

DISCOURSE WITH AN ACTUALIZED PREPOSITIVE QUESTION COMPONENT

V.D. SHINKARUK, Doctor in Philology, Professor,
National University of life and environmental sciences of Ukraine

E-mail: vashyn2010@ukr.net

ORCID: 0000-0001-9081-2667

O.M. DUBOVYK, Senior Lecturer,
National University of life and environmental sciences of Ukraine

E-mail: elenandubovik@gmail.com

ORCID: 0000-0001-9379-3369

Abstract. *This article deals with coherent text questions; analyzing discursive sayings, which are classified as a text unit, in which there is a communicative implementation of the grammatical sentence. The basis for the allocation of a discursive utterance in a separate communicative unit is the coreference (communicative-functional equivalence) to a grammatical sentence. Discourse statements with the actualized prepositional interrogative component and their relation to the grammatical formal-elementary (simple) sentence are studied in detail.*

Keywords: *coherent speech syntax, discourse, text, discourse statement, correlation, simple sentence, questioning component*

Introduction. For a long time a sentence has been considered the most important unit of a language and speech. However, this approach did not provide any theoretical study of the process of speech communication, nor the implementation of practical tasks to improve the culture of speech. In recent decades, the attention of linguists is increasingly drawn by coherent speech, the mechanism of the emergence of syntactic units both in the field of a language and in the field of live communication, as well as the nature of the interaction and dynamics of both fields.

Many linguists try to explain syntactical units in terms of sign language theory. This attempt is interesting and promising, but it requires further refinements. In particular, the relationship between the sentence and the statement should be more clearly defined. The question of the nature of the sentence belongs to one of the most controversial syntax problems. Therefore, the sentence, occupying a central place in the syntactic system, has so far not been widely accepted interpretation.

The treatment of discourse as one of the variants of the communicative implementation of the grammatical sentence made it possible to elucidate a number of syntax problems in a new way.

Analysis of recent researches and publications. An in-depth analysis of the formal-grammatical and semantic nature of syntactic units studied in Ukrainian linguistics V.M. Rusanovsky, I.R. Vychovets, K.G. Gorodenska, N.V. Guywanyuk, S.Ya. Yermolenko, V.D. Shynkaruk and others. taking into account the functional and communicative characteristics of linguistic means, as well as the referential and denotative conception of the semantics of the sentence, is presented in the writings of T.P. Lomtyev, V.G. Gak, O.V. Paduchevoy, N.D. Arutyunova, V.I. Kononenko and others, have put on time the need to reflect in a new way the problem of text combinations of sentences - discourse statements.

I.P. Vykhovanets correctly states that "the description of language samples of syntactic units in their systemic relationships is a primary task of syntax. Comprehensive justification of the functional features of syntactic units in a linguistic plane testifies maturity of syntactic theory and its orientation to the explanation of the most complex syntactic phenomena. The high level of abstraction of the linguistic sphere does not ignore the indicators of the spheres of speech, but, on the contrary, allows for a deep explanation of all speech modifications of syntactic units "(underline ours - V.Sh.) [4, p. 20]. A known position on the duality of the definition of language units of the level of the sentence is revealed, on the one hand, in the correlation of such units with a certain situation, and on the other - in their interpretation within the limits of specific discourse [6, p. 13-21].

The purpose of the article is to research and highlight the features of discursive statements of the actualized segmented preposition of the questioning component and their correlation of a grammatical formal elementary (simple) sentence.

Results. O. S. Melnichuk believes that the sentence should be studied in a special linguistic science that is only created. For this science, he gives an interpretation of the sentence, defining it as "the main sign unit of speech, which is formed from lower-order verbal signs - lexical, phraseological and syntactic - and is noted by internal integrity and external autonomy, speaking out of context in the role of the finished segment of speech and being allocated to context at a single level of division "[12, p. 14]. Traditionally, the sentence is understood as a syntactic construction "from point to point" [11, p. 36]. Expressions are defined against the background of the sentence. "The statement is a unit of speech communication, depending on the various theoretical approaches, the difference in the expression from the sentence scientists see in the volume of these units, in the formally syntactic, semantic-syntactic and functional plans" [3, p. 154]. Communicative features of the sentence are manifested in the speech situation, in the text. "The sentence, which is considered from its communicative side, is called the statement" [9, p. 30]. The communicative organization of the sentence is associated with its actual categorization. This actual, communicative aspect relates to the topic-strain relations in the statement. Consequently, for the transformation of the sentence (abstract linguistic unit, sentence scheme) into a statement (the linguistic unit) becomes a large weight semantic division, essential for a certain situation, for the corresponding communicative task.

Due to the distinction between aspects of syntax, linguists mostly do not focus on the specifics of the expression, but interpret it as a communicative aspect of the sentence structure itself. Therefore, there is no apparent tendency to oppose the sentence to the statement. Linguistic text is now primarily interested in linguistic features of the connection of two or more sentences (statements) among themselves [10, p. 19]. The text is often defined as a set of sentences, the product of the integration of sentences [13, p. 321]. It is emphasized on the need to describe the text in connection with the typology of sentences - a unit of the previous level [7, p. 113]. It is noted that the sentence, being a dialectical-dual unit, is the highest unit of the structure of the language and the lower (initial) unit of the structure of speech, hence the text [5, p. 24].

In the language of artistic works and journalism, syntactic constructions are very common, which are dissected into two or more parts of the sentence. These parts are formalized in the text as separate sentences, that is, "from point to point," meaningful and grammatically closely linked with each other, and can easily be combined into one communicative unit - a simple or complex sentence.

Introduction to the scientific circle of the concept of discursive speech solves this problem. A discursive statement is a holistic communicative unit of coherent speech (text), which is a combination of several sentences or their parts and has clearly defined parameters [14, p. 3].

Discourse statements in coherent speech are syntactic units of higher order than formal-elementary (simple) sentences. These are segmented expressions with updated

components punctuated from the rest of the basic part of the statement. Their actualization is carried out by means of intonation and punctuation mark on the letter, that is, in other words, by means of parsing and connecting communication. VA Beloshapkova regards parclusion primarily as a "functionally significant deviation from the typical relationship between constructive and communicative organization of the sentence" [2, p. 162]. At the heart of parsing as a syntactic process in general is the objective ability of the language "with the help of the division of the text to implement the communicative task" [8, p. 111]. However, the syntactic category of parsing is, first of all, in the allocation of a certain segment of a holistic statement into a separate relatively independent part, which, however, does not break the syntactic and structural connection with the base part of the statement. Consequently, parceling is directly related to the structure of the text, with the so-called arranging of "meanings" or the modification of the functional perspective of expression.

Updating of the connecting connection is observed also within the structure of the grammatical sentences, in particular, when it is necessary to open the thought, clarify, explain, express your attitude to the above, give an estimate, etc. In discursive statements, the connecting link is used primarily in the parsing of the final components, which contain an addition to the main message after its expression. Under this condition, the informative significance of the connecting components is intensified.

Due to the attachment as a special type of actualized semantic-syntactic connection, as well as through the correlation of segmented expressions with grammatical sentences, a discursive statement can be considered a separate syntactic unit. A discursive statement with a parsed actualization component is a complex semantic, structural and intonational unity with an actualization pause for the allocation of components that are especially important in the information plan, a coherent one with an integral unit - a simple sentence - a statement.

The main means of expressing the actual division of the expression, as well as the actualization of individual components, is, as is known, the order of words and intonation.

Partial components of a simple sentence are mostly combined with unbound communication. For example: [Wind] Started the rally. Immediately with a light dance ... (O. Kobyljanska) // [Wind] Started the gulmu with a light dance at once ...; Cruiser? Where did he go from? (O. Gonchar) // Where did the cruiser take? But then there should be cleanliness! In all. (O. Gonchar) // But here still should be cleanliness in all !; I'll send you radiographs. Often. (O. Gonchar) // I will send you often radiograms.

The general essence of the discursive statement is that it is divided into two (or sometimes more) interrelated and at the same time structurally and functionally delimited parts for the purpose of expressive, mainly expressive their sounding. The first component of the discursive statement is the theme. This is the starting point of the statement, What is given at the initial stage of the wording of the expanded idea and requires specificity in the reed. For example, in a discursive statement from two components: There Vasily. Sitting in the woods under the old oak (O. Kobyljanska) there are two segments: There, Basil - the theme (in the center - the subject); Sitting in the woods under the old oak tree - the dragon (in the center - a predicate).

I. R Vakhovets analyzes the theme and problem in Ukrainian linguistics: "The theme is the initial part of the statement, the basis of the statement, given, known, due to the previous context. Remus - the main content of the message, the communicative center of expression, its core, new, that is, those that report the topic (the initial) part of the statement [3, p. 148].

A discursive statement, correlative with a simple grammatical sentence, may have a prepositive or postpositive segmented, updated component.

The actual division corresponds to a communicative task, that is, focused on the actual (important at the moment) information which is the essence of the corresponding communication and for the communication of which (information) this communication should take place. Consequently, the actual division applies only to speech and reflects the nature

of speech acts, which in speech are marked by the intonation of completion, and in the written speech - a point, a question mark, or a sign of exclamation.

A kind of discursive expression is also the expression with the initial parsed component of questioning constructions. These statements contain a question that motivates the interlocutor to answer; their communicative task is not the transmission of information, but the motivation to obtain the necessary information.

The main component, as well as the distributing members of the sentence, can be a substantial component. Example:

a) Substitutes: Son? How could he find her? (I. Chendei) // How could a son find her ?; Hairy fur cap? // In that smooth lady on the head? (O. Pchilka) // In that smooth lady he's on the head?

b) the sentences: was silent? How could he? (R. Ivanychuk) // How could he be silent ?; Will you wait? Why do you (B. Kharchuk) // Why will you wait?

c) proverbial propagators of the object type: Children? Picked up with you? (A. Golovko) // Having taken children with me ?; Cow Selling Vasilina? (L. Martovich) // Selling the cow to Vasilini ?; Dignity? What horde did we trample on? (3 presses) // What horde damped us?

d) Circumstances of the spread of time: [Chaban was alert]. See you tomorrow ? Why tomorrow (O. Gonchar) // [Chaban is alert] By tomorrow, why till tomorrow? Well, now? Why are you losing people? (M. Kotsyubinsky) // Well, now why are you losing people?

e) Circumstances of distributor of places: To the tomb? What is the tomb (M. Kotsyubinsky) // To what tomb?

e) Proverb propagators of the predictive type: Fatherland? [Order] Could not forget it? (From the press) // Could not he forget the parental order?

Not every question-sentence can be part of a discursive statement, for example: Already? So close? (M. Kotsyubinsky). As we see, the question-word sentence can not be part of a discursive statement, since it is not co-referential with a grammatical informative sentence.

For the division of the expression on the subject and the rime, such stability is not characteristic as for the allocation of morphologised members of the sentence. The actual division often allows for variations. A clear distinction is made between the topic and the rheum in question-answer dialogues. According to the type of question and the expected answer, the statements are divided into general and partial economics. General subjects are oriented either to the affirmative, or to the negative answer or to other modifications of these responses. Partly the same statements are aimed at obtaining some new partial information. In general statements, nutrition is expressed by particle or intonation, and in partial - the questioning of pronoun words, example : Well, now? Why are you losing people? (M. Kotsyubinsky) // Why do you lose people now? As you can see, the actualized circumstantial distributor of time, standing in the preposition, is amplified by a cry.

Actualized prepositive questioning components in discursive statements may have different degrees of emotional coloration. Some statements are pronounced with the usual questioning intonation, others are reinforced. Punitive discourse pronouncements pronounced with ordinary intonation are emotionally neutral. Emotionally stained, questioning statements that are pronounced with an intensified, intense intonation are emotionally colored.

A special kind in the language of artistic works are discourse statements, which at the beginning are formalized by questioning particles, pronouns or adverbs:

a) the questionable particles, except (with a tint of uncertainty), really (with a tint of surprise), etc., eg: Is it an offensive? Tomorrow? (O. Gonchar) // Is it tomorrow's offensive? Has he died? Opanas? (L. Martovich) // Has Happened Opanas ?;

b) who are the informal pronouns? what? which? whose? which? how many ?, for example: who is there? Sit sad over water (V. Stafanik) // Who is sitting there sad over water?;

c) helpful adverbs where? When? where? where?, eg: Where are you going? With collages (Jl. Martovich) // Where do you go with the collages?; When will they come? At Javan's Wedding (Jl.Martovich) // When will they come to Yvan's wedding?

A discursive statement forms a questioning tone, quite varied in its sound. An increase in the tone falls on the updated component, which contains the content of the question. If such a word stands at the beginning of a discursive statement, then the voice gradually decreases, although it never reaches a recession equal to a grammatical narrative sentence.

A separate kind of discursive statements with an actualized segmented presentation of a questioning component is the expression of a recipe inherent in oral speech; they begin with a repetitive, informative pronoun or adverb: someone, something, something like, when, etc., for example: Where to go? Tomorrow at midnight (L. Martovich) // Where to go tomorrow at midnight? How did you die? Heifer chip? (Jl Martovich) // How is the heifer chevron dying?; Where lives? Widow of Stepan Kiitsuka? (L. Martovich) // Where is the widow of Stepan Kischuk living?

The communicative task of discursive expressions with a segmented input component is not the transfer of information, as in narrative statements, but the motivation to obtain the necessary information.

Conclusions and research prospects.

The existence of discursive statements testifies to the high level of development of the syntax of the Ukrainian language. This is due to the fact that the sphere of syntax specifically includes those linguistic units that are directly intended to communicate with people and directly correlate the reported to the real reality.

In order to update the questioning component in discursive statements, the following means are used: questioning intonation, which manifests itself in raising the tone on the word related to the question; the order of words, which mostly consists in moving the word related to the beginning of the statement; question particles are, if not, etc .; questioning pronouns who, what, who, who, how, where, from, from, how, when, how, why, why and under.

An analysis of discursive statements makes it possible to gain a deeper understanding of the originality of the system organization of syntactic units, to find out the features of grammatical semantics, potential functional and stylistic possibilities, and in terms of the national specificity of the Ukrainian syntax.

Список використаних джерел

1. Андерш, Й.Ф. Типологія простих дієслівних речень у чеській мові в зіставленні з українською [Текст] / Й.Ф. Андерш.– К.: Наук. думка, 1987.– 191 с.
2. Безпояско О.К. Граматика української мови: Морфологія [Текст] / О.К. Безпояско, К.Г. Русанівський, В.М. Русанівський. – К.: Либідь, 1993.– 335 с.
3. Вихованець І. Р. Граматика української мови: Синтаксис [Текст]/І.Р. Вихованець. – К.: Либідь, 1993. – 354 с.
4. Вихованець, І. Р. Нариси з функціонального синтаксису української мови [Текст]/ І.Р. Вихованець. – К.: Наук, думка, 1992. – 222 с.
5. Волкова, С. С. О синтаксической сущности понятий “единица текста” и “текстуальная связь”[Текст]/ С.С. Волкова // Структурная и математическая лингвистика. – К., 1980. - Вып. 8. – С. 24.
6. Звєгинцев, В. А. О цельнооформленности единиц текста [Текст]/ В.А. Звєгинцев // Изв. АН СССР. Сер. лит. и яз. – М., 1980, – Т. 39. – Вып. 1. – С. 13-21.
7. Золотова Г. А. Роль ремы в организации и типологии текста [Текст]/ Г.А. Золотова // Синтаксис текста. – М., 1979. – С. 113-120.
8. Кадомцева, Л. О. Українська мова: Синтаксис простого речення [Текст] / Л.О. Кадомцева. – К.: Вища школа, 1985. – 227 с.
9. Ковтунова, И. И. Современный русский язык: Порядок слов и актуальное

- членение предложения [Текст]/ И.И. Ковтунова. – М.: Просвещение, 1976. – С. 30-56.
10. Леонтьев, А. А. Высказывание как предмет лингвистики, психолингвистики и теории коммуникации [Текст] / А.А. Леонтьев // Синтаксис текста. – М., 1979. – С. 321.
11. Реферовская, Б. А. Коммуникативная структура текста в лексико-грамматическом аспекте [Текст]/ Б.А. Реферовская. – Л.: Наука, 1989. – С. 12-36.
12. Сучасна українська літературна мова: Синтаксис [Текст]/ За ред. І. К. Білодіда. – К.: Наук, думка, 1972. – 515 с.
13. Фивегер, Д. Лингвистика текста в исследованиях ученых ГДР[Текст] / Д. Фивегер // Синтаксис текста. – М., 1979. – С. 321.
14. Шинкарук, В.Д. Нарис із синтаксису зв'язного мовлення (теоретичний спецкурс для університетів) [Текст]/ В.Д.Шинкарук. – Чернівці: "Рідна мова", 1997. – 152 с.
15. Шинкарук, В.Д. Дискурсивні висловлення в сучасній українській мові / В.Д.Шинкарук [Текст]// "Мовознавство". – К., 1996. – №6. – С.56-61.
16. Шинкарук, В.Д. Комунікативно-функціональна співвіднесеність синтаксичних одиниць у тексті [Текст]/ В.Д.Шинкарук // Науковий вісник Чернівецького університету. – Вип. 13. Слов'янська філологія. – Чернівці: ЧДУ, 1997. –С.144-152.
17. Шинкарук, В. Д. Особливості дискурсивних висловлень з недиференційованим однобічним відношенням частин [Текст]/ В.Д.Шинкарук // Наукові записки Вінницького державного педагогічного університету імені Михайла Коцюбинського. Серія: Філологія (мовознавство): збірник наукових праць. – Вінниця: ТОВ «фірма «Планер», 2017.– Вип. 24. – С.203-212.

References

- 1.Andersh, Y.F.(1987) Typologhii prostykh diieslivnykh rechen u cheskiei movi v zistavleni z ukrainskoiu [The typology of simple verb sentences in the Czech language in comparison with the Ukrainian language],Kyiv: Naukova. dumka, p.191 .
2. Bezpoiasko, O.K.,(1993) Rusanivskyi, K.H, Rusanivskyi, V.M. Hramatyka ukrainskoi movy: Morfolohiia [Grammar of the Ukrainian language: Morphology] /.Kyiv.: Lybid, p. 1993.
3. Vykhoanets, I. R. (1993) Hramatyka ukrainskoi movy: Syntaksys [Grammar of Ukrainian]. Kyiv. Lybid, 354.
4. Vykhoanets, I. R. (1992) Narysy z funktsionalnoho syntaksysu ukrainskoi movy [Essays on the Functional Syntax of the Ukrainian Language] Kyiv: Nauk, dumka, 222.
5. Volkova, S. S. (1980) O sintaksicheskoy suschnosti ponyatiy "edynitsa teksta" i "tekstualnaya svyaz" Strukturnaya i matematicheskaya lingvistika [On the syntactic essence of the notions "unit of text" and "textual connection".Structural and mathematical linguistics].Kyiv, Issue. 8, 24.
6. Zvegintsev, V. A. (1980) O tselnooformlennosti edynits teksta. Izv. AN SSSR. Ser. lit. i yaz.[On the whole-unit text units], "Izv. AN SSSR. Ser. lit. and яз. Moscow, T. 39. - Issue. 1, 13-21.
7. Zolotova, G. A. (1979) Rol remyi v organizatsii i tipologii teksta. Sintaksis teksta. [The role of the rema in the organization and typology of the text. Syntax of the text]. Moscow, 113-120.
8. Kadomtseva, L. O. (1985) Ukrainska mova: Syntaksys prostoho rechennia[The Ukrainian language: Syntax of a simple sentence].Kyiv.: Vyshcha shkola, 227
9. Kovtunova, I. I. (1976) Sovremennyiy russkiy yazyik: Poryadok slov i aktualnoe chlenenie predlozheniya [Modern Russian Language: The Order of Words and Actual Division of the sentence]. Moscow: Prosveschenie, 30-56.
10. Leontev, A. A. (1979) Vyiskazyivanie kak predmet lingvistiki, psiholingvistiki i teorii kommunikatsii.Sintaksis teksta[Speech as a subject of linguistics, psycholinguistics and communication theory]. Moscow, 321.

11. Referovskaya, B. A. (1989) Kommunikativnaya struktura teksta v leksiko-grammaticheskom aspekte [Communicative text structure in the lexical-grammatical aspect]. Leningrad: Nauka, 12-36.

12. Suchasna ukrainska literaturna mova: Syntaksys / Za red. I. K. Bilodida. (1972) Kyiv: Nauk, dumka, 515.

13. Fiveger, D. (1979) Lingvistika teksta v issledovaniyah uchenih GDR .Sintaksis teksta [Linguistics of the text in the studies of the students of the GDR. Syntax of the text]. Moscow, 321.

14. Shynkaruk, V.D. (1997) Narys iz syntaksysu zviaznoho movlennia (teoretychnyi spetskurs dlia universytetiv) [Essay on coherent speech syntax (theoretical special course for universities)]. Chernivtsi: "Ridna mova", 152.

15. Shynkaruk, V.D. (1996) Dyskursyvni vyslovlennia v suchasni ukrainskii movi. "Movoznavstvo" [Discursive Expressions in Modern Ukrainian Language]. Kyiv, №6, 56-61.

16. Shynkaruk, V.D. (1997) Komunikatyvno-funktsionalna spivvidnesenist syntaksychnykh odynyt u teksti [Communicative-functional correlation of syntactic units in the text]. Naukovyi visnyk Chernivetskoho universytetu. – Vyp. 13. Slovianska filolohiia. Chernivtsi: ChDU, 144-152.

17. Shynkaruk, V. D. (2017) Osoblyvosti dyskursyvnykh vysloven z nedyferentsiiovanyim odnobichnym vidnoshenniam chastyn [Features of discursive statements with undifferentiated one-sided ratio of parts] Naukovi zapysky Vinnytskoho derzhavnoho pedahohichnoho universytetu imeni Mykhaila Kotsiubynskoho. Serii: Filolohiia (movoznavstvo): zbirnyk naukovykh prats. Vinnytsia: TOV «firma «Planer», 2017.– Issue, 24, 203-212.

ДИСКУРСИВНІ ВИСЛОВЛЕННЯ З АКТУАЛІЗОВАНИМ ПРЕПОЗИТИВНИМ ПИТАЛЬНИМ КОМПОНЕНТОМ В.Д. Шинкарук, О. М. Дубовик

Анотація. У статті розглядаються питання синтаксису зв'язного мовлення; аналізуються дискурсивні висловлення, що кваліфікуються як одиниця тексту, в якій відбувається комунікативна реалізація граматичного речення. В основу виділення дискурсивного висловлення в окрему комунікативну одиницю покладено кореферентність (комунікативно-функціональну еквівалентність) з граматичним реченням. Детально досліджуються дискурсивні висловлення з актуалізованим препозитивним питальним компонентом і співвіднесеність їх з граматичним формально-елементарним (простим) реченням.

Ключові слова: синтаксис зв'язного мовлення, дискурс, текст, дискурсивне висловлення, кореферентність, просте речення, питальний компонент

ДИСКУРСИВНЫЕ ВЫСКАЗЫВАНИЯ С АКТУАЛИЗИРОВАННЫМ ПРЕПОЗИТИВНЫМ ВОПРОСИТЕЛЬНЫМ КОМПОНЕНТОМ В.Д. Шинкарук, Е.Н.Дубовик

Аннотация. В статье рассматриваются вопросы синтаксиса связного текста; анализируются дискурсивные высказывания, которые квалифицируются как единица текста, в которой происходит коммуникативная реализация грамматического предложения. В основу выделения дискурсивного высказывания в отдельную коммуникативную единицу положена кореферентность (коммуникативно-функциональная эквивалентность) с грамматическим предложением. Детально исследуются дискурсивные высказывания с актуализированным препозитивным вопросительным компонентом и соотношение их с грамматическим формально-элементарным (простым) предложением.

Ключевые слова: синтаксис связного вещания, дискурс, текст, дискурсивное высказывание, кореферентность, простое предложение, вопросительный компонент