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Abstract

The article presents a comprehensive multifaceted description of interrogative sentences in terms of the interaction of their semantic-syntactic (syntaxeme) and formal-grammatical articulation with their communicative articulation (relevant). The syntaxeme structure of interrogative sentences is determined according to the communicative intentions of the speaker. In particular, the following substantial syntaxemes, which serve as a means of modelling questions, are outlined: 1) the indefinite-interrogative subject of an action (physical, locative, intellectual, verbal); 2) the indefinite-interrogative subject of a state (physical, psycho-emotional, intellectual, locative, emotional-evaluative attitude, possessive); 3) the indefinite-interrogative subject of qualification feature, identification; 4) the indefinite-interrogative subject of a qualitative feature; 5) the indefinite-interrogative subject of a process; 6) the indefinite-interrogative object of an action (physical, intellectual-mental, verbal, perceptual); 7) the indefinite-interrogative object of a state (desire, intellectual); 8) the indefinite-interrogative object of a process (physical, psycho-emotional); 9) the indefinite-interrogative object of a qualitative feature; 10) the indefinite-interrogative addressee of an action or state; 11) the indefinite-interrogative means or instrument of an action; 12) the indefinite-interrogative locative.

All of these syntaxemes replace the positions of controlled subordinate parts in the formal-syntactic structure of a simple sentence. The emphasis is placed on interrogative words in the field of adverbial syntaxemes, in particular time, reasons, purposes, conditions, manner, and sources of information, which at the formal-syntactic level remain in the position of determinants — subordinate parts of the sentence. The specifics of the thematic-rhematic articulation of interrogative utterances and their communicative variants are examined. It is found that the communicative intention of the speaker’s request determines the intonation type of the question (full dictal, partial dictal, full modal, partial modal), and the syntaxeme and formal structure of the interrogative sentence. The communicative intention also determines the semantic, morphological and positional variants of the interrogative marker. It is observed that interrogative words are usually positioned at the beginning of the sentence and form the rhyme of the sentence.
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1 Introduction

Among all the communicative types of utterances, a special role in the language system is assigned to interrogative constructions, which verbalize one of the most important illocutionary tasks of a speaker — the intention of request. Corresponding speech acts must include, in addition to the speaker, the addressee of speech to whom the request is addressed. Through questions, the
speaker tries to obtain the information they need by encouraging the interlocutor to answer. Such characteristics of interrogative sentences to some extent bring them closer to imperative sentences, which express the will of the speaker. In addition, the illocution of interrogation contains the desired modality, the desire of the speaker to learn something or to fill information gaps in their competencies. Interrogative utterances, as well as imperative and narrative utterances, are the objects of study of communicative speech syntax, which first of all aims to establish the peculiarities of their intonation and semantic-syntactic articulation in a particular speech situation. However, any utterance, in addition to its communicative organization, has a semantic-syntactic and formal-grammatical structure in the language system. A multifaceted approach to the analysis of syntactic units and categories, based on the interaction of three main aspects — formal-syntactic, semantic-syntactic and communicative — dominates the modern linguistic paradigm.

In Ukrainian linguistics, different constructions (fragmentary and interrogative) have been studied by I. R. Vykhovanets (Vykhovanets, 1993), K. H. Horodenska (Horodens’ka, 1991), P. S. Dudyk (Dudyk, 1999), M. Ya. Pliusch (Pliusch, 2016), A. P. Zahnitko (Zahnitko, 2001), M. V. Mirchenko (Mirchenko, 2004), M. O. Vintoniv (Vintoniv, 2013), N. M. Kostusiak (Kostusiak, 2012), O. H. Mezhov (Mezhov, 2012), and others. In Ukrainian grammar, the first systematic description of sentences of direct (clarifying) and indirect interrogation, which forms the basis of textbooks on Ukrainian syntax, was proposed by L. O. Kadomtseva (Kadomtseva, 1972, pp. 128–133). In recent times, the studies of S. T. Shabat-Savky (Shabat, 2000, 2001; Shabat-Savka, 2016, 2019) have been devoted to relevant issues of content, markers of the actualization of intentions of request, and the communicative-pragmatic and derivational potential of interrogative utterances. Noteworthy are the review articles by M. V. Pankova on the evolution of linguistic views on the semantic and communicative structure of interrogative sentences, and the features of their thematic-rhematic articulation (Pankova, 2009, 2013). The problems raised by previous research require in-depth study. Particular attention should be paid to the balance between the formal, semantic and communicative organization of interrogative sentences in modern Ukrainian. It is important to study the semantic-syntactic potential of words that are directly involved in the formation of interrogative content. Pronouns and adverbs are dominant among such lexical items yet have been analysed the least in comparison with other parts of speech. Most recent studies have analysed the semantic potential of adjectives (Dimitrova & Stefanova, 2018), verbs and nouns (Dziob & Piasecki, 2018; Kostusiak, 2012; Mezhov, 2012; Mirchenko, 2004; Zahnitko, 2001).

New source bases should be used for research, in particular mass media texts as they best reflect language dynamics. It is important to study how some interrogative sentences, formed by journalists, implement the communicative-pragmatic function. It is also important to identify the dominant formal means of expressing different intentions of request and to characterize them in terms of cognitive load and the thematic-rhematic articulation of utterances.

The purpose of the article is therefore to present a comprehensive multifaceted description of interrogative sentences in terms of the interaction of their semantic-syntactic (syntaxeme) and formal-grammatical articulation with their communicative articulation (relevant). Achieving this goal involves the following main tasks: 1) to establish the syntaxeme structure of interrogative sentences in accordance with the communicative intentions of the speaker; 2) to study the specifics of the thematic-rhematic articulation of interrogative utterances and to identify their communicative variants; 3) to characterize the formal means of expressing interrogative modality in different types of utterances.

2 Typical Expressions of Request Intentions

The communicative-pragmatic goal of typical interrogative utterances is to obtain new information, to complete partial information, or to confirm the credibility of information in the form of a clear, specific answer from the addressee, which satisfies the speaker. If the interlocutors are unable to answer due to a lack of knowledge, do not want to answer, ask counter questions,
or knowingly provide false information, etc., the communication act must be considered to have been unsuccessful. S. T. Shabat-Savka states: “The linguistic form of expression of the category of interrogation represents a qualitative characteristic of the information gap in the knowledge of the subjects of communication — their desire to specify or clarify information, confirm or deny a fact of reality...” (Shabat-Savka, 2016, p. 105). This interpretation of the researcher served as the basis for distinguishing, following L. O. Kadomtseva (Kadomtseva, 1972, pp. 128–133), two typical expressions of intentions of request — specifying and clarifying (Shabat-Savka, 2016, p. 105).

R. Vykhovanets divides interrogative sentences according to the type of question and the expected answer into general interrogative (usually clarifying) and partial interrogative (specifying). Vykhovanets notes: “General questions are focused on either the affirmative answer (Yes), or the negative answer (No), or other modifications of these answers. Partial interrogative sentences are aimed at obtaining some new partial information” (Vykhovanets, 1993, p. 146).

3 Peculiarities of the Syntaxeme Structure of Partial Interrogative Sentences

The semantic-syntactic structure of partial interrogative sentences is determined by the nature of the information that the speaker seeks to obtain: information about the performer of the action or the bearer of the process, a state, qualitative and quantitative features; the person (other being) or object to whom/which an action, process, state is directed; the person to whom an action is addressed; the instrument or means of transportation; the location of a person (another being), the location of an object, the direction and mode of movement; the circumstances under which (or contrary to which) certain actions took place, or processes, states (time, cause, condition, etc.) took place; about an event, process or state.

In order to clarify the required partial information, the following syntaxemes are used:

1. the pronominal noun who?, specialized in the explication of questions about beings. It also appears in various non-prepositional (koho? [who?], komu? [whom?], kym? [who?]) and prepositional do (pro, dlaia, ribia) koho? [to (about, for, near) whom?], nakoho? [on whom?], na (pry, u) komu? [on (at, in) whom?] forms;
2. the pronominal noun shcho? [what?], which participates in the verbalization of questions about non-existent objects in various non-prepositional (choho? [what?], chym? [what?]) and prepositional do (bilia) choho? [to (near) what?], na (pro) shcho? [on (about) what?], na (pry, u) chomu? [on (near, in) what?] forms. These forms are used to determine the action or condition of a person (Shcho z nym diietia? [What is happening to him?]), as well as the reasons (chomu? [why?], za shcho? [for what?]) object or purpose of the subject (dlia (zadlia, zarady) choho? [for (for, for the sake of) what?]) in the case of adverbialization — the transition from the sphere of subjectification to the adverb;
3. the pronominal adjectives yakyi? [which?], kotryi? [which?], chyi? [whose?], which model questions about the properties and the qualitative and possessive features of beings and non-beings, their order by numbers (list), and their order by time time;
4. the pronominal numeral skilky? [how many?], which is the only representative of questions about the number of subjects;
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All of these interrogative forms refer to unknown, unclear, or unspecified (for the speaker) objects, features, and circumstances, which the speaker intends to learn from the interlocutor by structuring interrogative sentences and waiting for specific answers.

The main feature of the semantic-syntactic organization of partial interrogative sentences is that interrogative words or phrases are usually located at the beginning of the construction, regardless of their syntactic function or mode of expression. The representatives of semantic-syntactic organization with the formal-syntactic position of the subject (Kostusiak, 2012, pp. 74–100; Mezhov, 1993, p. 245) are distinguished on the basis of semantic relations — minimal syntactic units of semantic variety, which reflect the relationship between objects and phenomena of the extralinguistic world (Vykhovanets, 1993, p. 245).

To mark unknown persons, other beings, objects and phenomena in accordance with the illocutionary purpose, the speaker uses interrogative pronounal nouns and other means in the semantic-syntactic positions of the following substantial syntaxemes due to the valence of the basic predicate:

1. the indefinite-interrogative subject of an action; in addition to the functional characteristics defined by researchers (subjective function, nearside to the predicate position, activity, correlation with the formal-syntactic position of the subject (Kostusiak, 2012, pp. 74–100; Mezhov, 2012, pp. 125–145; Vykhovanets, 1993, pp. 258–260), the analysed language units show a certain originality. The following indefinite-interrogative syntaxemes function as subjects of the following actions:
   a) physical; in the case of subordination to verbs, the lexical content of which is associated with the marking of someone’s dynamic activity: Khto zbydau dorohu v Yevropu? [Who is going to build the road to Europe?] (https://day.kyiv.ua, 28.05.2015); Khto zrobyv iz pamiatky arkhitekturne opudalo ta chy mozhlyvo yii wriatuvaly? [Who turned architectural monument into scarecrow and is there a way to save it?] (https://vitativ.com.ua, 26.11.2020); Khto striihaic naikrasche? [Who shoots the best?] (https://ibis.net.ua, 19.06.2019); Khto zbduie dorohu v Yevropu? [Who will build the road to Europe?] (https://www.dw.com, 04.09.2020); Khto I koly znyshchyv u Rosii demokratiiu? [Who and when destroyed democracy in Russia?] (https://day.kyiv.ua, 11.10.2018);
   b) locative; in the structures of this variety, in addition to the subject with indefinite-interrogative semantics, there are predicate-dependent right-side syntaxemes with the meaning of place: Khto poide z mnoiu na krai svitu? [Who will go with me to the ends of the earth?] (https://day.kyiv.ua, 26.09.2012); Khto pide slidom? [Who will follow?] (https://tyzhden.ua, 18.08.2020);
   c) intellectual; usually in such sentences the indefinite-interrogative subject enters the valence frame of divalent verbs, which show their meaning also with the help of the obligatory right-side component mainly in the abstract meaning: Khto vyhadaiv nazvu? [Who came up with the name?] (https://day.kyiv.ua, 08.06.2011); Khto pryduayv termin “detektyv”, i khto vvershe sformuluvav prynsypy anhliiskoho klasu chnoho detektyvu? [Who invented the term “detective”, and who first introduced the principles of the English classic detective?] (https://day.kyiv.ua, 03.01.2017); Khto napysav muzyku v try roky? [Who wrote music in three years old?] (http://www.golos.com.ua, 01.09.2011);
d) verbal: when the prop predicate explicates a dynamically designed speech feature: I khto kazav, shcho Usyk bezudarnyi? [And who said that Usyk is unbeaten?] (https://www.volyn.com.ua, 25.12.2020); To yak azh real vartisthazu v Ukraini? Khto vidpovist na tse zapytannia? [So what is the real cost of Ukrainian gas? Who will answer this question?] (https://dilovyi.info, 09.05.2019);

2. the indefinite-interrogative subject of a state, characterized by the presence of indefinite-interrogative passivity as a temporary characteristic of a person. The syntaxemes of the analysed example is realized by interrogative pronominal nouns in different case and prepositional-case forms, denoting the carrier of the following types of class feature:

a) physical: associated with the expression of changes in the human body, the expression of physiological discomfort, stress, etc. or, on the other hand, signs of a positive nature: Finansy oblasti zablokovani: khto strazhdai? [The region’s finances are blocked: who is suffering?] (http://nova.te.ua, 11.09.2020); Khto naibilshe strazhdai v Rossii vid padinnia rublia? [Who is suffering the most in Russia from the ruble’s fall?] (https://news.24tv.ua, 23.12.2014);

b) psycho-emotional: the presence of which is not caused by the subject. Usually the formation of its psycho-emotional state is influenced by certain objective factors or other persons: Bo komu ne bulo liachno? [Because who wasn’t scared?] (https://prostir.museum, 14.04.2017);

c) intellectual: explaining the mental capacity of an unknown person: Khto znaiu istoriiu Kiyiva? [Who knows the history of Kyiv?] (https://day.kyiv.ua, 27.05.2008);

d) locative: the formation of which is directly influenced by the locative predicates to be, to remain, to happen, to live, etc., which may have an explicit expression: Komu shvyetsia veselo, prwylno v Ukraini? [Who lives happily, freely in Ukraine?] (https://day.kyiv.ua, 11.12.2009); Khto tut? [Who is here?] (https://day.kyiv.ua, 20.03.2018);

e) emotional and evaluative attitude: the following indefinite-interrogative subjective syntaxemes subordinated with predicates which express a positive or negative attitude towards someone or something, an inner state, feelings, or an interest: Komu tse mozhle buty tsikavo? [Who would be interested?] (https://day.kyiv.ua, 22.07.2013); Koho b ne zatsikavyla taka propozysinia? [Who wouldn’t be interested in such an offer?] (http://vilne.org.ua, 12.07.2016);

f) possessive: discovered due to belonging to an unknown person: U koho kliuchi vid “zernovoho raju”? [Who has the keys to the “grain paradise”?] (https://day.kyiv.ua, 16.10.2008);

3. the indefinite-interrogative subject of qualification features or identification, which indicates the absence of specific information about the being. Because of this, the speaker tries to discover its characteristics, peculiarities, features, etc., encouraging the addressee to specify certain information: Khto takyi Rei Voshbern? [Who is Ray Washburn?] (https://ukrainian.voanews.com, 27.08.2017); Kym buv Vasyl Stus? [Who was Vasyl Stus?] (https://www.radiosvoboda.org, 06.01.2018); Ale khto vin, toi Ivan Maksymovych Soshenko, dobryi Taras’ anhel? [But who is he, that Ivan Maksymovych Soshenko, a good angel of Taras?] (https://day.kyiv.ua, 18.03.2006);

4. the indefinite-interrogative subject of a qualitative feature, in particular a qualitative, variable, which by comparison reveals a partial advantage or excessive expression, as well as an ordinal one: Khto vygen u povenevii katastrofi na Prykarpatti? [Who is to blame for the flood catastrophe in Prykarpattia?] (https://vda.org.ua, 25.06.2020); Khto nakhraschchyi? Iz 19 po 21 bereznia u Kyievi vidbudetsia IV Mizhnarodnyi yunatskyi konkurs-festivul klassychnoho tantsiu “HRAN-PRI KYIV” [Who is the best? From March 19 to 21, the IV International Youth Competition Festival of Classical Dance “GRAND PRIX OF KYIV” will take place in Kyiv] (https://day.kyiv.ua, 15.03.2018); Komu potribynna knyzhka v Ukraini? [Who needs a book in Ukraine?] (https://day.kyiv.ua, 28.04.2017); Khto pershyi u kvesti? [Who is the first in
the quest?] [http://mradapology.gov.ua, 21.10.2020]; Kho pershyi u cheri na vaktsyna-
tsiu vid koronavirusu? [Who is first in line for coronavirus vaccination?] (https://itvmg.com,
07.12.2020);
5. the indefinite-interrogative subject of a process, in particular the procedural phenomena of
flora and the physiological processes of beings or personified objects: Shcho tsvite u lvivskomu
botanichnomu sadu? [What blooms in the Lviv Botanical Garden?] (http://tvomisto.tv,
25.04.2020); Shcho roste v lisakh? [What grows in forests?] (https://uprales.gov.ua,
15.06.2011); Kho to kvoritie na koronavirus? [Who is getting sick from coronavirus?] (http://
//www.auc.org.ua, 16.03.2020);
6. the indefinite-interrogative object of an action, the semantic ranking of which is related to
the semantic nature of the prop predicate, given that the right-side syntaxemes of this type
explicate the objects of such actions:

a) physical: Shcho zrobly u 2019 rotsi u shkolakh Menskoi OTH? [What was done in 2019 in
the schools of Minsk JTT?] (http://mena.org.ua, 14.01.2020); Richnytsia 9/11: shcho
zbuduvaly namistivezh-blyzniukiv? [9/11 Anniversary: what is rebuilt on the site of the
Twin Towers?] (https://www.bbc.com, 11.09.2018); Komu pryshluvaie verhikie kyivskoi
filii “stalinsko ho patriarkhu”? [Whom do the leaders of Kyiv branch of “Stalin patri-
archy” show favor to?] (https://day.kyiv.ua, 12.05.2015);
b) intellectual and mental, related to mental activity: Shcho ukrinints dumaiut pro Konstytut-
org.ua, 21.12.2020); Choho braty? Znaiomnyzho deyakymy nominantymy na prestyzhnu
mysytsev premiu [Whom to choose? Introducing with some nominees for the prestigious
art award] (https://day.kyiv.ua, 10.02.2007);
c) verbal, related to speech: Iryna Hrymak u Drohobychi. Pro shcho ho zovorly? [Iryna Hry-
mak in Drohobych. What were they talking about?] (https://drohobych-rama.gov.ua,
23.12.2020); Pro shcho prosiat Prezydenta v yoho hromadskykh pryzinalniakh? [What is
the President asked for in his public receptions?] (https://day.kyiv.ua, 14.07.2005);
d) receptive: I zreshtoiu, shcho same y kho ho pohnat hliadachi “5 kanalu” protiahom 23–24
serpnia navashomu kanali? [And in the end, what and who exactly will the viewers of
“Channel 5” see on August 23–24 on your channel?] (https://day.kyiv.ua, 19.08.2011);
7. the indefinite-interrogative object of a state, in particular:

a) desire; the semantic nature of such substantial syntaxemes is influenced by prop verbs
such as bazhaty [to wish], volity [to wish], zhadaty [to wish], mriaity [to wish], prahunty [to
want], khotity [to want]: Choho khochut? Ukrasty v ostanni tyzhni pered obranniam prezy-
denta? [What do they want? Steal in the last weeks before the election of the president?] (https://day.kyiv.ua,
15.05.2014); Otze, choho khoche molod? [So, what do young people want?] (https://mrb.com.ua,
24.11.2020); — Choho prahuny sohodni katolytski osviti zaklady y, zokrema, vash universytet? — What do Catholic educational
institutions and, in particular, your university wish for? (https://day.kyiv.ua, 07.11.2009);
b) intellectual; associated with the realization of mental dynamic features: Komu vyrity? [Who to trust?] (http://www.golos.com.ua, 08.07.2020); Komu poviryt Yevropa? [Whom
will Europe believe?] (https://day.kyiv.ua, 17.01.2009); Pro shcho dumaie Donbas? [What is Donbass thinking about?] (https://day.kyiv.ua,
26.04.2018); Kho shanuiesh, Ukraino? [Who do you respect, Ukraine?] (https://day.kyiv.ua,
15.08.2019);
8. the indefinite-interrogative object of a process (physical or psycho-emotional): Nad chym,
vasne, smialysis? [What, exactly, were they laughing at?] (https://day.kyiv.ua,
22.11.2000);
9. the indefinite-interrogative object of a qualititative feature, the functional features of which
make it possible to identify predicatively used adjectives: Choho verty vrebet baraniachoi
nohy, farshyrvanoi ustrystsiamy? [What is the recipe for lamb leg stuffed with oysters worth
10. the indefinite-interrogative addressee of an action or state. It is important to emphasize that in narrative constructions the addressee component correlates with the semi-strongly controlled subordinate part of the sentence. In interrogative constructions, on the other hand, its connection with the predicate is greatly enhanced. The speaker seeks to obtain information from an unknown person as the addressee: *Komu skazaty “diakuiu” za te, shcho zhyu?* [To whom can I say “thank you” for being alive?](https://day.kyiv.ua, 06.08.1997);

11. the indefinite-interrogative instrument or means of an action: *Chym zakhyshechaiaeno vrozhaiz shcho gimo?* [How do we protect the harvest and what do we eat?](https://day.kyiv.ua, 18.03.2019); *Chym doidut u didzhytalizowane mazbutnie ukraiinski selo?* [How will Ukrainian villages reach the digitalized future?](https://day.kyiv.ua, 24.09.2019);

12. the indefinite-interrogative locative. The valence of locative predicates in interrogative constructions involves the interrogative markers *de*? [where?], *zvidky*? [where?], *kudy*? [where?], *yakym shliakhom*? [in what way?] in the semantic-syntactic positions of locative syntaxemes of place, direction of movement (starting point and final destination), and way of movement: *De zh toi “rai”, za yakyi borolytia?* [Where is that “paradise” for which they fought?](https://day.kyiv.ua, 11.09.2020); *De pochynaetsia Yeuvropa?* [Where does Europe begin?](https://day.kyiv.ua, 22.12.2014); *Koly, zvidky y komu distantsia yakstyna?* [When, where and who will get the vaccine?](https://zz.te.ua, 24.12.2020); *Kudy plyve I kudy plynyste Ukraina?* [Where is Ukraine drifting now and where will it get?](https://day.kyiv.ua, 15.01.2020).

All of the previously characterized substantial syntaxemes replace the positions of the controlled subordinate parts in the formal-syntactic structure of a simple sentence due to the valence of basic predicates.

Interrogative pronominal adverbs and syntactic combinations in the semantic-syntactic positions of adverbial syntaxemes allow the speaker to discover unknown circumstances of events:

1. time: *De I koly pomyluvatysia tsvitom vesnoiu 2019?* [Where and when to admire the blossom in spring of 2019?](https://eventukraine.com, 01.04.2019); *Doky tryvatyme karantyn?* [How long will the quarantine last?](http://m-studio.net.ua, 25.06.2020);

2. reason: *Chomu liudy na tse zdatri?* [Why are people capable of this?](https://www.bbc.com, 08.11.2020); *Chomu khochut zakryty “Kryivku”?* [Why do they want to close Kryivka?](https://day.kyiv.ua, 07.12.2012)


4. condition: *Za yakyhk obstavym matyme perspektivy utopii “suverennoho Krymu”?* [Under what circumstances will the utopia of the “sovereign Crimea” have prospects?](https://day.kyiv.ua, 29.01.2020); *Za yakyhk umov bude olhosheno lokdaun?* [Under what conditions will the lockdown be announced?](www.segodnya.ua, 28.11.2020);

5. manner: *Yak prokhodyt rozsliduvannya sprav pro porushennia praw liudyn v aneksovanom Krymu?* [How is the investigation of human rights violations in the annexed Crimea?] (https://ua.krymr.com, 12.05.2017); *Yak narodylasia pisnia “Ridna maty moia”?* [How was the song “My Dearest Mother” born?](https://day.kyiv.ua, 17.05.2017); Chy vidbuvalya todi vybory i u yakyi sposib? [Did the elections take place then and in what way?](https://day.kyiv.ua, 04.07.2008);

6. sources of information: *Pro sohodnistniu zustrich zvidky diznalysia?* [How did you find out about today’s meeting?](https://pl.suspinile.media, 23.03.2019).

The pronominal adjectives *yakyi*? [what?], *kotryi*? [which?], *chiyi*? [whose?] and the pronominal numeral *skily*? [how many?] in the semantic-syntactic function of preposed predicate syntaxemes...
make it possible to verbalize questions about the qualitative and possessive features of beings and non-beings, their order in a list, their quantitative characteristics, and their chronological order: Yaka kontseptsiia festyvaliu? [What is the concept of the festival?] (https://day.kyiv.ua, 08.06.2011); Chyi zhe naspravdi Krym? [Whose Crimea is anyway?] (https://news.24tv.ua, 23.12.2014); Mists peredbachaietsia skilky? [How many seats are expected?] (https://day.kyiv.ua, 08.06.2011). In the corresponding communicative task, these interrogative words are able to move to the postposition: Kontseptsiia festyvaliu ye yaka? [in English translation the word order remains the same: What is the concept of the festival?] (https://day.kyiv.ua, 08.06.2011); Naspravdi zh Krym chyi? [in English translation the word order remains the same: Whose Crimea is anyway?] (https://news.24tv.ua, 23.12.2014); Mists peredbachaietsia skilky? [in English translation the word order remains the same: How many seats are expected?]. The answers to the corresponding questions, depending on the communicative purpose of the message and the need to focus on a particular feature, can be complete or incomplete nominative one-member sentences or compound constructions: Tsikava kontseptsiia festyvaliu [Interesting concept of the festival]; Tsikava [Interesting]; Kontseptsiia festyvaliu tsikava [The concept of the festival is interesting]; Ukrainskyi Krym [Ukrainian Crimea]; Ukrainskyi [Ukrainian]; Krym ukrainskyi [Crimea is Ukrainian]; Piat mists [Five seats]; Piat [Five]; Mists peredbachaietsia piat [Five places are expected].

At the formal-syntactic level of the sentence, the syntaxemes of time, reason, purpose, condition, manner, and sources of information are in the position of determinants — subordinate members.

4 The Thematic-Rhematic Articulation of Partial Interrogative Utterances

The thematic-rhematic articulation of partial interrogative utterances is peculiar, and is closely related to the semantic-syntactic articulation. If in narrative utterances the theme usually precedes the rHEME, then in partial interrogative utterances the theme follows the rHEME. This means that in the thematic-rhematic articulation of partial interrogative utterances, any interrogative markers fall into the communicative position of the rHEME: substantive, adverbial and predicate syntaxemes, expressed by pronominal words (nouns, adjectives, numerals and adverbs) or other units that “form the semantic centre of interrogative utterances, reflect the intentional horizons of the speaker...” (Shabat-Savka, 2019, p. 266).

For the subjective syntaxemes of narrative sentences, the typical initial position is the theme, whereas the typical position for the predicate is the theme. The utterance Instytut sadivnytstva (theme) / zbuduie virus solohichnyi kompleks (rHEME) [Institute of Horticulture (theme) / will build a virological complex (rHEME)] (https://agro.24tv.ua, 26.12.2020) is the answer to the general question Shcho zbuduie Instytut sadivnytstva? [What will the Horticultural Institute build?].

At the formal-syntactic level of the sentence, the syntaxemes of time, reason, purpose, condition, manner, and sources of information are in the position of determinants — subordinate members.
the answer of the interlocutor *Instytut sadivnytstva zbuduie (theme) / virusolohichnyi kompleks (rheme)* [Institute of Horticulture will build (theme) / a virological complex (rheme)] the logical emphasis will, according to the communicative task, move to the object syntaxeme. An additional means of expressing the object-rheme can be the limiting-intensifying particle *tilky* [only]: *Instytut sadivnytstva zbuduie (theme) / tilky virusolohichnyi kompleks (rheme)* [Institute of Horticulture will build (theme) / only a virological complex (rheme)].

The utterance *Ukraina daruie Makedonii (theme) / druzhu (rheme)* [Ukraine pledges friendship (rheme) / to Macedonia (theme)] ([https://day.kyiv.ua, 07.07.2001](https://day.kyiv.ua, 07.07.2001)) emphasizes the object action in the final position, answering the question *Shcho* (rheme) / *daruie Ukraina Makedonii* (theme)? *What (rheme) / does Ukraine pledge to Macedonia (theme)*? in which the objective syntaxeme, explicated by the possessive case of the pronounal noun, stands at the beginning. In the constructions of the analysed type, the so-called “addressee” verbs predict by their valence the obligatory addressee syntaxeme in the dative case, actualized in the communicative position of the complex rheme due to the speaker’s interrogative utterance. Compare: *Komu* (rheme) / *daruie Ukraina druzhu* (theme)? [To whom (rheme) / Ukraine pledges friendship (theme)*] And *Ukraina daruie druzhu* (theme) / *Makedonii* (rheme) [Ukraine pledges friendship (theme) / to Macedonia (rheme)].

If speakers want to learn about an instrument or a means of transportation, they use the interrogative pronouns *chym?* [what?], *na chomu?* [what?] in the position of a rheme as morphological variants of instrumental syntaxemes. For example, the utterance *...ukrainski deputaty yizdiat na liuksovykh avto...* [...ukrainian deputies drive luxury cars...] ([https://tsn.ua, 17.03.2018](https://tsn.ua, 17.03.2018)) will be an answer to the question *Na chomu* (rheme) / *yizdiat ukrainski deputaty* (theme) *What (rheme) / cars do Ukrainian deputies drive (theme)*, aimed at expanding the speaker’s knowledge with new information about the means of transportation. In the answer, the *connection na liuksovykh avto* [luxury cars] is in the final positions and in the nominative case.

The goal-oriented request of a speaker about the location of the subject or the direction or the way of its movement is conveyed by the pronominal adverbs-locatives *de?* [where?], *zvidky?* [where?], *kudy?* [where?], as well as the phrases *u yakom napriamku?* [in what direction?], *yakym shliakhom?* [which way?] in the rheme position of interrogative utterances. According to such communicative tasks, the relevant information of narrative sentences is in the final locative syntaxemes. Compare: *De* (rheme) / *sydyt liudyna* (theme)? [Where (rheme) / is a man sitting (theme)]? And ... *liudyna sydyt* (theme) / *v okopi* (rheme)... *...a man sitting (theme) / in trenches (theme)*... ([https://day.kyiv.ua, 24.11.2017](https://day.kyiv.ua, 24.11.2017)): *Zvidky* (rheme) / *vynosyly cherez try dni pisliha Triitsi lepekhu y inshi travy* (theme) *...from where (rheme) / were calamus and other herbs taken out three days after the Trinity (theme)*? And *Cherez chery dni pisliha Triitsi lepekhu y inshi travy ... vynosyly* (theme) / *z khaty* (rheme) [Three days after the Trinity calamus and other herbs ... were taken out (theme) / from the house (rheme)] ([https://day.kyiv.ua, 04.06.2020](https://day.kyiv.ua, 04.06.2020)): *Kudy* (rheme) / *vyrushyly 35 spirobitnyky v batallion u patrulnoi sluqhby politii osobylovo pryznachenannya* (theme) *...from where (rheme) / did 35 officers of the battalion of special tasks patrol police go (theme)* and 35 *spirobitnyky v batallionu patrulnoi sluqhby politii osobylovo pryznachenannya vyrushyly* (theme) / *do Mariupolja* (rheme) [35 officers of the battalion of special tasks patrol police went (theme) / to Mariupol (rheme)] ([https://day.kyiv.ua, 20.07.2020](https://day.kyiv.ua, 20.07.2020)).

With the help of explanatory questions, a speaker can obtain important information not only about objects and phenomena of the surrounding world, but also about the circumstances of certain events, their time, causes, and conditions. A speaker may learn about the purpose of any activity or the factors against which the action takes place. In the following utterances — *Shotlandiia vymahaie nezalezhnosti vid Velykoi Brytanii* (theme) / *pisliha Brexit* (rheme) [Scotland demands independence from Great Britain (theme) / after Brexit (rheme)] ([https://day.kyiv.ua, 24.12.2020](https://day.kyiv.ua, 24.12.2020)): *Publika obimilila* (theme) / *vid zdvywannia* (rheme) [Audience was blown away (theme) / by surprise (rheme)] ([https://showbiz.clutch.ua, 17.06.2020](https://showbiz.clutch.ua, 17.06.2020)): *Ukraina rozpochala perehovory z YeS* (theme) / *dlia otrymannya vaktsyny vid COVID-19* (rheme) [Ukraine has started negotiations with the EU (theme) / to receive a vaccine from COVID-19 (rheme)] ([https://day.
kyiv.ua, 21.12.2020) — clear answers are given, with communicatively significant circumstantial syntaxemes, to the following questions of the speaker — Koły (rheme) / Shotlandinia vymahai nezależności wiod Velykoii Brytanii (theme)? [When (rheme) / does Scotland demand independence from Great Britain (theme)?]; Zamovnyk (rheme) / publika obimlila (theme)? [Why (rheme) / was the audience blown away (theme)?]; Navishcho (rheme) / Ukraina rozpochała perehovory z YeS (theme)? [Why (rheme) / has Ukraine started negotiations with the EU (theme)?] — in which the initial rheme position is replaced by syntaxemes of time, cause and purpose, expressed by relevant interrogative words. The conditional and concessive interrogative words display the same communicative-functional potential.

The predicate syntaxemes of quality and quantity become the communicative core of messages if the speaker seeks to find out Skilky (rheme) / ye osib chy predmetiv (theme)? [How many (rheme) / are there persons or objects? (theme)]; Yakyny (rheme) / ye osoby chy predmety (theme)? [What (rheme) / are persons or objects (theme)?]; Komu (rheme) / nalezhat predmety (theme)? [Whom (rheme) / do the objects belong to (theme)?]. The answers to such requests are given by informative statements of a formally simple or compound structure. Compare: …napadnykiv (theme) / bilo dvoie (rheme)… [there were two (rheme) / attackers (theme)] (https://day.kyiv.ua, 06.12.2019) and Dvoie napadnykiv (rheme) [Two attackers (rheme)]; …viina (theme) / kryvaya i pidstupna (rheme)… [war (theme) / bloody and insidious (rheme)] (https://day.kyiv.ua, 06.07.2016) and Kryvaya y pidstupna viina (rheme) [Bloody and insidious war (rheme)]; …usi hazovi merezhi nalezhat (theme) / zamovnykam (rheme) …all gas networks belong (theme) / to customers (rheme) (https://day.kyiv.ua, 04.03.2020).

In partial interrogative utterances, the most frequent means of expression of the thematic-rhematic articulation are: a phrasal stress, which falls on the interrogative pronominal component; subjective word order (the pronominal syntaxeme is in the initial position of the rheme); the amplifying particle zh (zh) [but] in the interrogative word: Khoto zh (rheme) / naspradvi ye “dyvannymy stratehamy” (theme)? [But who (rheme) / are actually “armchair generals” (theme)?] (https://day.kyiv.ua, 15.08.2014). The considered partial interrogative utterances, according to Balli’s classification, express a partial dictal question, which reflects ignorance of a partial aspect of the event and is directed to a part of the information available in the utterances (Balli, 1955, pp. 47–48).

The accuracy or inaccuracy of information about a partial aspect of an event is revealed by partial modal questions with shades of doubt, mistrust, and surprise. One of the most important means of distinguishing the rheme in partial modal questions is the presence of the interrogative particles chy? [really?], khiba? [really?], nevzhe? [really?], which mostly appear at the beginning of a sentence in the communicative position of the rheme, together with the syntaxeme on which the clarifying question of the speaker is focused on, and which is accompanied by a special intonation stress with a logical emphasis. For example, the communicative paradigm of the sentence … chy zmozhut ukraintsi vidpochuty za kordonom?. [in English translation interrogative particles are not at the beginning: …will Ukrainians really be able to spend holidays abroad?..] (http://vycherpno.ck.ua, 01.07.2020) covers at least three interrogatives utterances — communicative variants, each of which the speaker tries in order to confirm the credibility of some partial aspect of the event, expressed by the following syntaxemes:

1. subjective: … chy ukraintsi (rheme) / zmozhut vidpochuty za kordonom (theme)? …will Ukrainians really (rheme) / be able to spend holidays abroad (theme)? — questions; Zmozhut vidpochuty za kordonom (theme) / ukraintsi (rheme) [Ukrainians (rheme) / will be able to spend holidays abroad (theme)] — answer;
2. predicate: Chy zmozhut vidpochuty (rheme) / ukraintsi za kordonom (theme)? [Will Ukrainians (theme) / be able to spend holidays abroad (rheme)?] — questions; Ukraintsi za kordonom (theme) / zmozhut vidpochuty (rheme) [Ukrainians (theme) / will be able to spend holidays abroad (rheme)] — answer;
3. locative: Chy za kordonom (rheme) / ukraintsi zmozhut vidpochuty (theme)? [Will Ukrainians be able to spend holidays (theme) / abroad (rheme)?] — question; Ukraintsi zmozhut vid-
Thus, the number of possible communicative variants of a partial modal question is directly proportional to the number of syntaxemes within it.

The negative particle *ne* in substantial syntaxemes may be a marker of the amplification of a rheme in partial interrogative requests, in particular:

1. subjective: *Khiba ne suspilstvo* (rheme) / *vymahalo vidkrytykh spysiv* (theme)? [Didn’t the society (rheme) / demand open lists (theme)?] ([https://rai.ua](https://rai.ua), 31.08.2020) — question; *Vymahalo vidkrytykh spysiv* (theme) / *same suspilstvo* (rheme) [The open lists (theme) / were demanded by the society (rheme)] — answer;
2. objective: *Ale khiba ne pro tse* (rheme) / *my chuico vyhe 20 rokiv pospil* (theme)? [But isn’t about this (rheme) / we’ve been hearing for 20 years in a row (theme)?] ([https://day.kyiv.ua](https://day.kyiv.ua), 14.12.2011) — question; *My chuico vyhe 20 rokiv pospil* (theme) / *same pro tse* (rheme) [We have been hearing for 20 years in a row (theme) / about this (rheme)] — the answer;
3. locative: *Do rechi, khiba ve Mezhyhirii* (rheme) / …*bula skhovana biblioteka Mudroho* (theme)? [By the way, wasn’t it Mezhyhiria (rheme) / … where the library of the Yaroslav the Wise was hidden (theme)] ([https://day.kyiv.ua](https://day.kyiv.ua), 13.01.2012) — question; *Biblioteka Mudroho bula skhovana* (theme) / *same v Mezhyhirii* (rheme) [Library of Yaroslav the Wise was hidden (theme) / in Mezhyhiria (rheme)] — answer;
4. instrumental: *Khiba ne tankamy* (rheme) / *voni zaikhaly todi* (theme)? [Weren’t there tanks (rheme) / they use (theme)?] ([https://day.kyiv.ua](https://day.kyiv.ua), 17.09.2016) — question; *Voni zaikhaly todi* (theme) / *same tankamy* (rheme) [They used (theme) / the tanks (rheme)] — the answer.

The particle *zhe* (zh) [but] enhances the significance of both substantive and secondary predicate (circumstantial) syntaxemes in the position of the rheme, in particular the subjective one: *Khiba zh Ukraina* (rheme) / — *vzhe bilshe ne khram* (theme)? [But is Ukraine (rheme) / no longer a temple (theme)]? ([http://svitlytsia.crimea.ua](http://svitlytsia.crimea.ua), 22.06.2012); objective: …*khiva zh usikh i use* (rheme) / *zapamiataiesh* (theme)? [… but is it possible to remember (theme) / everyone and everything (rheme)?] ([https://day.kyiv.ua](https://day.kyiv.ua), 02.01.2014); temporal: *Khiba zh u skrynny nut* (rheme) / *ne varto zrobity vse dlia toho, shcho b povernuty svoikh spivvitchyznykiv dodomu, dopomohty yim za bud-yaku tsinu?! (theme) [But in a difficult moment (rheme) / isn’t it important to do everything to bring your compatriots home, to help them at any cost?! (theme)] ([https://day.kyiv.ua](https://day.kyiv.ua), 20.02.2020), etc.

The limiting-intensifying participle *same* [really] determines the movement of the rheme into any communicative position — both at the beginning and at the end of the partial interrogative utterance. Compare: *Nevzhe same tut* (rheme) / *mistse dlia suchasnoho mystetstva* (theme)? [Is it really here (rheme) / the place for contemporary art (theme)?] ([https://tsn.ua](https://tsn.ua), 05.06.2015); *Nevzhe same tut* (rheme) / *nabymut “chystu, pytnu vodu”* (theme)? [Is it really here (rheme) / they are getting “clean, drinking water” (theme)?] ([https://portal.lviv.ua](https://portal.lviv.ua), 17.11.2008) and *Nevzhe Nevzhe Tkachenko zasluhy post Ministra kultury* (theme) / *same cherezy ii “vybrystva” (rheme)? [Did Tkachenko really deserve the post of Minister of Culture (theme) / really because of her “murder” (rheme)]? ([https://wikibaza.com](https://wikibaza.com), 03.06.2020).

5 The Functional-Communicative Features of General Interrogative Utterances

The particles *chy?* [but?], *khiba?* [really?], *nevzhe?* [really?] may not only refer to individual components, but also to whole utterances, expressing a complete modal question, “focused on what they know about the event as a whole, but do not know whether it is true. The question arises from doubts about the reality of the event and aims to determine the credibility of the information. 
obtained” (Vykhovannets’, 1993, p. 156). The role of the interrogative particle in such general interrogative constructions, in which we can trace a gradual increase of intonation until the end of the utterance without logical emphasis on a specific syntaxeme, is insignificant. This confirms the possibility of its extraction without loss of content. Compare: "Chy mozhna “peresichnomu slukhachevi” potrapyty na kontsert y vashoho festyvaliu? [But is it possible for an “average listener” to get tickets to the concerts of your festival?] (https://day.kyiv.ua, 08.06.2011) and Realno “peresichnomu slukhachevi” potrapyty na kontsert y vashoho festyvaliu? [Is it really possible for an “average listener” to get tickets to the concerts of your festival?]; Khiba zhy brakuie knyzhok? [Is there really the lack of books?] (https://day.kyiv.ua, 08.07.2011) and Brakuie knyzhok? [The lack of books?]; Nevyhe brakuie myttsiv? [Is there really the lack of artists?] (https://day.kyiv.ua, 02.06.2001) and Brakuie myttsiv? [The lack of artists?]. Of course, the absence of interrogative particles somewhat deprives the sentence of the expression of some modal nuances, including uncertainty, doubt, mistrust, hesitation, and surprise. However, the absence of interrogative particles does not diminish the main communicative purpose of the request — to determine the credibility of the information obtained. Each of the above questions, all the syntaxemes of which relate to the rheme, can be answered by an affirmative statement with an affirmative or negative predicate — “Peresichnomu slukhachevi” mozhna potrapyty na kontsert y vashoho festyvaliu [“The average listener can get tickets to the concerts of your festival”]; and “Peresichnomu slukhachevi” ne mozhna potrapyty nakontserty vashoho festyvaliu [“The average listener cannot get tickets to the concerts of your festival”]; Knyzhok brakuie [The lack of books] and Knyzhok ne brakuie [Enough books]; Myttsiv brakuie [The lack of artists] and Myttsiv ne brakuie [Enough artists] — or their equivalents, the unarticulated affirmative statement Tak [Yes], or the unarticulated negative statement Ni [No].

If the speakers do not know the event in general, then their so-called complete dictal question (in the terminology of S. Balli), is not directed to part of the information, but to the entire content of the utterance (Balli, 1955, p. 47). Examples are questions such as Shcho vidbulosia? [What happened?], Shcho trapylosia? [What happened?], Shcho stalosia [What happened?], U chomu rich? [What’s the matter?], Shcho robyv [subject]? [What did [the subject] do?], U yakomu stani chy protsesi perebuiaie [subject]? [In what state or process is [the subject]?], which constitute a complex rhyme, the main means of expression of which is interrogative intonation. According to the communicative task, the interlocutor can give an answer to utterances that are not articulated by theme or rhyme. Instead, all components are rhymes: Vechoriiie [It is getting dark] (https://day.kyiv.ua, 21.02.2008); Nastala tysha [Silence fell] (https://day.kyiv.ua, 22.06.2001).

6 Summary

The selected and analysed source base made it possible to identify some differences from the previously proposed theoretical statements. In particular, in addition to the previously stated division of interrogative constructions into those which implement full and partial dictation questions, we may talk about the existence of complete and partial modal questions. It was also found that interrogative utterances from headlines and from journalistic texts differ slightly. I headlines the intention of the request is usually partially levelled out. The communicative-pragmatic potential of such sentences, however, does not decrease. The illustrative material made it possible to identify a number of specific features of the analysed syntactic items.

Compared to the narrative sentences in headlines, the interrogative sentences are more aimed at interesting readers, encouraging them to read the article. The study of syntactic units with different functional potentials with the intention of request allows us to state that the headlines are dominated by sentences focused on obtaining new information about the subject. In accordance with the illocutionary purpose, the authors often use questions about the circumstances of events. The implementation of this function is often oriented to interrogative pronounal adverbs, which serve as a means of expressing adverbial syntaxemes, in particular time, reason, purpose,
condition, and manner. Quantitatively, they are much inferior to sentences in which the speaker formulates questions about objects, recipients and sources of information. The structures that implement questions about means of transportation, instruments and locatives are on the periphery. At the same time, the similarity of all the partial interrogative utterances is revealed in their communicative structure, which consists in the preposition of the rheme to the theme and in forming the rhyme with the different partial linguistic status of interrogative words, which indicates their informational significance. This pattern is slightly broken in general interrogative constructions, where the main emphasis is on the expression of modal shades of uncertainty, doubt, mistrust, hesitation, and surprise through the use of interrogative particles.

The communicative organization of interrogative sentences is closely related to their semantic-syntactic organization. The communicative intention of the speaker’s request determines the intonation type of the question (full dictal, partial dictal, full modal, partial modal), and accordingly the syntaxeme and formal structure of the interrogative sentence, and the semantic, morphological and positional variants of the interrogative marker.

Prospects for further research lie in the study of the communicative and semantic-syntactic organization of improper-interrogative sentences (rhetorical questions, interrogations, imperative questions), which are significantly close to narrative or imperative sentences.
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