4.
(. . . .) : ,1990.
5. : / - :
,1978. - 225 .
6.
: : 10.00.00. - ,
1961. - 275 .
7. /
- : ,1967. - 376 .
8.
: / - . : ,1976. -
239 .
9.
(. . . .) // :
75- — . : ,2002. — . 35-67.
10. /
- : ,1961. - 614 .
11. //
. -1955. - 1. - . 60-87.

12. /
 . . . - .: - . . . , 1963. - 255 .
13. / . . . - .: . . . ,
 2006. - 253 .
14. //
 / . . . - / : . . . , 1959. - 492 .
15.
 // . - : . . . , 1967. - .
 432-444.
16. / . . .
 - : - , 1958. - 459 .
17. / . . .
 - : . . . , 1955. - 463 .
18. : . . . / . . .
 , . . . - .: URSS, 2002. - 211 с.
19. / . . .
 . - 2- . . . - : : . . . , 2007. - 72 .
20. :
 : / . . . // 4 - .
 . - : . . . , 2004. - 205 .
21.
 : : 10.02.04. -
 - , 1960. - 16 .
22. / . . .
 . - : . . . , 1968. - 250 .
23.
 : / . . . -
 : « . . . » , 1972. - 325 .
24. / . . . -
 : . . . , 1977. - 223 .

25. Кожина, М. Н. Функциональный стиль / под ред. А. П. Сковородникова // Эффективное речевое общение (базовые компетенции) – Красноярск : Сибирский федеральный университет, 2014. – 852 с.

26. : 10.02.04. - , 1995. - 289 .

27. :
/ - :
, 1960. - 176 .

28. //
. 1984. 6. . 54-68.

29. - ...
. - ...
. - ., 1994.

30. //
. 1984. 6. . 54-68.

31. _____
// _____ . — .7. — ; :
- , 1952. — . 589—590.

32. - : ...
: 10.02.01. – , 1978. – 234

33. : 10.02.01. - ,
1982. - 192 .

34. :
/ - : , 1976. – 199 .

35. //
. 2016. 2. . 31-36.

36. , . . . / . . . //
/
: - « », 2002. - 507 .
37. , . . . / . . .
- : : , 1990. - 687 .
38. , . . . / . . .
. - : [. . .], 1969. - 400 .
39. , . . . / - ; : .
- , 1930. - 176 .
40. , . . . - : ...
. . . : 10.02.04. - . . . - . . . ,
1995. - 209 .
41. , . . . / . . .
- : « », 1972. - 166 .
42. ,
/ . . . - : « »:
, 2001. - 381 .
43. , . . . / . . .
- : ; , 1999. - 601 .
44. , . . . : /
. . . - : - , .
. - , 1975. - 174 .
45. , . . . / . . . //
/ . . . - . - , 1982. - . 43-
- 70.
46. , . . . -
():
. : 10.02.04. - . . . - . , 1990. - 16 .

47.
: 10.02.04. –, 1987. – 15 .
48. / –
: URSS, 2009. – 368 c.
49.
: : 10.02.04. – .
. , 1969. – 262 .
50.
/ //
: – .:, 1958.
– 375 .
51.
/ – : ,
1990. – 157 .
52. :
/ – .: , 1986. – 127 .
53. –
: : 10.02.01. –
. , 1953. – 16 c.
54.
: (.) / – : ,
1977. – 167 .
55. /
. — : – , 1974.
— 427 .
56. Alred, Gerald Junior. Handbook of technical writing / Gerald J. Alred, Charles.T. Brusaw, Walter E. Oliu. 9th ed. : St. Martin's Press, 2008. - 624 p
57. Andrews, E. A History of Scientific English / E. Andrews – N. Y. : LLC, 2012. – 352 p.

58. Breban, T. Special issue: Different perspectives on proper noun modifiers / T. Breban, J. Kolkman // Cambridge University Press. - 2019. – vol. 23 – P. 749-758.
59. Cargill, M. Writing scientific research articles: strategy and steps/ M. Cargill, P. O'Connor. Wiley-Blackwell, 2009. 184 p.
60. Charleston, B. M. Studies on the emotional and affective means of expression in modern English / B. M. Charleston – Bern : Francke, 1960. – 357 p.
61. Crystal, D. The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the English Language / Crystal D. – New York : Cambridge University Press, 1995. – 189 p.
62. *Crystal, D. Investigating English style / D. Crystal, D. Davy – Bloomington : Indiana University Press, 1969. – 164 p.*
63. Dixon, R. M. W. A semantic approach to the English grammar / R. M. W. Dixon – New York : Cambridge University Press, 2005. – 503 p.
64. Glasman-Deal, Hilary. Science research writing for non-native speakers of English : Monograph / Hilary Glasman-Deal – London : Imperial College Press, 2010. - 272 p.
65. Holliday, N. Intonational variation and incrementality in listener judgments of ethnicity / N. Holliday, D. Villarreal – London // Journal of the Association for Laboratory Phonology. 2020. – vol. 2 – P. 128 – 144.
66. Keneally, C. The first word / C. Keneally – London : Penguin Books Ltd, 2007. – 400 p. <https://www.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com/>
67. Larson Ch.U. Persuasion: reception and responsibility. Wadsworth Publishing Company. Belmont, Ca 1995. 216 p.
68. MacMillan Dictionary []. – : https://www.macmillandictionary.com/dictionary/british/style_1(29.09.2019)
69. McEnery, T. Corpus Linguistics: Method, Theory and Practice / T. McEnery, A. Hardie – New York : Cambridge University Press, 2012. – 294 p.
70. Oxford Dictionaries []. – : <https://www.lexico.com/en/definition/style> (29.09.2019)

71. Pei, M. A Dictionary of Linguistics / M. Pei, F. Gaynor – New York : Philosophical Library, 1954. – 238 p.
72. Pinker, S. How the creates language / S. Pinker – New York : Modern Classics, 1994. – 500 p.
73. Reum, A. Petit Dictionnaire de Style l'usage des Allemands / A. Reum Leipzig : Leipzig Weber, 1953. – 718 p.
74. Riesel, E., Schendels, E. Deutsche stilistik / E. Riesel, E. Schendels – münchen : High School, 1975. – 174 p.
75. Savory, Th. The language of Science / Th. Savory – London : British Book Centre, 1953 – 184 p.
76. Webster Dictionary []. - :
<http://www.webster-dictionary.net/definition/style> (29.09.2019)