Stylistic figures as a factor in the formation of communicative intention in scientific linguistic texts
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Abstract. The given article highlights the stylistic figures as a factor in the formation of communicative intention in scientific linguistic texts. For a comprehensive study of stylistic figures in the Ukrainian language is extremely important to learn the basic functions in the scientific linguistic articles. The actuality of the research topic is determined by the need of a systematic study of stylistic figures that are traditionally considered unusual for the text, but we will try to prove that they are relevant. The study of the linguistic features in scientific discourse is importance to find ways of explaining a certain material. The study, using a free associative experiment, has led to the conclusion that the use of stylistic figures in the educational and scientific texts makes it possible to master the material better. Generally speaking, the use of stylistic figures in scientific texts is not widespread, but the student audience prefers these texts. If the text is addressed to the reader for educational purposes, the correct use of paths will facilitate the quickest possible understanding of the basic thought of the message.
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1. Introduction

The role of science in society has grown tremendously in recent decades. The linguistic quality of scientific products significantly affects its theoretical and practical value. The functional purpose of scientific texts is the dynamic exchange of objective, logically constructed and complete information intended for a narrow circle of specialists in a particular field of knowledge.
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However, the current level of scientific language culture testifies to a large number of problems, including: insufficient linguistic-communicative, stylistic competence of researchers. Quite often in the latest linguistic literature, modern science is referred to as a kind of discourse.

The task of scientific discourse is to influence the listener or reader, to convince him of what has been said. Therefore, an important component is the impact on the recipient. The desired psychological influence depends on the choice of word, skillful combination of logical and emotional aspects, justified use of expressive means of speech. The study of linguistic features in scientific discourse is of great importance for finding ways to explain certain material.

Scientific research in any field has a certain logical structure, which determines its success. The effectiveness of scientific research largely depends on the correct sequence of research steps that should lead to true results, ie the logic of research. The logic of the study can be thoroughly described only if the correct selection of stylistic figures.

In recent years, there has been a growing research interest in the stylistic analysis of literature of various genres. In particular, Short [30] emphasizes the fundamentally argumentative role of stylistic figures in speech. Studying the features of styles and genres, scientists analyze stylistic figures in works of various genres – plays [3, 21], poetry [6, 13, 19], poems [17], short stories [18, 31], novels [5, 33] etc. Kaftandjiev and Kotova [11] study the role of stylistic figures such as metaphor, synecdoche for the study of various disciplines in primary and secondary school, analyze the role of stylistic figures in communications related to business and marketing. The works of Hoppmann [9] and Liubchenko et al. [15] are devoted to the analysis of stylistic devices in political discourse. The study of Manna et al. [16] is based on the study of complex semantic aspects of figurative authorial language with the help of NooJ software. In this study is discussed the analysis of stylistic figures in scientific styles.

2. Aim and tasks

The aim of the article is to clarify the semantic content of stylistic figures in scientific texts. Achieving this aim involves the following tasks: to consider the general theoretical principles of stylistic figures in scientific texts; to study the typology of stylistic figures in scientific texts; determine the functions of stylistic figures in individual linguistic explorations; to analyze the expediency of motivated use of stylistic figures in a scientific text. The main source of material was the linguistic works of Arutjunova [1], Bragina [4], Golovin [7], Gorbachevich [8], Ilchenko [10], Kotyurova [12], Lakoff [14], Nepyyvoda [20], Seliey [24] and others. However, this aspect has not been studied enough in the linguistic literature.

3. Research methods

The following methods have been used to solve certain tasks in research: descriptive, comparative-historical and comparable with the elements of external and internal reconstruction, structural with the use of the method of component analysis, elements of statistical analysis, the method of associative experiment.
4. Discussion

Each category is realized by a set of different levels of language, for example, the coherence of the text is achieved by a set of language units, among which it is difficult to prefer a single one, because the coherence of the text at both formal and semantic levels is formed phonetic, lexical, grammatical components. Lexical repetition can be distinguished among the active connectors and demarcators of the text.

The main reason for the use of repetition in scientific discourse is related to the main function of language – to be a means communication, because the repetition of what is said is related to the need of the speaker to convey the opinion to the listener, to impose it on him opinion. Repetition can help the recipient better understand what is said in case of unnecessary noise prevent successful communication. According to Wales [34], editor-in-chief of “A Dictionary of Stylistics”, a repetition that stands out as vivid manifestation of redundancy in language, in certain conditions, namely, when the “noise” interfere with successful communication, is communicatively motivated [15]. Text repetitions serve development thoughts and accordingly, the development of the semantic space of the text. Repetitions not only bind the text, but also make it dynamic.

During the analysis of linguistic works, we found that repetitions are often used in professional articles: “It is believed that abundant noun word usage ... In nouns ... speech ... nouns are inherent” [26]. We also give examples from other articles of the scientist: “Stylistic norm ... finiteness of norm ... norm fixes ... stylistic norms ... in the basis of stylistic norm” [27]; “We need to help them focus and keep their attention on the text ... In fact, the author has to organize the reader’s attention ... In general, ways to hold attention” [25].

Repetition helps to create a rhythm in prose, thanks to the identity of the final parts of the sentence. Performs the following functions: can give parts of the expression emphatic emphasis; can help create a climax effect; assumption effect. In order to interest the reader and stimulate him to further read the scientific article, Selihey [25] creates a climax effect with the same type of paragraph endings: “Interest in the course of the study ... Interest is sharpened ... We are in a state of intellectual nervous tension” [25].

Repetition serves as a background on which other semantic elements of the text are more clearly distinguished, as the reader’s attention, first of all, is attracted by new information, and already known acts as a background necessary for better perception of new material.

In scientific texts such kind of lexical repetition as repetition of words of one thematic group is quite often realized. We reviewed some linguistic relationships and performed statistical analysis. Thus, in the article Nepyyvoda [20] “The author of a scientific work: an essay of psychological portrait (Based on the book by Rusanivsky «The history of the ukrainian literature language. The textbook». (Kyiv, 2001. – 392 p.))” words with a common part psychologist – used 32 times: “psychological, psycholo-gist, psychology”. There are 56 uses of the root part of the psyche: “psychiological, psycholo-gist, psychology”. These are mostly well-known nouns and adjectives of the thematic group science, but the
author uses such rare lexemes as scientists, we would attribute this word to the author’s neologisms, because in the Academic Dictionary of the Ukrainian language this nomination is not fixed. Repeated lexical repetitions in the studied articles are evidence that they are the main subject of the article.

We also managed to witness frequent repetitions of deadlines. Investigating the article by Vykhovanets [32] of “Ukrainian spelling”, we recorded 77 uses of the terminological phrase Ukrainian spelling. There are 134 words with the root part of orthography in the studied text [32].

Repetition as a morpheme is recorded mainly in common root nouns and adjectives: science, scientist, scientific, pseudoscience, popular science, general science, scientists; psychological, psychologist, psychology, psychiatrist. The repetition of the keyword as a means of enhancing the expressiveness and drawing the recipient’s attention to important ideas of the text by repeating the predicate can be illustrated by the example of the Selihey [27] “Ukrainian scientific text: problems of communicative fullness and stylistic perfection”, where the phrase repetition of the scientific text is recorded – 36 times, pseudo-scientific text – 10 times, just the text – 123 times [27].

Our attention was also drawn to the pronoun repetitions. Since the personal pronoun is not used in the scientific style, the most common pronoun is he. [32] used the above pronoun in the article “Ukrainian language” 23 times, Nepyyvoda [20] 20 times [20]. Research has shown that some researchers avoid using pronouns in a scientific style.

Repetitions of certain verbs are also recorded. An example is the article by Selihey [26] “Substantivity versus verbality: in search of the golden mean”, in which the verb consider and its modifications are recorded 10 times: “A. Lombard consider”; “It is considered that abundant noun word usage”; “It is considered that because the Russian literary language was formed mainly on book sources”; “D.E. Shekhurin considered”; “The French Slavist considered the predicate to be the main structural member of the sentence” [26].

The study also identified numerous examples of repeating connectors. The scientific style is characterized by complex constructions. In the scientific style of Selihey [25] is often used as a conjunction be-cause. A striking example is his article “On the problem of communication qualities in academic discourse”, which has as many as 3 uses of this conjunction within one page of text: “… it is usually easy to persuade the author to eliminate it, because you can always refer to authoritative sources”; “… It is more difficult to prove to the author the finality of edits, because we still do not have an authoritative…”; “Of these qualities, some have been better studied, because they have been known since antiquity” [28].

This page also records the repetition of the preposition or 4 times: “the final thesis does not follow from the previous statement or contradicts the following theses”; “That it needs grinding or processing”; “Or: are they separate, or are they related as part and whole… and / or intensity” [28]. Frequently used conjunction in the scientific discourse of Selihey [26] is a word if: “If subordination obscures the structure”; “If the basis of Ukrainian was primarily a vernacular”; “However, if we turn to Russian fiction” [26]. In total, this article records 16 uses of the word under study.

A stylistic figure such as an antithesis serves as an organizer of the logical division of the text, helping to establish a logical connection between the meaningful fragments of the text. On the same type of structural-syntactic constructions, comparisons on antonymic features
stand out especially sharply. Antithesis is a phenomenon related to stylistics and logic. Often in the opposition itself there are no linguistic methods of implementing this opposition. In other words, we are dealing with logically opposite facts of reality. With the help of contrasting comparison of facts "their depth is most vividly depicted, because on a dark background the clearest is most clearly seen, the sound is perfectly perceived in silence, finding the end of something, subconsciously looking for its beginning” [22]. The author uses the antithesis to explain the nature of antonyms.

We were able to capture scientific antitheses based on lexical antonyms. They are completely transparent and have no expressive effect at all, the only purpose of their use is to organize a logical opposition: “Thanks to this we find common ground with other people (not so much figuratively as literally)”; “Early spelling and grammar, a little later – pronunciation, vocabulary, word formation”; “When choosing language tools, the team always evaluates them as right or wrong, appropriate or inappropriate, good or bad” [27].

Antithesis is a fairly common figure of language in scientific discourse, when the author needs to resolve certain controversial issues related to the implementation of semantic-syntactic categories of comparability and contrast, inconsistency, incompatibility, contradiction, counteraction, paradox, semantic conflict, contrast, etc. in the system simple and complex sentences, superphrase units and at the level of the integral structure of the scientific text.

In the scientific style, lexical antonyms are a kind of connectors and demarcators: “If in everyday thinking hypostasis is relatively safe, then in scientific and theoretical – it risks causing serious errors” [26]; “Stylistic correctness is, on the one hand, in the distribution of language units by texts according to their stylistic color, and on the other – in the use in the text only those stylistically marked units that are organic for a particular type of text” [27].

In general, the syntactic constructions in which the antithesis is realized are quite diverse: from a simple common sentence to a complex syntactic whole, paragraph: “Objectivity cannot be infinite, abstraction as a method of cognition should not be absolute” [26]). Such quotations in scientific discourse help the addressee to understand the difference between different concepts, only the antithesis illustrates and reveals the essence of the differences between certain terms and their features.

When in the text the conjunctions a, appear, but, nevertheless, when, the stylistic effect of the antithesis is greatly weakened. The opposite meaning of these conjunctions in itself prepares the reader for the contrasting statement, which should follow: “Moreover, in some of his genres he leans towards less variability (patent, thesis, reference book, dissertation abstract), and in others – more variability (popular science literature, scientific journalism, scientific essays)” [26].

The antithesis is based on parallel constructions, the components of which are expressed by the same members of the sentence and which are arranged in the same order: “A characteristic feature of irony in the analyzed text is that it is not abuse, not ridicule, but, so to speak, irony with a plus sign (with a positive emotional color), although combined with other, sometimes sad spectrum, feelings” [20]. The antithesis is to compare opposing views or images to enhance the impression of their differences, the opposition: “If the basis of Ukrainian was primarily a vernacular, then the basis of Russian – mostly book samples” [26].

Among the rhetorical figures are the figures of appeal, question, denial, exclamation. Rhetorical is an address that does not have the purpose of actual contact with the person, object or
phenomenon to which they are addressed, and serves only to attract the reader’s attention and express the attitude of the speaker.

In our opinion, the most frequently used in scientific communication is a rhetorical question – a question that does not provide an answer. An important place among the various mechanisms of argumentative influence used in scientific discourse is occupied by the rhetorical question as an effective means of dialogue of monologue language. As you know, a rhetorical question is a statement or objection embedded in the form of a question. It contains the answer in itself, so it does not provide an unambiguous answer “yes” or “no”. It evokes certain verbal and nonverbal reactions (thoughts, judgments, feelings, emotions), increases the expressiveness of language, gives it aesthetic value (it is no coincidence that this figure is called “rhetorical” because its stylistic function is obvious). Obviously, an important factor that determines the result of argumentative influence is the personality of the speaker. A rhetorical question in the speech of a decisive argumentator is not just an expressive phrase, not just a statement, it is an unappealable imperative. “There is something threatening in any completed phrase. To be strong means, first of all, to say one’s phrases to the end”, wrote Barthes [2].

Indeed, the analysis of scientific argumentative discourse has shown that the rhetorical question is more common in the speech of emotional, determined scholars, such as Selihay [26]: “Let us now try to evaluate this picture from a communicative and aesthetic point of view. Nouns, is concise, accurate, easy to understand and understand?” [26]; “So do we need brevity for clarity? The very thesis that verb nouns condense a phrase is not always correct” [26]; “If the masters of the pen so caustically ridicule the abuse of verb nouns, then they probably acutely feel their alienation. So can these nouns be considered so natural for the Russian literary language?” [26]; “Why did this happen? For a long time, these qualities were perceived as something subjective-tasteful, ephemeral-elusive, and their names were not considered terminological at all” [26].

We believe that the main function of the rhetorical question is pragmatic. It is to create a certain verbal-emotional reaction of the listener to encourage him to internal (verbally expressed) dialogue with the speaker, literally provoke, bring to such a dialogue that will lead to the acquisition of new knowledge by the recipient. The speaker anticipates what knowledge and attitudes (psychological, social, scientific, etc.) the addressee has and seeks to influence them. As the main illustrative material, we turn to the following fragments of articles by Selihay [26]: “From the text, we feel that it is about some activity. But what exactly is it?” [26]; “What exactly does not suit you in a modern scientific book?” [26, 27]; “What does the author say in essence?” [26].

Within scientific communication, this category is important because the main function of scientific discourse is to persuade, develop intentions in the addressee, provide ground for persuasion and encourage further research, in other words, create in the mind of the addressee the necessary settings for the speaker: “We think: What is the purpose of a scientist publishing his work” [25]; “What does it mean to focus on the reader? Let’s draw an analogy” [25]; “How can the author find interesting points in his research? One should ask oneself” [25].

The scientific manner of writing by Selihay [27] is easy to read, as the author deliberately uses a simple and clear presentation of the material. Using rhetorical questions, the author seems to ask both the reader and himself: “Does this mean that the stylistic norm is secondary? And in general: is there a reason to apply the concept of norm to style? If so, on what basis is
it determined?” [27]. The linguist uses a question-answer model to convey complex material: “Which stylistic devices are subject to normalization and which are not?” [27]. We have recorded such a stylistic device in the scientific speech of Nepyyvoda [20]: “Indeed, why is one scientist attracted to the structure of the atom, and another is trying to penetrate the mystery of the word?” [20].

In our opinion, the textual construction “question – answer”, which imitates the author’s dialogue with the reader, is most widely represented in the text “History of the Ukrainian literary language”: “Which of the manuscripts is more perfect? As V. V. Nimchuk proves, Arras. He interprets the structure of Ukrainian grammar better in many issues” [23]; “What happened to the old Ukrainian literary language? After all, it, like the modern Russian language...” [23]; “Can it be said that the connection with folklore is the same defining feature of national poetry? Probably so” [23]. Rhetorical questions can be asked not from one’s own person, but from a group of people or with the help of infinitive, impersonal constructions. In this case, the emphasis is on the expression of collective opinion. Rusanivskyi [23] deliberately raises questions not of his own accord, but resorts to general constructions. This stylistic device allows the reader to feel that this is his question.

In general, a rhetorical question does not need to be answered in two cases. The first is the most common, because the answer is already known to all listeners, it is only necessary to update it for the listener’s perception: “Stylistic skill – does a scientist need it?” [24]. Of course, everyone who reads this article knows the answer. Stylistic skill is an integral part of a scientist’s scientific style, but this is how the author deliberately begins this article. It motivates us to think more deeply about this issue, analyze it and highlight the main factors shaping the stylistic skills of the scientist.

The second case is also common: a rhetorical question is one to which no one knows the answer or does not exist at all, such as: Who is to blame? What shall I do? Where are we going? However, the author, without waiting for an answer, considers it necessary to ask questions to emphasize the unusualness of the situation, its tragedy or comedy, to draw the attention of interlocutors: “Why did this happen?” [27].

It should be noted that the figure of the rhetorical question is not as simple as it seems at first glance. The rhetorical question may combine elements of exclamation, objection and appeal: “And yet, Mr. Academician, who is the customer who inspired to write “Ukrainian spelling (draft of the latest edition)”, which was published in 1999? It would be worthwhile for the academic to state this clearly and unambiguously” [32]. The passage successfully combines the use of all rhetorical figures in order to emphasize the negative attitude to scientific thinking of Rusanivskyi [23].

A rhetorical address is a stylistic figure that reveals not only one’s own address, but also the reaction, the speaker’s attitude to the situation of communication, the subject, the speaker’s ideas, and so on. The author wants to emphasize that he completely disagrees with the opponent and convince all readers of his opinion, resorting to psychological pressure on the addressee. Characteristic features of persuasion are not only the subject’s confidence in the truth of the thought, but also the emotional attitude to this thought. Using irony, the argumentator intends to retransmit the instructive emotions of the audience, thereby causing it an appropriate emotional response.

The method of constructing a rhetorical question is also important. Thus, the rhetorical
question begins with a speech and rhythmic repetition, colored by an ironic intonation. This enhances the emotionality of speech, activates attention and perception: “Mr. Academician emphasizes that” it is not so simple and with the ending -i in the genitive case of feminine nouns of the third declension. Probably, it really happens quite often, but in what words?” [32]. In order for the reader to draw the right conclusions after reading, the linguist immediately gives answers to his questions.

In scientific discourse also records inversion, violation of the order of words in a sentence that seems normalized, normal. The logical sequence of the development of thought regulates, in particular, the order of the main members of the sentence, which form a kind of syntactic backbone of the expressed thought. Inversion individualizes and emotionally expresses speech. But its main function is not this. The syntactically inverted order of the members of the sentence serves primarily the purpose of highlighting some of the most important words in the context of this statement: “The review can be continued, but it is not part of our tasks” [27]; “The researcher is also responsible for the development of literary language in general” [24].

With the help of inversion, the author shades and highlights the right words, gives them greater sonority and expression: “The language of good scientific work O. M. Trubachov made three demands” [27]; “Until now, our spelling has been mixed in terms of its leading methodological formulations, often combining the phonemic principle with the morphophonemic one” [29].

Ukrainian and other East Slavic languages belong to the languages with free word order in sentences, but their certain syntactic sequence, due to its commonness, as well as its subordination to the logic of unfolding the thought, seems more natural, while changing such a sequence is psychologically perceived as a deviation from a certain constant norm. The logical sequence of deployment regulates, in particular, the order of the main members of the sentence, which form a kind of syntactic backbone of the expressed opinion.

The normal logical sequence of the development of thought involves its movement of the already known (ie, what has already been said, or what is presented as known in advance) to the unknown, what, in fact, is reported about this “already known” and records some changes.

Since “already known” in a sentence is usually expressed through the subject (subject of thought), the natural or, as they say, direct will be the order of words, according to which the predicate will be placed behind the subject, and their reverse order will be inverted: the predicate before the subject. This phrase is perceived as inverted because it first presents the predicate of the action, grammatically expressed by the predicate (the new one that is reported about the subject of the action), and only then is called the subject of the action, grammatically expressed by the subject. A different sequence of words should correspond to the normative-logical order of thought development here.

Inversion individualizes and emotionally expresses speech. But its main function is not this. The syntactically inverted order of the members of the sentence serves primarily the purpose of selecting individual, most important in the context of this statement of words. The inverted word, due to the fact that it falls into an unusual syntactic position, involuntarily attracts and retains more attention.

In order to identify the level of assimilation of the studied material among students, a survey was conducted in the form of a free associative experiment in the period from 01.09.2020 to 19.12.2020 as part of the study of the discipline “Business Ukrainian language”. To acquaint the
audience with the fourth topic of the curriculum “Scientific communication as a component of professional activity” students were offered various scientific articles, each had to choose only one article to study and justify their choice.

A total of 121 respondents studying at the National Aviation University took part in the experiment, including: according to age criteria (students aged 17 to 19); by gender criterion (65 women and 56 men); by field of study (40 students of the Faculty of Transport Management and Logistics, 40 students of the Faculty of Air Navigation, Electronics and Telecommunications, 41 students of the Faculty of Economics and Business Administration). The main source of material was the linguistic works of Nepyyvoda [20], Selihey [25, 26, 27] and other Ukrainian scientists.

After reading the scientific articles, students chose material that was rich in the following types of stylistic figures: repetition, antithesis, rhetorical question, rhetorical appeal, inversion. Each student had to write only one stylistic figure that was most memorable. Figure 1 shows the percentage of stylistic figures found in scientific articles.

![Figure 1: Stylistic figures in scientific articles.](image)

This research gives grounds to assert that repetitions and rhetorical questions are a powerful connector of scientific texts. Less prominent are inversion, rhetorical question and antithesis. However, all stylistic means emphasize the text and make it more understandable for students.

Here is an attempt to quantify the dependence of the degree of assimilation on the use of stylistic figures in the texts. Students were provided with 7 articles of the same volume (10-15 pages) about the features of the scientific text. The level of knowledge acquisition was assessed on a 100-point scale. The results of the study in the table 1.

To do this, we use the method of regression analysis to identify patterns between the dependent indicator of the degree of assimilation and in-dependent factors influencing stylistic figures.

We present the results of the analysis in the form of dependence: \( y = a_0 + a_1 x_1 + a_2 x_2 + a_3 x_3 + a_4 x_4 + a_5 x_5 \), based on the hypothesis of the linear nature of the relationship between the indicator and the factors, where \( y \) – learning evidence, \( x_1 \) – quantity of repetitions, \( x_2 \) –
Table 1
The results of the study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>y</th>
<th>x_1</th>
<th>x_2</th>
<th>x_3</th>
<th>x_4</th>
<th>x_5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2
Regression statistics.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multiple R</td>
<td>0,994113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R Square</td>
<td>0,988261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R Square</td>
<td>0,929568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Error</td>
<td>5,570471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3
ANOVA results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2612,398</td>
<td>522,4797</td>
<td>16,83781</td>
<td>0,182854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31,03014</td>
<td>31,03014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2643,429</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4
Regression coefficients.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a_0</td>
<td>20,59584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a_1</td>
<td>2,210441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a_2</td>
<td>0,680312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a_3</td>
<td>0,696295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a_4</td>
<td>0,125601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a_5</td>
<td>0,204525</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

quantity of rhetorical questions, \( x_3 \) – quantity of rhetorical appeals, \( x_4 \) – quantity of antithesis, \( x_5 \) – quantity of inversion, \( a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4, a_5 \) – unknown model parameters to be defined.

We will evaluate the parameters of the model using the one-step Least Squares Method (LSM) in MS Excel using the function Regression of the Data Analysis add-on. The results of the analysis are presented in the tables 2-4.
The value of the coefficient of determination indicates a very close relationship between the assimilation of the material and the use of stylistic figures in the texts. Checking the adequacy of the model by Fisher’s test showed that $F > F_t (16,84>0,18)$, so that the model can be adequately.

Thus, the relationship between the assimilation of the material of the articles and the use of stylistic figures can be expressed by the formula: 

$$y = 20.596 + 2.21x_1 + 0.68x_2 + 0.696x_3 + 0.126x_4 + 0.205x_5.$$  

It should be noted that according to the results of the analysis, the greatest influence on the assimilation of scientific texts is influenced by such means as: repetitions (greatest influence), rhetorical questions and appeals, to a lesser extent – antithesis, inversion.

5. Conclusions

A feature of modern scientific discourse is its social conditionality, which is a determining factor in the formation of the linguistic structure of a scientific linguistic text. In recent years, researchers have emphasized the special dynamism of scientific discourse, there is a refusal to use standard clichés, emotionality is expressed through the involvement of various types of expressive means.

Various stylistic figures are used to enhance the expressiveness of scientific discourse. In our study, repetitions, antithesis, inversion, rhetorical questions, and appeals were most often observed.

Stylistic figures perform a set of expressive functions that affect the reader’s mental processes (thinking, memory, emotions, imagination, attention), which perceive information. Repetitions, rhetorical figures, antithesis, inversion, if they are appropriate – all this actualizes the scientific message, makes it influential, accurately combines textual elements, performs the function of connectors and demarcations.

Analyzing modern linguistic sources, it can be argued that external dialogic is realized in the scientific text mostly through repetitions and rhetorical figures.

Scientific discourse is quite selective concerning stylistic figures, but they allow the sender of the message to more accurately reveal the essence of the problem, add individuality to the scientific text, make it more logical and understandable.

Repetition is an integral part of scientific linguistic discourse. Lexical repetitions of nouns, adjectives, pronouns, verbs are recorded in the studied texts. An important element of the study was the repetitions of conjunctions. It should be noted that the most common in scientific articles are partial syntactic or lexical-syntactic parallelism; enumeration is realized by repetition of homogeneous syntactic units, contact placement of components in a linear order gives the expression in the scientific work informativeness and significance. The general idea is created due to repetitions, which are a certain code, and using them, there is a switch from one subject to another according to the author’s plan from primary to secondary. In a scientific text, repetition serves an explanatory function and helps to enhance the reader’s perception of the material.

Analyzing the functions of rhetorical figures in scientific discourse, we concluded that rhetorical questions, appeals, and exclamations are a certain stage in the construction of argumentation, which forms the model of the listener’s world desired for the speaker. The rhetorical figure prompts the recipient to a certain idea, it forces the listener to think and formulate an idea of what has not been said to the end.
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