

vowel and consonant phonemes or their clusters may be enhanced by varying of the tone range, volume, tempo, rhythm, etc., as well as by the selection of musical instruments whose timbre pattern corresponds to the emotional and semantic nature of the work (e.g., the wind instruments amplify solemnity and significance of the described event; the strings help convey melancholia, sadness or alternatively playfulness, joy).

On the other hand the low level of emotional-and-pragmatic potential actualization can cause the dissonance in the interaction of text and music in speech-and-music works. The examples of the problematic adaptation of one semiotic system to another can include the incongruity of prosodic pattern of the verse phrase and the rhythmic and intonational organization of the musical one. A good example in this matter is the speech-and-music works created by setting Emily Dickinson's poems to music. It is well known that the rhythm of most of her poems is mostly mixed due to the slant rhyme, which greatly complicates the choice of music component.

The language-music dissonance in speech-and-music works is just as evident on the lexical-semantic level in cases when the semantic content of the verbal text and major/minor key features of the music component fail to correlate. For example, in the «Unhappy Birthday» by The Smiths lexical units with truly negative connotation *unhappy, evil, lie, you should die, sad, cry* are combined with major key, accelerated tempo, and joyful timber.

In view of the above said we can conclude that the consonance interaction of text and music in speech-and-music work is caused by high emotional-and-pragmatic potential of the poem it is based on and its rhythmic and metric structure. While the language-music dissonance occurs predominantly on phonetic and lexical-semantic levels.

Література:

1. Калита А. А. Калита А. А. Актуалізація емоційно-прагматичного потенціалу висловлення: [монографія] / А. А. Калита. – Тернопіль: Підручники і посібники, 2007. – 320 с.
2. Ланглебен М. Вокальная мелодия в плену у языка / М. Ланглебен // Музыка и незвучащее: [сб. науч. тр.]. – М.: «Наука», 2000. – С. 91-116.
3. Марченко В. В. Мовленнєво-музичний твір як елемент пісенного дискурсу / В. В. Марченко // Науковий вісник Східноєвропейського національного університету імені Лесі Українки. Серія: Філологічні науки. Мовознавство. – № 4 (281). – Луцьк, 2014. – С. 102-106.

## **DIVERSITY OF AUTHORIAL VOICE IN ACADEMIC ENGLISH**

**T.B. Maslova**

*National Technical University of Ukraine “Igor Sikorsky Kyiv Polytechnic Institute”*

Academic communication is known to aim at the conveyance of scientific knowledge and the negotiation and evaluation of a large number of views and opinions. As such, the participants of academic interaction have to construct a coherent and credible representation of themselves, and there are both external and internal factors that can influence the way the author's identity is made visible within the discourse community of a certain discipline [1, p.10]. The external factors comprise the author's social and cultural background as well as his/her knowledge of genre and disciplinary conventions existing in the language used to promote their scientific claims. Today, it is obviously English that serves the mission to ensure continuously ongoing international communication and cooperation in the fields of science, education, economics, culture, and politics. Thus, the awareness of how to support their arguments and ideas in English may determine the authoritativeness of non-native English speakers who are novice members of the academic community. The internal factors, on the other hand, are related inherently to the extent to which the author would like to promote him/herself and their own work. The objective of this research is to study the preferences in making the authorial presence explicit by rhetorical and stylistic devices of the English language, as displayed by members of a diverse academic discourse community.

The authorial voice, expressed through rhetorical and linguistic choices, can be regarded as stance, or author's personal contribution to the construction of a convincing argument, and engagement, that is involving readers and listeners as participants in the interaction, and guiding them towards intended interpretations. In writing, the voice is projected by a variety of language resources, such as specific lexical items, word order, syntax, text organization, but it becomes most apparent due to particular discourse markers and self-mention.

Accordingly, Hyland's taxonomy of metadiscourse markers comprises interactive and interactional devices, the former signalling the organization of the interaction and the latter suggesting the author's attitude toward the content of the message [4, p. 9; 5].

Among interactional metadiscourse markers one can distinguish between

- hedges, which serve the purpose of softening the author's claims (e.g. epistemic verbs *assume/ suppose*, modal auxiliaries, probability adverbs, approximators, etc.),
- boosters, which emphasize the degree of author's certainty (e.g. epistemic verbs *know/ believe*, epistemic adverbs *clearly, truly, undeniably*, modals *must/ will*, etc.),
- attitude markers, which express the author's feelings, viewpoint and evaluation of the propositional content (e.g. words that convey surprise, agreement, frustration, etc.);
- self-mentions, which directly reveal the author's stance (e.g. first person pronouns),
- engagement markers, which explicitly address the audience so that to draw it into the discourse (e.g. *you*-pronoun, questions, and directives).

The insight into the language across different disciplines typically presents insignificant variations in the number and types of interactional metadiscourse markers. The difference is often said to be a higher percentage of interactional markers, especially hedges, encountered in the soft rather than hard sciences, and this could be explained by a greater role of explicit personal contribution of research in the humanities [3; 5].

Still, there are also some other divergences available. For example, computer science, even though being a hard field, is found to differ from the general picture of impersonality of academic discourse because it displays a relatively high frequency of self-mentions and engagement markers [3, p. 173]. Within the engineering field, differences in the density and function of hedges have been revealed in students' papers compared with published research articles. It has been shown that students tend to use hedging devices as a means of avoiding responsibility for their claims more frequently, whereas the published engineers resort to fewer hedges, which is said to be largely personally attributed [4, p. 10]. Furthermore, the diachronic analysis of academic corpora in four disciplines, namely applied linguistics, sociology, electrical engineering and biology, demonstrates a gradual increase in the use of informal style features in the research articles. In particular, over the past 50 years electrical engineering and biology have increased the number of informal features by 9% and up to 25% respectively, this being mainly due to a more frequent use of first person pronouns [2, p. 44-45]. One may conclude, therefore, that for English native speakers impersonality is currently becoming a rhetorical option rather than convention in academic writing.

Thus, the problem might lie with academic English writing courses and style manuals that generally advise avoiding the use of personal forms and adhere to the passive voice and impersonal constructions as far as authorial presence is concerned. Today's trend, as seen from qualitative research data, is actually to display more explicitly the author's attitude to disciplinary scientific knowledge and practices, particularly in the fields of humanities and social sciences, and maintain far more effective writer-reader relationship in academic publications. For that reason, further linguistic research has to address the issue of authorial voice across various disciplines of academic discourse, and the findings on how the author's contribution to the field is emphasized must be used for reflection and wisely incorporated into teaching practices of academic English and English for specific purposes courses.

#### References:

1. Dontcheva-Navrátilová O. Authorial presence in academic discourse: functions of author-reference pronouns / Olga Dontcheva-Navrátilová // *Linguistica Pragensia* 23 (1), 2013. – P. 9-30.
2. Hyland K. Is academic writing becoming more informal? / Ken Hyland // *English for Specific Purposes* 45, 2017. – P. 40-51.
3. Hyland K. Metadiscourse in academic writing: a reappraisal / Ken Hyland // *Applied Linguistics* 25/2. – Oxford University press, 2004. – P. 156-177.

4. Nelson N. *Academic Writing and Authorial Voice* / Nancy Nelson, Montserrat Castelló // *University Writing: Selves and Texts in Academic Societies*. – UK: Emerald Group Publishing Ltd., 2012. – P. 33-51.
5. Maslova T. *Linguistic research on hedging in scientific discourse of the English language* / Tetiana Maslova // *Proceedings and Abstracts of the CIS International Symposium on Language, Linguistics, History, Literature and Education*. – Vol.1. – Science an Innovation Center Publishing House. – St. Louis, USA, 2017. – P. 63-68.

## **SCHAUPLÄTZE UND ERZÄHLSTRATEGIEN AFRIKANISCHER FLUCHTBEWEGUNGEN IN AKTUELLER DEUTSCHSPRACHIGER LITERATUR**

**J. A. Mwangovya**

*Dozentin an der Karatina-Universität, Nairobi, Kenya*

Die Auseinandersetzung mit Flüchtlingen bzw. Migranten gewinnt in der deutschsprachigen Literatur zunehmend an Bedeutung [3, S. 7]. Etliche Literaturwissenschaftler haben sich bereits mit Migrations- bzw. Migrantenliteratur beschäftigt. Sie sprechen von Migration als einem Phänomen, das in den letzten Jahren an Intensität gewonnen hat. An dieser Stelle möchte ich kurz begründen, weshalb dieses Thema als Forschungsgegenstand in der Germanistik wichtig ist. In der heutigen Welt wird viel über Migranten- und Migrationsliteratur in den Medien und Sachbüchern berichtet. Es gibt eine Reihe von wissenschaftlichen Studien, die sich mit den Romanen afrikanischer Migranten in Deutschland beschäftigen. Ein Beispiel hierfür ist Albert Guaffos Aufsatz [1, S. 53], der sich mit der sogenannten deutschen postkolonialen Literatur auseinandersetzt. Aber bislang gibt es keine wissenschaftliche Studie, die sich mit der Darstellung bzw. Wahrnehmung von Migranten hinsichtlich der Schauplätze bzw. Erzählstrategien in deutschsprachigen Romanen beschäftigt. Diese Arbeit versucht sich diesem Defizit anzunähern, indem drei deutschsprachige Romane, *Ohrfeige*, *Das dunkle Schiff* und *Gehen Ging Gegangen*, analysiert werden, um herauszufinden, wie Flüchtlinge in den Romanen dargestellt werden. Genauer gesagt, wird die geplante Studie die drei Romane in Hinblick auf die Schauplätze und Erzählstrategien analysieren.

Mein Plädoyer für die Darstellung der Migranten bezüglich der Schauplätze hat damit zu tun, dass Migranten bzw. Flüchtlinge als Leute betrachtet werden können, die sich in einer kontinuierlichen Wende befinden. Die Erzählstrategien auf der anderen Seite bieten den Lesern die Möglichkeit, an der fiktionalen Welt teilzuhaben. So geben die Autoren mehrere Möglichkeiten, ihre Geschichte zu delegieren. Ich habe daher drei deutschsprachige Romane ausführlich behandelt: *Gehen Ging Gegangen* von Jenny Erpenbeck, *Ohrfeige* von Abbas Khider, und *Das dunkle Schiff* von Sherko Fatah.