

Suima I. P.

Oles Honchar Dnipro National University

PRONOMINAL QUESTION WITHIN THE INTERROGANIVE DIALOGUE

The article deals with the peculiarities of functioning of pronominal questions within the interrogative dialogue. It is distinguished, that in linguistics, the point of view according to which the communicative meaning of the interrogative pronoun is considered depending on its text-forming function is most clearly presented. This fact consists in indicating an unknown element of thought and requiring the elimination of this unknown part in the answer. It is noted in the article, that the boundaries of the information gap of interest to the questioner are determined by the semantic values of the well-known components of the situation as the denotation of the question. It is considered, that pronominal questions are aimed at clarifying certain elements of the statement, but at the same time, the issue is not only the position in the logical-syntactic or communicative structure of the statement, but the semantic content itself. It is underlined, that questions in English have a fairly clear specialization, each question word is used to find the corresponding actant. It is noted, that the system of the English language has at its disposal a whole series of question words, strictly divided according to their functions, some question words have only one function, and some are multifunctional (for example, what or how), with their help we can construct different questions or search for different actants. It is explained in the article, that the interrogative dialogue can be formed not only in the form of a single interrogative statement, but also in the form of a complex of interrogative statements. The identified reasons for the development of interrogative dialogue can be divided into reasons of a linguistic nature, they include evasion of an answer and clarification, extralinguistic factors that lead to the development of an interrogative dialogue with an initiation such as a pronominal question can include the presupposition ignore. It is proved, that the reluctance to answer the question is one of the reasons for the appearance of the following questions, which violate the principle of communicative cooperation and the strategy of changing the topic is used, and the communicator, who initiates the conversation, uses the strategy of communicative pressure.

It is underlined in the article, that the most frequent strategies used by communicators in this type of dialogue are: clarification, repetition, amplification. As for the principles of dialogue construction, the principles of communicative sufficiency, interaction and cooperation are mostly violated.

Key words: dialogue, pronominal question, dialogical entity, communication, question, answer, speech act, definition, initiating line.

Problem statement and relevance. English grammars traditionally distinguish two main types of questions – general and special ones [2, p. 45; 11, p. 56].

In more recent studies most grammars by tradition include general, special and alternative questions on the basis of general [3, p. 65].

In German language, researchers mainly distinguish two basic types of interrogative sentences, they are without a question word (Entscheidungsfrage) and interrogative sentences with a question word (Ergänzungsfrage). Both types of questions are posed to a specific component statements. Applied at one time to interrogative sentences, the term Satzfrage means question to the whole sentence [1, p. 74]. According to the author, the most successful names of the main varieties of interrogative sentences are

“pronominal” questions (with a question word) and “non-pronominal” questions (without question word) [1, p. 75].

To denote interrogative statements, where the main intention is reduced to the requirement for responding interlocutor to confirm or refute the correctness information available to the initiating communicant, we use the term “non-pronominal question”. Interrogative sentences where communicative intention – a request for information about one of the actors, denoted by a question word, we define as pronominal ones.

In linguistics, the point of view is most clearly represented, according to which the communicative meaning of the interrogative pronoun considered depending on its text-forming function, consisting in pointing to an unknown element of thought and

demanding elimination of this uncertainty in the responsive statement [4, p. 130–153; 5, p. 125–245].

The boundaries of the information gap that interests the questioner, determined by the semantic meanings of the known components of the situation as a denotation of an interrogative statement. Pronominal interrogative sentences are aimed at clarifying certain elements of the utterance, but at the same time, the issue is not their position in the logical–syntactic or the communicative structure of the utterance, but the semantic content itself.

The question fulfills in the process of communication two functions:

1) expresses the opinion of the questioner to obtain knowledge and refers to the informant in order to satisfy this need;

2) communicates to the intended informant knowledge of what interested in the relevant aspect, based on which lack of knowledge should be satisfied [6, p. 76].

Knowledge of interest of the questioner is not information known at the time statements. The interrogative element of the initiating remark is actively participating in obtaining this information, outlines it. Interrogative element is not information, but a signal about the desire to receive information, therefore, in the composition of dialogical entity, it cannot be a rheme, but outlines a rheme, which implemented in a reactive line [7, p. 300]. Pronominal interrogative sentences mark the information gap as rhematic component and represent the requirement of its semantic filling.

The purpose of the article. The purpose of the article is to identify the main components and peculiarities of the dialogical entity and to describe the specificity of interrogative dialogues including questions with pronouns.

The presentation of the main material. Due to the generalized semantic filling, interrogative pronouns set only the search frame for the rheme of the reaction of the utterance. As for pronominal interrogative utterances, the rheme has an intended character [9, p. 87].

As mentioned above, pronominal questions are questions beginning with interrogative pronouns. In linguistic terms we also encounter the term “interrogative word” – this is a quantifier pronoun, it indicates only the denotative status of the expression, not calling him. In other words, the presence of interrogative pronouns in statement does not yet make its intention interrogative.

Conative interrogative statements have a communicative purpose of encouraging the addressee

to a certain activity, a goal of expressing their mental–emotional relation to reality or to the replica of the second communicant. Under the last type we understand rhetorical questions. Conative questions, in their turn, can be further divided into two groups depending on the nature activities: informative – encouraging to report information about the material world and the inner world of a human being, uninformative, encouraging psychophysical activity not related to transmission of the information. In informative questions, it can be also singled out the actual informative questions that are based on the speaker’s ignorance some information and the desire to receive it from the addressee, i.e. these are questions where the intention of questioning is presented in its pure form and not complicated by additional contextual intentions.

Thus, the pronominal question is an indicator of information about new, requesting information about one or two components of situations corresponding to one or two arguments of the proposition.

Interrogative dialogues are most often initiated with a single interrogative statement. To search for the required actant, can be used the corresponding question word. Question words in the English language have a fairly clear specialization. Every question word is designed to search for the corresponding actant. English language system has a whole set of interrogative words, strictly distributed according to their functions [8, p. 37; 10, p. 100]. Some of the question words have only one function, and some are polyfunctional (for example, what or how), with their help you can build different interrogative utterances or search for various actants.

With the participation of the pronoun what, many interrogative questions are built statements. The nature of the issue and its functional focus depend on which proposal model underlies the implementation, and what question word is used.

Consider questions with the pronoun what. question word outlines:

A) Perceptive, which should be named in the reaction of the interlocutor.

– *What! You’ve got my book! What do you think of it?*

– *Do you suppose I would read such a book, sir?*

– *Then why did you buy it? (Shaw, Man and Superman)*

The considered interrogative dialogue consists of three interrogative sentences linked together. Communicative situation is a conversation that takes place between Ramsden and Tanner, who are Annie’s guardians. They only today we found out that they were

appointed guardians, and we are very dissatisfied with this, because. They people of different generations. Ramsden says he would not like to Annie was brought up on the basis of the ideas that are preached in the book. Tanner. Tanner is very surprised that Ramsden knows about his book and asks what he thinks of it, assuming to hear the reader's opinion about it, that is tries to find out the general communicative attitude of the speaker. But the communicant, not justifying his hopes, reacts emotionally: "Really Do you think I would read such a book? As the analysis shows situation, the appearance of the second interrogative line is due to the unwillingness answer the question, which is a violation of the principle interaction, when the speaker responds inadequately to a question, an answer to which there should have been an utterance that complied with the rules speech etiquette, while using an avoidance strategy. But the interlocutor in order to implement his communicative attitude, he formulates a question, which can confuse the interlocutor. Tanner wonders why Ramsden then bought this book. The communicator violates the principle of communicative cooperation and applies a strategy of strengthening, putting its purpose is to rather put the interlocutor in an awkward, hopeless position than find out this information.

Descriptive function.

- *What is the name of that apparition that brought me here?*
- *My master and thin? (Twain, Yankee)*

This dialogue consists of two interrogative statements and takes place in a situation where the communicant (he was captured) is trying to find out where he is and asks the page who brought him to the dungeon, what is his name and expects to hear the specific name of the person who imprisoned him. Page clarifies whose name the interlocutor would like to hear, which may be related to by the fact that the master gave the order to imprison, and the page carried it out.

Thus, the appearance of the second interrogative is due to the desire the interlocutor to clarify the information so that the next step is more effective filling of the information gap, which in turn is violation of the principle of interaction, and the communicant applies the strategy clarifications.

A question may ask for information about an inanimate agent, cf.:

- *What is wrong, Dick?*
- *Why did you take iron yesterday when I'd told you not to?*
- *But why should you tell me not to? (Fraser, Tildy)*

The dialogue under consideration consists of three interrogative statements, the communicative context is a conversation between Tildy and Dick, their conversation takes place during a strike. Buyers of coal decided to lower the purchase price of coal, and stopped buying it from population. Tildy could not lose working days and bought coal from suppliers, because she needed to feed the baby.

The appearance of the second interrogative statement is due to the desire of the interlocutor to identify the general communicative attitude of the partner and find out the reasons for this act of Tildy. In this case, it happens violation of the principle of communicative cooperation and is applied amplification strategy for expressing the emotional state of the communicant.

Thus, the initiating cue is searching for an inanimate agent, and the following statements search for the causative.

The third interrogative statement is presented as a rhetorical question. The interlocutor does not want to continue the conversation and reacts emotionally. The use of the modal verb "should" reinforces emotionality of the statement (bewilderment and irritation). In this case, we can talk about evasion or a strategy of refusal response.

Refusal to cooperate may be associated with an internal psychological state, emotional stress a communicant who perceives a request for information as an attack on his/her social face. These circumstances determine the appearance reactive statements, which are refusals to answer. They are not fill the information gap of the request and are characterized by a reduced degree of cooperativeness, as well as the lack of a positive result in realization of the intention of the communicant asking the question.

In this situation, the refusal can be qualified as indirect conflict, because no explicit denial or non-interaction, but the strategy of such a refusal is to attack, a negative emotional attitude to the interlocutor, and this brings the dialogue to high conflict, aggressive level.

Showing a result.

- *What was it made of?*
- *Made of? Now how should I know? (Galsworthy, Property)*

The analyzed dialogue is an articulation of two interrogative statements, its deployment takes place within the framework of the following communicative context – this conversation takes place between Aunt Esther and Susie, who describes Irene's hat as something extraordinarily beautiful. Aunt Esther asks what this hat is made of, given an interrogative

statement is used to search for a result. Analysis of the communicative situation shows that the answer is an interrogative complex consisting of two interrogative statements, its appearance is due to the discrepancy between the knowledge fund of the interlocutors. Ignorance of the answer to the question causes an emotional reaction of the interlocutor, as a result of which a second interrogative statement appears in the form rhetorical question. In an interesting way of expressing unwillingness to communicate with the interlocutor is the denial of the addresser presuppositions of the question, although in this communicative situation we do not we can confidently say that they are true. In this case, there is a violation of the principle of interaction and a reacting

The communicator uses an avoidance strategy.

Interrogative word + verb form ask for a specific action

- *What's happened?*
- *What's your doctor's name? (Fitzgerald, Sunday)*

This dialogue consists of two interrogatives and is a conversation between Stella and Joel when they returned from the theatre, from. telephone conversation, they learned that Miles, her husband, had died in plane crash. An analysis of the dialogue shows that when asked about what happened, which aims to clarify the general communicative. Installations speaker, a seemingly unmotivated interrogative saying: "What is your doctor's name?" Joel asks. Given the statement is motivated by the situation, Stella may need help doctor when she learns of her husband's death. In this case, the principle is violated communicative sufficiency, when the responding communicant does not give enough information about what happened and applies an evasion strategy.

The following example is similar:

- *What happened really?*
- *Who can say? A push from behind? A piece of cotton or string tied a cross the top of the stairs and carefully removed afterward? (Christie, Suspects)*

The analyzed dialogue consists of two replicas, the first one is presented pronominal question, and the second by an interrogative complex consisting of three interrogative sentences.

Communicative context.

Sir Henry began to talk about the mysterious death, suggesting that it was murder. Interlocutors speculated about how murders, but he rejected them. One of the interlocutors asked: "What really happened?" As the analysis of the situation shows. Sir Henry answered with a series of rhetorical questions,

since he himself did not know the answer to them, this is a manifestation of the formula amplification strategy, which used by the communicator to draw the attention of interlocutors to discussed problem, but violates the principle of communicative cooperation.

So, the interrogative word what brings into the communicative course the intention to request information about: 1) perceptive; 2) descriptive; 3) inanimate agent of action; 4) result; 5) a request for the action.

Thus, using what in an interrogative dialogue can search for five arguments.

When deploying an interrogative dialogue, the communicants use interrogative complexes most often due to their emotional state. As our pragmatic analysis shows communicative contexts reasons for deployment interrogative dialogue with interrogative complexes are similar interrogative dialogues with one interrogative statement. However, the most common reasons are the emotional state of the interlocutor, the desire to clarify information and get attention.

Conclusions. In linguistics, the point of view is most clearly represented, according to which the communicative meaning of the interrogative pronoun considered depending on its text-forming function, consisting in pointing to an unknown element of thought and demanding elimination of this uncertainty in the response statement. For search necessary argument, the corresponding interrogative is used word. Interrogative words in English have a fairly clear specialization. Each question word is meant to be searched corresponding actant. The English language system has a whole a set of interrogative words, strictly distributed according to their functions. A number of question words have only one function, and some polyfunctional (for example, what or how), with their help you can build different interrogative statements or conduct a search various argument.

The initiating communicator assumes that the requested arguments should be named in the reaction of the interlocutor, but in a situation development of an interrogative dialogue, this does not happen for a number of reasons. The main reasons identified during pragmatic analysis of interrogative dialogues initiated pronominal interrogative sentences are: emotional state of the interlocutor (irritation, surprise), at the same time, the principle of communicative communication is most often violated.

As pragmatic analysis shows, when requesting a temporative, locative and causes of action the most frequent cause of the appearance the subsequent interrogative utterance is desire interlocutor to clarify the information. When requesting other arguments

the most common causes cannot be identified, which is due to a wide range of reasons for the development of an interrogative dialogue. The identified reasons for the development of an interrogative dialogue can be subdivided into reasons of a linguistic nature, to

them include evasion and clarification, extralinguistic factors, leading to the development of an interrogative dialogue with initiation in as a pronominal question, we can include presupposition, ignoring and communicative attitude of the speaker.

Bibliography:

1. Брызгунова Е.А. Диалог. Русский язык. Энциклопедия. Москва : Советская энциклопедия, 1979. С. 74-75.
2. Изаренков Д.И. Обучение диалогической речи: монография. Москва : Русский язык, 1981. 136 с.
3. Белова Н.С. Типы ответных реплик в составе диалогического единства с отрицательным вопросом : дис. ... канд. филол. наук : 10.02.05 «Романские языки». Москва, 2010. 179 с.
4. Богачева Е.В. Вербализация намерения говорящего в диалоге: на материале английского и русского языков : дис. ... канд. филол. наук : 10.02.19 «Теория языка». Москва, 2007. 172 с.
5. Гильмутдинов В.И. Безглагольные реплики-реакции в английской разговорной речи : дис. ... канд. филол. наук : 10.02.04 «Германские языки». Горький, 1984. 223 с.
6. Головаш Л.Б. Коммуникативные средства выражения стратегии уклонения от прямого ответа: на материале английского языка : дис. ... канд. филол. наук : 10.02.19 «Теория языка». Кемерово, 2008. 177 с.
7. Михайлов Л.М. Немецкий язык. Грамматика устной речи. Москва, Астрель, 2003. 348 с.
8. Сарычев В.В. Реплика как структурно-семантическая единица драматургического текста: на материале ряда трагедий В. Шекспира : дис. ... канд. филол. наук : 10.02.04 «Германские языки». Москва, 2009. 205 с.
9. Цирельсон Н.Ю. Взаимодействие иницирующих реплик и реплик-редакций в диалоге: на материале современного английского языка : дис. ... канд. филол. наук : 10.02.19 «Теория языка». Москва, 2002. 152 с.
10. Меньшиков И.И. Типология респонсивных предложений в современном русском языке. *Избранные труды по лингвистике*. Днепропетровск : Новая идеология, 2012. С. 85–100.
11. Sperber D., Wilson D. *Relevance: Communication and Cognition*, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1986. 97 p.

Суїма І. П. ЗАЙМЕННИКОВЕ ПИТАННЯ В ІНТЕРОГАТИВНОМУ ДІАЛОЗІ

Статтю присвячено дослідженню особливостей функціонування займенникового питання в інтерогативному діалозі. З'ясовано, що у лінгвістиці найбільш чітко представлена точка зору, згідно з якою комунікативне значення питального займенника розглядається в залежності від його текстоутворюючої функції, що полягає у вказівці на невідомий елемент думки та вимогу усунення цієї невідомості у відповіді. У статті відзначено, що межі інформаційної лакуни, що цікавить запитувача, визначаються семантичними значеннями відомих компонентів ситуації як денотату запитання. Визначено, що займенникові питання спрямовані на з'ясування певних елементів висловлювання, але при цьому запитується не їхня позиція в логіко-синтаксичній чи комунікативній структурі висловлювання, а семантичний зміст. Підкреслено, що запитання в англійській мові мають досить чітку спеціалізацію, кожне питальне слово призначене для пошуку відповідного актанта. Зазначено, що система англійської мови має у своєму розпорядженні цілу низку питальних слів, суворо розподілених за своїми функціями, деякі питальні слова мають лише одну функцію, а деякі поліфункціональні (наприклад, *what* або *how*), з їх допомогою можна побудувати різні запитання або вести пошук різних актантів. У статті зазначено, що інтерогативний діалог може оформлятися не тільки у формі одиночного питального висловлювання, а й у вигляді комплексу питальних висловлювань. Виявлені причини розгортання інтерогативного діалогу можуть бути розділені на причини лінгвістичного характеру, до них відносяться ухилення від відповіді та уточнення, до екстралінгвістичних факторів, що призводять до розгортання інтерогативного діалогу з ініціацією такою як займенникове питання, можна віднести пресупозицію ігнор. Доведено, що небажання відповідати на поставлене запитання – одна з причин появи наступних запитань, які порушують принцип комунікативної співпраці та застосовується стратегія зміни теми, а комунікант, що ініціює розмову, використовує стратегію комунікативного тиску.

У статті підкреслено, що найчастішими стратегіями, які використовують комуніканти у цьому типі діалогу є: уточнення, повтор, посилення. Щодо принципів побудови діалогу, то порушуються здебільшого принцип комунікативної достатності, взаємодії та співробітництва.

Ключові слова: діалог, займенникове питання, діалогічна єдність, спілкування, запитання, відповідь, мовленнєвий акт, дефініція, ініціююча репліка.