

доктора філософії. URL: <https://naqa.gov.ua/2022/03> (Дата звернення: 25.08.2023).

3. Освіта України в умовах воєнного стану: інформаційно-аналітичний збірник. Інститут освітньої аналітики. 2022. 358 с. URL: <https://mon.gov.ua/storage/app/media/zagalna%20serednya/serpneva-konferencia/20-22/Mizhn.serp.n.ped.nauk-prakt.konferentsiya/Inform-analitics.zbirn-Osvita.Ukrayi-ny.v.umovakh.voyennoho.stanu.22.08.2022.pdf> (Дата звернення: 26.08.2023).

4. Про затвердження Порядку присудження ступеня доктора філософії та скасування рішення разової спеціалізованої вченої ради закладу вищої освіти, наукової установи про присудження ступеня доктора філософії. Постанова КМУ від 12 січня 2022 р. № 44. URL: <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/44-2022-%D0%BF#Text> (Дата звернення: 25.08.2023).

5. Слатвінська М. О. Підготовка та захист докторів філософії в ЗВО: проблеми та перспективи. *Збірник матеріалів VI Міжнародної науково-методичної конференції «Забезпечення якості вищої освіти: проблеми та перспективи розвитку»*(м. Одеса, 21-22 лютого 2023 р.) Одеса: ОНЕУ, 2023. С. 34–35.

DOI <https://doi.org/10.36059/978-966-397-321-0-66>

LEXICAL AND GRAMMATICAL PECULIARITIES OF THE ENGLISH SUMMARY OF THE THESIS

Suima Irina Pavlivna

*Candidate of Philological Sciences, Associate Professor,
Associate Professor at the Department of English Language
for Non-Philological Specialities,
Oles Honchar Dnipro National University
Dnipro, Ukraine*

Writing a summary of the thesis (in native and foreign languages) is one of the most important skills. The development of it is of particular relevance in connection with the gradual increase in requirements for the professional training of specialists. The inability to form a summary correctly will indicate that the candidate lacks clear ideas about the goals and ways of implementing the proposed project or thesis.

The author's abstract to an article or project is a brief description of the work, containing only a list of main issues. The summary must identify the

main ideas/sections of the work, connect them together and present them in a fairly concise form. As a functional type of text, it has its own structure. Presenting the content of the entire work, the summary should include its main sections: relevance, statement of the problem, ways to solve the problem, results and conclusions.

At the same time, the question of the peculiarities of the implementation of certain general properties of the language of science, depending on the field of knowledge to which a given text belongs, continues to remain relevant, or more broadly, how its scientific and branch specificity is reflected in the functional and stylistic properties of the text. Thus, in scientific linguistic literature, attention has been repeatedly drawn to the differences that are found between the texts of descriptive and deductive sciences; sciences operating with significant amount of nomenclature and sciences limited to strictly conceptual terminology; sciences that widely use conventional symbols, and sciences that rely entirely on natural language, etc. These differences are most clearly revealed on the basis of linguistic research in the form of quantitative and frequency characteristics of the corresponding sublanguages. At the functional-stylistic level, these differences essentially boil down to the unequal "material content" of the fundamentally identical qualitative characteristics of the text.

The lexical filling of the summary in the scientific and technical style is characterized, first of all, by its structure with highly specialized and general scientific terms. This is explained by the specificity of the terms, their fundamental unambiguity, accuracy, economy, nominative and distinctive function, stylistic neutrality, great information richness, and lack of emotional expression.

Accurate selection of vocabulary contributes to clarity of presentation. Those lexical units are used that can be used to unambiguously convey the necessary scientific information. The variability of vocabulary in summary is quite limited. The scientific style is characterized by a desire for a standard. Texts can be informative only with the correct selection of clearly perceived lexical means. General scientific words play a major role in the creation of the summary, such as: *process, analysis, parameter, aspect, etc.*

Texts of the summary are characterized not only by certain lexical units, but also by their certain compatibility. Typical phrases pass from text to text, which create clichéd language, facilitate the perception of scientific information, and contribute to the unambiguousness of its presentation.

So, in accordance with the basic requirements (logicality, accuracy, objectivity) imposed on the style, the summary to the thesis shows universal stylistic features, but the choice of vocabulary, phonetic design of speech, morphological forms, word combinations, syntactic structure is specific to each language. The vocabulary of the scientific style is characterized by the

use of general book, neutral and terminological layers; the predominance of abstract nouns over concrete ones; the use of polysemantic words in one or two meanings; an increase in the share of internationalisms in terminology; relative homogeneity, closedness of the lexical composition; low usage of words with colloquial and colloquial connotations.

Due to the complex evolution of the English language, synonymy is widely developed in it, including lexical one: the same concept can be expressed in different words, mainly of Anglo-Saxon or Latin (French) origin. In scientific and technical literature, the latter are mostly used. For example, instead of the verb “to say”, the verbs “to assert”, “to state”, “to declare”, “to reply” are used; instead of “to soil” – “to contaminate”; instead of “to clean” – “to purify” [1]. This is necessary for more accurate differentiation of individual processes, as well as giving the language of scientific and technical literature a specific linguistic coloring.

A significant role in scientific and technical literature is played by functional words that create logical connections between individual elements of statements. These are prepositions and conjunctions (mostly compound) like: *on, upon, in, after, before, besides, instead of, in preference to, apart (aside) from, except (for), save, in addition (to), together with, owing to, due to, thanks to, according to, because of, by means of, in accordance with, in regard to, in this connection, for the purpose of, in order to, as a result, rather than, provided, providing, both... and, either... or, whether... or (not)* [2]. In addition, in scientific and technical literature adverbs like: *however, also, again, now, thus, alternatively, on the other hand* [3] are often used, which are integral elements of the development of logical reasoning. In many cases, when writing an abstract, you can limit yourself to only the first three components: relevance, statement of the problem and ways to solve the problem. When writing a summary in a foreign (English) language, you should also follow the structure proposed in this work. In addition, in order to convey the meaning more clearly and clearly in a foreign language, it is recommended to use words and expressions accepted in English-language academic discourse. Here are examples of the most common ones: to indicate relevance (go to the problem) *however*, to list the sections of the article (issues covered) *our paper (report / project) consists of several (three, four, five) sections: ...In the paper, first ..., then ..., finally ...First, ... Second... Third..., to indicate the results of the study and conclusions the data revealed ... The study showed ... The study proved ..., etc.*

In the field of morphology of the scientific style, its general extralinguistic features also appear – accuracy, abstraction, generalization. The selection of morphological forms in the text of summary to the thesis is dictated by the desire for abstraction and generalization, but it is quite difficult to identify common morphological features of the scientific style, since the level of

development of morphology in the compared languages is not the same and depends on the typological structure of the language. The typological features of the English language, for example, are reflected in the presence of two possibilities for passive verbal transformation due to the lack of case change in the noun, which makes the forms of the direct and indirect objects the same and allows passive verbal transformations for both direct and indirect objects. In Ukrainian, the direct object is expressed by a noun or pronoun in the accusative case; the transformation of a verb in the active form into a passive form is possible only with the transformation of the direct object into the subject.

In English, sentences in scientific texts use the pronouns *they* and *one* without indicating the performer of the action. In Ukrainian there is no pronoun; the action is conveyed by a verb in the third person plural, making the sentence indefinitely personal.

When writing the summary for a thesis, grammatical norms that are firmly established in written speech are used. Passive, impersonal and personal constructions are widespread. For the most part, complex and compound sentences are used, in which nouns, adjectives and non-finite forms of the verb predominate. Logical emphasis is often achieved by departing from fixed word order (inversion); relatively long sentences predominate. Unlike fiction, whose main task is to create images, scientific literature strives to describe and explain certain facts as accurately as possible. Therefore, it is dominated by nouns, adjectives and impersonal forms of the verb. In terms of syntactic structure, summaries are distinguished by their structural complexity. They are rich in participles, infinitive gerundial phrases, as well as some other purely bookish constructions.

References:

1. Англомовні елементи наукової праці: назва, анотація, резюме: A Practical Guide to Writing Research Paper Titles, Abstracts, Summaries : навчальний посібник / Харк. держ. акад. культури ; розробники : О. С. Частник, С. В. Частник. Харків: ХДАК, 2016. 78 с.
2. Буданов С.І., Борисова А.О. Business English. Донецьк: СПД ФО Сердюк В.І., 2005. 112 с.
3. Маслова Т.Б. Типологія наукового дискурсу в сучасній мовознавчій парадигмі. Англїстика та американїстика. 2013. Вип. 10. С. 39–43.